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"Know yourself," said Socrates, the Moralist.

"Know your neighbour," said Aristotle, the Rhetorician.

"Learn the weakness of men," said Hitler, the Propagandist.

Robert T. Oliver
THE PSYCHOLOGY OF PERSUASIVE SPEECH, p. 6.
CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND METHODOLOGY

This is a study of Adolf Hitler's persuasive speaking ability. The complex nature of such oral communication is indicated in the following statement:

Although in most of its external manifestations speech appears as a patently social activity, involved in the establishment and maintenance of relations among human beings, at the same time it has profound psychological implications. . . . Communication is, like all life, a process of stimulation and response, based on these drives and motives, some of which are internal and some external.¹

It was Aristotle who was among the first to systematically organize ideas concerning the analysis of persuasion. Three aspects of persuasion were of major concern to him: pathos, logos, and ethos. The first was considered to be related in the main to the audience, the second to the material included in the speech, and the third referred to

the persuasive powers of the speaker. Furthermore, these aspects of persuasion were divided by Aristotle into those of an "artistic" nature, and those which constituted "non-artistic" proof. The former referred to anything which dealt with the words of the speech, or a rhetorical device, while the latter referred to extrinsic material in the nature of facts, appearance, the situation, etc.

Concern with the use of extrinsic material is most important to this study. It will be attempted to deal with a fact which was outlined by Plato. His quarrel was with those who felt that a mere mastery of rules made a man a "good" speaker.

Unless a man estimate the various characters of his hearers and is able to divide existences into classes and sum them up in single ideas, he will never be a skillful rhetorician even with the limits of human power. And this art he will not attain without a great deal of trouble, which a good man ought to undergo, not for the sake of speaking and acting before men, but in order that he may be able to say what is acceptable to him as far as in him lies.

---

3Ibid., 1355b, pp. 6-9.
Thus a very basic moral concept was introduced. This concept strikes at the root of dictatorships, and the use of speech by their leaders to attain their ends.

I. The Problem

Statement of the problem. It is the purpose of this study to determine the means of persuasion Adolf Hitler used in speaking to the German people of his day. This study will be speaker-centered.

Hypotheses. The relationship of Hitler's background, character, and personality to his influence over the German people indicates that the persuasive powers of the man were centered around emotional factors.

The propaganda machine supporting Hitler and his own speeches developed images of the man and his beliefs among the German people which had little relation to facts.

Adolf Hitler was an untrained speaker in the formal sense. However, he was self-taught and used the methods of rhetoric in a most effective way.

Judgment of Hitler's effectiveness should in part be based on the fulfillment of the requirement that a speaker must be "pleasing to the gods," that he indeed must be a "good" man speaking well. The fact that Hitler
led his people to eventual national destruction would seem sufficient reason for consideration of this point.

Pathos and ethos were the main persuasive factors in Hitler's speaking. The two were combined to bring about the desired success.

Most of Hitler's speaking was of a deliberative nature. It was ultimately successful because he succeeded in appealing to man's basest desires. He was able to simplify all issues "ad absurdum."

Hitler was successful as a speaker because of a set of historical circumstances which called for a man of action, and he was able to create this image of himself.

Hitler was the first popular speaker of any importance in the history of Germany.

Importance of the study. Biographers of Hitler consistently state that his speaking ability put him into power.

It is generally conceded that two major factors made Hitler's ascent possible: Historical developments on an international and national level and his speaking ability. The former lies mainly within the area of historical research, the second mainly in the area of rhetorical criticism.
The large number of studies which are concerned with Hitler from a historical standpoint indicate the importance of the man. Studies relating to the second aspect of his success thus gain in importance.

Concern with mere effectiveness of a speaker should not be the main reason for a rhetorical study, in the light of statements made by major ancient rhetoricians. It is important, therefore, to study relevant contributing factors which made the ethos of Hitler a strong persuasive force. It will be shown that important events in Hitler's political career were closely tied to public speaking situations.

Chapter I. This is a study of the relationship of historical and rhetorical criticism, as well as a discussion of the problem and methodology.

Chapter II. Because of the influence of a man's upbringing, his family, his schooling, and experiences in his early life, a brief biography of Hitler is included. This chapter is important because of the unavailability of most of this information during Hitler's reign. The German leader's listeners thus had an incomplete image of the man.
Chapter III. Psychological and physical factors are important in the study of any speaker. They serve as indicators and even reasons for the overt behavior observed by audiences. This chapter, therefore, represents a summary study of relevant personality traits, physical appearance, and typical actions of the man, Hitler.

Chapter IV. The development of ethos in the case of a dictator must take into account the total political, economical, and propaganda situation contributing to the stature of a given leader. This chapter, therefore, studies all factors contributing to the persuasive powers of the German Fuehrer.

Chapter V. The most commonly used form of public address in Hitler's case was the deliberative speech. How this particular format was suited to contribute further to Hitler's ethos, and how it contributed to the development of pathos among his listeners, is the subject of this chapter.

Chapter VI. Considering the narrower concept of the relationship existing between a speaker and his audience, this chapter summarizes the factors contributing to both ethos and pathos in all public speaking situations. The eventual impact of the speaker, Adolf Hitler, upon his
audience is studied here; and the relationship of ethos to pathos and vice versa is set forth.

