MEIN KAMPF

ADOLF HITLER

VOLUME ONE

A NEW ENGLISH TRANSLATION BY

THOMAS DALTON

MEIN KAMPF

ADOLF HITLER

VOLUME ONE

MEIN KAMPF

ADOLF HITLER

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN

BY

THOMAS DALTON

VOLUME ONE

NEW YORK, LONDON
CLEMENS & BLAIR, LLC
2018

CLEMENS & BLAIR, LLC

Introduction and English translation copyright © 2018 by Thomas Dalton, PhD

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise.

Clemens & Blair, LLC, is a non-profit educational publisher.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Hitler, Adolf (1889-1945)
Mein Kampf (vol. 1)

p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 978-197-4502967 (pbk.: alk. paper)

Printing number: 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper.

DEDICATION

At 12:30 pm, on 9 November 1923, the following men fell in front of the Feldherrnhalle and in the courtyard of the former War Ministry in Munich, with loyal faith in the resurrection of their people:

Alfarth, Felix; *merchant*; b. 5 July 1901
Bauriedl, Andreas; *hatter*; b. 4 May 1879
Casella, Theodor; *bank clerk*; b. 8 August 1900
Ehrlich, Wilhelm; *bank clerk*; b. 19 August 1894
Faust, Martin; *bank clerk*; b. 27 January 1901
Hechenberger, Anton; *locksmith*; b. 28 September 1902
Körner, Oskar; *businessman*; b. 4 January 1875
Kuhn, Karl; *headwaiter*; b. 26 July 1897
Laforce, Karl; *engineering student*; b. 28 October 1904
Neubauer, Kurt; *valet*; b. 27 March 1899
Pape, Claus von; *businessman*; b. 16 August 1904
Pfordten, Theodor von der; *court councilor*; b. 14 May 1873
Rickmers, Johann; *retired captain*; b. 7 May 1881
Scheubner-Richter, Max Erwin von; *doctor of engineering*; b. 9 January 1884
Stransky, Lorenz von; *engineer*; b. 14 March 1889
Wolf, Wilhelm; *businessman*; b. 19 October 1898

The so-called national authorities refused these dead heroes a common grave.

Therefore, for the common memory, I dedicate to them the first volume of this work. As martyrs to the cause, may they shine forever, as a permanent inspiration to the followers of our movement.

Adolf Hitler
Landsberg am Lech
16 October 1924

CONTENTS

Introduction by Thomas Dalton 13

VOLUME ONE: A RECKONING

1. IN MY PARENTS' HOUSE

1.1 The Young Ringleader 45
1.2 'Choice' of Profession 46
1.3 Never a Civil Servant... 47
1.4 ...But Rather an Artist 48
1.5 The Young Nationalist 49
1.6 The German *Ostmark* 49
1.7 The Struggle for Germanism 50
1.8 Lessons from History 51
1.9 Devotion to Wagner 55
1.10 The Death of my Parents 56

2. YEARS OF STUDY AND SUFFERING IN VIENNA

2.1 Skill as an Architect 58
2.2 Formation of a Worldview 59
2.3 Removal of Petty-Bourgeois Blinders 60
2.4 Vienna's Social Conflicts 61
2.5 The Laborer 62
2.6 Fate of the Worker 63
2.7 The Path to Improvement 66
2.8 Lack of 'National Pride' 67
2.9 The Ordeal of the Worker's Child 68
2.10 Young Despiser of Authority 69
2.11 Architect and Watercolor Painter 70
2.12 The Art of Reading 71
2.13 Social Democracy 73
2.14 The Social-Democratic Press 76
2.15 Social-Democratic Tactics 78
2.16 Sins of the Bourgeoisie 80
2.17 The Trade Union Question 80
2.18 Politicization of the Trade Unions 82
2.19 The Key to Social Democracy 84
2.20 The Jewish Question 85

2.21 The So-Called World Press 86
2.22 Criticism of Kaiser Wilhelm II 87
2.23 Transformation into an Anti-Semite 88
2.24 The Jew as Leader of Social Democracy 93
2.25 Jewish Dialectics 95
2.26 Study of the Foundations of Marxism 96
2.27 Marxism as Destroyer of Culture 97

3. GENERAL POLITICAL REFLECTIONS FROM MY TIME IN VIENNA

3.1 The Politician 100
3.2 Vienna's Last Revival 101
3.3 Germandom in Austria 102
3.4 Centrifugal Forces of the Austrian People 103
3.5 Consequences of Ethnic Diversity 104
3.6 Joseph II 105
3.7 The Dissolution of the Habsburg Monarchy 106
3.8 Parliamentarianism 107
3.9 Lack of Responsibility 111
3.10 The Destruction of the Idea of Leadership 112
3.11 The Exclusion of the Individual Leader 113
3.12 'Public Opinion' 115
3.13 The Majority Principle 117
3.14 The Destruction of Character 120
3.15 Jewish Democracy 121
3.16 The Collapsing Dual Monarchy 122
3.17 Rebellion of the German-Austrians 124
3.18 Human Rights override States' Rights 125
3.19 Schönerer and Lueger 127
3.20 The Causes of Schönerer's Failure 130
3.21 Pan-Germans and Parliament 131
3.22 The Importance of the Spoken Word 134
3.23 Effect on the Mass 135
3.24 The 'Away-from-Rome' Movement 136
3.25 Concentration on a Single Enemy 144
3.26 The Way of Christian Socialism 145
3.27 Anti-Semitism on a Religious Basis 146
3.28 Pan-Germanism and Christian Socialism 147
3.29 Growing Aversion to the Habsburg State 149
3.30 The School of My Life 150

4. MUNICH

4.1	Germany's Defective Alliance Policy	154
4.2	The Four Paths of German Policy	157
4.3	Acquisition of New Land	162
4.4	With England, Against Russia	164
4.5	Solution to the Austrian Alliance	165
4.6	Economic Expansion Policy	166
4.7	With Russia, Against England	167
4.8	German Caricature of the Englishman	168
4.9	Inner Weakness of the Triple Alliance	169
4.10	Ludendorff's 1912 Memorandum	170
4.11	Austria as a Tempting Legacy	171
4.12	State and Economy	172
4.13	The Moment of Decay	176
4.14	Germany's Attitude toward Marxism	177

5. THE WORLD WAR

5.1	The Austrian Ultimatum	181
5.2	The German War for Freedom	183
5.3	Enlistment in a Bavarian Regiment	184
5.4	Baptism by Fire	185
5.5	From Young Volunteer to Old Soldier	186
5.6	Artificial Dampening of Enthusiasm	187
5.7	Misrecognizing Marxism	188
5.8	The Use of Naked Force	189
5.9	Attack of a Worldview	191
5.10	Bourgeois Class Parties	192

6. WAR PROPAGANDA

6.1	The Purpose of Propaganda	196
6.2	Propaganda Only for the Masses	197
6.3	The Psychology of Propaganda	199
6.4	Subjective—One-Sided—Necessary!	200
6.5	Restriction on Perseverance	202
6.6	Enemy War Propaganda	203

7. THE REVOLUTION

7.1	The First Enemy Leaflets	206
7.2	Wounded	207
7.3	Boasting of Cowardice	208

7.4 Slackers 209
7.5 Hatred of Prussia 210
7.6 The Army's New Hope 211
7.7 The Allies are Beaten Down 212
7.8 "Germany Facing Revolution!" 214
7.9 Last Wreaths of Immortal Laurel 215
7.10 Growing Moral Decay 216
7.11 Poisoned by Mustard Gas 217
7.12 'Republic' 219
7.13 All Sacrifice in Vain 220
7.14 Decision to Enter Politics 221

8. THE BEGINNING OF MY POLITICAL ACTIVITY
8.1 Discussion of the Formation of a New Party 224
8.2 Two Types of Capital 225
8.3 Theoretician and Politician 226
8.4 Marathon Runners of History 228
8.5 The Fight against International Finance Capital 228
8.6 The 'Educational Officer' 230

9. THE 'GERMAN WORKERS' PARTY'
9.1 The 'German Workers' Party' 232
9.2 The 'Committee Meeting' 234
9.3 A Final Decision 236

10. CAUSES OF THE COLLAPSE
10.1 The Sign of Collapse 240
10.2 The Causes of Collapse 241
10.3 Every Third German a Traitor 243
10.4 Moral Disarmament of a Dangerous Accuser 245
10.5 Toxins and Symptoms 246
10.6 The Rule of Money 247
10.7 Internationalization through Finance 248
10.8 Gravediggers of the Monarchy 249
10.9 'Fighters for the Monarchy' 251
10.10 Cowardice in the Face of Responsibility 252
10.11 Three Groups of Newspaper Readers 252
10.12 State and Press 254
10.13 Jewish Press Tactics 255
10.14 The 'Respectable' Press 255
10.15 Syphilis 257

10.16 The Sin against Blood and Race 259
10.17 The Task of Combating Syphilis 261
10.18 Sound Mind only in Sound Body 262
10.19 The Fight against Spiritual Poisoning 263
10.20 The 'Protection Clause' 265
10.21 The Bolshevization of Art 266
10.22 Vilification of a Great Past 268
10.23 Spiritual Preparation for Bolshevism 270
10.24 Modern Masses of Humanity 271
10.25 Religious Conditions 274
10.26 Political Misuse of Religion 275
10.27 Aimlessness of German Policy 275
10.28 Parliamentary Half-Measures 277
10.29 Parliamentary Crimes against the Army 278
10.30 Failed Navy Policy 279
10.31 German Advantages 282
10.32 The Army—An Irreplaceable School 284
10.33 The Incomparable Civil Service 286
10.34 State Authority 287

11. NATION AND RACE

11.1 The Result of Racial Mixing 291
11.2 Man and Idea 291
11.3 Race and Culture 293
11.4 The Aryan as Founder of Culture 294
11.5 Effects of Blood-Mixing 298
11.6 Service to the Community 299
11.7 Purest Idealism, Deepest Knowledge 301
11.8 Aryan and Jew 302
11.9 Consequence of Jewish Egoism 304
11.10 Sham Culture of the Jews 304
11.11 The Jew, a Parasite 305
11.12 Jewish 'Religious Community' 307
11.13 Jewish Religious Doctrine 308
11.14 The 'Elders of Zion' 309
11.15 The Way of Jewry 310
11.16 Standing of the Factory Worker 318
11.17 Jewish Tactics 320
11.18 The Core of the Marxist Worldview 321
11.19 Organization of Marxist World-Doctrine 322
11.20 Palestine as Organizational Center 325

11.21 Dictatorship of the Proletariat 326
11.22 From National Jews to Racial Jews 327
11.23 Bastardized People 327
11.24 Failure to Recognize the Inner Enemy 328

12. THE FIRST PERIOD OF DEVELOPMENT OF THE NATIONAL SOCIALIST GERMAN WORKERS' PARTY

12.1 Situation after the Revolution 332
12.2 Recovery of Political Power 333
12.3 Winning Over the Broad Masses 334
12.4 Nationalization of the Masses 336
12.5 Highest Authority, Highest Responsibility 342
12.6 Neither Monarchist nor Republican 343
12.7 The Necessary Evil of Organization 344
12.8 Inner Structure of the Movement 347
12.9 Education for Struggle 348
12.10 Education for Respect of the Person 349
12.11 Danger of Obscurity 350
12.12 The First Meeting 351
12.13 Soldiers as the Basis of the Movement 352
12.14 Second Meeting 354
12.15 Inner Formation of the Movement 355
12.16 Tin Swords and Tanned Bearskins 356
12.17 Rejection of the Word 'Folkish' 357
12.18 'Intellectual Weapons,' 'Silent Workers' 358
12.19 First Great Mass Meeting 359
12.20 Pöhner and Frick 361
12.21 Drafting the Program 362
12.22 A Movement on the March 362

Appendix A: The 25 Points of the National Socialist Program 365

Bibliography 369

Index 371

MEIN KAMPF

MEIN KAMPF: AN INTRODUCTION

THOMAS DALTON

Mein Kampf is the autobiography and articulated worldview of one of the most consequential and visionary leaders in world history. It is also one of the most maligned and least understood texts of the 20th century. There have been so many obfuscations, deceptions, and outright falsehoods circulated about this work, that one scarcely knows where to begin. Nonetheless, the time has come to set the story straight.

That Adolf Hitler would even have undertaken such a work is most fortunate. Being neither a formal academic nor a natural writer, and being fully preoccupied with pragmatic matters of party-building, he may never have begun such a major task—were it not for the luxury of year-long jail term. In one of the many ironies of Hitler's life, it took just such an adverse event to prompt him to dictate his party's early history and his own life story. This would become volume one of his two-part, 700-page magnum opus. It would have a dramatic effect on world history, and initiate a chain of events that has yet to fully play out. In this sense, *Mein Kampf* is as relevant today as when it was first written.

Perhaps the place to begin is with the rationale for the book. Why did Hitler write it at all? Clearly it was not a requirement; many major politicians in history have come and gone without leaving a personal written record. Even his time in prison could have been spent communicating with party leaders, building support, soliciting allies, and so on. But he chose to spend much of his stay documenting the origins and growth of his new movement. And for this we can be grateful.

The work at hand seems to have served at least four purposes for its author. First, it is autobiographical. This aspect consumes most of the first two chapters, and is repeatedly woven into the remainder of volume one. For those curious about the first 35 years of Hitler's life, this aspect is invaluable. It gives an accurate and relevant account of his upbringing, his education, and the early development of his worldview. Like any autobiography, it provides an irreplaceable first-hand description of a life. But as well, it offers the usual temptation to cast events in a flattering light, to downplay shortcomings, or to bypass inconvenient episodes. On this count, Hitler fares well; he provides an honest and open life story, devoid of known fabrications, obvious errors, or significant omissions. This book is essential for understanding his thinking and attitude on social, economic, and political matters that are of central concern.

Second, *Mein Kampf* is a kind of history lesson of Europe around the turn of the 20th century. Hitler was a proximate observer—and often first-hand witness—to many of the major events of the time. He served in the trenches of World War One for more than four years, which was virtually the entire duration of the war. Serving on the 'losing' side, he naturally gives a different interpretation of events than is commonly portrayed by historians of the victorious nations. But this fact should be welcomed by any impartial observer, and in itself makes the book worth reading. With rare exception—such as Jünger's *Storm of Steel*—no other contemporary non-fiction German source of this time is readily available in English. For those interested in the Great War and its immediate aftermath, this book is irreplaceable.

In its third aspect, the book serves to document the origins and basic features of Hitler's worldview. This, unsurprisingly, is the most distorted part of the book, in standard Western accounts. Here we find the insights and trigger events that led a young man without formal higher education, to develop a strikingly visionary, expansive, and forward-looking ideology. Hitler's primary concern, as we read, was the future and well-being of the German people—*all* Germans, regardless of the political unit in which they lived. The German people, or *Volk*, were, he believed, a single ethnicity with unique and singular self-interests. They were—indisputably—responsible for many of the greatest achievements in Western history. They were among the leading lights in music, literature, architecture, science, and technology. They were great warriors, and great nation-builders. They were, in large part, the driving force behind Western civilization itself. All this is true and undeniable, and Hitler is justly proud of his heritage. Equally

is he outraged at the indignities suffered by this great people in then-recent decades—culminating in the disastrous humiliation of WWI and the Treaty of Versailles. He seeks, above all, to remedy these injustices and restore greatness to the German people. To do this, he needs to identify both their primary opponents and the defective political ideologies and structures that bind them. Then he undertakes to outline a new socio-political system that can carry them forward to a higher and rightful destiny. He accomplishes all this, and more.

Finally, in its fourth aspect, *Mein Kampf* is a kind of blueprint for action. It describes the evolution and aims of National Socialism and the NSDAP, or Nazi Party, in compelling detail. Hitler naturally wants his new movement to succeed in assuming power in Germany and in a future German Reich. But this is no theoretical analysis. Hitler is nothing if not pragmatic. He has concrete goals and precise means of achieving them. He has nothing but disdain for the *geistigen Waffen*, the intellectual weapons, of the impotent intelligentsia. He demands results, and success. By all accounts, he achieved both.

Importantly, his analysis is, in large part, independent of context. It does not pertain only to Germans, or only to the circumstances of the mid-1920s. It is a broadly universal approach based on the conditions of the modern world, and on human nature. As such, Hitler's analysis of action is relevant and useful for many people today—for all those who might strive for greatness in body and spirit.

This complex textual structure of *Mein Kampf* explains some of the complaints of modern-day critics who decry Hitler's lack of 'coherence' or 'narrative flow.' He has many objectives here, and in their implementation, many points overlap. Perhaps he should have written four books, not one. Perhaps. But Hitler was a doer, not a writer. We must accept this fact, take what we have, and do our best to understand it in an open and objective fashion. He was not striving for a best-selling novel. He wanted to document history and a movement, and to this end he succeeded most admirably.

ORIGINS AND CONTEXT

Given that the book is, in large part, autobiographical, there is clearly no need to detail Hitler's life here. Even so, a few basic facts are in order, to establish the context of the work. Born on 20 April 1889 in present-day

Austria, Hitler grew up as a citizen of the multi-ethnic state known as the Austro-Hungarian Empire. This diverse amalgamation was formed in 1867, with the union of the Austrian and Hungarian monarchies; thus does Hitler refer to the state as the "Double Monarchy." Throughout its 50-year history, it was always a loose conjunction of many ethnicities, and never a truly unified state. The ethnic Germans in it were a minority, and had to struggle to promote their own interests. This fact caused Hitler no end of distress; he explicitly felt more attachment to the broader German *Volk* than to the multi-ethnic state into which he was born.

As a youth, his interests tended toward the arts, painting, and history. This led to conflict with his obstinate father, who envisioned a safe, comfortable, bureaucratic career for his son. But his father's death on 3 January 1903, when Adolf was 13, allowed the young man to determine his own future. Two years later he moved to Vienna, scraping by with manual labor jobs to survive. In late 1907, his mother died. At the age of 18, he then applied to enter the Viennese arts academy in painting, but was diverted to architecture. He worked and studied for two more years, eventually becoming skilled enough to work fulltime as a draftsman and painter of watercolors.

All the while, he studied the mass of humanity around him. He read the various writings and publications of the political parties. He observed the workings of the press. He watched how unions functioned. He sat in on Parliament. He followed events in neighboring Germany. And he became intrigued by the comings and goings of one particular Viennese minority: the Jews.

Gradually he became convinced that the two dominant threats to German well-being were Marxism—a Jewish form of communism—and the international capitalist Jews. The problems were compounded by the fundamentally inept workings of a representative democracy that tried to serve diverse ethnicities. In the end, the fine and noble concept of democracy became nothing other than a "Jewish democracy," working for the best interests of Jews instead of Austrians or Germans.

Upon turning 23 in 1912, Hitler went to Munich. It was his first extended contact with German culture, and he found it invigorating. He lived there for two years, until the outbreak of WWI in July 1914. Thrilled at the opportunity to defend the German homeland, he enlisted, serving on the Western front in Belgium. After more than 2 years of service, he was lightly wounded in October 1916 and sent back to Germany, spending some time in a reserve battalion in Munich. Appalled at both the role of Jews there and the negative public attitude, he returned to the front in March 1917.

By this time, the war had been dragging on for some two and a half years. It had effectively become a stalemate. Even the looming entrance of the Americans into the war—President Wilson would call for war the next month, and US troops would soon follow—would have little near-term effect. As Hitler explains, however, the Germans actually had reasons for optimism by late 1917. The Central Powers (primarily Germany and Austria-Hungary) had inflicted a decisive defeat on Italy in the Battle of Caporetto, and the Russians had pulled out of the war after the Bolshevik revolution, thus freeing up German troops for the Western front. Hitler recalls that his compatriots "looked forward with confidence" to the spring of 1918, when they anticipated final victory.

NOVEMBER REVOLUTION, AND A NEW MOVEMENT

But things would turn out differently. German dissatisfaction with the prolonged war effort was being fanned by Jewish activists calling for mass demonstrations, strikes, and even revolution against the Kaiser. In late January 1918 there was a large munitions strike. Various workers' actions and riots followed for months afterward. The Western front held, but Germany was weakening internally.

In mid-October of 1918, the German front near Ypres, Belgium was hit with mustard gas. Hitler's eyes were badly affected, and he was sent to a military hospital in Pasewalk, north of Berlin. In late October, a minor naval revolt in Kiel began to spread to the wider population. Two major Jewish-led parties, the Social Democrats (SPD) and the Independent Social Democratic Party (USPD), agitated for the Kaiser to abdicate—which he did, on November 9. Jewish activists in Berlin and Munich then declared independent "soviet" states; for a detailed discussion of these events, see Dalton (2014). Germany formally capitulated on November 11. After the dust had settled, a new 'Weimar' government was formed, one that was notably sympathetic to Jewish interests.

Hearing about the revolution from his hospital bed, Hitler was devastated. All the effort and sacrifices made at the front had proven worthless. Jewish agitators in the homeland had succeeded in whipping up local dissatisfaction to the point that the Kaiser was driven from power. The revolutionaries then assumed power and immediately surrendered to the enemy. This was the infamous "stab in the back" that would haunt German nationalists for years to come. And it was the triggering event that caused Hitler to enter politics.

In September 1919, working for the government, he was assigned to follow and report on a little-known group called the *Deutsche Arbeiterpartei*, or German Workers' Party (DAP). He ended up joining the group, and quickly assumed a leadership role. By early 1920, Hitler's speeches were drawing hundreds or even thousands of people. On February 24, he announced that the party would henceforth be known as the National Socialist German Workers' Party, or NSDAP—'Nazi,' in the parlance of its detractors. It is with this "first great mass meeting" that Hitler closes volume one of his book.

The new movement grew rapidly. Hitler formalized his leadership in July 1921. A series of stormy and occasionally violent public events occurred in the following months. In November 1922, ideological compatriot Mussolini took power in Italy, which served to bolster both National Socialist efforts domestically and their international reputation. It was on November 21 that the *New York Times* printed its first major article on Hitler: "New Popular Idol Rises in Bavaria." Calling the Nazis "violently anti-Semitic" and "reactionary" but "well disciplined," the NYT viewed them as "potentially dangerous, though not for the immediate future." Indeed—it would not be for another 10 years that they would assume power in Germany.

Soon thereafter, other events would favor the National Socialists. France had occupied the Ruhr valley in January 1923, claiming a violation of Versailles; this was taken as a grave insult to German sovereignty. It was also at this time that the infamous German hyperinflation took hold, wiping out the savings of ordinary Germans and forcing them to haul around bushels of cash for even the smallest purchases. By the end of the year, Germany was in a full-blown financial crisis. This led Hitler and the NSDAP leadership to plan for a revolutionary take-over of Munich on 9 November 1923.

This attempted 'putsch,' or coup, would fail. In a brief shoot-out, 16 Nazis and four policemen were killed. Hitler and the other leaders were arrested within days, put on trial in February 1924, and sentenced to light prison terms. In all, Hitler spent some 13 months in confinement, obtaining release in December of that year. It was during this time that he dictated what would become volume one of his book.

Hitler reportedly wanted to call his new book, "Four and a Half Years of Struggle against Lies, Stupidity, and Cowardice." The publisher adroitly suggested a shorter title: "My Struggle," or *Mein Kampf*. It would initially be published in July of 1925.

Hitler then began a second, shorter volume to complete his program. This appeared in December of 1926. The next year, the two volumes were slightly revised and combined into one work. This 1927 'second edition' of *Mein Kampf*, published when Hitler was 38 years old, is the version used in the present translation.

CHAPTER SYNOPSES

It will be useful at this point to provide a very brief summary of the main themes of each of the 27 chapters in the book.

VOLUME ONE

Chapter 1: In My Parents' House. Hitler's early life. Relationship with parents. Early education. Interest in history and art. Budding nationalism. Covers birth in 1889 to mother's death in late 1907, when Hitler was 18 years old.

Chapter 2: Years of Study and Suffering in Vienna. Time alone in Vienna. Marxism and international Jewry as main threats. Assessment and critique of Viennese government. Life of the working class. Study of the Social Democratic party, and its Jewish influence. Role of unions. Burgeoning anti-Semitism. Study of the destructive role of Marxism.

Chapter 3: General Political Reflections from my Time in Vienna. Observations on Austrian politics and representative democracy. Failings of multi-ethnic states. Critique of Western democracy. Failings of 'majority rule.' Demise of the pan-German movement. Unfortunate conflict with the Catholic Church. Anti-Semitism and religion. Covers period up to age 23 (1912).

Chapter 4: Munich. Moves to Munich. Critique of German alliances. Four possible paths of German policy. Population growth, and the need for land. Need for alliance with England. Initial discussion of the role of Aryans. Marxism as mortal foe. Covers up to mid-1914.

Chapter 5: The World War. Outbreak of World War One. Hitler enlists, at age 25. "Baptism by fire."

Chapter 6: War Propaganda. Role and need for propaganda. Effective use by England; failure by Germany.

Chapter 7: The Revolution. Course of the Great War. Wounded in late 1916. Jews and negative attitudes rampant in Munich. Munitions strike in early 1918. Poisoned by mustard gas in October 1918, at age 29. November Revolution.

Chapter 8: The Beginning of my Political Activity. Postwar time in Munich. Need for a new party. Negative role of global capitalism.
Chapter 9: The 'German Workers' Party.' Encounters German Workers' Party (DAP). Early meetings. Joins DAP, as member #7, at age 30.
Chapter 10: Causes of the Collapse. Analysis of the collapse of the German Empire in 1918. Dominance of international capitalism. Effect of the press on the masses. Jewish control of press. Combating the syphilis epidemic. Cultural decay in modern art. Ineffective parliament. The army as a source of discipline.
Chapter 11: Nation and Race. Detailed racial theory. Nature strives to improve species. Racial mixing between 'higher' and 'lower' types yields physical, moral, and cultural decay. Aryans as true founders of civilization. Aryan tendency for self-sacrifice. Aryan versus Jew. Jews as parasites. Fake Jewish 'religion.' Extended examination of "the way of Jewry"—historical, sociological, political. Marxist worldview. Jewish subversion of democracy. Ill-effects of racial impurity.
Chapter 12: The First Period of Development of the NSDAP. Evolution of DAP. Extended discussion of the need to nationalize the masses. How to organize a party. Gaining publicity. Second major meeting in October 1919. Growing success. Rejection of 'intellectual' weapons. First truly mass meeting in February 1920. Transition to NSDAP.

VOLUME TWO
Chapter 1: Worldview and Party. Corruption of democracy. Concept of 'folkish.' Transforming ideals into practice. Marxism pushes race equality. State must serve racial function: to promote the best.
Chapter 2: The State. Three conventional concepts of state. State as means to end: advancing human race. Must maintain racial integrity. Strong minorities end up ruling. Racial mixing leads to decay. State must promote healthy children. Basic eugenic theory. Folkish education, for physical, mental, and moral strength. Promote willpower, determination, responsibility. Meritocracy.
Chapter 3: Subjects and Citizens. Citizenship based on race. Three classes: citizen, subject, foreigner.
Chapter 4: Personality and the Folkish Concept of the State. Aristocratic principle. Value of the individual. Marxism promotes mass thinking. Government rule by the best individuals, not majority.
Chapter 5: Worldview and Organization. Need for an uncompromising worldview. Need for decisive leadership. 25-point NSDAP program is unshakable. Only NSDAP is truly folkish.

Chapter 6: Early Struggle—Significance of Speech. NSDAP must dominate mass opinion. Must fight against common views. Brest-Litovsk and Versailles. Importance of spoken word. Marxism flourished with speeches. Need for mass meetings.

Chapter 7: Wrestling with the Red Front. Resumes autobiography, from early 1920. Lame bourgeois mass meetings. Need for publicity. Control of mass meetings. Violent protests. Party flag and symbol: swastika. First use in summer 1920. Party strength by early 1921. Mass meeting 3 Feb at Circus Krone. Attempted disruption.

Chapter 8: The Strong One is Most Powerful Alone. Right of priority. Many folkish movements. Futility of compromise and coalition.

Chapter 9: Basic Ideas on the Meaning and Organization of the SA. Three pillars of authority. In warfare, survival of the inferior. Deserters and Jewish revolutionaries in November 1918. Bourgeois capitulation. Need for a great ideal. Creation of the SA (storm troops). NSDAP is neither secret nor illegal. SA as trained fighters. March to Coburg in Oct 1922. French occupation of the Ruhr.

Chapter 10: Federalism as a Mask. War industries in World War I. Bavaria versus Prussia as diversion. Kurt Eisner, Jewish revolutionary. Growth of anti-Semitism from 1918. Catholic versus Protestant as diversion. Federation versus unification. Opposition to Jewish Weimar.

Chapter 11: Propaganda and Organization. Role of propaganda. Supporters and members. Need for restricted growth. Leadership principle versus majority rule. Acquisition of *Völkischer Beobachter*. Building the party. Dissolution on 9 Nov 1923.

Chapter 12: The Trade Union Question. Question of trade unions. Necessity of unions. NSDAP must form a union. Union in service to the people. Priority of worldview.

Chapter 13: Postwar German Alliance Policy. Foreign policy as means for promoting national interest. Unification of German people. England against Germany. France against England. Need for alliance with England and Italy. Jews seek world conquest, racial contamination. Question of South Tyrol. Jews oppose German-Italian alliance. Only fascist Italy is opposing Jews. Jews gain power in America.

Chapter 14: Eastern Orientation or Eastern Policy. Russia policy is foremost. Top priority: need for land, living space. Victory goes to the strong. No colonies, but only an expanded Reich. Look to the East. Russia is ruled by Jews, cannot be an ally. Only possible alliances: England and Italy.

Chapter 15: The Right to Self-Defense. German submission. Locarno

Treaty as further submission. France seeks to dismember Germany. War with France is inevitable. France occupies Ruhr, opposes England. Must confront and destroy Marxism. Failure of Cuno's passive resistance.

Even this concise summary demonstrates the controversial nature of the text.

PREVIOUS ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS

For the first several years of its existence, there was no real need for English publishers to produce a translation of *Mein Kampf*. The National Socialist movement was small, limited more or less to Bavaria. It had little prospect for growth or real power. There was simply not much interest in an obscure Bavarian politician.

All this changed when the Nazis rose to national prominence in the 1930s. Suddenly there was a need to understand this man Hitler. A British translator, Edgar Dugdale, undertook the initial effort to produce an English version in 1931. It seems that he may have had ulterior motives; his wife, it turns out, was a noted Zionist who was active with major British Jewish groups at the time (see Barnes 1980: 4). The book ended up as a highly abridged edition, covering only some 40 percent of the full text. It was eventually published in England by Hurst & Blackett, and in the US by Houghton-Mifflin, in late 1933.

In 1936, the German government decided that they would sponsor their own, complete English translation. They hired a British writer and journalist, James Murphy. There not yet having been a second world war, and the worst excesses of Nazism still in the future, Murphy was inclined to produce a favorable and sympathetic translation. Apart from the present new effort, his is the only such sympathetic work in existence. Unfortunately, there was a falling out with Nazi officials and Murphy was discharged sometime in 1938, his project incomplete. Through some obscure process, the Germans completed Murphy's draft version on their own, and published it in the late 1930s. Today this is known as the Stalag edition, and is currently available in print in two forms: one by Ostara Publications, and one by Elite Minds (the "official Nazi English translation"). To call this version 'unpolished' is an understatement; more below.

By 1939, four new versions had appeared. After his dismissal, Murphy returned to England and revised and completed his translation, which was published by Hurst & Blackett. This is 'the' Murphy translation; it is widely

available on the Internet, and through various reprints. Under the Hutchinson imprint, the Murphy translation was republished in 1969 with a lengthy and hostile introduction by British historian D. C. Watt.

Secondly, the British firm Reynal & Hitchcock enlisted a team of people, headed by Alvin Johnson, to do their own translation. It was notably hostile to the content of the book and the National Socialist movement generally. Barnes (1980: 85), for example, cites one knowledgeable source: "Alvin Johnson...was an ardent opponent of Adolf Hitler."

Third, an American publisher, Stackpole Sons, produced a version under the direction of a Jewish editor, William Soskin. They hired a Jewish socialist, Ludwig Lore, to write the preface. Unsurprisingly, this too was a hostile effort. Soskin was successfully sued by Houghton-Mifflin for copyright infringement, and production was halted after only a few months.

The final work of 1939 was a second abridgment, produced by American journalist—and future senator—Alan Cranston. Cranston was also sued; he too lost, but not before allegedly selling several hundred thousand copies.

Dissatisfied with the abridged Dugdale translation, Houghton-Mifflin embarked on a new, full translation, entrusted to Jewish-German writer Ralph Manheim. They also solicited a short introduction by a Jewish-German journalist, Konrad Heiden. As expected, it was another blatantly hostile production. The book appeared in 1943, and has been continuously in print since then. To the present day, the Manheim version functions as the 'official' translation of *Mein Kampf*; it is the one quoted by nearly all academics and journalists. The latest Houghton edition, issued in 1998, includes an introduction by notorious Jewish Zionist Abraham Foxman. Clearly, little has changed in the intervening years.

For several decades, these were the extant English translations. Then in 2009, an unknown businessman, Michael Ford, produced his own self-published translation through Elite Minds. This edition has several shortcomings, as explained below.

Something of the flavor of these efforts can be seen in the very first words of the book. In the present translation, Chapter 1 is titled "In My Parents' House." (Original: *Im Elternhaus*.) The first sentence: "I consider it most fortunate today that destiny selected Braunau-on-the-Inn to be my birthplace." (*Als glückliche Bestimmung gilt es mir heute, dass das Schicksal mir zum Geburtsort gerade Braunau am Inn zuwies*.) By contrast, the table below gives the chapter title and the first few words, in the various translations.

TRANSLATION	CHAPTER 1	INITIAL WORDS
Dugdale	*My Home*	It stands me in good stead today that Fate...
Johnson	*At Home*	Today I consider it my good fortune that Fate...
Murphy ('Stalag')	*My Home*	To-day I consider it a good omen that destiny...
Murphy ('standard')	*In the Home of my Parents*	It has turned out fortunate for me to-day that destiny...
Manheim	*In the House of my Parents*	Today it seems to me providential that Fate...
Soskin	*Childhood Home*	Today I regard it as a happy change that Fate...
Ford	*Childhood Home*	Today, I am pleased that Fate chose the city...

The variability of even this simple leading sentence is striking. One can imagine the issues involved with the many more complicated thoughts that follow.

WHY A NEW TRANSLATION?

As it happens, every one of the previous translations has major problems and disadvantages, for a modern English reader.

The two primary versions—Murphy and Manheim—are written in the style of early 20th century British writers. They use a wide array of archaic 'British-isms' and British spellings that make reading awkward. Worse, they attempt to follow too literally Hitler's original style. Like most Germans of the time, Hitler wrote long sentences, fashioned into long, complex paragraphs. Manheim follows this style religiously, to the detriment of the reader; Murphy at least occasionally breaks up long sentences into more readable segments.

Worst of all, both major translations are simply poor efforts. They do not read well. One repeatedly encounters passages that are awkward, incoherent, or incomprehensible. There is little of the fluidity and lyrical power of the German original. For his part, Murphy takes a considerable amount of 'translator's license,' interjecting unwarranted terminology and wording, or simply leaving things out. Manheim is more literal, but in the end is scarcely more readable. The reader simply needs to scan a sampling of either text to understand the situation.

This is unfortunate, to say the least. It is almost as if the publishers intended, or at least preferred, that the translations be difficult to read. Certainly this limits the circulation of Hitler's ideas, and makes it easier to dismiss them—a convenient situation, for the book's many critics.

With the exception of Murphy, all of the standard editions betray their intentions with aggressive, hostile, and slanderous comments in their introductions. Consider this selection of remarks:

Johnson: Hitler is "no artist in literary expression," and "often indifferent to grammar and syntax." The book is "a propagandistic essay by a violent partisan" that "warps historical truth" or "ignores it completely." Hitler's discussions on race can be safely dismissed, because "the greatest anthropologists of the 20th century are agreed that 'race' is a practically meaningless word."

Lore: "I cannot conceive of any book of which I more positively disapprove." The book has an "atrocious style" and "countless contradictions." In essence, it is "an outpouring of willful perversion, clumsy forgery, vitriolic hatred, and violent denunciation."

Manheim: Hitler is a "paranoiac" who offers us "disjointed facts" and "largely unintelligible flights of Wagnerian fantasy." He creates "a dream-world," one "without color and movement."

Heiden: *Mein Kampf* was written "in white-hot hatred." It is "ill-founded, undocumented, and badly written." "The book may well be called a kind of satanic Bible."

Watt: The book is "lengthy, dull, bombastic, repetitious and extremely badly written." "Most of its statements of fact...are demonstrably untrue." It yields "an intolerably prolix German style and a total lack of any intellectual precision." As a work of political philosophy, "it has no claims whatever to be taken seriously." Hitler's racial theory—a "mystical racist mumbo-jumbo of Aryanism"—is a "revolting mixture of pseudo-science and bogus historicism." The work is self-consistent, but this only betrays "the terrible consistency of the insane." In the end, Hitler is nothing more than a "master of the inept, the undigested, the half-baked and the untrue."

Foxman: Hitler's "theories have long since been discredited." The book is "a work of ugliness and depravity." It is "unreliable as a source of historical

data," full of "lies, omissions, and half-truths." The book's "atrocious style, puerile digressions, and narcissistic self-absorption" are obvious. Its theories are "extremist, immoral, and seem to promise war." Hitler's "lunatic plan" is "absurd" and even "comical." All in all, "a ridiculous tract."

Any translator, editor, or publisher who would include such words can hardly be trusted to do an honest job. The intent to bias the reader is plain. Certainly there is no concern here for the author to obtain a fair and objective reading. In fact, precisely the opposite.

The recent Ford translation, while not overtly hostile, has several other major flaws. Ford has no discernible credentials, no publishing record, nor any documented history with such academic works. His 'in text' notes are awkward and distracting. The book includes many amateurish and cartoonish 'photos.' There is no index. And his so-called publishing house, Elite Minds, appears to be some kind of environmental group that focuses on the ecology of sharks, of all things. This is unfortunate; the last thing the public needs is another misleading, ill-conceived, and unqualified version of *Mein Kampf*.

The 'Nazi' or 'Stalag' edition of Murphy has its own problems. The version published by Elite Minds claims to be authentic, which means that they retained all the original flaws of grammar, punctuation, and spelling. The result is nearly unreadable. The Ostara edition fixes many of these problems, but still reads poorly. It does break up the long paragraphs, but to an extreme degree; one typically finds single-sentence paragraphs, as in a newspaper. This move destroys all flow and connection of ideas. And neither version has an index or explanatory footnotes.

BENEFITS OF THE NEW TRANSLATION

The present work addresses and resolves many of these unfortunate drawbacks.

Section headings have been added, in text, in bold. The German original employed such headings, but only at the top of each page. The reader thus never knew where a new section actually began. These headings have been translated and inserted at the appropriate points, directly in the text. This simple change greatly improves readability, by clearly organizing the narrative and breaking up long textual passages.

Much emphasis has been placed here on readability, without sacrificing accuracy. The English text reads smoothly and naturally. Also, numerous

contractions have been employed: it's, I'm, isn't, and so on. This again improves readability, and more closely matches the first-person 'dictation' style of the original.

Finally, the book has helpful and relevant footnotes, a useful index, and a bibliography of relevant secondary source material.

SOME CONTENTIOUS TOPICS

It goes without saying that this book is controversial. In fact, it may well be named as the single most controversial book in history. As such, the typical person is more or less guaranteed to get a slanted and biased account of it, if he knows much about it at all. And this is the first point of note: few people, even the so-called experts, really know what's in this book. Even highly educated people can tell you almost nothing about it. They will recognize the title and author, of course, and perhaps know roughly when it was written. But little more. The book has been functionally censored in the West for decades. And when academics or journalists are compelled to address it, it is always in slanderous and defamatory terms. This is the clearest demonstration that something important is happening in this text—something that most would rather leave unknown.

Of Hitler's many controversial statements and topics, four subjects warrant a brief mention here: National Socialism, race theory, religion, and the Jews.

Of the many simplistic and overused hyperboles in the modern lexicon, the use of 'Nazi' surely ranks among the worst. It's a crude and almost comical synonym for evil, hateful, cruel, tyrannical, and so on. This is consistent with the general demonization of everything Hitler.

'Nazi' is, of course, an abbreviation for National Socialist (*Nationalsozialist*). It was prompted by an earlier term, 'Sozi,' which was short for *Sozialdemokrat*, referring to the Social Democrat party that had been in existence since the mid-1800s. Hitler and colleagues rarely used 'Nazi,' generally viewing it as derogatory—although Goebbels did write an essay and short book titled *The Nazi-Sozi*.

As an ideology, National Socialism is utterly misunderstood. In fact, surprisingly, many people around the world today implicitly endorse some form of it. Take socialism. Most European countries, and many others globally, are some form of socialist. Socialism—loosely defined as government control and oversight of at least certain key portions of the economic sector—stands in contrast to free market capitalism, in which

for-profit corporations control such things. Suffice it to say that socialism is a respected political and economic system around the globe.

Nationalism places high priority on the well-being of the nation-state and its traditional residents. It is inward-looking, rather than outward. It tends toward economic independence and autonomy rather than globalization and inter-connectedness. It typically supports and strengthens the dominant ethnicity and culture, and devalues that of minorities. This, too, is hardly controversial; there are strong nationalist movements in many countries around the world today.

As it happens, the United States is neither nationalist nor socialist. Thus, its media and its economic and political elite tend to dismiss or abuse both of these concepts. Americans are functionally brainwashed to believe that socialism is evil—witness the mindless attacks against President Obama in recent years—and that nationalism is the hallmark of crude and primitive autocrats, and racist as well. This fact is revealing; American power elite want no one to get the idea that anything like nationalism or socialism—or, God forbid, national socialism—should become a credible ideology.

Now, it is true that Hitler's form of national socialism went further than these basic concepts. It explicitly targeted Marxists, Jews, and global capitalists as enemies of the German people. It also sought to replace representative democracy with a more efficient and accountable centralized governance. Hitler had rational arguments for all these issues, as he explains in his book.

In fact, the formal declaration of the National Socialist system—as stated in Hitler's "25 points" (shown in Appendix A)—is remarkably progressive and, dare we say, tame. They call for equal rights (points 2 and 9). They give citizens the right to select the laws and governmental structure (6). They abolish war-profiteering (12). They call for corporate profit-sharing with employees (14). They support retirement pensions, a strong middle class, free higher education, public health, maternity welfare, and religious freedom, including explicit support for "a positive Christianity" (15, 16, 20, 21, 24, respectively).

On the 'down' side, only a relative few points appear threatening or aggressive. They grant citizenship only to ethnic Germans, explicitly denying it to Jews (4). They block further immigration, and compel recent immigrants to leave (8). They seek to prohibit all financial speculation in land (17). They call for a death penalty against "traitors, usurers, and profiteers" (18). They demand that the German-language press be controlled only by ethnic Germans—without restricting press in other languages (23). And they call for "a strong central authority in the state" (25).

As anti-Semitic as Hitler was, it is surprising how lightly the Jews get off. They are banned from citizenship, and therefore from any role in government or the press. Recent (since August 1914) Jewish immigrants, like all immigrants, must leave. And the National Socialist view of religious freedom "fights against the Jewish materialist spirit" (24). But no threats to imprison or kill Jews. Longtime Jewish residents can stay in the country. No confiscation of wealth, with the stated exceptions. And certainly nothing that sounds like a looming 'Holocaust.'

In sum, Hitler's 'Nazism' is essentially the product of German nationalism and progressive socialism, combined with a mild form of anti-Semitism. Hardly the embodiment of evil.

RACIAL THEORY

Mein Kampf contains numerous references to 'blood' (*Blut*) and 'race' (*Rasse*). This is always portrayed in the worst possible terms, as some kind of demonic, hate-filled, blind racism. But we must first realize that such talk was commonplace in the early 20th century; Hitler's terminology, though odd-sounding today, was actually quite conventional at the time. Not being a scientist, and few having much understanding of genetics at the time, it is understandable that he would employ such widely-used terms.

Therefore, a literal interpretation of such words is misleading. In modern terminology, Hitler's 'race' is better viewed as 'ethnicity.' He was more an *ethnicist* than a racist. His call for justice for the "German race" is really on behalf of *ethnic* Germans—the *Volk*. Thus understood, his view is much less threatening than commonly portrayed. Yes, he viewed ethnic Germans as superior. Yes, he wanted the best for his people. Yes, he was not much interested in the welfare of minorities or other nationalities. This is hardly a sin. Many people around the world today fight for precisely such things, for their own ethnicities. And they are right to do so.

Even today, it is reasonable and appropriate to discuss issues of race. It is a relevant term in biological taxonomy, indicating the highest-level sub-grouping within the species Homo sapiens. By some accounts, there are three races: White/Caucasian, Black/Negroid, and Mongoloid/Asian. Within each race, we have the various ethnicities—of which there are some 5,000 worldwide.

By this measure, Hitler cared little about race. He made a few dismissive comments about Blacks, but nothing that wasn't standard at the time. He actually admired certain people of the Asian race, especially the Japanese.

But his primary concern was among the various White ethnicities. He sought a position of strength and influence for ethnic Germans; he sought alliances with ethnic Britons; and he sought to oppose ethnic Jews. He was an ethnicist, not a racist.

Then there is Hitler's infamous talk of 'Aryan.' Apart from passing mention elsewhere in the book, it is discussed in detail only in chapter 11. While there is no talk of any 'superman'—no reference to Nietzsche's *Übermensch*, for example—it is clear that Hitler views the Aryan as the highest human type, the greatest ethnicity, mover and creator of civilization. Notably, he never defines Aryan. Rather, we learn only what the Aryan is *not*: he is not Black, not Oriental, and certainly not Jewish. The Jew is the anti-Aryan, his dark and corrupting counterpart. The Aryan builds, the Jew destroys. The Aryan produces, the Jew consumes. The Aryan is idealistic, the Jew materialistic.

In the end, the Aryan is distinguished not by his superior intelligence, nor his great creativity, but mainly by his altruism: the Aryan is a self-sacrificing person, more willing than any others to work on behalf of society. Thus he builds civilization and culture, and spreads it to the world. Non-Aryans, to the extent that they have a culture, get it from the Aryans, even as they customize it to their own needs. But the original source and sustainer is the self-sacrificing Aryan.

The word 'Aryan' has an interesting origin, incidentally, and it has nothing to do with Hitler or the Germans. It comes from the Sanskrit *arya*, meaning 'noble.' It originally referred to the people and language that moved into India from the north, around 1500 BC. In the Indian caste system, the Aryans became the Brahmans—the highest and noblest caste. It was they who cultivated the Sanskrit language, and ultimately developed Indian culture. And a final point of interest: Those immigrants from the north came from the region that is known today as the Iranian plateau. In fact, the word 'Iran' derives directly from 'Aryan'; the Iranians were the original Aryans.

Not being a scholar of ancient history, and having no Internet at hand, Hitler knew little of all this. He simply picked up on prior German and European usage. In fact, talk of Aryans as a superior race predated Hitler by several decades. It was a main theme of Frenchman Arthur de Gobineau's book *Essay on the Inequality of the Human Races*, of 1855. And it was prominent in Briton-turned-German author Houston Chamberlain's book *Foundations of the Nineteenth Century*, published in 1899. By the time Hitler cited the term, it was old hat.

INTRODUCTION

ON RELIGION

Among other calumnies, Hitler is often portrayed as a godless atheist, a devil worshipper, the antichrist, or some kind of maniacal pagan. In fact he was none of these.

Rather, Hitler was broadly supportive of Christianity. He called it "the Religion of Love," and referred to Jesus, indirectly, as its "sublime founder" (volume 1, chapter 8). He argued that the masses are not and cannot be philosophical; their ethics must come from traditional religious sources. And he believed in separation of church and state: "political parties have no right to meddle in religious questions" (chapter 10). In chapter 11, he condemned the Jews because they mock religion, and portray ethics and morality as "antiquated sentiment."

His view on God is quite intriguing. Frequently he refers to a kind of cosmic deity or divine power, but in a variety of unconventional terms. We find many references, for example, to *Schicksal*—fate or destiny. In chapter 5 we read of the "Goddess of Destiny" (*Schicksalgöttin*). In chapter 7 he writes of "Providence" (*Vorsehung*), "Doom" or "Fate" (*Verhängnis*), and "the Lord" (*Herrn*). Elsewhere we find reference to "Chance" (*Zufall*) and "the eternal Creator" (*ewigen Schöpfer*). Volume one closes with a reference to "the Goddess of Inexorable Vengeance" (*die Göttin der unerbittlichen Rache*). These are not mere metaphors. It seems to be a kind of recognition of higher powers in the cosmos, but not those of traditional religions.

In the end, Hitler was most appalled by crude materialism: the quest for money and material power. This view has no concept of idealism, no notion of spirituality, no vision of higher powers in the universe. Materialism was the essence of both Marxism and capitalism—and both were embodied in the Jew. That's why these things are the mortal enemy of anyone seeking higher aims in life.

Hitler himself was no fan of religious dogma, but seems to have envisioned a future that moved toward a new kind of spirituality, one aligned with the workings of nature. We may perhaps best view him as a 'spiritual but not religious' sort of person—a view that is notably widespread today.

ON THE JEWS

If nothing else, Hitler is inevitably depicted as a confessed anti-Semite and Jew-hater. We should be clear: this is absolutely true. There are many

lies spread about Hitler, but this is not one of them. The key is understanding why he held this view.

In the second half of chapter 2, he describes in striking detail his gradual discovery of the role and effect of Jews in society. He recalls that, as a youth, he had known only one Jewish boy, but had no particular feelings toward him one way or the other. He hadn't even heard them discussed much until his mid-teens, and then only in a vaguely negative political context. When he moved to Vienna at age 15, he encountered a city of 2 million that was 10 percent Jewish. At first, he barely noticed them. When he did, he viewed them as representatives of a rather strange religion, but since he was generally tolerant of religious diversity, he gave them little thought. He was initially put off by the "anti-Semitic" press. As he says, "on grounds of human tolerance, I opposed the idea that [the Jew] should be attacked because he had a different faith."

But then Hitler began to pay attention to the mainstream press. They were informative and liberal, but yet often flamboyant and garish. They seemed anxious to curry favor with the corrupt monarchy. And they were uniformly critical of the German Kaiser and his people. He noticed that some of the anti-Semitic papers were actually more skeptical of Viennese authority, and more open-minded regarding the Germans. At the same time, he realized that the Jews were more numerous than he previously believed. In fact, certain districts of Vienna were 50 percent Jewish, or more. And they all seemed to endorse a strange ideology: Zionism.

Furthermore, they were visually and physically repellent. Their black caftans and braided hair locks looked comical. They had their own odd concept of 'cleanliness': "That they were not water-lovers was obvious upon first glance." They smelled bad: "The odor of those people in caftans often made me sick to my stomach." This was topped off by "the unkempt clothes and the generally ignoble appearance." All in all, a sorry sight.

Worst of all, hidden away inside, was their "moral rot." Jews seemed to be involved in all manner of shady, unethical, and illegal activities. Hitler began to study the situation in more detail. "The fact was that 90 percent of all the filthy literature, artistic trash, and theatrical idiocy had to be charged to the account of a people who formed scarcely one percent of the nation. This fact could not be denied." Pornography, lewd art and theater, prostitution, human trafficking...all could be tied to the Jews.

The famed mainstream Viennese press, Hitler discovered, was almost completely a Jewish enterprise. Jewish writers repeatedly praised Jewish actors, authors, and businessmen. People, events, and policies favorable to

Jews were lauded, and those that were disadvantageous were condemned. Even the dominant political party, the Social Democrats, was found to be led by Jews. Upon this realization, says Hitler, "the scales fell from my eyes." The whole pattern came together: a Jewish press supporting a Jewish political system, even as other Jews profited from the moral corruption of the people. Profit and power at all cost; lies and deceit without compunction; and an utter lack of concern for fairness, democracy, human welfare, or even human decency. "I gradually came to hate them," he said.

Considered globally, the situation was even worse. Marxism—the product of a Jew, Karl Marx—was promulgated by Jews in Europe and around the world. It sought to dominate and control both human and natural realms. It sought to level all social differences, thereby subverting the natural order in which the truly best people rightly flourish. In essence, it was a teaching and a means by which Jews could ruthlessly assume control of entire nations. Once that happened, thousands or even millions of natives would die. The 1917 Bolshevik Revolution in Russia was proof enough.

In other parts of Europe, the dominant ideology was capitalism. Here, money ruled. Here, the bankers and corporate moguls dictated even to kings. Markets must be opened, international trade promoted, and loans used to extract wealth from the masses. And when these titans of capital were investigated, they were found to be, more often than not, Jews.

For Hitler, these realizations were devastating. The recognition of the insidious role of the Jews was "the greatest inner revolution that I had yet experienced." Indeed: "From being a soft-hearted cosmopolitan, I became an out-and-out anti-Semite." No hidden views here.

Hitler's conversion to anti-Semitism was remarkable. In contrast to the common view, it was neither arbitrary nor irrational. He was not a born Jew-hater. It was a step-by-step process, taken over a long period of time, and based on actual data and observations about the real world. His was a *rational* anti-Semitism. Any person of dignity and self-respect, anyone with a concern for human life, anyone committed to the integrity of the natural world, will of necessity be an anti-Semite. In their ruthless pursuit of their own self-interest, Jews become the enemy of all mankind. Anyone not recognizing this fact—and acting accordingly—is a fool.

The modern person today winces at such talk. "A monster!" we say. "Hate speech!" "The devil!" And yet, these are not rational responses. The modern man is conditioned to say such things. We must be objective here. Hitler was not inventing facts. His observations were largely true, even if he had no access to formal data or statistics. Jews did dominate in Vienna,

and even more so in Germany. Consider the following numbers, cited by orthodox researcher Sarah Gordon (1984: 8-15):

> The reader may be surprised to learn that Jews were never a large percentage of the total German population; at no time did they exceed 1.09 percent of the population during the years 1871 to 1933... [In spite of this, Jews] were overrepresented in business, commerce, and public and private service... Within the fields of business and commerce, Jews... represented 25 percent of all individuals employed in retail business and handled 25 percent of total sales...; they owned 41 percent of iron and scrap iron firms and 57 percent of other metal businesses.... Jews were [also] prominent in private banking under both Jewish and non-Jewish ownership or control. They were especially visible in private banking in Berlin, which in 1923 had 150 private (versus state) Jewish banks, as opposed to only 11 private non-Jewish banks....

This trend held true in the academic and cultural spheres as well: "Jews were overrepresented among university professors and students between 1870 and 1933.... [A]lmost 19 percent of the instructors in Germany were of Jewish origin.... Jews were also highly active in the theater, the arts, film, and journalism. For example, in 1931, 50 percent of the 234 theater directors in Germany were Jewish, and in Berlin the number was 80 percent..." Hitler was not imaging things.

Furthermore, Jews did in fact curry favor with the monarchy when it was in their interest, but they were quick to revolt if that could yield a greater gain. Jewish Marxists had succeeded in Russia, and were prominent in the November Revolution in Germany, making them responsible, in part, for Germany's defeat in WWI. In sum, Jews were eager to profit by any means possible: war, corruption, immorality, exploitation, deception. And they were, for the most part, fanatical Zionists: committed to creating a Jewish state in Palestine, and willing to do whatever it took to achieve this.

The facts are what they are. We can pretend they don't exist, but then we only deceive ourselves. Worse: we surrender our future to ruthless Jews, who are only too happy to manipulate and exploit. A nation's failure to appreciate the profound importance of 'the Jewish Question' can only lead to its downfall. Chapter 11 of the first volume includes a lengthy and detailed analysis of precisely this situation.

INTRODUCTION

What to do? For Hitler, there was only one logical conclusion: Drive them out. This meant pushing them out of society, out of the economy, and restoring control of the media and government to non-Jews. It meant creating a *Judenrein*, or Jew-free, society, one that was free from internal and external manipulation by Jewish interests. This, in fact, was Hitler's conclusion years before he began *Mein Kampf*. In late 1919, as he was just becoming acquainted with the DAP party, he wrote a letter to one of his officers regarding how to respond to the Jewish question. This striking early letter concludes as follows:

> Rational anti-Semitism...must lead to a systematic and legal struggle against, and eradication of, the privileges the Jews enjoy over the other foreigners living among us (Alien Laws). Its final objective, however, must be the total removal of all Jews (*die Entfernung der Juden überhaupt*) from our midst. Both objectives can only be achieved by a government of national strength, never by a government of national impotence. (in Maser 1974: 215)

His view did not change in *Mein Kampf*, nor evidently anytime later in his life. His solution was always the same: drive them out. Total removal. Ruthlessly if necessary, but out they must go.

Here is an important point, however: With one minor exception, Hitler never called for killing the Jews. Though his terminology shifted over time, his words always referred to some form of removal. Jews should be "deported," "expelled," "rooted out." Their role and their power in the German Reich must be "destroyed" or "liquidated." But explicit words like 'killing,' 'shooting,' 'murder,' 'gassing,' virtually never appear in his speeches, writings, or even private conversations. Even the hostile commentator Ian Kershaw had to admit as much, at least regarding the public addresses: "An explicit call to murder [Jews] can be found in no...speech" (1998: 650). Kershaw fails to inform the reader, though, that the same holds for Hitler's writings and conversations.

The one exception is at the very end of *Mein Kampf*. There were about 600,000 Jews in Germany at the start of WWI, a war that ended in the deaths of over 2 million Germans. Hitler argues that killing "12 or 15 thousand Hebrew corrupters" at the start of the war, by the same poison gas that fell on the German troops in the battlefield, would have spared a million lives and led to German victory. Not all the Jews, or even most of

them; just one or two percent would have sufficed, to subvert their pernicious aims. But this seems to be his last such reference, in any documented writing or speech. In a sense, this exception proves the rule: If Hitler had wanted to speak of killing the Jews, he surely would have. Since we find no such talk after 1925—even during the war—we must assume that he in fact never intended their deaths.

The two most contentious words that Hitler used regarding the Jews were *ausrotten* and *vernichten*. English sources always translate these as intent to "exterminate," "destroy," or "annihilate" the Jews; but this is another deception. None of his actual words demands mass killing—or even any killing at all. If the Jews have been driven out of Germany, they have indeed been 'exterminated' (lit. 'driven beyond the border'). If their control over the economy has been terminated, their power has indeed been 'annihilated,' or 'brought to nothing.' If Jewish society has been removed, it may rightly be said to have been 'destroyed' (lit. 'un-built' or 'deconstructed'). Hitler's tough talk was never any different than that of any world leader when confronting a mortal enemy. President Obama often spoke of "destroying" the "cancer" of the Islamic State, but no one accused him of attempted genocide.

Thus, we find no talk of mass murder, extermination camps, genocide, or anything like this in *Mein Kampf*. Hitler's opponents search in vain for signs of an impending 'Holocaust.' The reader is invited to do the same. It is simply not there—much to the chagrin of his critics.

From all this, it should be clear that Hitler had only one real enemy in the Jews. He was not some all-purpose hater of humanity. He disliked the French, respected the British and Americans, and sympathized with the Russians, but didn't hate them. Even the lesser races were never a target of contempt, but rather, if anything, pity. Today we are under the impression that, in 1940, the entire world quivered at the thought of a Nazi takeover. But this was never more than trumped-up propaganda.

In short, *unless you were a Jew, you had nothing to fear*. Whites had nothing to fear—unless they allowed themselves to be ruled by Jewish Marxists or Jewish capitalists. Hispanics, Blacks, and Orientals, though of lower status, had nothing to fear. France and England had nothing to fear—until *they* declared war on Germany. America never had anything to fear—until Roosevelt and his Jewish advisors made the unwise decision to harass Germany and Japan into conflict. It was always and only the Jews who were his enemy.

From the Jewish perspective, of course, this is the ultimate evil: a man who seeks to destroy Jewish power, confiscate their obscene wealth, and

create a Jew-free society. Should he succeed, and should his new society flourish, it would mean catastrophe for Jews worldwide. People everywhere would see the pernicious result of Jewish control. People everywhere might also attempt to regain their own self-determination, drive out their own Jews, and create their own flourishing society. And that would be the end of Jewish power globally. For the Jews, this is a nightmare scenario. Thus they use all their might to oppose it.

This is why *Mein Kampf* is so dangerous.

HITLER'S LEGACY

Hitler had a great and noble vision for his German people. He desperately wanted them to assume their rightful place in the world, and to set an example for all those who aspired to something better than a crude material existence. By contrast, the social vision of virtually every other world leader pales to insignificance. The ideals of Bush, Blair, Cameron, Sarkozy, Hollande, Merkel, Obama, Trump...these are bad jokes, at best. But this is what we must expect, given their obeisance to Jewish interests.

Hitler had concrete goals in mind for his nation, and concrete plans to get there. He faced three fundamental challenges: (1) to restore the economy, (2) to achieve security and independence by becoming a world power, and (3) to create an idealistic, uplifting, and sustainable German society. He put his plan into action as soon as he came to power in 1933. And it worked. It worked so well that a beleaguered, beaten-down, hyper-inflated, emasculated German nation rose up to become a world power with astonishing speed. Consider: After just three years, Hitler's Germany had conquered inflation, driven down unemployment, and put industry back to work—all in the midst of a global depression. After six years, it was a world power. After eight years, his nation was so powerful that it took the combined effort of virtually the rest of the world to defeat it.

The first two aspects of his plan were attained. But the rest of the world, driven by Jewish hatred, jealousy, and spite, could not bear this, and so they sought to crush him and his German nation—which they did. The real tragedy of Hitler's story is that he never had time to tackle his third great challenge: to create a flourishing German society. Sadly, we will never know the long-term consequences of National Socialism, or whether a truly great society could have been constructed.

But what about the Holocaust? What about the death camps and gas chambers? Isn't this the terrible, inevitable outcome of Hitler's warped vision?

Here we have perhaps the greatest deception of all. In order to show the world the horrible outcome of a potent anti-Semitism, a tale of monumental human disaster had to be constructed. Once constructed, it then had to be promoted and sustained. The undeniable and tragic death of several hundred thousand Jews—which included many deaths by old age, disease, injury, suicide, and in combat situations—would have to become "6 million." Tough talk against Jews, aimed at driving them out of Germany, would have to become "euphemisms for mass murder." Rooms designed to disinfest clothing and bedding against disease-carrying lice would have to become "homicidal gas chambers." Hundreds of thousands of Jewish bodies would have to be burned down to ash, and then made to completely vanish. Transit camps constructed to move Jews out of the Reich—Treblinka, Belzec, Sobibor—would have to become "extermination camps" designed for mass-murder; and with diesel engine exhaust, no less. And a forced labor camp in which thousands of Jews died from typhus—Auschwitz—would have to become "the greatest death camp of all time."

Clearly there is much more to be said here. For those interested readers, sources such as Dalton (2014b, 2015) or Rudolf (2011) are recommended. Suffice to say that the Holocaust, as commonly portrayed, is an unsubstantiated, unwarranted, and unjustified exaggeration of epic proportions. Nearly every aspect of the story crumbles as soon as it is put to the test. The alleged horror of the Holocaust becomes, in the end, a story of the dismantling and expulsion of one particular minority community that held disproportionate power in a nation that did not want them, and that bore disproportionate guilt for that nation's misfortunes. That they themselves should have suffered as a result is unsurprising.

READING *MEIN KAMPF*

Two final things should be kept in mind by any contemporary reader of this book. First, the obvious point: *the writer did not know the future.* It is very difficult for us, knowing history, to imagine these words being written by a 38-year-old leader of a minor political party who could not have known what was to come. Hitler had visions, ideas, expectations—which turned out to be stunningly accurate. His powers of perception and foresight were astonishing. And yet for him, at the time, they were just thoughts of a

possible future. He believed that his NSDAP party would grow to dominate Germany—and it did. He believed that he could restore greatness to a shattered nation—and he did. Conflict with Russia, France, and England; tackling the 'Jewish Question'; a reinvigorated cultural and spiritual life—all these came about, more or less as he anticipated. And the engine behind these events was just as he envisioned: sheer force of will, by a single man.

Did he foresee a world united against him? The loss of some 4 million German lives? His own premature death? Apparently not. But surely he must have known that such things were possible. In a world of perpetual struggle, no victories are guaranteed. Success is always ephemeral. Striving for greatness always entails great risk. And yet the alternative is worse—to sink into a miasmatic existence, a placid and tepid peace, in which the global capitalists or communists invade the body politic and drain it of all higher and nobler aims.

Mein Kampf is a remarkable anticipation of things to come. Hitler's vision and worldview were realized more quickly than even he could have thought possible. This is tangible proof of the power of ideas to remake the world, when accompanied by a sense of greatness and higher purpose. Such things are utterly lacking in the world today, and thus they seem strange, odd, and even frightening to us. We forget that, for much of our history, they were the very means by which nations and cultures thrived.

The second point is this: The parallels to the present day are striking. Jewish domination of German society in the 1920s mirrors that of the United States, England, and Canada today. The tactics of AIPAC, the role of the Jewish Lobby, the sad state of media and entertainment industries, cowardice in corporate leadership, widespread moral decay, environmental degradation, manipulations of global capitalists and stock-market traders—all these have their counterparts in pre-Nazi Germany.

Hitler surely would have been appalled at the world of today. In America, he would find Jewish leadership in all major media organizations and film studios; Jewish money decisive in all national political races; and an American Supreme Court with three Jews, out of nine justices. Germany today wilts under the so-called leadership of the *Judenknecht* Merkel, who allows that once-great nation to be flooded with a mass of foreign ethnicities, even as she pays monumental Holocaust reparations to the Israeli state. And most all European nations readily sign up to fight Israel's wars in the Middle East and around the world. Malaysian leader Mahathir Mohamad was surely correct when he said, "Today Jews rule the world by proxy; they get others to fight and die for them." Again, just as Hitler had predicted—the demise

of National Socialism would mean the triumph of a Jewish-inspired worldview.

It seems hopeless. And yet, to a young Adolf Hitler in 1920's Germany, things also seemed hopeless. But he knew that, with a bold vision and true force of will, that things could change—and quickly. Thus has it always been so. The future is fixed only to those who cannot envision something better, something higher, something greater. Even in the worst of times, true visionaries have always emerged. It has happened in the past, and it will happen again.

Mein Kampf is one man's assessment of history and vision for the future. It is blunt; it is harsh; it is unapologetic. It does not comply with contemporary standards of politeness, objectivity, and political correctness. It sounds offensive to sensitive modern ears. But the book is undeniably important. It is more consequential than perhaps any other political work in history. It deserves to be read, in a clear and unbiased translation. And each reader will then be free to determine its ultimate value and meaning for themselves.

MEIN KAMPF

ADOLF HITLER

VOLUME ONE

CHAPTER 1:
IN MY PARENTS' HOUSE

I consider it most fortunate today that destiny selected Braunau-on-the-Inn to be my birthplace.[1] This little town lies on the border between two German states—the union of which seems, at least to us of the younger generation, a task to which we should dedicate our lives and pursue with every possible means!

German-Austria must return to the great German Motherland. And not for mere economic reasons. No, no. Even if the union were a matter of economic indifference, and even if it were to be economically disadvantageous, it still must take place. The same blood should be in the same Reich.[2] The German people have no right to engage in colonialism until they have brought all their sons together in one state. Only when the territory of the Reich embraces all Germans and then finds itself unable to assure them a livelihood, only then will the moral right arise to acquire foreign territory. The plow will then become the sword, and the tears of war will produce our daily bread for generations to come.

And so this little border town appeared to me as the symbol of a great mission. But in another way too, it points to a lesson that is applicable today. More than 100 years ago, this insignificant place was the scene of a tragic calamity that affected the whole German nation. It will be remembered forever, at least throughout German history. At the time of our Fatherland's deepest humiliation, Johannes Palm—Nuremberger,

[1] Braunau, Austria lies about 25 km north of Salzburg, and about 50 km east of Munich. It has a present-day population of some 16,000. The river Inn is the border with Germany.

[2] 'Reich' may be translated variously as 'empire,' 'kingdom,' or 'realm.' Throughout the present text, it will often appear as 'empire' but in general will be left untranslated.

bookseller, uncompromising nationalist, and enemy of the French—was put to death here because he had the misfortune to have loved Germany so passionately.[3] He stubbornly refused to reveal the names of his colleagues, or rather the leaders who were chiefly responsible for the affair. The same happened with Leo Schlageter.[4] The former, like the latter, was denounced to the French by a government agent. An Augsburg police chief won this unenviable fame on that occasion, and set the example that was later to be copied by neo-German officials of Herr Severing's regime.[5]

It was in this little town on the Inn—gilded by the memory of a German martyr, a town that was Bavarian by blood but under Austrian rule—that my parents lived, towards the end of the last century. My father was a civil servant who fulfilled his duties very conscientiously. My mother looked after the household and lovingly devoted herself to the care of her children.

I don't remember much from that period because, after a few years, my father had to leave that beloved border town. He took up a new post farther down the Inn, at Passau, hence in Germany itself.

In those days it was typical for an Austrian civil servant to be transferred periodically from one post to another. Soon my father was transferred to Linz, and there he retired to live on his pension. But this didn't mean that the old gentleman would now 'rest.' As the son of a poor cottager, and while still young, he grew restless and left home. When he was barely 13 years old, he slipped on his small backpack and set forth from his native woodland parish. Despite the pleas of villagers who could speak from experience, he went to Vienna to learn a trade. This was in the 1850s.

It was a difficult time, that of deciding to leave home and face the unknown, with three gulden in his pocket. By the time the boy of 13 became a youth of 17, he had passed his apprenticeship examination as a craftsman, but was not content. Quite the contrary. The long period of hardship, constant want, and misery strengthened his resolve to give up working at a trade and strive for 'something higher.' As a boy it had seemed to him that the position of the parish priest in his home village was the

---

[3] Palm was executed in 1806 by Napoleon's forces for publishing a pamphlet in defense of Germany.

[4] Schlageter actively opposed the French occupation of the Ruhr; he was shot in 1923.

[5] Carl Severing was German Minister of Interior during the Weimar regime. He held office from 1928 to 1930.

highest in the scale of attainment; but now that the big city had enlarged his outlook, he looked upon the state official as the highest of all. With the tenacity of one whom misery and suffering had already made 'old' while still young, the 17-year-old stuck to his new project. He became a civil servant. He was about 23 years old, I think, when he achieved his life's dream. Thus he was able to fulfill the promise he had made as a poor boy, to not return to his native village until he was a success.

He achieved his goal. But back in the village, there was no one who remembered him as a little boy, and the village itself had become strange to him.

Finally, when he was 56 years old, he retired. But he couldn't bear to be idle for even a single day. On the outskirts of the small market town of Lambach, in Upper Austria, he bought a farm and tilled it himself. Thus, at the end of a long and hard-working career, he came back to the life that his father had led.

1.1 THE YOUNG RINGLEADER

It was at this time that I first began to have ideals of my own. I spent a good deal of time playing out in the open, on the long road from school, and mixing up with some of the roughest boys, which caused my mother many anxious moments. This made me something quite the opposite of a stay-at-home. I gave scarcely any serious thought to the question of choosing a vocation in life; but I certainly had no interest in the kind of career that my father had followed.

I think that an inborn talent for speaking now began to develop in me, during the more or less strenuous arguments with my friends. I became a youthful ringleader, one who learned quickly at school but was rather difficult to manage. In my free time, I practiced singing in the choir of the monastery church at Lambach. I was well-situated to be emotionally impressed again and again by the magnificent splendor of the church ceremonies. It was natural for me to look upon the Abbot as representing the highest human ideal worth striving for, just as the humble village priest had appeared to my father in his day.

For awhile at least, that was this case. But my father didn't appreciate my oratorical gifts as beneficial for a career, and so he naturally couldn't understand my youthful ideas. This internal conflict made him feel somewhat concerned.

As it happened, my short-lived yearnings soon gave way to hopes that were better suited to my temperament. Browsing through my father's books, I happened to come across some publications that dealt with military subjects. One of these was a popular history of the Franco-German War of 1870–71. It consisted of two volumes of an illustrated periodical dating from those years. These became my favorite reading. Soon that great and heroic conflict began to dominate my thinking. And from that time on, I became more and more enthusiastic about everything that was at all connected with war or military affairs.

But this story had a special significance for me on other grounds, too. For the first time, and as yet in only quite a vague way, I began to think: Is there a difference—and if so, what is it—between the Germans who fought that war and the other Germans? Why didn't Austria also take part in it? Why didn't my father and all the others fight in that struggle?

Are we not the same as other Germans?

Do we not all belong together? That was the first time that this problem began to agitate my brain. And from the conclusions that I reached, I was forced to accept the fact—though with a secret envy—that not all Germans had the good luck to belong to Bismarck's Reich.

This was something that I couldn't understand.

1.2 'CHOICE' OF PROFESSION

It was decided that I should study.

Considering my whole personality, and especially my temperament, my father decided that the classical subjects studied at the Gymnasium were not suited to my natural talents. He thought that the *Realschule* would suit me better. My obvious talent for drawing confirmed this for him; in his opinion, drawing was a neglected subject in the Austrian Gymnasium. Another likely factor was the memory of his own hard road, and this contributed to him looking upon classical studies as unpractical; accordingly, he set little value on them. At the back of his mind, he believed that his son should also become a government official. Indeed, he had decided on that career for me.

Due to the difficulties through which he had to struggle in his own case, he overestimated what he had achieved. His success was exclusively the result of his own indefatigable effort and energy. The characteristic pride

of the self-made man led him to the idea that his son should follow the same calling—and if possible, to rise even higher. Moreover, this idea was strengthened by the consideration that the results of his own life's work put him in a position to aid his son's advancement in the same career.

It was simply inconceivable to him that I might reject that which had meant everything in life to him. My father's decision was simple, definite, and clear. In his eyes, it was something to be taken for granted. A man of such a nature, who had become domineering by reason of his own hard struggles, could not think of allowing inexperienced and irresponsible young men to choose their own careers.

To act in such a way, where the future of his own son was concerned, would have been a grave and reprehensible weakness in the exercise of parental authority and responsibility; it was something utterly incompatible with his characteristic sense of duty.

And yet things had to turn out differently.

1.3 NEVER A CIVIL SERVANT...

For the first time in my life—I was then 11 years old—I felt myself forced into open opposition. No matter how hard and determined my father might be about putting his own plans and opinions into action, I was no less obstinate in rejecting an idea that didn't appeal to me at all.

I wouldn't become a civil servant.

Neither persuasion nor 'serious' warnings could break down that opposition. I would not, on any account, become a state official. All the attempts that my father made to arouse in me a love for that profession, by envisioning his own career for me, had only the opposite effect. It nauseated me to think that one day I might be chained to an office desk, and that I couldn't control my own time but would be forced to spend the whole of my life filling out forms.

One can imagine what kind of thoughts such a prospect aroused in the mind of a young man who was by no means 'good' in the usual sense of that term!

The ridiculously easy school tasks that we were given made it possible for me to spend far more time outdoors than at home. Today—when my political opponents pry into my life with diligent scrutiny, as far back as the days of my boyhood, so as to finally be able to prove what dirty tricks

this 'Hitler' was used to in his youth—I thank heaven that I can look back to those happy days and find the memory helpful. The fields and the woods were then the battlefields on which all disputes were decided.

Even attendance at the *Realschule* could not alter my way of spending my time.

1.4 ...BUT RATHER AN ARTIST

But now I had another battle to fight.

As long as my father's plan to make me a state functionary contradicted my own inclinations only in theory, the conflict was bearable. I could be discreet about expressing my personal views and thus avoid constantly recurring arguments. My own resolution not to become a government official was sufficient for the time being to put my mind completely at rest. I resolutely held on to that conviction. But the situation became more difficult once I had a positive plan of my own, one that I presented to my father as an alternative. This happened when I was 12 years old.

How it happened, I cannot exactly say now. But one day it became clear to me that I would be a painter—I mean an artist. It was a fact that I had an aptitude for drawing. It was even one of the reasons why my father had sent me to the *Realschule.* But he had never thought of having that talent developed in such a way that I could become a professional painter. Quite the contrary. When, as a result of my renewed refusal to adopt his preferred plan, my father asked me for the first time what I myself really wished to be, my resolve expressed itself almost automatically. For a moment my father was speechless.

"A painter? An artist?"

He wondered whether I was sane. He thought that he might not have heard me right, or misunderstood me. But when I explained my ideas to him, and he saw how seriously I took them, he opposed it with all the determination of his nature. His decision was very fundamental; any consideration of my own natural abilities was out of the question.

"An artist, no, not as long as I live, never." But seeing as I had inherited much of my father's obstinacy—besides having other qualities of my own—my reply was equally forceful. Except that it stated something quite the contrary.

At that point, our struggle became a stalemate. Father would not abandon his 'Never,' and I became all the more firm in my 'Nevertheless.'

Naturally, the consequences were unpleasant. The old gentleman was bitterly annoyed; and indeed so was I, although I really loved him. My father forbade me to entertain any hopes of taking up the art of painting as a profession. I went a step further and declared that I would not study anything else. With such declarations, the situation became ever more strained, so that the old man irrevocably decided to assert his parental authority at all costs. That led me to adopt an attitude of circumspect silence, but I put my threat into action. I thought that once it became clear to my father that I was making no progress at the *Realschule*, he would be forced to allow me to follow my dream—for better or worse.

1.5 THE YOUNG NATIONALIST

I don't know whether I calculated rightly or not. My failure to make progress in school was obvious. I studied just the subjects that appealed to me, especially those that I thought I might need later as a painter. What didn't appear to have any importance, or what didn't otherwise appeal to me, I completely sabotaged. My school reports of that time were always in the extremes of good or bad, according to the subject. In one column my evaluation read 'very good' or 'excellent.' In another it read 'average' or even 'below average.' By far my best subjects were geography and, even more so, general history. These were my two favorite subjects, and I led the class in them.

When I look back over so many years and try to judge the results of that experience, I find two very significant facts standing out clearly:

First, I became a nationalist.

Second, I learned to understand and grasp the true meaning of history.

1.6 THE GERMAN OSTMARK

The old Austria was a multi-national state.

In those days, at least the citizens of the German Reich, taken through and through, couldn't understand what that fact meant in the everyday life of the people within such a state. After the magnificent triumphant march of the victorious armies in the Franco-German War, the Germans in the Reich became steadily more and more estranged from the Germans beyond their frontiers—partly because they didn't wish to appreciate the true value

of those other Germans, and partly because they were incapable of doing so. The degenerate dynasty was often confused with the people, who were at root healthy.

The Germans of the Reich didn't realize that if the Austrian Germans had not been of the best blood, they could never have given their characteristic stamp to an empire of 52 million—such that the erroneous idea arose that Austria was a German state. This error led to dire consequences. But all the same, it was a magnificent testimony to the character of the 10 million Germans in the *Ostmark*.[6] Only very few of the Germans in the Reich itself had an idea of the bitter struggle that those Eastern Germans had to carry on daily for the preservation of their German language, schools, and character.

Only today—when a tragic fate has torn several millions of our kinsfolk away from the Reich and forced them to live under foreign rule, dreaming of that common fatherland towards which all their yearnings are directed, and struggling to maintain the right to use their mother tongue—only now have the wider circles come to realize what it means to fight for one's people. Today perhaps there are some who can assess the greatness of that German spirit that animated the Reich's old *Ostmark*. It enabled those people, left entirely on their own, to defend the Reich against the East for several centuries. They also were able to secure the boundaries of the German language through a guerilla war of attrition, at a time when the Reich was more interested in colonies than in protecting its own flesh and blood at its very doorstep.

1.7 THE STRUGGLE FOR GERMANISM

In this battle over the language of old Austria, there were, as in every such struggle, three groups: the fighters, the slackers, and the traitors.

The sifting process began at school. And it is worth noting that the language-war was waged in perhaps its bitterest form in school; this was the nursery where the seeds had to be watered that were to spring up and form the coming generation. The tactical objective of the fight was to win over the child, and it was to the child that the first rallying cry was addressed:

[6] 'Ostmark' was the German nationalist designation for German-Austria, that is, the German part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

"German boy, don't forget that you are a German," and "Remember, little girl, that one day you must become a German mother!"

Those who know something of the youthful spirit can understand how the young will always lend a glad ear to such a rallying cry. The young people led the struggle through many forms, fighting in their own way and with their own weapons.

They refused to sing non-German songs. The greater the efforts made to win them away from their German allegiance, the more they exalted the glory of their German heroes. They went hungry so that they might spare their pennies to help the war chest of their elders. They were incredibly aware of the significance of what the non-German teachers said, and they contradicted them in unison. They wore the forbidden emblems of their own kinsfolk and were happily penalized or even beaten for doing so. On a small scale, they were mirrors of loyalty from which the elders might learn a lesson.

And thus it was that, at a comparatively early age, I took part in the nationalist struggles of old Austria. When meetings were held for the *Südmark* and the School League, we wore cornflowers and black-red-gold colors to express our loyalty. We greeted each other with "*Heil*," and instead of the Austrian anthem we sang *Deutschland über Alles*, despite warnings and penalties. Thus the youth were politically educated at a time when the citizens of the so-called national state knew little of their own nationality except the language.

