

THE POLITICAL THOUGHTS
EXPRESSED IN MEIN KAMPF

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council
of Texas State University-San Marcos
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements.

for the Degree

Master of ARTS

by

David P. Hinkelmann, B.A.

San Marcos, Texas
August 2005

COPYRIGHT

by

David P. Hinkelman

2005

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to begin by thanking my mother, Patricia Hinkelmann, and her husband Walter, for giving me the courage and strength I needed to complete my goals.

I am very thankful to the members of my thesis committee. My deep appreciation goes to Dr. Sullivan for always challenging me, as well as to Dr. Gorman for his teaching practices that created my desire to become a double major in Political Science and History. And finally I would like to thank Dr. Hindson.

Finally, I would like to thank the creator of Microsoft Word, that made it possible for a person with writing dyslexia to be able to obtain two college degrees. This manuscript was submitted on July, 5 2005.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION,.....	1
II. DARWINISM.....	7
Man	
Pacifism	
Law of Nature	
Naturalism	
III. NATIONALISM.....	18
Liberal Groups	
Internationalism	
IV. CONFLICTS OVER BECOMING THE CORE COUNTRY IN THE REGION.....	36
V. PROBLEMS IN GOVERNMENTS.....	46
Monarchy	
Parliaments	
Dictatorships	
Strong Will Leadership	
VI. IDEOLOGY.....	63
VII. PROPAGANDA.....	74
Fanatics Members	
Media	
Symbolism	
Mass Meetings	
Religion	
VIII. SOCIETY AND INDIVIDUALISM.....	87

	Naturalism	
	Role of a Citizen in a Nation	
IX	CONCLUSION.....	95
	REFERENCES.....	104

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

There are certain books so stigmatized very few people have read them, Adolf Hitler's *Mein Kampf* is one of them. I did find anti-Semitism, irrational beliefs, and distorted facts and perspectives, but I also found very advanced political ideas and questions plus instruction on how to create a political movement by the use of propaganda.

In the preface Hitler wrote that the reason he wrote *Mein Kampf* was to publish the aims of the National Socialist Workers Party (NSDAP). I found this book is not the fountain head of original theories and it appears that scholars “. . . have never agreed as unanimously on any point as they did in their verdict that Hitler did not have any ideas of his own” (Jäckel,15). In 1922 the Juni –Klub asked Hitler to speak to its membership which was composed of right-wing journalists, industrialists, and nationalists. The club's unofficial head was Moeller van den Bruck ¹ who published many items in the weekly journal *Gewissen, Unabhängige Zeitung für Volksbildung* in 1922 which had 30,000 readers. After listening to Hitler's speech and meeting with him privately Moeller wrote, “He did not understand how to give his national socialism any intellectual basis. He was passion incarnate, but entirely without measure or sense of proportion” (Stern, 238). Later the rest of the world would witness other shortcomings

¹ Author of *Das Drittle Reich* and critic of the government.

such as his dismal military skills and diplomacy as Führer. His true ability was how he dramatized his ideas in electrifying speeches which were often delivered in theatrical settings which became his hallmark and the source of his approval. We still face many of the problems and concerns that are discussed in *Mein Kampf* involving democracies being limited to only popular choices, the lack of accountability of some officeholders who make bad decisions, officeholders whose primary aim is to keep their position, and the question of qualification of officeholders. On the anathema side I found the danger of extreme nationalism, aspects of Darwinism, and the protection of one's ethnic group.

In *Mein Kampf* Hitler reasoned that the resources a country controls was the measure of the nation's power in the world and a chief factor in regime survival. Survival for people was not based solely on the amount of their resources, but upon being able to keep their individuality in society, so they do not become acquisitive and naturalism, as they should not just struggle for survival. Internationalism was seen as a threat to nationalism especially in regard to Judaism and Catholicism as members would have split loyalties.

Due to the huge following he gathered, to say that Hitler's rise to power is based only on anti-Semitism and intimidation practices seem too narrow. I believe one can not dismiss this book, as its concerns have not lessened, but have rather increased in importance. This is why an analysis of this work has significance. "If one reads it carefully, one finds in it everything, literally everything, which this man has brought onto the world²" (Jäckel, 20). This thesis will not judge whether Hitler or his party achieved these ends. The concept of Aryan superiority and much of the anti-Semitism in this book will not be discussed, but its rationalization will be examined.

² Jackel is quoting Hans Brand Gisevius, from his book *Adolf Hitler* pg, 38

As all political work is influenced by the times in which it is written, a short history of Germany will aid the reader. Fritz Stern in his book *The Politics Of Cultural Despair* wrote,

The distinctive qualities of these men are not to be found in their thought or their lives alone, but in the tension between their thought, their personalities and their culture, as well as in the form in which this tension was expressed. (268).

The men Stern was writing about were Paul de Lagarde, Julius Langbehn, and Moeller van den Bruck, but this quote offers guidance on the approaching turbulent conditions prevailing in pre-World War II Germany.

In 1862, there were three major civil wars³ going on in the world. As opposed to the U.S. Civil War which was marked by enormous casualties, the unification of Germany was relatively bloodless. Yet millions of lives were changed forever in both. Prussia's Otto Von Bismarck created the North Germany Confederation with the use of limited war and diplomacy acquiring Schleswig and South Germany and making William I the German Emperor. And, as in the American South, Southern German States became leery of Prussian mastery over them, a concern which would not be healed until the late 1930s.

In the industrial revolution, Germany was still divided not by individual states, but by three social classes. With the rise of democratic values first expressed in the United States, and then France, the lower class began to push their government for more rights and opportunities. They looked to socialism as a means to achieve and guarantee their rights using both conservative and liberal thoughts to express their discontent within German society. The middle class looked to liberalism and nationalism to raise

³ (1849-1878) The revolution and unification of Italy

its status, rejecting socialism and especially communism which was a threat to its way of life. The interest of the upper class of major and minor nobilities and major business leaders was in maintaining its authority. The Prussian leadership of Germany was locked into militarism which served it well, but hampered the reforming movements of the other two classes. Germany was an anomaly in Europe as no other nation had as great a degree of militarism. The upper class and military shaped German conservative political thought and had a much narrowed view of intellectualism and liberalism, reflected in the Realpolitik of Bismarck.

In Friedrich Meinecke's work *The German Catastrophe* raised the concerns of Jakob Burckhardt, Constantin Frantz, and Christian Planck:

Bismarck's policy, according to them, was destroying certain foundations of Western culture and the community of states and was opening the prospect of further revolutions and an era of wars. It meant, they said, the victory of Machiavellianism over the principles of morality and justice in international relations and it let perish the finer and higher things of culture in a striving after power and pleasure. (13)

What concerned these three the most was how Bismarck and Prussian militarism had raised Germany into a 'power-state' which assigned the first use of all resources in keeping the state powerful while the people's needs came second (Meinecke, 11). With the departure of Bismarck in 1890, Germany's preferred means of achieving resources was by imperialism and creating colonies, but due to the lateness of Germany's colonialism, the colonies Germany did create cost more to operate than the resources they provided. Soon the desire for more natural resources would shift attention to Russia.

The beginning of World War I was seen as a hopeful event by both liberals and conservatives, for the liberals were swept up by the strong patriotic spirit of the day and

had a chance to show the conservatives that though they might be liberals and socialists, they loved their country. All of the class differences were forgotten everyone was just German as the fatherland was in trouble. Perhaps, the best expression German feeling was from Thomas Mann when he was, “asked how the ‘soldier in the artist could not but praise God for the collapse of a peace-time world of which he had become sick, thoroughly sick, War! It meant a cleansing, a liberation . . . and an extraordinary sense of hope . . .” (Large, 48). This unity of all the classes would last only for a year and then even the unity of Germany was at risk as Prussian militarism itself began to wane as the war turn against them. “No one seemed to suspect that the collapse of Prussia would not by a long shot bring with it a resurgence of Bavaria; no, that on the contrary any fall of the one would inevitably carry the other along with it into the abyss” (Hitler, 194). It was the hope of the Weimar Republic that if Prussia were no longer dominant in Germany, the allies might give better terms to the Germans in surrender as they, too, had suffered under Prussia. After the war what hope the Germans had soon turned into despair: not only had their army surrendered, but the first promise of the liberal leaders who had formed the democratic Weimar Republic had not come true. The Treaty of Versailles was highly revengeful, “The peace terms evolved in Paris, Lloyd George wrote, ‘ought to be dictated in the spirit of judges sitting in a cause which does not personally engage their interests or emotions, and not in a spirit of savage vendetta, which is not satisfied without mutilation and infliction of pain and humiliation’”(Gilbert, 553). Winston Churchill called for a different plan than the terms of Treaty of Versailles as,

I do not think that we can afford to carry on this quarrel
with all its apparatus of hatred, indefinitely. I do not

think the structure of the civilized world is strong enough to stand the strain. With Russia on our hands in a state of utter ruin, with a greater part of Europe on the brink of famine, with bankruptcy, anarchy, and revolution threatening the victorious as well as the vanquished, . . . A way of atonement is open to Germany. By combating Bolshevism, by being the bulwark against it, Germany may take the first step toward ultimate reunion with the civilized world.⁴ (Stern, 1961, 220)

Accord to Crane Brinton,⁵ the most dangerous time for a government to fall is when the people are going through an economic setback after having experienced prosperity such was the German situation after World War I. Even after the war there were still food shortages, massive unemployment and runaway inflation that made many people's life savings worthless, all of which made support for the Weimar Republic especially hard to garner. People blamed the new republic for their woes and many looked for strong leadership to restore security and end an incredibly chaotic condition. Gyula Juhász, a Hungarian poet, wrote this stanza to proclaim his rejection of World War I, but the words speak very strongly about Germans after Hitler (Gilbert, 393).

We wanted something good, beautiful, brave,
but came disaster, sorrow, anguish,
and life lived in the pay of death,
and happiness and love festered.

⁴ Stein, *The New Europe*

⁵ Author of *The Anatomy Of Revolution*

CHAPTER II

DARWINISM

In 1859 Charles Darwin published 'The Origin of Species,' "Its full title was 'On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection or the Preservation of Favored Races in the Struggle for Life'" (Gaarder, 409). Contrary to popular notion, Darwin did not create the Theory of Evolution, but with the use of his Theory of Natural Selection he did what no one else had done before; he explained how a small number of life forms could have evolved into so many different species on earth. Many people prior to Darwin had believed in evolution, but could not explain how or why it occurred. The first example Darwin had offered was not truly proof of evolution in the biological sense, was when he found sea creature fossils high up in the Andes Mountains in South America. Could this be an example of proof that Sir Charles Lyell⁶ needed, to demonstrate that the surface of the Earth had been changing over time? Had South America been beneath the ocean at one time?

The second source of influence for Darwin was 'An Essay on the Principles of Population' by Thomas Malthus,⁷ who believed that there are more life forms born than can survive to mate and that those that do are the strongest of their specie as they prevailed in the struggle for survival (Gaardner, 414). Another way to state the thesis topic of Malthus' essay is, "Just as Nature does not concentrate her greatest attention in

⁶ Author of *Principles of Geology*, one of the books Darwin had taken on his voyage on the HMS Beagle.

⁷ Population specialist.

preserving what exists, but in breeding offspring to carry on the species,” (Hitler, 29). As Malthus’ essay had inspired Darwin, an essay by Benjamin Franklin had inspired Malthus (Gaardner, 414). The thrust of Franklin’s work was that if there were no control on a specie to adulthood be it predators, disease, or food supply, that specie would eventually spread over the entire world.

Darwin believed that the majority of species would mate only with others that were doing well (Darwin, 107). If a certain characteristic gave the specie an advantage in its environment perhaps beak size or cranial capacity those that had this characteristic would be stronger and able to survive easier and through generations of mating this characteristic would become a general feature for this certain specie living in this area. One of the many species Darwin discussed in his book was the green woodpecker. Since the color green was harder for predators to see, as there would be more greenish colored woodpeckers surviving and available for mating. Over generations the color green would become dominate as the other colored woodpeckers in this area decline until green became the characteristic color of this species. Color was not the only feature that could change: height, size, and shape could also change depending on what attribute was needed for the survival of the species in the area they lived in.

With the introduction of this theory which unlike previous works offered proof of the idea of fixity of created life forms was being challenged for all life forms have been changing over time, perhaps the whole world was just in a state of flux and change. Some scholars began to ask if history was not just a listing of events, but a line of events leading toward perfection for mankind. Society and culture were now seen as evolving toward a more perfect setting for mankind. Herbert Spencer a British

philosopher believed that society was shaped by competition, thus giving too much aid to the weak would drag the whole society down. *Social Darwinism* postulated that whenever a stronger life form came into contact with a weaker form the strong would survive and dominate the lesser form until the lesser was eliminated. With the addition of Spencer to Darwin, more advanced societies could justify their mistreatment of less powerful societies as they chose.” . . . to promote the victory of the better and stronger, and demand the subordination of the inferior and weaker in accordance with the eternal will that dominates this universe” (Hitler, 383). Even members of the same society could choose to treat less powerful members as they chose. One does not have to conjecture what the lower classes thought of this situation.

Just as Darwin’s theories were misused and misunderstood, so were the writings of Friedrich Nietzsche. Nietzsche was not a social Darwinist; his superman was the anti-Darwin man who shows what man can achieve by the use of will and purpose and not being controlled by nature. “No thinker could have been more alive to the danger of mass intoxication and the collapse of individual responsibility than Nietzsche who was once absurdly taken for a Nazi” (Chamberlain, 70). Nietzsche had been identified with the Nazis and fascism due to their misunderstanding of his work and their attempts to interpret it to fit their political ends. Mussolini and later the Nazis invoked the morality and ‘will of power’ from the individual then applied it to the Volk and then to the state. “Nietzsche had, of course warned against this illicit transfer of the will to power from man to the state” (Stern, 1969, 287). “To the same degree that the basic ideas of the national Socialist movement are *folkish*, the *folkish ideas* are *National Socialist* (Hitler, 461). One of the reasons that the Nazis could justify their actions through Nietzsche

was the contention that life was just the story of the powerful over the weak. Another factor was that some of Nietzsche's work was not his own, but that of his racist sister Elizabeth⁸ who claimed it was his. Unlike Friedrich, Elizabeth supported Richard Wagner, and was friends to Hitler and Mussolini who if Friedrich had lived to see their reigns would have called them enemies to individuality (Davies, 861). A very eerie letter indicates how strongly Nietzsche could be misunderstood especially for us who know of the horror of Auschwitz. It was written by D.H. Lawrence after reading Nietzsche's *The Will to Power*, as Lawrence believed Nietzsche had declared a war on the masses by superior men.

If I had my way, I would build a lethal chamber as big as the Crystal Palace with a military band playing softly, and a cinematograph working brightly, then I'd go out in the back streets and main streets and bring them in, all the sick, the halt, the maimed; I would lead them gently and they would smile a weary thanks; and the band would softly bubble out the Hallelujah Chorus, (Ibid).

Ernest Haeckel⁹ founded the Monist League in Germany which promoted eugenics for 'racial improvement.' The Monist league members determined that the most superior race was the white, with the German Aryan race the most superior of all (Gilbert, 141). The purity of race movement was not limited to Germany: in Britain selectiveness of one's offspring was encouraged by the Eugenics League. As demonstrated by one of its posters, "only healthy seeds must be sown." The use of sterilization of a feeble-mind was ordered in a court case¹⁰ by Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr. in the U.S. where between 1907 and 1933 two dozens states sterilized sixteen

⁸ Elizabeth Nietzsche Foerster, who created a Aryan colony in Paraguay

⁹ Distinguish Zoologist

¹⁰ Buck v. Bell

thousand people in the name of genetics. Genetics also led to restrictive 1924 immigration laws.

In Nazi Germany the use of the phrase ‘applied biology’ coined by Rudolf Hess would be the state’s goal for ‘health people.’ This program did not stop with genetics, but would also apply euthanasia to the German population. “Those who are physically and mentally unhealthy and unworthy must not perpetuate their suffering in the body of their children” (Hitler, 404). This program was kept secret from the German people, but when it was discovered it was ended due to public outcry (Rothstein, A13).

The impact Darwin had on the world can not be overstated as Karl Marx “wanted to dedicate the English edition of his greatest work, *Das Capital*, to Darwin, but Darwin declined the honor” (Gaarder, 405). Sigmund Freud also acknowledged the impact Darwin had on his own work as his “studies of the unconscious revealed that people’s action were often the result of ‘animal’ urges or instinct” (Gaarder, 406). In Freud, ‘psychoanalysis had resulted in an affront to mankind’s native egoism’ (Ibid).

Joseph Arthur, Comte de Gobineau, published a four volume work titled *Essai sur l'inégalité des races humaines*, which declared the Aryan race superior to all others. In many countries of the world his ideas were rejected, but they were accepted with excitement in Germany where supporters selected parts of this work to legitimize their belief in the superiority of an Aryan race where descendants had become known as Teutons. In fact, Gobineau could not find a direct link from the builders of European civilization to Teutons and “if any nation might lie claim to present descent from the pure Aryan race, it was England” (Snyder, 204). This part of Gobineau’s work was excluded in Germany.

In *Mein Kampf* Germans were cautioned not to mate with members of other races and particularly not with Jews. “Everything we admire on this earth today—science and art, technology and inventions—is only the creative product of a few people and originally perhaps of one race” (Hitler, 288). These words are akin to Darwinism with the exception that evolutionary improvement does not occur; the only means of keeping a race strong was to keep it pure. The Purity of race theory emerged in many other countries as well. “Swedes worried about the genetic effects of Finnish blood” (Rothstein, A-18). In the U.S. interracial mating of blacks and whites could lead to deadly actions especially in the South.

Spencer’s view that society was shaped by competition and enhanced by the battle for survival can be found in *Mein Kampf* with the influence of Thomas Hobbes and with Machiavelli’s view of living in a world where everyone who is not with us is against us and where national survival is always in question. “Those who want to live, let them fight, and those who do not want to fight in this eternal struggle do not deserve to live. . . This preservation is bound up with the rigid law of necessities and right to victory of the best and stronger in this world” (Ibid).

With the emphasis on nationalism and socialism, all healthy and strong Aryan members of society had value. Of course, not everyone had the same value, but workers were not to be abused as population was one of the criteria for judging the strength of a nation, and ill treated workers would have their “faith in a higher justice destroyed” (Hitler, 318). Similar to the evolution of a physical feature, a belief can evolve in people minds’ until it is a feature common to all members of the group. The ideal in this situation was seeing justice being destroyed by the upper class with the

government doing nothing to help the people, which would make them believe that the government cared more for the upper class than for justice. If nothing was done “the social difference would broaden into a classlike cleavage,” and eventually weaken the society or the nation (Ibid). Unlike in rural areas where the environment was controlled more by nature than by man, urban man was more in control especially in forming the rules of society which are an important part of the created environment. Karl Marx called this environment ‘society’s superstructure’ as man creates and controls morals, ethical values and what political institutions will and will not do. Also any changes to this superstructure will change the people that live in this environment for either bad or good (Gaarder, 393).

When one searches *The Origin of Species* one finds slight references to pacifism in the context that the weaker males usually do not fight the stronger males (108). Yet when one applies more specific study on Gorilla groups younger males will wait for the dominant male to age past his prime. In *Mein Kampf* this type of pacifism was not seen very clearly especially for the soldier, politician, and statesman. Pacifistic thinking was blamed for the loss of World War I, as the mood of the people changed from seeing victory to non-support of the war effort and “to be a slacker passed almost as a sign of higher wisdom” (Hitler, 103).

From an example of the influence that Hobbes and Machiavelli had in *Mein Kampf*, “In actual fact the pacifistic-humane idea is perfectly all right perhaps when the highest type of man has previously conquered and subjected the world to an extent that makes him the sole ruler of this earth” (Hitler, 288). Here Hitler agreed with Hobbes and Machiavelli that when wars were over and there was no more threat left, it would

become much easier to reign over people who were pacifist. But the time was not right for such thoughts yet, as now was the time for struggle and fighting for the survival of the fittest. “Those who want to live, let them fight, and those who do not want to fight in this world of eternal struggle do not deserve to live” (Hitler, 289). The general evaluation of WWI was that the German army had not been defeated, but had laid down its weapons due to liberal pacifistic leadership hoping for a more generous peace terms (Stein, 1969, 218). This was also the reason that the Weimar Republic’s democratic government was created. Furthermore, due to the vengeful Treaty of Versailles, the majority of Germans felt they had been betrayed.

In exactly the same way, our German pacifist will accept in silence the bloodiest rape of our nation at the hands of the most vicious military powers if a change in this state of affairs can be achieved only by resistance—this is, force—for this would be contrary to the spirit of his peace society (Hitler, 112).

The Law of Nature is an important part of *Mein Kampf* as the very heart of this book concerned the survival of a nation and a race.

For events in the lives of peoples are not expressions of chance, but processes related to the self-preservation and propagation of the species and the race and subject to the laws of Nature, even if people are not conscious of the inner reason for their actions. (283)

A school of thought that looked into the inner reason for man’s action was grouping of three men’s work from the 1970s; Konrad Lorenz, (naturalist) Robert Ardrey, (biologist) and Desmond Morris (anthropologist). As each of these men working in different scientific fields asked themselves the same question: could man’s need for nationalism come from an instinct still within us from earlier man and be the

same instinct of lower animals for the need to have their own area. Most of us are aware of the need for animals to have their own territory be it the dog who marks his yard and then barks and chases any animal that comes into it. Author Louis L. Snyder¹¹ calls these three men the LAM group whose thesis proclaims, “that man, like the lower animals, has been moved instinctively and unconsciously to defend his own living space in what is called the ‘territorial imperative’”(Snyder, 256). Control of land is not limited to man, but is also part of the animal world a instinct that man still shares with animals.

It is this territorial imperative that leads man to fight when his territory is threatened by invaders. The loss of one’s territory is not just a space issue, but the right of one to survive as not only is the space in jeopardy, but man’s ability to gather food, find shelter, and protect one’s offspring. In more psychological terms it is about who he is and wants to be. Critics of the LAM school have voiced concerns as to how strong this instinct is in every man. If one looks at the characters in Aharon Appelfeld’s book *Badenheim 1939* one only sees a few characters that fight for their physical or social territory. Also one can find this thought absent in hunter-gatherer. At the end of this section Snyder attributes territorial imperative more to patriotism than to just nationalism as one can not have patriotism unless one has nationalism.

In researching this subject I believed that the territorial imperative and patriotism can be enhanced by others especially in ideological youth where their concern for survival is not as great, such as the young schoolboys in *All Quiet at the Western Front* or *The Bridge*. There does seem to be a link between man and animals, but fighting does not seem to be the only action that animals use as the killdeer bird will use itself

¹¹ Roots of German Nationalism.

not to attack, but to draw predators away from its young by acting hurt while larger animals will often attack to protect their young. However, if the intruder retreats to a certain distance, the defender will end the fight, unlike man who may act more like a shark in a feeding frenzy. In *Mein Kampf*, territorial imperative is a rationale for extreme aggression. “Here, as everywhere else, strength lies not in defense but in attack” (Hitler, 146). Moeller van den Bruck¹² wrote in his book *Die Moderne Literatur* “Fighting is magnificent and more worthy of man than self-indulgence in smug comfort. Battle gives us, especially when it is of spirits and passions, our greatest kings and best heroes. . . .” (Stern, 1961, 188). Moeller’s political thought or Lebensphilosophie in *Die Moderne Literatur* came from combining Nietzsche’s superman and Darwinism’s struggle for survival.

With the idea that species changed due to their environment, scholars and scientists began to ask questions what effect man’s urban environment would have on people, as the means as to how man survived and prospered in the world had changed. No longer was man battling nature for survival using his egotistical aggression since the basis of much of modern civilization is trust and unity, in contrast to social Darwinism’s theory that only the fittest have a right to survive. If man’s egotistical aggression was not controlled within a society, the society as a whole would be weak. This is the departure that can be found in *Mein Kampf* from Darwinism to naturalism where civilization causes man to evolve to fit his environment. If the civilization is based on lying and stealing to survive, the majority of the members will be liars and thieves; if honesty and good deeds are stressed the majority of the members will be honest and do good deeds. In *Mein Kampf* Hitler observed in the poor when he lived in Vienna, that

¹² author of *Das Dritte Reich*, which predicted Hitler’s regime

people became the product of their environment. “Then, from all the misery and despair, from all the filth and outward degeneration, it was no longer human beings that emerged, but the deplorable results of deplorable laws, . . .”(Hitler, 29). “These people are the unfortunate victims of bad conditions” (Ibid).

Mein Kampf was not the first literary work that featured naturalism one only has to look at the work of Emile Zola and Frank Norris. A work written after *Mein Kampf* was Sigmund Freud’s *Civilization And Its Discontents* which stresses the mental damage that may occur to man in certain environments. The effect of environment on people was a common subject in most of the Western nations prior to the writing of *Mein Kampf*. The Progressive political movement in the United States was at its height and was making similar observations.

Writers like D.H. Lawrence, Ludwig Klages, and Johann Jakob Bachofen called for the world to use more reason and humanity in their actions. As Klages wrote, “An unprecedented orgy of destruction has been carried out in the name of ‘progress and civilization” (Large, 26). The reason for this destruction according to Klages was that men had become lost in the urban setting, “In their sensual myopia and technological arrogance they were willing to turn their physical environment into a wasteland of polluted rivers, clear-cut forests, and befouled air” (Ibid).

CHAPTER III

NATIONALISM

“ ‘Political nationalism,’ he said has become for the European of our age, the most important thing in the world, more important than humanity, decency, kindness, piety, more important than life itself “(Snyder, *vii*). These are the words of Norman Angell a British publicist in the early 1900s before World War I.

The sense of nationalism is more than just grouping of people who live in a certain area; it is a bond between people who share a cultural feeling of belonging together. A sentence from Thomas Mann’s book *Magic Mountain*, “ ‘Beer, tobacco, and music’, he said. ‘Behold the Fatherland. I see you’re caught up in the patriotic mood’ . . .”(Mann, 110). It is such trivial things we share plus a similar history and common personal and civil experiences linking members to their nation that are the building blocks of our national pride and identity. Adolf Hitler’s pride for Germany was more intense than most Germans especially when he wrote, “How many are aware of the infinite number of separate memories of the greatness of our national fatherland in all the fields of cultural and artistic life, whose total result is to inspire them with just pride at being members of a nation so blessed (Hitler, 31).

The strength of a country’s nationalism can be measured by the number of people that believe in or support nationalism. Bismarck may have united all the German states under Prussian rule and made a geographically united Germany, but the strength of

nationalism was still weak. The various German states promoted states rights against Kaiser Wilhelm's II policies of centralized government and citizens had split loyalties between the leaders of their states and the Kaiser. There were also conflicts between Prussian customs which many felt were pushed on to them. Not only was Germany divided into social classes, Germany was also divided by regional differences as Munich competed with Berlin as the cultural center of Germany. Unlike the heavy industries in Northern Germany, Bavarian businesses were small in scale, as most people in the region were self employed and businesses only had a few employees. Bavaria not only feared the political power of Northern Germany, but its economic power as well. The Northern businesses were seen as a threat to many Bavarian small business owners. It is really not surprising that radical political parties could be started in Bavaria with the modicum of power they had compared to northern and eastern Germany. As the subject of this thesis is political thoughts expressed in *Mein Kampf* which was written in Bavaria, the subject of regional differences will be limited to conflicts between Bavaria and Prussia.

Bavaria had been ruled by Prince Regent Luitpold from 1886 to 1912 when his second son took over as King Ludwig III with the help of the Catholic party which was the largest political party in Bavaria. His older brother Otto would have become king, but mental illness made him unfit. I mention this transfer of power to show the degree of separatism in Germany where some citizens served two kings as late as 1912. In the later section of this thesis titled 'Problems in Government' German culture is shown competing with Western society for cultural primacy. Munich in the 1890s had a long history of being the German cultural center and regarded Berlin as an unworthy rival

and did not see the Prussian leadership as capable of expanding Pan-German thinking within or outside of Germany (Austria, Bohemia primary.) Julius Friedrich Lehmann was one of the founders of the Pan-German League in Munich who published nationalistic and racist literature in which he attacked both Judaism and Catholicism as threats to German culture, identity, and nationalism (Large, xxiv). He believed these two religions would bring in corrupt foreign cultural values, especially the Jews whom he called, ‘internal aliens’ (ibid). This concept of “internal aliens” would also appear in the work of *Mein Kampf*, which held that people “. . . cannot serve two masters” referring to conflicts of interest among citizens who are also members of international groups (114).

In the creation of nationalism in Germany *Mein Kampf* advocates that youth should be schooled about the greatness that can be found in Germany and the accomplishments of its people, as well as to feel pride in being a member of the German nation (424). This was not the first time that *Gymnasiums* had been criticized about how they taught patriotism. In the 1880’s Julius Langbehn¹³ cited the *Gymnasium*, “for [their] its remoteness from things German and patriotic” (Stern, 1961, 172). Langbehn was also associated with the Youth Movement of 1897 not as a leader but from his writings which were the inspiration for the movement, which began in violation of the law as student organizations were not allowed to meet in school or out. Basically, this movement was like summer camp in the United States where middle-class youth could go on nature hikes and test their physical toughness, sing students songs and most importantly, talk to each other about their dreams, hopes and fears. To better understand this, the word ‘duty’ has to be introduced as in the obligation one has to his

¹³ Author of *Rembrandt als Erzieher*,

boss and work and to one's family or place in life. The duty one has to others and to one's self is still an important concept in Germany. "two days of travel separate this young man (and young he is, with few firm roots in life) from his everyday world, especially from what he called his duties, interests, worries, and prospects--separate him far more than he had dreamed possible."¹⁴ It was through such outings that the youth could take breaks before going on with the next phase of their lives. Many would make friendships and form a sense of belonging that would last the rest of their lives. Karl Fischer was an older organization head who planned many of these events for the movement; he was often called *Fuhrer* by the students and was greeted by the use of *Heil* (Ibid).

As committed to unity of whole as the Youth Movement was, liberalism was committed to the individual. ". . . brilliant knights of tradition who did battle with irreverent, seditious progress" and "liberal humanism, which tended toward anarchy and wanted at all costs to protect the precious individual from being sacrificed to the interest of the whole."¹⁵ This was the danger that conservatives felt from liberal ideas which could destroy the growth of German nationalism.

Paul Lagarde in 1853 wrote about the evilness of liberalism, which was 'un-German,' had no home in any nation, and promoted comfort, progress, and materialism. "Liberalism in its utter sterility was responsible for all the cultural ills of the age" (Stern, 1961, 65). Even tolerance was seen as something destructive as it did not imposed uniformity in the community, as Dostoevsky's Grand Inquisitor would argue

¹⁴ character Hans Castrop from *Magic Mountain*, Thomas Mann pg. 4.

¹⁵ Line from Thomas Mann's *Magic Mountain*, pg 685.

the need for uniformity in religion as, “. . . it must be something unquestionable, that all men can agree to worship communally” (306).

Anti-liberalism was the defensive thinking that opposed the thinking from the Age of Enlightenment when men began to question dogma, laws, and common beliefs. Such action conservatives saw as an attack on what binds society together. In Germany as late as Bismarck’s time the Junkers still held some power and wanted to keep as much power as they could. The battle between liberalism and conservatism was not just about moral issues, but changes in government which “shifts in the distribution of power within the state and by the need for adjustment to new external threats and new social forces” (Hintze, 15).

Since the time of the American and French Revolutions Europe had found itself in battles over the social order and human rights. To repel Napoleon all of the German States had to band together, their petty quarrels were forgotten; the only thing that mattered was saving the ‘Fatherland.’ Even with Napoleon’s defeat, the call for liberty had persisted as the people began to demand more rights and opportunities. “It has often been asserted that there is an inherent relation between universal military service and universal suffrage, in the sense that they appear to be two sides of the same equation” (Hintz, 211). This statement seems to be very applicable to the U.S. where after every war minorities seem to demand improved civil rights. In post-Napoleoan Germany the common German also demanded improved civil rights.

One reason for the Congress of Vienna was to reject the democratic ideas of the French Revolution as European monarchs sought to reinforce their right to power. It was this right to power that liberals were challenging as they believed that ability should

be the determination of high office and social class, rather than noble birth. What is alarming about this debate was how long it had been debated as this was the same contention that Peppen II¹⁶ (Peppin the Short) had made when he challenged Childeric III as to who should be king of the Franks. The early liberals did not want democracy for all, as they did not believe that the poor could understand politics. Benjamin Constant¹⁷ wrote “that only men who owned property would have the time and background to understand politics well” (Kagan, 769). Thus the liberal movement had weakened itself, but had also protected itself from popular demagogues, who could gather a crowd of supporters, which could be a safeguard against regional militancy styled on the French Revolution model.

These self-interested liberals, later known as the bourgeoisie would be condemned by men seeking more universal civil rights since the liberals sought only to increase their own rights and not those of the lower classes. The bourgeoisie would also be attacked in the conservative revolutionary movement of which the writing of *Mein Kampf* was part as they were seen as weakening the nation.

Since on innumerable occasions the bourgeoisie has in the clumsiest and most immoral way opposed demands which were justified from the universal human point of view, often without obtaining or even justifiably expecting any profit from such an attitude, even the most self-respecting worker was driven out of the trade-union organization into political activity. (Hitler, 43).

This is Hitler’s description of how Vienna’s bourgeoisie treated the working class. The German bourgeoisie were seen in a similar light, not only by Hitler, but by the true reformers and the working class. The general view was that they were selfish, greedy,

¹⁶ Father of Charlemagne

¹⁷ Liberal theorist from France

and materialistic comfort seekers. “An aristocracy of education and wealth has replaced the aristocracy of blood” (Hintze, 210).

As the world was changing and strong commerce was as important as a powerful military, the strength of the bourgeoisie was also increasing. They were becoming power brokers both in and out of the government and controlled the lives of many Germans. In Hintze’s account of the origin of civil rights in Western Civilization he traces them back to the ‘Estates’ of manorial lords who governed not on the principle of ‘command and obey,’ but on customs and loyalty which were honored by the estate owners throughout Europe. It was this tradition that the bourgeoisie was breaking and why they were being called un-German (Hintze, 314). In the government these were the men that blocked social bills to improve employment and living standards and whose major concern was self-advancement.

Of course, Germany was not the only nation facing such social problems which marked class divisions. Karl Marx declared in *The Communist’s Manifesto* that mankind’s history was basically the struggle between the capitalists and workers. In *Mein Kampf* the Jews were seen as bourgeois capitalists and identified as non-Germans members of an international organization that hid behind a religion.

In doing the research for this thesis what surprised me were all the social conflicts I found going on in Germany in this period. Conservatives v. liberals and sometimes both of these against the bourgeoisie in their battle over what society’s values should be for Germany. As the environment of man was changing from rural¹⁸ to urban, from a secure environment to one not so secure, the question arose as to what the role of government should be in this new world. No longer were the Junkers in charge as much

¹⁸ Rural regulation of 1816 and later that displaced the small farming class.

of the population of Germany came increasingly under the aegis of entrepreneurs. Unlike the lords of the Estates, the leaders of commerce did not have strong ties to the people they hired. From Marx, labor was just another commodity to be used as employer's true aim was in maximizing profits. "I soon learned that there was always some kind of work to be had, but equally soon I found out how easy it was to lose it" (Hitler, 25). It was in this larger society that man was being lost in uncertainties, unlike in the smaller setting people where people knew everyone. This migration from the rural area to the urban has happened in every nation of the world which has entered the modern age. The role of government was also expanding from the protection of people against invaders, to include protection of people on social and civil issues.

The liberal nationalist movement did have its moment in the sun with the revolution of 1848, but the effort failed. The liberals wrote a constitution that contained a bill of rights similar to those of the United States and France, but when they offered the crown to King Frederick William IV, he refused it under this constitution. In 1850, he accepted a more conservative constitution which protected the propertied classes. Thus the German people "bypassed by current liberty, equality, and fraternity and were left instead with Prussian discipline, authority and efficiency" (Snyder, 66).

With the unification of Germany and the start of the Second Reich, liberalism was not completely dead in Germany. The man that may have done the most for it was Edward Lasker who was a member of the *Reichstag* and chief-of-staff of the National Liberals as "Bismarck complained in later years that he could never pass a bill without a 'Lasker amendment' that gave it a more liberal flavor than he liked" (Snyder, 137). The Iron Chancellor viewed Lasker not only as a personal enemy, but as a threat to the

“national dignity of the German people,” which was the general view of the upper classes of all liberals (Snyder, 155). Bismarck did not just target liberals, but also socialists with his legislation, “banning party organizations, publications and meetings and by expelling socialist militants from their home” (Joll, 40). Not only were socialists being targeted, but Bismarck was also trying to split the liberal party by separating moderate and far-left liberals by introducing legislations that would put tariffs on imported goods, and then use the revenue to pay for social welfare programs to workers. As most liberals were for free trade, and for state aid to workers, this action left the liberals in a moral dilemma and put many moderates in a problematic position over loyalty to free trade or aid for workers.

There was no separation of powers in Germany as the Kaiser had the ultimate power and set policy himself. Bills could not become laws without his signature. Even with the amendments that Lasker could add he would still share any political rewards from the people with Bismarck and the Kaiser. The Prussian Government had more control over people’s lives than the Reichstag, as the Prussian Government controlled the police, taxation, and the military. Germany was stronger united, but each state was weaker than Prussia alone.

Most Germans did not mind this as they liked state control and planning and trusted the Kaiser and his government over the bourgeoisie. Individual socialists did have an effect on Bismarck and the Prussian government. Ferdinand Lassalle¹⁹ formed a political friendship with Bismarck as they both shared the view that the working class movement would strengthen Germany as a whole instead of strengthening one class

¹⁹ After his death in 1875, the General German workers’ association became the Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands (SPD) The world’s oldest social democratic party which governs Germany today.

over another. Lassalle differed with Marx as he did not just want to strengthen the workers as much as to create a 'self-contained national state' by the use of state ownership and planning (Joll, 55). Lassalle was also for universal suffrage which he believed would someday provide popular control of the state government. The use of state planning would create the mind set that would be needed as all economic planning would have to satisfy the question, 'is this action strengthening or hurting the state?' This concept would later be turned into National Socialism by the Nazis.