I, of course, didn't belong to the slackers. Within a short time I had become an ardent 'German Nationalist,' which had a different meaning from our present party concept.

I rapidly moved in the nationalist direction. By the time I was 15 years old, I had come to understand the distinction between dynastic 'patriotism' and 'nationalism' based on the concept of *Volk*, or people—my inclination being entirely in favor of the latter.

1.8 LESSONS FROM HISTORY

Such a preference may not perhaps be clearly intelligible to those who have never taken the trouble to study the internal conditions that prevailed under the Habsburg Monarchy.[7] Among historical studies, universal history

[7] The Habsburg Monarchy refers to the family dynasty that ruled in central Europe

was the subject almost exclusively taught in the Austrian schools; there was very little of specific Austrian history. The fate of this state was closely bound up with the existence and development of Germany as a whole—such that a division of history into German history and Austrian history would be practically inconceivable. And indeed it was only when the German people came to be divided into two states that this division of German history began to take place.

The insignia of former imperial glory, which are still preserved in Vienna, appear to cast a magic spell. They guarantee an eternal bond between these two peoples.

When the Habsburg State crumbled to pieces,[8] the Austrian Germans instinctively raised an outcry for union with their German fatherland. That was the voice of a unanimous yearning in the hearts of the whole people for a return to the never-forgotten home of their fathers. But such a general yearning could not be explained except by attributing its cause to the historical training through which the individual Austrian Germans had passed. Therein lay a spring that never dried up. Especially in times of distraction and forgetfulness, its quiet voice was a reminder of the past—bidding the people to look out beyond mere momentary prosperity to a new future.

The teaching of universal history in the so-called high schools is still very unsatisfactory. Few teachers realize that the purpose of teaching history is not the memorizing of certain dates and facts that the student is not interested in knowing: the exact date of a battle, or the birthday of some marshal or other. And the student isn't at all—or only incidentally—interested in knowing when the crown of his fathers was placed on the brow of some monarch. These are certainly not looked upon as important matters.

To study history means to search for and discover the forces that are the causes of those results that appear to us as historical events.

The art of reading and studying consists in this: Remember the essentials and forget what is inessential.

Probably my whole future life was determined by the fact that I had a history professor who understood, as few others understand, how to make this viewpoint prevail in the classroom. This teacher was Dr. Leopold

---

for 400 years. It began in 1519 with Charles V, and ended in 1918 with Charles I. The Habsburgs were the ruling power in the Austro-Hungarian Empire. The Monarchy was, of course, finished by the time Hitler wrote these words in 1923.

[8] In 1918.

Pötsch, of the *Realschule* at Linz.[9] He was the ideal personification of the qualities necessary for a teacher of history in the sense I mentioned above. An elderly gentleman with a decisive manner but a kindly heart, he was a very compelling speaker and was able to inspire us with his own enthusiasm.

Even today I cannot recall without emotion that venerable personality whose enthusiastic exposition of history so often made us entirely forget the present. He allowed us to be transported into the past, as if by magic. He penetrated through the dim mist of thousands of years and transformed the historical memory of the dead past into a living reality. When we listened to him, we became afire with enthusiasm; sometimes we were even moved to tears.

It was still more fortunate that this professor was able not only to illustrate the past by examples from the present, but from the past he was also able to draw a lesson for the present. He understood better than anyone else the everyday problems that were then stirring in our minds. He used the national fervor that we felt in our own small way as an instrument of our education, in that he often appealed to our national sense of honor. In that way he maintained order and held our attention much more easily than he could have done by any other means.

It was because of him that history became my favorite subject.

As a natural consequence, but without my teacher's deliberate intention, I then and there became a young revolutionary.

After all, who could have studied German history under such a teacher and not become an enemy of that state whose rulers exercised such a disastrous influence on the destinies of the German nation?

And how could one remain a faithful subject of the House of Habsburg, whose past history and present conduct proved it to be always ready to betray the interests of the German people, for the sake of trivial personal interests?

Did we not realize, even as youngsters, that this Austrian State did not, and could not, have any love for us Germans?

That which history taught us about the policy of the House of Habsburg was confirmed by our experiences. In north and south, the poison of foreign races was eating into the body of our people. Even Vienna was steadily becoming more and more a non-German city. The 'Imperial House' favored the Czechs on every possible occasion. Indeed, it was divine retribution that caused Germanism's most deadly enemy in Austria, the Archduke

[9] Pötsch (1853-1942) taught Hitler from ages 12 through 15.

Franz Ferdinand, to fall by the very bullets that he himself had helped to cast. Working from above, he was the chief patron of the movement to make Austria a Slav state.

The burdens laid on the shoulders of the German people were monstrous, and the sacrifices of blood and treasure that they had to make were incredibly heavy. Yet anyone who was not blind must have seen that it was all in vain. What affected us most bitterly was the awareness of the fact that this whole system was morally shielded by the alliance with Germany, whereby the slow rooting-out of Germanism from the old Austrian Monarchy seemed in some way to be more or less sanctioned by Germany herself. Habsburg hypocrisy, which outwardly tried to make the people believe that Austria was still a German state, increased the feeling of hatred against the Imperial House. At the same time, it aroused a spirit of rebellion and contempt.

But in the German Reich itself, its rulers understood nothing of what all this meant. As if struck blind, they stood beside a corpse; in the very symptoms of decomposition, they believed that they saw signs of a renewed vitality.

In that unhappy alliance between the young German Reich and the illusory Austrian State lay the germ of the [First] World War, and also of the final collapse.

In the course of this book, I will go to the root of the problem. Suffice it to say here that in the very early years of my youth, I came to certain conclusions that I have never abandoned. Indeed, I became more profoundly convinced of them as the years passed. They were:

That the dissolution of Austria is a preliminary condition for the defense of Germany; further, that national feeling is by no means identical with dynastic patriotism; finally, and above all, that the House of Habsburg was destined to bring misfortune to the German nation.

As a logical consequence of these convictions, there arose in me a feeling of intense love for my German-Austrian home, and a profound hatred of the Austrian State.

The kind of historical thinking that I developed through my study of history at school never left me afterwards. World history became more and more an inexhaustible source for the understanding of contemporary historical events—in other words, politics. Therefore I will not 'learn' politics, but rather let politics teach me.

A precocious 'revolutionary' in politics, I was no less a precocious revolutionary in art.

1.9 DEVOTION TO WAGNER

At that time, the provincial capital of Upper Austria had a theater that was, relatively speaking, not bad. Almost everything played there. When I was 12 years old, I saw *William Tell* performed. That was my first theater experience. Some months later I saw *Lohengrin*, the first opera I had ever heard. I was fascinated at once. My youthful enthusiasm for the Bayreuth Master [Wagner] knew no bounds. Again and again I was drawn to hear his operas; and today I consider it a great stroke of luck that these modest productions in the little provincial city made it possible for me to appreciate it more intensely later on.

But all this helped to reinforce my profound distaste for the career that my father had chosen for me. This dislike became especially strong after I outgrew my adolescence—a process that was, in my case, especially painful. I became more and more convinced that I'd never be happy as a state official. And now that the *Realschule* had acknowledged my aptitude for drawing, my own resolution became all the stronger.

Thereafter, neither pleas nor threats could change things.

I wanted to become a painter, and no power in the world could force me to become a civil servant.

Oddly though, as I grew older, I became more and more interested in architecture.

At the time, I considered this a natural development of my talent for painting, and I inwardly rejoiced at this expansion of my artistic interests.

I didn't suspect that things would turn out differently.

1.10 THE DEATH OF MY PARENTS

The question of my career was decided much sooner than I could have expected.

When I was 13, I suddenly lost my father. He was still in robust health when a stroke of apoplexy painlessly ended his earthly wanderings, and left us all deeply bereaved. His deepest wish was to be able to help his son advance in a career and thus to save me from the harsh ordeal that he himself had experienced. It appeared to him that he had failed. And yet, though he himself was not conscious of it, he had sown the seeds of a future that neither of us foresaw at that time.

At first, nothing changed outwardly.

My mother felt it her duty to continue my education in accordance with my father's wishes. This meant that she would have me study for the civil service. For my own part, I was more determined than ever to not undertake this career. The school curriculum and teaching methods were so far removed from my ideals that I became profoundly indifferent.

Illness suddenly came to my assistance. Within a few weeks, it decided my future, putting an end to the long-standing family conflict. My lungs became so seriously affected that the doctor strongly advised my mother not to allow me to take up a career that would require working in an office. He ordered me to stop attending the *Realschule* for at least a year. What I had secretly desired for such a long time, and had persistently fought for, now became a reality almost at one stroke.

Concerned about my illness, my mother agreed that I would leave the *Realschule* and attend the Academy.

Those were happy days, and they seemed to me almost as a dream; but they were bound to remain only a dream. Two years later, my mother's death put a brutal end to all my wonderful plans.

She succumbed to a long and painful illness, one that, from the very beginning, permitted little hope of recovery. Though expected, her death came as a terrible blow to me. I respected my father, but I loved my mother.

Poverty and hard reality forced me to decide quickly. The meager family resources had been almost entirely used up by my mother's severe illness. The allowance which came to me as an orphan was not enough for the bare necessities of life. Somehow or other, I would have to earn my own bread.

With my clothes and linen in hand, and with an indomitable resolution in my heart, I left for Vienna. I hoped to forestall fate, as my father had done 50 years before. I was determined to become 'something'—but certainly not a civil servant.

CHAPTER 2: YEARS OF STUDY AND SUFFERING IN VIENNA

When my mother died, my fate had already been decided, at least in one respect.

During the last months of her illness, I went to Vienna to take the entrance examination for the Academy of Fine Arts. Armed with a pile of drawings, I was sure that I would pass the examination quite easily. At the *Realschule*, I was by far the best student in the drawing class, and since that time I made exceptional progress in the practice of drawing. I was therefore quite pleased with myself, and was proud and happy at the prospect of what I considered to be a sure success.

But there was one misgiving. It seemed to me that I was better qualified for drawing than for painting, especially in the various branches of architectural drawing. At the same time, my interest in architecture was constantly growing. And I advanced more quickly in this direction after my first visit to Vienna, which lasted two weeks; I was not yet 16 years old.

I went to the Court Museum to study the paintings in the art gallery there; but the building itself captured almost all my interest, and from early morning until late at night I spent all my time visiting the various public buildings. And it was always the buildings themselves that were the main attraction for me. I stood for hours in wonderment at the Opera and the Parliament. The whole Ring Strasse had a magic effect upon me, as if it were a scene from the *Thousand-and-one-Nights.*

2.1 SKILL AS AN ARCHITECT

And now here I was, for the second time in this beautiful city, impatiently waiting to hear the result of the entrance exam but confident of success. I was so convinced that, when the news came that I had failed, it struck me like a bolt from the blue. Yet that's what happened. I went to see the Rector and asked him why they refused to accept me as a student in the general School of Painting, which was part of the Academy. He said that my sketches unquestionably showed that painting was not what I was suited for, but rather that they gave clear indications of my aptitude for architectural design. Therefore the place for me was the School of Architecture, which also formed part of the Academy. At first it was impossible to understand this, seeing that I had never been to an architectural school and had never received any instruction in architectural design.

I was quite dejected when I left Hansen Palace, on Schillerplatz. I felt at odds with myself for the first time in my young life. Those words came like a lightning flash, one that revealed a longstanding conflict within myself. But until this point, I couldn't give a clear account of it.

Within a few days, I myself also realized that I would become an architect.

But of course, the path was very difficult. I now bitterly regretted my former conduct in neglecting and despising certain subjects at the *Realschule*. Before taking up courses at the School of Architecture, it was necessary to attend the Technical Building School. But this in turn required a graduation certificate from high school. And I simply didn't have this. The fulfillment of my artistic dream seemed impossible.

After my mother's death, I came to Vienna for the third time. This visit was destined to last several years. Having been there before, I quickly recovered my old calm and determination. My former self-assurance came back, and I fixed my eyes steadily on the goal. I would be an architect. Obstacles are placed in our path in life, not to defeat us but to be surmounted. And I was fully determined to surmount these obstacles, constantly holding the picture of my father in my mind—he who raised himself up by his own efforts to the position of a civil servant, even though he was the poor son of a village shoemaker. I had a better start, and my odds of success were better. At that time, my lot in life seemed to me a harsh one; but today I see in it the wise workings of Providence. The Goddess of Fate took me in her arms and often threatened to smash me;

but my will grew stronger as the obstacles increased, and in the end, my will was triumphant.

I'm thankful for that period of my life because it hardened me and enabled me to be as tough as I am now. And even more so, because I appreciate the fact that I was thereby saved from an empty life of ease, and that a mother's darling was taken from her tender arms and handed over to Adversity as a new mother. Though I fought against it as too hard a fate, I'm grateful that I was thrust into a world of misery and poverty, and thus came to know the people for whom I was later to fight.

2.2 FORMATION OF A WORLDVIEW

It was during this time that my eyes were opened to two dangers, the names of which I had scarcely known before. I had no idea whatsoever of their terrible significance for the existence of the German people. These two dangers were *Marxism* and *Jewry*.

For many people, the name of Vienna signifies innocent pleasure, a festive place for happy people. For me, unfortunately, it's a living memory of the saddest period in my life.

Even today, the mention of that city arouses in me only gloomy thoughts. Five years of poverty in that Phaecian town.[1] Five years in which I had to earn my daily bread—first as a casual laborer and then as a painter of little trifles. And a meager morsel it was indeed, insufficient to calm my constant hunger. That hunger was my faithful guardian, one that never left me and took part in everything I did. Every book that I bought meant renewed hunger, and every visit to the opera meant the intrusion of that inhospitable companion in the days to follow. I was always struggling with my unsympathetic friend. Even so, it was during that time that I learned more than ever before. Apart from my architectural studies and rare visits to the opera—for which I had to go hungry—I had no other pleasure in life except my books.

I read a great deal then, and I thought deeply about what I read. All my free time after work was devoted exclusively to study. Thus within a few years, I was able to acquire a stock of knowledge that I find useful even to this day.

[1] A reference to Homer's *Odyssey* (Book VI). Phaeacia, or Scheria, was an island of legendary happiness, where residents preferred the pursuit of pleasure to hard work.

But even more than that:

During those years, a view of life and a definite worldview took shape in my mind. These became the granite foundation of my conduct at that time. Since then, I have extended that foundation only very little, and I have changed nothing in it.

On the contrary.

I am firmly convinced today that, generally speaking, it is in youth that men lay the essential groundwork of their creative thought, wherever that creative thought exists. I distinguish between the wisdom of age—which can only arise from the greater profundity and foresight that are based on the experiences of a long life—and the creative genius of youth. The latter blossoms out in thought and ideas with inexhaustible fertility, without being immediately useful, because of their very exuberance. These ideas furnish the building materials and plans for the future. And it is from them that age takes the stones and constructs the building—unless the so-called wisdom of age smothers the creative genius of youth.

2.3 REMOVAL OF PETTY-BOURGEOIS BLINDERS

The life that I previously led at home with my parents differed little from that of everyone else. I looked forward to the next day without worry, and there was no such thing as a social problem to be faced.

Those with whom I passed my younger days belonged to the small bourgeois class. It was therefore a world that had very little contact with the world of genuine manual laborers. For, though at first this may appear surprising, the gulf that separates that class—which is by no means economically well-off—from the manual laboring class is often deeper than people think. The reason for this division, which we may almost call enmity, lies in the fear that dominates a social group that has risen only slightly above the level of the manual laborer—a fear that it may fall back into its old condition, or at least be again classed with the laborers. Moreover, there is something repulsive in remembering the cultural indigence of that lower class and their rough manners with one another. Those who are only on the first rung of the social ladder find it unbearable to be forced into contact with the cultural level and standard of living from which they have risen.

Consequently, the higher classes feel less constraint in their dealings with the lowest class of men than would be possible for the 'up-starts.'

CHAPTER 2

For by the word 'up-start' I mean everyone who has raised himself through his own efforts to a social level higher than that to which he formerly belonged.

Ultimately this struggle, which is often hard, destroys all sympathy. Our own fight for existence kills our feeling for the misery of those who have been left behind.

From this point of view, fate was kind to me. Circumstances forced me to return to that world of poverty and economic insecurity that my father had raised himself from in his early days. The blinders of a narrow petty-bourgeois education were torn from my eyes. Now for the first time, I learned to know men; and I learned to distinguish between empty appearances or brutal manners and the real inner nature of the person.

2.4 VIENNA'S SOCIAL CONFLICTS

At the beginning of the century, Vienna was, socially speaking, one of the most backward cities in Europe.

Dazzling riches and loathsome poverty were intermingled in violent contrast. In the center and inner city, one felt the pulse of an empire of 52 million, one with all the perilous charm of a state of multiple nationalities. The dazzling splendor of the Court acted like a magnet on the wealth and intelligence of the whole empire. And this attraction was further strengthened by the centralizing power of the Habsburg Monarchy.

This centralizing policy was necessary in order to hold together that hodge-podge of mixed nationalities. But as a result, there was an extraordinary concentration of high officials in the city, which served as both a metropolis and the imperial residence.

But Vienna was not merely the political and intellectual center of the Danube Monarchy; it was also the commercial center. Besides the large group of ranking military officers, state officials, artists, and scientists, there was the still larger mass of workers. Abject poverty confronted the wealth of the aristocracy and the merchant class, face to face. Thousands of unemployed loitered in front of the palaces on the Ring Strasse; and beneath this *Via Triumphalis* of old Austria, the homeless huddled together in the murk and filth of the canals.

There was hardly any other German city in which the social question could be studied better than in Vienna. But here I must warn against the illusion that this problem can be 'studied' from the top down. The man who

has never been in the clutches of that crushing viper can never know what its poison is. An attempt to study it in any other way will result only in superficial talk and sentimental delusions. Both are harmful—the first because it can never go to the root of the question, the second because it completely evades the question.

I don't know which is worse: to ignore social distress, as do the majority of those who have been favored by fortune and those who have risen in the social scale through their own routine labor, or the equally arrogant and often tactlessness displayed by people who make a fad of being charitable and who claim to 'feel for the people.' In any case, such people sin more than they can imagine. Consequently, and to their own astonishment, they find that the 'social conscience' on which they pride themselves never produces any results; rather, it often causes resentment. And then they talk of the ingratitude of the people.

Such people are slow to learn that there is no place for merely social activities, and that there can be no expectation of gratitude. Here there's no question of distributing favors; it's essentially a matter of restoring justice.

I was protected against the temptation to study the social question this way, for the simple reason that I was forced to live in poverty. Therefore it was not a question of studying the problem objectively, but rather one of testing its effects on me. Though the guinea pig survived the experiment, this is not evidence that it was harmless.

When I try today to recall the succession of impressions I received at that time, I find that I can only do so approximately. Here I will describe only the more essential impressions and those that personally affected me the most. And I will mention the few lessons that I learned from this experience.

2.5 THE LABORER

At that time, it was generally not very difficult to find a job because I sought work not as a skilled tradesman but as a so-called laborer—ready to take any job that turned up by chance, just for the sake of earning my daily bread.

Thus I found myself in the same situation as all those emigrants who shake the dust of Europe from their feet, and with iron determination lay the foundations of a new existence in the New World, and earn for themselves a new home. Liberated from all the paralyzing prejudices of

class and position, environment and tradition, they take any service that opens its doors to them—accepting any work that comes their way, and filled more and more with the idea that honest work never disgraced anyone, no matter what it may be. And so I was resolved to leap into this new world with both feet, fighting my way ahead.

I soon found out that some kind of work was always available. But I also learned that it could just as quickly and easily be lost.

The uncertainty of earning my daily livelihood soon became the darkest feature of this new life.

The skilled worker was not so frequently thrown into the streets as the unskilled worker; yet the former was by no means protected against the same fate. Though he may not have to face unemployment due to a lack of demand, the lock-out and the strike had the same effect.

Here the element of insecurity in earning one's daily bread was the bitterest aspect of the whole social-economic system itself.

The country boy who migrates to the big city is attracted by what has been described as easy work—which it may actually be—and fewer working hours. He is especially dazzled by the glimmer of the big cities. Accustomed to earning a steady wage, he has been taught not to quit his former job until a new one is at least in sight. As there is a great scarcity of agricultural labor, the chance of long unemployment in the country is very small.

It's a mistake to presume that the boy who leaves the countryside for the city is less solid than those who stay at home to work on the land. On the contrary, experience shows that those who are healthier and more vigorous emigrate, and not the reverse. Among these people, I include not merely those who emigrate to America, but also the young rural farmhand who leaves his native village and migrates to the big city, where he will be a stranger. He is ready to take the risk of an uncertain fate. Typically he comes to town with little money in his pocket. For the first few days, he is not discouraged if he's not lucky enough to find work. But if he finds a job and then soon loses it, the situation is much worse. To find new work, especially in winter, is often difficult and indeed sometimes impossible.

2.6 FATE OF THE WORKER

For the first few weeks, life is still bearable. He receives his unemployment money from his trade union and thus is able to carry on. But when the last of his own money is gone and his union stops paying due

to prolonged unemployment, then comes the real distress. He now walks the streets, hungry. Often he pawns or sells the last of his belongings. His clothes become shabby. And with the increasing poverty of his outward appearance, he descends to a lower social level—mixing with a class of people that poison his mind, in addition to his physical suffering. He then has nowhere to sleep, and if that happens in winter—which is very often the case—he is in dire straits. Finally he gets work. But the old story repeats itself. For a second time, the same thing happens. Then a third time—by now, probably much worse. Little by little, he becomes indifferent to this permanent insecurity. Finally he gets used to the repetition.

Thus even a man who is normally hard-working grows careless in his whole attitude towards life. Gradually he becomes a tool in the hands of unscrupulous people, who exploit him for the sake of their own advantage. He has been so frequently unemployed, through no fault of his own, that he now doesn't care if the strike in which he joins is for securing his economic rights, or aimed at the destruction of the State, the social order, or even culture in general. He dislikes going on strike, yet he joins it anyway, out of sheer indifference.

I saw this process occur before my eyes thousands of times. And the longer I observed it, the more I came to hate that mammoth city that greedily attracts men to its heart, in order to mercilessly crush them in the end.

When they arrived, they still belonged to their own people; if they stayed, that tie was broken.

I, too, was so thrown about by life in the metropolis that I experienced the workings of this fate myself, and felt its effects on my own soul. One thing stood out clearly before my eyes: It was the sudden changes from work to idleness, and vice versa, that mattered. The constant fluctuations in earnings and spending finally destroyed the sense of thrift for many people, and also the habit of controlling spending in an intelligent way. One's body gradually adapts to eating well in good times and going hungry in bad.

Indeed, hunger destroys one's sense of normal spending in good times, when one is again employed. The reason for this is that the suffering that the unemployed worker has to endure must be psychologically compensated for by a persistent mental mirage in which he imagines himself eating well once again. And this dream turns into such an obsession that it becomes a morbid impulse to toss off all self-restraint when work and wages come again. Therefore, the moment new work is found, he loses

control and begins spending like there's no tomorrow. This upsets even the small weekly budget, because spending becomes irrational. When such a thing first happens, earnings will last for perhaps five days instead of seven. Later on, they last for only three days. If the habit persists, earnings will last for scarcely a day. And finally they will disappear in a night.

Often there are wife and children at home. And in many cases, it happens that they, too, are affected by such a way of life—especially if the husband is good to them and wants to do the best he can for them, and loves them in his own way. Then the week's earnings are spent within two or three days. The family eats and drinks together as long as the money lasts, but at the end of the week they go hungry. Then the wife wanders around the neighborhood, borrows a little, and runs up small debts with the shopkeepers in an effort to reach the end of the week. Their midday meal is meager, and often nonexistent. They wait for the coming payday, talking and making plans; and while they are hungry, they dream of the happiness to come.

And so the little children become acquainted with misery early in their lives.

But the evil culminates when the husband goes his own way from the beginning and the wife protests, simply out of love for the children. Then there are quarrels and bad feelings. The husband starts to drink, and becomes estranged from his wife. He now gets drunk every Saturday. Fighting for her own existence and that of the children, the wife nags him, from factory to tavern, in order to get a few pennies from him on payday. Then when he finally comes home—maybe on Sunday or even Monday, having spent his last cent—pathetic scenes follow, ones that cry out for God's mercy.

I have actually experienced this hundreds of times. At first I was disgusted and indignant. Later, I came to recognize the whole tragedy of their misfortune, and to understand the profound causes of it. They were the unhappy victims of bad conditions.

Housing conditions were very bad at that time. Viennese manual laborers lived in appalling misery. Even today, I shudder to think of the miserable dens in which people lived, the night shelters and the slums, and all the sordid scenes of garbage, repulsive filth, and worse.

Just imagine what will happen one day, when masses of freed slaves come forth from these dens of misery, swooping down on their unsuspecting fellow men!

For this other world is indeed unsuspecting.

They have mindlessly allowed these things to go on, without caring and even without suspecting that, sooner or later, destiny will take its vengeance—unless it is appeased in time.

Today I earnestly thank Providence for having sent me to such a school. There, I couldn't refuse to take an interest in matters that did not please me. This school soon taught me a profound lesson.

In order not to despair completely of the people with whom I lived, I had to separate the outward appearances of their lives from the reasons why they developed that way. Then I could bear everything without discouragement. Those who emerged from all this misfortune and misery, from this filth and outward degradation, were not human beings as such, but rather the deplorable results of deplorable laws. In my own life, similar hardships prevented me from giving way to a pitying sentimentality at the sight of these degraded products of this process of development.

No, this is not the way to understand these things.

2.7 THE PATH TO IMPROVEMENT

Even in those days, I already saw that there was a two-fold method by alone which conditions could be improved:

First: Create better fundamental conditions of social development by establishing a profound feeling for social responsibilities. Second: Combine this feeling with a ruthless determination to prune away all incurable tumors.

Just as Nature focuses her greatest attention not on the maintenance of what already exists, but on the selective breeding of offspring, so it is in human life. Life is less a matter of artificially improving the existing generation—which, owing to human characteristics, is impossible 99 percent of the time—and more a matter of securing from the very start a better road for future development.

During my struggle for existence in Vienna, I clearly perceived that the aim of all social activity must never be merely charitable relief, which is ridiculous and useless. Rather, it must be a means of finding a way to eliminate the fundamental deficiencies in our economic and cultural life—deficiencies that necessarily bring about the degradation of the individual, or at least lead him towards such degradation.

The difficulty of employing every means, even the most drastic, against those who endanger the state is largely due to an attitude of uncertainty in deciding upon the inner motives and causes of this contemporary phenomenon.

This uncertainty is grounded exclusively in the sense of guilt that each individual feels for having permitted this tragedy of degradation. That feeling paralyzes every effort at making a firm decision to act. Because they vacillate, these people are timid and half-hearted in putting into effect even the measures that are indispensable for self-preservation.

When the individual is no longer burdened by his own sense of guilt, then and only then will he have that inner strength and outer force to ruthlessly cut out the parasite growth, and to root out the weeds.

But because the Austrian State had almost no sense of social rights or social legislation, its inability to combat these evil tumors was obvious.

2.8 LACK OF 'NATIONAL PRIDE'

I don't know what appalled me more at that time: the economic misery of those who were then my companions, their crude customs and morals, or the low level of their intellectual development.

Our bourgeoisie often rise up in moral indignation upon hearing from the mouth of some pitiable tramp that it is all the same to him whether he be a German or not, and that he will find himself at home wherever he can get enough to keep himself together.

They protest sternly against such a lack of 'national pride,' and strongly express their horror at such sentiments.

But how many people really ask themselves, why it is that their own sentiments are better?

How many of them understand that their natural pride in being members of a favored nation arises from the many occasions they have encountered that remind them of the greatness of the Fatherland, and of the nation in all spheres of artistic and cultural life?

How many of them realize that pride in the Fatherland is largely dependent on knowledge of its greatness in all those spheres?

Do our bourgeois circles ever think what a ridiculously meager share 'the people' have in that knowledge that is a necessary prerequisite for the feeling of pride in one's fatherland?

It cannot be objected here that in other countries similar conditions exist, and that nevertheless the working classes in those countries have remained patriotic. Even if that were so, it would be no excuse for our negligent attitude. But it is not so. What we call 'chauvinistic' education—in the case of the French people, for example—is only the extreme emphasis on the

greatness of France in all spheres of culture or, as the French say, civilization. The French boy is not educated on purely objective principles. Wherever the importance of the political and cultural greatness of his country is concerned, he is taught in the most subjective way that one can imagine.

This education must always be confined to general ideas in a large perspective. These ought to be deeply engraved, by constant repetition if necessary, on the memories and feelings of the people.

In our case, however, we are not merely guilty of negative sins of omission but also of positively perverting the small bit of knowledge that some were fortunate to learn at school. The rats that poison our body-politic devour from the hearts and memories of the broad masses even the little bit remaining from distress and misery.

2.9 THE ORDEAL OF THE WORKER'S CHILD

Imagine the following scene:

There is a cellar apartment, and this lodging consists of two damp rooms. A workman and his family live in these rooms—seven people in all. Let's assume that one of the children is a 3-year-old boy. That is the age at which children first become conscious of the impressions that they receive. In the case of highly gifted people, traces of those early impressions survive until old age.

Now, the narrowness and congestion of those living quarters are not conducive to pleasant family relations. Quarrels and fits of mutual anger thus arise. These people can hardly be said to live *with* one another, but rather *on top of* one another. Small misunderstandings, ones that would disappear in a spacious family home, become here the source of chronic disputes. As far as the children are concerned, the situation is tolerable from one point of view. In such conditions, they are constantly quarrelling with one another, but the quarrels are quickly and entirely forgotten. But when the parents endlessly squabble, the daily arguments sink to an unimaginably low level. Such experiences must eventually have an effect on the children. One must actually live through such an environment to truly picture the results of these mutual recriminations—as when the father physically assaults the mother and abuses her in a fit of drunken rage.

At the age of six, the child can no longer ignore these sordid details, ones that even an adult would find revolting. Infected with moral poison,

bodily undernourished, and a head full of lice, the young 'citizen' goes to elementary school. With difficulty, he barely learns to read and write. There is no possibility of learning any lessons at home. On the contrary. The father and mother themselves speak ill of the teacher and school in front of the children, and they are far more inclined to insult the teachers than to put their child across the knee and knock sound reason into him. What the child hears at home only decreases his respect for his fellow citizens. Nothing good is said of human nature as a whole, and every institution, from the school to the government, is reviled. Whether they speak of religion and morals or the State and the social order, it's all the same; everything is disparaged.

When the young boy leaves elementary school at the age of 14, it would be difficult to say what are the most striking features of his character: incredible ignorance insofar as real knowledge is concerned, or cynical impudence combined with a negative attitude towards morality. For one of such a young age, it's enough to make your hair stand on end.

2.10 YOUNG DESPISER OF AUTHORITY

What station in life can such a person fill, to whom nothing is sacred, and who has never experienced anything noble—on the contrary, who has been intimately acquainted with the lowest kind of human existence?

This 3-year-old child has become a 15-year-old despiser of authority. He has been acquainted only with moral filth and vileness, and everything excluded that might stimulate his thought towards higher things.

And now this young man enters the school of life.

He leads the same kind of life that was exemplified for him by his father during childhood. He hangs around street corners and comes home at all hours. He occasionally even beats his poor mother. He curses God and the world, and finally ends up in a juvenile corrections center.

And there he gets his final polish.

And his bourgeois contemporaries are astonished at the lack of 'patriotic enthusiasm' that this young 'citizen' displays.

Day after day, they are all witnesses to the phenomenon of spreading poison among the people, through the use of theater and cinema, gutter journalism and obscene books. And yet they are astonished at the deplorable 'moral standards' and 'national indifference' of the masses. As if trash cinema, gutter press, and the like could impart knowledge of the

greatness of one's country—quite apart from the earlier education of the individual.

I then came to understand, quickly and thoroughly, what I had never been aware of before. It was the following:

The question of 'nationalizing' a people is first and foremost one of establishing healthy social conditions that will furnish the grounds necessary for the education of the individual. For only when family upbringing and school education have imparted to the individual cultural and economic knowledge and, above all, a sense of the political greatness of his own country—only then will it be possible for him to feel proud of being a citizen. I can fight only for something that I love. I can love only what I respect. And in order to respect something, I must at least have some knowledge of it.

2.11 ARCHITECT AND WATERCOLOR PAINTER

As soon as my interest in social questions was awakened, I began to study them in a fundamental way. A new and previously unknown world was thus revealed to me.

In the years 1909-1910, I had so improved my position that I no longer had to earn my daily bread as a manual laborer. I was now working independently as a draftsman and painter in watercolors. This career was a poor one indeed, at least as far as earnings were concerned. I barely had enough to meet the necessities of life. Yet it was interesting for me, in light of the profession that I aspired to.

Moreover, when I came home in the evenings, I was now no longer dead-tired as before, when I was unable to glance at a book without falling asleep almost immediately. My present work was therefore aligned with my future profession. Furthermore, I was master of my own time, and could distribute my working-hours better now than before.

I painted to make a living, and I studied for pleasure.

Thus I was able to acquire theoretical knowledge of the social problem, something that was a necessary complement to what I was learning through daily experience. I studied all the books I could find that dealt with this question, and I thought deeply about what I read.

I believe that those around me considered me an eccentric person.

Apart from my interest in the social question, I naturally devoted myself with enthusiasm to the study of architecture. Along side music, I

considered it queen of the arts. It was pleasure, not work, to study it. I could read or draw until late at night without ever getting tired. And I became more and more confident that my dream of a brilliant future would become true, even though I might have to wait years to achieve it. I was firmly convinced that one day I would make a name for myself as an architect.

The fact that, along side my professional studies, I took the greatest interest in everything political did not seem to be especially important. On the contrary—I looked upon this practical interest in politics as the obvious duty of every thinking man. Those who have no understanding of the political world around them have no right to criticize or complain.

I therefore continued to read and study politics extensively.

2.12 THE ART OF READING

Reading, however, had a different meaning for me than it has for the average run of our so-called 'intellectuals.'

I know people who read endlessly, book after book, from cover to cover, and yet I would not call them 'well-read.' Of course they 'know' an immense amount; but their brain seems incapable of sifting and organizing the information they have acquired. They don't have the ability to distinguish between what is useful and what is useless. They may retain the former in their minds and, if possible, skip over the latter while reading it—and if that's not possible, they will throw it overboard as useless ballast.

Reading is not an end in itself, but a means to an end. Its chief purpose is to help towards filling in the framework that comprises each person's talents and abilities. Thus each one acquires for himself the tools and materials needed for the fulfillment of his life's work—regardless whether this is the elementary task of earning one's daily bread or a calling that responds to higher human aspirations. Such is the first purpose of reading. And the second purpose is to provide an overall worldview.

In both cases, however, the information acquired through reading must not be stored up in the memory, corresponding to the successive chapters of the book. Rather, each little piece of knowledge thus gained must be treated as if it were a stone to be inserted into a mosaic, so that it finds its proper place among all the other elements that form a general worldview in the reader's mind. Otherwise only a confused jumble of chaotic notions will result from all this reading. That jumble is not merely useless, but it also tends to make the unfortunate possessor of it conceited. He seriously

thinks himself to be well-educated, and that he understands something of life. He believes that he has acquired knowledge, whereas the truth is that every increase in such 'knowledge' draws him further away from real life—until he finally ends up either in some sanatorium or in parliament.

Such a person never succeeds in making practical use of his knowledge when the moment calls for it. His mental equipment is not organized to meet the demands of everyday life. His knowledge is stored in his brain as a literal transcript of the books he has read, and in the order in which he has read them. And if fate should one day call upon him to use his book-knowledge, it will have to give him the title and page number—otherwise he will never be able to recall the needed information. But if the page is not mentioned at the critical moment, the bright boy will find himself in a state of hopeless embarrassment. Highly agitated, he searches for comparable cases, and it is almost certain that he will finally deliver the wrong prescription.

If that's an incorrect description, then how can we explain the political achievements of our parliamentary heroes, who hold the highest positions in government? Otherwise we would have to attribute their actions to malice and chicanery, rather than to pathology.

On the other hand, one who has cultivated the art of reading will instantly perceive, in a book or journal or pamphlet, what should be remembered—either because it meets one's needs or it has value in general. What he thus learns is incorporated into his mental picture of a problem or a thing, further correcting or enlarging it, so that it becomes more exact and precise. If some practical problem suddenly demands examination or a solution, memory will immediately select the appropriate information from the mass that has been acquired through years of reading. Memory will also place this information at the service of one's powers of judgment, so as to get a new and clearer view of the problem in question, or to produce a definitive solution.

Only thus can reading have any meaning or purpose.

For example, a speaker who does not have at hand the sources of information that are necessary to a proper treatment of his subject is unable to defend his opinions against an opponent, even though those opinions may be perfectly solid and true. In every discussion, his memory will abandon him. He cannot summon up arguments to support his statements, or to refute his opponent. As long as the speaker only has to defend himself, the situation is not serious; but the evil comes when fate places such a know-it-all—who in reality knows nothing—in charge of a state.

CHAPTER 2

From my earliest youth, I tried to read books in the right way, and I was fortunate to have good memory and intelligence to assist me. From that point of view, my time in Vienna was particularly useful and profitable. My experiences of everyday life there were a constant stimulus to study the most varied problems in new ways. Inasmuch as I was in a position to put theory to the test of reality—and reality to the test of theory—I was protected from the danger of pedantic theorizing on the one hand and, on the other, from being too impressed by superficial aspects of reality.

The experience of everyday life at that time forced me to make a fundamental theoretical study of the two most important questions—apart from the social question.

It is impossible to say when I might have begun to make a thorough study of the doctrine and characteristics of Marxism, were it not for the fact that I ran head-first into the problem!

2.13 SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

What I knew of Social Democracy[2] in my youth was precious little—and for the most part, wrong.

The fact that it led the struggle for universal suffrage and the secret ballot gave me an inner satisfaction. I then reasoned that this would weaken the Habsburg regime, which I so thoroughly detested. I was convinced that even if it should sacrifice the German element, the Danube State could not continue to exist. Even at the cost of a gradual Slavization of the Austrian Germans, the state would not thereby become a durable empire. This was because it was very questionable if, and to what degree, the Slavs possessed the necessary capacity for constructive politics. I therefore welcomed every movement that might lead towards the final disruption of that impossible state—one that had condemned 10 million Germans to death. The more this Babel of tongues wrought discord and disruption, even in the parliament, the nearer the hour came for the dissolution of this Babylonian Empire. That would mean the liberation of my German Austrian people. Only then would it become possible for them to be reunited with the Motherland.

---

[2] Formally called the Social Democratic Workers' Party of Austria (*Sozialdemokratische Arbeiterpartei Österreichs*), or SDAPÖ. The party was founded in 1889 by a Jewish doctor, Victor Adler (1852-1918). From the beginning, it was allied to Marxism.

Consequently, I had no feelings of antipathy towards the actual policy of the Social Democrats. That its avowed purpose was to raise the level of the working classes—which, in my ignorance, I foolishly believed—was another factor that spoke in favor of Social Democracy rather than against it. But what most repelled me was its hostile attitude towards the struggle for the preservation of Germanism in Austria. Also lamentable was its courting of the Slavic 'comrades'—who welcomed this development only as long as there were practical advantages. Otherwise, the Slavs maintained an arrogant reserve; this gave the fawning beggars their just desserts.

Thus, at the age of 17, the word 'Marxism' was very little known to me, while I viewed 'Social Democracy' and 'Socialism' as synonymous. It took a sudden blow from the hand of fate to open my eyes to the nature of this unparalleled betrayal of humanity.

Until then, my acquaintance with the Social Democratic Party was only that of a mere spectator at some of their mass meetings. I hadn't the slightest idea of social-democratic teachings or the mindset of its partisans. All of a sudden, I was brought face to face with the products of their teaching and what they called their *Weltanschauung*, or worldview. Thus a few months sufficed for me to learn something that, under other circumstances, might have taken decades of study—namely that, under the cloak of social virtue and love of one's neighbor, a veritable pestilence was spreading abroad, and that if this pestilence were not immediately stamped out, it might result in the end of the human race on this earth.

My first contact with the Social Democrats came while working in the building trade.

From the very start, it was none too pleasant for me. My clothes were still rather decent; I was careful in speech, and reserved in manner. I was so occupied with thinking of my own present lot, and of future possibilities, that I took little interest in my immediate surroundings. I sought work in order to eat, and also to make progress with my studies—even though it might be slow. I may have never bothered to be interested in my surroundings, if it weren't for the fact that, on the third or fourth day, an event occurred that forced me to take a definite stand. I was ordered to join the trade union.

At that time, I knew nothing about them. I had had no opportunity to form an opinion on their value, whatever it may be. But when I was told that I must join the union, I refused. The reasons I gave were simply that I knew nothing about the matter, and that, in any case, I wouldn't allow myself to be forced into anything. The first reason probably saved me from being thrown out right away. They likely thought that I might be

'converted' in a few days and become more docile. But if they thought that, they were deeply mistaken. After two weeks, I found it utterly impossible to contemplate, even if I had been willing to join at first. During those 14 days, I came to know my fellow workmen better; and no power in the world could have forced me to join an organization whose representatives had meanwhile shown themselves in such a bad light.

In the first few days, my resentment was aroused.

At noon, some of the workers adjourned to the nearest tavern, while the others remained on the building premises and ate their midday meal; in most cases, it was a very scanty one. These were married men, whose wives brought them soup in pathetic bowls. At week's end, there was a gradual increase in the number who stayed to eat on the premises. I later understood the reason for this. On these occasions, they talked politics.

I drank my milk and ate my morsel of bread somewhere off to the side, while I either cautiously studied my environment or else reflected on my own harsh lot. Yet I heard more than enough. And I often thought that some of what they said was meant for my ears, in the hope of drawing me in. But all that I heard infuriated me. Everything was disparaged: the nation, because it was an invention of the 'capitalist' class—how often I had to hear that phrase!; the Fatherland, because it was an instrument in the hands of the bourgeoisie for the exploitation of the working masses; the authority of the law, because that was a means of oppressing the proletariat; religion, as a means of doping the people, so as to exploit them afterwards; and morality, as a badge of stupid and sheepish docility. There was nothing that they didn't drag through the mud.

At first I remained silent; but that couldn't last very long. Then I began to take part in the discussion, and to reply to their statements. I recognized, however, that this was doomed to failure, as long as I didn't have at least a certain amount of definite information about the questions that were discussed. So I decided to examine the sources from which they claimed to have drawn their so-called wisdom. I studied book after book, pamphlet after pamphlet.

Meanwhile, we continued to argue with one another. Each day I was getting better-informed than my opponents. Then a day came when the more fearsome of my adversaries resorted to the weapon that most easily triumphs over reason: terror and violence. Some of the leaders among my opponents ordered me to leave the building, or else get thrown off the scaffolding. Since I was all alone, I couldn't put up any physical resistance; so I chose the first option and departed—but richer by experience.

I went away full of disgust. But at the same time, I was so deeply affected that it was quite impossible for me to ignore the whole situation and to stop thinking about it. When my anger began to calm down, my spirit of obstinacy got the upper hand and I decided that I would get back to work again in the building trade, at all costs. This decision became all the stronger a few weeks later, when my meager savings ran out and hunger clutched me once again in its merciless arms. I had no alternative. I got work again, but I soon had to leave for the same reasons as before.

Then I asked myself: Are these men worthy of belonging to a great people?

The question was profoundly disturbing. If the answer was 'Yes,' then the struggle to defend one's nationality is hardly worth all the pain and sacrifice we demand of our best men, if it only be in the interests of such rabble. On the other hand, if the answer was 'No,' then we are a nation of pitiful men.

During those days of mental anguish and deep reflection, I envisioned an ever-increasing mass of people who could no longer be reckoned as belonging to their own nation.

2.14 THE SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC PRESS

It was quite a different feeling a few days later, when I gazed at the endless columns, four abreast, of Viennese workmen parading at a mass demonstration! I stood dumbfounded for almost two hours, watching that enormous human dragon slowly uncoil itself in front of me. When I finally left the square and wandered home, I felt dismayed and depressed.

On my way, I noticed the *Arbeiter-Zeitung* (The Worker's Journal) in a tobacco shop. This was the chief press-organ of the old Austrian Social Democracy. It was also available in a cheap café that I used to visit, and where I often went to read the papers. But previously I couldn't bring myself to look at the wretched thing for more than two minutes; its whole tone angered me. Depressed by the demonstration I had just seen, an inner voice urged me to buy the paper in that tobacco shop and read it through. So I brought it home with me and spent the whole evening reading it—despite the steadily mounting rage provoked by a ceaseless outpouring of lies.

I now found that, in the social democratic daily papers, I could study the inner nature of their thought-process far better than in all their theoretical literature.

And what a striking difference there was between the two! In the literary text that dealt with Social Democracy theory, there was a display

of high-sounding phraseology about liberty, human dignity, and beauty. It was all promoted with an air of profound wisdom and calm prophetic assurance—a meticulously-woven glitter of words to dazzle and mislead the reader. On the other hand, the daily press hammered out this new doctrine of human redemption in a most brutal fashion. No means were too crude, provided they could be exploited in the slanderous campaign. These journalists were experts in the art of deception and twisting facts. The theoretical literature was intended for the middle- and upper-class 'intellectuals,' whereas the newspaper was intended for the masses.

This probing into books and newspapers, and studying the teachings of Social Democracy, drew me back to my own people.

And thus what at first seemed an impassable chasm became the occasion for a greater love.

With an understanding of the workings of the colossal system for poisoning the popular mind, only a fool could blame the victims. During the years that followed, I became more independent and, as I did so, I became better able to understand the inner cause of the success of this Social Democratic gospel. I now realized the meaning and purpose of those brutal orders to read only 'Red' books and newspapers, and attend only 'Red' meetings. In the harsh light of reality, I saw the inevitable consequences of that intolerant teaching.

The psyche of the masses is not receptive to anything half-hearted and weak.

There are women whose inner sensibilities are not swayed by abstract reasoning but are always subject to the influence of a vague emotional longing for the strength that completes their being, and who would rather bow to the strong man than dominate the weakling. Similarly, the masses prefer the commander to the beggar, and they are filled with a stronger sense of security by an unrivaled teaching than by one that offers them a choice among many. They have very little idea of how to make such a choice. Thus they are prone to feel that they have been abandoned. They are equally unaware of their shameless spiritual terrorism and the impudent abuse of their freedom; they haven't the slightest suspicion of the inner insanity of the whole doctrine. They see only the ruthless force and brutality of its calculated words, to which they always submit.

If Social Democracy were to be opposed by a more truthful but equally brutal teaching, then this truthful teaching will ultimately prevail—even though the struggle may be of the bitterest kind.

2.15 SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC TACTICS

In less than two years, I gained a clear understanding of the doctrine and operational technique of Social Democracy.

I recognized the infamous mental terrorism carried out against the bourgeoisie, who are neither morally nor spiritually equipped to withstand such attacks. The tactics of Social Democracy consisted in opening, at a given signal, a veritable onslaught of lies and slanders against the man whom they viewed as their strongest adversary—until his nerves gave way and they sacrificed the man who was attacked, simply in the hope of being allowed to live in peace.

But the fools never attained peace.

The same tactics are repeated again and again, until the fear of these mad dogs paralyzes their victims.

Thus did Social Democracy learn the value of strength, and for that reason it attacks mostly those who are of a stronger nature, which is rare indeed. On the other hand, it praises every weakling among its opponents, more or less cautiously, according to the measure of his mental qualities.

They have less fear of a man of genius who lacks will-power than of a vigorous character with mediocre intelligence. At the same time, they highly commend those who are devoid of intelligence and will-power.

The Social Democrats know how to create the impression that they alone are the protectors of peace. In this way, acting very circumspectly but never losing sight of their ultimate goal, they conquer one position after another—now by methods of quiet intimidation and now by sheer daylight robbery. They employ these tactics at those moments when public attention is turned towards other matters, or when the public considers an incident too trivial to raise a fuss about and thus provoke the anger of a vicious opponent.

These tactics are based on an accurate estimation of human weaknesses; they will lead to success, with almost mathematical certainty, unless the other side also learns how to fight poison gas with poison gas.

The weaker natures must be told that this is a case of 'to be or not to be.'

I also came to understand that physical terror has its significance for both the masses and the individual.

Here again the Socialists accurately calculated the psychological effect.

Terror in workshops and in factories, in assembly halls and at mass demonstrations, will always meet with success, as long as it does not encounter the same kind of terror in a stronger form.

In this case, the party will surely cry bloody murder. It will appeal to the authority of the state, though they have previously repudiated it. In doing so, their aim is to add to the general confusion, so that they may have a better chance of reaching their own goal unobserved. They will search for some idiot among the higher government officials, one who hopes to ingratiate himself with them, and who will help this world-pest defeat its opponents.

The impression that such successful tactics make on the minds of the masses, whether they be supporters or opponents, can be estimated only by one who knows the popular mind—practically, not theoretically. Successes that are thus won are taken by Social Democrats as a triumphant symbol of the righteousness of their own cause. On the other hand, the defeated opponent very often loses faith in the effectiveness of any further resistance.

The more I understood the methods of physical terror that were employed, the more sympathy I had for the multitude that had succumbed to it.

I am grateful now for that time of suffering. It allowed me to think kindly again of my own people; and it enabled me to distinguish between the false leaders and the victims who were led astray.

We must look upon the latter simply as victims. I have just now tried to depict some of the mental traits of those on the lowest rung of the social ladder. But my picture would be unbalanced if I do not add that, amid the social depths, I still found light. I experienced a rare spirit of self-sacrifice and loyal comradeship among those men, who demanded little from life and were content amid their modest surroundings. This was true especially of the older generation of workmen. And although these qualities were disappearing from the younger generation, due to the pervasive influence of the big city, yet even among them, there were many who were sound at the core, and who were able to keep themselves uncontaminated amid the sordid surroundings of their everyday existence.

If these men—who in many cases were upright and well-meaning—supported the politics of their common enemy, it was because those decent workmen did not and could not grasp the baseness of the doctrine taught by the socialist agitators. Additionally, no other sector of society worried much about the working classes. Finally, social conditions were such that men who otherwise would have acted differently were forced to submit to them, if unwillingly at first. The day came when poverty gained the upper hand and drove those workmen into the Social Democratic camp.

2.16 SINS OF THE BOURGEOISIE

On many occasions, the bourgeoisie took a definite stand against even the most reasonable demands of the working classes. Such conduct was ill-considered and indeed immoral; it could bring no gain whatsoever to the bourgeois class. The result was that the honest workman was dragged out of the trade-union organization and into politics.

Millions of workers surely began with hostility to the Social Democratic Party; but their defenses were repeatedly attacked, and finally they had to surrender. But this outcome was due to the stupidity of the *bourgeois* parties, who opposed every social demand put forth by the working class. Bourgeois leaders' tactics included: a short-sighted refusal to make an effort towards improving labor conditions; a refusal to adopt accident insurance for factory workers; a refusal to forbid child labor; and a refusal to consider protective measures for women workers, especially pregnant ones. These leaders were thankful for every opportunity that they could exploit for forcing the masses into their net. Our bourgeois parties can never repair the damage that resulted from these mistakes. They sowed the seeds of hatred when they opposed all efforts at social reform. And thus they gave, at least, apparent grounds to justify the Social Democrats' claim that they, alone, stood up for the interests of the working class.

And this became the principal ground for the justification of the existence of the trade unions; thus they became, from that time onward, the chief political recruiting tool for growing the ranks of the Social Democratic Party.

2.17 THE TRADE-UNION QUESTION

During my years in Vienna, I was forced—whether I liked it or not—to take a position on the trade unions.

Because I saw them as inseparable from the Social Democratic Party, my decision was hasty—and mistaken.

I rejected them as a matter of course.

But on this essential question, fate intervened and taught me a lesson.

As a result, I changed my initial opinion.

When I was 20 years old, I learned to distinguish between the trade unions as, on the one hand, a means of defending the social rights of the

employees and fighting for better living conditions and, on the other, as a political instrument used by the party in the class struggle.

The Social Democrats understood the enormous importance of the trade union movement. They appropriated it as a tool and used it with success, while the bourgeois parties failed to understand it and thus lost political prestige. They thought that their own arrogant 'rejection' would arrest the logical development of the movement, forcing it into an illogical position.

But it is absurd and false to say that the trade union movement is, in itself, hostile to the nation. Rather, the opposite is true. If the activities of the trade union are directed towards improving the condition of the working-class, and are successful, such activities are not against the Fatherland or the state but are, in the truest sense of the word, national. In this way, the trade union organization helps to create social conditions that are indispensable for a general system of national education. It deserves high recognition when it destroys the intellectual and physical germs of social disease, and thus promotes the general welfare of the nation.

It is superfluous to ask whether the trade union is necessary.

As long as there are employers who lack social understanding and have wrong ideas of justice and fair play, it is not only the right but also the duty of their employees—who are, after all, an integral part of our people—to protect the public interest from individual greed and irrationality. To safeguard the loyalty and confidence of the people is as much in the interests of the nation as to safeguard public health.

Both are seriously menaced by dishonorable employers, who are unaware of their duty as members of a national community. Their personal greed or ruthlessness sows the seeds of future trouble.

To eliminate the causes of such a development is truly a service to the nation.

One must not say that the individual worker is always free to escape from the consequences of a perceived or actual injustice by an employer—in other words, that he is free to leave. No! That argument is only a ruse to distract from the question at hand. Is it, or is it not, in the interests of the nation to remove the causes of social unrest? If it is, then the fight must be carried on with the only weapons that might prevail. But the individual worker is never in a position to stand up against the power of the big employer. The question here is not one that concerns the victory of that which is right. If this were the guiding principle, then the conflict would never have arisen. Rather, it is a question of who is *stronger*. If the case

were otherwise, justice alone would solve the dispute in an honorable way—or, more precisely, such matters would not have come to dispute at all.

No. If unsocial and unjust treatment of men provokes resistance, then, until legislative action is taken to alleviate the situation, the stronger party can simply impose its will. Therefore it is evident that if the individual worker is to have any chance at all of winning, he must join together with his fellow workers and present a united front to the individual employer. For his part, the employer incorporates in his own person the collective strength of the vested interests in the industrial or commercial undertaking that he manages.

Thus the trade unions can hope to promote and strengthen a sense of social responsibility in the typical work-life, and can open the way to practical results. In doing this, they tend to remove those causes of friction that are a continual source of dissatisfaction and complaint.

If this is not so, it is largely the fault of those who blocked the path to legislative social reform, or rendered such a reform ineffective by sabotaging it through their political influence.

2.18 POLITICIZATION OF THE TRADE UNIONS

The political bourgeoisie failed to understand—or rather, did not wish to understand—the importance of the trade union movement. The Social Democrats thereby took advantage of this mistake and pulled the labor movement under their sole protection, without any protest. Thus they established for themselves a solid foundation of support. Correspondingly, the real purpose of the union movement gradually fell into oblivion, and was replaced by new objectives.

It never occurred to the Social Democrats that they should respect the original purpose of the union movement.

No, that was never their intention.

Within a few decades, the trade union movement was transformed, by the expert hand of Social Democracy, from an instrument that was originally created for the defense of human rights into one for the destruction of the national economic structure. Working-class interests were never respected, even for a moment. In politics, the application of economic blackmail is always possible if the one side is sufficiently unscrupulous and the other sufficiently docile.

In this case, both conditions were fulfilled.

CHAPTER 2

By the turn of the century, the trade union movement had already ceased to serve its original function. Year after year, it fell more and more under the political control of the Social Democrats, until finally it became a battering-ram in the class struggle. The plan was to shatter, by means of constantly repeated blows, the economic foundation of a carefully constructed system. Once this was achieved, the destruction of the state would soon follow, because it was already deprived of its economic foundations.

Social-Democratic attention to the real interests of the working-classes steadily decreased, until the cunning leaders saw that it would serve their immediate political interests if the demands of the masses remained unheeded; there was a danger that, if they became content, the masses could no longer be used as mere passive material in the political struggle.

The gloomy prospect that presented itself to the leaders of the class warfare—that the masses might no longer be used as a weapon of war—created so much anxiety among them that they suppressed and opposed even the most basic measures of social reform.

And conditions were such that those leaders had no trouble justifying such an illogical policy.

As the public demands increased, the possibility of satisfying them dwindled. Whatever small measure were taken became more and more insignificant. Ultimately they were able to persuade the masses that these small actions represented a diabolical plan to weaken their fighting power, and perhaps even to paralyze it. Considering the stupidity of the masses, we shouldn't be surprised at the success of these methods.

The bourgeois camp was indignant over the bad faith of the Social Democratic tactics; but they did nothing to draw the practical conclusion and organize a counter attack from the bourgeois side. The fear that the Social Democrats might truly raise the working-classes out of misery should have induced the bourgeois parties to make the most strenuous efforts in this direction—thus snatching the most important weapon from the hands of the class-warfare leaders.

But this was not done.

Instead of attacking their opponent's position, the bourgeoisie allowed itself to be pressed and harried. Finally it adopted means that were so late and so insignificant that they were ineffective—and consequently repudiated. So the whole situation remained just as it was before; but the discontent was greater.

Like a threatening storm-cloud, the 'free trade union' hovered over the political horizon and over the life of each individual.

It was one of the most frightful instruments of terror; it threatened the security and independence of the national economic structure, the foundations of the state, and individual liberty.

Above all, it was the 'free trade union' that turned democracy into a ridiculous and scorned phrase, and insulted the ideal of liberty. It also stigmatized the notion of brotherhood with the slogan 'If you won't become our comrade, we will crack your skull.'

This was how I came to know this 'friend' of humanity. During the years that followed, my knowledge of it became wider and deeper—but it hasn't fundamentally changed.

2.19 THE KEY TO SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

The more I became acquainted with the external forms of Social Democracy, the greater was my desire to understand the inner nature of its doctrines.

Official party literature was not very useful. On economic questions, its statements were false and its proofs unsound. In treating of political aims, its attitude was insincere. Furthermore, its modern methods of chicanery in the presentation of its arguments were profoundly repugnant to me. Its flamboyant sentences, its obscure and incomprehensible phrases, pretended to contain great thoughts, but they were devoid of thought, and meaningless. One would have to be a decadent urban Bohemian in order to be comfortable in that maze of aberrant reasoning, so that he might discover an 'inner experience' amid this dung-heap of literary Dadaism. They were obviously counting on the proverbial humility of certain of our people, who believe that incomprehensibility equals wisdom.

In confronting the theoretical falsity and absurdity of that doctrine with the reality of the phenomenon, I gradually acquired a clear picture of its aims.

At such times, I was overcome by dark forebodings and fear of something evil. I saw before me a teaching inspired by egoism and hatred, mathematically calculated to win a victory—but the triumph of which would be a mortal blow to humanity.

Meanwhile, I discovered the relationship between this destructive teaching and the specific character of a people who, up to that time, were almost completely unknown to me.

CHAPTER 2

2.20 THE JEWISH QUESTION

Knowledge of the Jews is the only key whereby one may understand the inner nature, and therefore the real aims, of Social Democracy.

The man who comes to know this race succeeds in removing a veil from his eyes, one that shows the aims and meaning of this party in a false light. And then, out of the fog and mist of socialist phrases, rises the grinning figure of Marxism.

It is difficult, if not impossible, for me to now say when the word 'Jew' first began to raise any particular thought in my mind. I don't remember even having heard the word at home during my father's lifetime. If it were mentioned in a derogatory sense, I think the old man would just have considered those who used it to be culturally backward. In his career, he became more or less a cosmopolitan, with strong views on nationalism, which had its effect on me as well.

In school, too, I found no reason to change the picture of things I had formed at home.

At the *Realschule*, I knew one Jewish boy. We were all on guard in our relations with him; his reticence and certain of his actions warned us to be discreet. Beyond that, my schoolmates and I had no particular opinions about him.

It was not until I was 14 or 15 years old that I frequently ran up against the word 'Jew,' partly in connection with political controversies. These references aroused a mild distaste in me, and an uncomfortable feeling always came over me when I had to listen to religious disputes.

But at that time, I had no other feelings about the Jewish question.

There were very few Jews in Linz. Over the centuries, the Jews who lived there had become Europeanized in external appearance, and were so much like other people that I even looked upon them as Germans. The reason why I didn't then perceive the absurdity of such an illusion was that I saw no other distinguishing feature but the strange religion. I believed that they were persecuted on account of their faith, and my aversion at hearing such remarks nearly grew into a feeling of abhorrence.

I hadn't the slightest idea that there could be such a thing as a systematic anti-Semitism.

Then I came to Vienna.

Preoccupied by the mass of impressions I received from the architectural surroundings, and depressed by my own troubles, I did not at first distinguish the different social strata of that huge city. Although Vienna

then had about 200,000 Jews among its population of 2 million, I didn't notice them.[3] During my first few weeks there, my eyes and my mind were unable to cope with the onrush of new ideas and values. Not until I gradually became accustomed to my surroundings, and the confused picture began to grow clearer, did I gain a more discriminating view of my new world. It was then that I came upon the Jewish question.

I won't say that the manner of my initial acquaintance with it was particularly unpleasant. I saw in the Jew only a man of a different religion. Therefore, on grounds of human tolerance, I opposed the idea that he should be attacked because he had a different faith. And so I considered the anti-Semitic press in Vienna to be unworthy of the cultural traditions of a great people. The memory of certain events that happened in the Middle Ages came to mind, and I felt that they should not be repeated.[4] Generally speaking, these anti-Semitic newspapers did not have a good reputation—though at the time, I didn't understand why—and so I regarded them more as the products of jealousy and envy rather than the expression of a sincere, though perhaps mistaken, outlook.

2.21 THE SO-CALLED WORLD PRESS

My own opinions were confirmed by what I considered to be the infinitely more dignified manner in which the big papers replied to those attacks—or even better, simply ignored them.

I diligently read the so-called 'world press'—*Neue Freie Presse*, *Wiener Tagblatt*, etc.[5]—and I was astonished by the abundance of

[3] Jewish population in Vienna was just 6,000 in 1860, but increased rapidly in the latter half of the 19th century: 40,200 in 1870; 118,000 in 1890; and 147,000 in 1900. By 1922, it was over 200,000.

[4] Jews were expelled from several European countries in the Middle Ages, including England (1290), France (1306), Spain (1492), and Italy (1593). They were initially expelled from Vienna in 1420. A second explusion occurred in 1669, under Leopold I. The 1782 'Edict of Tolerance' permitted Jews to return to Austria and granted them limited civil rights.

[5] The *Neue Freie Presse* was co-founded by a Jewish journalist, Max Friedländer, in 1864. Among its correspondents were notorious Zionists Max Nordau and Theodor Herzl. During Hitler's day, the paper was run by the Jewish businessman Moriz Benedikt. The *Wiener Tagblatt* was run by a Jewish industrialist, Rudolf Sieghart.

information they gave their readers, and the impartial way that they presented particular problems. I appreciated their dignified tone. But sometimes the flamboyant style was unconvincing, and I didn't like it. Even so, I attributed all this to the overpowering influence of the whole metropolis.

Since I considered Vienna at that time as just such a world metropolis, I thought this fact sufficient to excuse these shortcomings of the press.

But I was frequently disgusted by the undignified manner in which this press curried favor with the Court. They were either presenting everything that happened at the Hofburg in glorious tones or lamenting the critics of Wilhelm II.[6] It was a foolish practice, one that—especially when it had to do with 'The Wisest Monarch of all Time'—reminded me of the mating dance of the mountain cock.

The whole thing seemed artificial.

In my eyes, it was a stain on the ideal of liberal democracy.

To curry favor at the Court like this, and in such an indecent manner, was unworthy of the nation.

This was the first shadow to darken my appreciation of the 'great' Vienna press.

2.22 CRITICISM OF KAISER WILHELM II

While in Vienna, I continued to follow all the events that were taking place in Germany with an ardent zeal—regardless if they were political or cultural questions. I had a feeling of pride and admiration when I contrasted the rise of the young Reich with the decline of the Austrian state. But even though the Reich's overall foreign policy was pleasing, the internal political situation was not always so good.

I didn't approve of the struggle against Wilhelm II. I regarded him not only as the German Emperor but, above all, as the creator of the German Navy. The fact that the Kaiser was prohibited from speaking in the Reichstag made me very angry, because the prohibition came from those with no authority to do so. At a single sitting, those same parliamentary imbeciles cackled together more than did the whole dynasty of emperors—even including the weakest—in the course of centuries.

---

[6] Kaiser Wilhelm II (1859-1942) ruled Germany as its last emperor from 1888 to 1918. He was effectively forced to abdicate at the close of WWI.

I was outraged that, in a nation where any half-wit could claim for himself the right to criticize others as a 'legislator' in the Reichstag, the bearer of the imperial crown was himself subject to reprimand by the most miserable assembly of drivellers that has ever existed.

I was even more disgusted at the way this same Viennese press pandered to the every rickety horse in the Court, and then flew into wild ecstasies of joy if he wagged his tail in response. At the same time, these very newspapers displayed anxiety at anything to do with the German Emperor—all the while trying to hide their enmity. But to me, it was poorly cloaked. Of course, they denied any intention of meddling in Germany's internal affairs—God forbid. They pretended that, by touching these wounds in a friendly way, they were both fulfilling the duties of the mutual alliance between the two countries and were also meeting their journalistic obligations. Having thus excused themselves, they then poked their finger ruthlessly into the wound.

That sort of thing made my blood boil.

I then began to be increasingly on guard when reading the great Viennese press.

2.23 TRANSFORMATION INTO AN ANTI-SEMITE

I had to acknowledge, however, that on such subjects, one of the anti-Semitic papers—the *Deutsche Volksblatt*—acted more decently.

One thing that got on my nerves was the disgusting manner in which the big newspapers cultivated admiration for France. One really had to feel ashamed of being a German when confronted by those saccharine hymns of praise for 'the great cultural nation.' This wretched Francophilia more than once made me throw away one of those 'world newspapers.' On such occasions, I often turned to the *Volksblatt*, which was much smaller in size but which treated such subjects more decently. I disagreed with its sharp anti-Semitic tone; but I found, again and again, that its arguments gave me grounds for serious thought.

Anyhow, it was as a result of such readings that I came to know the man and the movement that determined Vienna's fate. These were Dr. Karl Lueger and the Christian Socialist Movement.[7]

[7] Karl Lueger (1844-1910) was the popular mayor of Vienna from 1897 to his death in 1910. He was also co-founder, in 1891, of the Christian Socialist Party of Austria. From 1920 onward, Christian Socialism was the dominant party in Austria. Upon the Anschluss with Germany in 1938, the party was dissolved.

CHAPTER 2

When I arrived in Vienna, I was opposed to both.

I viewed both the man and the movement as 'reactionary.'

But even an elementary sense of justice forced me to change my opinion when I had the opportunity to know the man and his work. Slowly, as I developed a stronger basis for judgment, that opinion grew into outspoken admiration. Today, more than ever, I hold this man Lueger as the preeminent type of German mayor.

So many of my basic principles were overthrown by this change in my attitude towards the Christian-Socialist movement!

My ideas about anti-Semitism also changed in the course of time, and this was my most difficult transformation.

It cost me a great internal struggle, and it was only after a long battle between reason and sentiment that the former emerged victorious. Two years later, sentiment rallied to the side of reason and became its faithful guardian and advisor.

At the time of this bitter struggle between calm reason and my spiritual sentiments, the lessons that I learned on the Vienna streets proved to be invaluable. A time came when I no longer passed blindly along the streets of the mighty city; now my eyes were open to both buildings and human beings.

Once, while passing through the inner city, I suddenly encountered an apparition in a long caftan and wearing black hair-locks.

My first thought was: Is this also a Jew?

They certainly didn't have this appearance in Linz. I watched the man stealthily and cautiously; but the longer I gazed at the strange face and examined it feature by feature, the more that my first question became a new question:

Is this also a German?

As was always my habit in such cases, I turned to books for help in removing my doubts. For the first time in my life, I bought some anti-Semitic pamphlets for a few cents. But unfortunately they all began by assuming that the reader had at least some degree of knowledge about the Jewish question, or was at least familiar with it. Moreover, the tone of most of these pamphlets made me skeptical once again, both because they were partly superficial and because their 'proofs' were incredibly unscientific.

For weeks, and even months, I returned to my old way of thinking.

The subject appeared so enormous, and the accusations so far-reaching, that I was afraid of dealing with it unfairly; and so I again became anxious and uncertain.

Yet I could no longer doubt that this was not a question of Germans who happened to be of a different religion, but rather one of an entirely different people. As soon as I began to investigate the matter and observe the Jews, Vienna then appeared to me in a different light. Wherever I went, I saw Jews.[8] And the more I saw of them, the more strikingly and clearly they stood out as a different people from the other citizens. Especially the inner city and the districts north of the Danube, swarmed with a people who, even in outer appearance, had no similarity to the Germans.

Whatever doubts I may still have had at that point were finally removed by the activities of a certain section of the Jews themselves.

There was a great movement among them, well-represented in Vienna, and which strongly confirmed the national character of Jewry: this was *Zionism*.[9]

From outward appearances, it seemed as if only part of the Jews championed this movement, while the great majority disapproved of or even repudiated it. But a close examination showed that those appearances were deliberately misleading. They emerged from a fog of theories that were produced for reasons of expediency, if not outright deception. The so-called liberal Jews did not reject the Zionists as if non-Jews, but only as brother Jews with an impractical or even dangerous way of promoting Jewry.

There was no real conflict in their inner nature.

This fictitious conflict between the Zionists and the liberal Jews soon disgusted me; it was thoroughly false, and in direct contradiction to the moral dignity and immaculate character on which that people had always prided itself.

Cleanliness, whether moral or otherwise, has its own peculiar meaning for these people. That they were not water-lovers was obvious upon first glance, and unfortunately, often also when not looking at them at all. The odor of those people in caftans often made me sick to my stomach.[10]

---

[8] By the 1920s, Jews were roughly 10 percent of the Viennese population—though in certain districts, they exceeded 50 percent.

[9] Zionism may be defined as the movement to establish a Jewish homeland in Palestine. It was founded in 1899, and rapidly grew during the first few decades of the 20th century.

[10] There is a long history of negative commentary on 'the Jewish stench,' dating back to the Roman poet Martial (ca. 100 AD). Among the more recent commentators was Arthur Schopenhauer, who issued a number of biting remarks on the "foetor Judaicus."

Beyond that, there were the unkempt clothes and the generally ignoble appearance.

All these details were certainly not attractive. But the truly revolting feature was that, beneath their unclean exterior, one suddenly perceived the moral rot of this 'chosen people.'[11]

What soon gave me cause for serious thought, with a slowly rising insight, were the activities of the Jews in certain fields of life.

Was there any shady undertaking, any form of nastiness—especially in cultural life—in which at least one Jew did not participate?[12]

On putting the probing knife carefully to that kind of abscess, one immediately discovers, like a maggot in a rotting corpse, often blinded by the dazzling light: a little Jew.

In my eyes, the charge against Jewry became a grave one the moment I discovered their activities in the press, art, literature, and the theater. All protests to the contrary were now essentially futile. One needed only to look at the posters announcing the monstrous productions of the cinema and theater, and study the names of the authors who were so highly praised there, in order to become permanently unwavering.

Here was a pestilence, a *moral* pestilence, with which the public was being infected—one worse than the Black Death. And in what mighty doses this poison was manufactured and distributed! Naturally, the lower the moral and intellectual level of such artists, the more inexhaustible their fecundity. Sometimes it happened that these fellows, acting like a sewage pump, would spew their filth directly in the face of humanity. We must recall that there is no limit to the number of such people. One must realize that, for every Goethe, nature may bring into existence 10,000 despoilers, who act as germ-carriers of the worst sort, poisoning human souls.

---

[11] "For you are a people holy to the LORD your God. The LORD your God has chosen you to be a people for his own possession, out of all the peoples that are on the face of the earth" (Deut 7:6). The idea of a people being "chosen" by God was a religious innovation of Judaism; no other religion was so self-centered. It naturally prompted Jews to think of themselves as special, different, and better than others. And it led directly to the idea that the Jews harbored "a hatred of all mankind"—a view noted by Hecateus, Tacitus, and many other observers over the centuries. See Dalton (2011) for an elaboration.

[12] Jews have long been prominent in ethically dubious industries, including usury, slavery, war-profiteering, alcohol, drugs, gambling, and pornography. For details, see Davis (2012), Nation of Islam (1991), Gertzman (1999), Darkmoon (2014), and Joyce (2015).

It was a terrible thought—and yet it couldn't be avoided, that most of the Jews seemed particularly destined by nature to play this shameful role.

Is this why they can be called 'the chosen people'?

I then began to carefully investigate the names of all the fabricators of these filthy cultural products. As a result, I became even more disgusted with the Jews than I was previously. Even if my feelings might resist a thousand times, reason now had to draw its own conclusions.

The fact was that 90 percent of all the filthy literature, artistic trash, and theatrical idiocy had to be charged to the account of a people who formed scarcely one percent of the nation. This fact could not be denied. It was there, and had to be admitted.

Then I began to examine my beloved 'world press' from a different point of view.

The deeper I probed, the lesser grew my respect for that press that I formerly admired. Its style became even more repellent, and I was forced to reject its ideas as entirely shallow and superficial. The claim that it impartially presented facts and ideas was more lie than truth. And the writers were—Jews.

Thousands of details that I scarcely noticed before now came to deserve new attention. I began to grasp and understand things differently than I had before.

I now saw the liberal press in a different light. Its dignified tone in replying to its opponents' attacks, and its dead silence on other issues, now became clear to me as part of a cunning and despicable way of deceiving the reader. Its brilliant theatrical criticisms always praised the Jewish authors, whereas its negative criticism was reserved exclusively for the Germans. The gentle pinpricks against Wilhelm II showed the persistency of its policy, as did its systematic praise of French culture and civilization. The subject matter of the short story was trashy and often indecent. The entire language of this press had the accent of a foreign people. The general tone was so openly derogatory to the Germans that it must have been intentional.

In whose interest was this?

Was all this merely an accident?

My doubts gradually increased.

CHAPTER 2

2.24 THE JEW AS LEADER OF SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

Then something happened that accelerated my insight. I began to see the deeper meaning of a whole series of events that were taking place. All these were inspired by a general concept of ethics and morals that were openly practiced by a majority of the Jews—one that had practical applications.

Here again, life on the streets taught me what evil really is.

The relationship of the Jews to prostitution and, even more, to human trafficking, could be studied here better than in any other West European city—with the possible exception of certain ports in southern France. Walking at night along the streets of the Leopoldstadt, at almost every turn, whether one wished it or not, one witnessed certain happenings that were unknown to most Germans—at least, until the war made it possible, or rather inevitable, to see such things on the Eastern front.

A cold shiver ran down my spine when I first realized that it was the cold-blooded, shameless, and calculating Jew who skillfully directed this revolting exploitation of the scum of the big city.

Then I became enraged.

I no longer hesitated about bringing up the Jewish question. No; now I sought it. As I learned to track down the Jew in many different spheres of cultural and artistic life—and in various manifestations of life everywhere—I suddenly found him where I least expected to.

I now realized that the Jews were the leaders of Social Democracy. With that revelation, the scales fell from my eyes. My long inner struggle was at an end.

In my relations with my fellow workers, I was often astonished at how easily and often they changed their opinions on the same questions—sometimes within a few days, and sometimes even within a few hours. I found it difficult to understand how men who were reasonable as individuals suddenly lost this ability as soon as they acted as a mass. This phenomenon often tempted me to despair. I argued with them for hours, and when I succeeded in bringing them to what I considered a reasonable way of thinking, I celebrated my success. But the next day, I found that it was all in vain. It was disgusting to have to begin all over again. Like an eternal pendulum, they would swing back to their absurd opinions.

All this was understandable. They were dissatisfied with their lot and cursed the fate that hit them so hard. They hated their employers, whom they looked upon as the heartless administrators of their cruel destiny. They

often used abusive language against public officials, whom they accused of being completely unsympathetic to the situation of working people. They conducted public protests against the cost of living, and paraded through the streets in defense of their claims.

All this, at least, could be reasonably explained. But impossible to explain was the boundless hatred against their fellow citizen—how they disparaged their own nation, mocked its greatness, reviled its history, and dragged the names of its most illustrious men through the gutter.

This hostility towards their own kind, their own native land and home, was as irrational as it was incomprehensible. It was deeply unnatural.

One could temporarily cure this malady, but only for a few days or some weeks. But upon later meeting those were converted, one found that they were the same as before.

That unnatural illness once again possessed them.

I gradually discovered that the Social Democratic press was predominantly controlled by Jews. But I didn't attach special importance to this circumstance because the same state of affairs existed in the other newspapers. But there was one striking fact: not a single newspaper connected to the Jews could be called 'national'—as I understood the term.

I swallowed my disgust and tried to read this type of Marxist press; but in doing so, my revulsion increased all the more. I then set about learning something of the people who wrote and published this mischievous stuff.

From the publisher on down, they were all Jews.

I grabbed all the Social Democratic pamphlets I could find, and checked the names of their authors: Jews. I noted the names of all the leaders; most of them were also members of 'the chosen people.' It didn't matter if they were representatives in the Reichsrat or trade union secretaries, organizational heads or street agitators. Everywhere it was always the same sinister picture. I'll never forget the list of names: Austerlitz, David, Adler, Ellenbogen, and others.[13]

---

[13] Friedrich Austerlitz (1862-1931) was a journalist, editor of the *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, and active SDAPÖ member. Wilhelm Ellenbogen (1863-1951) was a doctor, SDAPÖ activist, and member of the Austrian National Assembly. 'Adler' is ambiguous; it may refer to Victor Adler, founder of SDAPÖ; or his brother Max Adler (1873-1937), the noted Marxist; or Victor's son Friedrich Adler (1879-1960), secretary-general of SDAPÖ and member of the Austrian National Council (this latter Adler became well-known for assassinating a leading Austrian politician, Karl von Stürgkh, in 1916). The reference to

One fact became quite evident to me: that this alien people held in its hands the leadership of the Social Democratic Party, with whose minor representatives I had been disputing for months. I was happy to finally know for certain that the Jew is not a German.

Only then did I truly understand who the evil seducers of our people were.

A single year of my sojourn in Vienna sufficed to convince me that no worker is so rooted in his preconceptions that he will not surrender them to better and clearer arguments and explanations. Gradually I became an expert in Marxist doctrine. I used this knowledge as an instrument to drive home my own firm convictions.

Success was almost always on my side.

2.25 JEWISH DIALECTICS

The great masses can be rescued, but only by sacrificing much time and patience.

But a Jew can never be parted from his opinions.

It was simple enough, at that time, to try to show them the absurdity of their teaching. Within my small circle, I talked to them until my throat ached and my voice grew hoarse. I believed that I could finally convince them of the danger inherent in Marxist foolishness. But I only achieved the contrary result. It seemed that the more they understood the destructiveness of Social-Democratic doctrine and its consequences, the more firmly they clung to it.

The more I debated with them, the more familiar I became with their argumentative tactics. At the outset they counted upon the stupidity of their opponents; but when they got so tied up that they couldn't find a way out, they played the trick of acting as innocent simpletons. Should that fail, in spite of their tricks of logic, they acted as if they couldn't understand the counter arguments, and jumped away to another topic of discussion. They

---

'David' is ambiguous and unknown.

Hitler might have mentioned other Jewish names as well: Helene Bauer, Otto Braun, Heinrich Braun, Julius Braunthal, Hugo Breitner, Robert Danneberg, Julius Deutsch, Gustav Eckstein, Rudolf Hilferding, Sigmund Kaff, Benno Karpeles, Oskar Pollak, Therese Schlesinger, Friedrich Stampfer, and Julius Tandler. All these individuals were "Social Democratic leaders with Jewish backgrounds" (Maderthaner and Silverman 2009: 79).

stated truisms and platitudes; and if you accepted these, they applied them to other matters of an essentially different nature. If you pointed this out, they escaped again and avoided any precise statement. Whenever one tried to get a firm grip on one of these apostles, one's hand grasped only a jelly-like slime—that slipped through the fingers, and then recombined into a solid mass a moment later.

But if you really struck a blow on one of these adversaries and, due to the audience present, he had to concede the point, a surprise was in store for you the following day. The Jew would be utterly oblivious to what had happened the day before. He would start once again by repeating his former absurdities, as if nothing had happened. If you became indignant and reminded him of yesterday's defeat, he feigned astonishment, and couldn't remember a thing—except that on the day before, he was proven correct.

Sometimes I was simply dumbfounded.

I don't know what amazed me more: the agility of their speech or their art of lying.

I gradually came to hate them.

Yet all this had its good side. The more I came to know the individual leaders of Social Democracy, or at least the propagandists, the more my love for my own people grew. Considering the diabolical craftiness of these seducers, who could blame their unfortunate victims? How hard it was, even for me, to get the best of this race of dialectical liars! How futile it was to try to win over such people with argument, seeing how their mouths distorted the truth—disowning the very words they had just used, and then, a moment later, taking credit for them!