Some forty years later, in the early 1900s, Walther Rathenau²⁰ address these same concerns in books and articles calling for a redistribution of the wealth and privileges of the upper class (Joll, 146). Rathenau wanted industrialists to work with the government in planning what would be good for both of them instead of just for their private business interests. This idea was rebuffed by his fellow industrialists, but during the Nazis rule business and government would work and plan together in strengthening both. He was also concerned about the conflicts in the social classes as he saw the new capitalist class pushing government for only their concerns as the bourgeoisie had done. He also warned about the quality of life for workers in the new technological world which should benefit all and not make the worker's life as hard as that of the medieval serf where instead of being tied to the land workers were now tied to the factory (Ibid). Rathenau was not a socialist or pro-union, but a nationalist who as he saw that constraints had to be placed on both workers and company owners. Once again neither social class should dominate, but all should benefit. Rathenau warned that 'lobbies' would take over government, that government would be only the protective arm for industries and not for the people. "In general it should not be forgotten that the highest

²⁰ Chairman of *Allemeine Elektrizitar Gesellschaft* (German General Electric Company)

aim of human existence is not the preservation of a state, let alone a government, but the preservation of the species” (Hitler, 96).

An often overlooked part of liberalism is that some extreme liberals will turn middle-of-the-road listeners off by their support of some off the wall belief. In the Munich of the 1890s the liberal movement was associated with rebellious artists and writers. “The Munchners’ only passion, he cried, was for beer and roast beef; woe be to anyone who tried to make them ‘chew on ideas!’” (Large, 11). Oskar Panizza made this statement after being released from prison, but the impact of this statement was lost due to his eccentricities. He had been imprisoned²¹ due to his play *The Council of Love* which portrayed the Holy Family as “drugged debauches who conspire with Lucifer to infect humanity with syphilis” (Ibid). From 1923 to 1933 the Nazis downplayed their extreme ‘final solution’ for the Jews as they realized this issue would not receive wide enough support from all the classes to build a big political movement (Brustein, 37). It was enacted only after Hitler had secured his power in Germany²² and even then in gradual steps which are portrayed very well by Daniel Jonah Goldhagen in his book *Hitler’s Willing Executioners Ordinary Germans And The Holocaust*. This is the problem for many liberals as many of them are government outsiders who do not control their rebellious spirit or understand Realpolitik. The liberal parties would often be split internally and too extreme in their platforms. The German Communist Party (KPD) and the Social Democratic of Germany (SPD) both maintained their opposition to capitalism in any form. The German People’s Party (DVP) supported both the rights of white-collar workers and big-business though both groups eyed the DVP with

²¹ “crimes against religion, committed through the press” (Large, 10)

²² Stein points to the unproven belief that Hitler started this program when he realized Germany could not take Moscow.

leeriness. The German Democratic Party (DDP) tried to win support of civil servants, but backed Brüning's²³ reforms featuring civil servants salary cuts.

Even the conservative parties were having a hard time building memberships especially the Catholic Center Party which divided into conservative and progressive wings. Its primary goal was to be a religious party which limited its membership as they were against divorce and were frequently in debates over pornography. The Center Party was also a loyal defender of the Weimar government (Brustein, 40). Another Catholic party was the Bavarian People's Party (BVP) which stood for states' rights, parochial schools, and denounced Germany's membership in the League of Nations. The BVP also did not like working in the German government with socialists and some non religious liberals (Ibid).

Later on both liberal and conservative parties that were heavy associated with the Weimar Republic would be frowned upon by the German public as many Germans blamed their woes on this government. "Its initial assertion was the fact that the Weimar Republic, by virtue of defeat in the world war, inflation and world economic crisis, had created a deep-seated feeling of insecurity and made many Germans grasp thankfully even at pseudo-solutions" (Peukert, 76).

The National Socialists (Nazi) party was neither liberal nor conservative in its platform and unlike the other parties was not associated with the Second Reich, World War I, and most importantly, the Weimar Republic. "With the victorious march of German technology and industry, the rising successes of German commerce, the realization was increasingly lost that all this was only possible on the basis of a strong state" (Hitler, 149). They were for a strong state, but they had the rationality to hide

²³ Heinrich Brüning chancellor 1930-32.

their affiliations with big business from their supporters. Their platform of National-socialism was the source of their wide support as it promised jobs for the working class, return of privilege to the middle class and protection for upper class property and power.

At a conference held at the house of the President of the Reichstag (Hermann Göring) February 20, 1933 twenty five industrialists headed by Gustav Krupp (Krupp Armament) met with Chancellor Hitler as they saw in him the means to control the masses and to deter them from turning to socialism and or communism. “ ‘In financing the terror elections of 1933’ Professor Arthur Schweitzer wrote twenty years later, ‘the leaders of big business made a substantial investment in the new government and became thereby a full partner in the Third Reich’ (Manchester, 407).

Hitler and the Nazis chiefs from the late 1920s had been forming an alterative government that showed strength, organization, and national spirit unlike the Weimar Republic. Like the Second Reich they had a strong leader. When one examines the success of the Nazis one finds that many public officials had helped them, for example the leniency the judge in Hitler’s high treason trial gave him in sentencing, especially since Hitler should had been transferred to the National Court for the Protection of the Republic in Leipzig (Large, 191). While Hitler was in prison the Munich government had outlawed the Nazi Party, but when he was released he met with Prime Minister Held who lifted the ban. In a speech a few weeks later Hitler got himself in trouble again by declaring that only the Nazis could deal with the Marxist threat as well as the Jewish one. He ridiculed the Reichstag and called for violence “Either we walk over the dead bodies of our enemies, or they walk over ours” (Hitler, 203). Hitler was now

banned from speaking at public meetings; it would take Hitler two years to convince the government to lift this ban. In the meantime the Bavarian Nazi party was almost in ruins as Hitler's speeches were the party's chief means of gathering revenue. The reason the ban was lifted was the belief that Hitler and the Nazis were no longer popular (Large, 215).

The strongest appeal of Nazism or National Socialism was its aim to unite all of the social classes. "Whatever economic concessions are made to our working class today, they stand in no proportion to the gain for the entire nation if they help to give the broad masses back to their nation" (Hitler, 336). The concept was an easy one to follow: if the lower classes had jobs they would be consuming goods and services which would benefit the other classes and strengthen the government. Thus the nation would be stronger and no one class would be taking too much advantage of the others, or hurting the nation. A simple example of this would be the lower class which usually makes the majority of the military. If one has an army of 5,000 men, but all of the men are 50 pounds underweight they can not perform tasks well, and if these men have no loyalty to their nation even if they are physical strong they will also not perform tasks well. "For one thing, the possibility of preserving a healthy peasant class as a foundation for a whole nation can never be valued highly enough (Hitler, 138). This was the explanation for one of the problems that was mentioned in *Mein Kampf* of why Germany surrendered to the allies in World War I due to a lack of patriotism. Unity of classes, patriotism, and nationalism were the criteria for a strong nation and factors for determining the strength of a nation in the world.

National-socialism by itself was not an evil concept: the ideal of all classes working together for the enrichment of the nation as a whole is the basis of just old fashioned team work. Good military units are based on good health, (mental and physical), positive morale, and a binding comradeship, “this was German soil, German forest, these were German youths; and he saw that he stood apart, alone, with no one to help him . . . each of the youths looked like all the others, with shorts, bare knees, brown shirt, a kerchief around the neck” this is from the novel *Hitlerjunge Quex*²⁴, about a boy (Quex) who joins the Hitler Youth. This reflects the double edged sword of nationalism for if the above quote was about the Boy Scouts one would not be alarmed and would see Quex making a positive difference in his life. The words of James Madison never rang more true “That the great difficulty lies in this: you must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place oblige it to control itself.”

Internationalism was seen as an enemy to Germany in many different ways as already mentioned it led to dual-loyalty for citizens as did Catholicism, and Judaism.

Since their sole task now becomes the creation of a balance²⁵ between domestic production and demand in all fields, they make the subsistence of the people as a whole more or less independent of foreign countries, and thus help to secure the freedom of the state and the independence of the nation, particularly in difficult periods. (Hitler, 138)

The benefits of a closed, semi-closed, or an open economy have been debated for many years and most national economies have a mix of all three under governmental

²⁴ Schenzinger

²⁵ The first part of this quote is using the second edition translation as Ralph Manheim believed it was printer's error see page 138 footnote.

controls. The use of controls for a nation's economy can be traced back to the eighteenth century in the form of nationalist-etatism which is, "an ideology that rejects economic liberalism and promotes the right of the state to intervene in all spheres of life, including the economy" (Brustein, 51). The economic platform that NSDAP expounded in the 1920s featured nationalization of banks, job creation, and more credit in the economy. The NSDAP was trying to develop an economic system between capitalism and Marxism, by combining Nationlist-etatism and Keynesian²⁶ economics which would later be used in the U.S. by President Franklin Roosevelt in his New Deal programs. It advocated an increased investment in capital goods to strengthen the German economy as the only hope for full employment (Ibid). In 1919, Gottfried Feder had called for governmental control of public utilities, national resources, and transportation, as well as of rent, interest, and mortgage rates (Brustein, 55). "Right after listening to Feder's first lecture, the thought ran through my head that I had now found the way to one of the most essential premises for the foundation of a new party" (Hitler, 210). As one examines *Mein Kampf* one finds much of a rewriting of other's ideas whose purposes were shaped to fit Hitler's need to create a strong Germany. From the writings of David Large²⁷ about Hitler's failed Munich putsch, ". . . Hitler finally allow himself to be convinced by Ludendorff's argument for a march. The more he came around to the idea, the more he adopted it as his own, refining it according to his personal vision" (183).

²⁶ John Maynard Keynes author of *The Economic Consequences of the Peace*, which was highly regarded by NSDAP economists.

²⁷ Author of *Where Ghosts Walked Munich's Road to the Third Reich*

Cosmopolitanism which the conservatives credited liberals with creating, was seen as anti-nationalism where the “. . . dynamic forces of the individual peoples would grow stronger than the force of common interests, and that would be the end of Austria”²⁸ (Hitler, 71). This concern is even more relative to our time than in the 1920s as it is now much easier to travel and live in other countries than then. The basic question in this statement is style of life v. nationalism, would one just move somewhere else to keep their style of life or fight if needed to maintain your style of life in that nation? Yet this is not just an issue about cosmopolitan living, but an question of the strength of the bond the government has created with the people.

What set Hitler’s nationalism-socialism apart from Lassalle’s was its basis on race. As the ancient Greeks said there were two types of people in the world; Greeks and all others, so it was for Hitler; the Aryan race and all others. From the psychological analysis of Hitler by Erich Fromm²⁹ one finds a very disturbed man, a person who does not trust well, but in the chaotic years in Germany after World War I many people in Germany shared these characteristics of Hitler’s which aided him in his rise to power. Due to the bitterness of the times many people felt a need for revenge, mistrusted everyone, and felt betrayed by both allied powers and the Weimar Republic which they created.

One has to remember that the biggest personal asset in Hitler’s possession was his ability to create and keep supporters by his speeches and propaganda, but even as good of a speaker as he was he still had to offer something the audience would want to hear, “. . . indeed he had to yield to the grievances and desires of the day and of the masses

²⁸ This quote comes from the time Hitler spent in Vienna

²⁹ Author of *The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness* (details Hitler in chapter on Malignant Aggression :)

(Jäckel, 72). Even though where he led them they might not have ventured on their own. During the treasons trials of the Munich putsch a folk singer named Weiss Ferdl summed up the platform of the Nazi's very well, "Tell me, what have they done wrong? / Can it really be a crime to try to save one's fatherland from disgrace and despair?" (Large, 193).

The strongest rationale for xenophobia over internationalism was the Treaty of Versailles, especially article 231 which stated:

The Allied and Associated Governments affirm and Germany accepts the responsibility of Germany and her allies for causing all the loss and damage to which the Allied and Associated Governments and the nationals have been subjected as a consequence of the war imposed upon them by the aggression of Germany and her allies. (Cochran, xv)

As early as 1921, scholars began rejecting placing all of the blame on Germany for starting WWI. The first scholar to present evidence supporting this view was Dr. Sidney B. Fay³⁰ in a three part article in the *American Historical Review*. Soon a group called the Revisionists would publish more articles trying to 'expose the myths of war propaganda; correct the misconceptions and false information acquired during the war, and revise the mythological history of the war and its origins" (Ibid).

³⁰ American Historian

CHAPTER IV

CONFLICTS OVER BECOMING THE CORE COUNTRY IN THE REGION.

In almost every region of the world there is one country that can be called its core country. One of the easiest core countries to identify is the United States which has the largest army and economy in its region. For the most part the U.S. has been a peaceful neighbor and usually uses economic instead of military power, which is not generally true for all core countries. Europe on the other hand has had many core countries throughout the ages and many wars. England with its powerful navy often imposed its will on the other countries in Europe usually against France. In the American Revolution, France had backed the colonies instead of England not with the view that the colonies should have freedom and liberty, but in the hope that England would lose some of the power it had gained over France in the Seven Years' War (1756-1763).

It is worth mentioning how the Seven Years' War started; Frederick II³¹ of Prussia invaded Saxony as he believed that Saxony was in league with Austria and France to destroy Prussia. Russia and Sweden would also enter this war, but after the death of Empress Elizabeth, Russia withdrew due to the new Tsar Peter III's friendship toward Frederick II. England was not so much fighting on the side of Prussia, as she was fighting France in North America to acquire French territory there. After Washington's

³¹ After this war he would be known as Frederick the Great

surrender at Fort Necessity, the action switched to Europe as the “Indians, realizing that the conflict between European encroachers was not theirs, “(Flexner, 18).

Prussia entered another war against France during the reign of Napoleon which Napoleon won, but which gave the German States their first taste of nationalism due to their joint effort in rebelling against Napoleon and France. With Bismarck Germany became a modern military power state after the defeat of France in the Franco-Prussian War (1870). The newly unified Germany controlled by Prussia was much stronger than the Prussian state had ever been alone. Even with unification Germany was still a small country compared to France or Russia. England’s superior navy could halt German shipping at will, thus in 1912 Germany began to build a larger navy and army to thwart not only England, but France, and especially Russia which was becoming closely aligned with England. Moscow’s military means were not as powerful as England’s, but Russia was a sleeping bear with the potential to become more powerful than all three, which would be seen in the 1940s.

The reasons for Germany entering World War I were as many and as confusing as the men involved. Chancellor Theobald von Bethmann Hollweg saw the risk as well as the good that could come to Germany if it entered the war. “He saw Germany with decrepit Austria its only ally, surrounded by a ring of enemies, ready to block its continued growth” (Stern, 1969, 277). It was this stagnation, with his belief in social Darwinism, and cultural pessimism that made him want to support entering the war (Ibid). In *Mein Kampf* the same thought is expressed that Germany had no other option, but to fight to gain land or be doomed to be a second rate country, always following and obeying bigger countries and never achieving the greatness she deserved.

From his diary one can read his concerns about Russia's "growing demands and colossal explosive power," these fears that Russia would invade and take over Germany were shared by most Germans (Stern, 1961, 286). Bethmann wanted to fight this war under the rationale that it was a defensive war and not an aggressive act as he was not sure how long the lower classes would fight with the widening division between the classes. Even as great as the military spirit was in Germany, even as true as Count Honoré de Mirabeau's description may have been that Germany was not "a state with an army, but an army with a state" if the foot soldiers' hearts are not in the battle the most superior army can be defeated (Stern, 1987, 29). Fritz Stern (a German historical and political analyst) brought up an interesting question: was Bethmann powerless against the German militarism and the Pan-German movement that he knew he could not stop.

‘An action against Serbia can lead to world war. The Chancellor expects that a war, whatever its outcome, will result in the uprooting of everything that exists. The existing [world] very antiquated, without ideas’ [wrote Riezler]. He thought it was a symptom of the general blindness that conservatives hoped that a war would strengthen the monarchical order in Germany [said Riezler] ‘Thick fog over the people. The same in all in of Europe. The future’ belongs to Russia . . .’ (Stern, 1969, 282)

Another characteristic of core countries is a belief that they should be considered not only a core country, but a world power. While Germany had the largest army in Europe and was a powerhouse in the world of commerce and industry, Stern asks what it all for was if not to be the core country in Europe and be a world power. By entering the war Germans were not just trying to prove their greatness by military means, but

were claiming the right of the young over the old³², England and France had had their turn in the sun and now were seen as old powers whose time was ending. Germany was to be the new power in this new age just as the Romans had taken over from the Etruscans and used the resources that the Latins did not know what to do with; the Germans would succeed England, France, and Austria and take over the resources of Russia.

After the war Bethmann's secretary Kurt Riezler wrote in his diary, "The dream about the world [Welttraum] finished forever. The end of all hubris." (Stern, 1969, 303). But, unknown to Riezler and many others, the embers of World War I would be fanned into a blaze by many Germans.

"The size of the area inhabited by a people constitutes in itself an essential factor for determining its outward security" (Hitler, 136). Germans were not only worried about their security, but also the stagnation that was occurring in Germany from the lack of space and resources. After World War I the unemployment rate in Germany skyrocketed, the wartime food shortages did not stop and even those who had jobs and income saw their living standards fall as inflation soared. As a friend³³ whose grandfather had lived during this period in Germany told me once, "Thank God for diamonds."

Due to World War I Germany had been reduced both in land and population. Instead of decreasing the threat that Germany would be a battlefield between Russia and Western Europe, it had actually increased it due to the communist takeover of Russia. It is interesting to note that Germany had helped Lenin return to Russia in the hope that

³² Moeller van der Bruck (Stern, 1969, 219)

³³ Interview with Ursula Overdiek im Komit.

he could take over the country and end its involvement in World War I. The Russian communist danger would not end until the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991.

Russia has always been seen as backward compared to the European nations. When Peter the Great led one of the more successful attempts at modernization he used foreign workers (engineers, artists, doctors, apothecaries, merchants, schoolmasters, and many other tradesmen) which were mostly German and even lived in a part of Moscow called the German Suburb.³⁴ “For centuries Russia drew nourishment from this Germanic nucleus of its upper leading strata” (Hitler, 655). Yet even with the all of the attempts at modernization by the Romanovs since Peter the majority of the populations were still illiterate peasants. Even Russian’s commercial, industrial, and governmental structures were still in the infancy stage by Western Europe standards. This inefficiency would be highlighted during Russia’s participation in World War I and would be one of the causes of the fall of the tsarist government.

From *Mein Kampf* one can find the theme that life is one survival struggle after another for both individuals and for nations; Hitler rejected the thought of “inner colonization” as he believed that it would be too limiting as the land would soon be at peak production and would still not satisfy the needs of the growing population in Germany. Due to the belief that, “the world will be dominated in accordance with the laws of the natural order of force, and then it is the peoples of brutal will who will conquer . . .” the only choice open for Germany was to gain land from the East to increase Germany’s resources (Hitler, 135). The need for more land for Germany was not just for the natural resources, but for living space and protection.

The size of the area inhabited by a people constitutes

³⁴ Robert K. Massie *Peter The Great His Life And World*, pg 111

in itself an essential factor for determining its outward security. The greater the quantity of space at the disposal of a people, the greater its natural protection; for military decision against peoples living in a small restricted area have always been obtained more quickly and hence more easily, and in particular more effectively and completely, than can, conversely, be possible against territorially extensive states. (Hitler, 136)

Colonization had not been a successful program for Germany as it was one of the last European powers to obtain colonies and the colonies that Germany did acquire proved to be more of a financial liability than an asset. According to Hitler, the only choice for Germany was to take part of Russia, “If one wanted land and soil in Europe, then, by and large, this could only have been done at Russian expense . . . “(Jäckel, 34). The plan for acquiring Russian land was not supposed to be activated until after France was neutralized so she could not attack Germany since Hitler did not want to wage a two front war as in World War I. The ally that Hitler wanted in the war with France was England He was not alone in this thought as early as 1901 Kaiser Wilhelm II had sought an alliance with England, but due to Germany’s alliance with Austria-Hungary this offer was never considered by the British government.³⁵

In Mein Kampf one can feel hatred and frustration concerning France,

This, to be sure, meant a life-and-death struggle, and there existed a prospect of life only if we succeeded in isolating France to such a degree that this second war would not again constitute a struggle of Germany against the world, but a defense of Germany against a France which was constantly disturbing the world and its peace. (674)

The worst accusations were that France’s ultimate goal was to dissolve the unification of Germany and make it a second class state, some of this could be

³⁵ Martin Gilbert *A History Of The Twentieth Century*, pg 39

construed from France's occupation of the Ruhr and the heavy reparations laid on Berlin. Looking deeper one can see signs of a battle brewing between Germany and France to become the core country of Europe. The only hope for Germany was “. . . *the resurrection visible to all of a German will for self-preservation, achieves the character of a state which plays on the general European chessboard* (Hitler, 633).

In reading *Mein Kampf* one can sense desperation for Germany to become a core country lest it be reduced to a second class state. Throughout this book, runs the theme that Germany had no choice but to fight as in the quote above it was a “life-and-death struggle” against France. This also shows the Hobbesian outlook of the world one finds in Nazism, ‘us against them, the strong have the right to do what they want with the weak,’ Due to these concerns Germany had only one option and that was to fight before it was too late. History does show that these concerns had some precedence as just over a hundred years ago Poland had been divided among Prussia, Russia, and Austria. And later France and England had acquired Syria, Jordan, and Iraq from the weak Ottoman Empire. Again one of the reasons why so many countries had been involved in World War I was to gain a share of Austria. “In the first place, Austria possessed too many enemies who were planning to grab what they could from the rotten state . . .” (Hitler, 147).

Hitler and Wilhelm II also had another similarity as neither knew when to stop a war. Germany had won a massive amount of territory from Russia and had made peace with Moscow with the signing of the Treaty of Brest Litovsk; (The Baltic provinces, Poland, White Russia, Finland, Bessarabia, Ukraine and the Caucasus) Germany was now larger than France in land size and with Russia in civil war the Russian threat

would not be a concern for many years to come. Instead of trying to make peace with the Allies Germany withdrew from the secret peace talks in Switzerland (Gilbert, 489). It is easy to judge battle plans in hind sight, but the fact remains that prudence would have been a good option. One of the reasons for not seeking peace with the allies was the idea that the German u-boats could keep U.S. supply ships from reaching Europe and it would be this unrestricted use of u-boats which would greatly affect the Treaty of Versailles. Germany had achieved lebensraum and lost it.

Not only were concerns about Germany being the European core country expressed in *Mein Kampf*, but also the prospect of Germany being a world power. “In an era when the earth is gradually being divided up among states, some of which embrace almost entire continents, we cannot speak of a world power in connection with a formation whose political mother country is limited to the absurd area of five hundred thousand square kilometers” (644). This is one of the thoughts that seems to have merit, as when one looks at the size and resources of any nation in Western Europe compared to a world power, it is only by putting them all together can one say that they constitute world power status. This is a major reason as why the European Union (EU) has evolved and grown in strength as all of the member states recognize this. Although the reason for the organization of the EU was not so much to be a military world power as to be a world economic and political power.

The man credited with founding the European Union was Jean Monnet, but the idea of trading zones in Europe was not a new idea. The newness of this idea was that no single country would be in charge of the union. The thought of an economic zone for

Germany (*Grossraum -wirtschaft*, or *Lebensraum*)³⁶ can be traced back to the 1700s, from such nationalist-socialism thinkers as Friedrich List, Heinrich Müller, and others. Germany's market zone was to include countries in Eastern Europe as a means to insure a market for German industries and instead of using protectionism for German agriculture by the use of tariffs, trade agreements would be used. Germany would dominate this market, expanding its economic base. Germany was not the only country that had seen the importance of an economic zone, England, Russia, and China had also seen the merits of creating zones for themselves (Ibid).

A rumor going through Germany was; France wanted to create an economic zone for herself that would exclude Germany from the markets of Western Europe, thus making Germany weaker. An economic zone was only one part of the plan that National Socialism had for Germany as it also envisioned government control since the prime goal of the economy should be to serve the government and not individuals or companies. The zone would operate in a semi-closed system to outside countries as the chief concern would be for these markets to serve the state and not to create individual wealth for a few. Taking into consideration the affect of naval blockades that had shut down German ports during the war until Germany signed the Treaty of Versailles one could see how attractive this logic would be to Germans. This plan would bring security to both the worker and to the industrialist, especially as Germany became more socialist orientated. Commercial production would be organized into geographical networks under one single authority.

³⁶ William Brustein, *The Logic of Evil*, pg 52-53.

The Nazis were not the only political party to endorse these ideas, but they were the first to put these concepts in their main party platform as principles of National Socialism.

CHAPTER V

PROBLEMS IN GOVERNMENT.

“ . . . to decide the important question, whether societies of men are really capable or not, of establishing good governments from reflection and choice, or whether they are forever destined to depend, for their political constitutions, on accidents and force”

Alexander Hamilton, The Federalist Papers³⁷

As one studies all of the forms of government that have been used to govern people, one quickly finds that none of them are without faults. Some are highly idealistic such as socialism and communism, others such as despotism, and oligarchy are based on power and privilege. Most working governments may be labeled with one word as to type, but will use parts of other forms of government. As the United States was waging the cold war against communism, retired people in the U.S. were collecting retirement benefits from the Social Security Administration which was a very collective action that could fit both the socialist and communist platforms. Perhaps, the worst mix is pseudo-democracy where a dictator rules, but calls his government a democracy as it has a representative legislature.

The one thing that all governments must have is authority. From *Mein Kampf* authority can come from three elements: popularity, power, and tradition (518). Popularity

³⁷ Pg, 2

is weak by itself, because the government must always maintain its popularity. Force alone also suffers as the government is always checking to make sure its power is paramount. A combination of power and popularity is better, but still unstable as the countless military coups have proven. Tradition is more stable, but tradition by itself leads to stagnation, and impotency, so the most successful government is one that has all three. The new communist Russian government had popularity and force, but no tradition. The Weimar Republic never really had any of the three as its force was weak, its popularity was never established and tradition could only be linked to the parliamentary Reichstag. Moeller van den Bruck in *Germany's Third Empire* claimed that parliament had no tradition in Germany. He used the word tradition as a feeling of security which the Reichstag had never given the Germany people this sense of security (131).

There are those who believe government tends to evolve towards a more perfect type of governorship. Monarchism was established thousands of years ago, but many believe that popular governments are superior, due to fact they grew out of monarchy. But even if one uses the number of people whose lives are improved as the harbinger of approaching utopian perfection in government, which is an idealistic dream, which John Locke would say involved 'secondary qualities' that not everyone can agree on. Take for example; asking people to eat a really great tasting apple, and someone will tell you they hate apples.

After World War I most of the Germans were not idealistic thinkers looking for perfection, they were people who had experienced hunger and betrayal who had lost whatever hope of greatness they felt as a culture. These were needful people looking not so much for an ideal government, but for one that could satisfy their basic needs and provide them with security.

Even as the Paris Talks were going on 15,000 communists were demonstrating in Munich. In Hungary Bolsheviks had taken over the government and inspired Bavarian communists. A month later Bavarian Socialists led by Ernst Toller tried to turn their state into a Bavarian Socialist Republic; they did succeed in taking over Munich (Gilbert, 538). In their three weeks of control they terrorized Bavarians by their decrees, ordering the nationalization of banks and large industries, as well as closing all but one restaurant and bar which they used (Large, 111). Perhaps, their worst actions were in creating revolutionary tribunals for hunting down counterrevolutionaries, confiscating money from citizens in exchange for credit slips. Toller was soon fighting an army from Bamberg headed by Johannes Hoffman for control of Munich, Hoffman's troops were anti-communists loyal to Weimar, but they were also anti-democratic racists who after capturing the city, "simple killed at random"³⁸ which terrorized the Bavarians even more.

To make matter even worse the allies were still imposing the shipping blockade on Germany. Norman Angell "denounced the blockade as a weapon 'against the children, the weak, the sick, the old, the women, the mothers, the decrepit'³⁹. The blockade was as wicked, he said as the German sinking of the *Lusitania* had been" (Gilbert, 552).

In 1920 Berlin was taken over by right wing members of the Conservative Party headed by Dr. Wolfgang Kapp who forced Chancellor Gustav Bauer and President Friedrich Ebert to leave Berlin. Bauer and Ebert called for a general strike to take place in the city, forcing Kapp to leave Berlin. Meanwhile Communists had taken over several towns in western Prussia, Bavaria and the Ruhr including Württemberg, and Leipzig. The German government could not send troops to the Ruhr (Essen, and Wesel) without seeking

³⁸ One of the victims was a chimney sweep killed because he had a red flag that was used in his profession (Ibid).

³⁹ British socialist "who before the war had warned that war would cripple victor and vanquished" (Ibid).

permission from the allies which with the exception of France, all favored. When German troops were dispatched before permission was granted, France took this action as a violation of the treaty and entered the southern part of the neutral zone, occupying Frankfurt-an-main, Darmstadt, Hanau, and Homburg (Gilbert, 582). When France was condemned by the allies and told to stop acting without group approval, France withdrew its troops.

In 1921 in another communist uprising headed by Max Hölz, starving workers rebelled in Halle, Merseburg, and Eisleben. Hölz and over two thousand followers were arrested and at his trial he rationalized his action,

Of what use, he asked in his manifesto, were the noblest creations of the mind and the highest ideals of a Socrates, a Rousseau, a Kant, Fichte or Marx, so long as they remain nothing but ideas, words, dead letters; so long as they cannot be realized as the stuff of life and liberating deed ? (Gilbert, 609)

Hölz was charged with murder and sentenced to life in prison. Seven years later he was given amnesty after he led a political prisoner protest and when he arrived back in Berlin he was greeted by 100,000 supporters. The popular thought was that he would continue his support for the communist agitation in Germany, but he was ordered to go to Russia where he was reported to have died in a boating accident. Dr. Alfred Apfel, Hölz's attorney wrote ". . . if Hölz had been in Germany in 1932 and 1933, Hitler would have found his task less easy" (Ibid). After Hölz's uprising most of the following rebellions came from the right winged former army officers who never engendered the degree of support Hölz had enjoyed.

In Germany of the 1920s three of the most important political thinkers were Friedrich Meineke, Carl Schmitt, and Karl Mannheim who dominated the academic community. In

an essay Friedrich Meinecke⁴⁰ called for academia “to weaken the impact of destructive class struggle and to overcome it through social reforms and the creation of ethical, humane and national values connected with these reforms” (Stern, 1969, 436). He wanted an intellectual outlook that would reconcile party, political, and economic interest groups. What Meinecke was calling for was something between progressivism and socialism as “the base of his idealism was religious and not philosophical” (Stern, 1969, 448). To him the easiest means to end social conflict was to turn to the Ten Commandments and ‘love your brother as yourself.’ A idealistic movie that Meinecke would have heartily approved was *Gabriel over the White House*,⁴¹ wherein the U.S. President awakes from a coma, ends the unemployment of the Great Depression, and puts an end to gangsters by going around laws, congress, and the party line. The author of *Paradise Lost*, John Milton, envisioned a society ruled by reason instead of passion, but unlike Meinecke he concluded that man was still ruled more by his passions for greed and self-interest than by reason.

Carl Schmitt,⁴² noting that Parliament can pass laws by a margin of as little as 51 percent ‘for’ with 49 percent, ‘against,’ declared that the 49 percent of the nation is disregarded and used this argument to justify authoritarian rule (Stern, 1969, 437). He rejected the idea that officeholders can represent the views of all of the people they represent. “Thus, according to Schmitt, a government appointed from above that achieves approval of its measures by plebiscite is equally legitimate” or as long as the government has the support of the people it has legitimacy (Ibid).

Karl Mannheim noted many differences between conservatives and liberals, but said the point that separates them the most was their conflicting concepts of utopian society.

⁴⁰ Professor at University of Berlin, author of the essay *Frei Generationen deutscher Gelehrtenpolitik*

⁴¹ released in 1933

⁴² Author of Legalität und Legitimität

The reason that they shared so little was that they were from different social classes and neither understood the other (Stern, 1969, 438). Mannheim was sharp enough to note in his book *Ideology and Utopia*, where he warns of the Nazis' "unconditional subordination to the leader . . ." (Brustein, 4).

What is striking about these three political academics is how far behind they were with political thought in the Western World. But as the Enlightenment had not really touched German politics, the power of the cities had not affected the nobility as much in Germany as it had in the rest of Europe. Change only occurred when it was more dangerous to maintain the status quo, as only the leadership could create any change. It would have been folly to discuss change in university classrooms as any professor who did not support conservative ideals would be committing academic suicide. It is not surprising that expressions of true liberalism first came from political outsiders in the form of literary works.

It was ironic that Meinecke called for academics to abandon idealistic theory as his thoughts are the most idealistic of the three. Mannheim's biggest weakness is the fact that conservatives and liberals can be found in all social classes. The complaints by Schmitt about officeholders not representing all the people appears in *Mein Kampf*.

"... the sole form in which the monarch could be approached; that is never to contradict him, but agree to anything and everything that his Majesty condescends to do." These words could have come from Thomas More, John Milton, and especially Baldassare Castiglione⁴³ but they came from *Mein Kampf* (237). It might seem strange that with the fall of the Tsar, the ousting of Wilhelm II and the collapse of the Austrian Empire that a criticism of monarchy would be needed. Yet even in the 1920s there was still talk of a

⁴³ Author of *Book of the Courtier*

monarch for Germany to restore the stability of the Second Reich. “We were well served by our monarchy for centuries . . . reflecting that the good experience of it in the past should carry more weight than the bad, and that many centuries rightly outweigh a couple of decades” was an argument that came from Moeller van den Bruck whose work. “was inseparable from the National movement: almost its Bible” accord to Mary Agnes Hamilton who wrote the Introduction of the English translation of Bruck’s work *Germany’s Third Empire* (9).

In discussing monarchies Hamilton faults many of them for selfish ambition and charges that they “have always demonstrated the greatest arrogance toward the rest of humanity” (Ibid). This was markedly evident in Germany where the nobility and upper Bourgeoisie had isolated themselves so well. What was even more unforgivable for Hitler was how they had been of no help in the peace talks yet now had come back to urge a return to monarchy. The economist Max Weber who also wrote about Germany politics had influenced Friedrich Meineke. Weber believed that the basic problem of monarchy had always been too few candidates for the office. “If the greatness of this institution lay in the momentary person of the monarch, it would be the worst institution that can be imagined; for monarchs only in the rarest cases are the cream of wisdom and reason or even of character . . .”(Ibid). Often the kingdom was stuck with someone with mental or physical problems and views shaped not by Realpolitik, but by misguided policies like the late Shah of Iran.

“Germany, however, was governed by parliamentarians and party men, not by peasants. The German tradition of sneering at parliament and parliamentarians is nearly as old and widespread as the contempt for Jews and journalists” (Stein, 1969, 148). One of

the first problems about parliament mentioned in *Mein Kampf* was its failure to care about the people that elected them. “How anxiously he begs the approval of the majority for every measure, to assure himself of the necessary accomplices, so he can unload the responsibility at any time” wrote Hitler about an office holder (82). This is the sad, but true part of a majority ruled system-if a parliamentarian votes with the majority very little fault can occur to him as long as his party keeps its majority. As *Mein Kampf* was a propaganda document parliamentarians are not well depicted as trustees, being viewed instead as mere pawns and men “of cowardice” who are afraid to do anything that may discredit their party standing and lose them votes (Hitler, 82). Hitler makes the claim that officeholders are not held accountable for their action, but here he inadvertently proves the opposite. The cowardice of officeholders was in not introducing new plans and strategies to solve the problems facing the people. This is a “do not rock the boat” syndrome, where nothing is done in the hope that problems will go away and only acting when forced to.

Moeller van den Bruck made the claim that the Weimar Republic elections were tainted, “His voting had no influence on the results of the election which produced a number of unknown representatives, each of them tied down from the start by allegiance to his party and provided rule-of-thumb instructions for any contingency” (120). This would certainly add to *Mein Kampf's* argument of parliamentarians placing party loyalty over loyalty to the voters.

The politician mentioned as a ‘true statesman’ was Dr. Karl Lueger, mayor of Vienna who “conjured up one amazing achievement after another in, we may say every field of economics and cultural municipal politics, thereby strengthening the heart of the whole Empire . . .” (Hitler, 69). This is the attraction of National Socialism over U.S. democracy

where many U.S. governmental projects are not necessarily best for the whole nation, but often debated by congressional log-rolling and political pork.

Mein Kampf is arguing that in parliamentary democracies innumerable bad decisions can be made before majority opinion adapts to a changing situation. Parliamentary governments do not have the decision-making quickness of a government under one dedicated leader and many opportunities are lost. One of the staunchest supporters of democratic rule bypassed laws and overreached his constitutional authority and the result was one of the largest peaceful land acquisitions of all time, Thomas Jefferson's Louisiana Purchase. "For there is one thing which we must never forget; in this, too, the majority can never replace the man" (Ibid). It is interesting to note Gandhi's remarks about the Indian National Congress that he volunteered for in 1901. He despaired at the waste of time which marked the snail-paced sessions and at the partisan voting of legislators. This showed the problems of political parties and congresses that have pyramid systems with offices that can reward members who prove their loyalty to superiors and commonly disregard their national interest.

Aristotle wrote, "It is evident that many who have participated in this office have been thoroughly affected by bribery and favoritism in handling many common matters" *Mein Kampf* came to the same conclusion that the wrong men seek office (Book 2, Chapter 9). "There is absolutely nothing one of these spiritual robber barons will not do to achieve his savory aims" (Hitler, 86). This is the sad side of politics that turns so many people off and gives them an excuse for not voting.