No. The more I came to know the Jew, the easier it was to excuse the workers.

In my opinion, the greatest guilt lay not with the workers but rather with those who didn't find it worthwhile to sympathize with their own people. They should have given the hard-working son of the national family what he was owed, and at the same time placed his seducer and corrupter up against the wall.

2.26 STUDY OF THE FOUNDATIONS OF MARXISM

Urged by my own daily experiences, I now began to investigate more thoroughly the sources of Marxist doctrine. Its effects were well-known to me in detail. As a result of careful observation, its daily progress became

obvious. And one needed only a little imagination in order to be able to predict the consequences that must result. The only question now was: Did the founders foresee the effects of their work in the form that they appeared, or were they themselves the victims of an error?

To my mind, both alternatives were possible.

If the latter case, it was the duty of every thinking person to oppose this sinister movement, hoping to avoid the worst results. But if the former were true, then it must be admitted that the original authors of this plague of nations must have been devils incarnate. For only in the brain of a monster, and not that of a man, could such a plan take shape—one whose workings must finally bring about the collapse of human civilization and the devastation of the world.

Such being the case, the only alternative left was to fight. This fight must employ all the weapons that the human spirit, intellect, and will can muster—leaving it to fate to decide who shall prevail.

And so I began to make myself familiar with the authors of this doctrine, in order to study the principles of the movement. The fact that I attained my objective faster than anticipated was due to the deeper insight that I had acquired into the Jewish question—my prior knowledge having been rather superficial. This newly acquired knowledge, by itself, enabled me to make a practical comparison between the real content and the theoretical pretentiousness of the doctrine laid down by the apostolic founders of Social Democracy; I now understood the language of the Jewish people. I realized that they use language for the purpose of disguising or veiling their thought, so that their real aim cannot be discovered by what they say, but rather only by reading between the lines.

This insight was, for me, the greatest inner revolution that I had yet experienced.

From being a soft-hearted cosmopolitan, I became an outright anti-Semite.

2.27 MARXISM AS DESTROYER OF CULTURE

Only on one further occasion—and that for the last time—did oppressing thoughts arise that caused me some moments of profound anguish.

As I critically reviewed the historical activities of the Jewish people, I became anxious. I asked myself if, for some inscrutable reasons beyond

mortal comprehension, destiny might not have irrevocably decreed that final victory must go to this little nation?

Is it possible that this people, which has lived only for the earth, was promised the earth as compensation?

Do we have an objective right to struggle for our own self-preservation, or is it merely a subjective thing?

Fate answered the question for me, insofar as it led me to make a detached and exhaustive inquiry into Marxist doctrine, and into the activities of the Jewish people in connection with it.

The Jewish doctrine of Marxism rejects the aristocratic principle of nature, substituting for it the eternal privilege of force and energy, numerical mass and dead weight. Thus it denies the individual value of the human personality, and impugns the idea that nationhood and race have primary significance. In doing so, it takes away the very foundations of human existence and culture.

If this doctrine were ever accepted as the foundation of the universe, it would lead to the disappearance of all conceivable order. Adopting such a law would provoke chaos in the structure of the greatest organism that we know—and the inhabitants of this earth would vanish.

If the Jew, with the aid of his Marxist creed, were to triumph over the people of this world, his crown will be the funeral wreath of mankind. And this planet will once again follow its orbit through the ether devoid of humanity, just as it did millions of years ago.

Eternal Nature inevitably avenges those who violate her commands.

Hence today I believe that I am acting in accordance with the will of the Almighty Creator: In defending myself against the Jew, I am fighting for the work of the Lord.

CHAPTER 3: GENERAL POLITICAL REFLECTIONS FROM MY TIME IN VIENNA

Today I am convinced that, in general, a man should not publicly take part in politics before the age of 30—except for cases of extraordinary talent. Until then, a man's mental development will mostly consist in acquiring the necessary knowledge to serve as the groundwork of a general platform, one from which he can evaluate different political problems. One must first acquire a fund of general ideas—a worldview. Then he will have that mental equipment necessary for consistency and steadfastness in the formation of his political opinions. He will then be qualified to take part in politics.

Otherwise he will run a twofold risk. He may find that his original position was wrong, at least regarding some essential questions. He will then either have to abandon his former position, or else stick with it—against his better judgment, and after reason has shown it untenable. In the former case, he will find himself in a difficult personal situation. He will appear inconsistent, and will lose the right to expect his followers to remain loyal. The followers themselves may see him as lacking in judgment, causing them to feel uncomfortable and nervous.

In the second case—which happens frequently—the leader no longer has the power of personal persuasion. Hence the defense of his cause becomes hollow and superficial. He now becomes vulgar. He no longer fights seriously for his political ideas (no man will die in defense of something that he does not believe), and he makes increasing demands on his followers. Indeed, the greater his own insincerity, the more unfortunate

and inconsiderate become his claims on his followers. Finally, he abandons the last vestiges of true leadership and becomes 'a politician.' At this point, his only consistency is his inconsistency—combined with overbearing insolence and an artful lying, all developed to a shameful degree.

If, to the misfortune of all decent people, such a person succeeds in becoming a parliamentarian, it will be clear at the outset that, for him, the essence of political activity consists in a heroic struggle to keep a permanent hold on this milk-bottle for himself and his family. The more his wife and children are dependent on him, the more stubbornly he will fight to stay in office. For that reason, anyone else who shows signs of political competence is his personal enemy. In every new movement, he will sense the possible beginning of his own end. And anyone who is a better man than himself will appear to him as a danger.

I shall have more to say later about this kind of parliamentary vermin.

3.1 THE POLITICIAN

At the age of 30, a man obviously still has a great deal to learn. But henceforth, what he learns will principally be an amplification of his basic ideas; it will support his basic worldview. What he learns will not imply the abandonment of his principles, but rather a deeper knowledge of them. And thus his supporters will never have the uncomfortable feeling that they have been misled by him. On the contrary: their confidence will grow when they see that their leader's qualities are progressing and developing organically by the assimilation of new ideas. His followers will see this process as an enrichment of his doctrine, one that reinforces the correctness of the view.

A leader who must abandon the platform founded on his general worldview, because he recognizes it as false, can only act honorably when he declares his readiness to accept the final consequences of his erroneous views. In such a case, he should refrain from any further political activity. Having once gone astray on essential matters, he may possibly go astray a second time. In any case, he has no right whatsoever to expect or demand that his fellow citizens continue to support him.

How little such a line of conduct commends itself to our public leaders nowadays is proved by the general corruption prevalent among the present cabal, which feels itself 'called' to political leadership.

Overall, there is scarcely one who is prepared for this task.

Even though, in those days, I used to give more time than most others to the consideration of political questions, I still carefully refrained from taking an open part in politics. I spoke of those things that bothered me, but only to a small circle of friends. This habit had many advantages. Rather than talk *at* them, I learned to listen—to get the feel of others' way of thinking. Often their outlook and views were quite primitive. But I trained myself well, without losing the time and opportunity for education.

Nowhere in Germany was the opportunity for making such a study so favorable as in Vienna.

In the old Danubian Monarchy, political thought had a wider range and richer variety of interests than in old Germany of the same era—excepting certain parts of Prussia, Hamburg, and the districts bordering on the North Sea. When I say 'Austria,' I mean that part of the great Habsburg Empire that supplied, through its German population, not only the historic basis for the formation of this state, but also whose population was, for several centuries, also the exclusive source of cultural life in that artificial political system. As time went on, the stability of the Austrian State and the guarantee of its continued existence depended more and more on the maintenance of this germ-cell of the empire.

3.2 VIENNA'S LAST REVIVAL

The hereditary territories were the heart of the empire. And it was this heart that constantly sent the life-blood pulsating through the whole political and cultural system. If this was the heart, Vienna was the brain and the will.

At that time, Vienna appeared like an enthroned queen, whose authoritative sway united the conglomeration of heterogenous nationalities. The radiant beauty of the capital city made one forget the sad symptoms of senile decay that were manifested in the state as a whole.

Though the empire was quivering internally because of the conflicts among the various nationalities, the outside world—and Germany in particular—saw only that lovely picture of the city. The illusion was all the greater because, at that time, Vienna seemed to have experienced its greatest revival. Under a truly gifted mayor, one who had the stamp of administrative genius, the venerable Residence of the Emperors seemed to have recaptured the glory of its youth. The last great German who sprang from the ranks of the people that had colonized the Ostmark was not a

so-called statesman. This Dr. Lueger, in his role as mayor of the Imperial Capital Vienna, achieved so much in almost all spheres of municipal activity—both economic and cultural—that the heart of the empire throbbed with renewed energy. He thus proved himself a much greater statesman than the so-called 'diplomats' of that period.

3.3 GERMANDOM IN AUSTRIA

The fact that this political system of heterogeneous nations called 'Austria' finally broke down is no sign of political incapacity on the part of the Germans in the old Ostmark. The collapse was the inevitable result of an impossible situation. Ten million people cannot permanently hold together a state of 50 million, one composed of different and conflicting nationalities—unless certain definite prerequisite conditions are established in time.

The German-Austrian had very big ways of thinking.

Accustomed to living in a great empire, he had a strong sense of obligation. He was the only member of the Austrian State who looked beyond the narrow borders of his own people and took in the full sweep of the empire. When destiny severed him from his common Fatherland, he tried to manage the tremendous task at hand. This task was to maintain for the German-Austrians that which, through innumerable struggles, their ancestors had originally won from the East. And it must be remembered that they couldn't put their undivided strength into this effort, because their hearts and minds were always turning back towards their kinsfolk in the Motherland—leaving only a small part for the homeland.

The general horizon of the German-Austrian was comparatively broad. His commercial interests comprised almost every part of the heterogeneous empire. The conduct of nearly all major business activity was in his hands. For the most part, he provided the state with its leading technical experts and civil servants. He was responsible for conducting foreign trade, to the extent that that sphere of activity was not under Jewish control. He held the state together. His military duties carried him far beyond the narrow borders of his homeland. Though the recruit might join a German regiment, the regiment itself might be stationed in Herzegovina, Vienna, or Galicia. The officers in the Habsburg armies were still Germans, and so were the better parts of the civil service.

Furthermore, art and science were in German hands. Apart from the new artistic trash—which might just as well have been produced by a

nation of Negroes—all genuine artistic inspiration came from the Germans. In music, architecture, sculpture, and painting, Vienna abundantly supplied the entire Dual Monarchy. And this source never seemed to show signs of exhaustion.

Finally, it was the German element that determined the conduct of foreign policy—though a small number of Hungarians were also active in that field.

All efforts, however, to save the unity of the state were doomed to end in failure, because the essential prerequisites were missing.

3.4 CENTRIFUGAL FORCES OF THE AUSTRIAN PEOPLE

There was only one possible way to control and hold in check the centrifugal forces of the differing nationalities. This was to centrally govern the Austrian State and organize it internally on this basis. In no other way could the existence of that state be assured.

Now and then there were lucid moments in the ruling authorities when this truth was recognized. But it was quickly forgotten or ignored, because of the practical difficulties. Every step toward federalism was bound to fail because, without a strong central authority, there was insufficient power to hold the federal elements together.

It must be remembered that the conditions in Austria were quite different from Bismarck's Germany. That was faced with only one difficulty, namely, overcoming political conditions; the whole Reich already had a common cultural basis. Apart from a few minor fragments, it comprised only a single people.

Conditions in Austria were quite the opposite.

Apart from Hungary, there was no great political tradition in any of the various nations. If there were, time either erased all traces, or at least rendered them obscure. Moreover, this was the age of ascendant nationalism—the awakening of national instincts in the various countries of the empire. They were difficult to control because, just outside the borders of the empire, new national states were forming, consisting of the same racial stock as those within it. These new states were able to exercise a greater influence than the German element.

Even Vienna couldn't hold out forever in this conflict.

When Budapest developed into a metropolis, a rival appeared—one who's mission was to strengthen one part of the empire, and not to help

hold it together. Soon Prague followed the example of Budapest; and later on came Lemberg, Laibach, and others. As these former provincial towns rose to become national cities, they became the centers of an independent cultural life. Through this, local national instincts acquired a spiritual foundation and thereby gained a deeper hold on the people. The time was bound to come when the particular interests of those various nations would become stronger than their common imperial interests. Once that stage was reached, Austria's doom was sealed.

The course of this development was clearly perceptible since the death of Joseph II.[1] Its rapidity depended on a number of factors, some of which had their source in the Monarchy itself. Others resulted from the position that the empire took in foreign policy.

Only a firm and persistent policy of centralization could hope to be successful at enforcing a permanent consolidation of the Austrian State. Before all, the principle should have been adopted that only one common language could be used as the official language of the state. In this way it would be possible to emphasize the formal unity of the imperial commonwealth. And thus the administration would have in its hands a technical instrument to ensure the persistence of the state as a political unity. In the same way, schools and other forms of education should have been used to inculcate a feeling of common citizenship. Such an objective could not be reached in 10 or 20 years; the effort would take centuries. Just as in all problems of colonization, steady perseverance is a far more important element than a momentary output of energetic effort.

It goes without saying that, in such circumstances, the country must be governed by strictly adhering to the principle of uniformity.

3.5 CONSEQUENCES OF ETHNIC DIVERSITY

For me it was quite instructive to discover why this did not occur—or rather, why it was not done. Those who were guilty of the omission must be held responsible for the break-up of the Habsburg Empire.

More than any other state, the existence of the old Austria depended on a strong and capable government. It lacked ethnic uniformity; this constitutes the fundamental basis of a national state, and will preserve its

[1] Joseph II was emperor of the Holy Roman Empire from 1765 to his death in 1790.

existence even should the ruling power be grossly inefficient. When a state is composed of a homogeneous population, the natural inertia of such a population will hold it together and maintain its existence through astonishingly long periods of misgovernment and poor administration. It may often seem as if there were no life in such a body-politic. But a time comes when the supposed corpse rises up and displays to the world an astonishing manifestation of its indestructible vitality.

But the situation is utterly different in a country where the population is not homogeneous, where there is no bond of common blood, but only a ruling hand. Should that hand show signs of weakness, the result will not be a kind of hibernation of the state, but rather an awakening of the individual instincts that are slumbering in the various ethnicities. These instincts are dormant when the state has a strong central government. The danger that exists in these slumbering instincts can be attenuated only by centuries of common education, traditions, and interests.

The younger such states are, the more their existence will depend on the ability and strength of the central government. If they survive only due to the power of a strong individual leader, they often collapse as soon as he dies. But even after centuries of effort, these separatist instincts cannot always be completely overcome. They may suddenly awaken when the central government shows weakness, or when centralizing efforts prove unable to counteract the vital energies of the separate nationalities, as they forge ahead towards shaping their own individual existence.

The failure to see the truth of all this constituted perhaps the tragic guilt of the House of Habsburg.

3.6 JOSEPH II

For only one Habsburg ruler did Destiny hold aloft the torch over the future of his country. But the torch was then extinguished forever.

Joseph II, Roman Kaiser of the German nation, was filled with growing anxiety when he realized that his House was moved to an outlying corner of the Reich, and that before long it would be overturned and engulfed in the whirlpool of Babylonian nationalities—unless something was done at the eleventh hour to overcome the dire consequences of longstanding negligence. With superhuman energy, this 'Friend of Humanity' made every possible effort to counteract the carelessness of his predecessors. Within one decade he strove to repair centuries of damage. If Destiny had granted him

40 years for his labors, and if but two generations had carried on his work, the miracle might have been performed. But when he died, broken in body and spirit after ten years of rulership, his work sank with him into the grave. They now rest forever in that Capuchin crypt, never to awake.

His successors had neither the ability nor the will-power necessary for the task they faced.

When the first signs of a new revolutionary epoch appeared in Europe, they gradually scattered the fire throughout Austria. And when the fire began to steadily burn, it was fanned, not by the social or political conditions, but by forces that had their origin in the nationalist yearnings of the various ethnic groups.

The European revolutions of 1848 primarily took the form of a class conflict in almost every other country, but in Austria it took the form of a new racial struggle. Insofar as the German-Austrians there forgot the origins of the movement—or perhaps had failed to recognize them at the start and consequently took part in the revolutionary uprising—they sealed their own fate. They helped to awaken the spirit of Western democracy that, within a short while, shattered the foundations of their own existence.

3.7 THE DISSOLUTION OF THE HABSBURG MONARCHY

Setting up a representative parliamentary body, without first insisting that only one language be used in all public discourse, was the first great blow to the German element in the Dual Monarchy. From that moment on, the state itself was lost. All that followed was nothing but the historic liquidation of an empire.

To watch that process of progressive disintegration was a tragic but also instructive experience. The execution of history's decree was carried out in thousands of details. The fact that great numbers of people wandered around blindly, even as they were surrounded by signs of decay, only proves that the gods had decreed Austria's destruction.

I don't want to dwell on details here, because that would lie outside the scope of this book. I want to treat in detail only those events that are typical among the causes that lead to the decline of nations and states, and which are therefore of importance to our present age. Moreover, the study of these events helped to furnish the basis of my own political outlook.

CHAPTER 3

3.8 PARLIAMENTARIANISM

Among the institutions that most clearly showed unmistakable signs of decay, even to the weak-sighted Philistine, was that which, of all the institutions of state, should have been the most firmly founded—I mean the Parliament, or *Reichsrat* as it was called in Austria.

The pattern for this corporate body was obviously that which existed in England, the land of classic 'democracy.' The whole of that blissful organization was bodily transferred, unchanged, to Vienna.

An Austrian counterpart to the British two-chamber system was established: a Chamber of Deputies and a House of Lords. The 'houses' themselves, considered as buildings, were somewhat different. When Barry built his palaces on the shore of the Thames, he could look to the history of the British Empire for his inspiration.[2] In that history he found sufficient material to fill and decorate the 1,200 niches, brackets, and pillars of his magnificent edifice. The House of Lords and the House of Commons became temples dedicated to the glory of the nation.

This was when the first difficulty came for Vienna. When Hansen, the Danish architect,[3] completed the last gable of the marble palace, he turned to the ancient classical world for subjects to fill out his decorative plan. This theatrical shrine of 'western democracy' was adorned with the statues and portraits of Greek and Roman statesmen and philosophers. As if in symbolic irony, the horses of the *quadriga* atop the two Houses are pulling apart in all four directions. There could be no better symbol for the kind of activity going on within the walls of that very building.

The 'nationalities' were opposed to any kind of glorification of Austrian history in the decoration of this building; they insisted that it would constitute an offence to them. Much the same happened in Germany, where Wallot's Reichstag building was dedicated to the Germans only under the thunder of cannons in the World War—and then only in an inscription.

I was not yet 20 when I first entered the Palace on the *Franzensring* to watch and listen in the Chamber of Deputies. That first experience aroused in me a profound feeling of repugnance.

I always hated the Parliament, but not as an institution in itself. On the contrary, as one who cherished ideals of political freedom, I couldn't even

---

[2] Charles Barry (1795-1860) designed and rebuilt the Houses of Parliament in the mid-1800s.

[3] Theophil Hansen (1813-1891).

imagine any other form of government. In light of my attitude towards the House of Habsburg, I would then have thought it a crime against liberty and reason to consider any kind of dictatorship as a possible form of government.

I had a certain admiration for the British Parliament, and this contributed to the formation of my opinion. This feeling came almost unconsciously, much of it while reading the newspapers when I was young. I couldn't discard that admiration in an instant. The dignified way in which the British House of Commons fulfilled its function impressed me greatly, thanks largely to the glowing terms used by the Austrian press. Could there could be any nobler form of government than self-government by the people?

But these considerations furnished the very basis of my hostility to the Austrian Parliament. The way it was represented here seemed unworthy of its great example. The following thoughts also influenced my attitude:

The fate of the Germans in the Austrian State depended on their position in the *Reichsrat*. Prior to the introduction of universal suffrage by secret ballot, the Germans had a majority in the *Reichsrat*—though not a very substantial one. This was a cause for concern because the Social-Democratic faction of the German majority was unreliable regarding national questions. In matters of critical concern to the Germans, the Social-Democrats always took an anti-German stand because they were afraid of losing support among the other national groups. Even before universal suffrage, the Social-Democratic Party could no longer be considered a German Party. Universal suffrage put an end even to the purely numerical dominance of the German element. The way was now clear for the further de-Germanization of the state.

My nationalist instinct of self-preservation made it impossible for me to welcome a system in which the German element was not really represented as such, but always betrayed by the Social-Democratic faction. Yet all these defects, and many others, could not be attributed to the parliamentary system as such, but rather to the Austrian State in particular. I still believed that if the German majority could be restored in the representative body, there would be no occasion to oppose such a system—as long as the old Austrian State continued to exist.

Such was my general attitude at the time when I first entered those sacred and contentious halls. For me, they were sacred only because of the radiant beauty of that majestic building. A Greek wonder on German soil.

But I soon became enraged by the hideous spectacle that met my eyes!

CHAPTER 3

Several hundred representatives were there to discuss a problem of great economic importance, and each one had the right to have his say.

That experience of a single day was enough to supply me with food for thought during several weeks afterwards.

The intellectual level of the debate was quite low. Sometimes the debaters didn't make themselves intelligible at all. Several of those present didn't speak German, but only their Slav vernaculars or dialects. Thus I had the opportunity of hearing with my own ears what I had previously known only by reading the newspapers. A turbulent mass of people, all gesticulating and screaming at one another, with a pathetic old man shaking his bell and making frantic efforts to call the House to order by friendly appeals, exhortations, and grave warnings.[4]

I had to laugh.

I paid a second visit several weeks later. It was an entirely different picture—almost unrecognizable. The hall was nearly empty. They were sleeping in the other rooms below. Only a few deputies were in their places, yawning in each other's faces. One was 'speaking.' A deputy speaker was in the chair. He looked around with obvious boredom.

Then I began to reflect seriously on the whole thing. I went to the Parliament whenever I had any time to spare, and silently but attentively watched the spectacle. I listened to the debates, as far as they could be understood. And I studied the more or less intelligent features of those elected representatives of the various nationalities that composed that motley state. Gradually I formed my own ideas about what I saw.

A year of such quiet observation was sufficient to transform or completely eliminate my former convictions regarding the character of this institution. I no longer opposed merely the perverted form that the principle of parliamentary representation had assumed in Austria; no. It became impossible for me to accept the system in itself. Up to that time, I had believed that the disastrous deficiencies of the Austrian Parliament were due to the lack of a German majority. But now I recognized that the very essence and form of the institution itself was wrong.

A number of questions arose in my mind.

---

[4] Interestingly, Mark Twain made a similar observation just a decade before. In the non-fiction essay "Stirring times in Austria" (1898), he lampoons the chaotic and sorry state of the Austrian parliament. Notably, he remarks on how all sides found the Jews to blame for their problems: "In all cases the Jew had to roast, no matter which side he was on" (p. 540). A follow-up essay, "Concerning the Jews" (1899), is also relevant for the discussion at hand.

I studied the democratic principle of majority rule more closely. And I scrutinized no less carefully the intellectual and moral worth of the gentlemen who, as the chosen representatives of the nation, were entrusted with the task of making this institution function.

Thus I came to know both the institution itself and those in it.

And thus I formed a clear and vivid picture of a typical example of that most dignified phenomenon of our time: the parliamentarian. The picture of him that I then formed became deeply engraved on my mind, and I have never altered its essential character.

Once again, these object-lessons taken from real life saved me from getting firmly entangled by a theory that, at first glance, seems so alluring to many people—though that theory itself is a symptom of human decadence.

Western democracy, as practised today, is the forerunner of Marxism. In fact, the latter would be inconceivable without the former. Democracy is the breeding ground in which the bacilli of the Marxist world-pest can grow and spread. By the introduction of parliamentarianism, democracy produced an 'abomination of filth and fire'[5]—the creative fire of which, however, seems to have died out.

I'm very grateful to Fate that I noticed this problem when I was still in Vienna; if I had been in Germany at that time, I might easily have found only a superficial solution. If I had been in Berlin when I first discovered what an illogical institution 'parliament' is, I might easily have gone to the other extreme. I might have believed—as many did, and not without apparently good reason—that the salvation of the people and the empire could be secured only by restrengthening imperial authority. Those who believed didn't understand the tendencies of their time, and were blind to the aspirations of the people.

In Austria, this was impossible.

Here it wasn't so easy to fall from one error into another. If the Parliament was worthless, the Habsburgs were worse—or at least no better. The problem wasn't solved by rejecting the parliamentary system. A question immediately arose: What then? To repudiate and abolish the Vienna Parliament would have resulted in leaving all power in the hands of the Habsburgs. For me especially, that idea was unthinkable.

Since this problem was particularly difficult in regard to Austria, I was forced, while still quite young, to go more thoroughly into the essentials of the whole question than I would otherwise have done.

---

[5] A reference to Goethe's *Faust* (part 1, line 5356).

3.9 LACK OF RESPONSIBILITY

The aspect of the situation that was most thought-provoking to me was the manifest lack of any individual responsibility.

The parliament takes an action that may have the most devastating consequences, and yet nobody bears responsibility for it. No one can be called to account. Can we call the government responsible if, in the face of a catastrophe, it simply resigns? Or if the coalition is changed, or even if parliament is dissolved?

Can a fluctuating majority of people ever be truly responsible for anything?

Isn't the idea of responsibility bound to an individual person?

Is it even possible to actually hold the parliamentary leaders accountable for any action that originated in the desires of the mass of representatives, and was carried out under their direction?

Instead of developing constructive ideas and plans, does the true statesman's business really consist in the art of making a whole pack of blockheads understand his projects? Is it really his job to beg and plead so that they will grant him their generous consent?

Is it really an indispensable quality in a statesman that he should possess a gift of persuasion commensurate with his ability to conceive great political measures, and to carry them through into practice?

Does it really prove that a statesman is incompetent if he should fail to win over a majority of votes in an assembly that has been called together as the chance result of an electoral system?

Has there ever been a case where such an assembly has worthily appraised a great political concept *before* that concept was proven a success?

In this world, isn't the creative act of genius always a protest against the inertia of the mass? And what should the statesman do if he doesn't succeed in coaxing the parliamentary mob to give its consent?

Should he buy it?

Or, when confronted with the obstinate stupidity of his fellow citizens, should he then refrain from pushing forward the vital necessities? Should he resign or remain in power?

In such a case, doesn't a man of character find himself face to face with an insoluble contradiction between knowledge and moral integrity—or better, his sense of honesty?

3.10 THE DESTRUCTION OF THE IDEA OF LEADERSHIP

Where can we draw the line between public duty and personal honor?

Shouldn't every genuine leader renounce the idea of degrading himself to the level of a political gangster?

And, on the other hand, doesn't every gangster feel the itch to 'play politics,' seeing that the final responsibility will never rest with him personally but rather with an anonymous, unaccountable mob?

Doesn't our parliamentary principle of majority rule necessarily lead to the destruction of the idea of leadership?

Does anyone honestly believe that human progress originates in the brain of the majority, and not in the brain of the individual personality?

Or may it be presumed that future human civilization can dispense with this as a condition of its existence?

Or rather, doesn't this seem today to be more indispensible than ever?

The parliamentary principle of majority rule rejects the authority of the individual and puts a numerical quota of anonymous heads in its place. In doing so, it contradicts the aristocratic principle, which is a fundamental law of nature—though it must be admitted that this principle is not reflected in the decadence of our upper 10,000.[6]

The devastating influence of this parliamentary institution might not easily be recognized by those who read the Jewish press, unless the reader has learned how to think independently and examine facts for himself. This institution is primarily responsible for the crowded inrush of mediocre people into the field of politics. Confronted with such a phenomenon, a man who is endowed with real qualities of leadership will be tempted to refrain from taking part in politics; under these circumstances, the situation doesn't call for a man who has a capacity for constructive statesmanship but rather for a man who is capable of bargaining for the favor of the majority. The situation appeals to small minds, and it attracts them accordingly.

The narrower the spirit and knowledge of our leather-handlers, the more accurately can they assess their own situation. They will therefore be all the more inclined to praise a system that doesn't demand creative genius or even high-class talent, but rather the craftiness of an efficient town clerk. Indeed, they value this kind of petty craftiness more than the political

[6] In other words, of the "1%".

genius of a Pericles.[7] Such mediocrity never worries about responsibility. From the beginning, our parliamentarian knows that, whatever be the results of his 'statesmanship,' his end is already written in the stars; one day, he will have to clear out and make room for another equally great spirit.

It's a sign of our decadent times that the number of eminent statesmen grows as the caliber of individual personality dwindles. That caliber will inevitably shrink as the individual politician increasingly depends upon parliamentary majorities. A man of real political ability will refuse to be the lackey of idiotic incompetents and big-mouths. And they in turn, being the representatives of the majority—and hence of stupidity—hate nothing so much as a superior mind.

For such an assembly of wise men, it's always a consolation to be led by a person whose intellectual stature is on par with their own. Thus each one may have the occasional opportunity to shine in debate; and above all, each one feels that he too may rise to the top. If Peter be boss today, then why not Paul tomorrow?

3.11 THE EXCLUSION OF THE INDIVIDUAL LEADER

This invention of democracy is very closely connected with a peculiar phenomenon that has recently become a real disgrace—namely, the cowardice of a large section of our so-called political leaders. Whenever important decisions must be made, they always find themselves fortunate in being able to hide behind the so-called majority!

In observing one of these political manipulators, one notices how he begs the majority for their approval for whatever action he takes. He needs to have accomplices, in order to shift responsibility to other shoulders whenever it is convenient to do so. That's the main reason why this kind of political activity is abhorrent to men of character and courage. At the same time, it attracts inferior types; for a person who is not willing to accept responsibility for his own actions, but is always seeking to hide, is a cowardly scoundrel. Whenever a national leader comes from that low class of politicians, evil consequences will soon follow. No one will then have the courage to take a decisive step. They will submit to abuse and defamation rather than rise up and take a stand. And thus nobody is left

[7] Pericles (ca. 495 – 429 BC) was one of the great Athenian statesmen.

who is willing to risk his position and his career, if necessary, in support of a determined line of policy.

One truth must always be kept in mind: the majority can never replace the man. The majority represents not only ignorance but also cowardice. And just as a hundred blockheads don't equal one wise man, so a hundred cowards are incapable of any heroic action.

The lighter the burden of responsibility on each individual leader, the greater will be the number of those who, in spite of their sorry mediocrity, will come to place their immortal energies at the service of the nation. They are so anxious that they find it hard to wait their turn. They stand in a long line, painfully and sadly counting the number of those ahead of them, and calculating the hours until their turn comes. They watch every change in personnel, and they are grateful for every scandal that thins the ranks ahead of them.

And if someone sticks to his stool too long, they consider this as almost a breach of a holy pact of solidarity. They grow vindictive, and don't rest until that inconsiderate person is finally driven out and forced to hand over his cosy berth back to the public. After that, he will have little chance of getting another opportunity. Usually those creatures who have been forced to give up their posts try to get in line again, unless they are hounded away by the protests of the others.

The result of all this is that, in such a state, the succession of sudden changes in public offices has a very troubling effect in general, one that may easily lead to disaster. It's not only the ignorant and the incompetent person who may fall victim to those parliamentary conditions; the genuine leader may be affected just as much as the others, if not more so, whenever Fate has placed a capable man in a leadership position. If the superior quality of such a leader becomes recognized, it will result in a united front against him—particularly if that leader, though not coming from their ranks, should fall into the habit of intermingling with this exalted society. They want to have only their own types as company, and they will quickly take a hostile attitude towards any man who might show himself superior to them. Their instinct, which is so blind in other ways, is very sharp in this respect.

The inevitable result is that the intellectual level of the ruling class steadily declines. One can easily predict how much the nation and state are bound to suffer from such a condition—provided one doesn't belong to that same class of 'leaders.'

The parliamentary régime in the old Austria was the purest form of this institution.

Though the Austrian prime minister was appointed by the emperor and king, this act of appointment merely gave practical effect to the parliamentary will. The huckstering and bargaining that went on in regard to every ministerial position showed all the typical marks of western democracy. The results that followed were in keeping with the principles applied. The intervals between the replacement of one person by another gradually became shorter, finally ending up in a veritable chase. With each change, the quality of the 'statesman' in question deteriorated, until finally only the petty type of political gangster remained. In such people, the qualities of statesmanship were measured and valued according to the skill with which they pieced together one coalition after another; in other words, their craftiness in manipulating the pettiest political transactions, which is the only kind of practical activity suited to the aptitudes of these representatives.

In this sphere, Vienna was the school that offered the most impressive examples.

Another feature that engaged my attention even more was the contrast between the talents and knowledge of these representatives of the people on the one hand and, on the other, the nature of the tasks they had to face. Willingly or unwillingly, one couldn't help thinking seriously of the narrow intellectual outlook of these chosen representatives of the various nationalities. And one couldn't avoid contemplating the methods through which these noble figures in our public life were first discovered.

It was worthwhile to make a thorough study of the way in which the real talents of these gentlemen were devoted to the service of their country—in other words, to thoroughly analyze the technical process of their activities.

The more I penetrated into the intimate structure of parliamentary life, and the more I studied the persons and principles of the system in a spirit of ruthless objectivity, the more deplorable it became. Indeed, it's mandatory to be strictly objective in the study of an institution whose sponsors speak of 'objectivity' as the only fair basis of examination and judgment. If one studied these gentlemen and the laws of their sordid existence, the results were surprising.

3.12 'PUBLIC OPINION'

Objectively considered, there is no other principle that turns out to be quite so ill-conceived as parliamentarianism.

Here we may pass over the methods according to which the election of the representatives takes place, as well as the ways that bring them into office and bestow new titles on them. It is quite evident that public wishes are satisfied only to a small degree, by the manner in which an election takes place. Everyone who properly estimates the political intelligence of the masses can easily see that it is insufficient to independently form a general political outlook, or to select the men who might be competent to carry out their ideas.

Whatever definition we may give of the term 'public opinion,' only a very small part of it originates from personal experience or individual insight. The greater portion results from the manner in which public matters have been presented to the people, through an overwhelmingly impressive and persistent system of 'information.'

In the theologial sphere, religious yearnings slumber in the soul, and the profession of a denominational belief is largely the result of education. So too, the political opinions of the masses are the final result of influences systematically operating on the human soul and intelligence, in light of a method that is applied with unbelievable thoroughness and perseverance.

By far the most effective branch of political education—that which is best expressed by the word 'propaganda'—is conducted by the press. The press is the chief means employed in the process of political 'enlightenment.' It represents a kind of school for adults. This educational activity, however, is not in the hands of the state but in the clutches of powers that are of a very inferior character.

While still a young man in Vienna, I had excellent opportunities for coming to know the men who owned this machine for mass instruction, as well as those who supplied it with ideas. At first I was quite surprised when I realized how little time was necessary for this great evil power within the state to produce a certain belief among the public. In doing so, the genuine will and convictions of the public were often completely misconstrued. It took the press only a few days to transform some ridiculously trivial matter into an issue of national importance—while vital problems were completely ignored or hidden away from public view.

The press succeeded in the magical art of producing names from nowhere within just a few weeks. They made it appear that the great hopes of the masses were bound up with those names. And so they made those names more popular than any man of real ability could ever hope for. All this was done, despite the fact that such names were utterly unknown, even up to a month before the press publicly extolled them.

At the same time, older figures in politics and other spheres of life quickly faded from the public memory, and were forgotten as if they were dead—though they were still vigorous and healthy. Or they were so vilely abused that it looked as if their names would soon stand as permanent symbols of villainy. To understand the really pernicious influence that the press can exercise, one must study this infamous Jewish method whereby honorable and decent people are besmirched with filth, in the lowest form of abuse and slander, from hundreds of directions simultaneously—as if by magic.

These spiritual robbers will grab at anything that might serve their evil ends.

They would poke their noses into the most intimate family affairs, and not rest until they had sniffed out some petty issue that could be used to destroy the victim's reputation. But even if nothing were discovered in the private or public life of the victim, they continued to hurl abuse at him in the belief that some of their charges would stick, even though refuted a thousand times. In most cases, it finally became impossible for the victim to continue his defense because the accuser worked together with so many accomplices that his slanders were repeated interminably.

But these slanderers would never admit that they were acting from motives that were believable or comprehensible to the common run of humanity. God forbid! The scoundrel who defamed his contemporaries in this villainous way would, like an octopus, cover himself with a cloud of respectability and clever phrases about his 'journalistic duty' and other such nonsense. When these pests gathered together in large numbers at meetings and congresses, they would dish out a lot of slimy talk about a special kind of 'honor'—namely, the professional honor of the journalist. Then the assembled species would bow their respects to one another.

This rabble fabricates more than two-thirds of the so-called public opinion, from whose foam the parliamentary Aphrodite eventually arises.[8]

3.13 THE MAJORITY PRINCIPLE

Several volumes would be needed if one were to give an adequate account of all its hollow fallacies. But if we pass over the details and look

[8] The name 'Aphrodite' means literally 'foam-risen.' In Greek mythology, Aphrodite arose from the foam of the sea.

at the product itself while in operation, I think this alone will suffice to open the eyes of even the most innocent and naïve person, so that he may recognize the absurdity of this institution by looking at it objectively.

This human aberration is as harmful as it is absurd. In order to see this, the best and easiest method is to compare democratic parliamentarianism with a genuine German democracy.

The remarkable characteristic of the parliamentary form of democracy is the fact that a number of persons, let us say 500—these days, including women also—are elected to parliament and invested with authority to give final judgment on everything. In practice, they alone are the governing body; for although they may appoint a cabinet that outwardly seems to direct state affairs, this cabinet has no real existence of its own. In reality this so-called government can't do anything against the will of the assembly. It can never be called to account for anything, since the right of decision is not vested in the cabinet but in the parliamentary majority. The cabinet always functions only as the executor of the will of the majority. Its political ability can be judged only by how far it succeeds in adapting to the will of the majority, or in persuading the majority to agree to its proposals.

But this means that it must descend from the level of a real governing power to that of a beggar, one who has to beg for the approval of a majority. Indeed, the main job of the cabinet is to secure for itself the favor of the majority then in power or, failing that, to form a new majority that will be more favorably disposed. If it should succeed in either of these efforts, it may go on 'governing' for a little while. If it should fail to win or form a majority, it must resign. Whether its policy per se was right or wrong doesn't matter at all.

For all practical purposes, responsibility is abolished.

The consequences of such a state of affairs can easily be understood from the following simple considerations:

Those 500 deputies who have been elected by the people come from various dissimilar callings in life; they show widely varying degrees of political capacity, with the result that the whole picture is incoherent and deplorable. Surely nobody believes that these elected representatives of the nation are the choice spirits or first-class intellects! No one, I hope, is foolish enough to pretend that hundreds of true statesmen can emerge from papers placed in the ballot box by voters who are just of average intelligence.

The absurd notion that men of genius are born out of universal suffrage cannot be too strongly repudiated. In the first place, those times may be

really called blessed when *one* genuine statesman appears among a people. Such statesmen don't appear by the hundreds or more. Secondly, the broad masses instinctively display a definite antipathy towards every outstanding genius. There's a better chance of a camel passing through the eye of a needle than of a truly great man being 'discovered' through an election.

Throughout world history, exceptional events have mostly been due to the driving force of an individual personality.

But here, 500 persons of sub-par intellectual qualities pass judgment on the most important problems affecting the nation. They form governments, that in turn learn to win the approval of the illustrious assembly for every legislative step—which means that the policy to be carried out is actually the policy of the 500.

And that's just what it usually looks like.

But let's pass over the intellectual qualities of these representatives and ask what is the nature of the task set before them. If we consider the fact that the problems to be addressed are variable and diverse, we can very well realize how inefficient a governing system must be that entrusts the right of decision to a mass assembly, one in which only very few possess the requisite knowledge and experience to properly deal with the matters. The most important economic measures are submitted to a tribunal in which not more than 10 percent have studied economics. This means that final authority is vested in men who are utterly devoid of any preparatory training that would make them competent to decide on the questions at hand.

The same holds true of every other problem. It's always a majority of ignorant and incompetent people who decide on each measure. The composition of the institution does not change, while the problems to be dealt with come from the most varied spheres of public life. An intelligent judgment would be possible only if different deputies had the authority to deal with different issues. It's out of the question to think that the same people are qualified to decide on transportation questions as well as, say, on questions of foreign policy—unless each is a universal genius. But scarcely more than one true genius appears in a century.

Here we are scarcely ever dealing with real thinkers, but only with dilettantes who are as narrow-minded as they are conceited and arrogant—intellectual prostitutes of the worst kind. That's why these honorable gentlemen show such astonishing levity in debating matters that would demand the most painstaking consideration, even from great minds. Measures of momentous importance for the future existence of the state

are discussed in an atmosphere more suited to the card-table. Indeed, the latter would be a much more fitting occupation for these gentlemen than that of deciding the destinies of a race.

Of course, it would be unfair to assume that *every* member in such a parliament was endowed by nature with such a small sense of responsibility.

No, by no means.

3.14 THE DESTRUCTION OF CHARACTER

But this system, by forcing the individual to pass judgment on questions for which he is not competent, gradually debases his moral character. Nobody will have the courage to say, "Gentlemen, I'm afraid we know nothing about what we are talking about. I for one have no competency in the matter at all." (Besides, if such a declaration were made, it wouldn't change matters very much; such outspoken honesty would not be understood. The person who made the declaration would be deemed an honorable ass who shouldn't be allowed to spoil the game.) Those who know human nature know that nobody likes to be considered a fool among his associates; and in certain circles, honesty is taken as a measure of stupidity.

Thus even a man who was originally honest, once he finds himself elected to parliament, may eventually be forced to acquiesce in a line of conduct that is base in itself, and which amounts to a betrayal of the public trust. This destroys every real sense of honor that might occasionally rise up in the conscience of one person or another. Finally, the otherwise upright deputy will succeed in persuading himself that he is by no means the worst of the lot, and that by playing along, he may prevent something worse from happening.

An objection may be raised here. It may be said that, of course, the individual member may not have a knowledge of what's required for addressing this or that question. But in such a case, the party sets up special committees of experts who have more than the required knowledge for dealing with the questions before them.

At first glance, that argument seems sound. But then another question arises: namely, why are 500 persons elected if only a few have the wisdom that is required to deal with the more important problems?

Yes—this is the worm in the apple.

CHAPTER 3

3.15 JEWISH DEMOCRACY

It isn't the aim of our modern democratic parliamentary system to bring together an assembly of intelligent and well-informed men. The aim rather is to bring together a group of non-entities who are dependent on others for their views, and who can be all the more easily led, the narrower their mental outlook. This is the only way that party policy—according to the evil meaning it has today—can be put into effect.

Only in this way is it possible for the wire-puller, who exercises real control, to remain in the dark, so that he personally can never be held accountable. Under such circumstances, none of the decisions taken, no matter how disastrous they may be, can be laid at the foot of the scoundrel who is truly to blame. All responsibility is shifted to the shoulders of the party as a whole.

In practice, no actual responsibility remains. It arises only from personal duty and not from the obligations that rest with a parliamentary assembly of empty talkers.

The parliamentary institution attracts liars and moles, people who shun the light of day. No upright man, who is ready to accept personal responsibility for his acts, will be attracted to such an institution.

That's the reason why this brand of democracy has become a tool in the hand of that race that, because of its inner goals, must shun the open light—as it has always done and always will do. Only the Jew can praise an institution which is as corrupt and false as himself.

By contrast, consider a truly German democracy. Here the leader is freely chosen and is obliged to accept full responsibility for all his actions and omissions. Problems are not put to a majority vote, but they are decided upon by the individual. As a guarantee of responsibility for those decisions, he pledges his worldly belongings, and even his life.

The objection may be raised here that, under such conditions, it would be very difficult to find a man who would be ready to devote himself to so risky a task. There is only one answer to that:

Thank God that our German democracy will prevent the chance careerist, who may be intellectually worthless and a moral slacker, from coming to power in devious ways. The fear of undertaking such far-reaching responsibilities, under German democracy, will scare off the ignorant and the incompetent.

But if it happens that such a person sneaks in, it will be easy enough to ruthlessly identify and challenge him—somewhat as follows: "Be gone,

you scoundrel! Don't soil these steps with your feet; these are the steps of the Pantheon of History, and they are not meant for status-seekers but for men of noble character!"

Such were the views I formed after two years of attending the sessions of the Viennese Parliament.

Then I never went back.

3.16 THE COLLAPSING DUAL MONARCHY

The parliamentary regime was one of the chief reasons why the Habsburg State steadily declined during its final years. The more that the German element was whittled away through parliamentary procedure, the stronger was the system of playing off the various constituent nationalities against the other. In the *Reichsrat*, this always occurred at the expense of the Germans, which meant that the results were detrimental to the empire as a whole. At the close of the century, even a simpleton could see that the cohesive forces in the Dual Monarchy could no longer counterbalance the separatist tendencies of the provincial nationalities.

On the contrary.

The measures that the state adopted for its own maintenance became increasingly mean-spirited; correspondingly, general disrespect for the state increased. Hungary and the various Slav provinces gradually ceased to identify themselves with the unified monarchy, and therefore they didn't feel its weakness as in any way detrimental to themselves. Rather, they welcomed those symptoms of decay. They looked forward to the final dissolution of the state, not to its recovery.

Complete collapse was temporarily averted in parliament by the humiliating concessions that were made to all kinds of annoying demands, at the expense of the Germans. Everywhere the defense of the state rested on playing off the various nationalities against one another. But the general trend of this development was always directed against the Germans. Given that the right of royal succession gave a certain influence to the Archduke Franz Ferdinand, a policy of increasing the power of the Czechs was systematically enacted throughout the administration.[9] With all the means

[9] Franz Ferdinand (1863-1914) supported equal representation for the Slavic nations of the empire. His assassination on 28 June 1914 precipitated World War I.

at his disposal, the heir to the Dual Monarchy personally furthered a policy aimed at eliminating the influence of the Germans—or at least he defended that policy. Purely German districts were gradually but decisively brought within the danger zone of the mixed languages. Even in Lower Austria, this process began to make increasingly rapid progress, and Vienna was looked upon by the Czechs as their largest city.

The central idea of this new Habsburg was to establish a Slavic State in Central Europe. The Czech language was favored. (The Archduke's wife had formerly been a Czech countess, and she was wedded to the prince by an arranged marriage. She came from an environment of traditional hostility to the Germans.) This new state was to be constructed on a purely Catholic basis, so as to serve as a bulwark against Orthodox Russia. As had happened often in Habsburg history, religion was thus exploited to serve a purely political policy—and in this case, a fatal policy, at least for the Germans.

The result was lamentable in many respects.

Neither the House of Habsburg nor the Catholic Church received the reward that they expected.

Habsburg lost the throne, and the Church lost a great state.

By employing religious motives in the service of politics, a spirit was aroused that the instigators had never thought possible.

The attempt to root out Germandom in the old monarchy led to the emergence of the Pan-German Movement in Austria.

In the 1880s, Manchester Liberalism, which was fundamentally Jewish in its outlook, had reached or even passed the zenith of its influence in the Dual Monarchy.[10] The reaction that set in arose not from social but from nationalistic tendencies, as was always the case in old Austria. The instinct for self-preservation drove the Germans to vigorously defend themselves. Economic considerations only slowly began to grow in influence; but they were of secondary concern. But of the general political chaos, two party organizations emerged. The one was more of a national character, and the other more social. Both were highly interesting and instructive for the future.

After the humiliating end of the War of 1866, the House of Habsburg contemplated a military revenge.[11] Only the tragic death of Emperor Maximilian of Mexico prevented a still closer collaboration with France.

[10] Manchester Liberalism was an economic school of thought that originated in Manchester, England in the mid-19th century. It was "Jewish" insofar as it promoted free trade and globalism generally.

[11] The War of 1866 was essentially a German civil war, in which Prussia triumphed over the Austrian-Germans.

The chief blame for Maximilian's disastrous expedition was attributed to Napoleon III; the fact that the French abandoned him aroused a general feeling of indignation. Yet the Habsburgs were still lying in wait for their opportunity. If the War of 1870-71 had not been such a singular triumph, the Viennese Court might have risked a bloody venture in order to avenge Sadowa.[12] But when the first reports arrived from the Franco-German battlefield, which, though true, seemed miraculous and almost incredible, the 'wisest' of all monarchs recognized that it was an inopportune moment, and tried to put the best face on a bad situation.

The heroic conflict of those two years [1870–71] produced an even greater miracle. With the Habsburgs, the change of attitude came only from the pressure of circumstances, never from a heartfelt urge. The German people of the Ostmark, however, were entranced by the triumphant glory of the newly-established German Reich, and were profoundly moved when they saw the dream of their fathers resurrected in a glorious reality.

Let there be no mistake: The true German-Austrian realized, from this time onward, that Königgrätz was the tragic but necessary pre-condition for the re-establishment of an empire that would no longer be burdened with the morbidity of the old alliance. Above all, the German-Austrian came to feel, in the very depths of his own being, that the historic mission of the House of Habsburg had come to an end, and that the new empire could choose only a kaiser whose heroic convictions were worthy to wear the 'Crown of the Rhine.' It was right and just that destiny be praised for having chosen a scion of that house which, in Frederick the Great, gave the nation an elevated and shining symbol for all time to come.

3.17 REBELLION OF THE GERMAN-AUSTRIANS

After the great war [of 1870–71], the House of Habsburg desperately set to work to slowly and deliberately root out the dangerous German element—whose inner feelings and attitude could not be doubted. Such a process would be the final result of the Slavization policy. It was then that the fire of rebellion burned among the doomed people, such as has never been seen in modern German history.

[12] The War of 1870, also known as the Franco-Prussian War, resulted in German victory, the fall of Paris, and the absorption of Alsace-Lorraine into the German empire. 'Sadowa' ('Königgrätz,' in German) is present-day Sadova, in the Czech Republic; it was the decisive battle in the war, and ended in Prussian victory.

For the first time, nationalists and patriots were transformed into rebels. Not rebels against the nation or the state as such, but rebels against that form of government that they were convinced would inevitably bring about the ruin of their own people.

For the first time in modern history, the traditional dynastic patriotism and national love of fatherland and people were in open conflict.

It was to the merit of the pan-German movement in Austria during the 1890s that it pointed out clearly and unequivocally that a state is entitled to demand respect and protection only when it is administered in accordance with the interests of the nation—or at least not in a manner detrimental to those interests.

The authority of the state can never be an end in itself. If that were so, any kind of tyranny would be inviolable and sacred.

If a government uses the instruments of power in its hands for the purpose of leading a people to ruin, then rebellion is not only the right of every individual citizen—it is his duty.

The question of whether and when such a situation exists cannot be answered by theoretical dissertations, but only by the exercise of force; and it is success that decides the issue.

Every government—even one that is the worst possible, and even though it may have betrayed the nation's trust in a thousand ways—will claim that its duty is to uphold the authority of the state. Its adversaries, who are fighting for national self-preservation, must use the same weapons that the government uses, if they are to prevail against such a rule and secure their own freedom and independence. Therefore the conflict will be fought with 'legal' means as long as the power to be overthrown uses them. But the insurgents won't hesitate to apply illegal means if the oppressor himself uses them.

Generally speaking, we must not forget that the highest aim of human existence is not the maintenance of a state of government, but rather the preservation of the species.

3.18 HUMAN RIGHTS OVERRIDE STATES' RIGHTS

If the species is in danger of being oppressed or even eliminated, the question of legality is only of secondary importance. The established power may, in such a case, employ only those means that are alleged to be 'legal.' And yet the instinct of self-preservation on the part of the oppressed will always justify, to the greater degree, the use of all possible resources.

Only on the basis of this principle was it possible to conduct those struggles against foreign enslavement or domestic oppression, of which history supplies us with many magnificent examples.

Human rights surpass the rights of the state.

But if a people be defeated in the struggle for its human rights, this means that its weight has proved too light in the scale of destiny, to be worthy of survival on this earth. When a people is unwilling or unable to fight for its existence, then Providence, in its eternal justice, will decree that people's end.

The world is not here for cowards.

Austria affords a very clear and striking example of how easy it is for tyranny to hide its head under the cloak of so-called 'legality.'

The legal exercise of power in the Habsburg State was then based on the anti-German attitude of the parliament, with its non-German majorities, and on the dynastic House, which was also hostile to the German element. The whole authority of the state was incorporated in these two factors. Any attempt to alter the lot of the Germans through these two factors would have been absurd. Those who advised the 'legal' way as the only possible means offered no resistance; no policy of resistance could have been put into effect through legal measures. To follow the advice of the legalist counsellors would have meant the inevitable ruin of the German element within the monarchy. And this disaster would have come very soon. The Germans were actually saved only by the collapse of the state.

The spectacled theorist would still rather die for his doctrine than for his people.

Because men have made laws, he subsequently comes to think that they exist for the sake of the laws.

The pan-German movement rendered a great service by abolishing all such nonsense—to the horror of all doctrinaire theorists and other fetish-worshippers.

When the Habsburgs attempted to attack the German element through all available means, the Pan-German Party hit back ruthlessly against the 'illustrious' dynasty. This party was the first to probe into the corrupt condition of the state. In doing so, they opened the eyes of hundreds of thousands. To its credit, it liberated the high ideal of love for one's country from the embrace of this deplorable dynasty.

When that party first made its appearance, it secured a large following—in fact, almost an avalanche. But the initial successes didn't last. When I came to Vienna, the Pan-German Party had been eclipsed by the Christian-

Socialist Party, which had meanwhile come into power. Indeed, the Pan-German Party had been reduced to almost complete insignificance.

The rise and fall of the pan-German movement on the one hand, and the unprecedented progress of the Christian-Socialist Party on the other, became a classic object of study for me. They played an important part in the development of my own views.

When I came to Vienna, all my sympathies were exclusively with the pan-German movement.

I was impressed by the fact that they had the courage to shout '*Heil Hohenzollern,*' and I rejoiced at their determination to consider themselves an integral part of the German Reich, from which they were only temporarily separated. They never missed an opportunity to explain their attitude in public, which raised my enthusiasm and confidence. To publicly avow one's principles on every problem that concerned Germanism, and to never compromise, seemed to me the only way of saving our people. What I couldn't understand was how this movement declined so soon after such a magnificent start. And it was no less incomprehensible that the Christian-Socialists should gain such tremendous power within such a short time. They had just reached the pinnacle of their popularity.

When I began to compare those two movements, Fate gave me the best means of understanding the causes of this puzzling problem—in this case, accelerated by my own sad circumstances.

3.19 SCHÖNERER AND LUEGER

I'll begin my analysis with an account of the two men who must be regarded as the founders and leaders of the two movements: George von Schönerer and Dr. Karl Lueger.

As far as personality goes, both were far above the level and stature of the so-called parliamentary figures. They lived lives of immaculate and irreproachable purity amidst the morass of general political corruption. My initial sympathies lay with the Pan-German representative, Schönerer; it was only afterwards, and gradually, that I felt an equal liking for the Christian-Socialist leader.

When I compared their respective abilities, Schönerer seemed to me a better and more profound thinker on fundamental problems. He foresaw the inevitable downfall of the Austrian State more clearly and accurately than anyone else. If this warning to the Habsburg Empire had been heeded

in Germany, the disastrous World War, which pitted Germany against the whole of Europe, would never have taken place.

But though Schönerer succeeded in penetrating to the essentials of a problem, he was frequently mistaken in his judgment of men.

And here, on the other hand, lay Dr. Lueger's strength.

He had a rare gift of insight into human nature, and he was very careful not to take men as something better than they really were. He based his plans on the practical possibilities that human life offered him, whereas Schönerer had only little understanding in that respect. All ideas that this pan-German had were theoretically right, but he didn't have the forcefulness or understanding necessary to put his ideas across to the broad masses. He was unable to formulate them for the masses, whose powers of comprehension are limited, and will always remain so. Therefore all Schönerer's knowledge was only visionary wisdom; he never could succeed in putting it into practice.

This lack of insight into human nature led him to err in estimating the forces behind certain movements and the inherent strength of old institutions.

Schönerer indeed realized that his questions involved the nature of a worldview. But he didn't understand that only the broad masses of a nation can make such convictions—which are almost religious in nature—prevail.

Unfortunately, he only poorly understood how weak the fighting spirit of the so-called bourgeoisie is. That weakness is due to their business interests; they are much too afraid of taking risks, and this deters them from acting.

And generally speaking, a worldview has no prospect of success unless the broad masses declare themselves ready to act as its standard-bearers, and to fight on its behalf—wherever and to whatever degree necessary.

This failure to understand the importance of the lower strata of society resulted in a very inadequate conception of the social question.

In all this, Dr. Lueger was the opposite of Schönerer.

His profound knowledge of human nature enabled him to correctly judge the various social forces, and it saved him from underrating the power of existing institutions. And it was perhaps this very quality that enabled him to utilize those institutions as a means to serve the purposes of his policy.

He saw only too clearly that, in our day, the political fighting power of the upper classes is quite insignificant; it is incapable of fighting for a great new movement until the triumph of that movement is secured. Thus he devoted the larger part of his political activity to the task of winning over those sections of the population whose existence was in danger, and to fostering a militant spirit in them rather than attempting to paralyze it. He

was also quick to adopt all available means for winning the support of long-established institutions, in order to derive the greatest possible advantage for his movement from those old sources of power.

Thus it was that, first of all, he chose as the social basis of his new party a middle class that was threatened with extinction. He thus secured a solid following, one that was willing to make great sacrifices and had good fighting power. His extremely wise attitude towards the Catholic Church rapidly won over large numbers of younger clergy—so much so that the old Clerical Party was forced to abandon the field of action or else, which was the wiser course, join the new party, in the hope of gradually winning back one position after another.

But it would be a serious injustice to the man if we regarded this as his essential characteristic. For he possessed the qualities of an astute tactician, and had the true genius of a great reformer; but all these were limited by his exact perception of the possibilities at hand, and also of his own capabilities.

The goals that this really eminent man decided to pursue were intensely practical. He wished to conquer Vienna, the heart of the monarchy. It was from Vienna that the last pulses of life beat through the diseased, worn-out body of the crumbling empire. If the heart could be made healthier, the others parts of the body were bound to revive. That idea was correct in principle. But the time required to make this happen was strictly limited.

And that was the man's weakness.

His achievements as mayor of the city of Vienna are immortal, in the best sense of the word. But all that could not save the monarchy—it came too late.

His rival, Schönerer, saw this more clearly.

All of Dr. Lueger's practical efforts were marvellously successful; but the hoped-for results never materialized.

Schönerer failed to attain his goals, but his most terrible fears came true.

Thus both these men failed to attain their ultimate objectives. Lueger couldn't save Austria, and Schönerer couldn't save the German people in Austria from ruin.

To study the causes of failure in the case of these two parties is to learn a highly instructive lesson for our own time. This is especially useful for my friends, because in many points the circumstances of our own day are similar to those of that time. Therefore such a lesson may help us to guard against the mistakes that brought one of those movements to an end, and rendered the other sterile.

3.20 THE CAUSES OF SCHÖNERER'S FAILURE

In my opinion, the collapse of the pan-German movement in Austria must be attributed to three causes.

First, the leaders didn't have a clear concept of the importance of the social problem, particularly for a new and revolutionary party.

Schönerer and his followers directed their attention primarily to the bourgeoisie. For that reason, the party was bound to turn out mediocre and tame.

The German bourgeoisie, especially in its upper circles, is pacifist even to the point of complete self-abnegation—though some may not be aware of this—wherever the internal affairs of the nation or state are concerned. In good times, which in this case means times of good government, such a psychological attitude makes this class extraordinarily valuable to the state. But when there is bad government, such a quality has a destructive effect. In order to assure the possibility of carrying through a really serious struggle, the pan-German movement should have devoted its efforts to winning over the masses. The failure to do this left the movement, from the very beginning, without the elemental impulse that such a wave needs if it's not to shortly ebb away.

In failing to see the truth of this principle clearly at the very outset of the movement, and in neglecting to put it into practice, the new party made an initial mistake from which it couldn't recover. The numerous moderate bourgeois elements admitted into the movement increasingly determined its internal orientation. This preempted all further prospects of gaining any appreciable support among the masses. Under such conditions, the movement couldn't get beyond mere discussion and criticism. Quasi-religious faith and the spirit of sacrifice were no longer found in the movement. Their place was taken by the effort towards 'positive' collaboration, which in this case meant acknowledging the existing state of affairs. Such a gradual whittling away of the rough corners of the questions in dispute resulted in the making of a dishonorable peace.

Such was the fate of the pan-German movement because, from the start, the leaders didn't realize that the most important condition of success was to recruit their followers from the broad masses. The movement thus became 'bourgeois' and 'respectable'—and only moderately 'radical.'

CHAPTER 3

3.21 PAN-GERMANS AND PARLIAMENT

From this failure came the second cause of its rapid decline.

The position of the Germans in Austria was already desperate when pan-Germanism arose. Year after year, parliament was being used more and more as an instrument for the slow destruction of the German-Austrian people. The only hope for an eleventh-hour effort to save it lay in the overthrow of the parliamentary system; but there was very little prospect of this happening.

Thus the movement was confronted with a question of primary importance:

To overthrow the parliament, should the pan-Germanists have entered it 'to undermine it from within,' as they say? Or should they have attacked the institution as such from the outside?

They went in, and came out defeated.

But they were compelled to enter.

In order to wage an effective war against such a power from the outside, indomitable courage and a ready spirit of sacrifice are necessary weapons. In such cases, the bull must be seized by the horns. Furious attacks may drive you to the ground again and again. But if you have a stout heart, you will stand up, perhaps with broken bones. And only after a long and tough struggle will you triumph. New fighters are attracted to a cause by the appeal of great sacrifices made for its sake, until at last tenacity is rewarded with success.

For such a result, however, the children of the the great masses are necessary.

They alone have the requisite determination and tenacity to fight through to the end.

But the pan-German movement didn't have these broad masses, and so the only other solution was to enter parliamcnt.

It would be a mistake to think that this decision resulted from a long series of internal moral hesitations, or that it was the outcome of careful calculation. No; they didn't even consider another solution. Those who participated in this blunder were motivated by vague notions regarding the significance and effect of participating in an institution that they had condemned on principle. In general, they hoped that they would thus be able to promote their cause to the great masses of people, because they could speak before 'the forum of the whole nation.' Also, it seemed reasonable to believe that by attacking the root of the evil, they would be more effective than by attacking from outside. They believed that, if

protected by the immunity of parliament, the position of the individual protagonists would be strengthened, and that therefore the force of their attacks would be enhanced.

In reality, everything turned out very differently.

The forum before which the pan-German representatives spoke hadn't grown greater, but had actually become smaller. Each spoke only to the circle that was ready to listen to him or could read the report of his speech in the newspapers.

But the largest forum of direct listeners isn't the parliamentary auditorium; it's the great public meeting.

Here alone there will be thousands of men who have come simply to hear what a speaker has to say, whereas in parliament only a few hundred are present. For the most part, they are there only to earn their daily attendance fees and not to be enlightened by the wisdom of one of the 'representatives of the people.'

Above all: The same public is always present, and it never wishes to learn anything new. Setting aside the question of its intelligence, it lacks even that modest amount of will power that's necessary for learning.

Not one of the peoples' representatives will honor a superior truth and devote himself to its service. No, not one of them will do this, unless he has grounds for hoping that, by such a conversion, he can retain the representation of his constituency in the coming legislature. Therefore, only when it becomes obvious that the old party is likely to have a bad time at the forthcoming elections, will those models of manly virtue set out in search of a new party or a new policy that may have better electoral prospects. But of course, this change of position will be accompanied by a veritable deluge of high moral justifications. And thus it always happens that, when an existing party has incurred such general disfavor among the public that it is threatened with a crushing defeat, then a great migration begins. The parliamentary rats abandon the party ship.

All this happens not because the affected individuals have become better informed on the questions at issue and have resolved to act accordingly. These superficial changes are evidence only of that gift of clairvoyance that warns the parliamentary flea at the right moment, and causes him to hop into another warm party bed.

To speak before such a forum signifies casting pearls before a certain well-known animal. It is truly worthless! The result will always be negative.

And that's what actually happened. The pan-German deputies could have talked themselves hoarse: but to no result.

The press either ignored them totally or so mutilated their speeches that the logical consistency was destroyed, and the meaning twisted around in such a way that the public got the wrong impression of the aims of the new movement. What the individual members said wasn't important. The important matter was what people read as coming from them. This consisted of mere extracts that had been taken out of context, and gave an impression of incoherent nonsense—as was in fact intended. Thus the only public before which they really spoke consisted of a mere 500 parliamentarians—and that says it all.

But the worst was the following:

The pan-German movement could only hope for success if the leaders realized from the very start that it was not a question of a new party as of a new *worldview*. This alone could arouse the inner moral forces that were necessary for such a gigantic struggle. And for this struggle, the leaders must be men of first-class minds and indomitable courage.

If the struggle on behalf of a worldview is not led by men of heroic spirit who are ready to sacrifice everything, it will soon become impossible to find real warriors who are ready to die for the cause. A man who fights only for his own existence has little remaining for society.

In order to secure the requirements for success, everyone concerned must understand that the new movement looks to posterity for its honor and glory, and that it has nothing to offer to present-day members. If a movement offers a large number of positions and offices to be filled, the number of inferior candidates will constantly grow. Eventually, a day will come when there will be such a preponderance of political profiteers that the original combatants will now scarcely recognize their own party. They may even be ejected by the later arrivals as unwanted ballast. At this point, the 'mission' of the movement is lost.

Once the pan-Germanists decided to collaborate with parliament, they were no longer leaders and combatants in a popular movement, but merely 'parliamentarians.' The movement thus sank to the level of a common political party, and no longer had the strength to face a hostile fate and defy the risk of martyrdom. Instead of fighting, the pan-German leaders fell into the habit of 'talking' and 'negotiating.' These new parliamentarians soon found that it was a more satisfactory, and less risky, way of fulfilling their task: to defend their new worldview with the intellectual weapon of parliamentary rhetoric rather than take up a fight in which they would risk their lives. Such a fight would have uncertain outcomes, and offer no possibility of personal gain.

3.22 THE IMPORTANCE OF THE SPOKEN WORD

Once they had members in parliament, their outside supporters hoped and waited for miracles. Of course, no such miracles occurred, or could occur. The supporters of the movement soon grew impatient, because reports they read about their own deputies was in no way up to their expectations. The reason for this wasn't hard to find. It was due to the fact that a hostile press failed to give a true account of what the pan-German deputies were actually doing.

As the new deputies became accustomed to this mild form of 'revolution,' and to the provincial diets, they gradually became reluctant to resume the more hazardous work of expounding the movement's principles to the broad masses of the people.

Mass meetings in public became rarer and rarer, though these are the only means of exercising an effective influence on people. Here, the influence comes from direct personal contact, and earns the support of large numbers.

Once the parliamentary platform was substituted for the beer-hall table, where thousands were addressed, and once speeches were no longer addressed to the people directly but to the so-called 'chosen' representatives, the pan-German movement lost its popular character. It soon degenerated to the level of an academic discussion club.

Thus, the misleading impression created by the press was no longer corrected by personal contact with the people through public meetings, wherein a true account might be given. The end result of this neglect was that the word 'pan-German' came to have an unpleasant sound in the ears of the masses.

The knights of the pen and the literary snobs of today must realize that the great transformations that have taken place in this world were never conducted by a goose-quill!

No—the task of the pen must always be reserved to that of presenting the theoretical foundations.

The force that has ever and always set in motion great historical avalanches of religious and political movements is the magic power of the spoken word.

The broad masses of a population are more amenable to the appeal of rhetoric than to any other force. All great movements are popular movements. They are the volcanic eruptions of human passions and emotions, stirred into activity either by the ruthless Goddess of Distress or

by the torch of the spoken word cast into the people's midst. In no case have great movements been set afoot by the syrupy effusions of literary aesthetes and drawing-room heroes.

A nation's destiny can be averted only by a storm of hot passion. But only those who are passionate themselves can arouse passion in others.

It's only the capacity for passionate feeling that, like hammer blows, will open the door to the hearts of the people.

3.23 EFFECT ON THE MASS

He who is incapable of passionate feeling and speech was never chosen by Providence to proclaim its will.

Therefore a mere writer should stick to his ink-bottle and busy himself with theoretical questions, if he has the requisite ability and knowledge. He has been neither born nor chosen to be a leader.

A movement that has great ends to achieve must carefully guard against the danger of losing contact with the masses of the people.

Every question encountered must be examined primarily from this viewpoint, and the decision to be made must always be accordingly.

The movement must avoid everything that might weaken its power of influencing the masses—not from 'demagogic' motives but because of the simple fact that no great idea, no matter how sublime and exalted it may appear, can be realized in practice without the effective power of the popular masses.

Hard reality alone must mark the way to the goal. Unwillingness to walk the road of hardship means, only too often in this world, the total renunciation of one's aims and purposes—whether consciously willed or not.

As soon as the pan-German leaders accepted the parliamentary principle and moved the center of their activities away from the people, they sacrificed the future for the sake of a cheap momentary success.

They chose the easier way in the struggle, and in doing so rendered themselves unworthy of final victory.

While in Vienna, I used to seriously ponder over these two questions. I saw that the main reason for the collapse of the pan-German movement lay in the fact that these very questions were underappreciated. In my opinion, the movement seemed chosen to lead the German element in Austria.

These first two blunders, which led to the downfall of the pan-German movement, were very closely related. Faulty recognition of the inner driving forces that push great movements forward led to an inadequate appreciation of the part played by the broad masses. The result was that too little attention was given to the social problem, and that attempts to capture the minds of the lower classes were too few and too weak. Another failure was in accepting the parliamentary policy.

If there had been a proper appreciation of the tremendous powers of endurance always shown by the masses in revolutionary movements, a different attitude towards the social problem and propaganda would have been taken. The movement's center wouldn't have been transferred to parliament, but would have remained in the workshops and the streets.

3.24 THE 'AWAY-FROM-ROME' MOVEMENT

There was a third mistake, one that also had its roots in the failure to understand the value of the masses. The masses are first set in motion, in a definite direction, by men of superior talents. But once in motion, they are like a flywheel; they sustain the momentum and steady balance of the offensive.

The policy of the pan-German leaders in deciding to carry through a hard struggle against the Catholic Church can be explained only by attributing it to an inadequate understanding of the spiritual nature of the people.

The reasons why the new party engaged in a violent campaign against Rome were as follows:

As soon as the House of Habsburg had definitely decided to transform Austria into a Slav State, all sorts of means were adopted that seemed to serve that end. The Habsburg rulers had no scruples of conscience about exploiting even religious institutions in the service of this new 'State Idea.'

One of the many methods thus employed was the use of Czech parishes and their clergy as instruments for spreading Slav hegemony throughout Austria.

This proceeding was carried out as follows:

Czech priests were appointed in purely German districts. They gradually and steadily pushed forward the interests of the Czech people before those of the Church, and thus became germ cells in the de-Germanization process.

Unfortunately the German-Austrian clergy completely failed to counter this procedure. Not only were they incapable of taking a similar initiative on the German side, but they showed themselves unable to meet the Czech offensive with adequate resistance. Germandom was accordingly pushed backwards, slowly but steadily, through the perversion of religious belief on the one side, and the lack of resistance on the other side.

Such tactics were used in dealing with the smaller problems; and in larger matters, the situation was not very different.

The anti-German aims pursued by the Habsburgs, especially through the higher clergy, didn't meet with any vigorous resistance, while the clerical representatives of the German interests withdrew completely to the rear.

The general impression could only be that the Catholic clergy as such grossly neglected the rights of the German population.

Therefore it looked as if the Catholic Church was not in sympathy with the German people, but rather that it unjustly supported their enemies. The root of the whole evil, especially in Schönerer's opinion, lay in the fact that the leadership of the Catholic Church was not in Germany, and that this fact alone accounted for the hostile attitude of the Church towards the interests of our people.

The so-called cultural problem receded almost completely into the background, as was generally the case everywhere throughout Austria at that time. In assuming a hostile attitude towards the Catholic Church, the pan-German leaders were influenced not so much by the Church's position on science, etc., but rather because of its failure to defend German rights, and conversely, its aid and support for Slavic arrogance and greed.

George Schönerer wasn't a man who did things half-way. He went into battle against the Church because he was convinced that this was the only way to save the German people. The "Away-from-Rome" movement seemed the most powerful, but at the same time most difficult, way of attacking the adversary's citadel. Schönerer believed that if this movement succeeded, the tragic division between the two great religious denominations in Germany would be wiped out, and the inner forces of the German Reich and nation would be enormously enhanced by such a victory.

But both the premise and the conclusion in this case were erroneous.

It was undoubtedly true that the national powers of resistance, in everything concerning Germanism as such, were much weaker among the German Catholic clergy than among their non-German brethren, especially the Czechs.

And only a fool could be unaware of the fact that it never entered the mind of the German clergy to take the offensive on behalf of German interests.

But at the same time, everyone who isn't blind to facts must admit that all this can be attributed to a characteristic under which all we Germans must suffer: that is, the objective way in which we regard our own nationality, along with everything else.

While the Czech priest adopted a *subjective* attitude towards his own people and only an objective attitude towards the Church, the German priest showed a subjective devotion to his Church and remained *objective* in regard to his nation. This phenomenon, unfortunately, can be found occurring in exactly the same way in thousands of other cases.

It is by no means a peculiar legacy from Catholicism; but it is something in us that quickly corrodes almost every institution, especially institutions of state and those that have ideal aims.

Take, for example, the attitude of our state officials in regard to the efforts made for bringing about a national resurgence. Compare this attitude with the stand that the officials of any other nation would have taken in such a case. Or should we believe that the military officers of any other country in the world would refuse to come forward on behalf of national aspirations, and would rather hide behind the phrase 'state authority,' as has been the case in our country during the last five years? Or let us take another example. In regard to the Jewish question, don't both Christian denominations take up a standpoint today that responds to neither national requirements nor to real needs of religion? Compare the attitude of a Jewish rabbi towards any question, even an insignificant one, concerning Jewry as a race, with that of the majority of our clergy, whether Catholic or Protestant!

We observe the same phenomenon wherever it is a matter of defending an abstract idea.

'State authority,' 'democracy,' 'pacifism,' 'international solidarity,' etc.—all such notions become rigid, dogmatic concepts with us. And the more vital the general necessities of the nation, the more will they be judged exclusively in light of those concepts.

This unfortunate habit of looking at all national demands from the viewpoint of a pre-conceived notion makes it impossible for us to see the subjective side of a thing that objectively contradicts one's own doctrine. It finally leads to a complete reversal of means and ends. Any attempt at a national revival will be opposed if a pre-condition is that a bad and

pernicious regime must first of all be overthrown; such an action will be considered as a violation of 'state authority.'

From this standpoint, 'state authority' is not a means to serve an end but rather, to the mind of the dogmatic believer in objectivity, an end in itself. He looks upon that as sufficient apology for his own miserable life. Such people would raise an outcry if, for instance, anyone should attempt to set up a dictatorship, even if it were a Frederick the Great, and even though the parliamentary politicians were small and incompetent men.

To such sticklers for abstract principles, the law of democracy is more sacred than the welfare of the nation. Accordingly, such men will defend the worst kind of tyranny, though it may be leading a people to ruin, because it is the fleeting embodiment of 'state authority.' Others will reject even a highly beneficent government if it should fall short of their notion of 'democracy.'

In the same way, our German pacifist will remain silent while the nation is groaning under oppression by a vicious military power, if this condition calls for active resistance; such resistance means the employment of physical force, which is against the spirit of the pacifist society. The international German socialist may be plundered by his comrades around the world in the name of 'solidarity,' but he responds with fraternal kindness, and never thinks of retribution, or even of self-defense. Simply because he is—a German.

It may be unpleasant to dwell on such truths, but if something is to be changed, we must first acknowledge it.

The same is true with the weak manner in which German interests are promoted and defended by a part of the clergy.

Such conduct is not the result of a malicious intent, nor is it the outcome of orders given from 'above'; but such a lack of national determination is due to defects in our educational system. Instead of inculcating a lively sense of German nationality, the aim of the educational system is to make the youth submit to 'the idea' become idol.

Education in such abstract notions as 'democracy,' 'international socialism,' 'pacifism,' etc., is so hard-and-fast and exclusive, and so purely subjective, that they fundamentally influence one's picture of the world. But on the other hand, the attitude towards their own German nationality has been very objective from youth upwards. The pacifist (insofar as he is a German) who surrenders himself subjectively to the dictates of dogmatic principles will always first consider the objective right or wrong of a situation when danger threatens. But he will never take his stand in the

ranks of his own people, and fight for them from the sheer instinct of self-preservation.

That this also applies to the different religious denominations is shown by the following:

Insofar as its origin and tradition are based on German ideals, Protestantism defends those ideals better. But it fails the moment it is called upon to defend *national* interests, ones that don't belong to the sphere of its ideals and traditional development—or which, for some reason or other, may be rejected by that sphere.

Therefore Protestantism will always take its part in promoting German ideals as concerns moral integrity or national education, when the German spiritual being, or language, or spiritual freedom are to be defended; these represent the principles on which Protestantism itself is grounded. But this same Protestantism violently opposes every attempt to rescue the nation from the clutches of its mortal enemy. The Protestant attitude towards the Jews is more or less rigidly and dogmatically fixed. And yet this is the first problem which has to be solved, unless all attempts to bring about a German resurgence, or to raise the level of the nation's standing, are to remain senseless and impossible.

During my sojourn in Vienna, I had ample leisure time to study this problem without allowing any prejudices to intervene; and in my daily contacts I was able to confirm my view thousands of times.

In this focal point of various nationalities, it was quite obvious that the German pacifist was always and exclusively the one who tried to consider his own national interests objectively. But you would never find a Jew who took a similar attitude towards his own people. Furthermore, I found that only the German Socialist is 'international' in the sense that he feels himself obliged to demand justice for his own people only by whining and wailing to his international comrades. No one could ever charge the Czechs, or Poles, or other nations with such conduct. In short, I recognized even then that this evil is only partly a result of these doctrines, but mainly the result of our totally inadequate system of education, and its resulting lack of devotion to our own nation.

Thus, the first theoretical argument advanced by the pan-German leaders in their offensive against Catholicism was quite untenable.

The only way to remedy this evil is to train the Germans from youth upwards to an absolute recognition of the rights of their own people, instead of poisoning their minds with the curse of 'objectivity'—even in matters concerning the very maintenance of our own existence. The result of this

would be that the Catholic in Germany—just as in Ireland, Poland, or France—would be a German above all. But all this presupposes a radical change in the national government.

The strongest proof of this is supplied by what took place at that historical juncture when our people were last called, before the tribunal of history to defend their own existence in a life-or-death struggle.

As long as there was no lack of leadership, the people overwhelmingly fulfilled their duty and obligations. Whether Protestant pastor or Catholic priest, each did his very utmost in helping our powers of resistance to hold out—not only in the trenches but also, and even more so, at home. During those years, and especially during the first outburst of enthusiasm, in both religious camps there was one undivided and sacred German Reich, for whose preservation and future existence they all prayed to heaven.

The pan-German movement in Austria should have asked itself one question: Is the maintenance of Germandom in Austria possible or not, as long as it remains within the fold of the Catholic faith? If yes, then the political party shouldn't have meddled in religious and denominational questions. But if no, then a religious reformation should have been started, and not a political party movement.

Anyone who believes that religious reformation can be achieved through the agency of a political organization shows that he has no understanding of the development of religious conceptions and doctrines, and of how these are given practical effect by the Church.

No man can serve two masters. And I hold that the foundation or overthrow of a religion has far greater consequences than the foundation or overthrow of a state, let alone a party.

It is no counterargument to say that the attacks were only defensive measures against attacks from the other side!

Undoubtedly there have always been unscrupulous rogues who did not hesitate to degrade religion to a tool of politics. Nearly always such a people had nothing else in mind except to make a business of religions and politics. But on the other hand, it would be wrong to hold religion itself, or a religious denomination, responsible for a number of rascals who exploit the Church for their own base interests, just as they would exploit anything else in which they had a part.

Nothing could be more to the taste of these parliamentary loungers and tricksters than to find a scapegoat for their political swindling—even after the fact. The moment that religion is attacked and made responsible for his personal misdeeds, this shrewd fellow will raise an outcry at once, and call

the world to witness how justified he was in acting as he did, proclaiming that he and his eloquence alone have saved the Church. The public, which is mostly stupid and forgetful, is incapable of recognizing the real instigator of the quarrel in the midst of the ruckus. Frequently it doesn't even remember the beginning of the fight, and so the rogue gets away with his stunt.

A cunning fellow of that sort is well aware that his misdeeds have nothing to do with religion. And so he will quietly laugh up his sleeve when his honest but artless opponent loses the game and, eventually losing faith in humanity, resigns from it all.