Majority rule elections Hitler deemed as likely to break up communities into groups, those that were for something and those who were not. As there are many issues in any

community the successful candidate would have to represent the issues that had the largest amount of supporters even if their desires were bad for the community. Now the goal of democratic politicians became not the ability to reach wise decisions, but to form and keep majorities. A great candidate can be a really bad officeholder and a great officeholder can be a really bad candidate.

Is it the criterion of the statesman that he should possess the art of persuasion in as high degree as that of political intelligence in formulating great policies or decisions?
 . . . not in the birth of a creative idea or plan as such, but rather in the art of making the brilliance of his projects intelligible to a herd of sheep and blockheads, and subsequently begging for their kind approval? (Hitler, 80).

This is the sad reality for politics that people will favor a candidate by how he looks and his personality over his proven performance, and many voters will never bother to compare the candidates' political platforms. Hitler reasoned that with popular elections the threat of Marxism would not decrease as "he begins to replace the idea of democracy by the dictatorship of the proletariat" (Hitler, 325). I found this passage very interesting since this was exactly how the Nazis had took over Germany.

Another problem with popular elections is that the newly elected officeholder does not represent all of the voters, but only the majority that elected them. This is the point that Carl Schmitt emphasized where as many as 49 percent of all of the voters maybe forced to go along with the majority. A conclusion not featured in *Mein Kampf* was that when a government does not represent their views these groups may turn away from it and not vote and in the time many will even stop expressing their concerns. The officeholder is often torn tied between being a delegate who votes for legislation that represents what his

constituents want and a trustee when not bound by party demands, who uses his own best judgment on issues.

Returning to the idealistic movie *Gabriel over the White House*, the U.S. President maneuvers around congress and the political parties and solves problems by use of decrees. The act of gathering support and waiting for the right time ('windows of opportunity') to introduce bills, Hitler sees as only fit for a 'parliamentary gangster'⁴⁴ and such action can be made worse if these windows are created by the use of propaganda and not truth. By always waiting for 'windows of opportunity' majority rule governments sometimes gets bad results from delays. We all have heard the cry especially with roadways about, 'how many people must die before the problem is fixed.' Yet the idealistic concept of an all powerful leader taking swift action is a potential slippery slope towards totalitarianism.

The fears that *Mein Kampf* had for parliamentary government included how easily the press could create these windows of opportunity, "In a few days a ridiculous episode had become a significant state action, while, conversely, at the same time, vital problems fell prey to public oblivion, or rather were simply filched from the memory and consciousness of the masses" (85). The abuse of the press power of the press was not limited to Germany as William Randolph Hearst was reporting that Washington needed to declare war on Spain over Cuba when the battleship Maine suffered an explosion in a Cuban harbor. Hearst wired Frederick Remington, "You furnish the pictures and I'll furnish the war."⁴⁵ For Germany the betrayal by the liberal press was in its promise of better peace terms. Wilson's "Peace without Victory" may have made some attention, surrender without suffering did not. In the eyes of most of the Germans, liberals were totally responsible for the hated

⁴⁴ *Mein Kampf*, pg 84

⁴⁵ Edward S. Greenberg, *The Struggle For Democracy* pg.184.

Treaty of Versailles, “Liberalism has taught the west to turn its principles into tactics to deceive the people . . .” anything featuring liberal ideas was labeled deceitful; liberal newspapers, liberal western institutions such as parliaments, and democracy itself. Even to this day the power of the press is a hotly discussed topic as well as the slant news agencies may adopt.

To understand why *Mein Kampf* was written one can not overstress how much the Germans had felt betrayed by the Treaty of Versailles. Not only had the army surrendered, the Germans people had created a revolutionary change of government from a monarchy to parliamentary democracy. When the harshness of the treaty took effect, the Weimar Republic became the surrogate for hatred for Western ideas and especially for liberal democracy. “Liberalism is a product of occidentalism which still lurks in parliaments and calls itself democracy” (Bruck, 76).

Germany society had long been a ‘stressed society’ due to its authoritarian monarchy with very narrowly defined social classes and in the aftermath of Treaty of Versailles the condition worsened.

Our normal or healthy society, then will not be one in which there are no criticisms of the government or the ruling class, no gloomy sermons on the moral decay of the times, no Utopian dreams of a better world around the corner, no strikes, no lockouts, no unemployment, no crime waves, no extremists, no attack on civil liberties.
(Crane Brinton, 28)

In the time of the Weimar Republic Germany had all of this plus a call to the youth, “Only a new generation can set us free from the consequences of this fate . . . (Bruck, 111).

The chief fault with democracies was that too often their actions aim not at what was best for the country, but to satisfy one group and in this constant battle between groups,

each one seeks to form a majority. Even if the group passes legislation⁴⁶ people still could be deceived just as the Germans had been, “But there was now no further talk of the promises to Germany that if she would put an end to the War by a Revolution she would be received into the elect company of the ‘free people’ as an ‘emancipated nation’” (Bruck, 81). Instead of uniting people democracy seemed to drive people apart into interest groups espousing conflicting goals. Langbehn hated democracy, because it was based, on “the principle of human equality and run by human mediocrity” (Stern, 1961, 148).

Hitler asserted that even qualification for office was not as important as amassing a group of voters and after elections officeholders were supposed to judge plans that they might have no expertise in and would not acknowledge that fact. “No one will summon up the courage to declare: ‘Gentlemen, I believe we understand nothing about this matter. . . .’” “Anyone with knowledge of people will realize that in such an illustrious company no one is eager to be the stupidest, and in certain circles honesty is almost synonymous with stupidity” (Hitler, 89). In defense of the officeholder one can turn to Crane Brinton’s admonition that the ‘ruling class’ should never look inept (51). Hitler’s confessed that he had always disliked parliaments, yet he did see a need for them as a means to give politicians background and experience, “because in them, above all, personalities to which special responsible tasks can later be entrusted have an opportunity gradually to rise up” to advance offices in government as well as a remedy against inept politicians (450).

In reading *Mein Kampf* one immediately notices how the work showcases the NSDAP and Hitler, but one can also see that he really tends to dismiss the public. “Since the great masses of the people in the very bottom of their hearts tend to be corrupted rather

⁴⁶ Legislation would pass, but officeholders would not promulgate money or assign any penalty for violating the legislation.

than consciously and purposely evil, and that therefore, in view of the primitive simplicity of their minds,” (231). “. . . the majority of mankind which is lazy and cowardly” (581). With thoughts such as these one can easily see why Hitler was against majority rule governments which he believed would eventually be corrupted and fail. Alexis de Tocqueville saw the common people differently, but members of congress the same as Hitler and Gandhi, as he wrote, “On my arrival in the United States I was surprised to find so much distinguished talent among the citizens and so little among the heads of the government.” (80).

Max Weber was for democracy as he had seen the ineptness of Wilhelm II and noted the extremely limited choice of leaders in monarchical government. Democracy would offer more candidates to lead Germany, but Weber ultimately wanted a fuehrer that would be a tough, charismatic leader who “would fortify his will to power, [and] would gain some of that passion and magnetism that would inflame the people” (Stern, 1969, 303).

The layout of *Mein Kampf* starts out telling the story of Hitler from the carefree days of his youth to his struggles as an artist and his pride in serving in World War I. Finally it describes his political awakening and the writing of the NSDAP political platform. Underneath this story is also the record of how his views gradually evolved. The aim of this work is to make the reader’s ideas develop along with Hitler’s. This is why in the beginning of his book he says of parliamentary government, “On the contrary, as a freedom loving-loving man I could not even conceive of any other possibility of government, for the idea of any sort of dictatorship would, in view of my attitude toward the House of Hapsburg, have seemed to me a crime against freedom and reason” (76). In a speech on May 4, 1923 less than two years away from the publishing of *Mein Kampf*, Hitler said, “our

task is to give the dictator, when he comes, a people ready for him.” He had reached the type of government that he considered would be the best for Germany and the German people (Kershaw, 169). He saw Germany as isolated in a world where only the strong would survive, and came to believe that the only hope for Germany was a strong leader.

The Pan-German movement could count on success only if it realized from the very first day that what was required was not a new party, but a new philosophy. Only the latter could produce the inward power to fight this gigantic struggle to its end. And for this, only the very best and courageous minds can serve as leaders” (Hitler, 105).

The power of this leader should be absolute, but one should not fear him as his chief concerns are preservation of the Aryan race and of Germany. There is a great mystery about *Mein Kampf* in that the purpose and procedures of how to use propaganda are laid out so well that it should have alerted the world, but as Brustein noted few people read this work prior to 1933 (51). “Hitler was a genius at dissembling—yet reckless at revealing his true nature” (Stern, 1987, 125).

Building on the popular admiration for Bismarck, the faults of Germany’s wartime leadership and the problems of the Weimar Republic, Hitler reasoned that Germany needed another strong confident leader. Using historical examples he made the case that only through the action of strong willed leadership did a nation become great and only by the use of force did nations become empires. It was always the work and leadership of one man whose determination created a drive in his followers to conquer new territories. This tied in with his earlier rationale for *lebensraum* or the need for more land for the growing population of Germany. A factor that one can not forget about Germany was its great military achievements in World War I, when they took a vast amount of land from Russia,

fought in eight theatres of war and held France and England at bay for four years, “when they [Allied generals] were still thinking of hanging on grimly till the campaign of 1919 when perhaps the Americans might tip the balance” (Joll, 236). Adding the fact that to Hitler the German army had not been defeated, but was sold out by the liberals, the question was of course what Germany could now do with a strong leader unlike the immature Wilhelm II.

Hitler wanted to show that he was not only a great leader, but also a theoretician whose plan and vision would lift Germany out of the shackles of national slavery as he had done with the NWSP. Though most theoreticians were not great detail men nor could they create a following, he could do both. It was his ability to control the masses that led the industrialists to sponsor him to stop the spread of Marxism. Through he failed to win a majority in the 1932 election; his party was still the largest in parliament and appeared to have control of the people; that President Hindenburg offered him the position of chancellor in January, 1933 in the hope that with Hitler in his government it would become stronger. Both the industrialists and Hindenburg believed they could control him.

Max Weber⁴⁷ described a politician as one who “allows himself to come into contact with diabolical powers lurking in every form of violence” (Stern, 1969, 280). Riezler (secretary to Bethmann) “politics is really the art of doing evil and attaining the good- to be wise enough to know how everything is interlocked [and] through malice to lead the ill-intentioned to something good” (Ibid). They had misjudged Hitler and soon he and his followers had the upper hand on them. In rapid succession he obtained presidential permission for a new election, using the February 1933 Reichstag fire as an excuse for controlling individual freedoms, and in the confusion pulled 44 percent of the vote. In

⁴⁷ Author of *Politics as Vocation*

March 1933, with the passage of the Law for Alleviating the Distress of the People and Reich (the infamous Enabling bill) Hitler soon banned all opposition parties. He then won the support of the army by disbanding his private army, the S.A. and summarily executing its leaders Ernst Röhm and Edmund Heines among others. Hitler at last could fulfill his promises to give strong leadership that would lead Germany to greatness and to end the corruption that rewarded the few at the expense of the people. He would save the industrialists from the threat of communism and rebuild the military so the people could feel safe again. But in the course of these achievements he had executed a coup-de-état and became the Führer and dictator of Germany. This was not really surprising as Crane Briton had observed that after every revolution the more radical members had always taken over the government from the moderates, especially when they had the backing of the military. Unlike the previous Weimar leaders he had given everyone something they wanted. “*Ein Volk, ein Reich, ein Führer* was exactly what the majority of Germans wanted to hear” and those relatively few who had read *Mein Kampf* prior to 1933 had a preview of Adolf Hitler (Davies, 970).

CHAPTER VI

IDEOLOGY

The most profound ideology that can be found in *Mein Kampf* was the concept of National-Socialism based on race. The lure of National-Socialism with all three classes working together is very appealing. The government was to create laws aimed to do the best for the nation instead of favoring one district over another one with less political power, and despite some legislation that might reward a select few, the objective was still what is best for the nation. Corporations would work with the government to enhance the society as a whole, instead of merely creating profits for shareholders. No longer would government be ruled by an oligarchy or monarchy; instead of one social class dominating the others, national policy would enhance the lives of all citizens. Social clashes would no longer exist as the leader would have the wisdom of Solomon and exhibit empathy for both sides in any conflicts.

In *Mein Kampf* the ideology of the German people was much different than other countries within Western culture. Unlike the United States, in Germany democracy was not seen as the ultimate style of government by the people. Thomas Mann described the psychological undertows in a play by Stefan George on what George believed were the desires of the German people, “. . .[which] revealed an intriguing mixture of uncompromising absolutism, hunger for grand solutions, hero worship, and eagerness for self-sacrifice in the name of purification and redemption” (Large, 33). One can easily see

that the chaotic methods of democratic institutions were not what the German people wanted. Democracy and especially the Weimar Republic had no grand legitimacy as had the monarchy in the days of Bismarck. The defects of democracy that were decried in *Mein Kampf* had already been criticized by many Germans prior to *Mein Kampf*. As democracy was just the will of the people at any one time it lacked proper safeguards as any rights one group might win one day could be gone the next day depending on who had a majority. This was why the background of the leaders was emphasized in *Mein Kampf*, especially those who did not change their minds often, as this would guarantee safety. A true leader had beliefs which he would follow compared to a mere politician “. . . whose only real conviction is lack of conviction, combined with offensive impertinence and an art of lying . . .” (Hitler, 67).

The NSDAP was a socialist party which in some aspects was close to, but not the same as communism or democracy which both espouse rule in the name of the majority. Communism wanted a dominant class of proletarians to morph into a classless society which is a nice idealistic thought, but all men are not created equal in natural abilities. All systems that manage human resources need some form of popular reward be it as simple as in an athletic team giving an MVP award to just one member, thus encouraging others to strive for the same reward. It is hard to judge communism well, because after Stalin became its leader, the USSR was not a true communistic state, since the proletariat did not actually rule, but rather an oligarchy composed of communist party members under the ultimate power of only one man, Stalin.

Germans in the 1920-30s for the most part did not desire communism, since the ultimate power would be in Moscow and not in Germany. This may have been why Max

Hölz was ordered to Russia instead of being left to organize his supporters in Germany, where he could have become a political threat to Lenin. Several of the points that people liked the about NSDAP were that it opposed communism and upheld the rights of property owners. Unlike the communists, NSDAP supported some forms of capitalism, it was profit not based on work that they viewed as wrong. The planners of the NSDAP were well aware that “a defense of private property was necessary if the party hoped to attract those who feared communism” (Bristein, 91).

In his book *Dreams and Delusions* Fritz Stern did a biographical sketch of Fritz Haber,⁴⁸ who lost his directorship at Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Physical Chemistry and Electrochemistry,⁴⁹ which had become the premier scientific institute of the world by assembling scientists from many nations. Albert Einstein was just one of the premier scientists who worked at this institution. Haber was forced to leave Germany because he was Jewish. The sentiments Stern writes about Haber’s beliefs correspond to Mann’s,

[He] dreams of a democratic Caesar, of a *Fuhrerdemokratie*, probably ran strong in him, He hoped for a leader or at least a strong political authority that would rescue Germany from chaos and from threatened radical tyranny. He probably never had much faith in ‘the invisible hand’ in the automatic processes of capitalism. He probably also had little patience for the laborious process of democracy, for endless parliamentary wrangling, which by 1930 or 1931 had reached a virtual breakdown in any case. (72).

Democracy would also not address the fear of communism, as it created a potential vehicle for communists to take over Germany. All the communists had to do was win over the workers and they would have a majority or at least a plurality.

⁴⁸ Invented the process of separating nitrogen from air, was a German veteran of WWI created the combination of gases to be used in the German gas warfare in WWI

⁴⁹ After WWII the name of the institution would be changed to Fritz Haber Institute for Physical Chemistry and Electrochemistry.

One of the objectives of the Treaty of Versailles was to destroy militarism in Germany, but the treaty went too far and in the depression, Germany was facing chaotic conditions. Even inside the structure of the Weimar Republic one did not find loyalty for its institutions. “The reactionary, agrarian, upper bourgeois, and big-business elements which were united in the German National People’s party was positively determined not to reform the Weimar system in the way that Brüning wished, but to sabotage it” (Meinecke, 62). The Weimar government was not seen as a government, but as a means for shackling Germany to the Treaty of Versailles.

As the German army had not been defeated in World War I, but had surrendered, many people in Germany felt that the army had been betrayed this was even believed by the intelligentsia of Germany from the writing by Stern about Moeller, “Because of it, Germans were able to feel that the Allies had tricked, not defeated, them—hence, that moral wrong had been committed. From it evolved the invidious belief that the great army had been betrayed by civilian elements at home, by the socialists, liberals, and Jews, and that the republic had been fathered by traitors.” (Stern, 1961, 218).

The one thing that all of the political parties in Germany did agree on was that the German army had not been conquered. As Friedrich Ebert said, when he was welcoming the soldiers home, “As you return unconquered from the field of battle. I salute you.” Perhaps, Ernest Troeltsch sums up this popular belief, “[this betrayal] became the dogma and the flag of the discontented” (Ibid).

One of the most important tasks of a government and the reason that man had created civilization was to replace chaos with order. Mussolini had demanded that he be made Prime Minister because the Italian government could not stop the chaos in Italy, whereas he could, never mind the fact that he had created it. It is interesting to note that when Italians

in allied controlled Italy first saw the movie *The Great Dictator*⁵⁰ in 1944, they were much surprised about how the rest of the world had viewed Mussolini.⁵¹ And still another dictator brought order to a depression-plagued nation and civil mayhem as General Francisco Franco defeated the leftist Spanish Republic.

It was believed that what Germany needed was another Bismarck, a strong leader who could unify and defend Germany once again. Stern, writing about Moeller could have been writing about any German in this period when he remarked, “He had longed for a new spiritual community amidst the political glitter of the Wilhelmine period; how much more would he seek an escape form the spiritual pluralism and the political disunity of Weimar” (Stern, 1961, 222). As the November Revolt had not ended, the Weimar Republic was just the first phase, and as Crane Briton would predict the second phase would come when the radicals would take over the revolution from the moderates, the question becoming which radical leader would take over Germany.

It was due to a lack of strong competition that Hitler would become chancellor. The Nazis did not have a majority in the Reichstag but was the largest party and boasted that without their support, no majority rule government would be possible; a coalition would have to be formed with the Nazis. This was the aim of Hindenburg and Hugenberg when they offered Hitler the chancellorship in the belief that they could control him, and he could control the masses thus providing more popular support to Hindenburg’s government (Meinecke, 62).

Even with all of the warnings that one can find in *Mein Kampf*, which was not widely read until after Hitler came to power, the true nature of Hitler was hidden. He did not

⁵⁰ New York Times wire service article.

⁵¹ Jack Oakie the actor portray Mussolini received a Academy Award domination for this perform.

deceive the people in becoming a dictator, but in not being a true Führergedanke, as in one of his first acts as chancellor he settled a labor strike, not as a mediator or wise judge, but by brute force. Hitler was truly Nietzsche's man hiding behind his mask⁵² and when he obtained power he revealed his true self. But hints of it could be seen in *Mein Kampf*, "Terror at the place of employment, in the factory, in the meeting hall, and on the occasion of mass demonstrations will always be successful unless opposed by equal terror" (44).

Norman Davies believed there are seventeen points that can be found in all totalitarian regimes. All of these points can be found in the Nazi regime, but what is most interesting was how many of these points were already in use prior to Nazism (945). Of the seventeen, eight were already in place, four somewhat, and six soon came. Of course, all of the existing points were intensified when Hitler assumed power. The following is a summary of how the German situation fits Davies' assessment of points that can be found in a totalitarian regime.

Davies' *Contempt for liberal democracy* was widespread after World War I, and contempt for liberals was significant even prior to WWI. *Militarism* had also been around prior to WWI to be spawned by the Spartan like military spirit of Prussia, especially after the Enabling Act, in March, 1933 and as the Nazis enlarged the military for the coming war. The military elite swore allegiance to Hitler once he disbanded his personal brownish shirt army (Meinecke, 47).

The dialectical enemy had also been around, but was popularized by Hitler and WWI towards Westerns, liberals, and especially Jews.

it was in those years of inflation and depression of outraged nationalism and a sense of aggrievement at being treated as outcasts, that the accumulated anti-Semitism in Germany

⁵² Beyond Good and Evil, pg 161

became concentrated into a frenzied political gospel and directed against a minority that had long since lost the strength or power it had once possessed. (Stern, 1987,113)

Anti-Semitic propaganda was not limited to Germany. One of the most bizarre proofs that one should hate Jews had originated with the Tsarist government's claim to have found a secret society's document called, *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, which showed that Jews wanted to enslave the entire world (Large, 155). This document was translated by the Thule Society to spread anti-Semitic hatred across Germany. *The psychology of Hatred* on Jews was turned up to an extreme level once Hitler was in power, leading ultimately to the "Final Solution" of a state-run mass extermination.

In Germany one could discern a new point "*the psychology of Fear*," seen in many other totalitarian regimes, where the people can only trust their own countrymen as everyone else is against them. German culture had created a fear and hopelessness even before World War I, that if Germany did not become a bigger country it would be wiped out or at the least become enslaved by a bigger country. As Germans had great concerns about France and Russia prior to World War I, this fear escalated dramatically with the Treaty of Versailles as all of the allied nations were conceived to be against them, and this fear turned into need for revenge which Hitler would manipulate to his advantage. When one studies this period one finds many groups that did not need any encouragement from the Nazis. One only has to look at the Krupp factories as they kept working on weapons of warfare in secret, hiding plans and production from the Allies' inspectors (Manchester, 384). These inspectors were aided by members of the Social Democrats Party (SPD); "at a great risk to themselves. As the decade advanced, more and more Social Democrats became victims of the right-winged Femen [political assassins], toward whom the Weimar courts

were astonishingly lenient” (Ibid). “And this future of the Reich was nothing other than the question of preserving the German’s people’s possibility of existence.” This quote was about the entrance into World War I and would re-echo in World War II (Hitler, 131).

Pseudo-Science beliefs in the superiority of the Aryan race, as well as the inhumanness of Jews had been around prior to WWI. *Utopian goals* had been a part of German life for hundreds of years as almost all nations have some form of Das Dritte Reich society in folklore. *The Fuhrerprinzip (leader principle)* envisioned that God would send a ruler down to lead the people. A *Fuhrergedanke* leader was similar to what the Jews believed the Son of God would be when he came to Earth as the King of Kings, to defeat all the enemies of the Jewish people, or the French Joan of Arc who would help defeat the English. The legendary King Arthur not only had *Fuhrergedanke* qualities as he had taken the sword out of the rock, but would make Camelot into a Das Dritte Reich. “What gives the latter the nature of political religion is its axiom of the ‘exclusiveness’ of the political ‘all-or-nothing’ [and] its mystical Messiah-faith in the ‘word-mighty’ Führer as the only one summoned to control destiny” (Stern,1987, 130). “This folk hero would be on the scale of another Luther or Shakespeare, and he would rise to be the acknowledged legislator of all Germans” (Stern, 1961, 149). Langbehn was talking about the ‘secret emperor who would rescue Germany, something which can be found in the very old German mythology of Barbarossa in his Kyffhäuser Mountain (Ibid). These points had been established in Germanic culture prior to Hitler and Mein Kampf. What is disturbing is how many other countries have similar points in their culture even today.

One of the four points that were “somewhat” in German culture was *Propaganda* which has been used very effectively by Bismarck in unification and by Wilhelm II in his

posturing as a strong leader. As Germany had only abandoned a very powerful style of monarchy just fifteen years prior to Hitler becoming Chancellor, the notion of a strong single leader being the best form of government was still accepted by many. As most Germans viewed the Weimar Republic as a betrayal, the glorification of the old authoritarian regime gave the people a yearning for stability which played into the promises of the Nazis.

Collectivism was highlighted as a gathering the whole Aryan family into the Nazi movement which was made into a national goal. Everyone had a role in the government, the woman of the family was to produce and raise healthy children while the father was to provide for the family and support Germany as the protector of the Aryan race. Its sense of community support separated the Aryan race from all others, according to *Mein Kampf* (297). Of Davies's seventeen points. Collectivism was perhaps the least emphasized in this regard. The only families mentioned were the dysfunctional day-labor families in Vienna where the parents had contempt for all authorities and their attitudes were passed on to their children, resulting in more community problems. Collectivism was seen as a means of ending these patterns (Hitler, 29).

The education of the youth emphasized patriotism and the Aryan race would develop a group thought that would eclipse the individual. "The right of personal freedom recedes before the duty to preserve the race" (Hitler, 255). The youth movement of 1897 was more like a group therapy meeting for boys to transcend into adulthood. The youth movement in *Mein Kampf* replaced individuality with thoughts on community and its greatness and the responsibility one has because one is Aryan. As Hitler condemned the Folkism movement

as it, “will truly bring about no great and profound, hence real, reform of existing conditions . . .” action was needed now (443).

Moral nihilism, meant that due to the great importance of a goal, the means justifies the ends. Bismarck was the best and worst example of this as he would use any means he could to achieve his objectives from trickery to war. From *Mein Kampf* one will not find an account of ‘the night of the long knives’ or of the other cruel means Hitler would use as Chancellor. One does find the want to rid the world of Jews, the need for a ‘cold-ruthlessness’ that will bring salvation to Germany and the use of terror against terror (117). He lauds his home guard’s ‘monitor service’ for terrorizing anyone disturbing their meetings (490).

The Aesthetics of Power (glorifying the organization), was almost the main theme of *Mein Kampf* especially in the leadership capability of Hitler. The aesthetics of power preceded the NSDAP, as it formed the foundation and justification of the power of the nobility and tradition.

As the other points only occur after Hitler came to power which is outside the area of this thesis I will only list them. The *dualist party-state*, in which the regime creates its own apparatus to oversee existing institutions. *Pre-emptive censorship*, in which censorship eliminated freedom of speech. *Genocide and coercion* (God bless all the Holocaust victims).

Pope Leo XIII said it best, “ And the danger lies in this, that crafty agitators are intent on making use of these differences of opinion to pervert men’s judgments and to stir up the people in revolt”(2). It seems fitting to end this chapter with these words as the conservatives believed that the greatest threat to society would come from the liberals, yet

the darkest chapter of German History would be under the conservative agitator, Adolf Hitler.

CHAPTER VII

PROPAGANDA

“I had reserved for myself the organization of propaganda and began ruthlessly to carry it out” (Hitler, 365).

The use of propaganda has been used by every country and every political organization in the world. By definition propaganda is meant to deceive. The method can be in the form of communication, the design of buildings, almost anything. Propaganda is as old as civilization itself and one of its earliest use was to intimidate people. As an ancient poet wrote “the pen is mightier than the sword” and as a modern practitioner wrote, “. . . propaganda is no more than a weapon, though a frightful one in the hand of an expert” (Hitler, 179)

The first mentioning of propaganda in *Mein Kampf* was with reference to World War I, as Hitler did not see Germany using it well. He would later express the need for *Lebensraum* (living space) which would give Germany “freedom and independence” he believed was not addressed by Berlin in WWI (Hitler, 177).

In the use of propaganda, there should be two types; one for the intelligentsia and another for the less educated. The intelligentsia should have scientific instruction, but the emphasis for the second group should be, “ . . . in calling the masses’ attention to certain facts, processes, necessities, etc., whose significance is thus for the first time placed within their field of vision” (Hitler, 179). The art of this process is to make the theme as

convincing as a real fact, an example for this is a poster that shows two young boys outside without their shirts on in the wintertime. The message at the bottom reads, “Toughening the Body is the Best Remedy against Cold,⁵³” the hidden point of the theme was to take away from the condition that Germans had less fuel to heat their homes as well as shortages of food. Another poster⁵⁴ that shows more of the war effort was a picture of children in a game of tug-of-war with the message at the bottom “We Want to Win.” which is really a subliminal message as the war is not directly mentioned, but winning the war and fighting for the children is being introduced to ones mind. The first poster is aimed towards intelligentsia offering a new fact; the second is aimed at sentimental as propaganda, “must be aimed at the emotions and only to a very limited degree at the so-call intellect” (Hitler, 180).

Overall propaganda should not be produced at too high an intellectual level, preferably it should appeal to the lowest level of intellects in the audience. *Mein Kampf* does not offer a direct reason for this, but if one uses TV commercials as a guide, all of us have seen commercials that were so captivating that the viewer can not tell you what product was being sold. The message should be short as most people forget complex thought more easily. This seems to be born out by the slogans advertising most products.

The message should appeal to the heart of the masses and not to their intelligence. In the art of selling things there is a vast difference between what one ‘needs’ to what one ‘wants.’ Needs are requirements, such as food, cloth, shelter and such; wants go past this, as it is not just enough to have food, but a specific type of food. “Every speech and every rally was a celebration of passion and unreason” (Stern, Dreams, 122). Hobbes believed

⁵³ J.K. Peukert, *Inside Nazi Germany*, illustration page 10.

⁵⁴ Ibid

that passion is the strongest drive in man as reason was only exercising another desire. Hobbes believed that war was caused by man's egotistic passion to guarantee his own happiness, especially when threatened. Germany at this time was a hot bed of this thought not only with the Nazis, but also with many writers and groups. "No more glorious end could be conceived for a great people than to perish in a World War where a world in arms overcame one single country" (Bruck, 243).

During World War I, Hitler believed that Germany's propaganda sent the wrong message to their soldiers as the Austrian and German comics made enemy soldiers appear ridiculous. When the new German soldiers arrived at the front they soon found out the enemy was not ridiculous and this discovery would dampen their spirits. He used this example in showing propaganda that was psychology wrong. Hitler thought that the allies had done much better by calling the Germans soldiers 'barbarians and Huns' as this served to "prepare the individual soldier for the terrors of war, and thus helped to preserve him from disappointments . . . seemed only to confirm what his propagandist had told him; it likewise reinforced his faith in the truth of his government's assertion, while on the other hand it increased his rage and hatred against the vile enemy" (181). Of course not mentioned in this section of *Mein Kampf* was the use of poison gas and u-boats.

The next point was that propaganda should never be a comparison which gave the enemy any good points or yours any bad ones. It should be simple presenting a black and white world of good v. evil as well as being "unified and coherent" (Ibid). In *Mein Kampf* British propaganda was praised for its consistency in declaring 'Germany had started the war' and even in the peace treaty they still clung to this claim which would later be proven questionable. Effective propaganda cannot contain too many points and each has to be

repeated often. A slogan should show different angles, but must always go back to the original point. From *Mein Kampf* propaganda also has a cycle as at first people often think it is crazy, and then irritating and finally it is accepted. The people who cannot be reached by propaganda are those who are blasé or callous enough to pick it apart and never bond with it.

Hitler thought that Germans began to believe the allies' propaganda in WWI starting with German liberals who were susceptible and wanted peace. This seems a little too short sighted as many Germans prior to World War I wanted the Prussian leadership to fall. Going back to Hobbes's egoistic passion Germans no longer believed that they had to fight the allies, but that there should be a change in the government of Germany. To overcome man's egoistic passion, the fear of death has to become more of a concern than his egoistic passion. "British tank assaults in August and September produced panic in the German lines and provided a welcome excuse to give up positions with not much of a struggle.' The tanks had arrived,' they reported; 'there was nothing more to be done'" (Large, 72). Another example can be found in the movie *Das Boot* which covers a German submarine crew in World War II from the beginning of its mission to the end, by which time they return they had lost all their ideology and only wanted to survive.

To start a political movement there has to be a reason, a problem that must be addressed, even if one has to create the problem and develop an organization which has the best solution. Yet most critical to the success of a movement is how many supporters and members it can gather. "The function of propaganda is to attract supporters, the function of organization to win members" (Hitler, 581). There is a big difference between members and supporters as a supporter agrees with the aims of the movement and may never even

attend a meeting, whereas a member is one who works and even fights for the movement. In *Mein Kampf* one can find a ratio of supporters to members of two to one. This ratio may appear low, but members were usually paid a salary which kept membership down.

Membership requires only an activist frame of mind and this corresponds only to the minority of men” (Hitler, 581). This minority aspect should be expected as the party and later the government had aspects of totalitarianism in which only a few men would be true members who so believed in the party line that reality becomes a blur. Yet there would be millions of supporters who would believe the rhetoric that would soon become the truth.

The greatness of every mighty organization embodying an idea in this world lies in the religious fanaticism and intolerance with which, fanatically convinced of its own right it intolerantly imposes it will against all others. If an idea in itself is sound and, thus armed, takes up a struggle on this earth, it is unconquerable and every persecution will only add to its inner strength, (Hitler, 351).

It seems odd that persecution would not deter the fanatic, but Eric Hoffer⁵⁵ makes the claim that what the fanatic wants from the organization is to lose himself in the cause, where he does not have to think or take responsible for his action (148). The effect of persecution does not increase his desire to abandon the group, but reinforces his hatred of the world. As he does not like the present and as most totalitarian groups live more in tomorrow his membership in a totalitarian movement frees him from the present. Even the ‘fear of death’ does not affect him as this is the ultimate means to escape the present. In turning around the media attack Hitler made the claim that a person was not a “decent German and no[t] National Socialist” if he was not being attacked by liberal newspapers. After all, such newspapers had fought to turn Germany into a democracy and ended the

⁵⁵ Author of *The True Believer*

war, which made all of Germany suffer. The fanatics would give Hitler blind loyalty in preferring fantasy over reality would not even notice mistakes in Hitler's actions.

Symbolism was an important part of the Nazi movement especially strength. The "Badenweiler March" during the abortive Munich putsch was a disaster in organization, but, "Hitler and his fellow putschists got more propagandistic exposure from the trial than from the putsch itself" (Large, 192). At the front of the marchers were Hitler and General Erich Ludenorff⁵⁶ and other Nazi officials, and behind them were the Stosstrupp Hitler, a special unit of the SA, "these men looked convincingly military, with gray-green uniforms and steel helmets, carbines over their backs, and hand grenades . . ." (Large 185). As Germany had turned into a place of uncertainty and insecurity, the Nazi displays of strength were in deed a very powerful psychological use of propaganda.

In *Mein Kampf* one can read about the decision process of what the Nazi flag should look like as "black, white, and red were praised by Hitler, "In effect, to be sure, this color combination stands high above all others. It is the most brilliant harmony in existence" the new flag would have "a red background, a white disk, and a black swastika" (495). The significance of the colors was that the red would represent the "social idea of the movement," the white the "nationalistic idea" and the swastika, "the mission of the struggle for the victory of the Aryan man, and by the same token, the victory of the idea of creative work, which as such always has been and always will be anti-Semitic."

There are various claims about the origin of the symbol for the Nazi movement, the swastika. The oldest record of the use of the swastika was as a Hindu symbol which represented the sun. In one of Alfred Klages poems he made the reference to a coil with the

⁵⁶ Retired hero of World War I who at the end of World War I may had been suffering from a nervous breakdown due to his strange actions (Large, 72).

swastika as the wheel of the Sun (“coupling of God-father with Earth-mother) which he referred to as ‘thousand-spoked wheel of fire’ which should be used against the Jews (Large, 28). William Reich who wrote the *Mass Psychology of Fascism* believes the symbol awoke one’s unfilled sexual desires. Adolf Lanz (also known as Jörg Lanz von Liebenfels) founded the ‘New Templar Order’ that used the swastika. He also wrote a racial magazine *Ostara*, in which the swastika appeared in many issues. Lanz believe that the remedy, “for overcoming the evils of the modern world and restoring the domination of the ‘blond race’ was racial purity and racial struggle, involving the slavery and forced sterilization or even extermination of the inferior races . . .” (Jershaw, 50). There is conflicting evidence on how much influence Lanz had on Hitler’s choice of the swastika, as well as his impact on some of the programs that Himmler’s SS carried out in World War II.

Guido von List, known as ‘guru of the cultist believers,’ had popularized the swastika earlier than Lanz and had associated the sign with “Unconquerable, the German Hero, the ‘Strong One from Above’” (Ibid). No mater where the swastika came from it was a powerful symbol and the Nazi flag was very unique compared to other movements and later national flags. The swastika was also displayed on armbands to identify members of the Nazis party.

The swastika also was used by the Thule Society whose members would occupy key positions in Nazi Germany including, Rudolf Hess, Alfred Rosenberg, “chief ideologist and head of the Nazis’ foreign political office, and Dietrich Eckart, Hitler’s close confidant (Large, 79). The Thule Society used the swastika on top of daggers which were displayed around their headquarters. The Thule Society was a ‘secret society’ which believed that ancient Thule (Nordic) had originated from a mystic place in the north, whose secrets could

be obtained by magical rituals. Membership was limited to pure Germanic people who could trace their ancestry's roots back by at least three generations. The Thule Society was also anti-Semitic. Members of this society were "industrialists, brewers, judges, lawyers, doctors, high police officials, university professors, and courtiers" (Ibid). A guest member of the society was Anton Drexler who had established the 'Free Labor Committee for a Good Peace' which would become the German Workers' Party (DAP).

The DAP organization was a relatively small organization when Hitler joined as he claimed that he was issued the 7th membership card, which can be disputed by a copy of Hitler's membership card in Ian Kershaw's book *Hitler 1889-1936 HUBRIS* which shows the number 555. Either way the organization was small. From *Mein Kampf* the claim is made that it was Hitler's speeches that enabled DAP to grow which seems true as Large claimed that during Hitler's ban on public speaking the NSDAP lost its biggest form of revenue.

The pattern of Hitler's speeches were to "beginning slowly, plenty of sarcasm, personalized attacks on named targets, then a gradual crescendo to a climax – whipping his audience into a frenzy" (Kershaw, 152). Hitler's speeches would be interrupted by the audience as they cheered and applauded his attacks. It is really not surprising that Hitler's speeches were popular as it gave the listeners an avenue to vent their frustration. "The mass meeting is also necessary for the reason that in it the individual, who at first, while becoming a supporter of a young movement, feels lonely and easily succumbs to the fear of being alone, for the first time gets the picture of a larger community, which in most people has a strengthening, encouraging effect" (Hitler, 478).