And there is another sense in which it would be wrong to make religion, or the Church per se, responsible for individual misdeeds. If one compares the magnitude of the organization as it appears to all, with the typical weakness of human nature, we will have to admit that the proportion of good to bad is more favorable here than anywhere else. Among the priests there may, of course, be some who use their sacred calling to further their political ambitions. There are clergy who unfortunately forget that in the political struggle they should be the guardians of higher truths and not the abettors of lies and slander. But for each one of these unworthy specimens we can find a thousand or more who fulfil their mission nobly, as the trustworthy guardians of souls, and who tower above the level of our corrupt epoch, as little islands above the morass.

I cannot condemn the Church per se, and I would still feel unjustified in doing so if some depraved person in a priest's robe commits some offence against moral law. Nor would I for a moment think of blaming the Church if one of its innumerable members betrays and besmirches his compatriots, especially not at a time when such conduct is quite common. We must not forget, particularly in our day, that for one such Ephialtes[13] there are a thousand whose hearts bleed in sympathy with their people during these years of misfortune, and who, together with the best of our nation, yearn for the hour when fortune will smile on us again.

If it be objected that here we are concerned not with the petty problems of everyday life but principally with fundamental truths and questions of dogma, the only way of answering that objection is to ask a question:

Do you feel that fate has called you to proclaim the truth to the world? If so, then go and do it. But have the courage to do it directly, and not use

[13] Ephialtes of Trachis (ca. 480 BC) was an Athenian who betrayed his homeland to the Persians, thus helping them to win the Battle of Thermopylae.

some political party as your mouthpiece; for this is a swindle. For today's evil, substitute your future good.

But if you lack the courage, or if your good isn't clear even to yourself, then leave the whole thing alone. But whatever happens, don't try to reach the goal in the roundabout way of a political party if you aren't brave enough to fight with your cap lifted.

Political parties have no right to meddle in religious questions, except when these relate to something that is alien to the national well-being, and thus calculated to undermine racial customs and morals.

If some Church dignitaries should misuse religious ceremonies or religious teaching to injure their own nation, their opponents should never take the same road and fight them with the same weapons.

To a political leader, the religious teachings and practices of his people should be sacred and inviolable. Otherwise he shouldn't be a statesman but a reformer—if he has the necessary qualities for such a task!

Any other line of conduct will lead to disaster, especially in Germany.

In studying the pan-German movement and its conflict with Rome, I was then firmly persuaded, and especially in the years to come, of the following conviction: By their failure to understand the importance of the social problem, the pan-Germanists lost the support of the broad masses, who are the indispensable combatants. By entering parliament, the pan-German leaders deprived themselves of the great driving force that resides in the masses, and also took on all the defects of the parliamentary institution. Their struggle against the Church made their position impossible in the lower and middle classes, while at the same time it robbed them of innumerable high-class elements—some of the best that the nation possessed.

Thus the outcome of the Austrian *Kulturkampf* was practically nothing.

Although they succeeded in winning 100,000 members away from the Church, that didn't cause much harm. The Church didn't really need to shed any tears over these lost sheep; it lost only those who had long ago ceased to belong to it in their hearts. The difference between this new reformation and the great Reformation was that, in the historic epoch of the great Reformation, some of the best members left the Church because of religious convictions. Whereas in this new reformation, only those left who had been indifferent before and were now influenced by political considerations.

From the political point of view alone, the result was as laughable as it was deplorable.

Once again, a political movement that had promised so much for the German nation collapsed, because it was not conducted in a spirit of unflinching adherence to naked reality, but rather became lost in fields where it was bound to disintegrate.

3.25 CONCENTRATION ON A SINGLE ENEMY

One thing is certainly true:

The pan-German movement would never have made this mistake if it had properly understood the psyche of the broad masses. If the leaders had known that, for psychological reasons alone, one should never place two or more sets of adversaries before the masses—since that divides their fighting strength—they would have concentrated the full and undivided force of their attack against a single adversary. Nothing in the policy of a political party is so fraught with danger as to allow its decisions to be directed by those jack-of-all-trades who want everything, even though they don't know how to do anything.

But even though much can be said against the various religious denominations, political leaders mustn't forget that the experience of history teaches us that no purely political party, in similar circumstances, ever successfully brought about a religious reformation. One doesn't study history for the purpose of later forgetting or mistrusting its lessons. It would be a mistake to believe that in this particular case things were different, so that the eternal truths of history no longer applied. One learns history in order to be able to apply its lessons in the present day, and whoever fails to do this cannot pretend to be a political leader. In reality he is quite a superficial person or, as is mostly the case, a conceited simpleton whose good intentions cannot make up for his incompetence in practical affairs.

The art of leadership, as displayed by all truly great popular leaders of history, consists in focusing the attention of the people against a single adversary, and ensuring that nothing will break it up. The more the militant energies of the people are directed towards one objective, the more will new recruits join the movement—attracted by the magnetism of its unified action. Therefore the striking power will be all the greater. The leader of genius must have the ability to make different opponents appear as if they belonged to one category. Otherwise, weak and wavering followers may easily begin to doubt the justice of their own cause, if they have to face different enemies.

As soon as the vacillating masses find themselves facing many enemies, their sense of objectivity will be aroused. They will ask how it is possible that all the others can be wrong, and that they themselves, and their movement, alone are right.

Such a feeling would be the first step towards a paralysis of their own power. Hence it will always be necessary to group all opponents together, as forming one solid front, so that the mass of followers will see only one common enemy against whom they have to fight. Such uniformity intensifies their belief in the justice of their own cause, and strengthens their feeling of hostility towards the opponent.

The pan-German movement was unsuccessful because the leaders didn't grasp the significance of that truth.

They clearly saw that the goal and their intentions were right; but they took the wrong road. It was like an Alpine climber who never loses sight of the peak he wants to reach, and who sets out with the greatest determination and energy, but pays no attention to the road beneath his feet. With his eye always fixed firmly on the goal, he overlooks the nature of the ascent, and finally he fails.

3.26 THE WAY OF CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM

The manner in which the great competitor of the Pan-German Party—the Christian Social Party—set out to attain its goal was quite different.

The way it took was correct and well-chosen; but it didn't have a clear vision of the goal.

In almost all the matters where the pan-German movement failed, the policy of the Christian-Socialist Party was correct and systematic.

They assessed the importance of the masses correctly, and thus they gained the support of large numbers by emphasizing the social character of the movement from the very start. By directing their appeal especially to the lower middle class and the artisans, they gained adherents who were faithful, enduring, and self-sacrificing. The Christian-Socialist leaders took care to avoid all controversy with the institutions of religion, and thus they secured the support of that mighty organization, the Catholic Church. Those leaders recognized the value of propaganda on a large scale, and they were veritable virtuosos in working up the spiritual instincts of the broad masses of their followers.

3.27 ANTI-SEMITISM ON A RELIGIOUS BASIS

The failure of this party to fulfill its dream of saving Austria from dissolution must be attributed to two main defects in the means they employed, and also the lack of clarity regarding the goal itself.

First: The anti-Semitism of the new movement was based on religious instead of racial principles. The reason for this mistake gave rise to the second error also.

The founders of the Christian-Socialist Party believed that they couldn't base their position on the racial principle if they wished to save Austria, because they felt that a general disintegration of the state might quickly result. In the opinion of the party chiefs, the situation in Vienna demanded that all factors that tended to estrange the nationalities from one another should be carefully avoided, and that all factors making for unity should be encouraged.

At that time, Vienna was so permeated with foreign elements, especially Czechs, that great tolerance was necessary if these elements were to be enlisted in any party that was not anti-German on principle. If Austria was to be saved, those elements were indispensable. And so attempts were made to win the support of the small traders—a great number of whom were Czechs—by combating liberal Manchesterism. And they believed that by adopting this attitude, they had found a slogan against Jewry that would unite all the different nationalities that made up the population of old Austria.

It was obvious, however, that this kind of anti-Semitism didn't upset the Jews very much, simply because it had a purely religious foundation. If worst came to worst, a few drops of baptismal water could always save the Jew and the business at the same time.

On such superficial grounds, it was impossible to deal with the whole problem in a serious and rational way. The result was that many people couldn't understand this kind of anti-Semitism, and therefore refused to join it. The attractive force of the idea was thus restricted exclusively to narrow-minded circles, because the leaders failed to go beyond the mere emotional appeal and didn't ground their position on a truly rational basis. The intellectuals were opposed to such a policy on principle. It looked more and more as if the whole movement was a new attempt to convert the Jews or, on the other hand, as if it merely wished to compete with other movements.

Thus the struggle lost all traces of having been organized for a higher spiritual mission. Indeed, it seemed to some people—and these were by no means the worst ones—to be immoral and reprehensible. The movement

failed to awaken a belief that this was a problem of vital importance for the whole of humanity, and that the destiny of the whole non-Jewish world depended on a solution.

Through this half-hearted approach, the anti-Semitism of the Christian-Socialists turned out to be worthless.

It was a sham anti-Semitism—almost worse than none at all. The pretence gave rise to a false sense of security among people, who believed that the enemy had been taken by the ears. But in reality, the people themselves were being led by the nose.

The Jew readily adapted to this form of anti-Semitism. In fact, its continuance was more beneficial to him than its absence would have been.

This led to great sacrifices being made for the sake of that multi-national state; but much greater sacrifices were required by the German element.

One didn't dare to be a 'nationalist,' even in Vienna, lest the ground should fall away from under one's feet. It was hoped that the Habsburg State might be saved by quietly avoiding the nationalist question; but this policy led that state to ruin. The same policy also led to the collapse of Christian Socialism, as this movement lost the only source of energy from which a political party can draw the necessary driving force. It became a party like any other.

3.28 PAN-GERMANISM AND CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM

During those years, I carefully followed the two movements and observed how they developed: the one, because my heart was with it, and the other because of my admiration for that remarkable man who then appeared to me as a bitter symbol of all Austrian-Germanism.

When the imposing funeral procession of the dead mayor wound its way from city hall towards the Ring Strasse, I stood among the hundreds of thousands who watched it pass by. As I stood there, I felt deeply moved, and my instinct clearly told me that the work of this man was all in vain; a fatal destiny was inexorably leading this state to its downfall. If Dr. Karl Lueger had lived in Germany, he would have been ranked among the great leaders of our people. It was a misfortune for his work, and for himself, that he had to live in this impossible state.

When he died, a fire had already been kindled in the Balkans, and it was spreading month by month. Fate was merciful in sparing him the sight of that which, even to the end, he had hoped to prevent.

I tried to analyze the cause that rendered the one movement futile, and wrecked the progress of the other. The outcome was the profound conviction that, apart from the inherent impossibility of bolstering the position of the state in old Austria, the two parties made the following fatal mistake:

The Pan-German Party was perfectly right in its fundamental ideas regarding its aim, which was to bring about a German renaissance. But it was unfortunate in its choice of means. It was nationalist, but unfortunately it was not socialistic enought to gain the support of the masses. Its anti-Semitic policy, however, was grounded on a correct perception of the significance of race and not on religious principles. But its struggle against one of the religious denominations was tactically false.

The Christian-Social movement had only a vague concept of a German revival, but it was intelligent and fortunate in its choice of means to. The Christian-Socialists grasped the significance of the social question, but they had wrong ideas in the struggle against Jewry, and had no sense of the power of the nationalistic idea.

If only the Christian-Socialist Party, together with its shrewd judgment of the worth of the popular masses, had rightly judged the importance of the racial problem—as the pan-German movement did—and if this party had been really nationalist, then a movement would have developed that, in my opinion, might have successfully altered the course of German destiny. Or if the pan-German leaders, on the other hand, in addition to their correct judgment of the Jewish question and of the national idea, had adopted the practical wisdom of the Christian-Socialist Party—and particularly their attitude towards socialism—the same might have happened.

If things didn't turn out this way, the fault primarily lay in the nature of the Austrian State.

No other party then in existence supported my convictions, and so I couldn't bring myself to enlist as a member in any of them, or even lend a hand in their struggle. Even at that time, all those organizations seemed to be already exhausted in their energies, and were therefore incapable of bringing about a national revival of the German people in a really profound way, rather than in a merely superficial way.

CHAPTER 3

3.29 GROWING AVERSION TO THE HABSBURG STATE

My inner aversion to the Habsburg State was steadily increasing.

The more I paid special attention to questions of foreign policy, the more my conviction grew that this state would surely bring misfortune on the Germans. I realized more and more that the destiny of the German nation couldn't be decisively influenced from here, but only in the German Reich itself. And this was true not only in regard to general political questions but also—and to an equal degree—regarding the whole sphere of cultural life.

Here too, in all matters affecting national culture and art, the Austrian State showed all the signs of degeneration—or at least, of ceasing to be of any consequence to the German nation. This was especially true of its architecture. The new architecture couldn't produce any great results in Austria because, since the building of the Ring Strasse, architectural activities—at least in Vienna—became insignificant when compared with the progressive plans arising in Germany.

And so I came, more and more, to lead a double life. Reason and reality told me to continue my harsh but beneficial apprenticeship in Austria. But my heart was elsewhere.

A growing sense of discontentment made me depressed, the more that I came to realize the inner hollowness of this state, and the impossibility of saving it from collapse. At the same time, I felt perfectly certain that it would bring nothing but misfortune to the German people.

I was convinced that the Habsburg State would hinder and oppress every German who might show signs of real greatness—while at the same time, it would aid and abet every non-German activity. I was repelled by the conglomeration of heterogeneous races that the capital of the Dual Monarchy showed me: this motley crew of Czechs, Poles, Hungarians, Ruthenians, Serbs, and Croats, etc. And above all, that eternal fungus of humanity—Jews and more Jews.

The giant city seemed to be the incarnation of racial depravity.

The German vernacular of my youth was the local idiom of Lower Bavaria. I never forgot that particular style of speech, and I never learned the Viennese dialect. The longer I lived there, the stronger became my hatred for the mixture of foreign peoples that had begun to erode that ancient ground of German culture.

The idea that this state could maintain its existence much longer was quite laughable.

Austria was then like an ancient mosaic, one in which the cohesive cement had dried up and become old and crumbly. As long as it remains untouched, it may hold together and continue to exist. But the moment some blow is struck, it then breaks up into a thousand fragments. The question was only when the blow would come.

Because my heart was always with the German Reich and not the Austrian monarchy, the hour of Austria's dissolution as a state appeared as only the first step towards the emancipation of the German nation.

3.30 THE SCHOOL OF MY LIFE

All these considerations intensified my desire to go to that country that my heart had been secretly longing for, since the days of my youth.

I hoped someday to make my mark as an architect, and that I could devote my talents to the service of my country on a large or small scale, according to the will of fate.

But finally I wanted to enjoy the happiness of living and working in the land from which the movement that I had always longed for would be launched: namely, the union of my beloved homeland with our common fatherland, the German Reich.

There are many who may not understand how such a yearning can be so strong. But I appeal especially to two groups of people. The first includes all those who are still denied the happiness I have spoken of; and the second embraces those who once enjoyed that happiness but had it cruelly torn from them. I turn to all those who have been torn from their motherland, who have to struggle for the preservation of their sacred language, and who are persecuted and harried because of their loyalty and love for the homeland. To such people I address my words, and I know: they will understand me!

Only he who has experienced in his inner being what it means to be German, and yet denied the right of belonging to his fatherland, can appreciate the profound longing caused by enforced exile. It's an eternal heartache; and there's no place for joy and contentment until the doors of the paternal home are thrown open, and all those of kindred blood find peace and tranquility in their common Reich.

Vienna was and remains the hardest, though most profound, school of my life. I was scarcely more than a boy when I came to live there, and when I left it, I had grown to be a grave and thoughtful man. In Vienna I acquired

the foundations of a worldview, and I developed a faculty for analyzing political questions in particular. That worldview and the political ideas then formed have never been abandoned—though they were later expanded upon in certain directions. Only now can I fully appreciate how valuable those years of study were for me.

That's why I have given a detailed account of this period. There, in Vienna, stark reality taught me the truths that now form the fundamental principles of the party that, within the course of five years, has grown from modest beginnings to a great mass movement. I don't know what my attitude towards Jewry, Social Democracy, even more to Marxism in general, to the social problem, etc., would be today, if I hadn't acquired a stock of personal beliefs at such an early age, under the duress of fate—and by my own hard study.

For, although the misfortunes of the Fatherland may have stimulated many thousands to ponder over the inner causes of the collapse, that couldn't lead to such a thorough knowledge and deep insight as a man may develop, who has fought a hard struggle for many years so that he might be the master of his own destiny.

CHAPTER 4: MUNICH

Finally I came to Munich, in the spring of 1912.[1]

The city itself was as familiar to me as if I had lived there for years. This was because my architectural studies had been constantly turning my attention to the metropolis of German art. One must know Munich if one would know Germany, and it's impossible to acquire a knowledge of German art without seeing Munich.

In any case, this period was by far the happiest and most contented time of my life. My earnings were very meager. But after all, I didn't live for the sake of painting; I painted in order to get the bare necessities of life while I continued my studies. I was firmly convinced that I would finally succeed in reaching the goal I set for myself. And this conviction alone was strong enough to enable me to bear the petty hardships of everyday life without worrying too much about them.

Moreover, almost from the very first moment of my sojourn there, I came to love that city more than any other place I had known. A German city! How different from Vienna! It was with a feeling of disgust that I recalled that Babylon of races. I enjoyed the spoken language; the Munich idiom recalled the days of my youth, especially when I spoke with those who had come to Munich from Lower Bavaria. There were a thousand or more things that I truly loved, or came to love, during the course of my stay. But what attracted me most was the marvelous marriage of native folk-energy with the fine artistic spirit of the city—that unique harmony from the Hofbräuhaus to the Odeon, from the Oktoberfest to the Pinakothek, and so on.[2] Today I am more attached to this city than any

[1] At age 23.

[2] The Hofbräuhaus is a large, state-owned beer hall in central Munich; it was founded in 1589. The Odeon was a concert hall and ballroom, built in 1828. The

other; it will remain inseparably connected to the development of my own career. My feelings of inner happiness and satisfaction with the place can be attributed to the charm of the Residence of the Wittelsbachs;[3] it has attracted probably everyone who is blessed with a feeling for beauty, as well as a calculating mind.

4.1 GERMANY'S DEFECTIVE ALLIANCE POLICY

Apart from my professional work, what most attracted me was the study of current political events—particularly those connected with foreign relations. I approached these by way of the German policy of alliances which, from my Austrian days, I had considered to be utterly mistaken. But in Vienna, I hadn't yet seen quite clearly how deluded the German Empire had become. There I was inclined to assume—or probably I persuaded myself, as an excuse—that possibly the authorities in Berlin knew how weak and unreliable their ally would prove to be. But I thought that, for some strange reason, they refrained from making their opinions on this known. In reality, they believed that they should support the policy of alliances that Bismarck had initiated. They felt that a sudden break would be undesirable—if for no other reason than that it might arouse those foreign countries that were lying in wait for their chance, or might alarm the businessmen at home.

But my contact with the people soon taught me, to my horror, that my assumptions were wrong. I was amazed to find everywhere, even in knowledgeable circles, that nobody had the slightest idea of the real character of the Habsburg monarchy. Especially among the common people, there was a prevalent illusion that the Austrian ally was a true power—one that would have to be seriously reckoned with, and would rally its people in the hour of need. The masses continued to look upon the Dual Monarchy as a 'German' state. They believed that it was dependable. They assumed that its strength could be measured by the millions of its subjects, as was the case in Germany. But first of all, they didn't realize that Austria had ceased to *be* a German state. And secondly, that the prevailing conditions in the Austrian Empire were steadily pushing it toward disintegration.

Pinakothek is the main art museum of Munich, dating originally from 1836.

[3] The Wittelsbachs are a famous Bavarian royal family, having ruled in the region since the year 1200.

CHAPTER 4

I knew then the state of affairs in Austria better than the so-called diplomats. They stumbled along, nearly always blindly, on their way to disaster. The prevailing opinions among most people reflected only what had been drummed into them from above. And the higher authorities groveled before the 'ally,' as though bowing down before the Golden Calf. They probably thought that by being polite and amiable, they might offset the lack of honesty on the other side. Thus they took every declaration at face value.

Even while in Vienna, I was repeatedly annoyed by the discrepancy between the speeches of the official statesmen and the contents of the Viennese press. And yet Vienna was still a German city—at least on the surface. But it was an utterly different state of affairs on leaving Vienna—or rather German-Austria—and coming into the Slav provinces! Only a glance at the Prague newspapers was needed to see how the whole exalted hocus-pocus of the Triple Alliance was judged from there.[4] In Prague, there was nothing but gibes and sneers for that 'masterpiece of statesmanship.' Even in times of peace, when the two emperors kissed each other on the brow in token friendship, those papers didn't hide their belief that the alliance would be finished the moment an attempt was made to bring it down from the shimmering glory of a Nibelungen ideal to practical reality.

Great indignation was aroused a few years later, when the alliances were put to the first practical test. Italy not only withdrew from the Triple Alliance—leaving the other two on their own—but she even joined their enemies! That anyone would believe, even for a moment, in the possibility of such a miracle as Italy fighting on the same side as Austria is simply incredible to anyone—at least, who didn't suffer from diplomatic blindness. And that was just how people felt in Austria too.

In Austria, only the Habsburgs and the German-Austrians supported the alliance. The Habsburgs did so from shrewd calculation of their own self-interests, and necessity. The Germans did it out of good faith and political—stupidity. They acted in good faith, inasmuch as they believed that by establishing the Triple Alliance they were doing a great service to the German Reich and were thus helping to defend it. They showed their political stupidity, however, in holding such ideas, because, instead of helping the Reich they really chained it to a moribund state that might drag its partner to the grave. And above all, by championing this alliance they fell more and more prey to the Habsburg policy of de-Germanization.

---

[4] The Triple Alliance was a pact between Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Italy. It was formed in 1882 and survived until the start of WWI.

The alliance gave the Habsburgs good grounds for believing that the German Reich wouldn't interfere in their domestic affairs, and thus they were in a position to carry out, with more ease and less risk, their domestic policy of gradually eliminating the German element. Not only could the 'objectiveness' of the German government be counted on, and thus there need be no fear of protest from that quarter, but one could always remind the German-Austrians of the alliance. This would silence them in case they might ever object to the reprehensible Slavization.

But what could the German-Austrians do, when the people of the German Reich itself had openly proclaimed their trust and confidence in the Habsburg government? Should they resist, and thus be openly branded as traitors before their own people? They, who for so many decades had sacrificed so much for the sake of their German tradition?

What would be the value of the alliance, once the influence of the Germans in Austria had been rooted out? If the Triple Alliance were to be advantageous to Germany, wasn't it necessary that the predominance of the Germans in Austria be maintained? Or did anyone really believe that Germany could continue to be an ally of a Slavic Habsburg Empire?

The official attitude of German diplomacy, as well as that of the general public towards internal problems affecting the Austrian nationalities, was not merely stupid; it was simply insane! On the alliance, as if a solid foundation, they grounded the security and future existence of a nation of 70 million. At the same time, they allowed their partner to continue its policy of methodically undermining the sole foundation of that alliance. The day was bound to come when nothing but a 'contract' with Viennese diplomats would be left. The alliance itself would be lost to Germany.

Concerning Italy, such had been the case from the beginning.

If people in Germany had studied the history and psychology of nations a bit more carefully, not one of them could have believed for a minute that the Quirinal and the Viennese Hofburg could ever stand together on a common battle front. Italy would have exploded like a volcano if any Italian government had dared to send a single Italian soldier to the battlefield with the Habsburg State—except as an enemy. More than once in Vienna, I witnessed the contempt and profound hatred that 'allied' the Italian to the Austrian State. The crimes that the House of Habsburg committed against Italian freedom and independence during several centuries were too grave to be forgiven, even with the best of goodwill. But this goodwill didn't exist, either among the rank and file of the population or in the government. Therefore, for Italy, there were only two ways of co-existing with Austria: alliance or war.

By choosing the first, the Italians could leisurely prepare for the second.

Especially since relations between Russia and Austria tended more and more towards military conflict, the German policy of alliances was as senseless as it was dangerous.

Here was a classic case that demonstrated the lack of any broad or logical lines of thinking.

But what was the reason for forming the alliance at all? It must have been the wish to better secure the future of the Reich, than if it were to depend exclusively on its own resources. But 'the future of the Reich' could mean only the matter of securing the means of existence for the German people.

4.2 THE FOUR PATHS OF GERMAN POLICY

Therefore the only questions were the following: What form will the life of the nation take in the near future? And by what means can the necessary foundation and security be guaranteed, within the framework of the general power distribution among the European nations?

A clear analysis of the principles on which the foreign policy of German statecraft were to be based should have led to the following conclusions:

The annual population increase in Germany amounts to almost 900,000 souls. The difficulties of feeding this army of new citizens must grow from year to year, and must finally lead to a catastrophe, unless ways and means are found to forestall the danger of misery and hunger.

There were four ways of avoiding this terrible future calamity:

(1) It was possible to follow the French example and artificially restrict the number of births, thus avoiding an excess of population.

Nature herself—in periods of distress or under bad climatic condition, or if the soil becomes depleted—tends to restrict the increase of population among certain countries and races. And her method is quite as ruthless as it is wise. It doesn't impede the procreative faculty per se; but it does restrict the further existence of the offspring by submitting them to such tests and privations that everything that is less strong, or less healthy, is forced to retreat into the bosom of the unknown. Whatever survives these hardships of existence has been tested and tried a thousand-fold; it is hardened, and rendered fit to continue the process of procreation. Hence the same thorough selection will begin all over again. By thus dealing brutally with

the individual, and recalling him the very moment he shows that he is not fit for the trials of life, nature preserves the strength of the race and the species; she raises it to the highest degree of efficiency.

A *decrease* in numbers therefore implies an *increase* in strength of the individual, and in this way the species is invigorated.

But the case is different when man himself starts to restrict his own numbers. Man is not carved from the same wood as nature; he is 'humane.' He thinks he knows better than the ruthless Queen of Wisdom. He doesn't impede the preservation of lesser individuals, but prevents procreation itself. To the individual, who always sees only himself and not the race, this approach seems more humane and more justified than the opposite way. But unfortunately, the consequences are also the opposite:

By leaving the process of procreation unchecked, and by submitting the individual to the hardest tests in life, nature selects the best from an abundance of individuals; she stamps them as fit to live and carry on the conservation of the species. But man, when he restricts the procreative faculty, obstinately works to keep alive all who have been born. This 'correction' of the Divine Will seems to him to be wise and humane; he rejoices at having trumped nature's card—in one game at least—and thus 'proves' that she is inadequate. The dear little ape of an all-mighty Father is delighted to see that he has succeeded in reducing human numbers. But he would be very upset to hear that his system brings about a degeneration in personal value.

As soon as the procreative faculty is thwarted and the number of births diminished, the natural struggle for existence, which allows only healthy and strong individuals to survive, is replaced by a sheer desire to 'save' feeble and even diseased ones at any cost. And thus the seeds are sown for a human progeny that will become more and more deplorable from one generation to another, as long as nature's will is scorned.

And if that policy is carried out, the final results must be that such a nation will eventually terminate its own existence on this earth. Though man may defy the eternal laws of procreation for a little while, vengeance will sooner or later follow. A stronger race will oust that which has grown weak. The vital urge, in its ultimate form, will break all the absurd chains of this so-called humanitarianism for the individual, and will replace it with the humanity of nature—which destroys what is weak in order to make way for the strong.

Any policy that aims at securing the existence of the German nation by restricting the birth-rate, robs that nation of its future.

(2) There is a second solution, one that is frequently proposed and recommended in our own time: internal colonization. It's a suggestion that is well-intended, but is misunderstood by most people. Thus it's the source of an unimaginable amount of harm.

Undoubtedly, the productivity of the soil can be increased somewhat; but only within defined limits, and not indefinitely. By increasing the productive powers of the soil, it will be possible to balance the effect of a surplus birth-rate in Germany for a short period of time, without running any danger of hunger. But we have to face the fact that the general life-demands are rising more quickly than even the birth rate. The need for food and clothing are becoming greater from year to year, and are disproportionate to those of our ancestors of, say, 100 years ago. It would, therefore, be crazy to argue that continuous increase in the productive powers of the soil will supply the needs for an increasing population. No; this is true up to a certain point only, for at least a portion of the increased productivity will be consumed by the growing demands caused by a steady rise in the standard of living.

But even if these demands were restricted to the narrowest range possible, we would still reach a definite limit, one that is conditioned by the inherent nature of the soil itself. No matter how hard we work, we cannot increase agricultural production beyond this limit.

Therefore, though we may postpone the time of distress, it will eventually arrive. First, there will be the recurrence of famine periods from time to time, after bad harvests, etc. The intervals between these famines will become shorter and shorter, the more the population increases. Finally, famine will disappear only in those rare years of plenty, when the granaries are full. And a time will ultimately come when, even in those years of plenty, there won't be enough to go around. Hunger will dog the footsteps of the nation. Nature will then step in once more and select those who are to survive—or else man will help himself by artificially preventing his own increase, with all the fatal consequences for the race and species mentioned above.

It may be objected here that, in one form or another, this future is in store for all mankind, and that the individual nation cannot escape the general fate.

At first glance, this objection seems correct. But we have to take the following into account:

The day will certainly come when the whole of mankind will be forced to restrict the growth of the human species, because there will be no further possibility of adjusting the productivity of the soil to the perpetual increase in population. Nature must then be allowed to use her own methods; or

man may possibly take the task of regulation into his own hands and establish the necessary equilibrium, using better means than we have today. But then it will be a problem for all of mankind, whereas now only those races must suffer which no longer have the strength and daring to acquire sufficient soil to meet their needs. As things stand today, there are vast spaces uncultivated spaces all over the surface of the globe. Those spaces are only waiting to be used. And it's quite certain that nature didn't set those territories apart for any one nation or race; such land awaits the people who have the strength to acquire it and the diligence to cultivate it.

Nature knows no political boundaries. She begins by establishing life on this globe, and then watches the free play of forces. Those who show the greatest courage and industry are the children nearest to her heart. They will be granted the sovereign right of existence.

If a nation confines itself to internal colonization while other races are perpetually increasing their territories, that nation will be forced to restrict the growth of its population at a time when the others are increasing theirs. This situation must eventually arrive, and it will arrive sooner if the nation has a small territory. It is unfortunately true that, only too often, the best nations—or rather, the only really cultured nations, who are also the standard-bearers of human progress—have decided, in their blind pacifism, to refrain from the acquisition of new territory, and to be content with 'internal' colonization. But at the same time, inferior nations succeed in grabbing large spaces for colonization all over the globe. This must lead to the following result:

Races that are culturally superior but less ruthless will be forced to restrict their increase, because of insufficient territory to support their population; less civilized races could increase indefinitely, owing to the vast territories at their disposal. In other words: Should that state of affairs continue, then the world will one day be possessed by that portion of mankind that is culturally inferior but more energetic.

A time will come, even though in the distant future, when there can be only two alternatives: Either the world will be ruled according to our modern concept of democracy, in which case every decision will be in favor of the numerically larger races. Or the world will be governed by the law of the natural distribution of power—and then those nations will succeed who possess a more brutal will, and not the nations who have practiced self-restriction.

No one can doubt that this world will one day be the scene of dreadful struggles for existence on the part of mankind. In the end, only the instinct of self-preservation will triumph. This so-called humanitarianism—which

connotes only a mixture of stupidity, cowardice, and self-conceit—will melt away like snow under a March sun. Man has become great through perpetual struggle. In perpetual peace, he must decline.

For us Germans, the slogan 'internal colonization' is fatal because it encourages the belief that we have discovered a means that is in accordance with our innate pacifism, and that will enable us to work for our livelihood in a half-slumbering existence. If such a teaching were taken seriously by our people, it would mean the end of all effort to acquire our rightful place in the world. If the average German were convinced that he could ensure his life and future this way, it would mean the end of any attempt to take an active and fruitful role in sustaining the vital demands of his country. Should the nation adopt such an attitude, then any really useful foreign policy might be looked upon as dead and buried—together with all hope for the future of the German people.

Once we understand these consequences, we can no longer consider it a mere accident the fact that, among those who propagate this dangerous mentality in our people, the Jew is always first in line. He knows well that his softies are ready to be the grateful victims of every swindle that promises them a gold-brick in the shape of a discovery that will enable them to outwit nature, and thus avoid the hard and inexorable struggle for existence—and finally that they may become lords of the earth, partly by working, partly by doing nothing, depending on how things 'turn out.'

It cannot be too strongly emphasized that any German internal colonization must only serve to relieve social abuses. To carry out such a system, the most important preliminary measure would be to free the soil from the grip of the speculator. But such a system could never suffice to assure the future of the nation without acquiring new territory.

If we adopt a different plan, we will soon arrive not only at the end of our soil, but also at the end of our strength.

In conclusion, the following must be said:

The limitation to a small area of land—inherent in internal colonization, and similar to the effect achieved by restricting procreation—leads to an exceptionally unfavorable military and political situation for the nation.

The size of the national territory is a determining factor in the external security of a nation. The larger the territory that a people has at its disposal, the stronger are its national defenses. Military decisions against people living in a small area are more quickly and easily—and thus more completely and effectively—achieved, than against states that have large territories. Moreover, the size of a national territory is in itself a certain guarantee that

an outside power will not hastily invade. In that case, the struggle would be long and exhausting before victory could be gained. The risk of assault would be great, and would not be undertaken without exceptional reasons. Hence the very size of a state furnishes a basis upon which national liberty and independence can be maintained with relative ease. Conversely, a state whose territory is small offers a natural temptation to the invader.

Actually, so-called nationalist circles in the German Reich rejected those first two possibilities of establishing a balance between the increasing population and a fixed national territory. But the reasons given for that rejection were different from those just mentioned: It was mainly on the basis of certain moral sentiments that a restricted birth rate was rejected. Proposals for internal colonization were indignantly refused because it was suspected that such a policy might mean an attack on the big landowners, and that this might be the forerunner of a general assault on the principle of private property. The form of the latter solution [i.e. internal colonization] perhaps justified the concerns of the big landowners.

Overall, the resistance to the broad masses wasn't very clever, and in any case didn't go to the root of the problem.

Only two further ways were left open in which work and bread could be secured for the increasing population.

(3) Either it was possible to consider acquiring new territory, on which the excess of the increasing population could be settled each year; or else

(4) Industry and commerce could be organized for export, and thus support the people by the increased financial surplus.

In other words: Either territorial expansion, or a colonial and commercial policy.

Both ways were considered, examined, recommended, and rejected, from various standpoints—and as a result, the last alternative was finally adopted.

The sounder alternative, however, was undoubtedly the first [i.e. number (3)].

4.3 ACQUISITION OF NEW LAND

The principle of acquiring new territory on which to settle the surplus population has many advantages to recommend it, especially if we look to the future.[5]

[5] What follows is an elaboration of alternative (3), Hitler's preferred choice.

CHAPTER 4

In the first place, it's impossible to overestimate the need to maintain a healthy peasant class, as the basis of the national community. Many of our present evils have their origin exclusively in the imbalance between urban and rural populations. A solid group of small- and mid-scale farmers has always been the best protection against social disease. Moreover, this is the only solution that guarantees the daily bread of a nation, within the framework of its domestic national economy.

With this guaranteed, industry and commerce would recede from their present unhealthy position of dominance, and would take their due place in the economy, adjusting the balance between supply and demand. They would no longer constitute the basis of national subsistence, but would be supporting institutions. By fulfilling their proper role—to adjust the balance between national production and consumption—they allow the nation to be more or less free from foreign countries. This ensures the freedom and independence of the nation, especially in times of difficulty.

Such a territorial policy, however, cannot be fulfilled in the Cameroons, but rather exclusively here in Europe. One must calmly and squarely face the truth that it certainly cannot be Divine Will to give 50 times as much land to one nation as to another. In the present case, one mustn't allow existing political borders to distract attention from what should exist on the basis of eternal justice. If this earth has sufficient room for all, then we should have that share of the land that is absolutely necessary for our existence.

But people will not do this willingly. Then the right of self-preservation comes into effect. And when attempts to settle the difficulty in an amicable way fail, then the fist must take by force. If our ancestors had based their political decisions on pacifist nonsense like our present generation does, we wouldn't possess more than one-third of our present territory. And likely there would be no German nation to worry about its future in Europe. No—we owe the two Ostmarks of the Reich to the natural determination of our forefathers in their struggle for existence.[6] From this same policy arises our present inner strength, something that is based on the greatness of our state and national territory, and which alone has made it possible for us to persist.

And there is still another reason why that solution would have been correct:

Many contemporary European nations are like pyramids standing on their peaks. Their European territory is ridiculously small when compared with the enormous overhead weight of their colonies, foreign trade, etc.

---

[6] The two Ostmarks are German-Austria and East Prussia. This latter is today a region covering parts of Poland, Russia, and Lithuania.

One may say: apex in Europe, and the base all over the world—quite different from the USA, which has its base on the American continent and touches the rest of the world only through its apex. This accounts for the incomparable inner strength of the USA and the corresponding weakness of most of the colonial European powers.

England is no proof to the contrary, because a quick glance at the British Empire overlooks the whole Anglo-Saxon world. England cannot be compared with any other state in Europe, since it forms a vast community of language and culture together with the USA.

Therefore the only possibility that Germany had to conduct a sound territorial policy was to acquire new territory in Europe itself. Colonies cannot serve this purpose, since they aren't suited for large-scale European settlement. From the 19th century on, it was no longer possible to peacefully acquire such colonies. Therefore any attempt at such a colonial expansion would have meant an enormous military struggle. Thus it was more practical to undertake that military struggle for new territory in Europe, rather than to wage war for foreign acquisition.

Such a decision naturally demands the nation's undivided attention. A policy like this requires all available energy on the part of everyone concerned, and cannot be carried out by half-measures or hesitatingly. The political leadership of the German Reich should have been exclusively devoted to this goal. No step should have been taken other than one that served as a means to this end. It should have been clear that such a goal could only be reached by war; and this prospect should have been faced with calm and collected determination.

All alliances should have been envisioned and judged only from this standpoint. If new territory were to be acquired in Europe, it should have been mainly at Russia's expense. Once again, the new German Reich should have set out on the same road as was formerly traveled by the Teutonic Knights—this time to acquire soil for the German plow by means of the German sword, and thus provide the nation with its daily bread.

4.4 WITH ENGLAND, AGAINST RUSSIA

Such a policy, however, could have only one possible European ally: England.

Only by alliance with England was it possible to safeguard the rear of the new German crusade. And the justification for undertaking such an

expedition was stronger than that of our forefathers. Not one of our pacifists refuses to eat the bread made from grain grown in the East; and yet the first plow here was 'the sword'!

No sacrifice should have been considered too great, in order to win England's friendship. Colonial and naval ambitions should have been abandoned, and attempts to compete against British industries avoided.

Only a clear and definite policy could achieve such a goal. This would involve renunciation of global trade and colonies, renunciation of a German navy, and a concentration of state military power on land forces.

The result would have been a temporary limitation, but for the sake of a great and powerful future.

There was a time when England might have reasoned with us, on such grounds. It would have understood that the problem of a steadily rising population would force Germany to look for a solution either within Europe—with the help of England—or without England, elsewhere in the world.

This outlook was probably the chief reason why London tried to draw nearer to Germany at the turn of the century. For the first time, an attitude became evident that, in recent years, has displayed itself in a most tragic way. People were unhappy with the thought of having to pull England's chestnuts out of the fire—as if there could ever be an alliance on any basis other than mutual benefit. Such a deal could have been made with England. British diplomats were still wise enough to know that an equivalent must be offered in reply to any such services rendered.

Let's suppose that our German foreign policy was managed astutely enough in 1904 to enable us to take the part that Japan played. We can scarcely measure the beneficial consequences for Germany.

There would have been no 'World War.'

Any bloodshed in 1904 would have been a tenth of that shed from 1914 to 1918.

And what a position Germany would hold in the world today!

4.5 SOLUTION TO THE AUSTRIAN ALLIANCE

In any case, the alliance with Austria was then an absurdity.

This mummified state didn't attach itself to Germany for the purpose of carrying out a war, but rather to maintain a perpetual state of peace—one that was to be exploited for the purpose of slowly but surely rooting out the German element in the Dual Monarchy.

Another reason for the impossible nature of this alliance was that no one could expect such a state to take an active part in defending German national interests, given that it had insufficient strength to end de-Germanization within its own borders. If Germany herself was neither sufficiently motivated nor ruthless to deny that absurd Habsburg State the right to decide the destinies of 10 million Germans, surely it was out of the question to expect the Habsburg State to assist in any great and courageous German undertaking. The attitude of the old Reich towards the Austrian question could have been considered a test of its stamina in the struggle of national destinies.

In any case, the policy of oppression against the German population in Austria should never have been allowed to continue and to strengthen year by year. The value of Austria as an ally could be determined only by preserving the German element there.

But that path was not followed.

Nothing was feared as much as war; and yet they were ultimately forced to confront it, at the most unfavorable moment.

They wanted to flee from destiny, but it held them fast. They dreamt of maintaining world peace, but landed in a world war.

And this was the most significant reason why the above-mentioned third alternative was not even considered. New territory could be gained only in the East; but this meant war, whereas they wanted peace at any cost. Previously, the slogan of German foreign policy was: Preserve the German nation at all costs. Now it was changed to: Maintain world peace at all costs. We know the outcome.

I will return to this point in detail later on.

4.6 ECONOMIC EXPANSION POLICY

Meanwhile, there remained the fourth alternative: Industry and world trade, naval power and colonies.

Such a development would certainly have been easier and more rapidly attainable. To colonize a territory is a slow process, often extending over centuries. Yet this fact is the source of its inner strength; it doesn't happen through a sudden burst of enthusiasm, but rather through a gradual and enduring process of growth—one quite different from industrial progress, which can be expanded within a few years. Results are achieved, but they aren't of lasting quality; rather, something frail, like a soap-bubble. It's

much easier to quickly build a navy than to carry through the tough task of settling new lands with farmers and establishing farmsteads. But the former is more quickly destroyed than the latter.

In adopting such a course, Germany must have known that it would eventually mean war, sooner or later. Only a child could believe those sweet and syrupy expressions of goodness: that peaceful intentions could get them their bananas through this 'friendly competition between the nations,' without ever having to fight for them.

No. Once we had taken this path, England was bound to become our enemy. Naturally, it fit in nicely with our innocent assumptions. But still, it was absurd to become indignant at the fact that the day came when England took the liberty of opposing our peaceful activity with a violent and brutal self-interest.

Naturally, we on our side would never have done such a thing.

4.7 WITH RUSSIA, AGAINST ENGLAND

If a European territorial policy against Russia was only possible with England as our ally, by contrast then, a policy of colonies and global trade could have been conducted only against England and with Russia. But then we would have to face the consequences—and above all, to abandon Austria as quickly as possible.

At the turn of the century, the Austrian alliance had become a veritable absurdity from all points of view.

But no one considered an alliance with Russia against England, any more than one with England against Russia. In either case, the final result would have been war. And an avoidance of war was the very point of the commercial and industrial policy. It was believed that the 'peaceful, economic' conquest of the world provided a method that would permanently replace a policy of violence.

Occasionally, however, there were doubts about this principle, especially when some incomprehensible warnings came from England now and again. That was the reason why the [German] naval fleet was built. It wasn't for attacking or destroying England but rather to defend the concept of 'world peace' and the 'peaceful' conquest of the world. Therefore this fleet was kept within modest limits—not only regarding the number and tonnage of the vessels but their armaments as well. The idea was to show the transparency of our peaceful intentions.

Such talk about the 'peaceful, economic' conquest of the world was probably the greatest nonsense ever to be raised to the level of state policy. It became even more foolish when England was pointed out as a prime example of how it could be done. Our academic analyses of history and ideas have done irreparable harm; they offer a striking proof of how people 'learn' history without understanding anything of it.

In fact, England should have been looked upon as a convincing argument *against* the theory of such peaceful conquest. No nation prepared the way for its commercial conquests more brutally than England did, and none has defended such conquests more ruthlessly. Isn't it typical of British statecraft that it knows how to use political power in order to gain economic advantages and, inversely, to turn economic conquests into political power? What an error it was to believe that England was too cowardly to spill its own blood for the purposes of economic expansion!

The fact that England didn't possess a national army proved nothing. It's not the military of the moment that matters, but rather the will and determination to use whatever strength is available. England has always had the arms needed. It always fought with the weapons necessary for success. It sent mercenary troops to fight, when mercenaries sufficed. But it never hesitated to draw from the best blood of the nation when that was the only means. And in every case, the determination, the tenacity, and the ruthless pursuit of victory remained unchanged.

4.8 GERMAN CARICATURE OF THE ENGLISHMAN

But in Germany, the schools, the press, and the comic papers promoted an idea of the Englishman that was eventually bound to lead to the worst kind of self-deception. This absurdity slowly but persistently spread into every aspect of German life. The result was an undervaluation that cost us dearly. The delusion was so deep that the Englishman was looked upon as a shrewd businessman, but personally as an unbelievable coward.

Unfortunately, our lofty history professors didn't impress their students with the truth that it's impossible to build up such a mighty organization as the British Empire by mere swindle and fraud. The few who called attention to that truth were either ignored or silenced. I can vividly recall the astonished looks of my comrades when they found themselves face to face, for the first time, with the Tommies in Flanders. After a few days of fighting, it slowly dawned on our soldiers that those

Scotsmen were not like the ones described in the comic papers and press communiqués.

It was then that I formed my first ideas of the effectiveness of various forms of propaganda.

Such a falsification, however, served a good purpose for those who fabricated it: This caricature of the Englishman, though false, could be used to prove the possibility of global economic conquest. If the Englishman succeeded, we could too. And our greater honesty, and our freedom from that specifically-English 'perfidy,' would be assets on our side. It was thereby hoped that the sympathy of the smaller nations—and the confidence of the larger—could be gained more easily.

We didn't realize that our honesty was an object of profound aversion for other people, because we ourselves believed in it. The rest of the world looked on our behavior as a kind of shrewd deceitfulness. But when the Revolution came, then they were amazed at the boundless stupidity of our 'honest' intentions.[7]

4.9 INNER WEAKNESS OF THE TRIPLE ALLIANCE

Once we understand that absurd notion of 'peaceful economic conquest' of the world, we can more clearly understand that other absurdity, the Triple Alliance. With what other state could we have made an alliance? With Austria, we couldn't acquire new territory by military means, even in Europe. And this very fact was the real reason for the inner weakness of the Triple Alliance. A Bismarck could permit himself such a makeshift alliance to meet temporary needs, but certainly none of his bungling successors could do so—and least of all when the original conditions no longer existed. In Bismarck's time, Austria could still be looked upon as a German State. But the gradual introduction of universal suffrage turned the country into a non-German mishmash, one in which the German voice was scarcely heard.

From the standpoint of racial policy, the Austrian alliance was simply disastrous. A new, great Slavic power was allowed to grow up close to the borders of the German Reich. Later on, this power was bound to take an entirely different attitude toward Germany than, say, Russia. The Alliance

[7] Hitler refers to the November Revolution of 1918—a tragic event of major historical importance, in his eyes. It is elaborated in Chapter 7.

was thus bound to become emptier and feebler, because its only supporters were losing their influence and were being systematically pushed out of the more important public offices.

By the turn of the century, the alliance with Austria had already entered the same phase as Austria's alliance with Italy.

Here, too, there were just two possibilities: Either to take the side of the Habsburg Monarchy or to raise a protest against the oppression of the German element in Austria. But generally speaking, when one takes such a course, it's eventually bound to lead to open war.

Even psychologically, the Triple Alliance became weaker as long as its main objective was a defense of the status quo. Conversely, an alliance becomes stronger the more the parties involved see it as a means to territorial expansion. Here, as everywhere else, strength lies not in defense, but in attack.

4.10 LUDENDORFF'S 1912 MEMORANDUM

This truth was recognized in various quarters, but unfortunately, not by the so-called 'authorities.' As early as 1912, Ludendorff[8]—who was then colonel and an officer of the general staff—pointed out these weaknesses of the Alliance in a memorandum that he drew up. But of course, none of the 'statesmen' attached any importance or value to that it. In general, this seems to be due to the fact that common sense, which is active in ordinary people, is entirely lacking when it comes to those known as 'diplomats.'

It was lucky for Germany that the war of 1914 broke out indirectly, through Austria; therefore, the Habsburgs were compelled to participate. Had it been otherwise, Germany would have been left to her own resources. The Habsburg State would have been neither ready nor willing to enter a war of which Germany was responsible. That which was so shameful in the case of Italy would, in the case of Austria, have happened earlier. In other words, Austria would have remained 'neutral' in order to safeguard against any revolution that might begin immediately after the war had started. The Slavs would rather have smashed the Dual Monarchy than come to Germany's assistance.

[8] Erich Ludendorff (1865-1937) was a leading German general during World War I. He was an early supporter of Hitler's, and participated with him in the failed putsch of 1923.

CHAPTER 4

4.11 AUSTRIA AS A TEMPTING LEGACY

But at that time, there were only a few who understood all the dangers and aggravations that resulted from the alliance with the Danubian Monarchy.

In the first place, Austria had too many enemies who were eagerly looking forward to obtaining the legacy of that decrepit state. These people came to have a certain hatred of Germany because it held the monarchy together. Thus the idea emerged that Vienna could be reached only by passing through Berlin.

In the second place, Germany thus lost its best and most promising chances of other alliances. In their place, one now observed a growing tension in relations with Russia and even Italy. And this, despite a generally pro-German, anti-Austrian mood in Rome—a mood that slept in the heart of every Italian, flaring up now and then.

Since the adoption of a commercial and industrial policy, there was no longer a basis for war against Russia. Only the common enemies of these two countries, Germany and Russia, could have an active interest in such a war. As a matter of fact, it was only the Jews and the Marxists who tried to stir up bad blood between the two states.

In the third place, the Alliance constituted a permanent danger to German security. Any great power that was hostile to Bismarck's Reich could mobilize many other states in a war against Germany, simply by promising them tempting spoils at the expense of the Austrian ally.

It was possible to arouse the whole of Eastern Europe against the monarchy—especially Russia and Italy. The world coalition that developed under the leadership of King Edward could never have become a reality, if Germany's ally, Austria, hadn't offered such an alluring prospect. This fact alone made it possible to combine so many heterogeneous states, with divergent interests, into a single offensive front. Every member could hope to enrich himself at the expense of Austria, if he joined in the general attack against Germany. The fact that Turkey was also a tacit party to the unfortunate alliance with Austria enhanced Germany's peril to an extraordinary degree.

International Jewish world finance needed this bait of the Austrian legacy in order to carry out its plans of ruining Germany, which thus far hadn't surrendered to the global superstate of finance and economics. Thus it was possible to consolidate that coalition and make it strong enough and brave enough—through the sheer weight of numbers—to join in physical conflict with the horned Siegfried.[9]

---

[9] In the Song of the Niebelungs, the Germanic warrior Siegfried kills a dragon. Bathing in its blood, his skin becomes dragon-like and 'horned,' and thus invincible.

The alliance with the Habsburg monarchy—which I loathed while still in Austria—was a matter of grave concern on my part. It caused me to meditate on it so persistently that finally I came to the conclusions I mentioned above.

In the small circles that I frequented at that time, I didn't hide my conviction that this sinister agreement with a state doomed to collapse would also bring catastrophe to Germany, if she didn't free herself from it in time. I never once wavered in that firm conviction—even when the tempest of the World War seemed to have made a shipwreck of reasoning itself, and had put blind enthusiasm in its place, even among those circles where the coolest and hardest objective thinking should have held sway. In the trenches, I voiced and defended my own opinion whenever these problems came under discussion. I argued that abandoning the Habsburg monarchy would involve no sacrifice for Germany if it could thereby reduce the number of its own enemies. The millions of Germans who had donned the steel helmet had done so not to fight for the maintenance of a corrupt dynasty, but rather for the salvation of the German people.

Before the war, there were a few occasions on which it seemed that at least one section of the German public had some slight misgivings about the political wisdom of the alliance policy. From time to time, German conservative circles issued warnings against being over-confident about the value of that alliance. But like every other reasonable suggestion of the time, it was thrown to the winds. The general conviction was that the right measures had been adopted to 'conquer' the world, and that the success would be enormous, and the sacrifices negligible.

Once again, the 'regular people' could do nothing but watch how the 'authorities' were marching straight towards disaster, and were enticing their beloved people to follow them, like the Pied Piper of Hamelin.

4.12 STATE AND ECONOMY

The deeper reasons why it was possible to foist upon the people this absurd notion of 'peacefully conquering the world through commerce' lay in the generally sick condition of the whole body of German political thought. This also shows how it was possible to put forth the maintenance of world peace as a national aim.

The triumphant progress of technical science in Germany, and the marvelous development of German industries and commerce, led us to

forget that a powerful state was the necessary prerequisite of that success. On the contrary, certain circles went even so far as to promote the theory that the state owed its very existence to these phenomena—that it was, above all, an economic institution and should be structured according to economic interests. Therefore, it was held, the state was dependent on economic structure. This condition of things was praised as the healthiest and most natural arrangement.

But the truth is that the state, in itself, has nothing whatsoever to do with any definite economic conception or development.

It's not a collection of contracting parties within a defined and limited space, for the purpose of serving economic ends. The state is a community of living beings who have kindred physical and spiritual natures. It's organized for the purpose of assuring the preservation of their own kind, and to help towards fulfilling those ends assigned by Providence. Therein, and therein alone, lay the purpose and meaning of a state. Economic activity is one of the many auxiliary means that are necessary for the attainment of those aims. But economic activity is never the origin or purpose of a state—except where it has been founded on a false and unnatural basis.

And this alone explains why a state per se doesn't necessarily need a certain delimited territory. This becomes necessary only among those people who are ready to carry on the struggle for existence by means of their own work. People who can sneak their way into the human body politic and, like parasites, make others work for them, can form a state without possessing any specific territory. This is chiefly applicable to that parasitic nation which, today more than ever, preys upon the honest portion of mankind: the Jews.

The Jewish State has never been delimited in space. It has been spread all over the world, without any borders whatsoever, and has always been constituted by only one race. That's why the Jews have always formed a State within the State.[10] One of the most ingenious tricks ever devised has

[10] This was a long-standing complaint against the Jews, going back at least to the German philosopher Johann Fichte. In 1793, he wrote, "Throughout almost all the countries of Europe there is spreading a mighty hostile state that is at perpetual war with all other states, and in many of them imposes fearful burdens on the citizens: it is the Jews. ... Do you not remember the state within the State? Does the thought not occur to you that if you give to the Jews, who are citizens of a state more solid and more powerful than any of yours, civil rights in your states, they will utterly crush the remainder of your citizens?" (cited in Poliakov 1965: 512).

been to make this state sail under the flag of 'religion,' thus assuring it of the religious tolerance that Aryans are always ready to grant.[11] But the Mosaic religion is really nothing else than the doctrine of the preservation of the Jewish race. It therefore takes in all spheres of sociological, political, and economic knowledge that have any bearing on this function.

The instinct for the preservation of one's own species is the primary cause that leads to the formation of human communities. Hence the state is a racial organism, and not an economic organization. The difference between the two is so great as to be incomprehensible to our contemporary so-called 'statesmen.' That's why they like to believe that the state may be constituted as an economic structure, whereas the truth is that it has always resulted from a will to preserve the species and the race.

But these qualities always exist and operate through the heroic virtues, and have nothing to do with commercial egoism. The preservation of the species always presupposes that the individual is ready to sacrifice himself. Such is the meaning of the poet's lines:

If you do not stake your life,
You will never win life for yourself.[12]

Individual sacrifice is necessary in order to ensure the preservation of the race. Hence, the most essential condition for the establishment and maintenance of a state is a certain feeling of solidarity, one grounded in an identity of character and species, and in a willingness to defend these at all costs. For a people with their own territory, this results in a development of the heroic virtues. With a parasitic people, it will develop the arts of subterfuge and malignant cruelty—unless these are intrinsic racial characteristics, in which case the varying political forms are only the outward manifestations of these qualities.

At least in the beginning, the formation of a state can only result from a manifestation of the heroic qualities. And the people who fail in the

[11] This is Hitler's first explicit mention of 'Aryan' in *Mein Kampf*. The word itself is ancient, dating back at least to the 6th century BC, when it simply meant 'Iranian.' It was in widespread use in the 1850s, due in part to the work of French theorist Arthur de Gobineau. And it achieved considerable publicity in Germany in the early 1900s, thanks to such writers as Houston S. Chamberlain. Despite common belief, the word was not an invention of Hitler or the Nazis. Hitler elaborates extensively on Aryanism in Chapter 11.

[12] From Friedrich Schiller's *Wallenstein* trilogy (1799).

struggle for existence—that is, those who become vassals and are thereby condemned to vanish—are those who do not display the heroic virtues, or who fall victim to the trickery of the parasites. And even in this latter case, the failure is not so much a lack of intelligence but rather of courage and determination—which then tries to conceal itself beneath a cloak of humanitarianism.

The qualities that are employed for the foundation and preservation of a state have therefore little or nothing to do with economics. And this is clearly demonstrated by the fact that the inner strength of a state only very rarely coincides with its economic prosperity. On the contrary, there are many examples showing that such prosperity indicates the approaching decline of a state. If it were correct to attribute the foundation of human societies to economic forces, then the power of the state would be at its peak during periods of economic prosperity, and not vice versa.

It is particularly difficult to understand how the belief that the state exists by virtue of economic forces could become accepted in a country that has given proof of the opposite, in every phase of its history. The history of Prussia shows, in a particularly clear and distinct way, that it's not material qualities but rather ideal virtues alone that lead to the formation of a state. Only under the protection of those virtues can economic activities be developed; the latter will continue to flourish until a time comes when the creative political capacity declines. Then the economic structure will also break down—a phenomenon that's happening now, in an alarming manner, before our eyes. The material interests of humanity can prosper only in the shadow of heroic virtues. As soon as they become the primary considerations of life, they destroy the basis of their own existence.

Whenever German political power was particularly strong, the economic situation also improved. But whenever economic interests dominated the life of the people, and pushed transcendent ideals into the background, the state collapsed; and economic ruin followed soon thereafter.

If we ask about those forces that are necessary for the creation and preservation of a state, we find them under one single heading: The capacity and readiness of the individual to sacrifice for the common welfare. That this has nothing at all to do with economics can be proved by observing the simple fact that man doesn't sacrifice himself for material interests. In other words, he will die for an ideal, but not for a business.

The marvelous English gift for public psychology was clearly shown in the way they presented their case in the World War. We were fighting

for our bread; but the English declared that they were fighting for 'freedom'—and not even their own freedom. No—for the freedom of the small nations. The Germans laughed at this effrontery, and were angered by it. But in doing so, they showed how much political thought had declined among our so-called diplomats in Germany, even before the war. We didn't have the slightest idea of the essence of that force that causes men to freely and willingly face their own death.

As long as the German people, in 1914, continued to believe that they were fighting for ideals, they stood firm. As soon as they were told that they were fighting only for their daily bread, they began to give up the struggle.

Our clever 'statesmen' were astounded at this change of attitude. They never understood that as soon as man is called upon to struggle for purely material causes, he'll avoid death as best he can; clearly, death and the enjoyment of the material rewards are quite incompatible. The frailest woman will become a heroine when the life of her own child is at stake. And only the will to save the species and the hearth—or the state that protects them—has, in all ages, compelled men to face the weapons of their enemies.

The following may be proclaimed as an eternal truth:

A state has never arisen from peaceful economic means, but always from the instinct to maintain the species—whether this instinct manifest itself in the heroic sphere, or in that of cunning craftiness. In the first case, we have the Aryan states, based on the principles of work and culture. In the second case, we have the Jewish parasitic colonies. But as soon as economic interests begin to predominate over the instincts in a people or a state, the situation quickly leads to subjugation and oppression.

4.13 THE MOMENT OF DECAY

The belief that prevailed in Germany before the war—that the world could be opened up and even conquered for Germany through a system of peaceful commerce and a colonial policy—was a typical symptom that indicated the decline of those real qualities whereby states are created and preserved. It also showed the decline of the insight, will power, and practical determination that belong to those qualities. The penalty for this, like a law of nature, was the World War, with its attendant consequences.

To anyone who hadn't thought deeply about the matter, this general attitude of the German people must have seemed an insoluble enigma. After all, Germany itself was a magnificent example of an empire that had been

built up purely through a policy of power. Prussia, which was the generative cell of the German Reich, was created by brilliant heroic deeds, and not by financial or commercial operations. And the Reich itself was but the magnificent compensation for a leadership that conducted a policy of power and military valor.

How then did it happen that the political instincts of this very same German people became so degenerate? It wasn't merely one isolated phenomenon that pointed to this decadence, but morbid symptoms which appeared in alarming numbers all over the body politic, eating into the nation like a gangrenous ulcer. It seemed as if some all-pervading poisonous fluid had been injected, by some mysterious hand, into the bloodstream of this once heroic body—bringing about a creeping paralysis that affected rationality and the basic instinct of self-preservation.

During the years 1912–1914, I wondered endlessly about those problems that related to the policy of the Triple Alliance and the economic policy then being pursued by the German Reich. Once again, I came to the conclusion that the only explanation for this enigma lay in the operation of that force that I had already become acquainted with in Vienna, though from a different angle of vision: the Marxist doctrine and worldview, and its organized action throughout the nation.

4.14 GERMANY'S ATTITUDE TOWARD MARXISM

For the second time in my life, I plunged deep into the study of that destructive teaching. This time, however, I was driven not by the impressions and influences of daily life, but rather by observation of general phenomena in German political life. In delving again into the theoretical literature of this new world, and trying to get a clear view of the possible consequences of its teaching, I compared the theoretical principles of Marxism with the phenomena and events brought about by its activities in political, cultural, and economic life.

For the first time in my life, I now turned my attention to the efforts that were being made to subdue this world plague.

I studied Bismarck's exceptional legislation in its original concept, its operation, and its results. Gradually I formed a basis for my own opinions, one that has proved as solid as a rock; I have never since had to change my attitude towards the general problem. I also made a further and more thorough analysis of the relationship between Marxism and Jewry.

Earlier in Vienna, I looked upon Germany as an imperturbable colossus. But even then, serious doubts and misgivings often disturbed me. In my own mind, and in my conversation with my small circle of acquaintances, I criticized Germany's foreign policy and the incredibly superficial way in which it dealt with Marxism—though it was then the most important problem in Germany. I couldn't understand how they could stumble blindfolded into the midst of this peril, the effects of which would be momentous, if Marxism's openly declared aims were put into practice. Even then I warned people around me, just as I am warning a wider audience now, against that soothing but cowardly slogan: 'Nothing can happen to us!' A similar mental contagion had already destroyed a mighty empire. Could Germany hope to escape the operation of those laws that bind all other human communities?

In the years 1913 and 1914, I expressed my opinion for the first time in various circles—now including some members of the National Socialist movement—that the question of securing the future of the German nation is the same as the question of destroying Marxism.

I considered the disastrous policy of the Triple Alliance as one of the consequences resulting from the disintegrating effects of Marxist teaching. The truly alarming feature was that this teaching was invisibly corrupting the foundations of a healthy political and economic outlook. Those who became contaminated by it frequently didn't realize that their aims and actions sprang from this worldview, which they otherwise openly rejected.

The spiritual and moral decline of the German people had long since begun. And yet, those who were affected by the morbid decadence were frequently unaware—as often happens—of the forces that were destroying their very existence. Sometimes they tried to cure the disease by treating the symptoms, which were taken as the cause. But since no one recognized, or wanted to recognize, the real cause of the disease, this way of combating Marxism was as ineffective as bungling quackery.

CHAPTER 5: THE WORLD WAR

During my boisterous youth, nothing dampened my wild spirits so much as the thought that I was born at a time when there would be no more temples of fame, except to honor businessmen and state officials. The historical tempest had subsided, and the future seemed to be given over to 'the peaceful competition of nations'—in other words, to a cozy mutual swindling match without the use of violence. Individual countries became commercial enterprises, grabbing customers and striving for concessions from each other. And it was all accompanied by loud but innocuous shouting.

This trend seemed destined to steadily and permanently progress. It seemed bound to eventually transform the world into a giant department store. In the entryway of this emporium, there would be rows of busts of profiteers and sheepish governmental officials. The salesmen were represented by the English, and the administrative officials by the Germans. The Jews would be sacrificed to the position of ownership—since, as they claim, they make no money and are always being called upon to 'pay out.' Moreover, they have the advantage of being versed in the foreign languages.

I used to ask, Why wasn't I born a hundred years ago? Perhaps around the time of the Wars of Liberation,[1] when a man was still of some value, even though he had no 'business'!

Thus I thought of it as an ill-deserved stroke of bad luck that I had arrived too late on this earth. I was chagrined at the idea that my life would have to run its course along peaceful and orderly lines. As a boy, I was anything but a pacifist, and all attempts to make me so were futile.

[1] Also known as the German Campaign of 1813. It liberated the German states from French control.

Then came the Boer War, like a flash of lightning.[2] Day after day, I gazed intently at the newspapers, and I devoured the telegrams and communiqués. I was overjoyed at witnessing that heroic struggle, even from so great a distance.

When the Russo-Japanese War came, I was older and better able to judge for myself.[3] For nationalistic reasons, I then took the side of the Japanese in our discussions. I looked upon the defeat of the Russians as a blow to Austrian Slavism.

Many years have passed between that time and my arrival in Munich. I now realized that what I formerly believed to be a morbid decadence was only the lull before the storm. During my Vienna days, the Balkans were already in the grip of that sultry pause that precedes a violent storm. Flashes of lightning occasionally appeared; but they rapidly disappeared in the sinister gloom. Then the Balkan War broke out.[4] The first gusts of the forthcoming tornado then swept across a highly-strung Europe. The intervening calm was an atmosphere of foreboding—so much so that the sense of an impending catastrophe was transformed into a feeling of anticipation. People wished that heaven would give free rein to a fate that could no longer be curbed. Then the first great bolt of lightning struck the earth. The storm broke, and a heavenly thunder intermingled with the roar of the cannons in the World War.

When news reached Munich that the Archduke Franz Ferdinand had been murdered, I was at home all day and didn't get the particulars of how it happened.[5] At first I feared that the shots may have been fired by some German-Austrian students who had become furiously aroused by his pro-Slav activities, and wished to free the Germans from this internal enemy. It was easy to imagine what the result of such a mistake would have been: a new wave of persecution, all 'justified' and 'explained' to the world. But soon afterwards, I heard the names of the presumed assassins, and also that they were known to be Serbs. I was somewhat dumbfounded by the inscrutable vengeance that destiny had wrought.

[2] Formally, the "second" Boer War, which ran from 1899 to 1902. In this war, Britain reasserted its control over black South Africans.

[3] The Russo-Japanese War ran from 1904 to 1905, regarding territory in Manchuria. It ended in Japanese victory.

[4] The Balkan War was a two-phase offensive, over the years 1912 to 1913. The Balkan states defeated the Ottoman Empire, though it regained some ground in the latter phase of the conflict.

[5] On 28 June 1914. This event precipitated World War I.

CHAPTER 5

The greatest friend of the Slavs fell victim to the bullets of Slavic fanatics.

Anyone observing the relationship between Austria and Serbia during the past few years could have no doubt: a stone had been set rolling, and it couldn't be stopped.

5.1 THE AUSTRIAN ULTIMATUM

It is unjust to the Vienna government to blame it now for the form and content of the ultimatum it issued. In a similar position and under similar circumstances, no other world power would have acted otherwise. On her southern border, Austria had a relentless mortal foe who indulged in increasingly frequent acts of provocation. This action would not have ceased until the moment came for the destruction of the empire. In Austria, there was good reason to fear that this would occur, at the latest, with the death of the emperor. Once he was gone, it was unlikely that the monarchy could offer any serious resistance. For several years, the state had been so completely identified with the personality of Franz Joseph that, in the eyes of most people, the death of this venerable personality would be tantamount to the death of the empire itself.

Indeed, it was one of the clever constructions of Slav policy to foster the impression that the Austrian State owed its very existence solely to the rare talents of that monarch. This kind of flattery was particularly welcomed at the Hofburg—all the more because it had no relation whatsoever to the real merits of the emperor. No effort whatsoever was made to locate the carefully hidden thorns within in this glorifying praise. One fact that was entirely overlooked, perhaps intentionally, was that the more the empire remained dependent on the so-called administrative talents of 'the wisest monarch of all times,' the more catastrophic the situation would be, when fate came knocking at the door and demanded payment.

Was it even possible to imagine the Austrian Empire without its venerable ruler?

Wouldn't the tragedy that once befell Maria Theresa be repeated?[6]

It's an injustice to the circles of Viennese government to reproach them for having instigated a war that might have been prevented. The war was

[6] Maria Theresa (1717-1780) ruled Austria for the last 40 years of her life. The "tragedy" was apparently her loss of Silesia to Prussia in 1748.

bound to come. Perhaps it might have been postponed for a year or two, at the most. But it was always the misfortune of German—and Austrian—diplomats that they endeavored to put off the inevitable day of reckoning, with the result that they were finally compelled to deliver their blow at a most inopportune moment.

No. Those who didn't want this war should have had the courage to take the consequences of the refusal, which must necessarily have meant the sacrifice of Austria. And even then, war would have come—not as a war of all nations against us, but in the form of a partition of the Habsburg monarchy. Then we would have had to decide either to join in, or to look on with folded arms, allowing fate to run its course.

Those, however, who are loudest today in their denouncing of the war, and offering the sagest opinions, are the very same ones who contributed most fatally in steering us towards the war.

For decades, the German Social Democrats were agitating, in an underhanded and knavish way, for war against Russia. At the same time, the German Center Party, with religious ends in view, worked to make the Austrian State the focal point of German policy. We now live with the consequences of this insanity. What came was bound to come—and it could never have been avoided. German guilt lay in the fact that it missed all opportunities for attack, simply to preserve the peace. It became entangled in an alliance for world peace, and thus became victim of an anti-German world coalition that was determined to bring about a world war.

Even if the Vienna government had formulated its ultimatum in less drastic terms, that wouldn't have changed the situation at all. But it certainly might have aroused public indignation. In the eyes of the great masses, the ultimatum was too moderate and certainly not excessive or brutal. Anyone who would deny this today is either a simpleton with a feeble memory, or else a deliberate liar.

The War of 1914 was certainly not forced on the masses; for God's sake, no. It was even desired by the whole people.

There was a desire to bring the general feeling of uncertainty to an end, once and for all. And it's only in this light that we can understand how more than two million German men and boys voluntarily joined the colors, ready to shed the last drop of their blood for the cause.

CHAPTER 5

5.2 THE GERMAN WAR FOR FREEDOM

For me, these hours came as a deliverance from the distress that had weighed upon me during the days of my youth. I'm not ashamed to admit today that I was carried away by the enthusiasm of the moment. I sank down on my knees and thanked heaven, out of the fullness of my heart, for the good fortune of living at such a time.

The fight for freedom had begun, on an unparalleled scale in world history. From the moment that fate took the helm, a conviction grew among the masses that now it wasn't a question of deciding the destinies of Austria or Serbia, but that the very existence of the German nation itself was at stake.

At last, after many years, the people clearly saw the future. Therefore, almost immediately after the gigantic struggle began, an excessive enthusiasm was replaced by a more earnest and more fitting undertone; the rapture of the popular spirit was not a mere passing frenzy. It was only too necessary that the gravity of the situation be recognized. At that time there was, generally speaking, not the slightest presentiment or conception of how long the war might last. People dreamed of the soldiers being home that winter, and that they would then resume their daily work in peace.

Whatever a man wants is what he hopes for and believes in. The overwhelming majority of the people have long since tired of the perpetual insecurity in public affairs. Hence it was only natural that few anticipated a peaceful conclusion to the Austro-Serbian conflict; they looked forward to a definitive resolution. I, too, was one of these millions.

The moment the news of the assassination reached Munich, two thoughts came into my mind: First, that war was absolutely inevitable; and second, that the Habsburg State would now be forced to honor its alliance. What I had most feared was that one day Germany itself, perhaps as a result of the alliance, would become involved in a conflict not directly caused by Austria. In this case, Austria might not be able to muster the will to fight on behalf of its ally. The Slavic majority in the empire would have immediately begun to undermine any such intentions, and would have always preferred to shatter the entire state rather than to aid its ally. But now this danger was removed. The old state was compelled to fight, whether it wished to or not.

My own attitude towards the conflict was equally simple and clear. I believed that it wasn't a case of Austria fighting to get satisfaction from Serbia, but rather a case of Germany fighting for her own existence—for the life or death of the German nation, for its freedom and for its future.

Bismarck's work must now be carried on. Young Germany must show itself worthy of the blood shed by our fathers on so many heroic battlefields, from Weissenburg to Sedan and Paris. And if this struggle should bring us victory, our people will again rank foremost among the great nations. Only then could the German Reich assert itself as the mighty champion of peace, without needing to restrict the daily bread of its children for the sake of maintaining the peace.

As a boy and young man, I often wished for the occasion to prove that my national enthusiasm was no mere empty whim. Cheering sometimes seemed to me to be a kind of sinful indulgence, though I couldn't give any justification for that feeling. After all, who has the right to shout a triumphant word if he hasn't won the right to do so in a place where there is no play-acting, and where the Goddess of Destiny's inexorable hand tests the truth and sincerity of nations and men? Just as millions of others, I felt a proud joy in being permitted to go through this test. I had so often sung *Deutschland über Alles,* and so often roared '*Heil*,' that I now saw it as a kind of belated grace that I was allowed to appear before the Court of Eternal Justice, and to testify to the truth of those feelings.

One thing was clear to me from the very beginning, namely, that in the event of war—which now seemed inevitable—my books would have to be set aside. I also realized that my place would have to be where my inner voice directed me.

I left Austria principally for political reasons. Even more rational, however, was that, now that the war had begun, that I should put into practice the logical consequences of my political opinions! I had no desire to fight for the Habsburg cause, but I was prepared to die at any time for my own people and the Reich to which they belonged.

5.3 ENLISTMENT IN A BAVARIAN REGIMENT

On 3 August 1914, I presented an urgent petition to His Majesty, King Ludwig III, requesting to be allowed to serve in a Bavarian regiment. In those days, the chancellery certainly had its hands full, and I was therefore all the more pleased when I received an answer the next day. I opened the document with trembling hands; and no words could describe the joy that I felt on reading that I was instructed to report to a Bavarian regiment. Within a few days, I was wearing the uniform that I was not to take off again for nearly six years.

CHAPTER 5

For me, as for every German, the most memorable period of my life now began. Face to face with that mighty struggle, everything past fell away into oblivion. I look back on those days with a wistful pride, especially because we are now approaching the tenth anniversary of that memorable event. I think back on those early weeks of war, when kind Fate allowed me to take my place in that heroic struggle among the nations.

As I recall the scene, it seems like only yesterday. I see myself among my young comrades on our first parade drill, exercising, and so on, until at last the day came for us to march off.

Like so many others, I had one worry during those days: that we might not reach the front in time. Again and again, that thought disturbed me; every announcement of a victorious battle left a slight bitter taste—which only increased as news of further victories arrived.

5.4 BAPTISM BY FIRE

At long last, the day came when we left Munich to fulfill our duty. For the first time in my life, I saw the Rhine; we journeyed westwards to stand guard before that historic German river, against its traditional and greedy enemy. As the first soft rays of the morning sun broke through the light mist, showing the Niederwald Statue,[7] the whole transport train broke into strains of *Die Wacht am Rhein*. I felt as though my heart would burst.

Then followed a damp, cold night in Flanders. We marched in silence throughout the night, and as the morning sun came through the mist, an iron greeting suddenly burst above our heads. Shrapnel exploded in our midst, spluttering in the damp ground. But before the smoke of the explosion disappeared, a wild 'Hurrah' arose from 200 throats, in response to this first greeting of death. Then began the whistling of bullets and the booming of cannons, the shouting and singing of the combatants. With eyes straining feverishly, we pressed forward, quicker and quicker, until we finally came to hand-to-hand combat—there beyond the beet-fields and meadows. Soon the strains of a song reached us from afar. Nearer and nearer, from company to company, it came. And while death began to wreak havoc in our ranks, we passed the song on to those beside us: *Deutschland, Deutschland über Alles, über Alles in der Welt!*

---

[7] The Niederwald Statue was begun in 1871 by Kaiser Wilhelm I, to commemorate the unification of Germany. It was dedicated in 1883.

5.5 FROM YOUNG VOLUNTEER TO OLD SOLDIER

After four days in the trenches, we came back. Even our step had changed. Boys of 17 now looked like men.

The volunteers of the List Regiment may not have learned how to fight properly, but they knew how to die like old soldiers.

That was the beginning.

And thus we carried on from year to year. A feeling of horror replaced the romantic fighting spirit. Enthusiasm gradually cooled down, and exuberant spirits were quelled by the fear of ever-present death. A time came for each of us to experience the conflict between the urge to self-preservation and the call of duty. I, too, had to go through that conflict. As death unrelentingly sought its prey everywhere, a vague something rebelled within the body. It tried to pass as common sense; but in reality, it was fear. Fear took on this cloak in order to impose itself on the individual. Yet the more this voice called for caution, and the louder and more persistent its demands, the stronger our resistance became. Finally, the internal struggle was over, and the call of duty was triumphant. By the winter of 1915–1916, I had come through that inner struggle. My will had asserted its indisputable mastery.

In the early days, I went into the fight with a cheer and a laugh. Now, however, I was calm and resolute. And that frame of mind endured. Fate could now put me to the final test without my nerves or reason giving way.

The young volunteer had become an old soldier.

This same transformation took place throughout the whole army. Constant fighting had aged, toughened, and hardened it, so that it stood firm and dauntless against every assault.

Only now is it possible to judge that army. After two or three years of continuous fighting, and having been thrown into one battle after another, bravely facing superior numbers and superior armament, suffering hunger and privation, the time had come when one could assess the value of that singular fighting force.

For a thousand years to come, no one will dare to speak of heroism without recalling the German Army of the World War. And then, from the dim past, there will emerge an immortal vision of those solid ranks of steel helmets that never flinched and never faltered. As long as Germans live, they will be proud to remember that these men were the sons of their people.

CHAPTER 5

5.6 ARTIFICIAL DAMPENING OF ENTHUSIASM

I was a soldier then, and didn't really wish to meddle in politics—all the more so because the time was inopportune. I still believe that the humblest stable-boy of those days served his country better than the best of, let's say, our 'parliamentarians.' My hatred for those big-mouths was never greater than in the days when all decent men, who had anything to say, said it point-blank to the enemy's face; or else, failing this, kept their mouths shut and did their duty elsewhere. Yes, I hated all those politicians. And if I had my way, I would have formed them into a labor battalion and given them the opportunity to babble amongst themselves all they liked, without offence or harm to decent people.

In those days, I cared nothing for politics. But I couldn't help forming an opinion on certain manifestations that affected not only the whole nation but also us soldiers in particular.

There were two things that caused me the greatest anxiety at that time, and which I had come to regard as harmful.

First: Shortly after our first series of victories, a certain section of the press already began to throw cold water, drip by drip, on public enthusiasm. At first this wasn't obvious. It was done under the mask of good intentions and solicitude. The public was told that big victory celebrations were somewhat out of place, and weren't worthy expressions of the spirit of a great nation. The fortitude and valor of German soldiers were accepted facts that didn't necessarily call for celebration. Furthermore, foreign opinion would have much to say about such activities. It would react better to a quiet and sober form of celebration rather than to a bunch of wild jubilation. Surely the time had come for us Germans to remember that this war was not our doing, and thus that we should always be willing to contribute our share to a reconciliation of mankind. For this reason, it wouldn't be wise to besmirch the radiant deeds of our army with unbecoming jubilation; the rest of the world would never understand this. Furthermore, nothing is more appreciated than the modesty with which a true hero quietly and unassumingly carries on—and willingly forgets the past. Such was the gist of their warning.

Instead of taking these fellows by their long ears, dragging them to some ditch, and stringing them up on a rope—so that the victorious enthusiasm of the nation would no longer offend the aesthetic sensibilities of these knights of the pen—a general campaign was conducted against what was called 'unseemly' forms of celebration.

No one seemed to have the faintest idea that, once public enthusiasm is damped, nothing can spark it again, when the need arises. It's an intoxication, and must be maintained in that form. Without the power of an enthusiastic spirit, how would it be possible to endure a struggle that made such immense demands on the spiritual qualities of the nation?

I was only too well acquainted with the psychology of the broad masses not to know that, in such cases, a high 'aesthetic' tone cannot fan the fire enough to keep the iron hot. In my eyes, it was even a mistake not to have tried to raise the pitch of public enthusiasm higher still. Therefore I couldn't at all understand why they adopted the opposite policy—that is, of damping the public spirit.

5.7 MISRECOGNIZING MARXISM

The second thing that irritated me was the manner in which Marxism was regarded and accepted. In my eyes, all this proved how little they knew about this plague. It was believed, in all seriousness, that the abolition of party distinctions during the war made Marxism a mild and moderate thing.

But this was no question of party. It was a matter of a doctrine that must lead to the destruction of all humanity. The intention of this doctrine was misunderstood because nothing was said about it in our Jew-ridden universities, and because our arrogant bureaucratic officials didn't think it worthwhile to study a subject that wasn't included in the university curriculum. This mighty revolutionary trend was going right in front of them; but those 'intellectuals' didn't pay any attention. That's why state institutions nearly always lag behind private enterprises. It is to such people, by God, that the maxim applies: 'What the peasant doesn't know, won't bother him.' Here too, a few exceptions only confirm the rule.