It was at mass meeting where the ‘bully boys’ would make their first appearance.

They would attack and fight communists and others who tried to interrupt Hitler’s speeches.

And how did these lads fight! Like a swarm of hornets they swooped down on the disturbers of our meetings, without regard for their superior power, no matter how great it might be, without regard for wounds and bloody victims, filled entirely with the one great thought of creating a free path for the holy mission of our movement. (Hitler, 491)

These incidents only increased the belief that Hitler could not only stand up to enemies, but could beat them. One should also keep in mind that people who have feelings of powerless take extreme delight in watching and hearing about people they do not like getting beaten.

At Hitler’s first speech⁵⁷ after the public speaking ban was lifted, the event was sold out. The audience was waving small swastika flags, the SA were posted around the stage and throughout the area. “The crowd was ‘excited and filled with high expectations,’ reported a police observer (Large, 216). The reason I mention this meeting is because the speech did not go over very well, the audience was not whipped into frenzy. “He gestured wildly with his arms and hands and jumped around excitedly to get the crowd’s attention” (Ibid). There were two reasons as to why this rally did not go over very well. One, Hitler’s performance was not ‘terribly impressive’ accord to a police observer and second, Germany was having an economic upturn that would not end till the Great Depression. To put it in other words, people were not too upset about the present. This was a limitation of the Nazi movement it only worked well when people hated the present and saw the future as dismal. Not mention in *Mein Kampf*, but worth noting was the lateness of these mass meetings as they would last past midnight. The reason was purely psychological; when people become

⁵⁷ At the Zirkus Krone, in Munich Feb 9, 1927

tired they also become more accepting and less judgmental about material. Hitler's messages would address always the same points, the greatness of the German race, and German history and how the Nazis were the only ones who could satisfy the needs of the German people. As Fritz Stern wrote, "Every speech and every rally was a celebration of passion and unreason" (1999, 122).

In listing the faults of parliamentary government Hitler made the claim in *Mein Kampf* that the press could manipulate the public, "In a few days a ridiculous episode had become a significant state action, while, conversely, at the same time, vital problems fell prey to public oblivion, or rather were simply filched from the memory and consciousness of the masses" (85). The aim of Nazi propaganda was not for the public to forget, but to persuade and to do this well they needed to know their audience well.

First, into those who believe everything they read;
second, into those who have ceased to believe anything;
third, into the minds which critically examine what they
read, and judge accordingly, (Mein Kampf, 240)

The first group was the largest and was composed of people who did not possess the ability to think independently (241). Also included in this group were the mentally lazy people who believe what they read since someone had already done the research to make a claim, so it must be correct. Members of the second group were once members to the first group, but due to disappointments in life do not believe anything they read. The third group was of people who were taught how to think independently. They would examine the work for contradictions and compare it to other sources and determine if the author was presenting the material in a prejudice manner. The third group which had the smallest number were to be cherished as these were the true thinkers of the nation and should be protected from bad

educators, “the state, therefore has the duty of watching over their education and preventing any mischief. It must particularly exercise strict control over the press; for its influence on these people is by far the strongest and most penetrating” (Hitler, 242). I like this last part in the name of protection the government must censor the press.

Part of the Volkism movement was rediscovering and preserving Germanic heritage, which also included the mystical part of their history. One of the myths they rediscovered was ‘Das dritte Reich’ (The Third Empire) a government which “would herald the end of all domestic strife and reconcile all classes.” This would be the ‘final empire’ where people would live in idealistic unity and be the masters of the world. In Bruck’s book called *Germany’s Third Empire*, he appealed to Germans to quit daydreaming and start the steps needed to create this empire where Germany would stand, “alone would stand strong and inviolable,” where no nation would dare to challenge Germany there would be eternal peace. But first Germans would need God to fulfill his promise of Führergedanke (a leader given to the people by God) as this Führer (leader) would be able to unite all of the Germans and make them undefeatable (Stern, 1961, 262). Brock was not the only one to call for divine help as decades earlier Julius Friedrich Lehmann⁵⁸ had called for a “‘Germanic Christianity’ that would incorporate the myths and legends handed down from pagan ancestors” to strengthen Germany and rid the nation of the internal alien’s influences (Large, xxv).

The Nazi propaganda machine would take full advantage of these myths by linking Hitler to the Führergedanke.

Hitler’s rhetoric was religious; he dissolved politics in a

⁵⁸ “One of the founders of the Munich branch of Pan-German League” (Large, XXIV)

religious aura, and all the theological terms which had been previously secularized were now the great standard themes of his appeals: He promised deliverance and redemption, rebirth and satanic; he did all that in the name of Providence, for he believed that Providence had selected him to deliver the German people. (Stern, 1987, 144)

During the first Christmas season when Hitler was in prison, artists created a tableau titled “Adolf Hitler in Prison” in Munich. Hitler was sitting alone on his prison bed with his head in his hands in despair, when an angel entered his cell delivering him a Christmas tree, with a choir singing *Silent Night* in the background. Hitler would lift his head up and turn to the audience (Large, 196).

Not only would Hitler use religion to unite Germans, but as a reason for his actions, “Hence today I believe that I am acting in accordance with the will of the Almighty Creator: *by defending myself against the Jew, I am fighting for the work of the Lord*” (Mein Kampf, 65). This was not the only reference that the Nazis were working for God, “Thus, for the first time the state achieves a lofty inner goal. Compared to the absurd catchword about safeguarding law and order, thus laying a peaceable groundwork for mutual swindlers, the task of preserving and advancing the highest humanity, given to this earth by the benevolence of the Almighty, seems a truly high mission” (Hitler, 398).

Religion would be used in the defense of racial purity, “No, there is only one holiest human right, and this right is at the same time the holiest obligation to wit: to see to it that the blood is preserved pure and, by preserving the best humanity, to create the possibility of a nobler development of these beings” (Hitler, 402). Hitler would also prove his claim that producing interracial offspring violated the sanctity of marriage, “which is called upon to produce images of the Lord and not monstrosities halfway between man and ape” (Ibid).

It was only after Hitler’s defeat that Germans came to

realize just how many of their traditions, how many of their dreams and delusions, Hitler had annexed, exploited, corrupted, and betrayed. (Stern, 1987, 15)

CHAPTER VIII

SOCIETY AND INDIVIDUALISM

In the 1890s a change was occurring in the Western world as many of the old traditions and customs were being questioned or ignored and old schools of thought were being challenged by Darwin, Nietzsche, and Freud as to what was the role of mankind in the modern world. In *Mein Kampf* the answer for man was to serve the community (state). Citizens were to acquire a strong physic and determined mind to protect the state, and the state would come first in people's lives. As the state would be very militaristic, one gets the impression that if a military emergency broke out during a symphony concert, both the audience and the orchestra would rush home and don military fatigues. The reason for this militarism reflected Hobbes and totalitarianism in an uncertain world where safety came from a strong state and leader and one's first duty was to protect the state with iron-willed determination.

Above all we appeal to the mighty army of our German youth. They are growing up at a great turning point and the evils brought about by the inertia and indifference of their fathers will force them to struggle. Some day the German youth will either be the builder of a new folkish state, or they be the last witness of total collapse, the end of the bourgeois world. (Hitler, 406)

Not only did the state need to be protected by the military, but society had to be protected from foreign influences. *Amerikanisierung* (Americanism) which was coined by Du Bois-Reymond who in 1877, warned that Europe was in danger of losing it's culture to

America's "excessive realism and technology" (Stern, politics, 131). One of the first effects on European Society of this technology was the introduction of American style manufacturing into Europe. As these factories were placed in the larger cities of Europe they created a migration of workers from the rural areas. Not only was the urban area creating more jobs, the rural areas were losing jobs due to commercial farming. Soon there would be more people in the cities than the factories could employ, with this excess amount of laborers factories could pay minimal wages. As housing for all of these workers was in short supply the price of rent skyrocketed. "the working conditions of the new class were more than dismal" (Hitler, 317). The result was massive amount of people living in poverty, even those who had obtained jobs.

"Thus, though previously the fourteen or even fifteen-hour working day had been bearable, it certainly ceased to be bearable at a time when every minute was exploited to the fullest" (Hitler, 318). Workers began to form unions not only to create a unified voice, but also to create a political voice. In Vienna Hitler was asked to join a union which he refused, and later gave the reason that the union was too communistic in its thinking. As the state was portrayed as only "the authority of law as a means for oppressing the proletarians" which displeased Hitler as there was no nationalistic feeling in the union and as the people became more beaten down by this system they would bore contempt for the state and all authority (40).

What was even more disturbing about *Amerikanisierung* was its effect on other parts of society. The old social order was being dismantled. The aristocracy declined as social order was being based on the amount of money one had and how important one was to the government. A good example of this would be the Krupp family relationship with the

Kaiser who with “his brother Prince Heinrich, his cabinet, and the army and the navy had given the bride [Bertha Krupp]⁵⁹ away,” which was rare enough among nobles, much less with a commoner family (Manchester, 281).

With the expansion of big industry money was needed more than ever, not only in the financing of buildings and equipment, but also in the selling and buying of the products. Never before had there been such a demand for money, as many of these companies were too large for only one person to own or finance. Many companies began to issue stocks and bonds to the public offered people a source of income that previously had been limited to only a few. According to *Mein Kampf* this was one of the ways that Jews were taking over Germany. This offering available to the middle class became a means to acquire income that unfortunately led to the buying of stocks on speculation and the failure of many who became overextended, which was one of the reasons for the Great Depression.

It was the degeneracy of morals in this practice of *Amerikanisierung* (Americanism) that alarmed Pope Leo XIII that he began to address the church’s view on capital and workers and employers rights. In *Rerum Novarum*,⁶⁰ he did not label his point as solely against Americanism, but against all forms of materialism,

The elements of the conflict now raging are unmistakable, in the vast expansion of industrial pursuits and the marvellous discoveries of science; in the changed relations between masters and workmen; in the enormous fortunes of some few individuals, and the utter poverty of the masses; the increased self reliance and closer mutual combination of the working classes; as also, finally, in the prevailing moral degeneracy. The momentous gravity of the state of things now obtaining fills every mind with painful apprehension; wise men are discussing it; practical

⁵⁹ Her Father Fritz had died several years prior. This was also the woman that the cannon *Big Bertha* was named in honor of.

⁶⁰ ENCYCLICAL OF POPE LEO XIII ON CAPITAL AND LABOR, *Rights and Duties of Capital and Labor*, May 15, 1891.

men are proposing schemes; popular meetings, legislatures, and rulers of nations are all busied with it- . . . (1)

He praised the accomplishments of the Guild system of Europe and hoped that workers unions would use them as a guide. He also condemned socialism, as he talked about the nationalizing of property and a state with no private property (I got the impression he was really condemning what would be known later as communism and not socialism) as God did not disapprove of wealth and property as long as people obtained by it honest means.

As there will always be some people who do better than others it was obligation of the more talented people to help the less fortunate. An agency should be set up to help people who were injured, disabled, or had become too old to work. Employers had the obligation to pay their workers wages that “ought not to be insufficient to support a frugal and well-behaved wage-earner” (Pope Leo XIII, 45). Leo XIII condemned the use of riots in labor issues and called for laws to remedy disputes as quickly as possible. The obligations of the workers were to work hard, and act responsibly to the owner and his property.

A condition that is almost as old as man himself is greed which was address by the Pope who called on employers to look after the condition of their workers and not use money as a divider of society. All classes should work together for mutual benefits (19). *Rerum Novarum* was written thirty years before *Mein Kampf* and had some similar aims as both were against Marxism’s belief, that the history of mankind is the history of the struggle between the two social classes.

As *Mein Kampf* condemned the bourgeois practice of mindless senseless acquisition of luxuries which only widened the gap between the social classes. One has to remember

this was the time when extremely wealth people (paying little in the way of taxes) would build huge mansions and have several houses and apartments to use depending on the season. One of the reasons for a revolution accord to Crane Briton was the belief that one class was living a decadent lifestyle by the exploitation of the other classes. And worse, this class was seen as holding down the other classes both in the economic sense and limiting the movement of people from one social class to a higher one⁶¹.

Brüning's central form government⁶² believed the best plan for Germany's economic recovery was to give aid to big business and large labor unions, thus changing the German economy from primarily small businesses which were owned mostly by the old middle class to large enterprises. As a result of this policy the older middle class began to suffer. To make this matter worse, the old middle class was providing the government with most of its revenue. Thus providing the money that the government was giving to its competition and which would eventually force them out of business.⁶³ From 1930-32 over 50,000 middle class businesses would file for bankruptcy, indirectly the Brüning government was giving the needed fodder for the growth of the NSDAP party by this policy. The income of small business owners from 1925 to 1932 would drop on average from 3,450 marks to 2,500 or twenty seven percent (Ibid). A similar policy would be used in the U.S. with the spread of Wal-Mart sized businesses from the 1960s which are at times given drastically discounted governmental loans and sometimes free land and buildings or tax abatements to encourage them.

The key to a healthy community in *Mein Kampf* was not for the majority of the citizens to just survive by any means they could in a world of uncertainty and limitations,

⁶¹ Crane Brinton, *The Anatomy of Revolution*, pg 33

⁶² 1930-32

⁶³ Brustem, pg 73

but to be able by their own merit to advance their living standard. For the classes to have a sense of nationalism was a key factor. This was also the same belief that the progressive movement in the U.S. wanted for workers.

In the section of *Mein Kampf* that was focused on the poverty of the working class in Vienna, Hitler noted what we now would call the cycle of dysfunctional family life where the father, mother or both would abuse drugs or alcohol and commit crimes, as the children would get into trouble through violence, and crime and eventually repeat the cycle (317). Even those who avoided crime and addiction could develop an indifference towards the rest of the country, contempt for authority and a resignation to existing conditions.

Such conditioning of the children in the home would severely limit their potential. “When at the age of fourteen the young man is discharged from school, it is hard to decide what is stronger in him; his incredible stupidity as far as any real knowledge and ability are concerned, or the corrosive insolence of his behavior, combined with an immorality. . .” (Ibid). Of course as dismal as this actual situation was, one has to remember what Hitler thought of people “Since the great masses of the people in the very bottom of their hearts tend to be corrupted rather than consciously and purposely evil, and that therefore, in view of the primitive simplicity of their minds,” (231). *Mein Kampf*’s proposals to raise people out of this situation included more security in their jobs, involving youth in training programs and mandated enlistment in the army. All of these solutions would address the naturalism view of the nation, but would not really enlarge the individual as a whole he would as only be switching one environmental group thought for another.

Mein Kampf had rejected this part of Nietzsche on individuality as he thought that individualism was more than just ‘duty’ and that for man to reach the higher level of

thought he had to be free of ‘society and conventions.’ (Stern, 1961, 170). Society would be everything for the Aryan man not only for the protection of his society, but would shape his mind as his education would be completely free of anything that contradicted or offered an alternative to the philosophy of the state. Once in power the Nazi would demonstrate this by burning library books. Four years after a book burning, the Essen City library put out a poster that praised⁶⁴ this event as the number of users in the reader room had gone down by 32 percent and the number of books borrowed had dropped by 36 percent. Credit was given as to rise in employment. The propaganda line in the poster which offered no proof, was, “This shows that books are being read more thoroughly and will therefore have a more lasting effect.”⁶⁵

“The real source of individuality was the Volk or the community. The individualism of the Germanic critics was a slippery notion, as it had to be in order to avoid the political conclusions of liberalism and democracy” (Stern, 1961, 138). Even worse was renaissance humanism’s belief on individualism, where man should delight in life of the here and now, which was the opposite of totalitarianism and unlike the philosophical works of Søren Kierkegaard on individualism where every man is unique and only lives for a brief time, and every man is always alone. As the old story goes about the dying man who asks his old friend to be with him and his friend respond, “I can not as only you are dying and I’m only sitting by you.” Kierkegaard’s individual man was that of Thomas Mann’s character Hans Castrop of *The Magic Mountain* in the end at the Clinic he becomes Hegel’s man (whose

⁶⁴ 1937, Peukert, pg 193

⁶⁵ The information that would be needed to prove this point would be a comparison to the number of days a reader had a book which was not given.

actions are ruled by society's thought at this time in history) and leaves the clinic to fight in World War I.

It would have been extremely hard for one to be an individual in a state that needed to protect the community from the world and a government that needed to protect itself from any alternative thought that may challenge it. From Meinecke, one may suspect, however, that it helped materially to collectivize the masses and to deeply modify their feeling about legal rights; that is, of the right of the individual would be dimmed and the rights of the total state over the individual would be allowed to become continually stronger (16).

Unlike Count Honoré de Mirabeau's description that Germany was not "a state with an army, but an army with a state," Hitler would have made Germany into not a 'people with an army, but a state with people.'

CHAPTER IX

CONCLUSION

I found *Mein Kampf* to be a political warning of what can happen when a group of skillful analytical people decide to create a mass movement aimed ultimately at the overthrow of the existing government, on the grounds that it was suppressing citizens' potential. In *Mein Kampf* four types of governments were dissected showing not only their flaws, but the idealistic wants of the people that these governments could not satisfy. Yet what set the NSDAP apart was not only in discovering these faults, but its brilliant campaigning, particular sensing what to stress and what to hide until it controlled all of Germany.

The early twentieth century was an unusual time in the Western World; the second industrial revolution was changing society with technology that people a hundred years before would have labeled as pure fantasy. A handful of European countries would move from monarchy to dictatorships, and the continent was ravaged by two of the worst and largest wars in the history of mankind. New technology had changed all aspect of society which government had to address as old customs had become outdated. Not only were people moving from rural areas to urban areas by the millions, but city employment was changing from small businesses to huge business where thousands might work in one factory. In these large factories the owner would no longer know every employee. With

the introduction of stocks and bonds there would be hundreds of owners, whose main concern was maximizing their profits which often meant low wages and harsh working conditions.

Even people who did not work for these new industries were being effected, especially business owners who had to compete against these them. Often the government would provide aid to the large companies to spur their growth, which made the middle and lower class frustrated and insecure. As the people asked their governments to address these issues, to make their voices heard they would formed mass movements in demanding action. Not all of these movements wanted to work in connection with the existing government; especially those with political ideology of rule by the people.

Gone was the medieval guild system with it guidelines which Pope Leo XIII had praised in *Rerum Novarum* replaced by the new business philosophy of *Amerikanisierung*. Labor was based on supply and demand, as the number of job seekers increased employers would cut worker's pay. If the company could save money by laying off employees it did. Companies increased in size to thousands of workers which only added to the dehumanization. From *Mein Kampf* this was not only bad for the people; it was bad for the nation because these people would not have any loyalty to the government; especially if they believed the government flavored these large companies at their expensive. Not only was *Amerikanisierung* violating how man should treat his fellow man, it violated the social contract between how the strong and weak should treat each other since the strong where casting the weak back into a state of nature.