In August of 1914, the German worker was looked upon as a Marxist. That was absurd. When those fateful hours dawned, the German worker shook off the poisonous clutches of that plague; otherwise he wouldn't have been so ready and willing to fight. People were stupid enough to imagine that Marxism had now become 'national'—another demonstration of the fact that the authorities never took the trouble to study the essence of Marxist teaching. If they had done so, they never would have made such foolish errors.

Marxism—whose final objective was, is, and will continue to be the destruction of all non-Jewish national states—saw in those days of July 1914 how the German working classes were aroused by a national spirit,

and rapidly entered the service of the Fatherland. Within a few days, the deceptive smoke-screen of that infamous national betrayal vanished into thin air, and the gang of Jewish bosses suddenly found themselves alone and deserted. It was as if no vestige remained of the folly and madness that was foisted upon the mass of the German people for 60 years. That was a bad day for the betrayers of the German working class. The moment, however, that the leaders recognized the danger that threatened them, they pulled the magic cap of deceit over their ears, and insolently mimicked the national awakening.

The time had come for taking action against these Jewish poisoners of the people. That was the time to deal with them, regardless of any whining or protestation. At one stroke, in August of 1914, all the empty nonsense about international solidarity was knocked out of the heads of the German working classes. A few weeks later, instead of this stupid talk ringing in their ears, they heard the noise of American-made shrapnel bursting over the heads of the marching columns; there was your 'international brotherhood.' Now that the German worker had rediscovered the road to nationhood, it should have been the duty of any caring government to mercilessly root out the agitators who were misleading the nation.

If the best were dying at the front, the least we could do is to exterminate the vermin.

Instead, His Majesty the Kaiser held out his hand to these old criminals, thus sparing these treacherous murderers of the nation and allowing them to regain their composure.

And so the viper could begin his work again—this time, more carefully than before, but even more destructively. While honest people dreamt of reconciliation, these perjured criminals were organizing a revolution.

5.8 THE USE OF NAKED FORCE

Naturally I was distressed at the half-measures that were adopted at that time; but I never thought it possible that the final consequences could have been so disastrous.

But what should have been done? Throw the ringleaders into jail, prosecute them, and rid the nation of them. Uncompromising military measures should have been adopted to root out this pestilence. Parties should have been abolished, and the Reichstag brought to its senses at the point of the bayonet, if necessary—or better still, immediately dissolved.

Just as the Republic today dissolves the parties when it wants to, so in those days there was even more justification for doing so, seeing that the very existence of the nation was at stake!

Of course, this suggestion would give rise to the question: Is it possible to eradicate ideas with the sword? Can a worldview be attacked by means of force?

At that time, I turned these questions over and over again in my mind.

By studying analogous cases in history, particularly those arising from religious circumstances, I came to the following fundamental conclusion:

Ideas and philosophical systems, as well as movements grounded on a definite spiritual foundation, whether true or not, can never be broken by the use of force after a certain stage, except on one condition: namely, that this use of force is in the service of a new creative idea or worldview.

The application of force alone, without moral support based on a spiritual concept, can never bring about the destruction of an idea or halt its propagation—unless one is willing to ruthlessly root out its last remaining defenders, and also to destroy any remaining tradition. Now, in most cases, the result of such action has been to exclude such a state, either temporarily or forever, from the sphere of political significance. But experience has also shown that such a blood sacrifice arouses the better segment of the people. As a matter of fact, every persecution that is unsupported by spiritual motives is morally unjust; it raises opposition among the best elements of the population—to the point that they are driven to champion the very ideas that are unjustly persecuted. With many people, this arises from a sheer feeling of opposition to every attempt at suppressing ideas by brute force.

In this way, the number of convinced followers of the persecuted doctrine grows as the persecution increases. Hence the total destruction of a new doctrine can be accomplished only by a complete rooting-out—which ultimately means the loss of some of the best blood in a nation or state. As a consequence, even though a so-called 'internal' clean-up may occur, it will cause a collapse in the nation's strength. And such a procedure is always condemned to futility from the very start, if the attacked doctrine has spread beyond a small circle.

That's why in this case, as with all other growths, the doctrine can best be destroyed in its earliest stages. As time goes on, its powers of resistance increase—until it approaches old age and then gives way to younger ideas, but in another form and from other motives.

CHAPTER 5

5.9 ATTACK OF A WORLDVIEW

The fact remains that nearly all attempts to root out a doctrine and its organizational manifestations, without having some spiritual basis of attack against it, are doomed to failure. In many cases, in fact, the very opposite was achieved, for the following reasons:

When sheer force is used to combat the spread of a doctrine, then that force must be employed systematically and persistently. In other words, the chances of success in the suppression of a doctrine lie only in the persistent and uniform application of the methods chosen. The moment hesitation is shown, and periods of tolerance alternate with the application of force, the targeted doctrine will not only recover strength, but every successive persecution will bring with it new adherents who have been shocked by the oppressive methods used. The old followers will become more embittered, and their allegiance will thereby be strengthened. Therefore, when force is employed, success is dependent on the consistent manner in which it is used.

This persistence, however, is nothing less than the product of definite spiritual convictions. Every form of force that isn't supported by a spiritual backing will always be indecisive and uncertain. Such a force lacks the stability that can be found only in a worldview that has its devoted champions. Such a force is the expression of individual energies; it therefore is periodically dependent upon the change of persons in charge, and also upon their characters and capacities.

But there is something else to be said:

Every worldview, whether religious or political—and it's sometimes hard to differentiate the two—fights not so much for the negative destruction of the opposing world of ideas as for the positive realization of its own ideas. Its struggle thus lies more in attack rather than in defense. It has the advantage of knowing where its objective lies, and this objective represents the realization of its own ideas.

Inversely, it's difficult to say when the negative aim of the destruction of a hostile doctrine is achieved. For this reason alone, an aggressive worldview is more powerful and decisive in action than one that takes up a merely defensive attitude. If force is used to combat a spiritual power, that force remains a defensive measure, as long as its advocates aren't the standard-bearers and apostles of a new spiritual doctrine.

To sum up, we can establish the following:

That every attempt to combat a worldview by means of force will turn out futile in the end, if the struggle fails to take the form of an offensive

for the establishment of an entirely new spiritual attitude. It is only in the struggle between two worldviews that physical force, consistently and ruthlessly applied, will eventually succeed.

This is why the fight against Marxism failed.

This was also the reason why Bismarck's anti-socialist legislation failed, and was bound to fail in the long run, despite everything. It lacked the basis of a new worldview to serve as the basis for the development and extension of the struggle. To say that the drivel about so-called 'state authority' or 'law and order' was an adequate foundation for the spiritual driving force in a life-or-death struggle is just what one would expect to hear from the 'wise ones' in high official positions.

It was because there were no adequate spiritual motives behind this offensive that Bismarck was compelled to hand over the administration of his socialist legislative measures to the judgment of those who were themselves the product of the Marxist teaching. Thus the Iron Chancellor surrendered the fate of his struggle against Marxism to the goodwill of the bourgeois democracy. He left the goat to take care of the garden.

But this was only the necessary result of the failure to find a fundamentally new anti-Marxist worldview, one with a stormy will to conquer.

And thus the result of the Bismarckian campaign was deplorable.

Were the conditions any different during the World War, or at the beginning of it? Unfortunately, no.

5.10 BOURGEOIS CLASS PARTIES

The more I examined the need for a change in the government's attitude towards Social Democracy as the embodiment of contemporary Marxism, the more I realized the lack of a practical substitute for this doctrine. Supposing Social Democracy were overthrown, what would be offered to the masses instead? There wasn't one movement in existence that promised any success in attracting large numbers of workers who are presently leaderless. It is nonsensical to imagine that the international fanatic who has just severed his connection with a class party would henceforth join a bourgeois party—or in other words, another class organization. However unsatisfactory these various organizations may appear to be, it cannot be denied that bourgeois politicians view the distinction between classes as a very important factor in social life—provided it doesn't become politically disadvantageous to them.

The denial of this fact only proves the impudence, and also the stupidity, of the liars.

Generally speaking, one should guard against considering the masses as stupider than they really are. In political matters, it often happens that feeling is a better judge than intellect. But the idea that this stupid international attitude of the masses is sufficient proof of their unsoundness is refuted by the simple fact that pacifist democracy is no less insane, even though it draws its supporters almost exclusively from bourgeois circles. As long as millions of citizens daily swallow what the Jewish democratic press tells them, they are in no position to joke about the stupidity of the 'comrades'—who, in the end, swallow the same garbage, though in a different form. In both cases, the maker is one and the same Jew.

One has to be careful about contradicting established facts. It's an undeniable fact that the class question has nothing to do with questions concerning ideals, as is claimed at election time. Class arrogance among a large section of our people, as well as a prevailing tendency to look down on the manual laborer, are obvious facts, and not the fantasies of some daydreamer.

Nevertheless, it only shows the mentality of our so-called intelligentsia, that they have not yet grasped the fact that any circumstances that are incapable of preventing the growth of such a plague as Marxism are certainly not capable of restoring what has been lost.

The 'bourgeois' parties, as they call themselves, will never again be able to win over the 'proletarian' masses. The two worlds stand opposed to one another, partly by nature and partly artificially. These two camps have just one mutual relation, namely, struggle. But in such a fight, the younger will succeed—and that's Marxism.

In 1914, a fight against Social Democracy was indeed quite conceivable. But the lack of any practical substitute made it doubtful how long the fight could be kept up.

In this respect, there was a gaping void.

Long before the war, I was of the same opinion. This was why I couldn't decide to join any of the existing parties. During the course of the World War, my conviction was still further confirmed by the obvious impossibility of fighting Social Democracy in anything like a thorough way. This would have required a movement that was something more than a mere 'parliamentary' party.

I frequently discussed this with my intimate comrades.

And it was then that I first thought of taking up political work later on.

I often assured my friends that, after the war, I intended to become a speaker, in addition to my professional work.

And I know that I was very serious about this.

CHAPTER 6: WAR PROPAGANDA

In watching the course of political events, I was always struck by the active part played by propaganda. I saw that the Marxist socialist organizations knew how to handle this tool in a masterly way, and how to put it to practical uses. Thus I soon came to realize that the right use of propaganda was an art in itself, and that this art was practically unknown to our bourgeois parties. Only the Christian-Socialist Party, especially in Lueger's time, showed a certain efficiency in the use of this instrument, and owed much of their success to it.

It was during the war, however, that we had the best chance of estimating the tremendous results that could be obtained by a properly conducted propagandist system. Here again, unfortunately, everything was left to the other side. The work done on our side was worse than insignificant. It was the total failure of the whole German system of information—perfectly obvious to every soldier—that urged me to consider the question of propaganda in a comprehensive way.

I had ample opportunity to learn a practical lesson in this matter; unfortunately, it was only too well taught by the enemy.

The lack on our side was exploited by the enemy in such an efficient manner that it showed itself as a real work of genius. In that enemy propaganda, I found admirable sources of instruction. The lesson to be learned from this unfortunately had no attraction for the geniuses on our own side. They were simply above such things—partly because they were too clever to learn from the enemy, and partly because there was a lack of good will.

Had we any propaganda at all?

Unfortunately I must answer in the negative. Everything that was actually done in this direction was so utterly inadequate and misconceived

from the very beginning that proved not only useless, but at times downright harmful.

In substance it was insufficient. Psychologically it was all wrong. Anyone who examined German propaganda would see that.

There wasn't even any clarity about the primary question itself: Is propaganda a means or an end?

Propaganda is a means, and must therefore be judged in relation to its end. It must be organized in such a way as to be capable of attaining its objective. And it's also obvious that the objective can vary in importance from the standpoint of general need, and that the essential internal character of the propaganda must vary accordingly. The cause for which we fought during the war was the noblest and highest that man could strive for. We were fighting for the freedom and independence of our country, for the security of our future welfare, and for the honor of the nation. Despite all views to the contrary, such honor does actually exist—or rather it will have to exist. A nation without honor will sooner or later lose its freedom and independence. This is in accordance with the ruling of higher justice, for a generation of rabble is not entitled to freedom. He who would be a slave cannot have honor. In such a case, honor would soon become an object of contempt.

6.1 THE PURPOSE OF PROPAGANDA

Germany was waging war for its very existence. The purpose of its war propaganda should have been to strengthen the fighting spirit in that struggle, and to help bring about victory.

But when nations are fighting for their existence on this earth, when the fateful question of 'to be or not to be' must be answered, then all humane and aesthetic considerations must be set aside. These ideals don't float about in the air, but are the product of man's creative imagination; they disappear when he disappears. Nature knows nothing of them. Moreover, they are characteristic of only a small number of nations—or rather, of races—and their value depends on the degree to which they spring from the national or racial feeling. Humane and aesthetic ideals will disappear from the inhabited earth when those races that created and upheld them disappear.

All such ideals are only of secondary importance when a nation is fighting for its existence. In fact, they must be excluded from the struggle

as soon as they threaten to weaken the nation's power of self-preservation. That has always been their only visible effect.

As for humanitarianism, Moltke stated that in time of war, one must reach the quickest decision, and that the most ruthless methods of fighting are also the most humane.[1]

When people attempt to answer this reasoning with nonsense about aesthetics and so on, only one answer can be given: that the vital questions involved in the struggle of a nation for its existence must not be subordinated to aesthetic considerations. The yoke of slavery is and always will remain the most unpleasant experience that mankind can endure. Do the Schwabing[2] decadents look upon Germany's lot today as 'aesthetic'? And we certainly don't have to discuss such a question with the Jews, because they are the modern inventors of this cultural perfume. Their very existence is an incarnate denial of the aesthetics of God's image.

Since these ideals of humanitarianism and beauty have no place in warfare, they must not be used as standards of war propaganda.

During the war, propaganda was a means to an end. And this end was the struggle for existence of the German nation. Propaganda, therefore, should have been regarded from the standpoint of its usefulness for that purpose. The cruelest weapons were then the most humane, provided they helped towards a speedier victory. And only those methods were good and beautiful that helped secure the dignity and freedom of the nation.

Such was the only possible attitude to adopt towards war propaganda in a life-or-death struggle.

If those so-called responsible authorities had realized this, there would have been no uncertainty about the form and use of war propaganda as a weapon; it is nothing but a weapon, and indeed a most terrifying weapon in the hands of those who know how to use it.

6.2 PROPAGANDA ONLY FOR THE MASSES

The second question of decisive importance is this: To whom should propaganda be addressed? To the educated intellectual classes, or to the less educated masses?

---

[1] Helmuth von Moltke (1800-1891) was chief of staff for the Prussian military.

[2] Schwabing is a 'bohemian' and artist district in Munich, not far from the university.

Propaganda must always address itself to the masses!

For the so-called intelligentsia, propaganda is not appropriate, but rather scientific instruction. Propaganda has as little to do with science as an advertisement poster has to do with art. The art of the poster consists in the designer's ability to attract the attention of the crowd through form and colors. A poster announcing an exhibition of art has no other aim than to convince the public of the importance of the exhibition. The better it does that, the better it is. Being meant to impress upon the public the meaning of the exposition, the poster can never take the place of the art on display. They are two entirely different things. Therefore, those who wish to study the artistic display must study something that's quite different from the poster—and it won't be enough to merely wander through the gallery. The student of art must carefully and thoroughly study each exhibit in order to form a judicious opinion about it.

The situation is the same with respect to the word 'propaganda.'

The purpose of propaganda is not the personal instruction of the individual, but rather to attract public attention to certain things—the importance of which can be impressed upon the masses only by this means.

The art of propaganda consists in putting a matter so clearly and forcibly that is creates a general conviction regarding the reality, necessity, and justice of a certain essential thing. But this art is not an end in itself. Its purpose must be exactly that of the advertisement poster: to attract the attention of the masses. It should not dispense individual instructions to those who already have an educated opinion on things, or who wish to form such an opinion on grounds of objective study. This is not the purpose of propaganda. It must appeal to the feelings of the public rather than to their so-called rationality.

All propaganda must be presented in a popular form; it must adjust its intellectual level to the least intelligent of those to whom it is directed. Thus its purely intellectual level will have to be that of the lowest mental common denominator among the public it is desired to reach. When it's a question of bringing a whole nation within the circle of its influence—as in the case of war propaganda—then great care must be taken to avoid a high level, which presupposes a relatively high degree of intelligence among the public.

The more modest the scientific tenor of this propaganda, and the more it is addressed exclusively to public sentiment, the more decisive will be its success. This is the best test of the value of a propaganda—and not the approval of a small group of intellectuals or artists.

CHAPTER 6

6.3 THE PSYCHOLOGY OF PROPAGANDA

The art of propaganda consists precisely in being able to awaken the imagination of the public through an appeal to their feelings—that is, in finding the appropriate psychological form that will appeal to the hearts of the masses. The fact that our 'bright boys' don't understand this merely shows their conceit and mental laziness.

Once we see the need to concentrate the persuasive forces of propaganda on the masses, the following lesson results:

It's a mistake to make propaganda multi-sided, as if it were a system of scientific instruction.

The receptive powers of the masses are very restricted, and their understanding is feeble. On the other hand, they quickly forget. Such being the case, all effective propaganda must be confined to a few bare essentials, and those must be expressed in stereotyped formulas. These slogans should be persistently repeated until the very last individual has come to grasp the idea that has been put forth. If this principle is forgotten, and if an attempt is made to be abstract and general, the propaganda will turn out ineffective; the public won't be able to digest or retain what's offered to them in this way.

Therefore, propaganda must follow a simple line; correspondingly, the basic tactics must be psychologically efficient.

It was, for example, a fundamental mistake to ridicule the value of the enemy, as the Austrian and German comic papers did. The very principle here is a mistaken one. When they came face to face with the enemy, our soldiers had quite a different impression. Therefore, the mistake had disastrous results. Once the German soldier realized what a tough enemy he had to fight, he felt that he had been deceived by the makers of his information. Instead of strengthening and stimulating his fighting spirit, this information had quite the opposite effect. Finally he lost heart.

On the other hand, British and American war propaganda was psychologically efficient. By representing the Germans to their own people as barbarians and Huns, they were preparing their soldiers for the horrors of war, and safeguarding them against illusions. The most terrible weapons that those soldiers encountered in the field merely confirmed the information that they had already received, and their belief in the truth of the assertions made by their governments was accordingly reinforced. And their rage and hatred against the vile enemy was increased. The terrible havoc caused by the German weapons of war was only another illustration

of the 'Hunnish' brutality of the barbarians; and their soldiers had no time to consider the fact that their own weapons were capable of an equal degree of terror.

Thus the British soldier was never allowed to feel that the information he received at home was false. Unfortunately the opposite was the case with the Germans, who finally wound up rejecting everything from home as pure swindle and humbug. All this was a result of the idea that any old simpleton—or anyone who was intelligent about 'other things'—could be entrusted with propaganda work. And they had no idea that propaganda demands the greatest psychological skill.

Thus the German war propaganda gave us an incomparable example of how the work of 'enlightenment' should *not* be done, and how such an example was the result of a complete failure to take any psychological considerations into account.

6.4 SUBJECTIVE – ONE-SIDED – NECESSARY!

From the enemy, however, much could be learned by those who kept their eyes open, whose powers of perception had not yet become sclerotic, and who, during 4½ years, had to experience the perpetual flood of enemy propaganda.

The worst of all was that our people didn't understand the very first rule of propaganda: namely, a systematically one-sided attitude towards every problem to be dealt with. In this regard, so many errors were committed, even from the very start of the war, that it was justifiable to doubt whether so much nonsense could really be attributed to the stupidity of those in power.

What, for example, would we say of a poster that advertised some new brand of soap by insisting that the competitive brands were 'good'?

We would only shake our heads.

Exactly the same applies to political advertising.

The aim of propaganda is not to try to pass judgment on conflicting rights, giving each its due, but exclusively to emphasize the right that we are asserting. Propaganda must not investigate the truth objectively and, insofar as it is favorable to the other side, present it according to the academic fairness; it must present only that which is favorable to its own side.

It was a fundamental mistake to discuss the question of who was responsible for the outbreak of the war, and to declare that the sole

responsibility could *not* be attributed to Germany. Sole responsibility should have been laid squarely on the shoulders of the enemy, without any discussion as to whether this was true or not.

And what was the consequence of these half-measures?

The broad masses of the people are not made up of diplomats, or professors of political law, nor simply of people who are able to form reasoned judgment about things. Rather, they are a vacillating, child-like crowd who are constantly wavering between one idea and another. As soon as our own propaganda made the slightest suggestion that the enemy might have some valid concerns, the foundations were laid for questioning the justice of our own cause. The masses are in no position to discern where the enemy's injustice ends and where ours begins. In such a case, they become hesitant and distrustful, especially when the enemy doesn't make the same mistake, but heaps all the blame on the other side.

Could there be any clearer proof than the fact that our own people believed the enemy's propaganda, which was uniform and consistent, rather than its own? And that, of course, was increased by the German mania for objectivity! Everybody become so careful about doing an injustice to the enemy, even at the cost of seriously injuring or ruining his own people and state.

Naturally the masses were never aware of the fact that those in authority had failed to study the subject from this angle.

The great majority of a nation is so feminine in character and outlook that its thought and conduct are ruled by sentiment, rather than by sober reasoning.

This sentiment, however, is not complex, but simple and consistent. It's not highly differentiated, but has only the negative and positive notions of love and hatred, right and wrong, truth and falsehood. Its notions are never partly this and partly that.

English propaganda especially understood this in a marvelous way—and they acted accordingly. They allowed no half-measures that might have given rise to doubt.

Their brilliant understanding of the primitive feeling of the masses was shown in their policy of atrocity propaganda, which was adapted to the conditions of the time. They cleverly and ruthlessly prepared the ground for moral solidarity at the front, even in times of great defeats. Further, the way in which they pilloried the German enemy as solely responsible for the war—a brutal and absolute lie—and the way in which they proclaimed his guilt, was excellently calculated to reach the masses. They realized that

the masses are always extreme in their feelings. And so this atrocious lie was believed.

The effectiveness of this kind of propaganda is well illustrated by the fact that, after four years, not only was the enemy still carrying on his propaganda work, but it was already undermining the stamina of our people at home.

It's no surprise that our propaganda didn't achieve similar results. It had the germ of inefficiency lodged in it by reason of its inner ambiguity. And because of the nature of its content, one couldn't expect it to make the necessary impression on the masses. Only our hare-brained 'statesmen' could have imagined that such pacifistic swill could have inspired the necessary passion that leads men to die for their country.

And so this product of ours was not only worthless, but detrimental.

6.5 RESTRICTION ON PERSEVERANCE

No matter what amount of talent is employed in the organization of propaganda, it will be worthless if one doesn't take account of these fundamental principles. Propaganda must be limited to a few simple themes, and these must be represented again and again. Here, as in many other cases, perseverance is the first and most important condition for success.

Particularly in the field of propaganda, placid aesthetes and blasé intellectuals should never be allowed to take the lead. The former would readily transform the impressive character of real propaganda into something suitable only for literary tea parties. As to the second group, one must always beware of them because, lacking any fresh emotion of their own, they are always seeking new excitements.

Such people quickly tire of everything. They always long for change and will always be incapable of understanding the needs of their fellow men. They are always the first to criticize propaganda, or rather its message, because it appears to them to be outmoded and trivial. They are always looking for something new, always yearning for change; and thus they become the mortal enemies of all efforts to influence the masses in an effective way. The moment the organization and message of a propagandist movement begins to suit their tastes, it becomes incoherent and scattered.

The purpose of propaganda is not to create an interesting distraction for blasé young men. Its chief function is to convince the masses, whose

slowness of understanding needs to be given time to absorb the message. Only after the simplest ideas are repeated a thousand times will they finally remember them.

6.6 ENEMY WAR PROPAGANDA

Every change that's made in the propagandist message must always emphasize the same conclusion. The leading slogan must of course be illustrated in many ways and from several angles, but in the end, one must always return to the assertion of the same formula. This is the only way that propaganda can have consistent and dynamic effects.

Only by following these general lines and steadfastly sticking to them, with uniform and consistent emphasis, can we attain final success. One will then be rewarded by the surprising and almost incredible results that such a persistent policy delivers.

The success of any advertisement, whether of a business or political nature, depends on the consistency and perseverance with which it is applied.

Here too, the enemy propaganda gave us an excellent example. It confined itself to a few themes, which were meant exclusively for mass consumption, and it repeated these themes with untiring persistence. Once these fundamental themes and the manner of placing them before the world were recognized as correct, they adhered to them without the slightest alteration for the whole duration of the war. At first it appeared to be idiotic in its impudent assertiveness. Later it was looked upon as disturbing. But in the end, it was believed. After 4½ years, a revolution broke out in Germany; its slogans came from the enemy's war propaganda.

But in England they came to understand something further: namely, that this intellectual weapon can succeed only if it's applied on a vast scale. But this success more than rewards the cost.

Their propaganda was regarded as a first class weapon, while for us it was the last hope of unemployed politicians, and a cozy job for slackers.

All in all, and as expected, its results were zero.

CHAPTER 7: THE REVOLUTION

In 1915, the enemy started his propaganda among our soldiers. From 1916 onwards, it steadily became more intensive, and at the beginning of 1918, it became a virtual flood. One could now judge the effects of this proselytizing movement at every step. Gradually our soldiers began to think just as the enemy wished them to.

On the German side, it was a complete failure.

At that time, the army authorities, under our able and determined commander, were also willing and ready to take up the propaganda fight, but unfortunately they didn't have the necessary means to make it happen. And in any case, it would have been a psychological error if they had done so. To be effective, propaganda had to come from home. Only then would it have been a success among men who, for nearly four years, were performing immortal deeds of heroism and privation for the homeland.

But what were the people at home doing?

Was their failure to act stupidity, or criminal?

In midsummer 1918, after the evacuation of the southern bank of the Marne, the German press adopted a policy that was so woefully inadequate, and even criminally stupid, that a question arose—one that made me more furious every day: Is there no one who will dare to put an end to this spiritual sabotage of our heroic troops?

What happened in France during 1914, when our armies invaded that country in a storm of victory? What happened in Italy when their armies collapsed on the Isonzo front?[1] What happened in France again during the spring of 1918, when German divisions took the main French positions by storm, and heavy long-distance artillery bombarded Paris?

[1] The Isonzo River, in present-day Slovenia, was the site of a number of battles between Austria-Hungary and Italy between 1915 and 1917.

How they whipped up the courage of those troops who were retreating, and fanned the fires of national enthusiasm among them! How their propaganda and their ingenious mass-influence reawakened the fighting spirit in that broken front, and hammered into them a firm belief in final victory!

Meanwhile, what were our people doing?

Nothing, or even worse than nothing!

Again and again, I became enraged and indignant as I read the latest papers and realized the nature of the psychological mass-murder they were committing.

More than once, I was tormented by the thought that if Providence had put me in charge of German propaganda, instead of those incompetent and even criminal ignoramuses and scoundrels, the outcome of our battle with fate might have been different.

During those months, I felt for the first time that a malicious Destiny was keeping me on the fighting front and in a position where any random bullet from some nigger might finish me off—while elsewhere I could have done a real service for the Fatherland!

I was then rash enough to believe that I would have been successful.

But I was a nameless soldier, one among 8 million!

And so it was better for me to keep my mouth shut and do my duty as best I could.

7.1 THE FIRST ENEMY LEAFLETS

In the summer of 1915, the first enemy leaflets were dropped on us.

They all told more or less the same story, with some minor variation: Suffering was steadily increasing in Germany. The war would last indefinitely. The prospect of victory for us was becoming fainter by the day. The people at home were longing for peace, but that 'militarism' and the 'Kaiser' would not permit it. The whole world—which knew this very well—wasn't waging war against the German people but only against the man who was exclusively responsible, the Kaiser. And finally, that until this enemy of world-peace was removed, there could be no end to the conflict. When the war was over, the liberal and democratic nations would receive the Germans as colleagues in the league for world peace. This would happen the moment that 'Prussian militarism' was destroyed.

To illustrate and substantiate all these statements, the leaflets often contained 'Letters from Home.' The contents appeared to confirm the enemy's assertions.

Generally speaking, we only laughed at all these efforts. The leaflets were read, sent to base headquarters, and then forgotten—until the wind once again blew a fresh batch into the trenches. These were mostly dropped from airplanes that were specially used for that purpose.

One feature of this propaganda was very striking: namely, in sections where Bavarian troops were stationed, every effort was made to stir up feelings against the Prussians. It assured the soldiers that Prussia and Prussia alone was the guilty party who was responsible for the whole war, and that there was no hostility whatsoever towards the Bavarians. But that there would be no possibility of coming to their assistance as long as they continued to serve Prussian interests and helped to pull the Prussian chestnuts out of the fire.

This persistent propaganda began to have a real effect in 1915. The feelings against Prussia grew quite visibly among the Bavarian troops; but those in authority did nothing to counteract it. This was more than a mere sin of omission. Sooner or later, not only were the Prussians bound to suffer for it, but the whole German nation and consequently the Bavarians as well.

In this direction, enemy propaganda began to achieve undoubted success from 1916 onwards.

In a similar way, letters coming directly from home had long since been exercising their effect. There was now no further need for the enemy to broadcast such letters in leaflet form. And also against this influence from home, nothing was done—except a few supremely stupid 'warnings' uttered by the 'government.' The whole front was drenched in this poison sent by thoughtless women at home. They didn't suspect for a moment that the enemy's chances of final victory were thereby strengthened, or that the sufferings of their own men at the front were thereby being prolonged and rendered more severe. These senseless letters written by German women eventually cost the lives of hundreds of thousands of our men.

7.2 WOUNDED

Thus, by 1916, several distressing phenomena had already appeared. The whole front was complaining and grousing, and discontented over many things—often justifiably so. While they were hungry and suffering,

and while their relatives at home were in distress, others were feasting and celebrating. Yes—even on the front itself, everything was not as it should have been.

Even in the early stages of the war, the soldiers were sometimes prone to complain; but such criticism was confined to 'internal affairs.' The man who, at one moment, groused and grumbled, ceased a few minutes later, and went about his duty silently, as if all were in order. The same company that was initially discontented now clung to its piece of trench with tooth and nail, as if Germany's fate depended on these few hundred meters of mud holes. The glorious old army was still at its post!

A sudden change soon gave me first-hand experience of the contrast between this old army and the homeland.

At the end of September 1916, my division was sent into the Battle of the Somme. For us this was the first of a series of heavy engagements, and it created an indescribable impression—more like hell than war.

We stood firm through weeks of incessant artillery bombardment—at times ceding a little ground but then taking it back again, and never giving way.

On 7 October 1916, I was wounded.

I had the good luck of getting back to the rear, and I was then ordered to be sent by transport to Germany.

Two years had passed since I left home—an almost endless period, in such circumstances. I could hardly imagine what Germans looked like without uniforms. In the field hospital at Hermies, I was startled when I suddenly heard the voice of a German nurse who was talking with one of the wounded men lying near me.

After two years—to first hear such a sound!

The nearer our train approached the German border, the more restless each of us became. En route we recognized all these places through which we passed two years before as young volunteers: Brussels, Louvain, Liège. Finally we recognized the first German homestead, with its familiar high gables and picturesque window-shutters.

The Fatherland!

In October 1914, we burned with stormy enthusiasm as we crossed the border. Now, silence and emotion reigned. Each of us was happy that fate allowed us to again see that which we had defended with our lives. And each was ashamed to let another look into his eye.

It was almost on the anniversary of the day that I left for the front, when I reached the hospital at Beelitz near Berlin.

CHAPTER 7

What a change! From the mud of the Somme battlefields to the spotless white beds in this wonderful building! We hesitated to lie in them. Only gradually did we grow accustomed to this new world again.

But unfortunately this world was also different in another respect.

7.3 BOASTING OF COWARDICE

The spirit of the army at the front was foreign here. For the first time, I encountered something that was unknown at the front: boasting of one's own cowardice. Though we certainly heard complaining and grousing at the front, this was never an incitement to insubordination, and certainly not a glorification of one's fear. No! There, a coward was a coward, and nothing more. And the contempt for him that was aroused in others was quite general, just as the real hero was widely admired. But here in hospital, it was nearly the opposite. Loudmouthed agitators were heaping ridicule on the good soldier, and lauding the spineless coward.

A couple of miserable human specimens set the tone. One of them boasted of having intentionally injured his hand in barbed-wire in order to get sent to hospital. Although his wound was slight, it appeared that he had been here for a long time. He got sent here in the transport train through some sort of a swindle. This poisonous specimen actually had the audacity to parade his cowardice as the result of a higher courage, one that was superior to that of the brave soldier who dies a hero's death. Many listened in silence, others left, but some assented.

Personally I was disgusted at the thought that such a seditious agitator was allowed to remain there. What could be done? The authorities must have known who and what he was; and actually they did know. But still they did nothing.

7.4 SLACKERS

As soon as I was able to walk again, I obtained leave to visit Berlin.

Dire misery was everywhere. The metropolis, with its teeming millions, was suffering from hunger. The talk in the soldiers' homes was much like that at the hospital. It seemed that these agitators had deliberately singled out such places, in order to spread their views.

But conditions in Munich were far worse!

After my discharge from hospital, I was sent to a reserve battalion there. I didn't recognize anything. Anger, discontent, complaints—wherever one went! This was partly due to the highly inept manner in which the soldiers who had returned from the front were treated by the non-commissioned officers—they who had never seen a day's active service, and who were thus incapable of creating a decent relationship towards the old soldiers. The old soldiers displayed certain characteristics that had been developed from their time in the trenches. The reserve officers couldn't understand these peculiarities. On the other hand, the officer home from active service was at least in a position to understand them himself. As a result, he received more respect from the men than the home officers.

But apart from all this, the general spirit was miserable. The art of slacking was looked on as almost proof of higher intelligence, and devotion to duty was considered a sign of weakness or bigotry. Government offices were filled with Jews. Almost every clerk was a Jew, and nearly every Jew was a clerk. I was amazed at this multitude of combatants who belonged to the chosen people; and I couldn't help comparing it with their slim numbers at the front.

In the business world, the situation was even worse. Here the Jewish people had actually become 'indispensable.' Like spiders, they were slowly sucking the blood from the pores of the national body. Through the war corporations, they found an instrument whereby all national free trade could be finished off.

Special emphasis was placed on the necessity of unhampered centralization.

Thus as early as 1916-17, practically all production was under the control of Jewish finance.

But against whom was the anger of the people directed?

It was then that I foresaw a looming disaster, one that would inevitably lead to collapse unless actions were taken in time.

7.5 HATRED OF PRUSSIA

While the Jew was busy robbing the nation and tightening the screws of his despotism, incitement against 'the Prussians' increased. And just as at the front, nothing was done to stop this poisonous propaganda. No one seemed capable of understanding that the collapse of Prussia could never bring about the rise of Bavaria. On the contrary, the collapse of the one would necessarily drag the other down into the abyss.

This kind of behavior affected me very deeply. I could see in it only a clever Jewish trick for diverting public attention from themselves to others. While Prussians and Bavarians were squabbling, the Jews were taking away the sustenance of both from under their very noses. While Prussians were being abused in Bavaria, the Jew organized the revolution, and with one stroke smashed both Prussia and Bavaria.

I couldn't tolerate this execrable squabbling among German peoples, and I longed to be at the front once again. Therefore, not long after arriving in Munich, I reported again for service.

At the beginning of March 1917, I had rejoined my old regiment.

7.6 THE ARMY'S NEW HOPE

Towards the end of 1917, we seemed to have gotten over the worst phases of moral depression at the front. After the Russian collapse, the whole army recovered its courage and hope.[2] All were gradually becoming more and more convinced that the struggle would end in victory. We could sing once again, and the naysayers faded from view. People once again believed in the future of the Fatherland.

The Italian collapse in the autumn of 1917 had a wonderful effect.[3] This victory proved that it was possible to break through another front, besides the Russian. An inspiring faith became dominant in the minds of millions, and it encouraged them to look forward with confidence to the spring of 1918. The enemy was visibly depressed. During this winter, the front was somewhat quieter than usual. But that was the calm before the storm.

Just when preparations were being made to launch a final offensive and bring this interminable war to an end—while endless columns of transports brought men and munitions to the front, and while the men were being trained for that final onslaught—then it was that the greatest act of treachery in the whole war occurred in Germany.

---

[2] The Russian Revolution of 1917 consisted of two phases: A workers' revolt in February that overthrew the Czar, and then the Bolshevik revolution in October that put the Jewish revolutionaries in power. Once in power, the Bolsheviks pulled Russia out of the war. This, as Hitler states, freed up German troops for the western front.

[3] The Battle of Caporetto took place from October 24 to November 19, near the present-day town of Kobarid, Slovenia, just across the Italian border. The Italians were routed by the Germans.

Germany would not win the war: At the last moment, when victory seemed ready to fly with German banners, a means was arranged for the purpose of striking at the heart of the German spring offensive with one blow from the rear, thus making victory impossible.

A munitions strike was organized.[4]

If this had succeeded, the German front would have collapsed, and the wishes of the *Vorwärts* that victory not take the side of the German banners would have been fulfilled.[5] For lack of munitions, the front would be broken through within a few weeks, the German offensive would be effectively stopped, and the Entente saved. International finance would assume control over Germany, and the internal goal of the Marxist national betrayal would be achieved.

Their objective was the destruction of the national economic system and the establishment of international capitalistic domination in its place. And this goal has really been reached, thanks to the stupidity and credulity of the one side and the bottomless cowardice of the other.

The munitions strike, however, didn't bring the final success that was hoped for: namely, to starve the front of ammunition. It lasted too short a time for any lack of ammunition to bring disaster to the army, as was originally planned. But the moral damage was much more terrible!

In the first place: What was the army fighting for, if the people at home didn't wish for victory? For whom were these enormous sacrifices and privations being made? Should the soldiers fight for victory, while the home front goes on strike against it?

And secondly: What effect did this move have on the enemy?

7.7 THE ALLIES ARE BEATEN DOWN

In the winter of 1917-18, dark clouds hovered in the firmament of the Entente. For nearly four years, many onslaughts were made against the German giant, but they failed to bring him to the ground. He fought them off with the one arm that held the defensive shield, because his other arm had to wield the sword against his other enemies, in the East and the South. But at last these enemies were overcome. Rivers of blood were shed in accomplishing that task. But now the sword was free to join with the shield

[4] This occurred on 28 January 1918.

[5] *Vorwärts* was the official paper of the Social Democrats.

on the western front. And since the enemy was thus far unable to break the German defense, he himself was now facing attack.

The enemy feared and trembled in the face of a German victory.

In Paris and London, conferences followed one after another, in unending series. Even the enemy propaganda encountered difficulties. It was no longer so easy to demonstrate the hopelessness of a German victory.

The same applied at the front. The insolence of their masters had suddenly subsided. A disturbing truth began to dawn on them. Their opinion of the German soldier had changed. Previously he was a fool destined for defeat. But now he was the destroyer of their Russian ally. The policy of restricting the offensive to the East, which in fact was a necessity, now appeared as a stroke of genius. For three years, these Germans had been battering away at the Russian front without any apparent success. Those fruitless efforts were almost sneered at; it was thought that, in the long run, the Russian giant would triumph through sheer force of numbers, while Germany would be worn out from shedding so much blood. And reality seemed to confirm this hope.

Since the September days of 1914, when for the first time endless columns of Russian war prisoners poured into Germany after the Battle of Tannenberg, it seemed as if the stream would never end. As soon as one army was defeated and routed, another would take its place. The gigantic empire gave the Czar an inexhaustible supply of new soldiers—and the war its new victims. How long could Germany hold out in this race? Wouldn't the day finally come when the Germans would win their last victory, and still the Russian armies would be marching into battle? And then what? In all likelihood, a Russian victory over Germany might be delayed, but it would inevitably come in the long run.

Now all these hopes were at an end. The ally, Russia, who had sacrificed the most blood on the altar of their mutual interests, came to the end of his resources, and lay prostrate before his unrelenting foe. A feeling of terror and dismay came over the Entente soldiers, who had previously been sustained by blind faith. They feared the coming spring. Seeing that they had previously failed to break the Germans when they could concentrate only part of the fighting strength on the western front, how could they count on victory now that the entire power of that amazing heroic state appeared to be gathering for an attack in the west?

The shadow of the events that took place in South Tyrol, the specter of General Cadorna's defeated armies,[6] were reflected in the gloomy faces of

[6] Luigi Cadorna (1850-1928) was an Italian general who led his troops into

the Entente troops in misty Flanders. Faith in victory gave way to fear of defeat to come.

7.8 "GERMANY FACING REVOLUTION!"

Then—on those cold nights, when one almost heard the tread of the German armies advancing to the great assault, and the decision was being awaited in fear and trembling, suddenly a flaming red light was set aglow in Germany, sending its rays into the last shell-hole on the enemy's front. At the very moment when the German divisions were receiving their final orders for the great offensive, a general strike broke out in Germany.

At first the world was dumbfounded. Then the enemy propaganda became active again and pounced on this theme at the eleventh hour. Suddenly a means appeared that could be used to revive the sinking confidence of the Allied soldiers. The probability of victory was now presented as certain, and the anxious foreboding about coming events was transformed into a determined confidence. The regiments awaiting German attack could now be inspired by the conviction that the decisive event in the war was not the boldness of the German attack, but rather the persistence of the defense. Let the Germans have whatever victories they liked; the revolution, and not the victorious army, was at the door of the homeland.

British, French, and American newspapers began to spread this belief among their readers, while a shrewd propaganda campaign boosted the morale of the troops at the front.

'Germany Facing Revolution! Allied Victory Inevitable!' That was the best medicine to set the staggering *poilu* and Tommy on their feet once again. Our rifles and machine guns could now open fire once again; but instead of creating a panic-stricken retreat, they were met with a determined resistance.

This was the result of the munitions strike. It strengthened the enemy's belief in victory, and it relieved that paralyzing feeling of despair at the front. Consequently, the strike cost the lives of thousands of German soldiers. And the despicable instigators of that dastardly strike were candidates for the highest public offices in revolutionary Germany.

At first it was apparently possible to overcome the repercussion of these events on the German soldiers. But on the enemy's side, they had a

---

defeat on the Isonzo front.

lasting effect. The resistance lost all the character of an army fighting for a lost cause, and in its place was a grim determination to struggle through to victory.

Now, according to best judgment, victory would be assured if the western front could hold out against the German attack for only a few months. The Allied parliaments recognized the possibilities of a better future, and voted huge sums of money for on-going propaganda to disrupt Germany.

7.9 LAST WREATHS OF IMMORTAL LAUREL

It was my good luck to fight in the first two offensives, and in the last.

These became the most stupendous impressions of my life—stupendous, because now for the last time, the struggle lost its defensive character and became that of an offense, just as it was in 1914. A sigh of relief went up from the German trenches and dug-outs when finally, after three years of endurance in that inferno, the day of retribution arrived. Once again the lusty cheering of victorious battalions was heard, as they hung the last crowns of the immortal laurel on the banners they consecrated to victory. Once again the strains of patriotic songs soared upwards to the heavens above the endless columns of marching troops, and for the last time the Lord smiled on his ungrateful children.

In midsummer of 1918, a feeling of sultry oppression hung over the front. At home they were quarrelling. About what? We heard a great deal among various units at the front: that the war was now a hopeless affair; that only fools could think of victory; that it wasn't the people but the capitalists and the monarchy who were interested in carrying on. Such were the ideas that came from home and were discussed at the front.

At first there was only very slight reaction. What did universal suffrage matter to us? Is this why we fought for four years? It was a dastardly piece of robbery thus to steal from the graves of our heroes the ideals for which they had fallen. It wasn't for the slogan, 'Long Live Universal Suffrage' that our troops in Flanders faced certain death, but for the cry '*Deutschland über Alles in der Welt*'—a small but not unimportant difference. And most of those who were shouting for this suffrage were absent when it came to fighting for it. The front was unknown to this political rabble. During those days, only a small fraction of these parliamentarian gentlemen were to be seen where honest Germans gathered.

The old soldiers who had fought at the front had little liking for those new war aims of Messrs. Ebert, Scheidemann, Barth, Liebknecht, and others.[7] We couldn't understand why, all of a sudden, the slackers should grant all executive powers to themselves, without having any regard to the army.

From the very beginning, I had my own definite personal views. I hated the whole gang of miserable party politicians who had betrayed the people. I long ago realized that national interests played only a very small part with this disreputable crew, and that what counted with them was the possibility of filling their own empty pockets. My opinion was that those people thoroughly deserved to be hanged, because they were ready to sacrifice the peace, and allow Germany to be defeated, just to serve their own ends. To consider their wishes would mean to sacrifice the interests of the working classes for the benefit of a gang of thieves. These wishes could only be fulfilled by sacrificing Germany.

Such, too, was the opinion still held by the majority of the army. But the reinforcements that came from home were fast becoming worse and worse—so much so that their arrival was a source of weakness rather than of strength. The young recruits in particular were mostly useless. Sometimes it was hard to believe that they were sons of the same nation that sent its youth into the battles for Ypres.

7.10 GROWING MORAL DECAY

In August and September, the symptoms of moral disintegration increased rapidly, although the enemy's offensive was not at all comparable to the terror of our former defensive battles. In contrast, the battles of the Somme and Flanders were much more terrible.

At the end of September, my division occupied, for the third time, those positions that we had once taken by storm as young volunteers.

What a memory!

---

[7] Friedrich Ebert (1871-1925) was a leader of the German Social Democrats, and the first President of Germany, post-WWI. Philipp Scheidemann (1865-1939) was a post-war Chancellor of Germany in 1919, succeeding Ebert. Emil Barth (1879-1941) was a key figure in the November Revolution of 1918. Karl Liebknecht (1871-1919) was also central to the Revolution; he was killed, along with Jewish socialist Rosa Luxemburg, shortly thereafter. Liebknecht was half-Jewish, the others German.

CHAPTER 7

Here we had received our baptism by fire, in October and November 1914. With a burning love of the homeland in our hearts and a song on our lips, our young regiment went into action as if going to a dance. The dearest blood was given freely here in the belief that it was shed to protect the freedom and independence of the Fatherland.

In July 1917 we set foot for the second time on what we regarded as sacred soil. Our best comrades lay here, some of them little more than boys—the soldiers who had rushed into death, with gleaming eyes, for the one true Fatherland.

The older ones among us, who had been with the regiment from the beginning, were deeply moved as we stood on this sacred spot where we had sworn 'Loyalty and Duty unto Death.'

Three years ago the regiment had taken this position by storm; now it was called upon to defend it in a grueling struggle.

With an artillery bombardment that lasted three weeks, the English prepared for their great offensive in Flanders. There the spirits of the dead seemed to live again. The regiment dug itself into the mud, clung to its shell-holes and craters, neither flinching nor wavering. Our numbers grew steadily smaller, until finally the British launched their attack on 31 July 1917.

We were relieved in the beginning of August.

The regiment had dwindled down to a few companies, who staggered back, mud-crusted, more like ghosts than human beings. Besides a few hundred meters of shell-holes, death was the only reward that the English gained.

Now, in the autumn of 1918, we stood for the third time on the ground we had stormed in 1914. The village of Comines, which formerly had served us as a base, was now within the fighting zone. Although little had changed in the surrounding battlefield, the men became different. They now talked 'politics.' Like everywhere else, the poison from home was having its effect here also. The young recruits succumbed to it completely—they came directly from home.

7.11 POISONED BY MUSTARD GAS

During the night of October 13-14, the British opened an attack with gas on the front, south of Ypres. They used mustard gas, whose effect was unknown to us, at least from personal experience. I would experience it

that very night. On a hill south of Wervick, in the evening of October 13, we were subjected for several hours to a heavy bombardment with gas bombs, which continued throughout the night with more or less intensity. About midnight, a number of us were put out of action—some forever. Towards morning, I also began to feel pain. It increased with every quarter of an hour; and at about 7:00 my eyes were scorching as I staggered back and delivered the last dispatch that I would carry in this war.

A few hours later, my eyes were like glowing coals, and all was darkness around me.

I was sent to a hospital at Pasewalk in Pomerania, and it was there that I had to experience—the Revolution!

For a long time, there was something in the air that was indefinable and repulsive. People were saying that something was bound to happen within the next few weeks, although I couldn't imagine what this meant. First I thought of a strike, similar to the one that took place in spring. Unfavorable rumors were constantly coming from the Navy, which was said to be in a state of ferment. But this seemed to be the fanciful creation of a few isolated malcontents. At the hospital, they were all talking about the end of the war and hoping that this was not far off, but no one counted on anything immediately. I wasn't able to read the newspapers.

In November, the general tension increased.

Then one day, disaster broke upon us suddenly and without warning. Sailors came in trucks and proclaimed the revolution. A few Jewish youth were the 'leaders' in that combat for the 'Liberty, Beauty, and Dignity' of our national being. Not one of them saw active service at the front. By way of a so-called 'hospital for venereal disease,' these three Orientals had been sent back home. Now their red rags were being raised here.[8]

After a few days, I began to feel somewhat better. The burning pain in my eye sockets diminished. Gradually I was able to distinguish the rough outlines of my immediate surroundings. And I allowed myself to hope that

[8] It's unclear to which "few" or "three" Jews Hitler is referring. Many Jews were active in the German revolt, as with other revolutions throughout Europe at that time. Prominent among the Jewish leaders of the Social Democrats were Otto Landesberg, Eduard Bernstein, and Rudolf Hilferding. The primary agitator, though, was the Independent Social Democratic Party (USPD), which was dominated by Jews: Kurt Eisner, Rosa Luxemburg, Hugo Haase, Karl Liebknecht (half-Jewish), Leo Jogiches, Karl Radek, Alexander Parvus, Ernst Toller, Gustav Landauer, and Erich Muehsam. For a detailed account of the Jewish role in the revolution, see Dalton (2013, 2014).

I would at least recover my sight sufficiently to be able to take up some profession later on. But it was out of the question that I might ever draw again. In any case, I was on the way to recovery when the monstrous hour arrived.

My first thought was that this outbreak of high treason was only a local affair. I tried to encourage this belief among my comrades. My Bavarian hospital friends were particularly responsive to this. Their mood was anything but 'revolutionary.' I couldn't imagine this madness breaking out in Munich; loyalty to the House of Wittelsbach was, after all, stronger than the will of a few Jews. And so I couldn't help but believe that this was merely a local revolt by the Navy, and that it would be suppressed within the next few days.

7.12 'REPUBLIC'

With the next few days came the most terrible information of my life. The rumors grew more and more persistent. What I had taken as a local affair was in reality a general revolution. In addition to this, shameful news came from the front. They wanted to capitulate. Was such a thing possible?

On November 10 the local pastor gave a short address at the hospital; now we learned the whole story.

I was in a state of extreme agitation as I listened to the address. The reverend old gentleman seemed to be trembling as he informed us that the House of Hohenzollern would no longer wear the imperial crown. The Fatherland had become a 'Republic,' and we should pray to the Almighty to grant us his blessing in the new order of things and to not abandon our people in the days to come. In delivering his speech, he couldn't do more than briefly express appreciation to the royal house, its services to Pomerania, to Prussia, indeed, to the whole of the German Fatherland, and—here he began to weep. A feeling of profound dismay fell upon the people in that little hall, and I don't think there was a single dry eye in the crowd.

As for myself, I broke down completely when the old gentleman tried to resume his story by informing us that we must now end this long war. The war was lost, he said, and we were at the mercy of the victor. The Fatherland would have to bear heavy burdens in the future. We were to accept the terms of the armistice, and trust in the magnanimity of our former enemies. It was impossible for me to stay and listen any longer.

Darkness surrounded me as I staggered and stumbled back to my ward and buried my aching head into the blankets and pillow.

I hadn't cried since the day I stood beside my mother's grave. Whenever fate dealt cruelly with me in my youth, my spirit of determination grew stronger. During all those long years of war, when death claimed many friends and comrades, it would have been almost sinful to have uttered a word of complaint—they died for Germany! And finally, in the last few days of that titanic struggle, when the waves of poison gas enveloped me and began to penetrate my eyes, and the thought of becoming permanently blind unnerved me, my voice of conscience cried out: 'Miserable fellow, will you start howling when there are thousands of others whose lot is a hundred times worse than yours?' And so I accepted my misfortune in silence, realizing that nothing else could be done, and that my personal suffering was nothing compared with the misfortune of the Fatherland.

7.13 ALL SACRIFICE IN VAIN

So all had been in vain. In vain all the sacrifices and privations; in vain the hunger and thirst for endless months; in vain those hours that we stuck to our posts even though mortal fear gripped our souls; and in vain the deaths of two million. Of those hundreds of thousands who set out with hearts full of faith in their Fatherland, and never returned—shouldn't their graves now open, so that the spirits of those heroes splattered with mud and blood may come home and take vengeance on those who had so despicably betrayed the greatest sacrifice that a human being can make for his country? Was it for this that the soldiers died in August and September 1914? For this, that the volunteer regiments followed the old comrades in the autumn of the same year? For this, that those boys of 17 sank into the earth of Flanders? Was this the meaning of the sacrifice that German mothers made for their Fatherland when, with heavy hearts, they said goodbye to their sons who never returned? Has all this been done so that a gang of despicable criminals could lay their hands on the Fatherland?

Was this why the German soldier struggled through sweltering heat and blinding snowstorm, enduring hunger and thirst and cold, fatigued from sleepless nights and endless marches? Was it for this that he lived through an inferno of artillery bombardments, gasping and choking during gas attacks, neither flinching nor faltering, but always thinking of his duty to defend the Fatherland against the enemy?

Certainly these heroes deserved a headstone: "Wanderer, when you come to Germany, tell those at home that we lie here, true to the Fatherland and faithful to our duty."[9]

And at home?

But—was this the only sacrifice that we had to consider? Was the Germany of the past less valuable? Did she not owe a certain duty to her own history? Were we still worthy to partake in the glory of the past? How could we justify this act to future generations?

Despicable and degenerate criminals!

The more I tried to gain some clarity on this monstrous event, the more my head burned with rage and shame. What was the pain in my eyes compared with this tragedy?

The following days were terrible to bear, and the nights worse still. I knew that all was lost. Only fools, liars, or criminals could depend on the mercy of the enemy. During those nights, my hatred grew—hatred for the originators of this crime.

7.14 DECISION TO ENTER POLITICS

In the days that followed, my own fate became clear to me. I had to laugh at the thought of my personal future, which only recently was the cause of so much concern. Was it not ridiculous to build something on such a foundation? Finally, it became clear that the inevitable had happened, something that I had long feared, though I didn't have the heart to believe it.

Kaiser Wilhelm II was the first German Emperor to offer the hand of friendship to the Marxist leaders, not suspecting that they were scoundrels without honor. While they held the imperial hand in theirs, the other hand was already reaching for the dagger.

There is no coming to agreement with the Jews, but rather only the hard 'either-or.'

It was then that I decided to take up politics.

---

[9] A variation on a saying by Herodotus, recalling a message inscribed in stone by the Greek defenders of Thermopylae. See *Histories* (7.228).

CHAPTER 8: THE BEGINNING OF MY POLITICAL ACTIVITY

At the end of November 1918, I returned to Munich. I went to the replacement battalion of my regiment, which was now in the hands of the 'soldiers' council.' Their whole administration was quite repulsive to me, and so I decided to leave it as soon as possible. With my faithful war-comrade Ernst Schmiedt, I went to Traunstein and remained there until the camp was broken up.

In March 1919 we were back again in Munich.

The situation there was unsustainable; a further extension of the revolution was inevitable. Eisner's death served only to hasten this development, and it finally led to a dictatorship of the councils—or, to put it more correctly, to a Jewish hegemony.[1] This turned out to be transitory, but it was the original aim of those who had instigated the revolution.

At that time, countless plans took shape in my mind. I spent days pondering about what could be done. Unfortunately, every project gave way before the hard fact that I was quite unknown and therefore didn't have even the minimum requirements for effective action. Later on I will explain the reasons why I didn't join any of the existing parties.

As the new revolution of the Councils ran its course in Munich, my activities began to draw the ire of the Central Council. In the early morning of 27 April 1919, I was supposed to have been arrested. But the three fellows who came for me didn't have the courage to face my rifle, and withdrew just as they had arrived.

[1] Kurt Eisner (1867-1919) was a leading Jewish revolutionary of Bavaria. He temporarily took power in late 1918, but was killed in February 1919 by German soldiers who had reasserted control over the region.

A few days after the liberation of Munich, I was ordered to appear before the inquiry commission that was set up in the 2nd Infantry Regiment for the purpose of watching revolutionary activities.

That was my first more-or-less purely political activity.

A few weeks later I received orders to attend a 'course' that was being given to members of the army. This course was meant to teach certain fundamental civic principles. For me, the advantage of this organization was that it gave me a chance to meet fellow soldiers who were of the same mind, and with whom I could discuss the actual situation. We were all more or less firmly convinced that Germany could not be saved from imminent disaster by those who had participated in the November treachery—which is to say, the Center and the Social Democrats. Also, the so-called Bourgeois National group couldn't repair the damage that had been done, even if they had the best intentions. They lacked a number of prerequisites, without which such a task could never be successful. The years that followed justified the opinions that we held at that time.

8.1 DISCUSSION ON THE FORMATION OF A NEW PARTY

In our small circle, we discussed the project of forming a new party. The leading ideas that we then proposed were the same as those that were carried into effect later on, when the German Labor Party was founded. The name of the new movement that was to be founded should be such that, of itself, it would appeal to the masses. All our efforts would be vain and useless if this condition were lacking. And that was one reason why we chose the name 'Social Revolutionary Party'; the social principles of our new organization were indeed revolutionary.

But a more fundamental reason was the following:

The attention that I gave to economic problems during my earlier years was more or less confined to considerations arising directly from social problems. Later this outlook broadened as I came to study the German alliance policy. This policy was largely the result of an erroneous valuation of the economic situation, together with a confused notion of the basis by which the future subsistence of the German people could be guaranteed. All these ideas were based on the principle that capital is exclusively the product of labor, and that therefore, just like labor, it was subject to all the factors that can restrict or promote human activity. Hence, from a national standpoint, the significance of capital depended on the greatness, freedom, and power

of the state, and hence of the nation. Furthermore, it's this dependence alone that leads capital to promote the interests of the state and the nation, from an instinct of self-preservation and for the sake of its own development. This dependence of capital on the independent state would therefore compel capital to promote the freedom, power, strength, etc of the nation.

On such principles, the attitude of the state towards capital would be relatively simple and clear. Its only object would be to make sure that capital remained subservient to the state and didn't allocate to itself the right to dominate national interests. Thus its activities would be bound by the following two limits: on the one side, to assure a vital and independent national economy and, on the other, to safeguard the social rights of the workers.

8.2 TWO TYPES OF CAPITAL

Previously I didn't clearly recognize the difference between capital that is purely the product of creative labor, and capital that is exclusively the result of financial speculation. Here I needed an inspiration to set my mind thinking in this direction; but that impulse had not appeared.

The necessary inspiration now came from one of the men who lectured in the course I mentioned earlier. This was Gottfried Feder.[2]

For the first time in my life, I heard a discussion of the principles of international stock exchange capital and loan capital.

After hearing Feder's first lecture, the idea immediately came into my head that I had now found one of the most essential prerequisites for the founding of a new party.

To my mind, Feder's merit lay in the ruthlessly brutal way in which he described the double character of capital engaged in stock-exchange and loan transaction, exposing the fact that this capital is always dependent on the payment of interest. In fundamental questions, his statements were so full of common sense that his critics didn't deny their theoretical soundness, but only whether it would be possible to put these ideas into practice. To me this seemed the strongest point in Feder's teaching, though others considered it a weakness.

---

[2] Feder (1883-1941) was an economist by training, and one of the central founders of the National Socialist party. When Hitler came to power in 1933, Feder joined the government, quickly rising to the level of Reich commissioner. But by 1935 he had withdrawn from politics, preferring a university professorship in Berlin. He stayed there until his death in 1941, at age 58.

8.3 THEORETICIAN AND POLITICIAN

It isn't the task of the theoretician to explain the various ways in which something can be put into practice. His task is to deal with the problem as such; he has to look to the end rather than the means. The important question is whether an idea is fundamentally correct, not whether it can be carried out. When a man whose task is to lay down the principles of a program or policy begins to busy himself with so-called 'usefulness' or 'reality' instead of the absolute truth, his work will cease to be a guiding star to those who are looking for enlightenment. It will become a mere recipe for everyday life. The theoretician must consider only the goal; the politician must then strive for its fulfillment. The thought of the former will, therefore, be determined by eternal truths, whereas the activity of the latter must always be guided by the practical reality of the moment.

The greatness of the one will depend on the absolute truth of his idea; whereas that of the other will depend on whether or not he correctly judges the given realities and their advantageous application. In this sense, the theoretical goal is his guiding star. The test of a politician's greatness is the success of his plans and enterprises—in other words, his ability to reach his goal. Conversely, the theoretician's final goal can never be reached; human thought may grasp truths and envision ends that it sees with crystal clarity, even though such ends can never be completely fulfilled because human nature is weak and imperfect. The more correct an idea is in the abstract, and therefore, the more powerful, the smaller the chance of putting it into practice—at least as far as this depends on human beings. The significance of a theoretician doesn't depend on the practical success of his plans, but rather on their absolute truth and the influence they exert on the progress of humanity.

If it were otherwise, the founders of religions could never be considered the greatest men who have ever lived, because their moral aims would never be completely or even partially carried out in practice. Even the Religion of Love[3] is really no more than a faint reflection of the will of its sublime founder. But its significance lies in the orientation that it attempted to give to human civilization, ethics, and morality.

This vast difference between the functions of a theoretician and a politician is the reason why the necessary qualifications for both functions are rarely ever found in the same person. This applies especially to the so-

[3] That is, Christianity.

called 'successful' politician of the smaller kind, whose activity is indeed hardly more than practicing 'the art of the possible,' as Bismarck modestly defined politics in general. If such a politician resolutely avoids great ideas, his success will be all the easier to attain; and it will be quicker and more tangible. By reason of this very fact, however, such success is doomed to futility, and sometimes doesn't even survive the death of its author. Generally speaking, the work of politicians is insignificant for following generation, because their temporary success is based on the expediency of avoiding all truly great and profound problems and ideas—the very things that would have been valuable to future generations.

To pursue ideals that will still be of value and significance for the future is generally not a very profitable undertaking. He who follows such a course is only very rarely understood by the masses, who find beer and milk a more persuasive index of political values than far-sighted plans for the future—which are realized only much later, and whose benefits are reaped only by posterity.

Because of a certain vanity—which is always a cousin of stupidity—the general run of politicians will always avoid those schemes for the future that are very difficult to put into practice. And they will practice this avoidance so as to not lose the immediate favor of the mob. The success and importance of such politicians belong exclusively to the present; they will be of no consequence for the future. But that doesn't worry small-minded people, who are quite content with momentary results.

The position of the theoretician is quite different. The importance of his work must always be judged from the standpoint of the future. He is frequently described by the word *weltfremd*, or unworldly. While the art of the politician is the art of the possible, the theoretician belongs to those who are said to please the gods, only because they demand the impossible. Such men will always have to renounce present-day fame; but if their ideas are immortal, posterity will grant them its reward.

Over long spans of human progress, it may occasionally happen that the politician and theoretician are one. The more intimate this union, the greater the obstacles that the activity of the politician will have to face. Such a man doesn't labor for the purpose of satisfying demands that are obvious to every shopkeeper, but he reaches out towards ends that can be understood only by the few. His life is thus torn apart by hatred and love. The protest of his contemporaries, who don't understand him, is in conflict with the recognition of posterity, for whom he also works.

8.4 MARATHON RUNNERS OF HISTORY

The greater the work that a man does for the future, the less he will be appreciated by his contemporaries. His struggle will be all harder, and his success rarer. If, in the course of centuries, such a man appears who is blessed with success, then, towards the end of his days, he may have a faint vision of his future fame. But such great men are only the marathon runners of history. The laurels of contemporary fame are only for the brow of the dying hero.

The great warriors are those who fight for their ideas and ideals, despite the fact that they receive no recognition from their contemporaries. They are the men whose memories will be enshrined in the hearts of future generations. It almost seems as if each person felt a duty to atone for the wrongs committed against such great men. Their lives and their work are then studied with admiring gratitude and emotion. Especially in dark days of distress, such men have the power to heal broken hearts and elevate despairing souls.

To this group belong not only the genuinely great statesmen but all the great reformers as well. Beside Frederick the Great we have such men as Martin Luther and Richard Wagner.

8.5 FIGHT AGAINST INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CAPITAL

When I heard Gottfried Feder's first lecture on 'breaking interest-slavery,' I understood immediately that here was a truth of transcendental importance for the future of the German people. The absolute separation of stock exchange capital from the national economy would make it possible to oppose the internationalization of the German economy without at the same time attacking capital per se. Doing so would jeopardize the foundations of our national independence. I clearly saw what was developing in Germany, and I realized then that the hardest battle we would have to fight would not be against the enemy nations, but against international capital. In Feder's speech I found an effective rallying-cry for our coming struggle.

Here, again, later events proved how correct our impression was. The fools among our bourgeois politicians don't laugh at us now. Even they now see—insofar as they are not deliberate liars—that international stock-exchange capital was not only the chief instigator for the war, but that now when the fighting has ended, it turns the peace into a hell.

CHAPTER 8

The struggle against international finance capital and loan-capital has become one of the most important points in the program of the German nation's fight for economic independence and freedom.

Regarding the objections raised by so-called practical people, the following answer must suffice: All fears concerning the terrible economic consequences that would follow the abolition of interest-capital slavery are superfluous. In the first place, the economic principles followed thus far have proven nearly fatal to the interests of the German people. This situation recalls similar advice once given by experts in earlier times—such as the Bavarian Medical College, on the question of introducing railroads. None of the fears expressed by that august body of experts were realized. Those who travelled in the coaches of the new 'steam horse' didn't get dizzy. Those who looked on didn't become ill. And the board fences that were erected to conceal the new invention were eventually taken down. Only those board fences that obscured the vision of the so-called 'experts' were preserved for posterity.

In the second place, the following must be noted: Any idea may be a source of danger if it is seen as an end in itself, when really it's only the means to an end. For me and all true National Socialists, there is only one doctrine: People and Fatherland.

We have to fight to safeguard the existence and reproduction of our race and people, the sustenance of our children, the purity of our blood, and the freedom and independence of the Fatherland. Only then may our people fulfill the mission assigned to them by the creator of the universe.

All ideas and ideals, all teaching and all knowledge, must serve these ends. Everything must be examined from this viewpoint and turned to practical uses, or else discarded. Thus a theory can never become a mere dead doctrine, since everything must serve life.

Thus it was that Gottfried Feder's conclusions caused me to make a fundamental study of a question with which I had previously not been very familiar.

I began to study again, and thus it was that I came to truly understand the substance and purpose of the life-work of the Jew Karl Marx. His *Capital* became intelligible to me now for the first time.[4] I now exactly understood the Social Democrats' fight against national economics—a fight that was to prepare the ground for the hegemony of a true international and stock exchange capital.

---

[4] Marx's book *Das Kapital* ('Capital') was initially published in 1867.

8.6 THE 'EDUCATIONAL OFFICER'

In another direction too, this course of lectures had important consequences for me.

One day I asked to speak. Another participant felt obligated to break a lance for the Jews, and entered into a lengthy defense of them. This aroused my opposition. An overwhelming majority supported my views. The consequence of it all was that, a few days later, I was assigned to a regiment then stationed at Munich, and given a position there as a so-called 'educational officer.'

At that time, the discipline of the troops was rather weak. It was still suffering from the after-effects of the period when the soldiers' councils were in control. Only gradually and carefully was it possible to replace 'voluntary obedience'—a cute name given by Kurt Eisner's pig-sty of a regime—with a spirit of military discipline and subordination. The soldiers had to be taught to think and feel in a national and patriotic way. In these two directions lay my future line of action.

I began my work with the greatest enthusiasm and love. Here I was presented with an opportunity to speak before quite a large audience. I was now able to confirm what I had previously merely felt: I could 'speak.' My voice had become so much better that I could be clearly understood in all parts of the small squadron hall.

No task could have been more pleasing to me than this. Now, before being discharged, I was in a position to render useful service to an institution that was infinitely dear to my heart: the army.

I can now say that my talks were successful. During the course of my lectures, I led hundreds and even thousands of my fellow countrymen back to their people and Fatherland. I 'nationalized' these troops, and in doing so I helped to restore general discipline.

Here again I made the acquaintance of several like-minded comrades, who later came to form the core of the new movement.

CHAPTER 9: THE "GERMAN WORKERS' PARTY"

One day I received an order from my superiors to investigate the nature of an apparently political association. It called itself "The German Workers' Party," and was soon to hold a meeting at which Gottfried Feder would speak.[1] I was ordered to attend this meeting and report on the situation.

The curiosity of the army authorities toward political parties can be very well understood. The revolution gave the soldiers the right to take an active part in politics, and it was particularly those with the least experience who made the most of this right. But when the Center and the Social Democratic parties were forced to recognize that the soldiers' sympathies had turned away from the revolutionary parties and towards the national movement and reawakening, they felt obligated to withdraw the right to vote from the army and to forbid it all political activity.

The fact that the Center and Marxism adopted this policy was instructive, because if they hadn't thus curtailed 'civil rights'—as they called the political rights of the soldiers after the revolution—the 'November State' would have been overthrown within a few years, and thus the dishonor and disgrace of the nation wouldn't have been prolonged. At that time, the soldiers were on the verge of ridding the nation of the bloodsuckers and henchmen who served the cause of the Entente within our country. But the fact that the so-called 'national' parties voted enthusiastically for the doctrinaire policy of the November criminals also helped to render the army ineffective as an instrument of national restoration; it thus showed once again where men might be led by the purely doctrinaire ideas accepted by these most gullible people.

[1] *Deutsche Arbeiterpartei*, or DAP. This would be the forerunner of the National Socialist DAP, or NSDAP. To its detractors, it was the "Nazi" party.

The bourgeois middle classes became so senile that they sincerely believed the army could once again become what it had previously been, namely, a stronghold of German power. The Center and Marxism intended only to extract the poisonous fang of nationalism, without which an army must always remain just a police force, and can never be a military organization capable of fighting against the enemy. This truth was amply proved by subsequent events.

Or did our 'national politicians' believe that the development of our army could be other than national? This might have been possible, and could be explained by the fact that, during the war, they weren't soldiers but talkers; in other words, parliamentarians. As such, they didn't have the slightest idea of what was in the hearts of those men who remembered the greatness of their own past, and that they were once the best soldiers in the world.

9.1 THE "GERMAN WORKERS' PARTY"

I decided to attend the meeting of this party, which had previously been entirely unknown to me.

When I arrived that evening in the 'guest room' of the former Sternecker Brewery in Munich, I found approximately 20 to 25 people present, most of them belonging to the lower classes.

The theme of Feder's lecture was already familiar to me, so I could therefore focus my attention on the organization itself.

The impression was neither good nor bad—a new organization, just like any other. In those days, everyone felt called upon to form a new party whenever he was unhappy with the course of events and lost confidence in the existing parties. Thus it was that new associations sprang up all around, only to disappear just as quickly. Generally speaking, the founders of such associations didn't have the slightest idea of what it means to bring together a number of people for the formation of a party or a movement. Therefore, these associations disappeared because of their utter lack of anything like an adequate grasp of the necessities of the situation.

My opinion of the "German Workers' Party" was no different. I was glad when Feder finally came to a close. I had observed enough and was just about to leave when an open discussion period was announced; I decided to stay. At first this was just more of the same, when suddenly a 'professor' began to speak. He opened by throwing doubt on the accuracy of what Feder had said, and then—after Feder's able reply—the professor

suddenly began arguing on what he called 'the basis of facts.' He recommended that the young party take up 'secession' from 'Prussia.' In a most self-assured way, this man kept insisting that German-Austria should join Bavaria, and that the peace would then function much better...and other nonsense. At this point, I felt bound to ask for permission to speak and to tell the learned gentleman what I thought. As a result, and even before I finished, he slipped out of the hall like a wet poodle. While I spoke, the audience listened with an astonished expression on their faces. When I was just about to say good night to the assembly and leave, a man came after me quickly and introduced himself (I didn't quite catch his name). He placed a little booklet in my hand, which was obviously a political pamphlet, and asked me very urgently to read it.

I was quite pleased; in this way, I could come to know about this association without having to attend its tiresome meetings. Moreover, this apparent workman made a good impression on me.[2] I then left the hall.

At that time, I was living in one of the barracks of the 2nd Infantry Regiment. I had a little room that still bore the unmistakable traces of the revolution. During the day I was mostly out, with the 41st Rifle Regiment, or otherwise attending meetings or lectures held elsewhere. I spent only the night in my room. Since I usually woke up about 5:00 every morning, I got into the habit of amusing myself by watching little mice playing around in my small room. I placed a few pieces of hard bread or crust on the floor and watched the funny little creatures playing around and enjoying themselves with these delicacies. I had suffered so much poverty in my own life that I well knew what hunger was, and I could thus imagine the pleasure of these little creatures.

The next morning, around 5:00 AM, I was fully awake in bed, watching the mice playing and vying with each other. Since I couldn't sleep, I suddenly remembered the booklet that the worker had given me. I began to read. It was a small pamphlet, of which this worker was the author. He described how his mind had thrown off the shackles of Marxist and trade-union phraseology, and that he came back to nationalist ideals. That was the reason why he had entitled his little book: *My Political Awakening*.[3] The pamphlet grabbed my attention the moment I began to read, and I read it with interest to the end. The process described was similar to that which I had experienced in my own case, 12 years earlier. Unconsciously, my own development came

[2] The worker turned out to be Anton Drexler, one of the original founders of the DAP.

[3] *Mein Politisches Erwachen*, by Anton Drexler (1920; E. Boepple, Munich).

again to mind. During that day, my thoughts returned several times to what I had read; but eventually I forgot about it. A week or so later, however, I received a postcard that informed me, to my astonishment, that I had been admitted to the DAP. I was asked to reply to this communication and to attend a meeting of the Party Committee the next Wednesday.

This method of 'winning' members amazed me, and I didn't know whether to be angry or laugh. I had no intention of joining any existing party, but wanted to found one of my own. It was presumptuous of them to ask and, for me, completely out of the question.

I was about to send a written reply when curiosity got the better of me, and I decided to attend the gathering on the assigned date, so that I might explain my principles to these gentlemen in person.

9.2 THE 'COMMITTEE MEETING'

Wednesday came. The tavern in which the meeting was to take place was the Alte Rosenbad in the Herrnstrasse—a run-down place with very few guests. This wasn't very surprising in 1919, when the menus of even the larger restaurants were only very modest and scanty. But I had never before heard of this business.

I went through the badly-lighted guest room, where not a single guest was to be seen, and opened the door to the back room; there I found the 'session.' In the dim light of a grimy gas lamp, I could see four young people sitting around a table, one of them the author of the pamphlet. He greeted me cordially and welcomed me as a new member of the DAP.

I was somewhat taken aback. I was then informed that the 'national chairman' had not yet arrived; I decided that I would withhold my own ideas for the time being. Finally the chairman appeared. He was the same chairman as in the Sternecker Brewery, when Feder spoke.

My curiosity was growing, and I sat waiting for what was to come. Now at least I learned the names of the gentlemen. The chairman of the 'national organization' was a certain Herr Harrer;[4] and the leader of the Munich district was Anton Drexler.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read out, and a vote of confidence in the secretary was passed. Then came the treasurer's report.

[4] Karl Harrer (1890-1926) was a journalist and early founder of the DAP. He parted ways with Hitler not long after their initial meeting, and died soon thereafter at age 36.

CHAPTER 9

The association possessed a total of seven marks and 50 pfennigs, whereupon the treasurer was assured that he had the confidence of the members. This was now inserted in the minutes. Then the chairman's replies to a number of letters were read: first, to a letter received from Kiel, then to one from Düsseldorf, and finally to one from Berlin. Everyone expressed approval. Then the incoming letters were read: one from Berlin, one from Düsseldorf, and one from Kiel—all resulting in great satisfaction. This was taken as the best and most obvious sign of the growing importance of the DAP. And then—there followed a long discussion of the replies to be given.

Terrible, terrible! This was tedious bureaucracy of the worst sort. And was I to join such a club?

Next came the question of new members—that is to say, the question of my capture.

I now began to ask questions. But I found that, apart from a few general principles, there was nothing: no program, no pamphlet, nothing at all in print, no membership cards, not even a party stamp; only clear good faith and good intentions.

I no longer felt like laughing—for what else was all this but a typical sign of the most complete helplessness and total despair of all political parties, their programs, and their activities?

The feeling that induced those few young men to join in what seemed such a ridiculous enterprise was nothing but the call of an inner voice. It told them, more intuitively than consciously, that the whole party system as it existed was incapable of raising up the German nation or repairing the inner wounds. I quickly read through the list of principles that formed the party platform. These were stated on typewritten sheets. Here again I found evidence of a spirit of longing and searching, but no sign whatsoever of a knowledge of the conflict that had to be fought.

I myself had experienced the feelings that inspired those people: it was the longing for a movement that would be more than a party, in the usual sense of that word.

When I returned to the barracks that evening, I had formed a definite opinion of that association.

I was facing the hardest question of my life: Should I join this party, or should I decline?

9.3 A FINAL DECISION

Rationally, every consideration urged me to decline; but my feelings troubled me. The more I tried to prove to myself how senseless this club was, on the whole, the more my feelings inclined me to favor it.

In the days to follow, I was restless.

I began to consider all the pros and cons. I had long ago decided to take an active part in politics. It was clear that I could do so only through a new movement; but I had previously lacked the impulse to take concrete action. I'm not one of those people who will begin something one day and give it up the next, just for the sake of something new. That was the main reason why it was so difficult for me to decide to join such an organization. This would have to be the fulfillment of my goals, or else I shouldn't do it at all. I knew that such a decision would bind me forever, and that there could be no turning back. This was no idle game, but rather a serious and ardent cause. Even then I had an instinctive revulsion against people who took up everything, but never carried anything through to the end. I loathed these jacks-of-all-trades, and considered the activities of such people to be worse than doing nothing at all.

Fate itself now seemed to point the way. I would never have entered one of the big existing parties; I'll explain my reasons for this later on. This absurd little group, with its handful of members, seemed to have the unique advantage of not yet being frozen into an 'organization.' It still offered a chance for real personal activity on the part of the individual. Here it might still be possible to do some effective work; and, as the movement was still small, one could all the easier give it the proper shape. Here it was still possible to determine the character of the movement, the aims to be achieved, and the road to be taken; all of this would have been impossible in the big parties.

The longer I reflected on the situation, the more my opinion developed that just such a small movement could best serve to prepare the way for a national resurgence. This could never be done by the political parliamentary parties, which were too firmly attached to obsolete ideas or had an interest in supporting the new regime. What had to be proclaimed here was a new worldview, and not a new election slogan.

It was, however, infinitely more difficult to turn this intention into reality.

What qualifications did I bring to this task?

The fact that I was poor and without resources could, in my opinion, be the easiest to bear. But the fact that I was utterly unknown raised a more

difficult problem. I was only one of the millions that Chance allowed to exist, whom even their next-door neighbors will not consent to know. And another difficulty arose from my lack of schooling.

The so-called 'intellectuals' still look down with limitless disdain on anyone who hasn't been through the prescribed schools, and had the necessary knowledge pumped into them. The question has never been, What can a man do?, but rather, What has he learned? 'Educated' people look upon any idiot who is plastered with diplomas as superior to the ablest young man who lacks these precious documents. I could therefore easily imagine how this 'educated' world would receive me, and I was wrong only insofar as I then believed men to be better than they proved to be, in the harsh light of reality. Because they are this way, the few exceptions stand out all the more brightly. I learned more and more to distinguish between the eternal students and those who are the true men of ability.

After two days of careful brooding and reflection, I became convinced that I must take the step.

It was the most fateful decision of my life.

There was and could be no turning back.

Thus I registered as a member of the German Worker's Party, and received a provisional membership card, with the number: seven.

CHAPTER 10: CAUSES OF THE COLLAPSE

The depth of a fall is always measured by the difference between the level of a body's original position and that in which it now exists. The same holds good for nations and states. The matter of greatest importance here is the height of the original level, or rather the greatest height that was attained before the descent began. Only that which is capable of extraordinary heights can experience a profound decline or collapse. The collapse of the Reich[1] was so difficult and terrible because it had fallen from a height that can hardly be imagined in these days of misery and humiliation.

The Reich was founded in circumstances of such dazzling splendor that the whole nation had become entranced. Following an unparalleled series of victories, an empire was born for the children and grandchildren of the heroes. Whether they were conscious of it or not doesn't matter. What matters is that the Germans all felt that this empire had not been brought into existence by a series of parliamentary maneuvers, but by reason of the noblest circumstances. Its foundations were laid not amidst parliamentary debates but with the thunder and boom of war along the front that encircled Paris. It was thus that an act of statesmanship was accomplished whereby the German princes and people established the future Reich, and restored the symbol of the imperial crown. Bismarck's state was not founded on

[1] Throughout *Mein Kampf*, Hitler uses the word Reich to refer to what he would later call the 'Second Reich,' or the reign of Hohenzollerns (1871-1918), initiated by Otto von Bismarck. The First Reich was the Holy Roman Empire, which lasted from 962 to 1806. The phrase 'Third Reich' was coined in 1923, and only later, after 1933, was appropriated by the National Socialists.

treason and assassination by deserters and slackers but by the regiments that had fought at the front.

This unique birth and baptism of fire surrounded the Reich with a halo of historical splendor such as only the oldest states—seldom—could do.

And what an ascent now began!

Autonomy guaranteed the daily bread. The nation became rich in people and in worldly goods. The honor of the state—and thereby of the people as a whole—were secured and protected by an army that was the most striking witness of the difference between this new Reich and the old German Confederation.

10.1 THE SIGN OF COLLAPSE

The downfall of the Reich and the German people has been so profound that they all seem to have been dumb-struck and rendered incapable of feeling its significance. People can scarcely remember the former heights, whose greatness and majesty are in such contrast to our present misery.

It is therefore understandable that people are so dazed by the sublime that they forget to look for the signs of the great collapse, which must certainly have been present in some form or other.

Naturally this applies only to those for whom Germany was more than merely a source of income. These are the only people able to feel the present conditions as really catastrophic, whereas the others have considered these conditions as the fulfillment of something they had long sought and wished for.

The signs of future collapse were certainly there in those earlier days, although very few made any attempt to draw a practical lesson from them.

But today this is more necessary than ever.

Just as bodily diseases can be cured only when their origin has been diagnosed, so too with political disease. It's obvious that the external symptoms of any disease can be more readily detected than its internal causes; these strike the eye more easily. This is also the reason why so many people recognize only external effects and mistake them for causes. Indeed they will sometimes try to deny the existence of such causes. And that's why the majority of people among us recognize the German collapse only in terms of the prevailing economic distress and its consequences. Almost everyone has to carry his share of this burden, and that's why each one

looks on the economic catastrophe as the cause of the present deplorable state of affairs. The broad masses of people see little of the cultural, political, and moral background of this collapse. Many of them completely lack both the necessary feeling and intellect to understand it.

That the masses should hold such a view is quite understandable. But the fact that intelligentsia regard the German collapse primarily as an 'economic catastrophe,' and consequently that a cure requires an economic solution, seems to me the reason why any recovery has been thus far impossible. No improvement can be brought about until it is understood that economics play only a second- or third-rate role, while the primary factors are politics, morality, and blood. Only when this is understood will it be possible to understand the causes of the present evil, and thus to find the ways and means of curing them.

Therefore the question of why Germany really collapsed is one of decisive importance, especially for a political movement that aims at overcoming this defeat.

In scrutinizing the past, we must be careful not to be overly impressed by external results that readily strike the eye, while ignoring the less visible causes of these results.

10.2 THE CAUSES OF COLLAPSE

The most facile, and therefore the most widely-accepted way of accounting for the present misfortune is to say that it's the result of a lost war, and that the World War was therefore the real cause.

Probably there are many who honestly believe this nonsense, but there are many more in whose mouths this is a lie and a conscious falsehood. This applies to all those who are now feeding at the government troughs. For didn't the prophets of the revolution repeatedly declare to the people that the outcome of the war would be immaterial to the great masses? On the contrary, didn't they solemnly assure the public that it was 'big capital' that was principally interested in a victorious outcome of this gigantic struggle—but never the German people or the German workers? Indeed didn't these apostles of world conciliation habitually assert that, far from any German downfall, the opposite was bound to take place: namely, that the German nation would be resurrected, once 'militarism' had been destroyed? Didn't these circles sing the praises of the Entente, and did they not also lay the whole blame for the bloody struggle on Germany? Without

this explanation, would they have been able to put forth the theory that a military defeat would have no political consequences for the German people? Wasn't the whole revolution dressed up in gala colors as preventing a victory of the German flag, and thus that the German people would be assured of freedom, both at home and abroad?

Isn't that so, you miserable, lying scoundrels?

It takes a typically Jewish impudence to proclaim the defeat of the army as the cause of the collapse. Indeed, the Berlin *Vorwärts*, that organ and mouthpiece of sedition, wrote that the German nation should not be permitted to bring home its banner triumphantly!

And yet they attribute our collapse to this?

Of course it would be pointless to argue with these forgetful liars. I would waste no further words on them, were it not for the fact that there are many thoughtless people who parrot this nonsense without being necessarily inspired by any evil motives. But this discussion is also meant for our fighting followers, given that nowadays one's spoken words are often twisted in their meaning.

The assertion that the loss of the war was the cause of the German collapse can best be answered as follows:

It is admittedly a fact that the loss of the war was of tragic importance for the future of our Fatherland. But that loss was not in itself a cause. It was rather the consequence of other causes. It was clear to every straight thinker that a disastrous ending to this life-or-death conflict would involve catastrophic consquences. But unfortunately there were also people whose reasoning seemed to fail them at that critical moment. And there were others who had first questioned that truth and then denied it altogether. And there were people who, after their secret desire was fulfilled, were suddenly faced with the catastrophe that they themselves helped to bring about. They are guily of the collapse—and not the lost war, though they now want to attribute everything to this.

As a matter of fact, the loss of the war was a result of their activities and not of 'bad' leadership, as they now would like to maintain. Our enemies were not cowards. They also knew how to die. From the very first day of the war, they outnumbered the German army, and the arsenals and armament factories of the whole world were at their disposal for the replenishment of military equipment. Indeed, it is universally admitted that the German victories that were steadily won during four years of warfare against the whole world were due to superior leadership, apart of course from the heroism of the troops. This cannot be denied. The organization

and leadership of the German army was the mightiest thing that the world had ever seen. Any evident shortcomings were humanly unavoidable.

The collapse of that army was not the cause of our present distress. It was itself the consequence of other crimes. But this consequence in turn ushered in a further collapse, which was more visible.

That this was true can be shown as follows:

Must a military defeat necessarily lead to such a complete overthrow of the state and the nation? Since when has this been the result of an unlucky war? As a matter of fact, are nations ever ruined by a lost war, and by that alone?

The answer to this question can be briefly stated: military defeats are the result of internal decay, cowardice, lack of character, and in short, unworthiness. If these were not the causes, then a military defeat would lead to a national resurgence, and bring the nation to a higher pitch of effort. A military defeat is not the tombstone of national life.

History offers many examples to confirm the truth of that statement.

Unfortunately, Germany's military defeat wasn't an undeserved catastrophe, but a well-merited punishment that was in the nature of an eternal retribution. We more than deserved this defeat. It represented the greatest external sign of decay among a series of internal symptoms, which, although they were visible, weren't recognized by the majority of the people, who are like ostriches and see only what they want to see.

10.3 EVERY THIRD GERMAN IS A TRAITOR

Let's examine the symptoms that were evident at the time that the German people accepted this defeat. Isn't it true that, in several circles, the Fatherland's misfortunes were even welcomed with a shameless joy? Who could act in such a way without thereby earning the right to be punished? Weren't there people who even went further and boasted that they had caused the front to waver? And these things weren't done by the enemy—no, no—but rather our own countrymen!

Did they suffer misfortune unjustly? Was there ever a case in history where a people declared itself guilty of a war? And that, even against better judgment and better knowledge!

No, and again no. From the way that the German nation reacted to its defeat, we can see that the real cause of our collapse must be sought elsewhere, and not in the purely military loss of a few positions or the

failure of an offensive. For if the front had given way and thus brought about a national disaster, then the German nation would have accepted the defeat in quite another spirit. They would have borne the subsequent misfortune with clenched teeth, or they would have been overwhelmed by grief. Regret and fury would have filled their hearts against an enemy who was given victory by a chance event or by the will of fate. And in that case, the nation, following the example of the Roman Senate, would have greeted the defeated divisions on their return and expressed their thanks for the sacrifices that were made, and would have requested them not to lose faith in the Reich.[2] Even the capitulation would have been signed under the sway of calm reason, while the heart would have beaten in the hope of a coming resurrection.

This is the reception that would have been given to a military defeat due only to the adverse decree of fate. There would have been neither laughing nor dancing. There would have been no boasting of cowardice, nor any honoring of defeat. The returning troops wouldn't have been mocked, and the banner wouldn't have been dragged in the mud. But above all, we would never have had that disgraceful state of affairs in which a British officer, Colonel Repington, declared with scorn: "Every third German is a traitor!" No, this plague would never have become a veritable flood that, for the past five years, has drowned every bit of respect for the German nation in the world.

This shows only too clearly what a lie it is to say that the loss of the war was the cause of the German collapse. No—the military defeat was itself but the consequence of a whole series of morbid symptoms and their causes that were present in the German nation before the war broke out. The war was the catastrophic consequence, visible to all, of an ethical and moral poisoning, and of a degeneration of the instinct for self-preservation. These were the preliminary causes that, for many years, had been undermining the foundations of the nation and the Reich.

---

[2] Hitler seems to conflate two separate events in Roman history. In 390 BC, in the face of the invading Gauls, the Senators placed themselves on the main road into the city, hoping to sacrifice themselves and thus to assuage the enemy. Later, after the Roman loss to Hannibal at Cannae in 216 BC, the Roman citizens turned out to greet and thank the commander Varro because he fought nobly for the Republic.

10.4 MORAL DISARMAMENT OF A DANGEROUS ACCUSER

It required the entire bottomless falsehood of the Jews, and their fighting comrades the Marxists, to lay blame for the collapse precisely on the man who alone had shown a superhuman will and energy in his effort to prevent the catastrophe that he had foreseen, and to save the nation from that time of humiliation and disgrace. By placing sole blame for the loss of the World War on Ludendorff, they took away the weapon of moral right from the only adversary dangerous enough to be likely to succeed against the betrayers of the Fatherland.

All this was inspired by the unquestionably true principle that in the Big Lie there is always a certain degree of credibility, because the broad masses of a nation are always more easily corrupted in the very bottom of their hearts than consciously or voluntarily. And in the primitive simplicity of their minds, they more readily fall victims to the Big Lie than the small lie, since they themselves often tell small lies in little matters, but would be ashamed to resort to large-scale falsehoods. It would never occur to them to fabricate colossal untruths, and they would not believe that others could have the impudence to distort the truth so infamously.

Even though the facts that prove this are clear, they will still doubt and waver, and will continue to think that there must be some other explanation. The grossly impudent lie always leaves traces behind it, even after it has stuck—a fact that is known to all artful liars in this world, and to all who conspire together in the art of lying. These people know only too well how to use falsehood for the basest of purposes.

From time immemorial, however, the Jews have known better than any others how to exploit falsehood and calumny. Their very existence is based on one great lie, namely, that they are a religious community and not a race. And what a race. One of the greatest thinkers of mankind has branded them for all time with a statement that is profoundly and precisely true: he called them "The great master of the lie."[3] Those who don't realize the truth of

[3] Hitler quotes the philosopher Arthur Schopenhauer. In his book *Parerga and Paralipomena* (1851), Schopenhauer remarks on the historically low opinion of the Jews: "We see also from the two Roman authors [Tacitus and Justinus] how much the Jews were at all times, and by all nations, loathed and despised. This may be due partly to the fact that they were the only people on earth who did not credit man with any existence beyond this life, and were therefore regarded as cattle, as the dregs of humanity, but as past masters at telling lies" (1851/2010, vol. 2, p. 357). For further discussion see Dalton (2011b).

that statement, or don't wish to believe it, will never be able to lend a hand in this world to help truth prevail.

It was a great stroke of fortune for the German nation that its period of lingering sickness was so suddenly ended by a terrible catastrophe. If things had gone on as they were, the nation would have slowly but surely come to ruin. The disease would have become chronic; whereas, in the acute form, it at least showed itself clearly to a considerable number of observers. It was no accident that man conquered the black plague more easily than tuberculosis. The first appeared in terrifying waves of death that shook the whole of mankind; the other advances insidiously. The first induces terror; the other, gradual indifference. The result is, however, that men opposed the first with all their energy, while they try to control tuberculosis by feeble means. Thus man has mastered the plague, while tuberculosis masters him.

The same applies to diseases in national bodies. As long as these diseases aren't of a catastrophic nature, people will slowly accustom themselves to them, and eventually succumb. It is then a stroke of luck—though a bitter one—when fate decides to intervene in this slow process of decay and suddenly brings the victim face to face with the final stage of the disease. More often than not, the result of a catastrophe is that a cure is undertaken immediately, and carried through with a firm determination.

But even in such a case, the prerequisite is always the recognition of the internal causes that created the disease in question.

10.5 TOXINS AND SYMPTOMS

The important question here is the differentiation of the root causes from the circumstances growing from them. This becomes all the more difficult the longer the toxins remain in the national body, and the longer they are allowed to become an integral part of that body. It may easily happen that, as time goes on, unquestionably harmful poisons will be accepted as belonging to the national being, or that they are tolerated as a necessary evil. In this case, it won't even be seen as necessary to locate the alien virus.

During the long period of peace prior to the last war, certain evils were evident here and there—although, with one or two exceptions, very little effort was made against the virus. Here again, these exceptions were first and foremost those economic phenomena of the nation that were more apparent to the individual consciousness than the harmful conditions existing in many other spheres.

There were many signs of decay that should have been given serious thought.

As far as economics were concerned, the following may be said:

The amazing increase of the German population before the war brought the question of providing daily bread into a more prominent position in all spheres of political and economic thought and action. Unfortunately, those responsible couldn't decide to arrive at the only correct solution, but preferred to reach their goal by cheaper methods. Renouncing the idea of acquiring fresh territory, and substituting for it a mad desire for global economic conquest, was bound to eventually lead to unlimited and harmful industrialization.

The first and most fatal consequence was a weakening of the agricultural class, whose decline was proportionate to the increase in the proletariat of the urban areas. In the end, the equilibrium was completely upset.

The big barrier dividing rich and poor now became apparent. Luxury and poverty lived so close together that the consequences were bound to be deplorable. Poverty and frequent unemployment began to wreak havoc with the people, leaving discontent and embitterment behind them. The result of this was to divide the population into political classes. Discontent increased despite commercial prosperity. Matters finally reached the point at which everyone felt that 'things can't go on as they are,' although no one seemed able to visualize what was really going to happen.

These were typical signs of the depths to which the prevailing discontent had reached.

10.6 THE RULE OF MONEY

Far worse than these, however, were other consequences that became apparent as a result of the economization of the nation.

In proportion to the degree that commerce assumed definite control of the state, money became more of a god, to whom all had to serve and bow down. Heavenly gods became more and more old-fashioned, and were stuffed away in the corners to make room for the worship of Mammon. And thus began a period of utter degeneration. This was especially pernicious because it came at a time when the nation was at its critical hour, and more than ever needed an exalted ideal. Germany should have been prepared to protect with the sword her efforts to win her own daily bread through 'peaceful economic labor.'

Unfortunately, the domination of money was sanctioned in the very quarter that should have opposed it. His Majesty the Kaiser made a mistake when he raised representatives of the new finance capital to the ranks of nobility. Admittedly, it may be an excuse that even Bismarck failed to realize the looming danger in this respect. In practice, however, all ideal virtues became secondary considerations to those of money; it was clear that having once taken this road, the nobility of the sword would soon rank second to the nobility of finance.

Financial operations succeed easier than military ones. Hence it was no longer inviting for a true hero or even a statesman to be brought into touch with the nearest Jewish banker. Men of real merit weren't interested in cheap decorations, and declined them with thanks. But from the standpoint of blood-purity, such a development was deeply regrettable. The nobility began to lose more and more of the racial qualities that were a condition of its very existence. In many cases, the term 'ignobility' would have been more appropriate.

10.7 INTERNATIONALIZATION THROUGH FINANCE

A serious state of economic decay occurred through the slow elimination of the right of private property, and the gradual transference of the whole economic structure into the hands of joint stock corporations.

Labor became, for the first time, degraded into an object of speculation at the hands of unscrupulous exploiters. The alientation of property ownership increased on a vast scale. The stock exchange began to triumph, making slow but sure progress in assuming control of the whole national life.

Before the war, the internationalization of the German economy had already begun, by way of stock issues. It's true that a section of the German industrialists made a determined effort to avert the danger. But in the end, they gave way before the united attacks of greedy finance-capital, which was assisted in this fight by its faithful henchmen in the Marxist movement.

The persistent war against German 'heavy industry' was the visible start of the internationalization of German economic life, as envisioned by the Marxists. This, however, couldn't be brought to a successful conclusion until Marxism's victory in the revolution. As I write these words, the general attack on the German state railways has succeeded, which are now

being handed over to international finance-capital.[4] Thus 'international' Social Democracy has once again achieved one of its main objectives.

The best evidence of how far this 'economization' of the German nation was able to go can be plainly seen in the fact that when the war was over, one of the leading captains of German industry and commerce stated that commerce as such was the only force that could put Germany on its feet again.[5] This sort of nonsense was uttered just at the time when France was restoring public education on a humanitarian basis, thus doing away with the idea that national life is dependent on commerce rather than ideal values. The statement broadcast by Stinnes to the world at that time caused incredible confusion. It was immediately adopted as a leading slogan by all the quacks and big-mouths—the 'statesmen' that destiny unleashed on Germany after the revolution.

10.8 GRAVEDIGGERS OF THE MONARCHY

One of the worst symptoms of decadence in Germany before the war was the ever-increasing habit of doing things halfway. This was one of the consequences of the general insecurity of the time, and can be attributed to a certain cowardice resulting from this and other causes. This disease was aggravated by the educational system.

German education in pre-war times had an extraordinary number of weaknesses. It was simply and exclusively limited to the production of pure 'knowledge,' and paid little attention to 'ability.' Still less attention was given to the development of individual character, insofar as this is ever possible. And hardly any attention at all was paid to the development of a

[4] Hitler refers to the Dawes Plan, named after Charles Dawes, vice president under Calvin Coolidge. Approved in early 1924, the plan was essentially a repayment schedule for the $33 billion debt that was forced on Germany after WWI. Germany's Weimar government accepted the plan in April, which involved initial annual payments of 1 billion Marks, rising to 2.5 billion within five years. The German railway system was allocated one-third of the total debt, which it could not pay, and thus the railway was sold to a private corporation. As Hitler says, the railway was literally "handed over" to international finance capital.

[5] The industrialist was Hugo Stinnes (1870-1924). Stinnes profited greatly during WWI, and also during Germany's hyperinflation, which had ended just prior to the time that Hitler wrote these words.

sense of responsibility, and to strengthening the will and the powers of decision. The result was to produce, not strong individuals, but mere 'know-it-alls'—as we Germans had come to be known before the war. The German was liked because he was useful; but he was little respected, due to a weakness of will. It is instructive to note that, among all nationalities, the Germans were the first to forgo their citizenship when they moved to a foreign country. The lovely saying, 'With hat in hand, one travels throughout the whole land,' says it all.

This kind of compliance turned out disastrous when it prescribed the exclusive way in which one could approach the monarch. One must never contradict him, and everything that he supports must be praised.

It was here that the frank expression of manly dignity, and not subservience, was most needed. Otherwise the monarchy would some day perish from all this groveling—and groveling it was, and nothing else! Only sycophants and grovelers—in short, all those decadents who are happy moving in the higher circles of royalty, rather than honest citizens—consider this the proper form of interaction! These exceedingly 'humble' creatures however, though they grovel before their master and bread-giver, invariably show the greatest arrogance towards other mortals. This was particularly impudent when they posed as the only people who had the right to be called 'monarchists.' Only these newly-ennobled or yet-to-be-ennobled tapeworms could be capable of such gross impertinence!

And it has always been just such people who were the gravediggers of the monarchy and the monarchical ideal. Nothing else is conceivable. When a man is prepared to stand up for a cause, come what may, he never grovels before its representative. A man who is serious about the preservation of an institution won't allow himself to be discouraged when the representatives of that institution show certain failings. And he certainly won't shout this to the world, as certain false democratic 'friends' of the monarchy have done. Rather, he will approach His Majesty, the bearer of the crown himself, to warn him of the seriousness of a situation, and persuade the monarch to act. But the man I am thinking of will deem it his duty to protect the monarchy against the monarch himself, no matter what personal risk he may run in doing so.

If the worth of the monarchical institution is dependent on the monarch himself, then it would be the worst institution imaginable. Only in rare cases are kings found to be models of wisdom and understanding, and integrity of character, as some like to claim. But this fact is unacceptable to the professional sycophants and grovelers. Yet all upright men—and they

are the most valuable of the nation—reject such nonsense. For such men, history is history and truth is truth, even where monarchs are concerned. No, the good luck to possess a great king who is also a great man is so rare that the people may be thankful if an adverse fate has not allotted the worst to them.

It's clear that the worth and significance of the monarchic ideal cannot rest in the person of the monarch alone, unless heaven decrees that the crown should rest on the head of a brilliant hero like Frederick the Great, or a wise one like Wilhelm I. This happens once in several centuries, but hardly more. The ideal of the monarchy takes precedence over the person of the monarch, inasmuch as the meaning of the institution must lie in the institution itself. Thus the monarch himself is but one whose duty it is to serve. He, too, is but a wheel in this machine, and thus is obliged to do his duty towards it. He has to adapt himself to the fulfilment of higher goals. The 'monarchist,' then, is one who does not let the ruler debase the institution; rather, he defends it. Otherwise it would be impossible to depose an insane ruler, if everything merely centered around the 'sacred' person.

10.9 'FIGHTERS FOR THE MONARCHY'

It's vital to insist upon this truth at the present time, because recently certain individuals have appeared again, who were largely responsible responsible for the collapse of the monarchy. With a certain amount of native impudence, these persons once again talk about 'their king'—which is to say, the man whom they shamefully deserted a few years ago, at a most critical hour. Those who fail to support this chorus of lies are summarily classified as bad Germans. They who make the charge are the same class of quitters who ran away in 1918 and began wearing red badges. They thought that discretion was the better part of valor. They were indifferent about what happened to the Kaiser. They hid themselves as peaceful 'citizens,' but more often than not they vanished altogether! All of a sudden, these champions of royalty were nowhere to be found.

Cautiously, one by one, these 'servants and counsellors' of the crown reappeared, to resume their lip-service to royalty—but only after others had borne the brunt of the anti-royalist attack and rode out the revolutionary storm. And now they are all back again, wistfully remembering the flesh-pots of Egypt and almost bursting with devotion for the royal cause. This will continue until the day when red badges are again in the ascendant.

Then this whole ramshackle assembly of royal worshippers will scatter again, like mice from cats!

If monarchs weren't themselves responsible for such things, one could almost sympathize with them. But they must realize that, with such champions, thrones can be lost but certainly never gained.

All this servility was a mistake, and was the result of our whole educational system, which in this case brought about a particularly severe retribution. As a result, these pathetic creatures maintained themselves at all the courts and gradually undermined the basis of the monarchy. When it finally began to totter, everyone vanished. Naturally; grovellers and lick-spittles are never willing to die for their masters. That monarchs never realize this, and almost on principle never really learn it, has always been their undoing.

10.10 COWARDICE IN THE FACE OF RESPONSIBILITY

One of the worst symptoms of decay was a growing cowardice in the face of responsibility, and the resulting weakness in dealing with problems of vital importance.

The starting point of this epidemic, however, was in our parliamentary institution, where irresponsibility is particularly cultivated. Unfortunately the disease slowly spread to all branches of everyday life, especially the sphere of public affairs. Responsibility was being shirked everywhere, and this led to insufficient or half-hearted measures being taken. Personal responsibility for each act was reduced to a minimum.

If we consider the attitude of various governments towards a whole series of really pernicious phenomena in public life, we will immediately recognize the fearful significance of this policy of half-measures and cowardice in the face of responsibility.

10.11 THREE GROUPS OF NEWSPAPER READERS

I will take only a few examples from the large number of existing cases:

In journalistic circles, they like to speak of the press as a 'great power' within the state. As a matter of fact, its importance is immense. One cannot easily overestimate it, for the press continues the work of adult education.

Generally, readers can be divided into three groups:

First, those who believe everything they read;

Second, those who no longer believe anything;

Third, those who critically examine what they read and form their judgments accordingly.

Numerically, the first group is by far the largest. It consists of the broad masses of the people, and therefore, intellectually, it forms the simplest part of the nation.

It cannot be classified according to occupation but only by grades of intelligence. Under this category fall all those who haven't been born to think for themselves or who haven't learned to do so, and who—partly through incompetence and partly through ignorance—believe everything they read. This group includes that type of lazy individual who, although capable of thinking for himself, absorbs what others have thought, assuming that they must have put some effort into it.

The influence of the press on all these people is therefore enormous; they are, after all, the broad masses of a nation. They aren't willing or able to personally sift through what is being served up to them, and so their whole attitude towards daily problems is almost solely the result of outside influence. All this can be advantageous where public enlightenment is provided by serious lovers of the truth, but is catastrophic when done at the hand of scoundrels and liars.

The second group is numerically smaller, being partly composed of those who were formerly in the first group, but after a series of bitter disappointments are now prepared to believe nothing of what they read. They hate all newspapers. Either they don't read them at all or they become very annoyed at their contents, which they hold to be nothing but lies and falsehoods. These people are difficult to handle; they will always be skeptical of the truth. Consequently, they are useless for any form of positive work.

The third group is easily the smallest. It's composed of real intellectuals, who have the natural aptitude and education to think for themselves. In all things, they try to form their own judgments, while at the same time carefully sifting through what they read. They won't read any newspaper without using their own intelligence to challenge the writer, and naturally this makes things difficult. Journalists 'appreciate' this type of reader only with a large degree of caution.

For members of this third group, the nonsense served up by the newspapers isn't very dangerous or even very important. In the majority of cases, these readers have learned to regard every journalist as fundamentally a rogue who only rarely speaks the truth. Unfortunately, the value of these readers lies in their intelligence and not in their numbers—a misfortune, in

a period where wisdom counts for nothing and majorities for everything! Nowadays, when the ballots of the masses are the deciding factor, the decision lies in the hands of the numerically strongest group—which is to say, the first group: the crowd of simpletons and the credulous.

10.12 STATE AND PRESS

It is an overriding interest of the state and nation to prevent these people from falling into the hands of bad, ignorant, or even vicious-minded teachers. Therefore it is the duty of the state to supervise their education and prevent every form of mischief. Particular attention should be paid to the press. Its influence on these people is by far the strongest and most penetrating of all, because its effect is not transitory but continual. Its immense significance lies in the uniform and persistent repetition of its teaching. Here, if anywhere, the state should never forget that all means should serve the same end. It must not be led astray by the drivel of so-called 'freedom of the press,' or be talked into neglecting its duty, and withholding from the nation that which is good and which does good. With ruthless determination, the state must keep control of this instrument of popular education and place it at the service of the state and the nation.

But what dish did that German press serve up to its readers, in pre-war days? Was it not the worst poison imaginable? Wasn't the worst form of pacifism injected into our people at a time when others were preparing, slowly but surely, to pounce upon Germany? Even in peacetime, didn't this self-same press of ours already instill into the public mind a doubt as to the sovereign rights of the state itself, thereby limiting its means of defense? Wasn't it the German press that understood how to make all this nonsense about 'western democracy' palatable to our people, until an enthusiastic public was eventually prepared to entrust its future to the League of Nations? Wasn't this press responsible for promoting moral decay? Weren't morals and public decency made to look ridiculous and old-fashioned, until our people finally became 'modern'? By means of persistent attacks, didn't the press continue to undermine the authority of the state, until a single blow sufficed to bring this institution down? Didn't the press oppose with all its might every movement to give the state that which belongs to the state? Didn't it continually criticize the military, thus injuring its reputation, sabotage the draft, demand refusal of military credits, etc., until the result was inevitable?

CHAPTER 10

10.13 JEWISH PRESS TACTICS

The function of the so-called liberal press was to dig a grave for the German people and the German Reich. We need not mention the lying papers of the Marxist press; for them, lying is as much a vital necessity as the mouse is to a cat. Their sole task is to break the national backbone of the people, thus preparing the nation to become the slaves of international capital and its masters, the Jews.

And what did the state do to counteract this mass poisoning of the nation? Nothing, absolutely nothing at all! A few silly decrees, a few fines for criminality, and that was it. By this policy, they hoped to win the favor of this plague by means of flattery, with a recognition of the 'value' of the press, its 'importance,' its 'educational mission,' and similar nonsense. The Jews acknowledged all this with a knowing smile and a sly thanks.

The reason for this disgraceful failure on the part of the state lay not so much in its refusal to realize the danger, as in the cowardly way of meeting the situation through half-hearted decisions and measures. No one one had the courage to employ any thoroughly radical methods. Everyone piddled around with halfway prescriptions. Thus, instead of striking at its heart, they only irritated the viper. The result was that not only did everything remain the same, but the power of the institutions that should have been combated grew stronger year by year.

The government's defense in those days, against a mainly Jewish-controlled press that was slowly corrupting the nation, followed no definite line of action; it was lacking in resolve and, above all, had no fixed goal in view. This is where official understanding of the situation completely failed: in estimating the importance of the struggle, in choosing the means, and in deciding on a definite plan. They merely tinkered with the problem. Occasionally, when bitten, they imprisoned a journalistic viper for a few weeks or months, but the whole snakes' nest was allowed to carry on unmolested.

10.14 THE 'RESPECTABLE' PRESS

It must be admitted that all this was the result of, on the one hand, extraordinarily crafty tactics on the part of Jewry, and on the other, an obviously official stupidity or naïveté. The Jew was too clever to allow a simultaneous attack on the whole of his press. No: one section served as cover for the other.

In the most despicable manner possible, the Marxist newspapers reviled everything that was sacred, furiously attacking the state and government and inciting certain classes of the community against each other. At the same time, the Jewish bourgeois-democratic papers knew how to camouflage themselves as models of objectivity. They studiously avoided harsh language, knowing well that blockheads can only judge external appearances and never penetrate to the real depth and meaning of anything. They measure the worth of something by its exterior and not its content. The press owes its esteem to this human frailty.

For these people, the *Frankfurter Zeitung* was the essence of respectability. It always carefully avoided coarse language. It rejected the use of every form of physical force, and persistently appealed to the nobility of fighting with 'intellectual' weapons—an idea that was, curiously enough, most popular with the least intellectual classes. This is one of the results of our half-education, which turns people away from the instinct of nature, and pumps them with a certain amount of knowledge without being able to create a complete understanding. To this end, diligence and good will are useless; it requires a necessary, inborn intelligence.

Man must never fall into the insanity of thinking that he was meant to become lord and master of nature, which a half-education has helped to encourage. Man must realize the fundamental necessity of nature's rule, and realize that his existence is subject to the law of eternal strift and upward struggle. He will then feel that there cannot be a separate law for mankind in a universe in which planets orbit suns, moons orbit planets, and where the strong are always the masters of the weak—subjecting them to such laws, or crushing them. Man must submit to the eternal principles of this supreme wisdom. He may try to understand them, but he can never free himself from their sway.

It's for just such intellectual hedonists that the Jew writes his so-called intellectual press. The *Frankfurter Zeitung* and *Berliner Tageblatt* are written for them; the tone is adapted to them, and it is on them that such papers have an influence. While studiously avoiding all crude forms of expression, poison is injected from other vials into the hearts of the readers. The effervescent tone and the fine phraseology lull the readers into believing that a love for knowledge and moral principle is the sole driving force of such papers—whereas in reality these features represent a cunning way of disarming any opposition that might be directed against the press.

They make such a parade of respectability that the soft-headed readers are all the more ready to believe that the papers' excesses are only of a mild nature, and insufficient to warrant legal action being taken against them. Such

action, they say, would lead to a violation of press freedom—a euphemism for lying to and poisoning the people. Hence the authorities are very slow to take any steps against these bandits for fear of immediately alienating the 'respectable' press—a fear that's all too well grounded. The moment any attempt is made to proceed against a member of the gutter press, all the others rush to its assistance—not to support its policy, God forbid, but simply and solely to defend the principle of freedom of the press and of public opinion. This outcry will succeed in cowering even the staunchest critic, because it comes from the mouths of the 'respectable' papers.

And so this poison was allowed to enter the national bloodstream and infect public life without the government taking any action to control the disease. The ridiculous half-measures that were taken were, in themselves, are proof of a decay that was already threatening to break-up the Reich. An institution practically surrenders its existence when it no longer has the resolve to defend itself with all available weapons. Every half-measure is the outward expression of an inner process of decay, one that must eventually lead to an external collapse.

I believe that our present generation could easily master this danger, if they were rightly led. It has gone through certain experiences that surely strengthened the nerves of all those who didn't lose them completely. In days to come, the Jew will surely raise a tremendous cry in his newspapers, if a hand is laid on his favorite nest, if a move is made to end this press mischief, and if this tool of education is brought under state control and no longer left in the hands of aliens and enemies of the people. I believe that this will be easier for us than it was for our fathers. A 30-cm shell hisses louder than a thousand Jewish newspaper vipers—so let them hiss!

10.15 SYPHILIS

A further example of the weak and half-hearted way in which vital national problems were dealt with in pre-war Germany is the following: Parallel to the political, ethical, and moral infection of the nation has been, for many years, an equally virulent process of poisoning the public health. Particularly in large cities, syphilis has steadily increased, and tuberculosis has steadily reaped its harvest of death in almost every part of the country.

Although in both cases the effect on the nation was alarming, it seemed as if no one was able to undertake any decisive measures against these scourges.

In the case of syphilis especially, the attitude of state and governmental leaders was one of absolute capitulation. To combat it, something far more sweeping was required. The discovery of a questionable remedy, and its commercial exploitation, were only of little assistance in fighting this plague. Here again, the only correct course is to attack the disease in its causes rather than its symptoms. The cause lies mainly in the prostitution of love. Even if it didn't directly bring about this frightful plague, it would still be deeply harmful to the people; the moral havoc resulting from this degeneracy would be sufficient to bring about the destruction of the nation, slowly but surely.

This Judaizing of our spiritual life and mammonizing of our mating instinct will sooner or later ruin our future offspring. The vigorous children of a natural, emotional bond will be replaced by miserable specimens of financial expediency. Economic considerations are more and more becoming the basis and sole prerequisite for marriage. And love must then find its outlet somewhere else.

Here, as elsewhere, one may defy Nature for a certain period of time; but sooner or later she will take her revenge. And when we realize this truth, it's often too late.

Our own nobility offers an example of the devastating consequences that follow from a persistent refusal to recognize the natural requirements for marriage. Here we have before us the results of those reproductive habits that, on the one hand, are determined by social pressure and, on the other, by financial considerations. The one leads to inherited weaknesses, and the other to poisoning of the blood. Just consider how every department store Jewess is viewed as an eligible mate for our royalty—and indeed, it shows. All this leads to absolute degeneration.

Today our bourgeoisie strive to follow the same path; they will come to the same end.

These unpleasant truths are hastily and nonchalantly brushed aside, as if by so doing the truth could be abolished. No: it can't be denied that our urban populations are tending more and more toward a prostituted love-life, and are thus becoming more and more contaminated by the scourge of syphilis. It simply is true. The most visible effects of this mass contamination can be seen, on the one hand, in our insane asylums and, on the other, unfortunately, in our children. They are the sad product of this steadily growing contamination of our sexual life; in their sicknesses, the children reveal the vices of their parents.

There are many ways of reconciling oneself to this unpleasant and terrible fact. Many people go about seeing nothing at all or, more precisely,

not wanting to see anything. This is by far the simplest and easiest 'opinion.' Others cover themselves in the sacred mantle of prudery, as absurd as it is hypocritical. They describe the whole situation as sinful, and are profoundly indignant when brought face to face with a victim. They close their eyes in pious horror to this godless scourge, and pray to God that he might rain down fire and brimstone on this whole Sodom and Gomorrah—if possible, after their deaths. In doing so, God should once again make an instructive example of this shameless humanity. A third group, finally, are well aware of the terrible results that this scourge inevitably brings about, but they merely shrug their shoulders, fully convinced that nothing can be done against this danger. Hence the only thing to do is let matters take their own course.

10.16 THE SIN AGAINST BLOOD AND RACE

Undoubtedly all this is very convenient and simple, but it must not be forgotten that a nation can fall victim to such convenience. The excuse that other nations are also faring poorly doesn't change the fact of our own deterioration, except that feelings of sympathy for others makes our own suffering easier to bear.

But the important question, then, is this: Which nation will be the first to take the initiative in mastering this plague, and which nations will succumb to it? This is the crux of the whole situation. Here again we see the touchstone of racial value: the race that cannot withstand the test will simply die out, making room for healthier, tougher, or more resistant races. Because this question primarily concerns future generations, it is one of those cases where, with terrible justification, the sins of the fathers are visited upon their children, unto the tenth generation—a truism, but one that applies only to a desecration of blood and race.

The sin against blood and race is the original sin in this world. It brings an end to every nation that commits it.

The attitude towards this one vital problem in pre-war Germany was most regrettable. What measures were taken to halt the infection of our youth in the large cities? What was done to put an end to the contamination and mammonization of our love lives? What was done to fight the resultant syphilization of our national body?

The answer to this question can best be illustrated by showing what should have been done.

Instead of taking this problem lightly, the authorities should have realized that the fortunes or misfortunes of future generations depended on its solution. Yes—it would be decisive for the entire future of our people. But to admit this would have required ruthless measures and surgical operations. What was needed, first of all, was that the attention of entire country be concentrated on this terrible danger, so that everyone would realize the importance of fighting against it. It would be futile to impose definitive and often unbearable obligations, and to expect them to be effective, unless the public were thoroughly instructed on the need for such obligations. But this demands a widespread and systematic method of enlightenment, one that excludes any other daily problems that might distract the public's attention.

In every case where apparently impossible demands are involved, the entire public attention must be focused on this one question, as though its solution were a matter of life or death. Only in this way can the public be compelled to join in a great voluntary effort, and to achieve important results.

This principle applies also to the individual man, provided he wants to achieve some great end. He must always concentrate his efforts on one definitely limited stage of his progress, which has to be completed before the next step is attempted. Those who don't attempt to realize their aims step by step, and who don't concentrate their energy in reaching the individual stages, will never attain the final objective. At some point along the road, they will falter and fail. This systematic way of approaching an objective is an art in itself, and always calls for expending every ounce of energy in order to conquer the road, step by step.

Therefore the most essential prerequisite for an attack on such a difficult stage of the pathway of humanity is that the authorities must succeed in convincing the masses that the immediate objective that is now being sought is the only one that deserves to be considered, and the only one on which everything depends. The broad masses are never able to clearly see the whole stretch of road ahead without becoming tired and thus losing faith in their ability to complete the task. A certain number will keep the objective in mind, but they are only able to survey the road in small stages, as in the case of the traveller who knows where his journey will end but who tackles the endless stretch far better by attacking it in degrees. This is the only way can he advance without losing enthusiasm.

CHAPTER 10

10.17 THE TASK OF COMBATING SYPHILIS

In this way, with the assistance of every form of propaganda, the problem of fighting syphilis should have been placed before the public—not as *a* task, but as the *main* task. Every possible means should have been employed to bring this truth to the minds of the people, until the whole nation has been convinced that everything depends on the solution to this problem; which is to say, a healthy future or national decay.

Only after such preparatory measures—spread over a period of many years, if necessary—will the public be fully aroused, and only then can serious and definite measures be taken. We could then do so without the risk of being misunderstood, or of being suddenly faced with a slackening of the public will.

It must be made clear to all that a serious fight against this plague calls for tremendous sacrifices and an enormous amount of work.

A war against syphilis means fighting against prostitution, against prejudice, against old-established customs, against current fashion, public opinion, and last but not least, against a false prudery in certain circles.

The first prerequisite to be fulfilled before the state can claim a moral right to fight against all these things is the facilitation of earlier marriages for the coming generations. Whatever way we view it, late marriages have the sanction of a custom that is, and will remain, a disgrace to humanity. It's a cursed institution, ill-suited to a being who likes to regard himself as in the 'image' of God.

Prostitution is a disgrace to humanity, and cannot be removed simply by moralistic lectures, good intentions, etc. Its restriction and final elimination presupposes the removal of a whole series of contributory circumstances. The first remedy must always be to establish such conditions as will make early marriages possible, especially for young men—women are, after all, only passive subjects in this matter.

An illustration of the extent to which people have so often been led astray nowadays is shown by the fact that one often hears mothers in so-called 'good' society openly expressing their satisfaction at having found their daughter a man who has 'sown his wild oats,' etc. As there is no shortage of such men, the poor girl will be happy with one of these de-horned Siegfrieds, and the children will be a visible result of such supposedly sensible unions.

When one realizes that, apart from this, every possible effort is being made to hinder the process of procreation and that Nature is being wilfully

cheated of her rights, there remains really only one question: Why does such an institution still exist, and what purpose does it serve? Isn't it little better than prostitution? Doesn't our duty to posterity play a part any more? Or don't people realize the curse they are inflicting on themselves and their offspring by such criminally foolish neglect of one of the primary laws of nature?

This is how civilized nations degenerate and gradually perish.

Marriage is not an end in itself, but must serve a higher goal, which is to increase and maintain the species and race. This is its only meaning and purpose.

This being the case, it's clear that the institution of marriage must be judged by the manner in which it fulfills its function. Therefore early marriages should be the rule, because only the young couple will still have the strength necessary for raising healthy offspring. Of course, early marriages cannot be made the rule without a whole series of social changes; otherwise a policy of early marriages cannot even be contemplated. In other words, a solution of this seemingly small question cannot occur without decisive social measures. Their importance should be clear, especially when the so-called 'social' Republic has shown itself unable to solve the housing problem, and thus has made it impossible for innumerable couples to get married. That only furthers the advance of prostitution.

Another reason why early marriages are impossible is our absurd method of regulating the scale of salaries, which pays far too little attention to the problem of family support.

Prostitution, therefore, can only be seriously tackled if, by means of a radical social reform, early marriage is made easier than at present. This is the first preliminary requirement for the solution of this problem.

10.18 SOUND MIND ONLY IN SOUND BODY

Secondly, a whole series of evils must be eradicated through education and training—things that no one has yet worried about. First of all, our present educational system must establish a balance between mental instruction and physical training. The institution known today as *Gymnasium* is a positive insult to the Greek model. Our system of education entirely loses sight of the fact that, in the long run, a healthy mind can exist only in a healthy body. This statement, with few exceptions, applies particularly to the broad masses of the nation.

In pre-war Germany, there was a time when no one took the trouble to think over this truth. Training of the body was criminally neglected, and the one-sided training of 'the mind' was regarded as a sufficient guarantee for the nation's greatness. This mistake showed its effects sooner than anticipated. It's no accident that Bolshevik teaching flourishes in those regions whose population has been degenerated by hunger: in central Germany, Saxony, and the Ruhr Valley. In all these districts there is a marked absence of any serious resistance, even by the so-called intellectual classes, against this Jewish disease. And the simple reason is that the intellectual classes are themselves physically degenerate—not through privation, but through education. The exclusive intellectualism of education among our upper classes makes them incapable of defending themselves, let alone making their way in life. In nearly every case, physical weakness is the forerunner of personal cowardice.

The extreme emphasis on purely intellectual education, and the consequent neglect of physical training, necessarily leads to sexual thoughts in early youth. Those youth whose constitutions have been trained and hardened by sports and gymnastics are less prone to sexual indulgence than those stay-at-homes who have been fed exclusively with intellectual fare. A sensible system of education must bear this in mind. We must not forget that a healthy young man will have different expectations from a woman than those of a weakling who has been prematurely corrupted.

Thus, in every branch of our education, the daily curriculum must occupy a boy's free time in useful development of his physical powers. He has no right in those years to loaf about, becoming a nuisance in public streets and cinemas. But when his day's work is done, he should harden his young body so that he will not become soft later in life. To prepare for this, and to carry it out, should be the function of our educational system, and not exclusively to pump in so-called wisdom. Our school system must also rid itself of the notion that bodily training is best left to the individual himself. There is no such thing as freedom to sin against posterity, and thus against the race.

10.19 THE FIGHT AGAINST SPIRITUAL POISONING

The fight against the poisoning of the mind must be waged simultaneously with the training of the body. Our whole public life today may be compared to a hothouse for sexual ideas and incitements. A glance

at the bill-of-fare provided by our cinemas, playhouses, and theaters suffices to prove that this is not the right food, especially for our youth. In shop windows and advertisements, the most vulgar means are used to attract public attention. Anyone who hasn't completely lost contact with adolescent yearnings will realize that all this must cause great damage. This seductive and sensual atmosphere puts ideas into the heads of our youth that, at their age, should still be unknown to them.

Unfortunately, the results of this kind of education can best be seen in our contemporary youth. They mature too early and are therefore old before their time. The law courts occasionally throw a distressing light on the spiritual life of our 14- and 15-year-olds. Who, then, will be surprised to learn that syphilis claims its victims already at this age? And isn't it deplorable to see the number of physically weak and intellectually spoiled young men, who have been introduced to the rites of marriage by the big-city whores?

No; those who wish to seriously combat prostitution must first assist in removing its spiritual basis. They will have to ruthlessly clean up the moral plague of our city 'culture,' and do so without regard for the outcry that will follow. If we don't lift our youth out of the morass of their present environment, they will drown in it. Those who refuse to see these things are deliberately encouraging them, and thus are guilty of spreading the effects of prostitution to the future—since the future belongs to the coming generation. This process of cleansing our culture must be applied in practically all spheres. Theater, art, literature, the cinema, the press, and advertisements, all must remove the stains of our rotting world and be placed in the service of a moral, political, and cultural idea. Public life must be freed from the asphyxiating perfume of our modern eroticism, as well as from all unmanly and prudish hypocrisy. In all these things, the aim and the method must be determined by thoughtful consideration for the preservation of our national well-being in body and soul. The right to personal freedom falls behind the duty of maintaining the race.

Only after such measures have been put into practice can a medical campaign against this plague begin with some hope of success. But here again, half-measures are worthless. Far-reaching and important decisions must be made. It's a half-measure if incurables are given the opportunity of infecting one healthy person after another. This would be that kind of humanitarianism that allows a hundred to perish in order to avoid hurting one individual.

The demand that defective people be prevented from producing defective offspring is one that's based on the most reasonable grounds, and its proper fulfillment is the most humane act of mankind. Unhappy and

undeserved suffering of millions will be spared, with the result that there will be a gradual improvement in national health. A determination to act in this way will at the same time provide an obstacle against the further spread of venereal disease. It would then be a case, where necessary, of mercilessly isolating all incurables—a barbaric measure for those unfortunates, but a blessing for the present generation and for posterity. The temporary pain experienced in this century can and will spare millennia from suffering.

The fight against syphilis, and the prostitution that paves its way, is one of the gigantic tasks of humanity. It's not merely a case of solving a single problem but the removal of a whole series of evils that are the contributory causes of this plague. Disease of the body in this case is merely the result of a sickening of the moral, social, and racial instincts.

But if, for reasons of laziness or cowardice, this battle isn't fought to the finish, we can imagine what conditions will be like in 500 years. Little of God's image will be left in human nature, except to mock the Creator.

10.20 THE 'PROTECTION CLAUSE'

But what was done in old Germany to counteract this plague? If we think calmly about it, the answer is distressing. It's true that in governmental circles, the terrible and injurious effects of this disease were well known, even though they didn't consider the consequences. But the counter-measures that were officially adopted were ineffective and a hopeless failure. They tinkered with cures for the symptoms, and completely neglected the cause of the disease. Prostitutes were medically examined and controlled as far as possible, and when signs of infection were apparent, they were sent to a hospital. But when outwardly cured, they were once more let loose on humanity.

It's true that a 'protective clause' was introduced that made sexual intercourse a punishable offence for all those not completely cured, or those suffering from a disease. This legislation was correct in theory, but in practice it failed completely. In the first place, in the majority of cases, women will decline to appear in court as witnesses against men who have robbed them of their health. She, especially, has little to gain from it. In most cases, she will be the one to suffer the most; women would be far more exposed than men to uncharitable remarks. And one can only imagine what the situation would be if a woman was infected by her own husband! Should she lay charges against him? Or what should she do?

In the case of the man, there is the additional fact that he frequently is unfortunate enough to run up against this plague when he is under the influence of alcohol. His condition makes it impossible for him to assess the qualities of his 'beauty'—a fact that's well known to every diseased prostitute, and makes them single out men in this ideal condition for preference. The result is that the unfortunate man isn't able to later recall who his compassionate benefactress was, which isn't surprising in cities like Berlin and Munich. Many such cases are visitors from the provinces, who are held speechless and enthralled by the magic charm of city life.

In the final analysis, who is able to say whether he has been infected or not? Are there not innumerable cases on record where an apparently cured person has a relapse and does untold harm without knowing it?

Therefore, in practice, the results of these legislative measures are almost nothing. The same applies to the control of prostitution; and finally, even the medical treatment and cure are nowadays unsafe and doubtful. Only one thing is certain. The plague has spread further and further despite all measures, and this alone suffices to prove their ineffectiveness.

Everything else that was done was as inefficient as it was absurd. The spiritual prostitution of the people wasn't prevented; or rather, virtually nothing was done at all.

Those who don't regard this subject as a serious one would do well to examine the statistical data of the spread of this disease, study its growth in the last century, and then contemplate its further development. The ordinary observer, unless he were particularly stupid, would experience a cold shudder running down his back!

The half-hearted and wavering attitude adopted in old Germany towards this terrible phenomenon can assuredly be taken as a visible sign of national decay. When the courage to fight for one's own health is no longer in evidence, then the right to live in this world of struggle also ceases. This world belongs only to the forceful 'wholes,' and not to the weak 'halves.'

10.21 THE BOLSHEVIZATION OF ART

One of the most visible signs of decay in the old Reich was the slow decline of the cultural level. But by 'culture' I don't mean that which is nowadays designated as 'civilization,' which, on the contrary, may rather be regarded as inimical to a truly elevated standard of thinking and living.

CHAPTER 10

At the turn of the last century, a new artistic element began to make its appearance in our world. It was something that had been previously unknown and foreign to us. In former times, there were certainly offences against good taste; but these were mostly departures from the orthodox canons of art, and posterity could recognize a certain historical value in them. But the new products showed signs, not only of artistic aberration but of a destructive spiritual degeneration. Here, in the cultural sphere, the signs of the coming political collapse first became apparent.

The Bolshevization of art is the only cultural life-form, and the only spiritual manifestation, that Bolshevism is capable of.

Anyone to whom this statement may appear strange need only take a glance at those lucky Bolshevized states and, to his horror, he will there recognize those morbid monstrosities that have been produced by insane and degenerate men. All those artistic aberrations that are classified under the names of cubism and Dadaism,[6] since the turn of the century, are manifestations of art that have come to be officially recognized by the state itself. This phenomenon made its appearance even during the short-lived period of the Soviet Republic in Bavaria. Even here it was clear that all the official posters, propagandist drawings in newspapers, etc., showed signs not only of political but also of cultural decay.

About 60 years ago, a political collapse such as we are experiencing today would have been just as inconceivable as the cultural decline that was manifested in futurist and cubist works since 1900. Sixty years ago, an exhibition of so-called Dadaistic 'experiences' would have been an absolutely preposterous idea. The organizers of such an exhibition would then have been tossed into a madhouse, whereas today they are appointed presidents of art societies. At that time, such a plague would never have been allowed to spread. Public opinion wouldn't have tolerated it, and the government wouldn't have remained silent; for it is the duty of a government to save its people from being stampeded into such intellectual madness. But this would have been the inevitable result of this kind of art. It would have marked one of the worst changes in human history; for it would have meant that a retrogressive process had begun to take place in the human brain—of which the final stages would be unthinkable.

[6] Dada and cubism were iconoclastic and anti-classical schools of art that appeared in the early 20th century. Dadaism in particularly was heavily influenced by Jewish artists; see Sanderson (2011). Among the more prominent of these was Marc Chagall.

If we study the course of our cultural life during the last 25 years, we will be astonished to note how far we have already gone in this process of regression. Everywhere we find the presence of those germs that give rise to tumorous growths that must sooner or later bring about the ruin of our culture. Here we find undoubted symptoms of a slowly decaying world. And woe to the nations that are no longer able to master this disease!

Such diseases could be seen in almost every field of German art and culture. Here everything seems to have passed the peak of its excellence and now is rushing toward the abyss. At the beginning of the century, the theater seemed already degenerating and ceasing to be a cultural factor—except the Court theaters, which opposed this prostitution of the national art. Apart from these exceptions, and also a few other decent institutions, the plays produced on the stage were of such a nature that the people would have benefited by not visiting them at all. It was a sad symptom of decline that the youth could no longer visit most of these so-called 'art centers'—a fact that was shamelessly admitted by the frequently-seen warning: "Youth Not Admitted!"

10.22 VILIFICATION OF A GREAT PAST

Bear in mind that these precautions had to be taken in regard to institutions whose main purpose should have been to promote the education of the youth, and not merely to provide entertainment for sophisticated adults. What would the great dramatists of other times have said of such measures, and above all, of the conditions that made these measures necessary? How Schiller would have been enflamed, and how Goethe would have turned away in disgust!

But what are Schiller, Goethe, or Shakespeare when compared with the heroes of our modern German literature! Old, worn-out, and outmoded—nay, obsolete. For it was typical of this epoch that not only were its own products bad, but in the process it reviled everything that was truly great in the past. This phenomenon is very characteristic of such epochs. The more vile and miserable are the men and products, the more they will hate and denigrate the ideal achievements of former generations. What these people would like best is to completely destroy every vestige of the past, so that, by excluding the standard of comparison, their own kitsch could be looked upon as 'art.'

Hence every new institution, however wretched and miserable it is, will try all the harder to erase the traces of the past. But any real innovation that's

for the benefit of humanity can always face comparison with the best of the past; and frequently it happens that those accomplishments of past generations guarantee the acceptance of modern productions. There is no fear that modern works of real value will look pale and worthless beside the monuments of the past. That which is contributed to the general store of human culture often fulfills a necessary role, in order to keep the memory of old achievements alive, because this memory alone is the standard whereby our own works are properly appreciated. Only those who have nothing of value to give to the world, but would rather give it God-knows-what, will hate everything that already exists, and would like to negate or destroy it completely.

And this truth holds good not only for new cultural phenomena but also in politics. The more inferior new revolutionary movements are, the more they will try to denigrate the old forms. Here again the desire to pawn off their kitsch as great and original achievements leads them into a blind hatred of the superior work of the past. As long as the historical memory of Frederick the Great, for instance, still lives, Frederick Ebert can arouse nothing but limited amazement. The relation of the hero of Sans Souci to the former bartender of Bremen may be compared to that of the sun to the moon; for the moon can shine only after the sun has cast off its rays. Thus we can readily understand why all the new moons in human history have hated the permanent stars.

In politics, if fate should happen to temporarily place the power to rule in the hands of those non-entities, they are eager not only to defile and besmirch the past, but at the same time will use all means to evade criticism of their own acts. The law for the protection of the Republic, which the new German state enacted, may be taken as one example of this.

One has good grounds to be suspicious of any new idea, any doctrine, any new worldview, or any political or economical movement, that tries to deny everything that the past has produced, or to present it as inferior and worthless. In general, the reason for such hatred is either its own inferiority or an evil intention. Any renovation that's truly beneficial to human progress will always have to begin its constructive work where the last stones have been laid. It need not be ashamed of using those pre-existing truths. All of human culture, as well as man himself, is only the result of one long line of development, where each generation has contributed but one stone to the building of the whole structure. The meaning and purpose of revolutions cannot be to tear down the whole building, but to take away that which is bad or unsuitable, and to continue building on the space that has been laid bare.

Thus alone is it possible to talk of human progress. Otherwise the world would never be free of chaos, since each generation would feel entitled to reject the past and to destroy all its works, as the necessary prerequisite to any new work of its own.

10.23 SPIRITUAL PREPARATION FOR BOLSHEVISM

The saddest feature of our whole pre-war culture was not only that it was barren of any cultural or artistic creative force, but the hatred with which the memory of the greater past was besmirched and effaced. Around the end of the last century, people were less interested in producing new significant works of their own—particularly in the fields of dramatic art and literature—than in defaming the best works of the past, and in presenting them as inferior and outdated: as if this period of disgraceful decadence had the capacity to produce anything of superior quality.

Efforts to conceal the past from the eyes of the present afforded clear evidence of the fact that these apostles of the future acted from an evil intent. These signs should have made it clear to all that it wasn't a question of new, though wrong, cultural ideas, but of a process of destroying all culture. It threw the healthy artistic feeling into utter confusion, thus spiritually preparing the way for political Bolshevism. If the creative spirit of the Periclean age is manifested in the Parthenon, then the Bolshevist era is manifested through a cubist monstrosity.

In this connection, attention must be drawn once again to the lack of courage displayed by one section of our people, namely, by those who, in virtue of their education and position, should have been obligated to resist this cultural disgrace. But they failed to offer serious resistance, and surrendered to what they considered the inevitable. This abdication was due to a fear of the ruckus that would be raised by the apostles of Bolshevist art, who viciously attacked anyone not ready to acknowledge them as the crown of creation, and who strangled all opposition by calling it philistine and backward. People trembled in fear, lest these half-wits and swindlers accuse them of lacking in artistic appreciation—as if it were some disgrace not to understand the effusions of those spiritual degenerates and slimy swindlers.

These cultural disciples, however, had a very simple way of presenting their own nonsense as works of the highest quality. They offered incomprehensible and manifestly crazy stuff to their amazed contemporaries

as a so-called inner experience. Thus they forestalled all negative criticism at very little cost. Of course nobody ever doubted that there could have been inner experiences like that; the doubt was regarding the justification for exposing these hallucinations of lunatics and criminals to healthy human society. The works produced by a Moritz von Schwind or a Böcklin were also an inner experience, but these were the experiences of divinely gifted artists and not of buffoons.[7]

This situation offered a good opportunity to study the miserable cowardliness of our so-called intellectuals, who shirked the duty of resisting the poisoning of the healthy instincts of our people. They left it to the people themselves to deal with this impudent nonsense. Lest they be considered as understanding nothing of art, the people accepted every mockery of art, until they finally lost the power to judge what is truly good or bad. All in all, there were plenty of signs that times were getting very bad.

10.24 MODERN MASSES OF HUMANITY

Still another critical symptom has to be considered.

In the course of the 19th century, our towns and cities began to lose their character as centers of civilization, and became more and more centers of habitation. In our great modern cities, the proletarian man doesn't show much attachment to the place where he lives. This feeling results from the fact that his town is nothing but an accidental abode. The feeling is also partly due to the frequent change of residence that's forced upon him by social conditions; there's no time to form a bond to the place in which he lives. And yet another reason lies in the cultural barrenness and superficiality of our present-day cities.

At the time of the Wars of Liberation,[8] our German towns and cities were not only small in number but also very modest in size. The few that could be called great cities were mostly the residential cities of princes; as such, they almost always had a definite cultural value and cultural aspect. Those few towns of more than 50,000 inhabitants were, in comparison with modern cities of the same size, rich in scientific and artistic treasures. At

[7] Von Schwind (1804-1871) was an Austrian painter who spent much of his career in Munich. Arnold Böcklin (1827-1901) was a Swiss painter in the classic style.

[8] Circa 1813.

the time when Munich had not more than 60,000 souls, it was already well on the way to become one of the first German centers of art. Nowadays almost every industrial town has a population at least as large as that, without having anything of real value to call its own. They are masses of tenement houses and apartments, and nothing more. It's a mystery how anyone could grow sentimentally attached to such a meaningless place. No one can bond to a place that offers no more than any other place would offer, that has no character of its own, and where pains have obviously been taken to avoid everything that might have any resemblance to an artistic appearance.

But that's not all. Even great cities become more barren of real works of art the more they increase in population. They assume more and more a neutral atmosphere, and present the same aspect, though on a larger scale, as the poor little factory towns. Everything that our modern age has contributed to the civilization of our great cities is absolutely deficient. All our cities are living on the glory and the treasures of the past. If we take away from the Munich of today everything that was created under Ludwig I, we would be horror-stricken to see how meager has been the output of important artistic creations since that time.[9] One could say the same of Berlin and most of our other great cities.

But the following is the essential point: Our great modern cities have no outstanding monuments that dominate the city, ones that could be pointed to as symbols of a whole epoch. Yet almost every ancient town had a monument erected to its glory. It wasn't in private dwellings that the characteristic art of ancient cities was displayed, but in the public monuments, which were not meant to have a transitory interest but an enduring one. And this was because they didn't represent the wealth of some individual citizen, but rather the greatness and wealth of the community. Thus it was that those monuments arose that bound the individual inhabitants to their own town in a way that's almost incomprehensible to us today. What struck the eye of the ancient citizen wasn't a number of mediocre private buildings, but imposing structures that belonged to the whole community. Compared to them, private dwellings were of only very secondary importance.

When we compare the size of those ancient public buildings with that of the private dwellings, then we can understand the great importance that was given to the principle that communal works should take precedence

[9] Ludwig I, King of Bavaria (1786-1868), made Munich a major art center during the time of his rule, from 1825 to 1848.

over all others. What we today admire in the ruins of the ancient world aren't the former commercial palaces but rather temples and public structures. The community itself was the owner of those great works. Even in the pomp of late Rome, it wasn't the villas and palaces of some citizens that filled the most prominent place but rather the temples and the baths, the stadiums, the circuses, the aqueducts, the basilicas, etc., which belonged to the state, and therefore to the whole people.

In medieval Germany the same principle held sway, although the artistic outlook was quite different. In ancient times, that which found its expression in the Acropolis or the Pantheon was now cloaked in the forms of the Gothic cathedral. These monumental structures towered gigantically above the swarm of smaller buildings, with their framework walls of wood and brick. And they remain the dominant feature of these cities even today, although they are becoming more and more obscured by apartment buildings. They determine the character and appearance of the town. Cathedrals, city halls, corn exchanges, and defense towers are the outward expression of an idea that's based in the ancient world.

And how deplorable has the relationship become today between our state and private buildings! If a similar fate should befall Berlin as did Rome, future generations might gaze upon the ruins of some Jewish department stores or corporate hotels and think that these were the characteristic expressions of the culture of our time. In Berlin itself, just compare the shameful disproportion between the buildings of the Reich and those of trade and finance.

Funding for public buildings are, in most cases, inadequate and ridiculous. They aren't built for eternity, but mostly for responding to the need of the moment. No higher idea influenced such buildings. When the Berlin Palace was built, it had a quite different significance from what the new library has for our time. One battleship alone represents an expenditure of about 60 million marks, whereas less than half that sum was allotted for the building of the Reichstag—which is the most imposing structure erected for the Reich, and which should have been built to last for ages. Yet, when the question of internal decoration arose, the Upper House voted against the use of stone and ordered that the walls should be covered with stucco. For once, however, the parliamentarians made an appropriate decision; plaster heads would be out of place within stone walls.

The community per se is not the dominant characteristic of our contemporary cities, and therefore it's no surprise that the community finds itself architecturally underrepresented. Thus we must eventually arrive at

a state of desolation—with the practical effect that the individual citizen is totally indifferent to the fate of his city.

This too is a sign of our cultural decay and general collapse. Our era is entirely preoccupied with pointless little things, or rather, with the service of money. Therefore it's little wonder that, with the worship of such an idol, a sense of heroism entirely disappears. But the present is only reaping what the past has sown.

10.25 RELIGIOUS CONDITIONS

All these symptoms of decay must be attributed to the lack of a definite and uniformly accepted worldview, and the subsequent general uncertainty of attitude toward the great questions of the time. This accounts for the habit of doing everything half-way, beginning with the educational system, the reluctance to undertake responsibilities, and finally, the cowardly tolerance of recognized abuses. Humanitarian garbage became the fashion. And in weakly submitting to these aberrations and sparing individual feelings, the future of millions was sacrificed.

An examination of the religious situation before the war shows that the general process of disintegration was growing. A large part of the nation itself had, for a long time already, ceased to have any convictions of a uniform and effective worldview. In this matter, the main point was by no means the number of people who renounced their church membership, but rather the widespread indifference. While both Christian denominations maintain missions in Asia and Africa in order to win new followers—with only modest success compared to the growth of Islam—these same denominations were losing millions and millions of adherents at home in Europe. These former adherents either gave up all religion or adopted their own interpretation. The consequences, particularly in morality, are not good.

It must be noted too that the attack on the dogmatic foundations of the various churches became increasingly violent. And yet our world would be inconceivable without the practical existence of a religious faith. The great masses of a nation are not philosophers. For the masses of people, faith is the only basis of morality. The various substitutes that have been offered haven't shown any results that would justify replacing existing faiths.

But if religious teaching and faith are accepted by the masses, then the absolute authority of religious doctrines would be the foundation of all practical effort. There may be a few hundred thousand superior men who

can live wisely and intelligently without depending on social norms, but millions of others cannot. For them, the role of social norms corresponds to everyday life in the same way that laws relate to the state, and dogma to religion.

The purely intellectual idea is, of itself, a variable thing that is subject to endless interpretations. It's only through dogma that it has a precise and concrete form, without which religious couldn't become a living faith. Otherwise the intellectual idea would never become anything more than a mere metaphysical concept, or rather, a philosophical opinion. The attack against dogma is comparable to an attack against the general laws on which the state is founded. Such a political attack would lead, in the end, to complete political anarchy if it were successful; in the same way, an attack on dogma would lead to a worthless religious nihilism.

A political leader shouldn't estimate the value of a religion by taking its shortcomings into account, but rather by virtue of a demonstrably better substitute. Until such a substitute is available, only fools or criminals would think of abolishing that which exists.

Undoubtedly no small amount of blame for the present unsatisfactory religious situation must be attributed to those who have encumbered the religious ideal with purely material accessories; this gave rise to an utterly futile conflict between religion and so-called exact science.. In this conflict, victory will nearly always be on the side of science, though perhaps after a hard struggle. And religion will thus suffer heavily in the eyes of those who can't penetrate beyond mere superficial knowledge.

10.26 POLITICAL MISUSE OF RELIGION

But the greatest damage of all has come from the misuse of religion as a means to serve political interests. In truth, we can't attack hard enough those wretched criminals who would prefer to make religion provide political, or rather business, services for them. The impudent liars who do this profess their faith before the whole world in stentorian tones, so that all sinners may hear—not that they are ready to die for it, but rather that they may live all the better. They are ready to sell their faith for a single political swindle. For ten parliamentary mandates, they would ally themselves with the Marxists, who are the mortal foes of all religion. And for a seat in the cabinet, they would enter into marriage with the devil—if the latter hadn't still retained some traces of decency.

If religious life in pre-war Germany left a bad taste in many mouths, it was because Christianity was abused by a so-called 'Christian' party. They shamelessly attempted to identify the Catholic faith with a political party.

This false association was a disaster. It procured some worthless parliamentary mandates for a bunch of good-for-nothings, but the Church suffered damage.

The consequences of that situation had to be borne by the whole nation. The slackening of religious life occurred at a point when everything was beginning to waver and vacillate, and the traditional foundations of ethics and of morality were threatening to collapse.

Even then, all those cracks and rifts in the national body might not have been dangerous if no grave burdens arose. But they became disastrous when the internal solidarity of the nation was the most decisive factor in withstanding the storm of events.

10.27 AIMLESSNESS OF GERMAN POLICY

In the political field also, observant eyes might have noticed certain evils of the Reich that foretold disaster, unless some change and correction took place in time. The lack of orientation in German policy, both domestic and foreign, was obvious to everyone who was not purposely blind. The best thing that can be said about the business of compromise is that it seems to be in harmony with Bismarck's axiom that 'politics is the art of the possible.' But there was a small but crucial difference between Bismarck and the later German chancellors. This difference allowed the former to apply that formula to the very essence of his policy, while in the mouths of the others, it took on an utterly different meaning. When he uttered that phrase, Bismarck meant to say that, in order to attain a definite political end, all possible means should be employed—or at least, taken into account. But his successors saw in that phrase only a solemn declaration that one need not be bound to any political goals or ideas at all. And the political leaders of the Reich at that time had no far-seeing policy. Here again, the necessary foundation was lacking, namely, a definite worldview. And they also lacked the clear insight into the laws of political development that is a necessary quality in political leadership.

Many who took a gloomy view of things at that time condemned the lack of ideas and orientation that were evident in the policy of the Reich. They recognized the inner weakness and futility of this policy. But such

people played only a secondary role in politics. The official government authorities were quite indifferent to such principles of civil wisdom as those of Houston Stewart Chamberlain;[10] our current leaders still do the same. These people are too stupid to think for themselves. They are too conceited to learn from others—a fact that confirms Oxenstierna's saying, "The world is governed by a mere fraction of wisdom."[11] And indeed, nearly every civil servant embodies only an atom of this fraction.

But since Germany became a Republic, even this modicum is lacking. That's why they had to pass the Law for the Defense of the Republic, which prohibits expressing such views, or even thinking them. Oxenstierna was lucky to live when he did, and not in our wise Republic.

10.28 PARLIAMENTARY HALF-MEASURES

Even before the war, the institution that should have represented the strength of the Reich was recognized by many as its greatest weakness: the parliament, the Reichstag. Here, cowardice and irresponsibility were completely unified.

One of the most foolish ideas that one hears today is that, in Germany, the parliamentary institution has gone wrong 'since the revolution.' This too easily implies that the case was different before the revolution. But in reality, its effect was highly destructive—and this was true even in those days when people saw nothing, or didn't wish to see anything. The German downfall can be attributed, in no small degree, to this institution. But that the catastrophe didn't take place sooner is not to be credited to the parliament, but rather to those who opposed the influence of this institution which, during peace times, was digging the grave of the German nation and the German Reich.

From the immense number of devastating evils that were due either directly or indirectly to the parliament, I'll pick one of the most typical of this institution that was the most irresponsible of all time: the terrible half-heartedness and weakness of the political leaders in conducting the internal and external affairs of the Reich. This was primarily attributable to the

[10] Chamberlain (1855-1927) was born in England but spent the majority of his adult life in Germany. He was a prominent intellectual of the day; his best-known work, *Foundations of the 19th Century*, was highly influential to Hitler.

[11] Axel Oxenstierna (1583-1654) was prime minister of Sweden. But the saying seems to be apocryphal.

action of the Reichstag, and was one of the principal causes of the political collapse.

Everything subject to the influence of parliament was done in half-measures, no matter how you look at it.

The foreign policy of the Reich in the matter of alliances was an example of such half-heartedness. They wanted to maintain peace, but in doing so they steered straight into war.

Their Polish policy was also carried out by half-measures. One merely irritated without ever finishing anything. It resulted neither in a German triumph nor Polish conciliation, and it made enemies of the Russians.

They tried to solve the Alsace-Lorraine question through half-measures. Instead of crushing the French hydra's head once and for all with a brutal fist, and then granting Alsace-Lorraine equal rights, they did neither. Nor could they have done otherwise, for the biggest parties had among their ranks the biggest traitors—in the Center, for example, Mr. Wetterlé.[12]

10.29 PARLIAMENTARY CRIMES AGAINST THE ARMY

But all this would have been bearable, if the half-heartedness hadn't extended to that one power that was ultimately responsible for the survival of the Reich: the army.

The sins committed by the so-called German Reichstag were sufficient to draw down upon it the curses of the German nation for all time. On the most miserable of pretexts, these parliamentary henchmen filched from the hands of the nation its weapon of self-defense—the only thing protecting the liberty and independence of our people. If the graves of Flanders were to open today, bloodstained accusers would arise: hundreds of thousands of our best German youth, who, poorly- or half-trained, were driven into the arms of death by those conscienceless parliamentary criminals. Those youths, and other millions of the dead and mutilated, were lost to the Fatherland simply and solely in order that a few hundred deceivers of the people might carry out their political swindles and blackmail, or merely rattle off their doctrinaire theories.

While the Jews, in their Marxist and democratic press, spread the colossal falsehood about 'German militarism' throughout the world and

[12] Emile Wetterlé (1861-1931) was a French Catholic politician who founded the Alsatian Nationalist Party in 1910.

tried to incriminate Germany by every possible means, at the same time the Marxist and democratic parties obstructed measures that were necessary for the adequate training of our national defenses. The appalling crime thus committed by these people ought to have been obvious to everyone who could see that, in case of war, the whole nation would be called to arms. Furthermore, because of the huckstering of these so-called 'representatives of the people,' millions of Germans would have to face the enemy ill-equipped and insufficiently trained. But even apart from the consequences of the brutal unscupulousness of these parliamentarian scoundrels, it was quite clear that the lack of properly trained soldiers at the beginning of a war would likely lead to defeat; and this probability was confirmed, in a most terrible way, during the course of the World War.

The German people lost the struggle for the freedom and independence of their country because of the half-hearted and defective policy employed during peacetime, in the organization and training of the defensive strength of the Fatherland.

10.30 FAILED NAVAL POLICY

The number of recruits trained for the land forces was too small. But the same half-heartedness was shown in regard to the navy, and it made this weapon of national self-preservation more or less worthless. Unfortunately, even the naval authorities themselves were infected with this spirit of half-heartedness. The tendency to build all ships somewhat smaller than the British didn't show much foresight, and less genius. A fleet that can't achieve the same numerical strength as the enemy should compensate by the superior fighting power of the individual ship. It's superior fighting power that counts, and not any sort of traditional 'quality.' As a matter of fact, modern technical development is so advanced and so well proportioned among the various civilized states, that it must be looked on as practically impossible for one power to gain any appreciable fighting advantage over enemy ships of a similar size. And it's even less feasible to build ships of smaller size that will be superior in action to those of larger ones.

As a matter of fact, the smaller proportions of the German ships could be maintained only at the expense of speed and armament. The phrase used to justify this policy was in itself evidence of the lack of logical thinking on the part of the naval authorities who were in charge of these

matters in peacetime. They declared, for example, that the 28 cm German guns were definitely superior to the British 30.5 cm, in terms of performance!!

But that was just why they should have adopted a policy of building 30.5 cm guns as well; they should have aimed not for equality but superiority in fighting strength. Otherwise it would have been superfluous to equip the land forces with 42 cm mortars. The German 21 cm mortar was far superior to any high-angle French guns, and the fortresses could probably have been taken by means of 30.5 cm mortars. Army leadership calculated correctly; that of the navy, unfortunately, did not.

If they neglected superior artillery power and speed, it was because of their fundamentally false so-called 'principle of risk.' The naval authorities, from the very beginning, renounced the principle of attack, and thus had to follow a defensive policy. But by this attitude they also renounced any chance of final success, which can only be achieved by attack.

A ship with slower speed and weaker armament will be crippled and battered by an adversary that is faster, stronger, and can shoot from a favorable distance. A large number of our cruisers have been through this bitter experience. The erroneous nature of prevailing ideas among naval authorities was proven during the war. They were compelled to modify the armaments of the old ships, and to equip the new ones with better armaments. If the German vessels in the Battle of the Skagerrak had been of equal size, equal armament, and equal speed as the English, the British Fleet would have gone down under the tempest of the more accurate and more effective 38 cm German shells.[13]

Japan followed a different kind of naval policy. There, care was taken to create every single new vessel as a superior fighting force to that of the presumed adversaries. As a result of this policy, it was thereafter possible to use the fleet for offensives.

While the army authorities refused to adopt such fundamentally erroneous principles, the navy—which unfortunately had better 'parliamentary' representation—succumbed to the spirit that ruled there. The navy was organized on the basis of half-baked ideas, and was later used in the same way. The immortal glory that the navy won, in spite of these drawbacks, must be entirely credited to the good work, efficiency, and incomparable heroism of officers and crews. If the former commanders-in-

[13] The Battle of Skagerrak, also known as the Battle of Jutland, occurred over two days in early June 1916. The German and British fleets fought to a draw.

chief had been inspired with the same level of genius, all sacrifices would not have been in vain.

It was probably the very parliamentarian skill displayed by the naval chief during the years of peace that later caused the fatal collapse. Parliamentarian considerations had begun to play a more important role in the construction of the navy than military ones. The half-heartedness, weakness, and failure to adopt a logically consistent policy—which is typical of the parliamentary system—began to color the naval authorities.

As already emphasized, army leadership didn't allow themselves to be led astray by such fundamentally erroneous ideas. Ludendorff, who was then a colonel in the General Staff, led a desperate struggle against the criminal half-heartedness with which the Reichstag treated the most vital problems of the nation. In most cases, it voted against them. If the fight that this officer then waged remained unsuccessful, blame must be given in part to the parliament, and part to the weak and miserable attitude of the Reich Chancellor, Bethmann-Hollweg.[14] Yet those who are responsible for Germany's collapse don't hesitate now to lay all the blame on the shoulders of the one man who alone battled this neglect of national interests; one swindle, more or less, is nothing to these congenital tricksters.

Anyone who thinks of all the sacrifices that this nation had to bear as a result of the criminal neglect of those irresponsible individuals; anyone who thinks of the number of those who died or were maimed unnecessarily; anyone who thinks of the boundless shame and dishonor that was heaped upon us and of the immeasurable distress into which our people are now plunged; anyone who realizes that this was done simply to secure a few seats in parliament for some unscrupulous job-hunters and careerists—they will understand that such creatures can only be described by words such as 'scoundrel,' 'villain,' 'scum,' and 'criminal'; otherwise these words have no meaning. In comparison with these traitors to the nation, every pimp is an honorable man.

Oddly enough, all the real faults of the old Germany were exposed to the public gaze only when it served to damage the inner solidarity of the nation. Yes, indeed, unpleasant truths were openly proclaimed in the ears of the broad masses, while many other things were, at other times, shamefully hushed up or their existence simply denied—especially at times when an open discussion of such problems might have led to an improvement. At the same time, higher government authorities knew little

[14] Theobald von Bethmann-Hollweg (1856-1921) served as German Chancellor from 1909 to 1917.

or nothing of the value and nature of propaganda. Only the Jew knew that, by an able and persistent use of propaganda, heaven itself can be presented as hell, and vice versa, the most miserable kind of life as paradise. Only he knew this, and acted accordingly. But the German, or rather his government, hadn't the slightest idea of this.

During the war, we paid the heaviest of penalties for this ignorance.

10.31 GERMAN ADVANTAGES

Along side the innumerable evils that are mentioned here, and which affected German life before the war, there were many advantages. If we take an impartial survey, we must admit that most of our weaknesses were shared with other countries and peoples, and very often in a worse form than with us. And they didn't possess many of our actual advantages.

The foremost advantage was the fact that, alone among the European nations, the German nation made the strongest effort to preserve the national character of its economic structure; for this reason, it was less subject than others to control by international finance. And yet this was a dangerous advantage, one that later turned out to be the chief cause of the World War.

Aside from this and many other positive features, we must single out three institutions that were constant sources of regeneration. In their respective spheres, they were models of perfection and were partly unrivalled.

First, the state form as such, and the manner in which it was developed in modern Germany.

Of course, we must except those monarchs who, as human beings, were subject to the failings that afflict this earthly life and its children. If we weren't so tolerant in these matters, then the case of the present generation would be hopeless. If we take into consideration the personal capabilities and character of the representative figures in our present regime, it would be difficult to imagine a more modest level of intelligence and moral character. If we measure the 'value' of the German revolution by the personal worth and stature of the individuals whom this revolution has given to the German people since November 1918, then we may feel truly ashamed at how posterity will pass judgement, given that protective laws can no longer silence public opinion. Posterity will surely say that the intelligence and integrity of our new German leaders were in adverse ratio to their boasting and their vices.

CHAPTER 10

It must be admitted that the monarchy had become alien in spirit to many citizens, and especially the broad masses. This resulted from the fact that the monarchs were not always surrounded by the brightest minds, so to say, and certainly not always by the sincerest minds. Unfortunately many of them preferred flatterers to plain-spoken men, and hence received their 'instruction' from the former. This was a grave danger at a time when many of the world's old opinions were changing, and when this affected even the traditions of the court.

The average man could not have felt any special enthusiasm when, for example, at the turn of the century, a princess in uniform rode at the front of a parade. Those in high circles apparently had no idea of the impression that this made on the minds of ordinary people, or it wouldn't have happened. Moreover, the sentimental humanitarianism—not always very sincere—that was professed in those high circles was often more repulsive than attractive. When, for instance, Princess X decided to taste the products of a soup kitchen and found them excellent, as usual, such a gesture might have made a good impression in times past; but now it had the opposite effect. Even if we take it for granted that Her Highness didn't have the slightest idea that, on the day she sampled it, the food was not quite the same as on other days, it sufficed that the people knew it.

Even the best of intentions thus became an object of ridicule or a cause of exasperation.

Stories of the monarch's proverbial frugality, his early rise in the morning, the drudgery he had to go through all day long until late at night, and especially the constant fear that he might become undernourished, all aroused dubious comments. No one was eager to know what and how much the monarch ate or drank. No one begrudged him a full meal, or the necessary amount of sleep. Everyone was pleased when the monarch, as a man and a personality, brought honor on his family and his country, and fulfilled his duties as a ruler. All the legends that were circulated about him helped little, and in fact did much damage.