For Germany it was even worse as the lower and middle classes were not only struggling against the changing business market which the Weimar Republic supported,

they were also suffering under the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. As the level of frustration increased and the moderate mass movements seemed powerless to correct the problems, the people began to support more radical movements. The lesson is that one can learn governments have to monitor the amount of frustration within society. To simply say that the Germans were acting irrationally is too easy an answer, as one only has to look to Crane Brinton to find a pattern leading from discontent to successful revolution. Just as Hitler and his advisors had found the means to manipulate the discontent, so can others in the future. This is a warning that one should learn in *Mein Kampf*.

Specifically the Germans were rejecting the *Amerikanisierung* system, but the more universal rejection was the use of suppression by a privileged class so it could enjoy a lifestyle that others are were excepted from. The movie *Metropolis*⁶⁶ which was heavily censored at the time of release highlighted what could happen in the future if workers continued to lose civil rights. As one group of citizens lived above ground enjoying a carefree life, the workers lived underground only coming above ground to run the machines for 10 hour shifts. The uniqueness of this movie was in its depiction of the concepts of *Fuhrergedanke* and the extreme end result of *Amerikanisierung*. At the workers meeting Marie exclaimed, “Between the brain that plans and the hands that toiled there must be a mediator” and at the end of the movie instead of calling for a mediator she called for ‘heart’ to separate the brain and hands. One can also find anti-modernization when the workers destroy the robot and the inventor⁶⁷ dies in a fight with the hero.

A warning I see for governments from *Mein Kampf*, is that if a government represses too many citizens they will rebel. Of course, the government can not satisfy all of the

⁶⁶ Directed by Fritz Lang (UFA Film, 1925) from the novel by Thea Von Harbon.

⁶⁷ On the door of the inventor’s house was the ‘Star of David’

people's wants, but it must be seen as an ally of the suppressors and not the defender of the people. Justice cannot be only for a selected few with injustice for the many. Nor should laws be warped to cover up the moral wrongs of a privileged class. "Just because it is lawful does not make it right,"⁶⁸ was the moral value that Scrooge would learn in *A Christmas Carol* and this was the social responsibility that Langbehn declared must be part of capitalism.

The most appealing concept of National-Socialism was for all social classes to be working together with none exploiting the others, while the government made decisions based on what would be the best for the nation as a whole. Special interest groups would dominate the government. In commerce everyone would only receive what they deserved by their contribution. The flaw of National-Socialism was in its authoritarian principles. When Nazism was finally emerged in Germany the national interest was determined by an all powerful Führer who proved to be neither all-knowing nor impartial and embodied Lord action's dictum that "Power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

There was a better means to determine what was good for the nation mentioned in *Mein Kampf* which was based on how Folkish officials would use advisory bodies with 'unlimited responsibility in certain fields' to make decisions based on their expertise (Mein, Kampf, 450). Many countries in the world do use advisory bodies or independent committees, with various degree of power, in helping elected officials reach decisions. Canada's *collectivism* like many countries in Europe is close to the aims that *Mein Kampf* had for the relationship between business and society or 'capitalism with social responsibly' (Graig, 129).

⁶⁸ Unknown source.

One of the major ideas that one can derive from *Mein Kampf* is the danger of a government being out of touch with the majority of citizens. Not only was the Weimar Republic out of touch, its citizens did not believe it could protect them nor end their frustrations. Meanwhile industrialists became increasingly dissatisfied with this government as they did not believe the republic could protect their assets from the communist threat.

“Peculiar to the German mentality, as we have already indicated, was the often stormy inclination to rise up suddenly from the limitations of reality which surrounded it and perhaps more strongly moved it, enticed it, . . .”(Meinecke,54). The Germans in the 1930s would manifest this by adopting a strong leader who would advance Pan-Germanism. He would rally the spirit of the Germans, and shake them until they regained their confidence. As this may sound like folly, one has to remember that Germany had nothing to lose as it was already in economic and political shackles due to the Treaty of Versailles.

The greatest error by the Weimar Republic government was that it had forgotten that Machiavelli or Bismarck would have broken the support base of the mass movements by making their concerns the government’s concerns. Instead, Hindenburg decided “that in the future the government should in general be oriented to the right” which would hinder Brüning and help Hitler (Meinecke, 69). It is ironical that special interest groups (industrialists, Reichswehr) would promote Hitler’s career by pressuring Hindenburg to oust Brüning and appoint Hitler as chancellor, dismissing the fact that the Nazis were starting to lose popularity

“... the election of November 1932. The Nazis had campaigned hard across the Reich, but they dropped substantially from their performance in July. Losing a total of two million votes, the party had to give up thirty-four Reichstag seats.” (Large, 229).

The Reichswehr believed that Hitler was “a rising star” and one it wanted to promote as he aimed to increase the size of the military and restore its power (Meinecke, 43). When Groener attempted to ban Hitler’s SA⁶⁹ and SS troops, he was overruled by General von Schleicher. This cancellation may have saved a civil war from breaking out in Germany with the loyalty of the Reichswehr being in doubt. “It would be a pity to have to fire on these splendid youths, [SA]⁷⁰ was now the saying in the Reichswehr’s ranks” (Ibid). Amidst such developments Hitler was invited to join the government. “Thus, the fate of the Hitler movement at this time depended to a high degree upon the attitude and disposition of the Reichswehr” (Meinecke, 49).

When Hitler became Chancellor the Weimar Republic did not gain the popularity it had hoped for. Instead the Nazis gained in legitimizing their claim that they were the only ones who could lead Germany out of the chaos. The lesson that can be learned from this is the importance of not letting any organizations create a dual government in the country; which the NSDAP had already done.

One of the primary messages in *Mein Kampf* was the evilness of liberalism, especially that of the liberal media. One can see what can happen when a nation’s political spectrum becomes too dominated by a single theory. Liberalism was seen as something that would only disrupt and divide society and due to this mindset even fifteen years after the reign of the Kaiser; people still believed the best government for Germany was authoritarian rule.

⁶⁹ The SA had a military force of 400,000 (Weiss, 301)

⁷⁰ The SA would be disbanded due to Röhm’s demands for a ‘second revolution’ and the other radical politics (Large, 250).

On the other side of the political spectrum, if a society becomes too liberal, the result could be similar to the failed colony⁷¹ that was based on the principles of John Locke. As one of the rules of this colony was that if someone was not using something then it could be taken by another who needed it, in the attempt to change personal property into community property. It is important to mention this failure since the key concept of communism was the transfer of personal property to state property. In *Rerum Novarum* Pope Leo XIII defended the right of personal property as owning property. Having people work for themselves or for large corporations was not wrong; what was wrong was the use of oppression. This condemnation can also be found in *Mein Kampf* which stressed of the importance of governmental enforcement of fair business standards.

The one point that everyone in Germany could agree on was that Germany needed a new form of government. It was with this thought that *Mein Kampf* listed the faults of various types of governments, guiding reader to the decision that the best form of government was National-Socialism with one leader. But it was not the mere listing the faults of the various forms of governments that would trigger mass movements; it was when governments fail to make these faults the concerns of the government that they become vulnerable.

Many of the problems in democracy are still around, perhaps even in worse form than in the 1920s. Representative democracy often represents only a fraction of the people. For example, when only 80 percent of the total voting population participates, the winner's majority could only be 51 percent of the eighty percent, leaving the true majority (59 percent) of the total voting population unrepresented. Even worse is an election where only 30 percent of the voters participate leaving 84 percent of the voters unrepresented. Not

⁷¹ Richard J. Arneson article "Lockean Self-Ownership: Toward a Demolition"

mentioned in *Mein Kampf* were the frustrated citizens who just quit voting which adds to the number of the unrepresented. Voters still based their support not on issues, but on appearance and rhetoric. In the U.S. the chief requirement for many offices is neither experience nor education, and instead of the best person for the office being elected, it is the best campaigner.

The worst part of democracy accord to *Mein Kampf* was that communities are divided into political factions with varying beliefs and identify more with their political affiliation than with their nation. But the deeper problem was self-interest versus group interest. Of course, self-interest can never be totally eliminated nor would one want to, but it must be controlled, which accord to *Mein Kampf*, could not be done in a democracy. Where a see-saw of power that slows the advancement of society, where neglected problems (global warming, fossil energy dependence) can grow worse, but it can also protect society from reactive decisions that later everyone regret. Another fault the book lists for a democratic government was that it could lose its ability to govern as it would be too controlled by the people, resulting in a 'welfare state' where too much is given to the people. In democratic socialist governments this concern seems reflected especially in national health care, and labor standards, which at times absorb the lion's share of these governments' budgets. In *Mein Kampf* the solution was to create a leader similar to Hobbes's 'Absolute Monarch' who would have no self-interest and could control man's greed.

I first started reading *Mein Kampf* not with the idea of creating a thesis, but out of curiosity and I found this work was not just the mad notions of a bigot who wanted to rid the world of Jews, but a work which addressed pressing concern of the day. The established reasons for Nazism's growth, that of hatred and the use of intimidation by

Hitler's bully boys, appear somewhat simplistic when one considers how far the Weimar Republic's agenda was from meeting citizens' basic needs. No government can satisfy all of its people's wants, but it must furnish citizens with the means to meet their basic requirements and defeat serious foreign pressures.

Unlike most European democracies which have put social responsibility for their citizens above unfettered capitalism, in the U.S. big business has often been able to manipulate the government into creating laws and regulations that advantage them at the expense of others. At times the interests of business and government looks like a giant blur between the two⁷². The timeless battle between conservatives and liberal groups can become so polarized that the ability of legislators to achieve any compromises, such as, in the selection and approval of federal judges in the U.S. today. Although conditions in Western Democracies are far from those of the Great Depression I found similarities between the present U.S. and post World War II Germany and wonder whether a skillful power seeker might one day be able to manipulate our political machinery until he had complete control. Such conjurers made the reading of *Mein Kampf* interesting and made me challenge the concept that there was nothing that could be learned from this work. The reason that one should read it and study pre World War II Germany is to remove the likelihood that a group of skillful analytical people will succeed in recreating the chain of events which occurred in the pre World War II Germany.

⁷² Supreme Court case, *Kelo v New London* (6-23-05) which makes it easier for local governments to condemn private property to make room for economic development that will generate more tax revenue

REFERENCES

- Aquinas, Saint Thomas. On Law, Morality, and Politics. Ed. William P. Baumgarth and Richard J. Regan. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Co. 1988.
- Appelfeld, Aharon. Badenheim 1939. Tran. Dalya Bilu. Boston: David R. Godine. 1980.
- Arendt, Hannah. The Origins of Totalitarianism. New York: Harcourt Brace & Company, 1976.
- Aristotle, The Politics. Tran. Carnes Lord. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1984.
- Berlin, Isaiah. Three Critics of the Enlightenment. Rd. Henry Hardy. London: Pimlico. 2000.
- Berlin, Isaiah. The Sense of Reality. Ed. Henry Hardy. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux. 1996.
- Brinton, Crane. The Anatomy Of Revolution. New York: Vintage Books. 1965.
- Bruck, Moeller Van Den, Germany's Third Empire. Ed. E.O. Lorimer. New York: H. Fertig. 1971.
- Brustein, William. The Logic Of Evil The Social Origins of the Nazi Party, 1925 -1933. New Haven: Yale University Press. 1996.
- Burke, Edmund. Reflections On The Revolution In France. New York: Penguin Books. 1985.
- Calvert, Robert A. and Arnolo De León. The History Of Texas. Wheeling, Ill: Harlin Davidson, Inc. 1996.
- Capitalism and Democracy Schumpeter Revisted. Ed. Richard D. Coe and Charles K. Wilber. Notre Dame: University Of Notre Dame, 1985.
- Chamberlain, Lesley. Nietzsche in Turin The End Of The Future. London: Quarter Books. 1996.

Cochran, M.H. Germany Not Guilty In 1914 (Examining a Much Prized Book).
Colorado Springs: Ralph Myles, Publisher. 1972.

Darwin, Charles. The Origin of Species. Edison, New Jersey: Castle Books. 2004.

Davidson, James West. and William E. Gienapp. Nation Of Nations A Narrative History Of The American Republic. Vol. 1. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc. 1994.

Davies, Norman. Europe A History. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Dickens, Charles. The Old Curiosity Shop. New York: Penguin Books, 1974.

Dostoevsky, Fyodor. The Brothers Karamazov. Trans. Andrew H. MacAndrew.
New York: Bantam Books. 1970.

Engels, Frederick. Dialectics of Nature. Trans. Clemens Dutt. Moscow: Progress Publishers. 1972.

Erasmus, Desiderius. Praise of Folly. Trans. Hoyt Hopewell Hudson. Hertfordshire, England: Wordsworth Editions Limited. 1998.

Fallaci, Oriana. The Rage And The Pride. New York: Rizzoli International Publication, Inc. 2001.

Flexner, James Thomas. Washington The Indispensable Man. New York: Little Brown and Company. 1974.

Freud, Sigmund. Civilization and its Discontents. Trans. Ed. James Strachey.
New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc. 1961.

Fromm, Erich. Escape From Freedom. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1969.

Fromm, Erich. The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1973.

Gaarder, Jostein. Sophie's World A Novel About the History of Philosophy.
Tran. Paulette Møller. New York: Berkley Books. 1996.

Gandhi, Mohandas K. Mohandas K. Gandhi Autobiography The Story of My Experiments with Truth. Trans. Mahadev Desai. New York: Dover Publications, Inc. 1983.

Gilbert, Martin. A History Of The Twentieth Century. Vol. 1. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc. 1997.

Graig, Lauene A. Health of Nations An International Perspective on U.S. Health Care

- Reform. Washington: Congressional Quarterly, Inc. 1999.
- GoldHagen, Daniel Jonah. Hitler's Willing Executioners Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust. New York: Vintage Books. 1997.
- Hamilton, Alexander. James Madison and John Jay. The Federalist Papers. New York: Bantam, 1982.
- Harding, Thomas G. and David Kaplan Evolution and Culture. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press. 1966.
- Hintze, Otto The Historical Essays Of Otto Hintze. Ed. Felix Gilbert. New York: Oxford University Press. 1975.
- Hitler, Adolf. Mein Kampf. Trans. Ralph Manheim. New York: First Mariner Books. 1971.
- Hobbes, Thomas. Leviathan. Ed. C.B. MacPherson. New York: Penguin Books. 1974.
- Hoffer, Eric. The True Believer Thoughts On The Nature Of Mass Movements. New York: Harper Perennial. 1989.
- Huntington, Samuel P. The Clash of Civilizations Remaking of World Order. New York: Simon & Simon. 1996.
- Ignatieff, Michael. The Warrior's Honor Ethnic War And The Modern Conscience. New York: Henry Holt And Company. 1997.
- Jäckel, Eberhard. Hitler's World View A Blueprint For Power. Trans. Herbert Arnold. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press. 1981.
- Joll., James. Europe Since 1870 An International History. New York: Penguin Books 1990.
- Kaplan, D. Robert. The Coming Anarchy Shattering the Dreams of the Post Cold War. New York: Random House. 2000.
- Kershaw, Ian. Hitler 1889-1936 Hubris. New York: W.W. Norton & Company. 1999.
- Large, David, Clay. Where Ghosts Walked Munich's Road to the Third Reich. New York: W.W. Norton & Company. 1997.
- Manchester, William. The Arms of Krupp 1587-1968. New York: Bantam Books. 1981.

- Mann, Thomas. The Magic Mountain. Tran. John E. Woods. New York: Vintage Books. 1995.
- Massie, Robert K. Peter The Great His Life And World. New York: Ballantine Books. 1980.
- Mannheim, Karl, Ideology and Utopia An Introduction t the Sociology of Knowledge. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co. 1966.
- Meinecke, Friedrich. The German Catastrophe Reflectionsand Recollections. Trans. Sidney B.Fay. Boston: Beacon Press. 1969.
- Mill, John. Considerations on Representative Government. Ed. Currin V. Shields. New York, The Bobbs Merrill Company, Inc. 1958.
- Nazism And German Society 1933-1945. Ed. David F. Crew. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. Beyond Good and Evil. Trans. R.J. Hollingdale. New York: Penguin Books, 1990.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. On The Genealogy Of Morals and Ecce Homo. Tran. Walter Kaufman and R.J. Hollingdale. New York: Vintage Books. 1989.
- Norris, Frank. McTeague A Story of San Francisco. New York: Penguin Books, 1981.
- Overdiek, Ursula. Conversation, Nov2, 2003.
- Peukert, Detlev, J.K. Inside Nazi Germany Conformity, Opposition, And Racism In Everyday Life. Trans. Richard Deveson, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982.
- Pope Leo XIII. "Rerum Novarum." Encyclical Of Pope Leo XIII On Capital And Labor. 15pgs. 26 April. 2005 <http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/leo_xiii/Encyclicals/documents/hf_1-xiii_enc_15051891...>
- Riesman, David. The Lonely Crowd. New Haven: Yale University Press. 1969.
- Rothstein, Edward. The Tainted Science Of Nazi Atrocities. New York Times. January 2005. A13.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. The Social Contract. Tran. Maurice Cranston. New York: Penguin Books. 1968.

Snyder, Louis L. Roots of German Nationalism. Blommington: Ind. University Press. 1978.

Stern, Fritz. "Acceptance speech delivered by Fritz Stern upon receiving the Leo Baeck Medal at the 10th Annual Dinner of the Leo Baeck Institute" 10 pgs. 10 January 2005. <http://www.lbi.org/fritzstern.html>

Stern, Fritz. Dreams And Delusions The Drama Of German History. New Haven: Yale University Press. 1987.

Stern, Fritz. The Politics of Cultural Despair A Study in the Rise of the Germanic Ideology. Berkely: University of Berkely Press. 1961.

Stern, Fritz. The Responsibility of Power. New York: Doubleday Puboishing, Inc. 1969.

Tansey, Richard. G. And Fred S. Kleiner. Gardner's Art Through The Ages. Vol.1. New York: Harcourt Brace College Publishers. 1996.

Thucydides. History Of The Peloponnesian War. Tran. Rex Warner. New York: Penguin Books, 1972.

Tocqueville, Alexis, de. Democracy in America. Ed. Richard D. Heffner. New York: The New American Library, 1956.

Tooley, Hunt.T. National Identity And Weimar Germany Upper Silesia And The Eastern Border, 1918-1922. Lincoln: University Of Nebraska Press. 1997.

Weiss, John. Ideology Of Death Why The Holocaust Happened In Germany. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee. Publisher. 199

VITA

David Paul Hinkelmann was born in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, on March 11, 1958. He graduated from Jacksonville High School, Jacksonville, Texas, in 1976. While working in the construction industry he operated his own hog farm in Wisconsin, serving in various offices with his final position, president of the county chapter of the National Pork Producers. In 1989 he entered NorthCentral Technical College-Wausau, Wisconsin, receiving an Associate Degree. In the senior class, commercial structure design competition he placed 2nd. He entered Texas State University-San Marcos in 1993; in 1996 he received the Nesenholtz scholarship and was on the Dean's list for the Spring Semester. In 2001 he received his Bachelor of Arts degree and entered Graduate College of Texas State University-San Marcos in 2001.

Permanent Address: 750 Silent Valley Rd
Lockhart, Texas 78644

This thesis was typed by David Paul Hinkelmann.