These and such things, however, are only mere trifles. What was much worse was the feeling, spread throughout large sections of the nation, that the affairs of the individual were being taken care of from above, and that he needn't bother himself with them. As long as the government was really good, or at least moved by goodwill, no serious objections could be raised. But woe to all if the old government of good intentions were replaced by a new one that was not so decent. Then the public's docile obedience and childlike faith were the most fatal of evils imaginable.

But against these and other defects, there were many unquestionable assets.

For one thing, the monarchical form guarantees stability in the entire state leadership, and safeguards public offices from the speculative turmoil of ambitious politicians. Furthermore, the dignified tradition that this institution possesses gives weight to monarchical authority. Beyond this, there is the fact that the whole corps of officials, and the army in particular, are raised above the level of party obligations. And still another advantage was that the supreme rulership of the state was embodied in the monarch as an individual person, and whose example of personal responsibility was stronger than that of any anonymous parliamentary majority. Indeed, the proverbial integrity of the German administration must be attributed chiefly to this fact. Finally, the high cultural function of the monarch compensated for many of its defects. The German court cities have remained, even to our time, centers of an artistic spirit that now threatens to disappear in our materialistic age. The German princes did a great deal for art and science, especially during the 19th century. Our present age certainly has nothing to compare with it.

10.32 THE ARMY—AN IRREPLACEABLE SCHOOL

During that process of disintegration that was slowly extending throughout the social order, the most positive force of resistance was the army. This was the strongest school of the German nation, and for that reason, the hatred of our enemies was directed against this buttress of national freedom and independence. The strongest testimony in favor of this unique institution is the fact that it was derided, hated, combated, and also feared, by all inferior peoples. The fact that the international exploiters of our people, who gathered at Versailles, directed their enmity especially against the old German army proved once again that it deserved to be regarded as the defender of our national freedom against the power of the stock exchange.[15] Without this warning power, the intentions of Versailles would have long since been carried out. There is only one word to express what the German people owe to this army: everything.

It was the army that still promoted a sense of responsibility among the people when this quality was becoming very rare, and when the habit of

[15] The Treaty of Versailles was signed in June 1919, after the end of World War I. It imposed onerous and impossible conditions upon Germany, and falsely attributed full blame for the war to them.

evading it was steadily spreading. This habit had grown up under the influences of parliament, which was itself the very model of irresponsibility. The army trained the people to personal courage at a time when cowardice threatened to become an epidemic, when the spirit of sacrificing for the good of the community was considered as little more than stupidity, and when only those considered intelligent were the ones who promoted their own ego. The army was the school by which individual Germans were taught not to seek the salvation of their nation in the false ideology of international brotherhood between negroes, Germans, Chinese, French, English, etc., but in the strength and unity of their own people.

The army developed the individual's powers of resolve, and this at a time when a spirit of indecision and skepticism governed human affairs. In an age when the know-it-alls were everywhere setting the fashion, it needed courage to uphold the principle that any command is better than none. This one principle represents a robust and sound style of thought, one that would have vanished had the army not furnished a constant renewal of this fundamental force. A sufficient proof of this may be found in the appalling lack of decision that our present Reich authorities display. They can't shake off their mental and moral lethargy, and take definitive action, except when it comes to enforced decrees for exploiting the people. In that case they decline all responsibility, while at the same time they sign everything that the other side places before them, with the agility of a court stenographer. In this case, the decision is easy to make; it's dictated to them.

The army trained its men with a spirit of idealism and devotion to the Fatherland, while greed and materialism dominated everywhere else. The army united a people who were divided into classes; and in this respect had only one defect, which was the voluntary one-year military service. It was a mistake because the principle of absolute equality was thereby violated. Those who had a better education were thus placed outside the setting of their general environment.

The opposite would have been better. Since our upper classes were really ignorant of the corporate body of the nation, and were becoming increasingly estranged from it, the army could have had a very positive effect if it had refused to segregate the so-called intellectuals, especially within its own ranks. It was a mistake that this wasn't done. But what institution in this world makes no mistakes? And in the army, the good features were so absolutely predominant that the few defects it had were far below the average that generally arise from human weakness.

But the greatest credit earned by the army was that, at a time when the individual person counted for nothing and the majority was everything, it placed individual personal values above majority values. Confronted with the Jewish-democratic idea of a blind faith in numbers, the army defended its belief in personality. Thus it trained that which was most needed at the time: real men. In a period when men were falling into a morass of effeminacy and softness, 350,000 vigorous young men were trained each year. In the course of their two years' training, they lost the softness of their young days and developed bodies as tough as steel. The young man who had been taught obedience during this time was now ready to command. One could recognize the trained soldier by his very walk.

This was the great school of the German nation. It was not without reason that it drew all the bitter hatred of those who wanted the Reich to be weak and defenseless. The rest of the world recognized a fact that many Germans didn't wish to see, either due to blindness or ill will: the German army was the most powerful weapon for the freedom of the German nation, and the best guarantee for the sustenance of its children.

10.33 THE INCOMPARABLE CIVIL SERVICE

There was a third institution of value that has to be placed beside the monarchy and the army; this was the civil service of the old Reich.

Germany was the best organized and best administered country in the world. There may have been objections to the bureaucratic red tape, but from this point of view, the other countries were no better; and often worse. But the other states didn't have the wonderful German solidarity, nor were their civil servants of the same incorruptible honesty. It's certainly better to be a little old-fashioned but honest and loyal, than to be over-sophisticated and modern, with inferior character, and thus typically ignorant and inefficient.

If it be said today that the pre-war German administration was bureaucratically excellent but incompetent from a business point of view, I can only give the following reply: What other country in the world possessed a better-organized and administered business enterprise than the German State Railways? It was left to the revolution to destroy this exemplary organization, until a time came when it was taken out of the hands of the nation and socialized, in the sense of this Republic's founders. This made it subservient to the international stock exchange, who were the power behind the German revolution.

CHAPTER 10

The most outstanding trait of the civil service and entire administrative apparatus was their independence from the government, whose passing views had no effect on the role of German state officials. Since the revolution, this situation has been completely changed. Efficiency and capability have been replaced by party ties, and independence of character and initiative are more of a hindrance than a help.

10.34 STATE AUTHORITY

The wonderful might and power of the old Reich was based on the monarchical state-form, the army, and the civil service. On these three foundations rested that great strength that's now entirely lacking: State authority! For this cannot be based on the babbling that goes on in parliament or in the provincial diets, or upon laws made to protect the state, or upon sentences passed by the law courts to frighten those insolently deny it, but only on the general confidence placed in the leaderhsip and administration of the community. This confidence is in its turn nothing else than an unshakable inner conviction that the government and administration of a country is inspired by selflessness and honesty, and on agreement between the spirit of the law and the general moral convictions of the people. In the long run, systems of government are not maintained by threats of violence but on the belief of the people in the merits and sincerity of those who administer and promote the public interests.

Though in the pre-war period, certain grave evils tended to infect and corrode the inner strength of the nation, it must be remembered that the other states suffered even more than Germany from these drawbacks. And yet they didn't fail and breakdown when the time of crisis came. If we remember further that those defects in pre-war Germany were outweighed by great positive qualities, we'll have to look elsewhere for the effective cause of the collapse. And this is actually the case.

The ultimate and most profound reason for the German decline is the fact that the racial problem was ignored, and that its importance in the historical development of nations wasn't grasped. Events that take place in the life of nations are not due to chance, but are the natural results of the effort to conserve and multiply the species and the race—even if people aren't conscious of the inner motives of their conduct.

CHAPTER 11: NATION AND RACE

Certain truths are so obvious that, for this very reason, they are neither seen nor recognized by ordinary people. People are so blind to some of the simplest facts in everyday life that they are very surprised when someone calls attention to what everyone should know. Examples of the Columbus Egg surround us by the hundreds of thousands; but Columbuses are rare.[1]

Walking around in the garden of Nature, most men have the conceit to think that they know everything. Yet almost all are blind to one of the outstanding principles that Nature employs in her work: the inner separation of the species of all living beings on Earth.

Even a superficial glance shows that nature follows a rigid basic law in which all life-forms are restricted to definite limits when propagating and multiplying their own kind. Each animal mates only with one of its own species. The titmouse seeks the titmouse, the finch with the finch, the stork with the stork, the field mouse with the field mouse, the house mouse with the house mouse, the wolf with the she-wolf, etc.

Deviations from this law take place only in exceptional circumstances, such as the compulsion of captivity, or when some other obstacle makes intercourse impossible between members of the same species. But then Nature resists such intercourse with all her might. Her protest is most clearly demonstrated by the fact that the hybrid is either sterile or its descendants have limited fertility. In most cases, they are denied the ordinary powers of resistance to disease or to hostile attacks.

---

[1] The Columbus Egg refers to an apocryphal tale in which Christopher Columbus allegedly challenged a group of Spanish noblemen to balance an egg on one end. After they fail, he takes the egg, taps it on the table to slightly crush one end, and then it stands. The moral is that a seemingly impossible task, once done in a certain way, becomes obvious. Many inventions and discoveries are precisely of this nature.

This is only too natural.

Every crossing between two breeds that aren't quite equal yields a product that holds an intermediate place between the levels of the two parents. This means that the offspring will indeed be superior to the racially inferior parent, but not as high as the higher parent. For this reason, it must eventually succumb in any struggle against the higher species. Such mating contradicts the will of nature towards the selective improvements of life in general. The precondition to this improvement is not to mate superior and inferior, but rather to allow the complete triumph of the higher order. The stronger must dominate and not mate with the weaker, thus sacrificing its own greatness. Only the born weakling can look upon this principle as cruel, but he is only a feeble and limited man; for if such a law did not prevail, then the higher development of organic life would be inconceivable.

The consequence of this urge for racial purity, universally valid in nature, is not only the sharply-defined outward distinction between the races but also their uniform character in themselves. The fox is always a fox, the goose is a goose, the tiger is a tiger, etc. The only difference that can exist within the species must be in the various degrees of force, strength, intelligence, efficiency, endurance, etc., of the individual specimens. It would be impossible to find a fox that is kindly and protective towards geese, just as no cat has a friendly disposition towards mice.

That's why the struggle between the various species doesn't arise from mutual antipathy but rather from hunger, and from love. In both cases, Nature looks on calmly, and even with satisfaction. The struggle for daily bread leaves behind all those who are weak or sickly or wavering, while the male struggle for the female gives to the healthiest the right to propagate. And this struggle is a means of furthering the species' health and powers of resistance, and therefore its higher development.

If the case were different, progress would cease, and even regression would occur. Since the inferior always outnumber the superior, the former would always increase more rapidly if they possessed the same capacities for survival and reproduction. The end result would be that the best would be driven into the background. Therefore a corrective measure in favor of the better must intervene. Nature supplies this by establishing rigorous living conditions, to which the weaker will have to submit and will thereby be numerically restricted. But even the portion that survives cannot reproduce indiscriminately, for here a new and rigorous selection takes place, according to strength and health.

CHAPTER 11

11.1 THE RESULT OF RACIAL MIXING

If Nature doesn't wish that weaker individuals should mate with the stronger, even less does she wish that a superior race should mix with an inferior one. In such a case, all her efforts, throughout hundreds of thousands of years, to establish an evolutionary higher type of being, might be rendered futile.

History provides countless proofs of this law. It shows, with a startling clarity, that whenever Aryans have mingled their blood with that of an inferior race, the result has been the downfall of the cultured people. In North America, where the population is predominantly Germanic, and where those elements intermingled with the colored peoples only to a very small degree, there is a different humanity and culture than those of Central and South America. In these latter countries, the Latin immigrants mated with the aborigines, sometimes on a large scale. In this case we have a clear and decisive example of the effect of racial mixing. But in North America, the Germanic element, which has remained racially pure and unmixed, has come to dominate the American continent. And it will remain master, as long as that element doesn't fall victim to a defiling of the blood.

In short, the results of racial mixing are always the following:

(a) The level of the superior race becomes lowered; and

(b) Physical and mental degeneration sets in, thus leading slowly but surely towards a progressive sickness.

Such a development is nothing other than a sin against the will of the eternal Creator.

And as a sin, this act will be avenged.

Man's effort to contradict the iron logic of nature brings him into conflict with those principles to which he himself owes his own existence. By acting against nature, he prepares the way for his own ruin.

11.2 MAN AND IDEA

Here we meet an insolent pacifist objection, one that is Jewish in its inspiration: "Man can control even nature!"

There are millions who mindlessly repeat this Jewish nonsense, and end up imagining that somehow they themselves are the conquerors of nature. Yet their only weapon is just a mere idea, and a very preposterous one at that. If one accepted it, then it would be impossible even to imagine the existence of the world.

The real truth is that, not only has man failed to overcome nature in any sphere whatsoever, but that at best he has merely succeeded in getting hold of and lifting a tiny corner of the enormous veil she has spread over her eternal mysteries and secrets. He never creates anything. All he can do is to discover something. He doesn't master nature, but has only come to be the master of those living beings who lack the knowledge he has arrived at, by penetrating into some of nature's laws and mysteries. Apart from all this, an idea can never overcome the preconditions for the existence and development of mankind; the idea itself has come only from man. Without humanity, there would be no human idea in this world. The idea as such is therefore always dependent on the existence of man, and thus is dependent on those laws that created the conditions of his existence.

And not only that! Certain ideas are even confined to certain people. This holds particularly true with regard to those ideas that have roots not in objective scientific truth but in the world of feeling. In other words—to use a current phrase that expresses this truth—they reflect an 'inner experience.' All such ideas, which have nothing to do with cold logic per se but represent mere feelings, such as ethical and moral conceptions, etc., are inextricably bound up with man's existence. Such ideas owe their existence to the creative powers of man's imagination.

Now then, a necessary condition for the maintenance of such ideas is the existence of certain races and certain types of men. For example, anyone who sincerely wishes that the pacifist idea should prevail in this world should do everything possible to help the Germans conquer the world. If the opposite should happen, it may easily be the case that the last pacifist would disappear with the last German. I say this because, unfortunately, no one else in the world has fallen prey to this nonsense like our own people. Whether we liked it or not, we would have to wage war in order to achieve pacifism. This, and nothing less, was the plan of the American world-savior, Wilson.[2] Or at least, that was what our visionaries believed—and thus his goal was achieved.

The pacifist-humanitarian ideal may indeed be an excellent one, but only when the most superior type of man has succeeded in subjugating the world to such an extent that he is the sole ruler of the Earth. This ideal would have evil effects only to the extent in which its application became difficult and finally impossible. So, first of all, the fight; and then perhaps pacifism.

[2] Woodrow Wilson, American president during World War I. It was his administration, heavily populated with Jewish advisers, that dictated the harsh terms of the Versailles Treaty. Hitler never forgave him for that.

If the case were different, it would mean that mankind has already passed the peak of its development, and thus the end wouldn't be the supremacy of some moral ideal, but degeneration into barbarism and chaos. People may laugh at this statement. But our planet once moved through the ether for millions of years without men, and it may do so once again—if we forget that, wherever humans have reached a superior level of existence, it wasn't due to the ideas of a few crazy visionaries, but by knowing and rigorously applying the iron laws of nature.

11.3 RACE AND CULTURE

All that we admire in the world today—science, art, technology, and inventions—are the products of the creative activities of a few peoples; and perhaps even originally of one race. The maintenance of civilization is wholly dependent on them. Should they perish, all that makes this Earth beautiful will descend with them into the grave.

However much the soil, for example, can influence men, this influence will vary according the the particular race in question. Poor soil may stimulate one race to the highest achievements; in another race, it may be the cause of poverty and finally of malnourishment, with all its consequences. Though subject to external circumstances, it is the internal characteristics of a people that always determine the outcome. That which reduces one race to starvation drives another to hard work.

All the great civilizations of the past decayed because the originally creative race died out, as a result of poisoning of the blood.

The ultimate cause of such a decline is the fact that the people forgot that all culture depends on men, and not the reverse. In other words, to preserve a certain culture, the man that creates it must be preserved.

But this preservation is bound up with the inexorable law of necessity, and with the right of victory of the best and strongest.

He who would live must fight. And he who doesn't wish to fight in this world of permanent struggle has no right to live.

Such a saying may sound harsh—and so it is! Yet far harsher is the fate of he who believes that he can overcome nature, and thus in reality insults her. Distress, misery, and disease are her replies!

Whoever ignores or misjudges the laws of race deprives himself of the happiness that belongs to him. He places an obstacle in the victorious path of the superior race and, by doing so, interferes with a precondition of all

human progress. Burdened with humanitarian sentiment, he falls back to the realm of the helpless beast.

11.4 THE ARYAN AS FOUNDER OF CULTURE

It would be futile to attempt to determine which race or races were the original standard-bearers of human culture, and were thereby the real founders of all that we understand by the word 'humanity.' It's much simpler to deal with this question insofar as it relates to the present time. Here the answer is simple and clear. Every manifestation of human culture, every product of art, science, and technical skill that we see today, are almost exclusively the creative product of the Aryan. This very fact fully justifies the conclusion that it was the Aryan alone who founded a superior type of humanity; therefore he represents the archetype of what we understand by the term 'man.' He is the Prometheus of mankind, from whose shining brow the divine spark of genius has at all times flashed forth, always kindling anew the fire that, in the form of knowledge, illuminated the dark night by drawing aside the veil of mystery, showing man how to rise up and become master over all the other earthly beings. Exclude him—and a profound darkness will descend upon the Earth. Within a few thousand years, human culture will vanish and the world will become a desert.

If we divide mankind into three groups—founders of culture, bearers of culture, and destroyers of culture—the Aryan alone can be considered as representing the first group. It was he who erected the foundation and walls of every great structure in human culture. Only the shape and color of such structures can be attributed to the characteristics of the various peoples. The Aryan furnished the great building stones and plans for the edifices of all human progress; only the execution of these plans can be attributed to the qualities of each individual race.

Within a few decades, the whole of eastern Asia, for instance, will possess a culture was founded by the Greek mind and Germanic technology. Only the external form—at least partly—shows the traits of Asiatic inspiration. It isn't true, as some believe, that Japan adds European technology to its own culture. The truth rather is that European science and technology are just overlaid with the peculiar characteristics of Japanese civilization. The foundations of actual life in Japan today aren't those of native Japanese culture, although this colors daily life and thus appears striking to the European eye. Rather, the real foundations are the enormous

scientific and technical achievements of Europe and America; that is, of Aryan peoples. Only on basis of these achievements can the Orient follow contemporary world progress. They provide the basis of the struggle for daily bread, and create weapons and implements for this; only the outward form is gradually adapted to Japanese ways of life.

If, from today onwards, the Aryan influence on Japan ceased—if Europe and America collapsed—then Japan's present progress in science and technology might still last for a short while. But within a few decades, the inspiration would dry up, native Japanese character would flourish, and present civilization would become fossilized and fall back into the sleep from which it was aroused seven decades ago by Aryan culture. Therefore, just as present Japanese development is due to Aryan influence, so in the distant past, foreign influence and spirit awakened Japanese culture of that day.

The best proof of this is the fact that ancient Japanese civilization actually became fossilized and petrified. This can happen only if a people loses the racial nucleus that was originally creative, or if an outside influence is withdrawn after having awakened and maintained the initial cultural developments. If it be shown that a people owes the fundamental elements of its culture to foreign races, assimilating and elaborating such elements, and if subsequently that culture becomes fossilized whenever the external influence ceases, then such a race may be called 'culture-bearing' but never 'culture-creating.'

Examining various peoples from this standpoint shows that practically none of them were originally culture-founding, but almost always culture-bearing.

This development nearly always happens in the following way:

Aryan tribes, often ridiculously small in number, subjugate foreign peoples and, stimulated by the conditions of life in the new territory (fertility, climatic abundance, etc.), and profiting also by the abundance of manual labor, they develop the intellectual and organizational faculties dormant in them. Within a few thousand years, or even centuries, they create cultures that reflect the inner characteristics of the founders—though modified by the special qualities of the soil and the subjugated people.

In the end, though, the conquering race offends against the principle of blood purity to which they initially adhered. They begin to mix with the subjugated people, thus ending their own existence. Mankind's Fall in Paradise has always been followed by expulsion.

After a thousand years or more, the last visible traces of the former master people may then be found in a lighter tint of the skin that the blood

had bequeathed to the subjugated race, and in a petrified culture that it had originally created. Once the blood of the bodily and spiritual conqueror got lost in the blood of the subjected people, the fuel for the torch of human progress was lost! Just as the blood of the former ruling race left a light nuance of color in the blood of its descendants as a token memory, so too the night of cultural life is gently illuminated by the products of those who were the original bearers of light. Their radiance shines through the barbarism to which the subjected race has reverted. This often leads the superficial observer to believe that he sees before him an image of the present race, when in fact he is only gazing into a mirror of the past.

It may happen that, in the course of its history, such a people will come into contact a second time, or perhaps more, with the race of original founders of their culture. They may not even remember that distant association. Instinctively, though, the remnants of the master blood will be drawn towards this new phenomenon, and what had formerly been possible only under compulsion can now succeed through the people's own will. A new cultural wave flows in, and lasts until the blood of its standard-bearers once again submerges in the blood of the conquered peoples.

It will be the task of those who study the universal history of civilization to conduct research from this viewpoint, instead of allowing themselves to be smothered by a mass of external data—as is only too often the case with our present historical science.

This short sketch of the development of the culture-bearing nations gives a picture of the development and activity—and the decline—of those who are the true culture-founders on this Earth, the Aryans themselves.

Just as in our daily life the so-called man of genius needs a particular occasion, and sometimes indeed a special stimulus, to make him shine, so too with racial genius in the life of peoples. In the monotony of everyday life, even men of significance seem just like the others, and don't rise above the average of their fellow men. But as soon as such men find themselves in a situation in which others stray or become hopeless, the humble and ordinary man reveals traits of genius—often to the amazement of those who had, until then, only known him in the pettiness of everyday life. That's why a prophet only seldom counts for anything in his own country.

War offers an excellent occasion for observing this. In times of distress, when the others despair, apparently harmless boys suddenly spring up and become heroes, with death-defying determination and an icy-cool mindset. If such an hour of trial hadn't come, no one would have guessed that a hero lurked in the body of that beardless youth.

CHAPTER 11

A special impulse is almost always necessary to bring genius into view. The sledge-hammer of fate, which strikes down the one so easily, suddenly strikes steel in another. And when the shell of everyday life is broken, the hidden core lay visible to an astonished world. The world resists. It refuses to believe that something seemingly so normal is suddenly so different. This process is repeated every time a man of outstanding quality appears.

Though an inventor, for example, doesn't establish his fame until the day of his invention, it would be a mistake to believe that the creative genius didn't become alive until that moment. The spark of genius lives within the man who has it from the moment of birth. True genius is an innate quality; it can never be cultivated or learned.

As stated already, this applies not merely to the individual but also the race. Peoples with creative abilities have always been fundamentally creative. It belongs to their very nature, even though this fact may escape the eyes of the superficial observer. Here, too, recognition from outside is only the consequence of practical achievement. The rest of the world is incapable of recognizing genius as such, and can only see the visible manifestations of genius in the form of inventions, discoveries, buildings, paintings, etc. But even here, a long time passes before recognition is given. Just as the individual person who has been endowed with the gift of genius, or at least talent of a very high order, cannot realize that endowment until prompted by special circumstances, so too in the life of nations; creative capacities and powers frequently have to wait until certain conditions stimulate them to action.

The most obvious example of this truth is furnished by that race that has been, and still is, the standard-bearer of human progress: the Aryans. As soon as fate confronts them with special circumstances, their powers begin to develop progressively and to be manifested in tangible forms. The cultures that they create are almost always conditioned by the soil, the climate, and the people they subjugate.

The last factor is the most decisive. The more primitive the technical conditions for cultural activity, the more necessary is the existence of manual labor that can be organized and employed to take the place of mechanical power. Had it not been possible to employ members of the inferior race, the Aryans would never have been in a position to take the first steps toward a future culture. Similarly, without the help of certain suitable animals that they were able to tame, they would never have come to a technology that has subsequently enabled them to do without these beasts. The phrase, 'The Moor has done his work, the Moor can go' has, unfortunately, a deep

meaning.[3] For thousands of years, the horse has been the faithful servant of man, helping to lay the foundations of human progress; but now the motor car has made the horse superfluous. In a few years to come, the horse's function will cease entirely. And yet without its collaboration, man could scarcely have come to the stage of development where he is today.

For the establishment of superior types of cultures, the inferior races were one of the most essential prerequisites. They alone could compensate for the lack of mechanical means, without which no progress is possible. The first stages of human culture were certainly not based so much on tame animals as on the use of inferior human beings.

Only after subjugated races were used as slaves did a similar fate strike the animals, and not vice versa, as some people would like to believe. At first it was the conquered enemy who had to draw the plow—and only afterwards the horse. Only foolish pacifists can see this as a sign of human degradation. Such people fail to recognize that this development had to take place in order to reach that place where these apostles could force their drivel upon the world.

Human progress is like ascending an infinite ladder. One can't reach the higher levels without first having climbed the lower rungs. The Aryan therefore had to take the path to which reality directed him, and not that dreamt of by the modern pacifist. The path of reality, however, is difficult and hard; yet it's the only one that finally leads to the goal that others envisage in their dreams. In reality, the dreamers only lead man away from his goal, rather than towards it.

It was no accident that the first forms of culture arose where the Aryan came into contact with inferior races, subjugated them, and forced them to obey his command. The members of the inferior race became the first technical instrument in the service of a developing culture.[4]

11.5 EFFECTS OF BLOOD-MIXING

Thus the road that the Aryan had to follow was clearly marked. As a conqueror, he subjugated inferior races and turned their physical powers

[3] Quoting from Schiller's 1783 play *Die Verschwörung des Fiesko zu Genua* (Fiesco's Conspiracy at Genoa), Act III, Scene 4.

[4] This idea anticipates the later idea of the 'megamachine' as a systematic use of human labor to achieve social and cultural ends. See Mumford (1966).

into organized channels under his own leadership, forcing them to follow his will and aims. By imposing on them a useful, though hard, activity, he not only spared their lives but probably made their lives easier than they had been with their former so-called 'freedom.' While he ruthlessly maintained his position as their master, he not only remained master but he also maintained and advanced human culture. This depended exclusively on his inborn abilities and, therefore, on his preservation as such.

As soon, however, as his subject began to rise up and approach the level of their conqueror—probably at the point when they began to use his language—the dividing wall between master and servant broke down. The Aryan neglected his own racial purity and thereby lost the right to live in the paradise that he himself had created. He became submerged in the racial mixture and gradually lost his cultural creativeness, until he finally became, both mentally and physically, more like the subjugated aborigines rather than his own ancestors. For awhile he could continue to live on the cultural capital that still remained; but a condition of fossilization soon set in, and he sank into oblivion.

Thus cultures and empires declined, yielding their places to new formations.

Blood mixture and the subsequent racial deterioration are the only causes of the decline of ancient civilizations. It's never by war that nations are ruined, but by the loss of their powers of resistance, which are contained only in pure racial blood.

Everything in this world that is not racially good is like chaff.

Every historical event in the world is nothing but a manifestation of the instinct of racial self-preservation, whether for better or worse.

11.6 SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY

The question of the inner causes for the dominating importance of Aryanism can be answered by saying it isn't so much that they have a stronger survival instinct, but rather that this manifests itself in a special way. Considered subjectively, the will-to-live is equally strong everywhere; only the forms in which it is expressed are different.

Among the most primitive organisms, the survival instinct doesn't extend beyond concern for the individual ego. Egoism, as we call this passion, goes so far that it even includes *time*; the present moment is deemed the most important, and nothing is left to the future. The animal lives only

for itself, seeking food when hungry and fighting only for its own self-preservation. As long as the instinct for self-preservation manifests itself in this way, there is no basis for the formation of a community—not even the most primitive form of family. Even a community of two, male and female, demands an extension of the instinct for self-preservation, since the readiness to fight for one's own ego must be extended to the mate. The male sometimes provides food for the female, but in most cases both parents provide food for the offspring. Almost always, they are ready to protect and defend each other; so that here we find the first, though infinitely simple, form of the spirit of sacrifice. As soon as this spirit extends beyond the narrow limits of the family, we have the conditions under which larger associations, and finally even states, can be formed.

The lowest peoples of this Earth display this quality only to a very small degree, so that often they don't go beyond the formation of the family. With an increasing readiness to subordinate their immediate personal interests, the capacity develops for organizing more extensive communities.

The readiness to sacrifice one's personal labor and, if necessary, even one's life, for others is most highly developed in the Aryan. The greatness of the Aryan is not his intellect, but rather his willingness to devote all his faculties to the service of the community. Here the instinct for self-preservation has reached its noblest form. The Aryan willingly subordinates his own ego to the common interest and, when necessary, even sacrifices it.

The Aryan's peculiar ability for the building up of a culture is not grounded in his intellectual gifts alone. If that were so, they could only be destructive and could never be able to organize; the innermost essence of organization demands that the individual renounce his own personal opinions and interests, and lay both at the service of the larger group. By serving the common interest, he receives his reward in return. For example, he doesn't work directly for himself but makes his productive work a part of the activity of the group to which he belongs—not only for his own benefit, but for all. The spirit underlying this attitude is expressed by the word 'work,' which to him doesn't mean earning one's daily livelihood but rather a productive activity that doesn't clash with the interests of the community. Whenever human activity is directed exclusively to the service of the instinct for self-preservation, it's called theft, usury, robbery, burglary, etc.

This state of mind, which forces self-interest into the background in favor of the community, is the first prerequisite for any true human culture. From this alone rises all the great works of humanity, that bring little reward to the creator but is a source of great blessings for posterity. It's this spirit

alone that explains why a people can endure a harsh but honest existence, but at the same time consolidates the foundations on which the community exists. Every worker, every peasant, every inventor, state official, etc., who works without ever achieving fortune or prosperity for himself is a representative of this sublime idea—even though he may never become conscious of the profound meaning of his own activity.

That which applies to work as the fundamental condition of human sustenance and the means of human progress, applies even more so to work done in defense of man and his culture. Giving one's own life for the sake of the community is the crowning sense of sacrifice. Only in this way can we protect that which has been built by man, ensuring that it won't be overthrown by man or destroyed by nature.

11.7 PUREST IDEALISM, DEEPEST KNOWLEDGE

Our German language has a word that admirably expresses this kind of activity: *Pflichterfüllung*, or the service of the community before individual self-sufficiency.

To distinguish it from egoism or selfishness, we call the basic attitude that arises from this kind of activity—idealism. By this we signify the willingness of the individual to make sacrifices for the community and his fellow men.

It's of the utmost importance to insist again and again that idealism is not merely a superfluous expression of emotion, but rather something that has been, is, and always will be a necessary precondition of human culture—yes, even that it created the very idea of the concept of 'human.' The Aryan owes his position in the world to this kind of mentality; and to the world, man. From this pure spirit has arisen the creative force that, combining brutal fist with intellectual genius, has created the monuments of human culture.

Were it not for idealism, all the faculties of the intellect, even the most brilliant, would be nothing but intellect itself—a mere external phenomenon without inner value, and never a creative force.

Since true idealism, however, is essentially the subordination of individual interests and life to the community, and since the community, for its part, represents the prerequisite of every form of organization, this corresponds, in its innermost essence, with the final will of nature. This feeling alone makes men voluntarily acknowledge the privilege of strength

and power, and thus makes them a constituent particle in that order that shapes and forms the whole universe.

The purest idealism is unconsciously associated with the deepest knowledge.

How true this is, and how little genuine idealism has to do with fantastic imagination, becomes clear the moment we ask an unspoiled child—a healthy boy, for example—to give his opinion. The very same boy who listens to the rantings of an 'idealistic' pacifist without understanding them, and even rejects them, would readily sacrifice his young life for the ideal of his people.

Unconsciously, his instinct will obey the primal necessity of the preservation of the species, even at the cost of his individual life, and he will protest against the fantasies of pacifist ranters—who in reality are nothing better than cowardly but disguised egoists, and who contradict the laws of human development. Such development requires a willingness of the individual to sacrifice for the community, and not the morbid imaginings of cowardly know-it-alls and critics of nature.

Just at the time when the idealistic attitude threatens to disappear, we notice a weakening of the force that founds and maintains the community, and is thereby a necessary precondition of culture. As soon as egoism begins to prevail among a people, the bonds of social order break down; and man, by seeking his own personal happiness, falls out of heaven and right into hell.

Yes: Posterity will forget those who pursued only their own interests; but it will praise those heroes who have renounced their own happiness.

11.8 ARYAN AND JEW

The most striking contrast to the Aryan is the Jew. There is probably no other people in the world who have so developed the instinct of self-preservation as the so-called chosen people. The best proof of this is the simple fact that this race still exists. Where are another people that, in the course of the last 2,000 years, have undergone so few changes in mental outlook and character as the Jews? What other people has been involved in greater revolutionary changes—and yet, even after the most gigantic catastrophes, has emerged unchanged? What an infinitely tenacious will-to-live, to preserve one's kind, is shown by that fact!

The intellectual faculties of the Jew have been trained over thousands of years. Today he passes as 'smart'; and in a certain sense, he has been so

throughout the ages. But his intelligence is not the result of an inner evolution, but rather has been shaped by the object-lessons of others.

The human spirit cannot climb upwards without taking successive steps. For every step upwards, it needs the foundation of the past—which, in the comprehensive sense, only appears in general culture. All thinking originates, only to a very small degree, in personal experience. The largest part is based on the accumulated experiences of the past. The general level of culture subconsciously provides the individual with such an abundance of preliminary knowledge that he can thereby more easily take further steps of his own.

The boy of today, for example, grows up among such an overwhelming mass of technical achievements of the last centuries that he takes for granted many things that, a hundred years ago, were still mysteries even to the greatest minds. Yet these things are of enormous importance to those who would understand the progress we have made in these matters, and would like to carry on that progress. If a man of genius from the 1820s were to arise from his grave today, he would find it harder to understand our present age than the average 15-year-old boy. He would lack an extraordinary amount of preliminary information that our contemporary youth receive automatically, so to say, as they grow up among the products of our modern culture.

Since the Jew—for reasons that will become apparent—never had a culture of his own, he has always been supplied with a basis for his intellectual work by others. His intellect has always developed through the cultural achievements of those around him.

The process has never been the reverse.

Though the Jewish people's instinct for self-preservation hasn't been weaker but rather much stronger than among other peoples, and although one gets the impression that their intellectual powers are at least equal to those of other races, they completely lack the most essential prerequisite of a cultured people—the idealistic spirit.

With the Jewish people, the readiness for sacrifice doesn't extend beyond the simple instinct for individual preservation. The feeling of solidarity that they apparently manifest is nothing but a very primitive herd instinct, similar to that which is found among other organisms in this world. It's a remarkable fact that this herd instinct provides mutual support only as long as there is a common danger, which makes mutual assistance useful or inevitable. The same pack of wolves that just joined together in a common attack will dissolve into individuals as soon as their hunger is quenched. The same is true of horses, which unite to defend themselves against any aggressor but separate as soon as the danger is over.

11.9 CONSEQUENCES OF JEWISH EGOISM

It's the same with the Jew. His spirit of sacrifice is only apparent. It is present only as long as the individual's existence makes this an absolute necessity. But as soon as the common foe is conquered, the danger that threatened is overcome, and the prey secured, then the apparent Jewish harmony disappears and the original conditions return. The Jews act in concord only when a common danger threatens, or when a common prey attracts them. Where these two motives are lacking, the most brutal egoism appears; and these people, who had previously lived together in unity, turn into a bloody, fighting swarm of rats.

If the Jews were the only people in the world, they would wallow in filth and mire. They would exploit and uproot one another in a bitter struggle—except insofar as their utter lack of the ideal of sacrifice, which shows itself in their cowardice, turned the struggle into comic theater.

It would therefore be a complete mistake to infer any sense of sacrifice in the Jews from the fact that they stand together in a common struggle against—or rather, to exploit—their fellow man.

Here again, the Jew merely follows the naked egoism of the individual.

That's why the Jewish State—which should be a vital organization to preserve or increase the race—has absolutely no territorial boundaries. The territorial delimitation of a state always demands a certain spirit of idealism on the part of the race in question, and especially a proper interpretation of the idea of work. A territorially delimited state cannot be established or maintained without a generally positive attitude towards work. If this attitude is lacking, then the necessary basis of a culture is also lacking.

That's why the Jewish people, despite their apparent intellectual powers, have no culture—and certainly no culture of their own. The present sham culture of the Jew is the product of the work of others, and this product is debased in his hands.

11.10 SHAM CULTURE OF THE JEWS

In order to correctly evaluate Jewry's attitude toward the question of human culture, we must bear in mind the essential fact that there never has been any Jewish art, and consequently there is none today. Above all, in those two royal domains of art—architecture and music—Jewry has done nothing original. What they do achieve in the field of art is either a

patchwork, or intellectual theft.[5] The Jew essentially lacks the qualities that are characteristic of those creative races that are the founders of culture.

To what extent the Jew appropriates foreign civilization—or rather corrupts it—is indicated by the fact that he chiefly cultivates the art that calls for the least original invention, namely, acting. And even here he is only a 'juggler,' or rather an imitative monkey; he lacks the final touch that's necessary for true greatness. Even here, therefore, he is not a creative genius but rather a superficial imitator who, in spite of all his twists and tricks, cannot disguise the fact that there's no inner vitality in his work. Here the Jewish press comes in and renders friendly assistance by shouting hosannas over even the most ordinary bungler—as long as he's a Jew—until the rest of the world is stampeded into thinking that the object of so much praise must really be an artist. In reality he's nothing more than a pitiful comedian.

No; the Jew has no culture-creating abilities of any kind. There is not, and has never been, in him any spirit of idealism that is a necessary element in the higher development of mankind. His intellect will never be constructive, but always destructive. At best, it may serve as a stimulus in rare cases, but only as the archetype of "the power that always wants Evil and nevertheless creates the Good."[6] Human progress occurs not through him, but in spite of him.

11.11 THE JEW, A PARASITE

Since the Jew has never had a state based on territorial limits, and therefore never a culture of his own, the idea arose that here was a people who had to be considered as nomads.[7] This is a great and dangerous error. The true nomad does actually possess a definite territory; but he merely doesn't cultivate it, as the settled farmer does. He lives on the products of his herds, with which he wanders over his domain. The natural reason for this mode of existence can be found in the infertility of the soil, which doesn't allow permanent settlement.

---

[5] This complaint is ancient. For centuries, observers have remarked on the inability of Jews to create their own culture or civilization. As far back as circa 75 AD, Apollonius Molon wrote that the Jews "are the only people who have contributed no useful invention to civilization"; for details, see Dalton (2011).

[6] Goethe's *Faust*, line 1336.

[7] What we would today call 'nomadic hunter-gatherers.'

The deeper cause, though, lies in the fact that there is no technical culture at hand to make up for the natural poverty of the living space. There are territories where even the Aryan can establish fixed settlements only by means of his technology, developed over the course of more than a thousand years. Otherwise these territories would have to be abandoned, unless the Aryan were willing to wander about in nomadic fashion. But his technical tradition and his age-long experience in the use of technical means would probably make the nomadic life unbearable for him.

We should remember that, during the first period of American colonization, numerous Aryans earned their daily livelihood as trappers, hunters, etc., frequently wandering about in large groups with their women and children, very much like nomads. But as soon as their growing numbers and improved tools allowed the land to be cleared, and natives driven out, their established settlements rapidly grew.

The Aryan himself was probably at first a nomad, becoming a settler only in the course of ages. And therefore he was never a Jew! No, the Jew is not a nomad; the nomad already has a definite attitude towards the concept of 'work,' and this served as the basis of later cultural development, when the necessary intellectual conditions were at hand. There's a certain amount of idealism in the nomad, even though of a rather primitive kind. His whole character, therefore, may seem odd to the Aryan, but he will never be unsympathetic to it. The Jew, however, hasn't the slightest trace of idealism. He has never been a nomad, but always a parasite in the body of other peoples. If he occasionally abandoned regions where he had previously lived, he didn't do so voluntarily. He did it because, from time to time, he was driven out by those whom he had abused.[8] Jewish self-expansion is a typical parasitic phenomenon; he always seeks new feeding ground for his race.

But this has nothing to do with nomadism, because the Jew never thinks of leaving a territory that he has once occupied. He firmly stays where he is, with such tenacity that he can hardly be driven out, even by force. He expands into new territories only when certain conditions for his existence appear; but without them—unlike the nomad—he would never change his residence. He is and remains an eternal parasite, a sponger who, like a pernicious bacillus, spreads over wider and wider areas as they become favorable to him. The effect produced by his presence is also like

[8] For millennia, Jews have been driven out by their host populations. The Nazi expulsion of Jews was only the latest in a long history of such actions, reaching back at least to the ancient Egyptians.

that of a sponger; wherever he establishes himself, the host people die out, sooner or later.

11.12 JEWISH 'RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY'

Thus the Jew has, at all times, lived in states belonging to other people, and there he has formed his own state. It remains hidden behind the mask of 'religious community,' as long as external circumstances make it inadvisable to reveal its true nature. But as soon as he feels strong enough to do without a disguise, he lifts the mask and suddenly becomes that which many others didn't wish to believe or see: the Jew.

The Jew's life as a parasite thriving on the body of other nations and states explains a characteristic that caused Schopenhauer to describe the Jew as "the great master of lies."[9] Existence compels the Jew to lie, and to lie systematically—just as it compels the inhabitants of northern climates to wear warm clothes.

He can live among other peoples only as long as he succeeds in persuading them that he is not a people but a 'religious community'—though of a special sort.

This is but his first great lie.

In order to continue his existence as a parasite of other peoples, he is obliged to conceal his inner nature. The greater the intelligence of the individual Jew, the better will he succeed in deceiving others. It may go so far that his host people will actually believe that the Jew really is a Frenchman or Englishman, a German or Italian, who happens to belong to a special religious faith. State authorities in particular, who generally have only a minimal historical sense, fall victim to his notorious deception. In these circles, independent thinking is considered a sin against the sacred rules by which official promotion takes place. It's therefore unsurprising that even today, in the Bavarian government offices, for example, there isn't the slightest suspicion that the Jews form a people and not a 'religion.' One glance, though, at the Jewish press should provide sufficient proof for even those of the most modest intelligence. The *Jewish Echo*, however, is not an official gazette and therefore not authoritative in the eyes of those government potentates.

---

[9] See Chapter 10.4, note 3.

11.13 JEWISH RELIGIOUS DOCTRINE

Jewry has always been a nation of a definite racial character, and never a religion. Early on, and driven by a desire to get ahead, they began to seek for a means that would distract from any inconvenient attention. What could be more effective, and at the same time more above suspicion, than the idea of a religious community? Here, too, everything is copied, or rather stolen—the Jew could not possess any religious institution that developed from his own nature, seeing that he lacks any kind of idealism. As well, any belief in the afterlife is foreign to him.[10] To the Aryan mind, religion is unimaginable unless it embodies the conviction that life somehow survives after death. As a matter of fact, the Talmud is not a book that prepares one for the afterlife; it only supplies rules for a practical and profitable life in this world.

Jewish religious doctrine is principally a collection of instructions for maintaining the blood purity of Jewry, and for regulating intercourse between Jews, themselves, and the rest of the world—which is to say, their relation with non-Jews. But this teaching isn't concerned with moral problems. Rather, it's concerned with petty economic problems.

Of the moral value of Jewish religious teaching, there are, and have always been, exhaustive studies (not by Jews; Jewish drivel on this subject is always self-serving) that show this kind of religion to be utterly monstrous, from the Aryan perspective. The Jew himself is the best example of the product of this religious training. His life is only of this world, and his mentality is as foreign to the true spirit of Christianity as his character was to the great Founder of this new creed, 2,000 years ago.[11] The Founder made no secret of his estimation of the Jewish people. When necessary, he drove those enemies of the human race out of the temple of God; then, as always, they used religion as a means of advancing their commercial interests. In return, Christ was nailed to the cross. Our modern Christians, on the other hand, enter into party politics and, when elections are being held, they debase themselves to beg for Jewish votes. They even

[10] The Old Testament—that is, the Jewish Bible—is almost completely lacking in reference to an immortal soul, an afterlife, heaven and hell, etc. The focus is strictly on the present physical, material realm. This is partly why material concerns—money, material goods, sensual pleasure, power, etc—weigh so heavily within Judaism.

[11] Hitler seems unaware that Jesus, Mary, Joseph, and all 12 Apostles were Jews. For a detailed analysis of the relationship between Judaism and early Christianity, from Nietzsche's perspective, see Dalton (2010, 2011c).

enter into political swindles with the atheistic Jewish parties, against the interests of their own nation.

On this first and greatest lie—that Jewry is not a race but a religion—other subsequent lies are based. One of these relates to the language of the Jew. For him, language is not a means for expressing his inner thoughts but rather a means of concealing them. When he speaks French, he thinks Jewish; and when writing German verses, he only gives expression to the character of his own nationality.

As long as the Jew has not succeeded in mastering other peoples, he's forced to speak their language—whether he likes it or not. But as soon as they become his slaves, they would have to learn another language (Esperanto, for example!), so that by this means Jewry could more easily dominate them!

11.14 THE 'ELDERS OF ZION'

How much the whole existence of this people is based on a permanent lie is proved in a unique way by *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, so infinitely hated by the Jews.[12] With groans and moans, the *Frankfurter*

[12] The Protocols are a series of 24 short essays purporting to describe Jewish plans for world domination. Of uncertain origin, they emerged in Russia in the early 1900s, and were "exposed" as a hoax in 1921. From Hitler's standpoint, however, it's irrelevant who wrote it; what matters is whether it is a true account of the activities of international Jewry.

Copies are widely available on the Internet—for example, at www.radioislam.org and www.jewwatch.com. Radio Islam includes this brief and fairly accurate synopsis:

"Goyim are mentally inferior to Jews and can't run their nations properly. For their sake and ours, we need to abolish their governments and replace them with a single government. This will take a long time and involve much bloodshed, but it's for a good cause. Here's what we'll need to do:

- Place our agents and helpers everywhere.
- Take control of the media and use it in propaganda for our plans.
- Start fights between different races, classes, and religions.
- Use bribery, threats, and blackmail to get our way.
- Use Freemasonic Lodges to attract potential public officials.
- Appeal to successful peoples' egos.
- Appoint puppet leaders who can be controlled by blackmail.
- Replace royal rule with socialist rule, then communism, then despotism.

Zeitung repeats again and again that these are forgeries: the best proof of their authenticity. Here, what many Jews unconsciously wish to do is clearly set forth, and that's what counts. It doesn't matter from what Jewish brain these revelations sprang; the important thing is that they disclose, with an almost terrifying precision, the nature and activity of the Jewish people, exposing both their inner contexts and final aims.

The best way of judging them, however, is reality. If historical developments of the last few centuries are studied in light of this book, we will immediately understand the constant outcry of the Jewish press. The moment that the general public gets hold of this book, the Jewish danger will be stamped out.

11.15 THE WAY OF JEWRY

In order to properly know the Jew, it's necessary to study the road that he has followed among other peoples during the last few centuries. One example will suffice to give clear insight here. Since his way has been the same for all epochs—just as that of the people degraded by him has remained the same—it will be best, for present purposes, to mark his

---

- Abolish all rights and freedoms, except the right of force by us.
- Sacrifice people (including Jews sometimes) when necessary.
- Eliminate religion; replace it with science and materialism.
- Control the education system to spread deception and destroy intellect.
- Rewrite history to our benefit.
- Create entertaining distractions.
- Corrupt minds with filth and perversion.
- Encourage people to spy on one another.
- Keep the masses in poverty and perpetual labor.
- Take possession of all wealth, property, and (especially) gold.
- Use gold to manipulate the markets, cause depressions, etc.
- Introduce a progressive tax on wealth.
- Replace sound investment with speculation.
- Make long-term interest-bearing loans to governments.
- Give bad advice to governments and everyone else.

Eventually the Goyim will be so angry with their governments that they'll gladly have us take over. We will then appoint a descendant of David to be king of the world, and the remaining Goyim will bow down and sing his praises. Everyone will live in peace and obedient order under his glorious rule." Even this brief summary demonstrates the relevancy of the document.

development by stages. For the sake of simplicity, I will indicate these stages by letters of the alphabet.[13]

The first Jews came into ancient Germany during the time of the Roman invasion; as usual, they came as merchants. During the turmoil caused by subsequent great migrations, the Jews seem to have disappeared. The period of the first Germanic state formation may be seen as the beginning of a process whereby Central and Northern Europe was again, and this time permanently, Judaized. A development began that has always been the same, or similar, wherever Jews came into contact with Aryan peoples.

(a) As soon as the first permanent settlements were established, the Jew was suddenly 'there.' He arrived as a merchant, and in the beginning didn't bother to disguise his nationality. He still remained openly a Jew, partly because of the large racial difference between himself and his host people, partly because he knew too little of the language, and partly because the social cohesion of the host people was too strong; he couldn't appear as anything other than a foreign merchant. His cunning, combined with inexperience on the part of the host people, meant that it was no disadvantage to openly retain his Jewish character. Rather, it would have been an advantage; the foreigner was often well-received.

(b) Slowly but steadily, he began to take part in economic life—not as a producer, but only as a middleman. His commercial cunning, acquired over thousands of years of negotiation as an intermediary, made him superior to the Aryans, who were still quite helpless and boundlessly honest. After a short time, commerce threatened to become a Jewish monopoly.

He began to lend money at usurious interest. It was he who first introduced the payment of interest.[14] The danger of this innovation was not

---

[13] The remainder of this chapter is organized around 12 distinct points, designated 'a' through 'l'.

[14] Indeed, "the earliest roots of the concept [of usury] are found in the Old Testament and [later] in Aristotle" (Taeusch 1942: 291). And as Houkes (2004: 15) points out, Jews were prohibited from loaning at interest only to their fellow Jews, and not to strangers: "Lending to foreigners not only was permissible, but it was regarded a blessing of God." This is explicit in the Jewish Bible: "Thou shalt not lend upon usury to thy [Jewish] brother... To a foreigner you may lend upon usury, but to your brother you shall not lend upon usury" (Deut 23:19). And God indeed promised to the Jews that usury would lead to power over nations; "For the Lord your God will bless you, as he promised you, and you

initially recognized; rather, it was welcomed, because it offered momentary advantages.

(c) At this stage, the Jew became firmly settled. He inhabited special quarters of the cities and towns, gradually coming to form a State within a State.[15] He regarded the commercial domain and all financial transactions as his own exclusive privilege, which he ruthlessly exploited.

(d) Finance and trade became his complete monopoly. His usurious interest rates finally aroused opposition; his impudence gave rise to indignation; his wealth, to envy. His cup ran over when he included land among his commercial objects, and degraded it to the level of a commodity to be sold, or rather traded. Since he himself never cultivated the soil but considered it only as an object to be exploited—something on which the peasant could still live, but only by submitting to the miserable extortions of his new master—public antipathy grew into open hatred. His blood-sucking tyranny became so unbearable that excessive actions were taken against him. People began to scrutinize this foreigner more closely, discovering more and more repulsive traits and characteristics in him, until the cleft became unbridgeable.[16]

In times of distress, a wave of public anger has usually arisen against him, and the plundered and ruined masses began to defend themselves against what they considered to be a scourge of God. They came to know him though the course of centuries, eventually viewing his mere existence as something comparable to the plague.

(e) Now the Jew begins to reveal his true character. He pays court to governments with servile flattery, using his money to ingratiate himself further and thus securing the privilege of exploiting his victims. Although public wrath occasionally flares up against this eternal blood-sucker, driving him out, after a few years he reappears in those same places and carries on as before. No persecution can force him to give up this type of human exploitation, and none can drive him away; he always returns after a short time, and it's the same old story.

In an effort to at least prevent the worst from happening, people begin

---

shall lend to many nations, but you shall not borrow; and you shall rule over many nations, but they shall not rule over you" (Deut 15:6).

[15] See Chapter 4.12, note 10.

[16] Compare to this observation by the ancient Greek writer Philostratus: "The Jews have long been in revolt not only against the Romans, but against all humanity... [They] are separated from ourselves by a greater gulf than divides us from Susa or Bactra or the more distant Indies" (*Life of Apollonius*, V.33.4). Notably, this was written circa 225 AD. For details, see Dalton (2011).

to withdraw the land from his usurious hands by making it illegal for him to own land.

(f) As the power of kings and princes grows, so in proportion does he cozy up to them. He begs for 'charters' and 'privileges,' which those gentlemen, who are generally in financial difficulty, gladly supply in return for suitable payment. However high a price he has to pay, he succeeds in getting it back within a few years from interest and compound interest. He is a true blood-sucker who clings to the body of his unfortunate victims and cannot be removed; and when the princes find themselves again in need, they draw from his blood with their own hands.

This game is repeated unendingly. And the role of the so-called 'German princes' is nearly as bad as that of the Jews themselves. This royalty is God's punishment for their people. The only equivalent can be found in some of the government ministers of our present time.

It was due to the German princes that the German nation couldn't succeed in permanently freeing itself from the Jewish danger. Unfortunately nothing changed as time went on. All that the princes received from the Jews was their thousand-fold reward for the sins committed by them against their own people. They made a pact with the devil and found themselves in his embrace.[17]

(g) His ensnaring of the princes leads to their downfall. Slowly but surely, their standing among the people declines as they not only overlook the public interest but actually exploit them. The Jew knows very well how it will end for them, and works to hasten it. He increases their financial hardship by hindering their effective duty toward their people, by slithering around them with servile flattery, and by encouraging their vices—thus making himself all the more indispensible. His astuteness, or rather his unscrupulousness, in financial affairs allows him to squeeze new income from the princes, to grind the money out of them, and then to quickly spend it.

Thus every court has its 'court Jews,' as these monsters are called, who torture their innocent victims until they're driven to despair, while at the same time preparing eternal pleasures for the princes. Who, then, can be surprised that these ornaments of the human race received official honors, and were even admitted into the hereditary nobility, not only making that institution ridiculous but serving to poison it? Now, he can naturally exploit his position for his own advancement.

Finally he needs only to become baptized to possess all the rights and

[17] The parallels to modern-day American politicians, dominated as they are by AIPAC and the money of the American Jewish Lobby, are striking.

privileges of the native peoples. Not rarely does he avail himself of this business—to the great joy of the Church, having won over a new son, and also to the joy of Israel, which rejoices at pulling off such a swindle.

(h) A change now begins to take place within Jewry. Until now they have been Jews; that is, they hadn't previously put much value on pretending to be something else. And in any case, they couldn't easily overcome the distinctive racial characteristics that separated them from others. Even as late as the time of Frederick the Great,[18] no one looked upon the Jews as other than a 'foreign' people, and Goethe revolted at the thought that marriage between Christians and Jews might no longer be prohibited. And Goethe, by God, was certainly no reactionary or zealot; his words came from the voice of the blood and of reason. Notwithstanding the disgraceful happenings in court circles, the people instinctively recognized that the Jew was a foreign body in their own flesh, and they took the corresponding attitude toward him.

But all this was now to change. In the course of more than a thousand years, he has learned to master the host language so thoroughly that he can now downplay his Jewishness and place his 'Germanism' in the foreground. Though it seems ridiculous, or even absurd, he is impudent enough to call himself a 'Teuton,' which in this case means 'German.' With this he begins one of the most infamous deceptions imaginable. He doesn't possess the slightest bit of Germanism; he only has acquired the art of twisting the German language—and in the most disgusting way—to his own uses. Apart from this, he never mixes with the German character; his whole Germanism rests on language alone.

Race, however, doesn't lie in language, but only in the blood. No one knows this better than the Jew, seeing that he attaches so little importance to the preservation of his own language, while at the same time strives to maintain the purity of his own blood. A man may change his language without much trouble; but it's only his old ideas that he expresses in the new language. His inner nature is not thereby changed.

The Jew himself is the best proof of this; he can speak a thousand languages and yet he remains a Jew. His distinguishing characteristics are the same when he spoke Latin at Ostia 2,000 years ago as a grain merchant, as they are today when he profits from grain-selling with his garbled German. He's always the same Jew. And it's self-evident that this obvious fact goes unrecognized by the typical ministerial secretary or police official;

[18] That is, circa the 1780s.

there is scarcely anyone with less instinct or intelligence than these civil servants of our modern German state authority.

The reason why the Jew suddenly decides to transform himself into a 'German' is obvious. He senses that royal power is slowly crumbling, and he therefore looks around to find a new platform on which to stand. Furthermore, his financial domination over all spheres of economic life has become so powerful that he can no longer sustain or expand that enormous structure unless he earns full 'civil rights.' He desires both preservation and expansion; the higher he climbs, the more alluring becomes the prospect of reaching that ancient goal, promised to him long ago: the dream of world domination. He now anticipates this with feverish eyes. Therefore all his efforts are now directed toward full possession of 'civil rights.'[19]

This was the reason for his emancipation from the ghetto.

(i) And thus the Court Jew slowly develops into the national Jew. But naturally he still remains associated with the upper circles, and he even attempts to push his way in even further. But at the same time, others of his race curry favor with the beloved public. If we remember the crimes he has committed against the masses over the centuries, how repeatedly and ruthlessly he has exploited them, how he sucked out their very blood; and further, when we remember how they gradually came to hate him, and finally considered him as a punishment from the heavens—then we can well understand how difficult the Jew must have found this final transformation. Yes, it must be an arduous task to present themselves as 'friends of humanity' to their flayed victims.

He therefore begins by making amends for his previous sins. He begins his career as a 'benefactor' of humanity. Since his new philanthropy has a very concrete aim in view, he cannot very well apply to himself the biblical recommendation, not to allow the left hand to know what the right hand is giving.[20] No, he is obliged to let as many people as possible know how deeply the sufferings of the masses have grieved him, and to what a degree of personal sacrifice he is ready to make in order to help them—whether he likes it or not.

With this innate 'modesty,' he trumpets his virtues before the world, until finally people actually begin to believe him. Anyone who doubts him

---

[19] Jews began to gain civil rights in Germany in 1812, with partial political emancipation in Prussia. Rights for all German Jews came in 1870, upon German unification.

[20] Matthew (6:3).

is considered unjust. Thus after a little while, he begins to twist things around, so as to make it appear that it was he who suffered the injustices, and not vice versa. The particularly stupid ones believe him, and they can't help but pity 'the unfortunate.'

A remarkable fact is that, despite his proclaimed readiness to make personal sacrifices, the Jew never becomes impoverished. He knows how to make ends meet. Occasionally his benevolence might be compared to manure; it isn't spread around merely for love of the field, but rather with a view to future produce. Anyhow, after a comparatively short period of time, the Jew has come to be known as a 'benefactor and friend to mankind.' What an amazing transformation!

That which is more or less natural for others thus becomes an object of astonishment, and even admiration. That's why he receives more credit for his acts of benevolence than the rest of humanity.

And even more: The Jew becomes a liberal all at once, and begins to talk enthusiastically of the necessity of human progress.

Gradually he becomes the spokesman of a new age.

Yet at the same time he continues to destroy the foundations of that part of the economy that might truly benefit people. Through the purchase of stock, he pushes his influence into the circuit of national production, turning it into an object of trade, and thus ruining the basis on which personal ownership alone is possible. There then arises a feeling of estrangement between worker and employer, which eventually leads to political class struggle.

Finally, Jewish influence on all economic activities increases with a terrible speed via the stock exchange. He becomes the owner, or at least the controller, of the national labor force.

In order to strengthen his political position, he seeks to remove the racial and civil barriers that had previously hindered his advance. With a characteristic tenacity, he champions the cause of religious tolerance for this purpose. And in Freemasonry, which has completely fallen into his hands, he finds a magnificent weapon to achieve his ends.[21] Government circles, as well as the higher circles of the political and commercial

[21] The Freemasons were originally a guild of stone workers that was established in the 15th century. Because of its influence in medieval society, it expanded to become a private club of local or regional civic leaders. Over time it became known as a 'secret society' composed of powerful and hidden rulers of government. As Jews became wealthier and more influential in European society, they sought membership, and thus Freemasonry gradually became associated with Jewish power.

bourgeoisie, fall prey to his net of Masonic strings, though they themselves never suspect what is happening.

Only the people as such, or rather the masses who were just becoming conscious of their own power and were beginning to use it to fight for their rights and liberties, had escaped his grasp. But this influence is more necessary than anything else. The Jew realized that, in his efforts to attain a dominant public role, he would need a 'pace-maker.' And he thought he could find this in broad sections of the bourgeoisie. But the Freemasons failed to catch the glove-makers and linen-weavers in their fragile nets. It thus became necessary to find a coarser and more effective means.

Thus Freemasonry became joined with a second weapon in the service of Jewry: the press. The Jew exercises all his skill and tenacity in getting hold of it. By means of the press, he gradually begins to control the whole of public life. He drives it along a road that he has chosen to reach his own ends; he is now in a position to create and direct that force which, under the name of 'public opinion,' is better known today than it was a few decades ago.

In this, he gives himself the air of thirsting after knowledge. He praises every step of progress, particularly those phases that lead to the ruin of others. He judges all progress and development from the standpoint of his own advantage. And when it brings him no such advantage, he is the mortal enemy of enlightenment; he hates all true culture. He uses all the knowledge acquired in the schools of others exclusively in the service of his own race.

He guards his nationality more than ever. Though overflowing with 'enlightenment,' 'progress,' 'liberty,' 'humanity,' etc., his first concern is to preserve his own racial integrity. He occasionally bestows one of his women on an influential Christian; but the racial stock of his male descendants is always pure. He poisons the blood of others, but preserves his own. The Jew rarely marries a Christian girl, but the Christian marries a Jewess.[22] The resulting mongrels always fall on the Jewish side. Thus a part of the higher nobility becomes completely degenerate. The Jew is well aware of this fact, and thereby systematically 'disarms' the intellectual leaders of his racial adversaries. To mask his tactics and fool his victims,

[22] Orthodox Judaism is matrilinial; that is, a Jewish woman bears Jewish children, even if the father is non-Jewish. From a biological perspective, of course, a child of mixed parentage is half of each. But in Hitler's view, the Jewish (lower) half always prevails.

he speaks of the equality of all men, no matter their race or color.[23] And the fools begin to believe him.

Since his whole nature still has too foreign an odor for the broad masses to allow themselves to be caught in his nets, he uses the press to construct a picture of himself that is entirely untrue but well-designed to serve his purpose. In the comic papers, special efforts are made to represent the Jews as a harmless little people that, like all others, has its peculiarities. Despite their manners, which may seem a bit strange, the comics present them as fundamentally honest and benevolent souls. Attempts are generally made to make them appear more insignificant than dangerous.

During this phase of his progress, the chief goal of the Jew is the victory of democracy, or rather: rule of the parliamentary system. This is most compatible with his purposes; the personal element is excluded—and in its place we have the stupidity of the majority, incompetence, and last but not least, cowardice.

The final result must necessarily be the overthrow of the monarchy, which has to happen sooner or later.

11.16 STANDING OF THE FACTORY WORKER

(j) A tremendous economic development transforms the social structure of a nation. The small artisan class slowly disappears and the factory worker, who took its place, has scarcely any chance of establishing an independent existence of his own; he sinks more and more to the level of a proletariat. An essential characteristic of the industrial 'factory worker' is that he is scarcely ever able to support himself, now or later in life. He becomes propertyless, in the truest sense of the word. His old age is miserable and can hardly be called life at all.

In earlier times, a similar situation was created that demanded a solution; and one was found. Together with the peasant and the artisan, a new class was gradually formed, along with officials and salaried workers—especially from the state. All of them were propertyless, in the truest sense of the word. But the state found a remedy for this unhealthy situation by providing an old-age pension for its officials. Private enterprises slowly followed this example in increasing numbers, so that

[23] Though it is hard to believe today, there is a long philosophical and sociological legacy on behalf of the inequality of men. Thinkers as diverse as Plato, Aristotle, Gobineau, and Nietzsche held such a view.

today every regular non-manual worker receives a pension in his later years, provided that the firm in which he works surpasses a certain size. Only by caring for the state official in old age could they develop a high degree of unselfish devotion to duty; in pre-war times, this was one of the distinguishing characteristics of German officials.

Thus an entire propertyless class was saved from destitution, and found a place in the social structure of the national community.

The question is once again put before the state and nation, but this time in a much larger form. More and more, millions of people left the countryside and the villages to take up employment in the big city factories. The working and living conditions of this new class were worse than miserable. The more or less mechanical transformation of prior methods of artisian and peasant work didn't fit well. The way that the peasants and artisans formerly worked had nothing comparable to the intensive labor of the new factory worker. In the old trades, time did not play an important role, but it became an essential element in the new industrial system. The formal transfer of the old working hours into the large-scale industrial enterprises had fatal results. The actual amount of work previously accomplished within a certain time was comparatively small, because the modern methods of intensive production were then unknown. Therefore, though in the older system a working day of 14 or even 15 hours was bearable, now it was beyond the limits of human endurance because every minute was utilized to the extreme.

This absurd transfer of the old working hours to the new industrial system proved unfortunate in two respects: it ruined the workers' health, and it destroyed their faith in a higher law of justice. To this was finally added, on the one hand, miserable wages; and on the other side, the employer held a much more lucrative position than before.

In the country, there could be no social problem because the master and the farmhand were doing the same kind of work, and even ate out of the same dish. But this, too, changed.

The division between employer and employees seems now to have extended to all branches of life. How far this Judaizing process of our people has been allowed to extend is illustrated by the low standing, if not contempt, of the manual worker. This isn't German. It's due to the introduction of a foreign element into our lives—in truth, a Judaizing process. One effect has been to transform the old respect for manual work into a definite feeling of contempt for all physical labor.

Thus a new social class has grown up, one that stands in low esteem. The day must come when we will have to face the question of whether the

nation will be able to make this class an integral part of the social community, or whether the difference of status will become a permanent gulf separating this class from the others.

One thing, however, is certain: This class doesn't include the worst elements in its ranks, but rather the most energetic. The sophistication of so-called culture hasn't yet exercised its disintegrating and degenerating influence. The broad masses of this new lower class haven't yet been infected with the poison of pacifist weakness. They are still robust and can be, if necessary, even brutal.

While our bourgeoisie pay no attention at all to this question, and indifferently allow events to take their course, the Jew seizes upon the many possibilities for the future. While on the one hand he organizes capitalistic methods of exploitation to their ultimate degree, he curries favor with the victims of his policy and power, and in a short while becomes the leader of their struggle *against himself*. 'Against himself' is here only figuratively speaking; for this Great Master of Lies knows how to appear in the guise of the innocent, and throw the guilt on others.[24] Since he has the impudence to lead the masses, they never for a moment suspect that they are falling prey to one of the most infamous betrayals of all time.

And yet that's what it was.

11.17 JEWISH TACTICS

The moment this new class arises from the general economic situation, the Jew clearly sees where to find the necessary pacemaker for his own progressive march. First he uses the bourgeoisie as a battering-ram against the feudal order; and then the worker against the bourgeois world. Just as he succeeded in obtaining civil rights in the protection of the bourgeois class, he now hopes to use the workers' struggle for existence as his path to obtain full control over them.

---

[24] The idea that Jews cast themselves as innocents to hide their danger was already recognized by Nietzsche: "People of the basest origin, in part rabble, outcasts not only from good but also from respectable society, raised away from even the smell of culture, without discipline, without knowledge, without the remotest suspicion that there is such a thing as conscience in spiritual matters; simply—Jews: with an instinctive ability to create an advantage, a means of seduction out of every superstitious supposition... When Jews step forward as innocence itself, then the danger is great." (*Will to Power*, sec. 199.)

From that point on, the workers' only task is to fight for the future of the Jewish people. Without knowing it, the worker places himself at the service of the very power against which he believes he is fighting. The worker thinks he's fighting *against* capital, and thus is all the more easily brought to fight *for* capitalist interests. Outcries are raised against international capital, but in reality such actions are directed against the structure of national economics, in the hope that the international stock exchange can triumph over its dead body.

The Jew's procedure is as follows:

He approaches the worker, hypocritically pretending to feel pity for him and his lot of misery and poverty, thus gaining his confidence. He shows himself eager to study the workers' various hardships—and strives to awaken a yearning to change the conditions under which they live. He artfully encourages the desire for social justice, which is a typical Aryan characteristic, and this is then transformed into a hatred of the more fortunate ones. Next he turns the struggle for the elimination of social ills into a precise worldview. And thus he establishes the Marxist doctrine.

11.18 CORE OF THE MARXIST WORLDVIEW

By presenting his doctrine as a series of socially just demands, he propagates the doctrine all the more effectively. But he also provokes the opposition of decent people who refuse to admit these demands that seem fundamentally unjust and impossible to realize. Under this cloak of purely social ideas are hidden truly diabolic purposes, which are proclaimed with a boundless impudence. This doctrine is an inseparable mixture of reason and absurdity—but in such a way that only the absurdity can be realized, never the reason.

By categorically repudiating the value of the individual and also the nation and its racial content, this doctrine destroys the fundamental basis of all culture; for culture depends on these very factors. Such is the true core of the Marxist worldview—insofar as the term 'worldview' can be applied at all to this phantom product of a criminal brain. The shattering of the concept of personality and of race removes the chief obstacle that barred the way to domination by society's inferior element—and this is the Jew.

The significance of this doctrine lies precisely in its economic and political absurdity. For this reason, intelligent people refuse to support it, while all those who are less intellectual, or who are poorly educated in economic principles, join it with flying colors. The intelligence behind the

movement—for even this movement needs intelligence to exist—is 'served up' by the Jews themselves, from their own ranks.

Thus arises a movement that's composed exclusively of manual workers under Jewish leadership. By all appearances, this movement strives to improve the workers' living conditions; but in reality its aim is the enslavement, and thereby the destruction, of all non-Jewish people.

The Freemasons carried out a program of pacifistic paralysis of the instinct for national self-preservation among our so-called intelligentsia, which was then extended to the broad masses of the workers and bourgeoisie by means of the always-Jewish press.

To these two instruments of disintegration, a third and still more ruthless one was added, namely, organized brute force. As a shock- and storm-troop, Marxism seeks to finish off those parts of the social order left standing, after the two former weapons do their work.

The combined activity of all these forces has been wonderfully managed. And it won't be surprising if we find that those institutions which have always presented themselves as the organs of the more or less traditional state authority should now fail. Among our high and highest state officials (with very few exceptions), the Jew has always found the most complacent backers of his destructive work. An attitude of cringing submissiveness towards 'superiors,' and a condescending arrogance towards 'inferiors,' are the characteristics of this class, along with a degree of narrow-mindedness that is truly frightening. All this is exceeded only by a towering and utterly amazing self-conceit.

But these qualities are of greatest use to the Jew. Therefore they are the ones that he appreciates most.

11.19 ORGANIZATION OF MARXIST WORLD-DOCTRINE

The practical struggle, only now beginning, may be described as follows:

Consistent with the ultimate goals of the Jewish struggle—goals that are not exhausted by economic domination of the world—the Jew divides the organization of his Marxist world-doctrine into two parts. Though apparently distinct, these parts in truth form an indivisible unity: the political movement and the trade union movement.

The trade union movement gathers recruits. It offers assistance and protection to the workers in the hard struggle they must wage for the bare

means of existence—a struggle that's due to the greediness and narrow-mindedness of many of the employers. Unless the workers are ready to surrender all claims to their vital human rights, and unless they are ready to submit to those who are irresponsible and heartless, then the worker must necessarily take matters into his own hands. The organized national community—that is to say, the state—pays no attention to his needs.

The so-called national bourgeoisie, blinded by its own financial interests, opposes this life-or-death struggle of the workers, and places the heaviest obstacles in their way. Not only do they hinder all efforts at shortening the inhumanly long work hours, prohibiting child-labor, granting security and protection to women, and improving the hygienic conditions of the workshops and the dwellings of the working-class, but they actually sabotage them. All the while, the clever Jew takes the cause of the oppressed into his own hands. He gradually becomes the leader of the trade union movement. This is an easy task for him, because he doesn't genuinely intend to eliminate social evils; rather, his objective is to establish an economic stormtroop who will follow his commands and thereby destroy national economic independence. For while a sound social policy has to move between the two aims of securing public health and of safeguarding an independent national economy, the Jew gives no consideration to these goals at all. Rather, their elimination is his life's goal. He desires, not the preservation, but rather the destruction of an independent national economy.

Therefore, as leader of the union movement, he has no scruples about putting forth demands that not only exceed the declared purpose of the movement, but couldn't be carried out without ruining the national economy. Furthermore, he has no interest in seeing a healthy and sturdy population develop; he would prefer a degenerate, unthinking herd that can more easily be subjugated. Because these are his final objectives, he can afford to propose the most senseless demands—demands that are unrealizeable, and that therefore couldn't lead to any real change. At best, they can arouse a spirit of unrest among the masses. And that's precisely his purpose—and not a real and honest improvement of social conditions.

The leadership of Jewry will thus remain unquestioned, at least until an enormous effort is undertaken to enlighten the masses, so that they can better understand the causes of their misery. Or until the state gets rid of the Jew and his work. As long as the masses remain as ill-informed as they actually are today, and as long as the state remains as indifferent to their lot as it now is, the masses will follow whatever leader makes them the most extravagant

promises in economic matters. And the Jew is a master at this. His entire activities are unhampered by moral considerations of any kind.

Naturally, then, it takes him only a short time to defeat all his competitors in this field and drive them from the scene. In accordance with his general brutality and rapacity, he teaches the union movement the most brutal use of physical violence. Those who, using their intelligence, are able to resist the Jewish lures are now broken by terror. The success of that kind of activity is enormous.

By means of the union—which ought to be a blessing for the nation—the Jew shatters the foundation of the national economy.

Parallel to this runs the political organization.

It operates hand-in-hand with the union movement, inasmuch as the latter prepares the masses for political organization, and even forces them into it. This is also the source of the money that the political organization needs to keep its enormous apparatus in action. It is the organ of control for the political activity of its members, and recruits the masses at all big political demonstrations. In the end it ceases to struggle for economic interests, but places its chief weapon—the refusal to work, in the form of a general strike—at the disposal of a political idea.

By means of a press whose contents are adapted to the intellectual horizon of the most ignorant readers, the political and trade union organizations obtain an instrument that prepares the lowest stratum for a campaign of ruthless action. Its purpose isn't to lead people out of the swamp of baseness and to lift their minds up, but to cater to their lowest instincts. Among the lazy-minded and self-seeking sections of the masses, this kind of speculation turns out to be quite profitable.

Above all, it's this very press that carries on a fanatical campaign of slander, striving to tear down everything that might be considered as a support for national independence, and sabotaging all cultural values and the autonomy of the national economy along the way.

Above all, it attacks all men of character who refuse to yield to Jewish efforts to dominate, or who appear dangerous to the Jews merely because of their superior ability. In order to be hated by the Jew, it isn't necessary to openly combat him; it's quite sufficient if one be considered *capable* of opposing the Jew at some point in the future, or of using his talents to enhance the power and position of a nation hostile to the Jew.

His unfailing instinct readily sniffs out the inner spirit of all those he meets; and those who aren't of a kindred spirit with him may be sure to earn his hostility. Since the Jew is not the attacked but the attacker himself,

he considers as enemies not only those who attack him but also those who resist him. He then uses dishonorable means to break such upright people, including lies and slander.

He stops at nothing. His vileness is so appalling that one really cannot be surprised if, in the imagination of our people, the Jew is pictured as the personification of the devil and the symbol of all evil.

The ignorance of the broad masses about the inner character of the Jew, and the lack of instinct and narrow-mindedness of our upper classes, make our people an easy victim of this Jewish campaign of lies.

While the upper classes, with their innate cowardice, turn away from anyone whom the Jew attacks with lies and slander, the common people believe everything—either from ignorance or simple-mindedness. State authorities either wrap themselves in a robe of silence, or more frequently, they persecute the unjustly victimized ones in order to stop the campaign in the Jewish press. In the eyes of some official ass, such action appears to uphold the authority of the state and preserve public order.

Slowly, fear of the Marxist weapon of Jewry descends like a nightmare on the mind and soul of innocent people.

They begin to quiver before this fearful enemy, and thereby become his victims.

11.20 PALESTINE AS ORGANIZATIONAL CENTER

(k) Jewish domination in the state seems now so fully assured that not only can he afford to call himself a Jew again, but he even openly acknowledges his ideas on national and political questions. A part of his race avows itself quite openly as an alien people, but even here they lie. When the Zionists try to make the rest of the world believe that the new national consciousness of the Jews will be satisfied by the establishment of a Palestinian state,[25] the Jews thereby cleverly dupe the simple-minded goyim. They haven't the slightest intention of building up a Jewish state in Palestine so as to live there. What they really want is a central organization for their international world-swindle, one with sovereign rights and freedom from outside control—in other words, a refuge for convicted low-lifes and a training ground for budding criminals.

[25] That is, Israel—which only came into being in 1948, and then illegally.

As a sign of their growing confidence and sense of security, a certain portion of them openly and impudently proclaim their Jewish race, while another part hypocritically pretends that they are still German, French, or English.

Their blatant behavior in their relations with other people shows how close they see the approaching victory.

The black-haired Jewish youth lies in wait for hours, satanically glaring at the unsuspecting girl whom he plans to seduce, adulterating her blood and stealing her from her own people. He uses every possible means to undermine the racial foundations of a subjugated people. In his systematic efforts to ruin girls and women, he strives to break down the last racial barriers for other peoples, even on a large scale. The Jews were and are responsible for bringing Negroes into the Rhineland, with the ultimate idea of bastardizing the hated white race, and thus lowering its cultural and political level so that he himself might dominate.

A racially-pure people who are conscious of their blood can never be overcome by the Jew. In this world, he will only be the master over a bastardized people.

That's why he systematically tries to lower the racial quality of a people by a continuous poisoning of the individual.

11.21 DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT

In the field of politics, he now begins to replace the idea of democracy with a dictatorship of the proletariat.

In the organized mass of Marxism he has found a weapon that makes it possible for him to discard democracy, so as to subjugate and rule in a dictatorial fashion by the aid of brute force.

He systematically works to bring about this revolution in two ways: economically and politically.

Aided by international influences, he forms a ring of enemies around those nations that have proven too sturdy for him to attack from within. He incites them to war, and if necessary, plants the flag of revolution amidst the battlefield.

Economically he undermines the state, until social programs become so unprofitable that they are taken from the state and turned over to his financial control.

Politically he works to withdraw the means of subsistence from the state, undermines the foundations of national resistance and defense,

destroys confidence in leadership, reviles the past and its history, and drags everything truly great down into the gutter.

Culturally he contaminates art, literature, and the theater, scorns national sentiment, overturns all concepts of the sublime and beautiful, the worthy and the good, and ultimately drags the people down to the level of his own base nature.

Religion is mocked, and ethics and morality are portrayed as antiquated prejudices; until the last pillars have fallen, on which the national being depends, in its struggle for existence in this world.

11.22 FROM NATIONAL JEWS TO RACIAL JEWS

(l) Now begins the last great revolution. As soon as the Jew gains political power, he drops the last few veils. Out of the democratic national Jew arises the blood-Jew, the tyrant of the peoples. In the course of a few years, he tries to root out all those who represent the national intelligence. By thus depriving the people of their natural intellectual leaders, he makes them ripe for a slave's lot of permanent subjugation.

Russia offers the most terrible example of such slavery, where he killed or starved 30 million people in a bout of savage fanaticism, and partly by means of inhuman torture.[26] He did this so that a gang of Jewish journalists and stock exchange bandits could dominate a great people.

The final result is not merely the loss of freedom of people oppressed by the Jews, but also the end of this parasite of nations. The death of the victim is followed, sooner or later, by that of the vampire.

11.23 BASTARDIZED PEOPLE

If we review all the causes of the German collapse, we find that the most profound and decisive cause remains the failure to recognize the racial problem, and especially the Jewish danger.

---

[26] The total number of people killed by the Bolsheviks and Stalin is hard to estimate, but Hitler's figure is surely within reason. Russian scholars have long discussed a figure of 20 million, but that is almost certainly an underestimate. If we count deaths into the late Soviet period, some researchers have identified an overall toll of 50 to 60 million—an astounding figure that is rarely discussed in the West. It's an open question how many had died by 1925, when *Mein Kampf* was initially published.

It would have been easy enough to endure the defeats suffered on the battlefields in August 1918. They were nothing compared to the military victories that our nation achieved. Our downfall was not the result of those defeats. Rather, we were overthrown by a force that had prepared those defeats by systematically operating, for several decades, to steal the political and moral instincts and stamina that alone make a nation capable, and thus fit to exist.

By neglecting the problem of preserving the racial foundations of our nation, the old Reich disregarded the sole right that allowed it to survive in this world. Nations that make mongrels of their people, or allow their people to be turned into mongrels, sin against the will of eternal Providence. And thus their overthrow at the hands of a stronger opponent cannot be looked upon as a wrong but, on the contrary, as a restoration of justice. If a people refuses to guard and uphold the nature-given qualities that have their roots in the blood, then such a people has no right to complain over the loss of its earthly existence.

Everything on this Earth can be improved. Every defeat can be the foundation of a future victory. Every lost war can be the cause of a later resurgence. Every hardship can give a new impetus to human energy. And from every oppression, forces can emerge that bring about a new spiritual rebirth—provided that the blood is kept pure.

But the loss of racial purity will wreck inner happiness forever. It degrades men for all time. And the consequences can never be removed.

If this single problem is studied and compared with the other problems of life, we will easily recognize how insignificant they are. They are all limited in time; but the problem of the maintenance or loss of the purity of the blood lasts as long as man himself.

All symptoms of decline in the pre-war period can be traced back to racial causes.

11.24 FAILURE TO RECOGNIZE THE INNER ENEMY

Whether one is dealing with questions of general law or excesses of economic life, of symptoms of cultural decline or political degeneration, of defective schooling or the evil influence of the press over the adult population—always and everywhere, it's a fundamental disregard for the racial needs of the nation. That is, the failure to recognize the danger posed by a foreign race.

CHAPTER 11

That's why all attempts at reform, all institutions for social relief, all political striving, all economic progress, and all apparent increase in the general stock of knowledge, were futile, practically speaking. The nation and the organization that enables it to exist—the state—weren't becoming healthier but, on the contrary, were languishing more and more. The false prosperity of the old Reich couldn't disguise its inner weakness. And every attempt to invigorate it failed because the most important problem was disregarded.

It would be a mistake to think that the followers of the various political parties that tried to fix the condition of the German people, or even all their leaders, were bad or malevolent in themselves. Their activity was doomed to failure simply because of the fact that they saw nothing but the symptoms of our general malady, and tried to treat the symptoms while overlooking the real cause of the disease. If one makes a methodical study of the political development of the old Reich, one cannot help seeing that, after a careful political analysis, a process of inner degeneration had already set in even at the time of German unification. The general situation was declining year by year, despite the apparent political success and increasing economic wealth.

At the Reichstag elections, the growing number of Marxist votes indicated that the internal breakdown and political collapse were then rapidly approaching. All the victories of the so-called bourgeois parties were worthless—not only because they couldn't prevent the numerical increase in the growing mass of Marxist votes, but mainly because they themselves were already infected with the ferment of decay. Though quite unaware of it, the bourgeois world was infected from within with the deadly poison of Marxist ideas. Their occasional resistance was due to the competitive strife among ambitious political leaders, rather than any principled opposition between adversaries who were determined to fight to the bitter end.

During all those years, only one protagonist fought with steadfast perseverance, and that was the Jew. The Star of David steadily ascended as the will to national self-preservation declined.

Therefore, in August 1914, it wasn't a unified people resolved to attack that rushed to the battlefields. Rather, it was the last flicker of an instinct for national self-preservation against the creeping pacificist-Marxist paralysis of the national body. Even in those days of destiny, we didn't recognize the internal enemy; therefore all external efforts were bound to be in vain. Providence didn't grant her reward to the victorious sword, but followed the eternal law of retribution.

A profound recognition of all this was the source of those principles and tendencies that inspire our new movement. We were convinced that, only by recognizing such truths, could we halt the German national decline and lay a granite foundation on which the state could again be built—one that would not be an alien mechanism for economic purposes and interests, but a national organism:

A Germanic State
for the German Nation.

CHAPTER 12: THE FIRST PERIOD OF DEVELOPMENT OF THE NATIONAL SOCIALIST GERMAN WORKERS' PARTY

If, at the close of this volume, I describe the first stage in the progress of our movement and give a brief account of the problems raised, it's not because I seek to expound on the ideals of the movement. These are so momentous that they require a whole volume. Therefore I will devote the second volume of this book to a detailed survey of the principles that form the program of our movement, and attempt to draw a picture of what we mean by the word 'state.'

When I say 'we,' I mean to include all those hundreds of thousands who have fundamentally the same longing, though in the individual cases they cannot find adequate words to describe their inner vision. It's a noteworthy fact of all great reforms that, in the beginning, there is only one single champion to come forward on behalf of several million. The goal has often been the object of profound longing on the part of hundreds of thousands for many centuries, until finally one man comes forward to proclaim the will of the masses and become the standard-bearer of the old yearning—which he now leads to victory as a new idea.

The fact that millions yearn at heart for a radical change in our present conditions is proven by their profound discontentment. This feeling is manifest in a thousand ways: in some as discouragement and despair, in

others as resentment, anger, and indignation. One man reacts with indifference, another with violent excess. Other witnesses to this feeling are those who abstain from voting, as well as the many who tend to side with the fanatical leftwing extremists.

It was to the latter that our young movement was intended to appeal. It wasn't meant to be an organization for the contented and satisfied, but rather to embrace all those who were suffering from profound anxiety and could find no peace, the unhappy and the discontented. It wasn't meant to float on the surface of the nation but rather to push its roots deep among the masses.

12.1 SITUATION AFTER THE REVOLUTION

Considered purely politically, the year 1918 presented the following picture: a people torn in two. One part, and by far the smaller of the two, contained the intellectual classes of the nation. Superficially this part is nationalistic, but this word means to them little more than a vague and feeble defense of so-called state interests, which are in turn identical to dynastic interests. This class tries to defend its ideas and reach its goals with intellectual weapons; these are fragmentary and superficial, and they fail completely in the face of the enemy's brutality. With one violent blow, this class, which had previously governed, is now struck down. It trembles with fear and accepts every humiliation imposed on it by the ruthless victor.

Against them stands a second class, the broad masses of manual laborers. This group is organized with a more or less radical Marxist tendency, and is determined to break any kind of intellectual resistance by the use of brute force. They have no nationalist tendencies whatsoever, and deliberately reject all national interests. On the contrary, they promote the interests of the foreign oppressor. Numerically this class is the strongest, and more importantly, includes all those elements necessary for a national resurgence.

Already in 1918, one thing was clear: no resurgence of the German nation could take place without the restoration of outward-directed power. The prerequisites for this are not arms, as our bourgeois 'statesmen' babble, but rather the force of will. Earlier, the German people had more than enough arms. And yet they were not able to defend their liberty because they lacked those energies that spring from the instinct of national self-preservation: the will for self-preservation. Even the best armaments are

only dead and worthless material, as long as the spirit is lacking that makes men willing and determined to use them. Germany was rendered defenseless not for lack of arms, but for lack of will to protect its weapons for national survival.

Today our leftwing politicians in particular are constantly insisting that their spineless, compliant, and in truth treasonous foreign policy results from a lack of arms. To this we must say: no, the opposite is true. Through your anti-national and criminal policy, you surrendered our arms. And now you try to make people believe that your miserable villany is essentially caused by the lack of arms. Just like everything else you do, this is a lie and falsification.

But the politicians on the right deserve exactly the same reproach. It was through their miserable cowardice that those Jewish rabble came to power in 1918 to steal the nation's arms. They too have neither right nor reason on their side when they appeal to disarmament as the cause of their prudence (which is to say, cowardice). Rather, our defenselessness is the result of their cowardice.

Therefore the question of restoring Germany's power is not, How can we manufacture arms? but: How we can produce that spirit which enables a people to bear arms? Once this spirit prevails among a people, then the will finds a thousand ways—each of which ends in a weapon! But a coward won't fire even a single shot when attacked, even though he may have ten pistols. For him they are of less value than a knarled stick in the hands of a courageous man.

12.2 RECOVERY OF POLITICAL POWER

The problem of reestablishing the political power of our nation is primarily a problem of restoring the instinct of national self-preservation—if only because every preparatory step in foreign policy, and every judgment on the worth of a state, has been proved by experience to be grounded not on existing weapons but rather on the nation's moral capacity for resistance. The ability to build alliances is determined not so much by the inert mass of arms but by the obvious presence of a sturdy will to national self-preservation and a heroic, death-defying courage. An alliance is not made between arms but between men.

The British nation will therefore be considered as the most valuable ally in the world, as long as it can be counted upon to show that brutality

and tenacity in its government, as well as in the spirit of the broad masses, that enables it to carry through to victory any struggle that it begins—regardless of duration or sacrifice. And all this, even though the actual military weaponry at hand may be utterly inadequate when compared with that of other nations.

Once it's understood that German restoration is a question of reawakening the will to political self-preservation, we can see quite clearly that it won't be enough to win over those elements that are already national-minded, but only by the nationalization of the consciously anti-national masses.

12.3 WINNING OVER THE BROAD MASSES

A young movement that aims at reestablishing a German state with full sovereign powers will therefore have to direct its efforts entirely at winning over the broad masses. Our so-called 'national bourgeoisie' are so wretched, generally speaking, and their national spirit appears so feeble, that we can be sure they will offer no serious resistance to a powerful domestic or foreign policy. Even if the narrow-minded German bourgeoisie should maintain a passive resistance when the hour of deliverance is at hand—as they did in Bismarck's time—we will never have to fear any active resistance on their part, because of their recognized and proverbial cowardice.

It's quite different with our internationalized masses. In their primitive roughness, they are predisposed to the idea of violence, while at the same time their Jewish leaders are more brutal and ruthless. They will crush any German revival, just as they smashed the German army by striking from the rear. Above all, these organized masses will use their numerical majority in this parliamentarian state not only to hinder any national foreign policy, but also to prevent Germany from restoring its political power abroad—thus making it undesirable as an ally. Not only are we ourselves aware of the weakness in our 15 million Marxists, democrats, pacifists, and centrists; foreign countries also recognize this internal burden, and take it into consideration when considering possible alliances. No one allies himself with a state where the active portion of the population is even passively opposed to any resolute foreign policy.

Added to this is the fact that the leaders of those parties that were responsible for the national betrayal are ready to oppose every attempt at a revival, simply to retain power. Historically speaking, it's impossible for

the German people to recover their former position by retaliating against those who were the cause and occasion for the collapse of our state. Before the judgment seat of posterity, November 1918 will not be regarded as a simple rebellion but as high treason against the country.

Therefore any possibility of regaining German independence depends upon, first and foremost, a recovery of the inner unity of the people's will.

Looked at from a technical standpoint, it seems absurd to think of liberating Germany as long as the masses aren't willing to support an ideal of freedom. From a purely military point of view, every officer will agree that a war cannot be waged against an outside enemy by student battalions; together with the brains of the nation, fists are also necessary.

Furthermore, it must be remembered that the nation would be robbed of irreplaceable assets by a national defense in which only the so-called intelligentsia were engaged. The young German intellectuals who joined the volunteer regiments and fell on the battlefields of Flanders in the autumn of 1914 were bitterly missed later on. They were the highest treasure that the nation possessed; their loss couldn't be compensated in the course of the war. And it's not only the struggle itself that couldn't be waged without the working masses in the storm battalions, but also the necessary technical preparations couldn't be made without an inner unity of the national will.

Our nation—which has to exist disarmed, under a thousand eyes appointed by the Versailles Treaty—cannot make any technical preparations for the recovery of its freedom and human independence until the whole army of domestic spies is cut down to those few whose inborn baseness would lead them to betray anything and everything for the well-known 30 pieces of silver. But we can deal with such people. The millions, however, who are opposed to every kind of national revival simply because of their political opinions, constitute an insurmountable obstacle—as long as the cause of their opposition, the international Marxist worldview, is not overcome and banished from their hearts and minds.

From whatever viewpoint we may examine the possibility of recovering our state and national independence—whether from the standpoint of technical rearmament or from that of the actual struggle itself—the necessary prerequisite always remains the same. This is the winning over of the broad masses to accept the principle of our national independence.

If we don't regain our external freedom, every domestic reform will, at best, be an increase in our productive powers as a colony. The surplus of

any so-called economic improvement would only go into the hands of our international controllers, and any social betterment would at best increase the productivity of our labor for them. No cultural progress can be made by the German nation, because such progress is too much bound up with political independence and the dignity of our people.

Therefore, if we can find a satisfactory solution for the problem of Germany's future only by winning over the broad masses to the nationalist idea, this work of education must be considered the highest and most important task to be accomplished by a movement—that is, for one that doesn't strive merely to satisfy the needs of the moment but considers everything only in light of future results.

12.4 NATIONALIZATION OF THE MASSES

Thus, as early as 1919, we were convinced that accomplishing the nationalization of the masses would constitute our highest aim.

From a tactical standpoint, a number of obligations followed.[1]

(1) No social sacrifice could be considered too great, in order to win over the masses for a national revival.

Any economic concessions granted today to employees are negligible when compared with the benefit to the whole nation if they contribute to bringing back the masses of the people to their own nation. Nothing but meanness and shortsightedness—which, unfortunately, are prevalent characteristics of our employers—could prevent people from recognizing that, in the long run, no economic improvement, and therefore no rise in profits, are possible unless the internal national solidarity of our people is restored.

If the German unions had defended the interests of the working-classes uncompromisingly during the war; if, even during the war, they had used the labor strike a thousand times over to force the dividend-hungry industrialists to grant the workers' demands; if at the same time they had stood up as good Germans for the national defense as stoutly as for their own claims; and if they had given to their country what was their country's due—then the war would never have been lost. How ridiculously insignificant would all, and even the greatest, economic concessions have been in comparison with the tremendous importance of winning the war!

[1] What follows are 14 numbered sections, constituting Hitler's program of nationalization.

CHAPTER 12

For a movement that plans to restore the German worker to the German people, it's absolutely necessary to understand clearly that economic sacrifices should be utterly disregarded—provided, of course, that they don't go as far as endangering the independence and stability of the national economic system.

(2) The nationalistic education of the masses can be carried out only indirectly, by improving their social conditions. Only in this way can the economic conditions be created that enable everyone to participate in the cultural life of the nation.

(3) The nationalization of the broad masses can never be achieved by half-measures—that is, by feebly insisting on a so-called objective standpoint—but only by a ruthless and devoted insistence on the one goal to be attained. This means that a people cannot be made 'national' in the sense of that word given by our bourgeois class today—with so many limitations—but rather in the vehement and extreme sense. Poison can be overcome only by an antidote, and only a shallow bourgeois mind could think that the middle way is the road to heaven.

The broad masses of a nation are neither professors nor diplomats. They are only poorly acquainted with abstract ideas; their reactions lie more in the domain of the feelings. That's where their positive or negative attitude lies. They respond only to an expression of force from one of the two extremes, and never to any half-measure that wavers between the two. Their emotional grounds also account for their extraordinary stability. Faith is stronger than knowledge; love is less changeable than respect; hate is more permanent than aversion. And the driving force that has brought about the most tremendous revolutions on this Earth has never been a scientific teaching that has gained power over the masses, but always a fanaticism that has inspired them—and sometimes even a hysteria that has driven them forward.

Anyone who wishes to win over the masses must know the key that opens the door to their hearts. It's not objectivity—meaning, weakness—but rather will and power.

(4) The soul of the people can be won only if we carry through the positive struggle for our own aims, and also destroy the enemy that opposes them.

When they see a ruthless attack on a foe, the people take it as proof of the rightness of such action. Conversely, when the aggressor renounces the destruction of the foe, this makes their rightness seem uncertain, if not an injustice.

The masses are but a part of nature itself. Their feelings don't allow them to understand hand-shaking between avowed enemies. They desire the victory of the stronger and the destruction of the weaker, or at least his unconditional submission.

The nationalization of the masses will succeed only if, in the positive struggle to win the soul of the people, those international poisoners who oppose it are rooted out.

(5) All the great questions of our time are questions of the moment, and are only the results of certain definite causes. And among all those, there is only one that has a profoundly causal significance, namely, the question of the racial preservation of the people. Human strength and weakness depends on the blood alone. Nations that are unaware of the importance of their racial stock are like men who try to educate the poodle to do the work of the greyhound—not understanding that both the speed of the greyhound and the docility of the poodle are inborn qualities, and these cannot be learned. A people that fails to preserve its racial purity thereby renounces the unity of the soul of the nation, in all its manifestations. A disintegrated national character is the inevitable result of a disintegration of the blood. And the change in the spiritual and creative forces of a people is only an effect of the change in their racial foundations.

Whoever would free the German people from their vices of today—which did not spring from their original nature—must first rid them of the foreign viruses in the national body.

The German nation will never be restored unless the racial problem, and hence the Jewish question, is clearly understood.

The racial question supplies the key, not only to human history, but also to every kind of human culture.

(6) By incorporating the internationalist masses into the national community, we don't intend to neglect a safeguarding of trade and professional interests. Divergent professional interests are not the same as class division, but are inherent in our economic life. Professional grouping doesn't clash at all with the idea of a national community, for this means national unity in regard to all those problems that affect the life of the nation as such.

The integration of a professional group or class into the national community, or into the state, cannot be accomplished by lowering the higher classes, but only by raising up the lower classes. The class that carries through this process is never the higher class, but rather the lower—the one that's fighting for equal rights. The bourgeoisie of today was not

incorporated in the state through measures of the nobility, but only by its own energy and leadership.

The German worker cannot be raised and incorporated into the German national community via ineffectual talk of brotherhood, but by a systematic improvement in the social and cultural life of the worker—until the most serious differences are bridged. A movement that has this for its aim must try to recruit its followers mainly from the ranks of the workers. It may include members of the intellectual classes only insofar as they completely understand the goal to be achieved. This process of transformation and reunion cannot be completed within 10 or 20 years; it will take several generations, as experience has shown.

The most difficult obstacle to the reunion of our contemporary worker with the national community doesn't consist so much in the fact that he fights for the interests of his fellow workers, but rather in the international ideas with which he is imbued, and which are hostile to nationhood and fatherland. If inspired by the same leadership, the trade unions could turn millions of workers into the most valuable members of the national community, without thereby affecting their own struggles for their economic demands.

A movement that sincerely tries to bring the German worker back into his people, and rescue him from the folly of internationalism, must wage a vigorous campaign against certain notions that are prevalent among the industrialists. One of these is that the employee is obliged to surrender all his economic rights to the employer and, further, that the workers would come into conflict with the national community if they attempted to defend their own justified interests. This assertion is a deliberate lie; the idea of a national community doesn't impose any obligations on the one side that aren't imposed on the other.

A worker certainly sins against the spirit of the national community if he acts entirely on his own initiative and puts forward exaggerated demands without regard for the common good or the survival of the national economy. But an industrialist also does so if he adopts inhuman methods of exploitation and misuses the working forces of the nation, to make millions for himself unjustly from the sweat of the workers. He has no right to call himself 'national,' and no right to talk of a folk community; he's only an unscrupulous egoist who sows the seeds of social discontent and provokes a spirit of conflict that sooner or later must harm the interests of the nation.

The reservoir from which the young movement has to draw its members will primarily be the working masses. Those masses must be

delivered from the clutches of the international delusion. They must be freed from social distress. They must be raised above their present cultural misery and transformed into a united and valuable factor in the folk community, inspired by nationalist ideas and sentiment.

If, among nationalist intellectual circles, men can be found who genuinely love the people and eagerly anticipate the future of Germany, and at the same time have a sound grasp of the importance of a struggle for the soul of the masses, such men are cordially welcomed in the ranks of our movement. They can serve as a valuable intellectual force. But this movement can never aim at recruiting its membership from the herd of bourgeois voters. If it did so, the movement would be burdened with a group of people whose whole mentality would only paralyze our campaign to win over the masses.

In theory, it may be true that the broad masses ought to be influenced by a combined leadership of the upper and lower social strata within the framework of the movement. But notwithstanding all this, the fact remains that, though it may be possible to exercise a psychological influence on the bourgeois classes and to arouse some enthusiasm or even awaken some understanding among them by our public demonstrations, their traditional characteristics—or better, vices—cannot be changed. Such vices are part of a tradition that has developed over centuries. The difference between the cultural levels of the two groups, and between their attitudes towards economic questions, is still so great that it would become an obstacle as soon as the initial enthusiasm of our demonstrations subsided.

Finally, it's not part of our program to transform the nationalist camp itself, but rather to win over those who are anti-nationalist.

The strategy of the whole movement must finally be determined from this viewpoint.

(7) This one-sided but clear approach must be manifested in the propaganda of the movement; and on the other hand, this is absolutely necessary on propagandist grounds.

If propaganda is to be of service to the movement, it must be addressed to one side alone. If it varies, the direction of its appeal won't be understood in the one camp or may be rejected by the other, as merely obvious and uninteresting; for there is a great difference in the intellectual training of the two camps in question.

Even the style and tone can't have the same effect in those two opposite extremes of the social structure. If the propaganda refrains from using primitive forms of expression, it won't appeal to the sentiments of the

masses. If, on the other hand, it conforms to the crude sentiments of the masses in its words and gestures, it will be rejected by the so-called intellectual circles as coarse and vulgar.

Among a hundred so-called orators, there are scarcely ten who are capable of speaking with effect before an audience of street-sweepers, locksmiths, sewer-cleaners, etc. today, and then lecturing with equal effect tomorrow before an audience of university professors and students. Among a thousand public speakers, there may be only one who can speak to locksmiths and professors in the same hall in such a way that his statements can be fully comprehended by each group, while at the same time he effectively influences both and awakens enthusiasm, to hearty applause. But it must always be remembered that even the most beautiful theory, in most cases, can reach the public only through smaller minds.

What matters is not the vision of the man of genius who created the great idea, but rather the success that his prophets achieve in transmitting this idea to the broad masses.

Social Democracy and the whole Marxist movement were particularly attractive because of the uniformity of the public to which they addressed their appeal. The more limited and narrow their ideas and arguments, the easier it was for the masses to grasp and assimilate them; those ideas and arguments were well-adapted to a low level of intelligence.

These considerations led the new movement to adopt a clear and simple line:

In both its message and forms of expression, propaganda must be kept on a level with the intelligence of the masses, and its value must be measured only by the actual results.

At a public meeting of all classes, the best speaker is not the one who is closest to the intellectuals, but the one who knows how to win the hearts of the masses.

An educated man who is present, and who finds fault with an address because of its low intellectual level—even though he sees its effect on the lower groups to be won over—only proves the incapacity of his thinking and his worthlessness to the new movement. The only useful intellectuals are those who understand its mission and its aims so well that they have learned to judge the propaganda exclusively by the success obtained, and never by the impression made on the intellectuals themselves. Our propaganda isn't meant to serve as entertainment for those national-minded people, but to win over the enemies of nationalism—those who, nevertheless, are of our own blood.

In general, those trends that I briefly summarized in the chapter on 'War Propaganda' determined the approach that we adopted in our campaign, and the manner in which we put it into practice.[2]

Success proves that the decision was right.

(8) The goal of any political reform movement can never be reached by trying to educate the public or influence those in power, but only by gaining political power. Every world-changing idea has not only the right but also the obligation to secure those means that enable it to be carried out. In this world, success is the only basis for judging right or wrong. And by 'success' we don't mean the mere conquest of power—as in 1918—but an exercise of power that is beneficial to the nation. A coup d'etat cannot be considered successful if, as many empty-headed government lawyers in Germany now believe, the revolutionaries succeed in getting control of the state into their hands. It's successful only if, in comparison with conditions under the old regime, the lot of the nation has been improved. This certainly does not apply to the German revolution, as that movement was called, which brought a gang of bandits into power in the fall of 1918.

But if the conquest of political power is a prerequisite for the practical realization of the ideals that inspire a reform movement, then any movement that aims at reform must, from the very first, be considered as a movement of the masses—and not as a literary tea club, or a shopkeepers' bowling society.

12.5 HIGHEST AUTHORITY, HIGHEST RESPONSIBILITY

(9) The nature and internal organization of the new movement must be anti-parliamentarian. That is, it rejects in general, and in its own structure, the principle of majority rule, and the idea that the leader is only the executor of the will and opinion of others. In things both small and large, the movement holds that one person must have absolute authority combined with highest responsibility.

In our movement, the practical consequences of this principle are the following:

The leader of a local group is appointed, and he is then the responsible leader of his group. All committees are subject to his authority, and not he to theirs. There is no such thing as committees that vote, but only

[2] See Chapter 6.

committees that *work*. This work is allotted by the responsible leader, who is the head of the group. The same principle applies to the higher organizations: precinct, district, and region. In each case the leader is appointed from above and is invested with full authority and executive power. Only the leader of the whole party is elected at the general meeting of the members. But he is the sole leader of the movement. All committees are responsible to him, but he is not responsible to the committees. His decision is final, but he bears the full responsibility for it.

The members of the movement are entitled to call him to account by means of a new election, or to remove him from office, if he has violated the principles of the movement or has served it badly. He is then replaced by a more capable man who is invested with the same authority and obliged to bear the same responsibility.

One of the highest duties of the movement is to make this principle an imperative—not only within its own ranks but also for the whole state.

The man who wishes to become leader earns the highest and unlimited authority, but he also has to bear the final and gravest responsibility.

The man who hasn't the courage to shoulder responsibility for his actions isn't fitted to be a leader. Only a hero is suited to the task.

Human progress and culture are not a product of the majority, but rather are exclusively the work of personal genius and energy.

A prerequisite for recovering the greatness and power of our nation is the cultivation of individual personality, and the establishment of its rights.

Hence, our movement must necessarily be anti-parliamentarian. If it takes part in the parliamentary institution, it's only for the purpose of destroying it—for doing away with an institution that we must look upon as one of the gravest symptoms of human decline.

12.6 NEITHER MONARCHIST NOR REPUBLICAN

(10) The movement steadfastly refuses to take any stand on questions that are either outside its political framework, or that are not of fundamental importance, and hence irrelevant. It doesn't aim at a religious reformation, but rather a political reorganization of our people. It looks upon the two religious denominations as equally valuable mainstays for the existence of our people, and therefore it makes war on all those parties that would degrade this foundation—on which the religious and moral stability of our people is based—to an instrument in the service of party interests.

Finally, the movement doesn't aim at establishing any one form of state and fighting against another, but rather to create those fundamental principles without which no republic or monarchy can survive for any length of time. The movement doesn't consider its mission to be the establishment of a monarchy or the preservation of a republic, but rather to create a German state.

The question concerning the outer form of this state—which is to say, its final shape—is not of fundamental importance. This is something to be resolved only by questions of practical expediency.

Once a people has understood and appreciated the great problems that affect its existence, the question of outer formalities will never lead to any internal conflict.

12.7 THE NECESSARY EVIL OF ORGANIZATION

(11) The question of the inner organization of the movement isn't one of principle but of expediency.

The best kind of organization isn't that which places the largest intermediary apparatus between the leadership of the movement and the individual followers, but rather the smallest. It's the task of such an organization to transmit a certain idea—which originated in the brain of one individual—to a multitude of people, and to supervise its realization.

Therefore, organization is always only a necessary evil. At best it's a means of reaching certain ends; at worst, it becomes an end in itself.

Since the world produces more mechanical than intelligent beings, it's always easier to develop the form of an organization than ideas per se.

The march of any idea towards practical realization, especially those that seek to reform, may be roughly sketched as follows:

A creative idea takes shape in the mind of someone, who thereby feels himself called upon to transmit this idea to humanity. He preaches his faith and gradually wins a certain number of followers. This direct and personal way of promoting one's ideas among fellow men is the most ideal and natural. As the movement increases the number of followers of the new doctrine, it gradually becomes impossible for the original founder to continue exerting personal and direct influence on his followers, to guide and direct them. Proportionate to the growth of the community, direct communication become impossible; the ideal situation is gone, and is replaced by the necessary evil of organization. Small subsidiary groups

come into existence—as in the political movement, for example, where the local groups represent the germ-cells out of which the organization develops later on.

But such sub-divisions must not occur until the authority of the spiritual founder, and of the school he has created, are accepted without reservation. The importance of having one geographic center as the chief seat of the movement can't be over-emphasized. Only the existence of such a place, around which is woven a magic spell—as with Mecca or Rome—can supply a movement with a permanent driving force based on internal unity, and with the recognition of one head as representing this unity.

When the first organizational germ-cells are formed, care must always be taken to insist on the importance of the place where the idea originated. The creative, moral, and practical greatness of the place from which the movement emerged and is governed must be exalted to a supreme symbol. And all the more so, as the original cells of the movement become so numerous that they have to be reorganized into larger structural units.

When the number of individual followers became so large that direct personal contact with the head of the movement was out of the question, then we formed those first local groups. As those groups multiplied, it was necessary to establish higher levels into which the local groups were distributed, designated as regional or precinct groups.

Though it may be easy enough to maintain the original central authority over the lowest groups, it's much more difficult to do so in relation to the higher units of organization. And yet this is an indispensable condition if the unity of the movement is to be guaranteed and the idea of it carried out.

Finally, when those larger intermediary organizations have to be combined into new and still higher units, it becomes increasingly difficult to maintain the absolute supremacy of the original seat of the movement, its teachings, and so on.

Consequently, the mechanical forms of an organization must only be introduced to the degree that the spiritual authority and ideals of the central seat are firmly established. In the political sphere, it may often happen that this supremacy can be provided only by practical power.

From all this, the following principles were laid down for the inner structure of the movement:

(a) All activity should be concentrated in one place: Munich. A band of absolutely reliable followers must be trained, and a school founded that would help to propagate the ideas. The necessary authority must be acquired for the future through the greatest possible visible successes in this one place.

To make the movement and its leader known, it was necessary, not only to shatter the belief that the Marxist doctrine was invincible, but also to show that a counter-doctrine was possible.

(b) Local groups couldn't be established until the supremacy of the central authority in Munich was definitely acknowledged.

(c) Precinct, regional, and provincial groups could be formed only after the need for them became evident, and only after the supremacy of the central authority was satisfactorily guaranteed.

Further, the creation of subordinate organizational forms must depend on the availability and leadership of qualified men.

This can occur in two ways:

(a) The movement acquires the necessary funds to attract and train intelligent people who are capable of becoming leaders. The personnel thus obtained can then be systematically deployed according to tactical and efficiency demands.

This solution is quicker and easier. But it demands large financial resources; the leaders will work in the movement only if they are paid a salary.

(b) If the movement is not in a position to employ paid leaders, it must begin by depending on voluntary helpers.

This way is slower and more difficult.

The leaders of the movement must allow vast territories to lie fallow, unless someone comes forward to place himself at the service of the central authority for the purpose of organizing and directing the movement in the region concerned.

It may happen that in extensive regions no one can be found. But at the same time, in other regions, two or three may appear whose capabilities are almost equal. The difficulty involved here is very great, and can be overcome only with the passing of the years.

For the establishment of any branch of the organization, the prerequisite is always that a person can be found who is capable of leadership.

Just as the army and all its organization units are useless if there are no officers, so any political organization is worthless if it hasn't the right kind of leader.

If an inspiring leader cannot be found for the organization and direction of a local group, it's better to refrain from establishing it than to run the risk of failure after the group has been formed.

Leadership requires not only will but also ability. And greater importance must be placed on will power and energy than on intelligence. Most valuable of all is a combination of ability, determination, and perseverance.

12.8 INNER STRUCTURE OF THE MOVEMENT

(12) The future of a movement is determined by the devotion, and even intolerance, with which its members fight. Convinced of their correctness, they must carry it through to success against other similar organizations.

It's a great error to believe that the strength of a movement increases if it's combined with other similar movements. Any such expansion will of course mean an increase in external size, which superficially appears as an increase of power. But in reality, the movement thereby admits outside elements that will subsequently lead to an inner weakening.

Though it may be said that one movement is similar to another, in reality no such identity exists. Otherwise there would not be two movements, but only one. And whatever the difference may be—even if only in the abilities of the leaders—it is there. It's against the natural law of all development to couple dissimilar organisms; rather, the stronger must overcome the weaker and, through this struggle, increase the constitutional force and effective strength of the victor.

By combining political organizations that are approximately alike, certain immediate advantages may be gained. But in the long run, these are bound to become the cause of internal weaknesses that appear later on.

A movement can become great only by the unhampered development of its internal strength, and by its steady growth leading up to a final victory over its competitors.

One may safely say that the strength of a movement and its right to existence can be developed only as long as it remains true to the principle that struggle is a necessary condition of its progress. Its maximum strength will be reached only as soon as complete victory has been won.

Therefore a movement must not strive to obtain merely immediate and transitory successes, but it must show a spirit of uncompromising perseverance in carrying through a long struggle that will secure for it a long period of growth.

Movements that owe their expansion only to a so-called combination of similar structures—which means that their external strength is due to a policy of compromise—are like hothouse plants. They shoot up quickly but lack the inner strength to withstand the storms of centuries.

The greatness of every powerful organization that embodies a creative idea lies in the spirit of religious devotion and intolerance with which it stands out against all others. If an idea is right in itself and, thus armed, wages war on this earth, then it is invincible. Every persecution will only add to its internal strength.

The greatness of Christianity didn't arise from attempts to make compromises with similar philosophical opinions of the ancient world, but in the unrelenting fanaticism in defending its own teaching.

The apparent gains that a movement makes by joining with others is easily surpassed by the steady increase of strength that a doctrine and its organization acquires, if it remains independent and fights its own cause alone.

12.9 EDUCATION FOR STRUGGLE

(13) The movement must educate its adherents about the principle that struggle isn't to be considered a necessary evil but rather as desired in itself. Therefore they must not fear the hostility of their adversaries, but they must take it as a necessary condition for their whole right to existence. They must not try to avoid the hatred of the enemies of our people and our worldview, but must welcome it. Lies and slander are among the manifestations of this hatred.

The man who is not opposed, vilified, and slandered in the Jewish press is not a staunch German, and no true National Socialist. The best rule to measure the sincerity of his convictions, his character, and his strength of will is the hostility that his name arouses among the mortal enemies of our people.

The followers of the movement, and indeed the whole nation, must be reminded again and again of the fact that the Jew and his newspapers are always spreading lies. If he tells the truth on some occasions, it's only for the purpose of masking some greater deception, which turns the apparent truth into a deliberate falsehood. The Jew is the great master of lies.[3] Lies and deception are his weapons in struggle.

Every Jewish slander and every Jewish lie is a scar on the bodies of our warriors.

He whom they revile the most is nearest to us, and he whom they mortally hate is our best friend.

Anyone who opens a Jewish newspaper in the morning and doesn't find himself vilified there, has spent yesterday to no account. If he had achieved something, he would be persecuted, slandered, derided, abused, and besmirched. Those who effectively combat this mortal enemy of our

[3] Again recalling Schopenhauer. See Chapter 10.4, note 3.

people, who is at the same time the enemy of all Aryan peoples and culture, can only expect to arouse opposition on the part of this race and become the object of its slanderous attacks.

When these truths become part of the flesh and blood of our members, then the movement will be impregnable and invincible.

12.10 EDUCATION FOR RESPECT OF THE PERSON

(14) The movement must use all possible means to cultivate respect for the individual personality. It must never forget that all human values are based on *personal* values, and that every idea and achievement is the fruit of the creative power of one man. Admiration for everything great is a tribute to one creative personality, and all those who feel such admiration become thereby united.

Nothing can take the place of the individual. This is especially true when the individual embodies in himself not the mechanical but the creative and cultural element. No pupil can take the place of the master in completing a great picture that was left unfinished; and just in the same way, no substitute can take the place of the great poet or thinker, or the great statesman or military general. Their activity lies in the realm of art. It can never be mechanically acquired, because it's an innate product of divine grace.

The greatest revolutions and the greatest achievements of this world, its greatest cultural works and the immortal creations of great statesmen, are inseparably bound up with one name, and are represented by it. The failure to pay tribute to one of those great spirits signifies a neglect of that enormous source of power that lies in the names of all great men and women.

The Jew knows this best of all. He, whose great men have always been great only in their efforts to destroy mankind and its culture, worships them as idols. But he attempts to stigmatize respect for a nation's own great spirits as unworthy; this he labels a 'personality cult.'

As soon as a people has so lost its courage as to submit to this Jewish arrogance and defamation, it renounces the most important source of its own inner strength. This is not a pandering to the masses, but a veneration of genius, ennoblement, and enlightenment.

When men's hearts are breaking and their souls despair, their great forebears turn their eyes towards them from the dim shadows of the past—they who knew how conquer anxiety and affliction, despair and misery,

mental servitude and physical bondage—and extend their eternal hands to despairing souls!

Woe to the nation that is ashamed to grasp them!

12.11 DANGER OF OBSCURITY

During the initial phase of our movement, our greatest handicap was the fact that none of us were known and our names meant nothing—a fact that then seemed to diminish our chances for success. Our most difficult task then—when it was often only six, seven, or eight of us—was to make everyone in this tiny circle believe that there was a tremendous future in store for the movement.

Consider that only six or seven poor devils, who were entirely unknown, came together to found a movement that would succeed in doing what the great mass parties had failed to do: namely, to reconstruct a German Reich of greater power and glory. We would have been very pleased if we were attacked or even ridiculed. But the most depressing fact was that no one paid any attention to us at all. This utter lack of interest in us caused me the greatest suffering at the time.

When I entered the circle of those few men, there was no question of a party or a movement. I already described my initial impressions of that small organization. Subsequently, I had time and the occasion to study the form of this so-called party, which at first looked so impossible. By God, the picture was quite depressing and discouraging. There was nothing; absolutely nothing at all. There was only the name of a party. And the committee consisted of all the party members. Somehow or other, it seemed just like the kind of thing we were fighting against—a miniature parliament. The voting system ruled. When the great parliament cried until they were hoarse, at least they shouted about problems of importance. Here, this small circle engaged in interminable discussions as to how they might answer the letters that they were delighted to have received!

Needless to say, the public knew nothing of all this. In Munich, nobody knew of our party, not even by name, except our few members and their few friends.

Every Wednesday, a so-called committee meeting was held in one of the Munich cafés, and a lecture was arranged for one evening each week. In the beginning, all the members of the movement were also members of the committee; therefore all the faces were the same. Now the task was to

extend the narrow limits of this small circle and get new members; but above all, to make the movement known at any price.

We chose the following technique:

Monthly—and later, every two weeks—we decided to hold a 'meeting.' Some of the invitations were typewritten, and others were written by hand. For the first few meetings, we distributed them in the streets and delivered them personally. Each solicited among his own acquaintances and tried to persuade some of them to attend our meetings.

The result was lamentable.

I still remember how I once personally delivered 80 of these invitations, and how we waited in the evening for the crowds to come.

After an hour, the 'chairman' finally had to open the 'meeting.' Again there were only seven men: the same old seven.

12.12 THE FIRST MEETING

We then changed our methods. We had the invitations typed in a Munich stationery shop, and then mimeographed them. The result was that a few more people attended our next meeting. The number increased gradually: from 11 to 13, then to 17, to 23, and finally to 34.

We collected some money within our own circle, each poor devil giving a small contribution. In that way, we raised sufficient funds to be able to advertise one of our meetings in the *Munich Observer*, which was still an independent paper. This time we had an astonishing success. We chose the Munich Hofbräuhaus Keller (not to be confused with the Munich Hofbräuhaus Festsaal) as our meeting place. It was a small hall and would accommodate scarcely more than 130 people. To me, however, the hall seemed enormous, and we were all worried that this 'mighty' edifice might remain partly empty on the night of the meeting.[4]

At 7:00 pm, 111 people were present, and the meeting was opened.

A Munich professor delivered the principal address, and I spoke after him. That was my first time speaking in public.

The whole thing seemed very daring to Herr Harrer, who was the first chairman of the party. He was a very decent fellow; but he believed that I, despite a number of good qualities, had no talent for public speaking. Even later, he couldn't be persuaded to change his opinion.

[4] This was on 16 October 1919.

Things turned out differently. I was allotted 20 minutes for my speech on this occasion, which might be looked upon as our first public meeting.

I spoke for 30 minutes. And something that I always felt deep down in my heart, without really knowing, was here proven to be true: I could speak! After my 30 minutes, the people in the little hall were electrified. Their enthusiasm found its first expression in the fact that my appeal to those present brought us donations of 300 marks. That was a great relief for us. Our finances at that time were so meager that we couldn't afford to have our party slogans printed, or even distribute leaflets. Now we at least possessed the nucleus of a fund from which we could pay our most urgent and necessary expenses.

12.13 SOLDIERS AS THE BASIS OF THE MOVEMENT

But the success of this first larger meeting was also important from another point of view.

I had already begun to introduce some young and fresh members into the committee. During the long period of my military service, I had come to know a large number of good comrades whom I was now able to persuade to join our party. All of them were energetic and disciplined young men who, through their years of military service, had been imbued with a principle: Nothing is impossible, and that where there's a will, there's a way.

The need for this supply of fresh blood became evident to me after just a few weeks of collaboration.

Herr Harrer, who was first chairman of the party, was a journalist by profession, and as such he was widely educated. But as leader of the party, he had one very serious handicap: he couldn't speak to a crowd. Though he did his work conscientiously, it lacked the necessary driving force—probably because he had no oratorical gifts whatsoever. Herr Drexler, at that time chairman of the local Munich group, was a simple working man. He, too, was not of any great significance as a speaker, and moreover he wasn't a soldier, even during the war. This man, who was feeble and uncertain by nature, had missed the only school that knows how to transform such types into real men.

Therefore neither of those two men was made of the stuff that would have enabled them to stir up an ardent and indomitable faith in the ultimate triumph of the movement. Neither could brush aside with obstinate force and, if necessary, brutal ruthlessness, all obstacles that stood in the path of

the new idea. Such a task could be carried out only by men whose bodies and souls had been trained in those military virtues that perhaps can be described as: swift as a greyhound, tough as leather, and hard as Krupp steel.

At that time I was still a soldier. Outside and inside, I had the polish of six years of service, and so I must have looked quite strange in this circle. I had forgotten such phrases as: "That won't work," or "That's impossible," or "That's too risky," or "That's too dangerous," and so on.

The whole thing was dangerous. In 1920, there were many parts of Germany where it would have been absolutely impossible to openly invite people to a national meeting that dared to make a direct appeal to the masses. Those who attended such meetings were usually dispersed and driven away with bleeding heads. It certainly didn't call for any great skill to do things in that way. The largest so-called bourgeois mass meetings were accustomed to dissolving and scattering like rabbits frightened by a dog, at the sight of a dozen communists.

The Reds used to pay little attention to those bourgeois organizations where only babblers talked. They recognized their inner triviality and harmlessness better than the members themselves. They were determined to use all means of ridding themselves of a dangerous movement. Their most effective means in such cases have always been terror and brute force.

Marxist deceivers of the public naturally hated most of all a movement whose declared aim was to win over those masses that had previously been exclusively at the service of international Marxist and Jewish stock-exchange parties. The very title 'German Workers' Party' irritated them. It could easily be foreseen that, at the first opportune moment, we would have to confront the Marxist despots, who were still intoxicated with their victory.[5]

In the small circles of our own movement, people showed a certain amount of anxiety at the thought of such a conflict.

They wanted to avoid coming out into the open, because they feared being beaten. In their minds, they saw our first public meetings broken up and feared that the movement was ruined forever. I found it difficult to defend my own position: that conflict shouldn't be avoided but openly confronted, and that we should acquire the arms necessary for protection against violence. Terror cannot be overcome by the mind but only by counter-terror. The success of our first public meeting strengthened my own position. The members felt encouraged to arrange for a second meeting, on an even larger scale.

---

[5] Of 1918.

12.14 SECOND MEETING

Around October 1919, the second larger meeting took place in the Eberlbräu Keller. Theme: 'Brest-Litovsk and Versailles.' There were four speakers. I spoke for almost an hour, and the success was even more striking than at our first meeting. The number of people who attended had grown to more than 130. An attempted disturbance was immediately stopped by my comrades. The would-be disrupters were thrown down the stairs, with gashed heads.

Two weeks later, another meeting took place in the same hall. The attendance had now increased to more than 170, and the room was fairly well filled. I spoke again, and once more it was more successful than at the previous meeting.

I then proposed a larger hall. After looking around, we found one at the other end of the town, in the 'Deutschen Reich' on Dachauer Strasse. The first meeting there had a smaller attendance than the previous meeting: barely 140 people. The committee members got discouraged; those who had always been skeptical were now convinced that this drop-off was due to the fact that our events were held too frequently. There were vociferous discussions, in which I defended my own view, that a city with 700,000 inhabitants should be able to stand not one meeting every couple weeks, but ten every week. I held that we shouldn't be discouraged by a setback, that the tactics we had chosen were correct, and that sooner or later success would be ours—if we only continued with determined perseverance to push ahead on our path. This whole winter of 1919–1920 was one continual struggle to strengthen confidence in our ability to carry the movement through to success, and to instill a burning faith that could move mountains.

The next meeting in the small hall proved me correct. Our audience increased to more than 200. The publicity effect and financial success were spectacular.

I immediately urged that a further meeting be held. It took place in less than two weeks, and there were more than 270 people there.

Two weeks later, we invited our followers and their friends, for the seventh time, to attend our meeting. The same hall was scarcely large enough for the number that came. They amounted to more than 400.

CHAPTER 12

12.15 INNER FORMATION OF THE MOVEMENT

It was at this time that the young movement developed its inner form. Sometimes we had more or less violent discussions within our small circle. Various sides—then as now—objected to the idea of calling the young movement a party. I've always considered such criticism as a demonstration of the critic's practical incapacity and narrow-mindedness. Those objections have always been raised by men who couldn't differentiate between external appearances and inner strength, but tried to judge the movement by the high-sounding character of its name. To this end, they ransacked the vocabulary of our ancestors, with unfortunate results.

At that time, it was very difficult to make the people understand that every movement is a party as long as it hasn't brought its ideals to final victory and thus achieved its purpose. It's a party even if it takes a thousand different names.

If anyone tries to carry out an original idea whose realization would be for the benefit of his fellow men, he will first have to look for disciples who are ready to fight for his goals. And if these ends don't go beyond the destruction of the party system and thus put a stop to the process of disintegration, then all those who come forward as propagators of such an ideal are a party in themselves—as long as their final goal hasn't been reached. It's only hair-splitting and playing with words when these antiquated theorists, whose practical success is in inverse proportion to their wisdom, presume to think they can change the character of a movement—which is at the same time a party—merely by changing its name.

On the contrary.

It's highly distasteful to toss around old Germanic expressions that are neither appropriate for our present day, nor represent anything concrete. This deceives people into thinking that the importance of movement lies in its external vocabulary. This is a real menace, and unfortunately is quite prevalent today.

At that time, and later, I had to warn followers repeatedly against these German folklore-ish wandering scholars who never accomplished anything positive or practical, except to cultivate their own overflowing self-conceit.[6] A new movement must guard itself against an influx of people whose only recommendation is their own declaration—the same one that they have

[6] Hitler refers here to the leaders of other right-wing parties, with whom he was in competition.

been fighting for during the last 30 or 40 years. Anyone who has fought for an idea for 40 years, and has no positive results to show for it—not even of hindering their opponents—then the story of those 40 years of futile efforts provides sufficient proof for their incompetence. The chief danger is that they don't want to participate in the movement as ordinary members, but prefer to discuss their leadership of circles in which only they are qualified to carry on their work.

Woe to a young movement, if its conduct falls into such hands! A businessman who has been in charge of a great firm for 40 years, and who has completely destroyed it, isn't qualified to run a new firm. In the same way, any folkish Methuselah who has ineffectively preached an idea for 40 years, is utterly unqualified for the leadership of a new movement!

12.16 TIN SWORDS AND TANNED BEARSKINS

Furthermore, only a small portion of such people join a new movement to serve it. In most cases, they come because they think that, within the new movement, they will be able to promulgate their old ideas—to the misfortune of others. Anyhow, no one ever seems able to describe what exactly these ideas are.

It's typical of such people that they rant about ancient Teutonic heroes of the dim and distant ages, stone axes, battle spears, and shields; whereas in reality they themselves are the biggest cowards imaginable. Those very same people who brandish Teutonic tin swords and wear tanned bearskins, with ox horns mounted over their bearded faces, proclaim that all contemporary conflicts must be decided by intellectual weapons alone. And then they scatter when the first communist cudgel appears. Posterity will have little occasion to write a new epic about their heroic existence.

I've seen too much of those kind of people not to feel a profound contempt for their miserable play-acting. To the broad masses, they are just an object of ridicule; and the Jew finds it to his own interest to treat these folk-lore comedians with respect, and he prefers them to true fighters for a German state. And yet these comedians are extremely proud of themselves. Notwithstanding their proven incompetence, they pretend to know everything better than other people—so much so that they become a real plague to all sincere and honest patriots, to whom not only the heroism of the past is worthy of honor, but who also feel bound to leave examples of their own work for the inspiration of posterity.

Among those people, it's often hard to distinguish between those who are merely stupid and incompetent, and those who have a definite rationale. My impression, especially with the so-called religious reformers based on ancient Germanic customs, is that they are sent by those who don't wish to see a national revival of our people. Their whole activity leads people away from the common struggle against the common enemy, the Jew.

This causes people to waste their strength on senseless and ruinous religious controversies. These are the grounds for an authoritative and dominant centralizing force in the movement. Only in this way can it counteract the activity of such ruinous elements. And that's why these folklore wandering Jews are so hostile to any movement whose members are firmly united under one leader and one discipline. They hate such a movement because it's capable of putting a stop to their mischief.

12.17 REJECTION OF THE WORD 'FOLKISH'

It was not without good reason that we laid down a clearly defined program for the new movement that excluded the word 'folkish.' The concept underlying this term cannot serve as the basis of a movement, because it's too vague and general in its application. Because this concept is so indefinite from a practical viewpoint, it gives rise to various interpretations and thus people can more easily invoke its authority. The insertion of such a vague and ill-defined concept into a political movement tends to break up the disciplined solidarity of the fighting forces, because it allows each individual to define his own concept of faith and will.

It's disgraceful to see the kind of people who run around nowadays with the word 'folkish' on their caps, and how they have their own interpretation of this concept. A well-known professor in Bavaria—a famous combatant who fights only with intellectual weapons, and who boasts of having marched against Berlin—believes that the concept of folkish is the same as monarchical. But this learned authority failed to explain the identity between our German monarchs and the present-day concept of folkish. I think he would have a very hard time. It would be very difficult indeed to imagine anything less folkish than most of those German monarchical states. Had they been otherwise, they wouldn't have disappeared. Or if they were folkish, then their collapse would prove the failure of the folkish worldview.

Everyone interprets this concept in his own way. But to make such diverse opinions the basis of a political struggle is out of the question.

I won't even mention the unworldliness, and especially the failure to understand the popular soul, that's displayed by these folkish St. Johns of the 20th century. It suffices to point to the ridicule heaped upon them by the Left. They allow them to babble on, and then laugh.

12.18 'INTELLECTUAL WEAPONS,' 'SILENT WORKERS'

I don't put much value on the friendship of people who don't succeed in getting hated by their enemies. Therefore, we considered the friendship of such people as not only worthless, but even dangerous to our young movement. That was the main reason why we first called ourselves a 'party.' We hoped that, by giving ourselves such a name, we might scare away a whole host of folkish dreamers. And secondly, that was why we named ourselves The National Socialist German Workers' Party.

The first term, 'party,' kept away all those dreamers who live in the past and all the lovers of bombastic nomenclature, those advocates of the so-called 'folkish idea.' Secondly, the full name of the party kept away all those knights of the 'intellectual sword'—all those wretches whose 'intellectual weapons' hid their cowardice.

It was only to be expected that this latter class would attack us the hardest—not actively, of course, but only with their pens. This is the only weapon of the folkish goose-quills. To them, our principle "We shall meet violence with violence in our own defense," was terrifying. They reproached us bitterly, not only for what they called our crude worship of the cudgel, but also because, according to them, of our lack of spirit as such. They didn't realize for a moment that even a Demosthenes[7] could be reduced to silence at a mass-meeting by 50 idiots who had come there to shout him down and use their fists against his supporters. Their innate cowardice prevents them from exposing themselves to such a danger; they always work 'silently' and never dare to make 'noise,' or to come forward in public.

Even today, I must warn our young movement in the strongest possible terms to guard against falling into the snare of those so-called 'silent workers.' They are not only cowards but also, and always will be, incompetents and do-nothings. A man who is aware of certain things and knows that danger threatens, and at the same time sees the possibility of a

[7] Famed orator and stateman of ancient Athens, contemporary of Aristotle. Lived circa 350 BC.

certain remedy, has an obligation not to work 'in silence' but openly and publicly. He must fight against the evil, and for its cure. If he does not, then he is a timid weakling who fails from cowardice, laziness, or incompetence.

Most of these 'silent workers' generally pretend to know God-knows-what. They do nothing but try to fool the world with their tricks. Though quite indolent, they try to create the impression that their 'silent' work keeps them very busy. In short, they are sheer swindlers—political crooks who hate the honest work of others. When you find one of these folkish moths buzzing over the value of his 'silence,' you may bet a thousand-to-one that you are dealing with someone who does nothing productive at all, but steals—steals the fruits of others' labor.

Additionally, one should note the arrogance and conceited impudence with which these obscurantist idlers try to tear to pieces the work of other people—criticizing it with an air of superiority, and thus aiding the mortal enemy of our people.

Every last agitator, who has the courage to stand on a beerhall-table amid his enemies and manfully and openly defend his position, achieves a thousand times more than these lying, treacherous sneaks. He will at least convert one or another to the movement. One can examine his work and test its effectiveness by its actual results. Only those cowardly swindlers—who praise their own 'silent' work and shelter themselves under the despicable cloak of anonymity—are just worthless and, in the truest sense of the term, useless drones, for the purpose of our national reconstruction.

12.19 FIRST GREAT MASS MEETING

In the beginning of 1920, I put forward the idea of holding our first mass meeting. There were differences of opinion amongst us. Some leading members of our party thought that the time was not ripe for such a meeting, and that the outcome might be detrimental. The Red press began to take notice of us, and we were lucky enough to arouse their hatred. We had begun to appear at other meetings and to ask questions or contradict the speakers, and naturally we were shouted down. But still we thereby gained some success. People got to know us; and the better they understood us, the stronger was their aversion and their enmity. Therefore we expected that a large contingent of our friends from the Red camp would attend our first mass meeting.

I fully realized that our meeting would probably be broken up. But we had to face the fight; if not now, then some months later. Since the first day of our

founding, we were resolved to secure the future of the movement by fighting our way forward in a spirit of blind faith and ruthless determination. I was well-acquainted with the mentality of all those on the Red side, and I knew quite well that if we opposed them, not only would we make an impression but we might even win new followers. Thus we had to be resolved to put up resistance.

Herr Harrer was then chairman of our party. He didn't support my view as to the opportune time for our first mass meeting. Accordingly, as an honest and upright man, he resigned from the leadership of the movement. Herr Anton Drexler took his place. I kept the work of organizing the propaganda in my own hands and uncompromisingly carried it out.

We decided on 24 February 1920 as the date for the first great mass meeting of the still-unknown movement.

I made all the preparatory arrangements personally. They were very brief. The whole apparatus of our organization was designed to make rapid decisions. Within 24 hours, we had to decide on the attitude we would take in regard to the questions that would be put forth at the mass meeting. They would be announced on posters and leaflets, whose content followed the guidelines that I have already laid out regarding propaganda in general:[8] appeal to the broad masses; concentration on a few points; constant repetition; concise and dogmatic expression of ideas; perservance in distribution; and patience in awaiting the effect.

For our principal color, we chose red; it has an exciting effect on the eye and was therefore calculated to arouse and provoke our opponents. Thus they would have to remember us—whether they liked it or not.

Subsequently, the inner fraternization in Bavaria between the Marxists and the Center Party became clear. The ruling Bavarian People's Party[9] did its best to counteract the effect that our posters had on the Red working masses. Later they moved to prohibit them. If the police could find no other grounds for doing so, then they could claim that we were 'disturbing the traffic' in the streets. And thus the so-called German National People's Party pleased their inner, silent Red ally by completely banning those posters—posters that brought back hundreds of thousands of workers to their own people, who had been incited and seduced by internationalism. These posters—appended to the first and second editions of this book[10]—bear witness to the bitterness of the struggle in which the young movement

[8] That is, in Chapter 6.

[9] They were affiliated with the Center Party.

[10] Not included here.

was then engaged. Future generations will find in them a documentary proof of our determination and the justice of our own cause. And they show the despotism of our so-called national officials, who acted against us because we were nationalizing the broad masses of the people.

12.20 PÖHNER AND FRICK

These posters will also help to destroy the idea that there was then a national government in Bavaria. They also show that if Bavaria remained nationally-minded during the years 1919, 1920, 1921, 1922, and 1923, this was not due to a national government but because they were compelled to acknowledge the growing national sentiment among the people.

The government authorities themselves did everything in their power to restrict this process of recovery, and to make it impossible.

Two men, though, must be mentioned as exceptions.

Ernst Pöhner, chief of police at the time, and his loyal advisor and chief deputy Frick, were the only men with the courage to place the interests of the country above their own jobs.[11] Of those in responsible positions, Ernst Pöhner was the only one who didn't curry favor with the masses but felt that his duty was towards the nation as such. He was ready to risk and sacrifice everything, even his personal livelihood, to help in the restoration of the German people, whom he dearly loved. For that reason he was a bitter thorn in the side of the venal group of government officials who simply followed orders without considering the interests and needs of the people. They had no thought whatsoever for the national welfare that had been entrusted to their care.

Above all, Pöhner was one of those people who, in contrast with the majority of our so-called defenders of the state, wasn't afraid to incur the enmity of the traitors to the country and the nation, but rather courted it as a mark of honor and honesty. For him, the hatred of the Jews and Marxists, and the lies and slanders they spread, were the only source of happiness in the midst of national misery.

A man of granite loyalty, he was an ascetic character of the classical era, a straightforward German, for whom the saying 'Better dead than a slave' is not an empty phrase but the essence of his being.

[11] Ernst Pöhner (1870-1925) was the Munich police chief from 1919 to 1922. Wilhelm Frick (1877-1946) was Pöhner's deputy, and ultimately served in Hitler's cabinet for over 10 years. He was convicted at Nuremburg and sentenced to death by hanging.

In my eyes, he and his collaborator, Dr. Frick, are the only men holding state positions who have the right to be considered as co-creators of a national Bavaria.

12.21 DRAFTING THE PROGRAM

Before holding our first great mass meeting, it was necessary not only to have our propaganda material ready but also to have the main points of our program printed.

In the second volume of this book, I'll develop the guiding principles that we then followed in drawing up our program. Here I will only say that the program was arranged, not merely to set forth the form and content of the young movement, but also with the goal of making it understood among the broad masses.

The so-called intellectual circles made jokes and sneered at it, and then tried to criticize it. But the effectiveness of our program has proven that the ideas of that time were right.

During these years, I saw dozens of new movements arise and disappear without leaving a trace. A single one remains: the National Socialist German Workers' Party. Today I am more convinced than ever before that, though they may combat us and try to paralyze our movement, and though petty party ministers may forbid us to speak, they cannot prevent the triumph of our ideas.

When both the present system of state administration and the names of its advocates are forgotten, the fundamentals of the National Socialist program will supply the basis for a future state.

Our four months of meetings held before January 1920 slowly enabled us to collect the financial means necessary to have our first leaflets, posters, and programs printed.

12.22 A MOVEMENT ON THE MARCH

I'll bring the first part of this book to a close by referring to our first great mass meeting, because it marked the occasion on which it burst the bounds of a small club and began to exert an influence on the most powerful factor of our time: public opinion.

I myself had but one concern at that time: Will the hall be filled, or will we speak to a gaping void? I was firmly convinced that if only the people

would come, this day would turn out to be a great success for the young movement. And so I waited impatiently for the evening to come.

The meeting would begin at 7:30 pm. At 7:15, I walked through the chief hall of the Hofbräuhaus on the Platz in Munich, and my heart nearly burst with joy. The great hall—for at that time, it seemed very big to me—was filled to overflowing, shoulder to shoulder. Nearly 2,000 people were present. And above all, those people had come whom we had always wished to reach. More than half of the audience seemed to be communists or independents. Our first great demonstration was destined, in their view, to come to an abrupt end.

But things happened otherwise. When the first speaker finished, I got up to speak. After a few minutes, I was met with a hailstorm of interruptions, and violent encounters broke out in the hall. A handful of my loyal war comrades and some other followers wrestled with the disturbers and gradually restored order. I continued my speech. After half an hour, applause began to drown the interruptions and the shouting.

I now took up the program, and began to explain it for the first time.

Minute by minute, the interruptions was increasingly drowned out by shouts of applause. I finally came to explain the 25 points, and laid them out, point after point, before the masses.[12] As I asked them to pass their own judgment on each point, one after another was accepted with increasing enthusiasm—unanimously and again unanimously. When the last point was reached and found its way to the heart of the masses, I had before me a hall full of people united by a new conviction, a new faith, and a new will.

After nearly four hours, the hall began to clear. As the masses streamed towards the exit, crammed shoulder to shoulder, shoving and pushing, I knew that a movement was now set afoot among the German people that would never be forgotten.

A fire was kindled, from whose flame the sword would be fashioned that would restore freedom to the German Siegfried, and bring life back to the German nation.

And alongside the coming revival, I sensed that the Goddess of Inexorable Vengeance was now getting ready to redress the treason of 9 November 1918.

The hall slowly emptied.

The movement was on the march.

---

[12] Listed in Appendix A.

APPENDIX A

THE 25-POINT PROGRAM OF THE NSDAP

1. We demand the union of all Germans in a Greater Germany, on the basis of the principle of self-determination of all peoples.

2. We demand that the German people have rights equal to those of other nations, and that the Peace Treaties of Versailles and St. Germaine be abrogated.

3. We demand land and territory (colonies) for the maintenance of our people and the settlement of our surplus population.

4. Only those who are our fellow countrymen can become citizens. Only those who have German blood, regardless of creed, can be our countrymen. Therefore no Jew can be a countryman.

5. Those who are not citizens must live in Germany as foreigners and must be subject to the law of aliens.

6. The right to choose the government and determine the laws of the state shall belong only to citizens. We therefore demand that no public office, of whatever nature, whether in the central government, the province, or the municipality, shall be held by anyone who is not a citizen. We wage war against the corrupt parliamentary administration whereby men are appointed to posts by favor of the party without regard to character and ability.

7. We demand that the state shall above all undertake to ensure that every citizen shall have the possibility of living decently and earning a livelihood.

If it is not possible to feed the whole population, then aliens (non-citizens) must be expelled from the Reich.

8. Any further immigration of non-Germans must be prevented. We demand that all non-Germans who have entered Germany since 2 August 1914 shall be compelled to leave the Reich immediately.

9. All citizens must possess equal rights and duties.

10. The first duty of every citizen must be to work, mentally or physically. No individual shall do any work that offends against the interest of the community to the benefit of all.

Therefore we demand:

11. That all unearned income, and all interest-slavery, be abolished!

12. Since every war imposes on the people fearful sacrifices in blood and treasure, all personal profit arising from the war must be regarded as treason to the people. We therefore demand the total confiscation of all war profits.

13. We demand the nationalization of all trusts.

14. We demand profit-sharing in large industries.

15. We demand a generous increase in old-age pensions.

16. We demand the creation and maintenance of a sound middle-class, the immediate communalization of large stores which will be rented cheaply to small businessmen, and that the strongest consideration be given to ensure that small businessmen shall deliver the supplies needed by the state, the provinces, and the municipalities.

17. We demand agrarian reform in accordance with our national requirements, and the enactment of a law to expropriate the owners without compensation of any land needed for the common good. We demand the abolition of basis rents, and the prohibition of all land speculation.

18. We demand that ruthless war be waged against those who work to the detriment of the common welfare. Traitors, usurers, profiteers, etc., are to be punished with death, regardless of creed or race.

19. We demand that Roman law, that serves a materialist ordering of the world, be replaced by German common law.

20. In order to make it possible for every capable and industrious German to obtain higher education, and thus the opportunity to reach into positions of leadership, the state must assume the responsibility of thoroughly organizing the entire public cultural system. The curricula of all educational establishments shall be adapted to practical life. The conception of the state idea (civics) must be taught in the schools from the very beginning. We demand that exceptionally talented children of poor parents, whatever their station or occupation, be educated at the state's expense.

21. The state has the duty to help raise the standard of national health by providing maternity welfare centers, by prohibiting juvenile labor, by increasing physical fitness through the introduction of compulsory games and gymnastics, and by the greatest possible encouragement of associations concerned with the physical education of the young.

22. We demand the abolition of the regular army and the creation of a national folk army.

23. We demand that there be a legal battle against those who propagate deliberate political lies and disseminate them through the press. In order to make possible the creation of a German press, we demand:

(a) All editors and their assistants on newspapers published in the German language shall be German citizens.

(b) Non-German newspapers shall only be published with the express permission of the state. They must not be published in the German language.

(c) All financial interests that in any way affect German newspapers shall be forbidden to non-Germans by law, and we demand that the punishment for transgressing this law be the immediate suppression of the newspaper and the expulsion of the non-Germans from the Reich.

(d) Newspapers transgressing against the common welfare shall be suppressed. We demand a legal battle against those tendencies in art and literature that have a disruptive influence upon the life of our people; any organizations that offend against the foregoing demands shall be dissolved.

24. We demand freedom for all religious faiths in the state, insofar as they do not endanger its existence or offend the moral and ethical sense of the Germanic race. The party as such represents the point of view of a positive Christianity without binding itself to any one particular confession. It fights against the Jewish materialist spirit within and without, and is convinced that a lasting recovery of our people can only come about from the principle: Common Good before Individual Good.

25. In order to carry out this program we demand the creation of a strong central authority in the state, and the unconditional authority by the political central parliament of the whole state and all its organizations. Also: The formation of professional committees and of committees representing the several estates of the Reich, to ensure that the laws promulgated by the central authority shall be carried out by the federal states.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barnes, J. 1980. *Hitler's 'Mein Kampf' in Britain and America.* Cambridge University Press.

Dalton, T. 2010. "Nietzsche and the origins of Christianity." Online: <http://www.theoccidentalobserver.net>

Dalton, T. 2011. "Eternal strangers: Anti-Jewish musings throughout history" (Part I). *The Occidental Quarterly* 11(2). Online: <http://www.toqonline.com/archive>

Dalton, T. 2011b. "Eternal strangers: Anti-Jewish musings throughout history" (Part II). *The Occidental Quarterly* 11(3). Online: <http://www.toqonline.com/archive>

Dalton, T. 2011c. "A most subterranean conspiracy: Nietzsche and the Judeo-Christian worldview." In *Nietzsche: Thoughts and Perspectives* (T. Southgate, ed.). Black Front Press.

Dalton, T. 2013. "The Jewish hand in the world wars" (Part I). *Inconvenient History* 5(2). Online: <http://www.inconvenienthistory.com/archive>

Dalton, T. 2014. "The Jewish hand in the world wars" (Part II). *Inconvenient History* 6(2). Online: <http://www.inconvenienthistory.com/archive>

Dalton, T. 2014b. "The great Holocaust mystery." Online: <http://www.inconvenienthistory.com/archive.>

Dalton, T. 2015. *Debating the Holocaust* (2nd ed). Castle Hill.

Darkmoon, L. 2014. "Pornography as a secret weapon." Online: <http://www.darkmoon.me>

Davis, M. 2012. *Jews and Booze.* New York University Press.

Gertzman, J. 1999. *Bookleggers and Smuthounds.* University of Pennsylvania Press.

Gordon, S. 1984. *Hitler, Germans, and the 'Jewish Question.'* Princeton University Press.

Hitler, A. 1927/1933. *Mein Kampf* (E. Dugdale, trans.) Houghton Mifflin.

Hitler, A. 1927/1939. *Mein Kampf* (J. Murphy, trans.) Hurst & Blackett.

Hitler, A. 1927/1939. *Mein Kampf* (A. Johnson et al, trans.) Reynal & Hitchcock.

Hitler, A. 1927/1939. *Mein Kampf* (W. Soskin, trans.) Stackpole Sons.

Hitler, A. 1927/1943. *Mein Kampf* (R. Manheim, trans.) Houghton Mifflin.
Hitler, A. 1927/1999. *Mein Kampf* (R. Manheim, trans.; A. Foxman, intro.) Houghton Mifflin.
Houkes, J. 2004. *An Annotated Bibliography on the History of Usury*. Edwin Mellen.
Jacobs, J. 1992. *On Socialists and 'The Jewish Question' after Marx*. New York University Press.
Joyce, A. 2015. "Jews and moneylending." Online: <http://www.occidentalobserver.net>
Kershaw, I. 1998. *Hitler 1889-1936: Hubris*. W. W. Norton.
Maderthaner, W. and Silverman, L. 2009. "'Wiener Kreise': Jewishness, politics, and culture in interwar Vienna." In *Interwar Vienna* (Holmes and Silverman, eds.). Camden House.
Maser, W. 1974. *Hitler's Letters and Notes*. Harper and Row.
Mumford, L. 1966. "Technics and the nature of man." *Technology and Culture* 7: 303-317.
Nation of Islam. 1991. *The Secret Relationship between Blacks and Jews*. The Final Call.
Poliakov, L. 1965. *The History of Anti-Semitism* (3 volumes). Vanguard Press.
Rudolf, G. 2011. *Lectures on the Holocaust* (2nd ed). Barnes Review.
Sanderson, B. 2011. "Tristan Tzara and the Jewish roots of Dada." Online: <http://www.occidentalobserver.net>
Schopenhauer, A. 1851/2010. *Parerga and Paralipomena* (vol. 2; E.F.J. Payne, trans.). Oxford University Press.
Taeusch, C. 1942. "The concept of 'usury'." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 3(3): 291-318.
Twain, M. 1898. "Stirring times in Austria." *Harper's New Monthly Magazine* (March).
Twain, M. 1899. "Concerning the Jews." *Harper's New Monthly Magazine* (September).
Wistrich, R. 2012. *From Ambivalence to Betrayal*. University of Nebraska Press.

Useful Websites
www.hitlerpages.com
www.hitler.org
www.research.calvin.edu/german-propaganda-archive

INDEX

Acropolis 273
Adler, Victor 73n2, 94
Alsace-Lorraine 278
Alte Rosenbad tavern 234
America 63, 164, 199
anti-Semitism, not religious-based 146-147
architecture, modern decay of 271-274
army, German 278-279, 284-286
art 102-103, 266-272
  Bolshevism and 266-268, 270-271
  cubism 267
  Dadaism 267
Aryans 174, 176, 291, 294-303, 308, 349
  as founders of culture 294-303
  as nomads 306
  as self-sacrificing, idealistic 299-302
Austerlitz, Friedrich 94

Balkan War (1912-3) 180
Barry, Charles 107
Barth, Emil 216
Bavarian Medical College 229
Bavarian Peoples' Party 360
Bavarian Soviet Republic 267
Beelitz (Germany) 208
Belgium *see* Flanders, and specific cities
Benedikt, Moritz 86n5
Berlin 209
Berlin Palace 273
Bernstein, Eduard 218n8
Bethmann-Hollweg, Theobald von 281
Bible 315
"Big Lie" 245
Bismarck, Otto von 46, 103, 154, 169, 171, 178, 192, 227, 239, 248, 276
blood *see* race
Böcklin, Arnold 271
Boer War 180
Bolshevism, of art 266-268, 270-271
Braunau (Austria) 43
Brest-Litovsk Treaty 354
Britain *see* England

Cadorna, Luigi 213
capital
  international finance 248-249
  two types of 225, 228-229
Caporetto, Battle of 211n3
Catholic Church 123, 129, 136-144, 276
Central America 291
Chamberlain, Houston Stewart 174n11, 277
Christian Socialism 88-89, 127, 145, 147-148
Christianity 226, 274, 276, 308, 314, 348

Christians, and Jews 317
civil service, German 286-287
Columbus Egg 289
Comines (Belgium) 217
cubism 267
cultural decay 264, 266-274
culture, as function of race 293-305

Dadaism 267
Dalton, Thomas 91n11, 218n8, 245n3, 305n5, 308n11, 312n16
Darkmoon, Lasha 91n12
"*Das Kapital*" 229
Davis, M. 91n12
Dawes Plan 249n4
democracy, critique of 107-122, 160, 278-279
Demosthenes 358
"*Deutschland über Alles*" 51, 184-185, 215
Deutschen Reich 354
"*Die Wacht am Rhein*" 185
Drexler, Anton 233-234, 352, 360

Eberlbräu Keller 354
Ebert, Friedrich 216, 269
Edward VII, King 171
Eisner, Kurt 218n8, 223, 230
Ellenbogen, Wilhelm 94
England 107, 164-169, 176, 199-203, 280, 333
Ephialtes 142
Esperanto 309
eugenics 158, 160, 264-265

Feder, Gottfried 225, 228-229, 231-234
Ferdinand, Franz 53, 122, 180
Fichte, Johann 174n10
Flanders 185, 208, 215-217, 220, 278, 335
"folkish" 357-358
France 67-68, 88, 92, 205
Franco-Prussian War *see* War of 1870
Frederick the Great 124, 228, 251, 269, 314
Freemasons 316-317, 322
Frick, Wilhelm 361-362
Friedlander, Max 86n5

German Campaign of 1813 *see* Wars of Liberation
German Center Party 182
German National People's Party 360
German Workers' Party (DAP) 231-237, 353
Gertzman, J. 91n12
global trade 166-168, 173
Gobineau, Arthur de 174n11
Goethe, Wolfgang von 110n5, 268, 305, 314

Haase, Hugo 218n8
Habsburg, House of 51-54, 61, 106, 149-150, 154-156
Hansen, Theophil 107
Harrer, Karl 234, 351-352, 360
Hecateus 91n11
Hermies (France) 208
Herodotus 221n9
Herzl, Theodor 86n5
Hilferding, Rudolf 218n8
Hitler, Adolf
  as art student 48-49, 70
  as architecture student 57-58, 70-71, 150
  conversion to anti-Semitism 88-97
  critique of democracy 107-122, 160, 278-279
  DAP member #7 237
  decision to enter politics 221
  father, death of 55
  mother, death of 56, 220
  on the Big Lie 245

wounded in WWI, first time 207-208
wounded in WWI, second time 217-218
Hofsbräuhaus (am Platzl) 153, 363
Hofsbräuhaus Keller (= Hofbräukeller am Weiner Platz) 351
Hohenzollern, House of 127, 219
Homer 59n1
Houkes, J. 311n14

Independent Social Democratic Party 218n8
internal colonization 158-162
Islam 274
Isonzo Front 205
Italy 155-157, 171, 211

Japan 180, 280, 294-295
Jesus 308
Jews 59, 161, 179, 197, 334, 338, 356
anti-Semitism and 146-147
as a disease 263
as artful liars 96, 245
as blood-suckers 210, 312-315
as 'chosen people' 91-92, 94, 210, 302
as common enemy of society 357
as 'court Jews' 313-315
as democratic wire-pullers 121
as despised throughout history 91n11, 245n3
as dialectical liars 95-96
as eternal fungus 149
as global agitators 171
as 'great master of the lie' 245, 307, 320, 348
as leaders of Social Democracy 93-95
as mass-murderers 327
as moral pestilence 91
as parasites 173-176, 305-307, 327
as pernicious bacillus 306
as personification of devil 325
as poisoners of the masses 91-92, 177, 188-189, 210, 255-257, 326
as 'state within the state' 174, 307, 312
as symbol of all evil 325
as threat to human race 98, 349
as world-swindlers 325
attempts to control nature 291-293
compulsion to lie 307
contempt for manual laborers 319-321
control of trade unions 322-324
democracy and 286, 318, 326
expulsions of 86n4, 306
Freemasonry and 316-317, 322
global finance and 172, 210, 255, 315, 316
gradual integration into society 310-327
in Munich 210
in November Revolution 189, 210-211, 218, 221, 223
in the press, propaganda 193, 255-257, 278, 382, 305, 317, 322, 324-325, 348
in universities 188
in Vienna 85-86, 88-92, 109n4
Jewish State and 304-305
Judaism as fake religion 307-309
lack of belief in afterlife 308
lack of culture 304-305
lack of idealism 303-306, 308
marrying into royalty, nobility 258, 313
Marxism and 96-98, 321-326 (*see also* Marxism)
materialism of 308
miscegenation and 317-318, 326
moral and cultural corruption by 86, 93, 258, 327

Palestine/Israel and 325
Protocols of Zion and 309-310
racial purity of 308, 314, 317
stench of 90
tenacious will-to-live 302
usury and 311-312
Jogiches, Leo 218n8
Joseph I, Franz 181
Joseph II, Emperor 104-106
Joyce, Andrew 91n12
Judaism 317n22
as fake religion 307-309
Jutland, Battle of 280

Königgrätz *see* Sadowa

Lambach (Austria) 45
land
need for more 162-164
productivity of 159
Landauer, Gustav 218n8
Landesberg, Otto 218n8
League of Nations 254
Liebknecht, Karl 216, 218n8
Linz (Austria) 44, 52, 85, 89
London 213
Ludendorff, Erich 170, 245, 281
Ludwig I, King 272
Ludwig III, King 184
Lueger, Karl 88-89, 102, 127-129, 147, 195
Luther, Martin 228
Luxemburg, Rosa 216n7, 218n8

Maderthaner, W. 94n13
Manchester Liberalism 123, 146
Marne river 205
marriage 261-262
Marxism 59, 74
democracy as forerunner of 110
German attitudes toward 177-178, 188, 192-193, 231-232, 329, 341, 353
international finance and 248-249
Jews and 96-98, 321-326
Karl Marx and 229
materialism, as a vice 247-248
Maximilian, Emperor 123-124
Mecca 345
Moltke, Helmuth von 197
Muehsam, Erich 218n8
Mumford, Lewis 298n4
Munich
as center of NSDAP 345-346
culture of 153-154, 272
Hitler in 180, 223-224, 230
Jews in 209-211
November Revolution and 219
rise of NSDAP and 350-351
mustard gas 217-218

Napoleon III 124
Nation of Islam 91n12
National Socialist German Workers' Party (NSDAP) 358
doctrine of People and Fatherland 229
platform 362-363, Appendix A
nationalism, German 336-342
navy, German 168, 218-219, 279-281
Negro 103, 326
Nicholas II, Czar 213
Niederwald Statue 185
Nietzsche, Friedrich 320n24
nomadic way of life 305-306
Nordau, Max 86n5
North America 291
November Revolution (1918) 169, 205-221, 335, 363

Odeon 153
Oktoberfest 153
opera 55, 57, 59
Ostmark 49-50, 163
Oxenstierna, Axel 277

INDEX

Palestine/Israel 325
Palm, Johannes 43
Pan-Germanism 123, 126-127, 130-148
Pantheon 273
Paris 205, 213, 239
parliamentarianism 107-110, 113-122, 342-343
Parthenon 270
Parvus, Alexander 218n8
Pasewalk (Germany) 218
Passau (Germany) 44
Pericles 113, 270
Philostratus 213n16
Pinakothek 153
plague 246
Pötsch, Leopold 52-53
Pöhner, Ernst 361-362
population control 157-164
Prague 155
press, as a great power 252-257
  Jewish role in *see* Jews, in the press
  Viennese 86-88, 92
propaganda 195-207, 282, 340-342
prostitution 261-265
"Protocols of the Elders of Zion" 309-310
Protestantism 140

race
  culture and 293-305
  importance of 259, 262-264, 289-330, 338
Radek, Karl 218n8
religion, social role of 274-276
Repington, Charles 244
Revolution, German (1918) *see* November Revolution
Rhine river 185
Roman Senate, ancient 244
Rome 273, 345
Russia 167, 180, 211, 213, 327
Russian Revolution 211
Russo-Japanese War (1904-5) 180

Sadowa (Sadova) 124
Sanderson, Brenton 267n6
Sanssouci Palace 269
Scheidemann, Philipp 216
Schiller, Friedrich 174, 268, 297-298
Schlageter, Leo 44
Schmiedt, Ernst 223
Schönerer, George von 127-130, 137
Schopenhauer, Arthur 90, 245, 307
Schwabing (Munich) 197
Serbia 183
Severing, Carl 44
Shakespeare, William 268
Siegfried (mythology) 172, 261, 363
Sieghart, Rudolf 86n5
Skagerrak, Battle of 280
Slovenia 205n1, 211n3
Social Democracy 73-84, 93-95, 108, 192-193, 341
soil *see* land
Somme, Battle of 208, 216
South America 291
South Tyrol 213
Star of David 329
Sternecker Brewery 232, 234
Stinnes, Hugo 249
Stürgkh, Karl von 94n13
syphilis 257-265

Tacitus 91n11, 245n3
Talmud 308
Tannenberg, Battle of 213
Theresa, Maria 181
Third Reich 239n1
Toller, Ernst 218n8
Traunstein (Germany) 223
Triple Alliance 155-156, 169-171, 178
tuberculosis 246

Turkey 171
Twain, Mark 109n4

unions (trade) 80-84, 322-324, 336
United Kingdom *see* England
United States of America *see* America

Versailles Treaty 284, 335, 354
von Schwind, Moritz 271

Wagner, Richard 55, 228
War of 1866 123
War of 1870 124
Wars of Liberation 179, 271
Wervick (Belgium) 218
Wetterlé, Emile 278
Wilhelm I, Kaiser 185n7, 251
Wilhelm II, Kaiser 87-88, 206, 221, 248
Wilson, Woodrow 292
Wittelsbach, House of 154, 219

Ypres 216-217

Zionism 90, 325



CPSIA information can be obtained
at www.ICGtesting.com
Printed in the USA
BVHW042207230420
578342BV00010B/574