Chapter VII. After considering the development of ethos and pathos on the broad basis, and its development in specific audience-speaker relationships, two of Hitler's most important speeches are critically studied in this chapter. Specific arguments and the specific interpretation of ideas discussed earlier, thus, are illustrated. A summary and evaluation of the study indicates the areas of persuasion in which Hitler excelled and final criticism of Hitler as an orator.

II. The Study

Sources. The following major sources were used in conducting the present study of Hitler: (1) historical records in the form of studies carried out by generally accepted experts, and historical records available to the writer; (2) expert opinions in the form of letters from former German government leaders who served under Hitler; (3) original copies of the speeches Hitler made as they appeared in the newspaper, "Voelkischer Beobachter"; (4) records and tapes of all or part of his speeches to be used in this study; (5) captured German movies, newsreels, and
other fragmentary visual material made available to the writer by the historical film library of the University of California at Los Angeles; (6) rhetorical criticism and articles in ancient standard works of rhetorical studies in the form of books, articles in Speech journals dealing with public address, persuasion, and rhetorical devices; (7) government offices and officers, learned societies and individual scholars, newspapers, broadcasters, and publishers both in Germany and the United States; (8) Hitler's own books and stenographic records of some of his conversations; (9) personal experience, since the writer lived in Nazi Germany during Hitler's rule, heard all of his speeches, and served as a leader in the Hitler Youth Movement.

Subject. As Winans wrote:

To persuade a man, then, seems to be nothing more or less than to win his undivided attention to the desired conduct, to make him think of that and stop thinking of other courses, or of any inhibiting ideas . . . Persuasion is the process of inducing others to give fair, favorable or undivided attention to propositions.5

It is historically obvious that Hitler succeeded in persuading the German people to follow him, even into death.

These happenings provided indications of something Sarett and Foster stated.

Give a man the power to do a thing and a sufficient psychological drive to do it, and he will do it. Persuasion is a method whereby a speaker induces an individual or an audience to believe, or to act by implanting a wish to do so by driving at a deep hunger, emotion, or habit that intensifies that wish, or by touching off some other psychological spring of human action.6

The actions of Hitler and his nation and their influence on others is a matter of record. The problem remained to find both the sufficient psychological drive of the man, Hitler, and the devices used in speaking to implant his ideas in the minds of others. For this reason, an attempt was made to understand his personality and character. His speeches were searched for clues providing information concerning these points. Hitler's persuasive speeches were considered on the basis of an idea expressed by Oliver.

For three thousand years, students of speech have insisted that a persuasive speaker must first of all be a good man . . . He who would master the art of persuasive speech must first

of all master himself, for his influence will depend upon all that he is in word, in thought, and in deed.7

It is the writer's contention that a study can only represent rhetorical "criticism" if more than a description of devices is attempted. The writer, therefore, considered the available means of persuasion in the case of Hitler. This required a study of the speaker appearing behind the podium and the image those saw who knew him well. Only in this way can it be determined whether Hitler mastered himself.

Some claim mere historical developments caused the rise of Hitler. This would seem to indicate that unless some specific factors in the background of Hitler inevitably caused his rise to power, millions of others with a similar background should have climbed to the same position of importance. If this cannot be shown to be the case, then his peculiar abilities made him the leader of his people.

If Hitler was merely provided with a following by others, the study of persuasion would be of little importance. If, on the other hand, he had to gather a following

himself, the study of persuasion becomes of major importance. If Hitler had an outstanding mind and was of high intelligence, if his speeches were mainly concerned with facts, a study of Logos would seem indicated. If this is not the case, the main remaining forms of persuasion, Ethos and Pathos, require our concern.

In order to study speeches delivered in Hitler's Germany, consideration had to be given to the drastic changes which took place. Winans suggested how deep a study of Hitler's persuasiveness must go.

... it is sometimes worth while to win the support of existing organizations, or even to form a new society to promote your cause ... People like to join organizations just to belong, and especially they like to join organizations that promise to become popular.\(^8\)

Without considering the drastic changes in Germany under Hitler, a critical study of him as a speaker would not seem possible. The full impact of Hitler's persuasiveness could be seen by the fact that the new society he created ceased existing when he died.

Thus, it was decided to study as much of Hitler's background as possible. Historical sources were consulted, while an attempt was made to study all happenings from a rhetorical standpoint. Hitler's speeches were studied in

\(^8\) Winans, op. cit., pp. 210-211.
their original German form. This gave a better indication of Hitler's attitudes, intentions, and beliefs. Recorded material and films were studied to provide the writer with a more complete image of the speaker, the situation, and the speech.

The writer's concern with the orator, Adolf Hitler, follows quite closely the brief outline Cicero provided.

When after hearing and understanding the nature of a cause, I proceed to examine the subject matter of it, I settle nothing until I have ascertained to what point my whole speech, bearing immediately on the question and case, must be directed. I then very diligently consider two other points; the one, how to recommend myself, or those for whom I plead; the other, how to sway the minds of those before whom I speak to that which I desire. Thus the whole business of speaking rests upon three things for success in persuasion; that we prove what we maintain to be true; that we conciliate those who hear; that we produce in their minds whatever feelings our cause may require.9

In his attempt to understand the character and background of Hitler, the writer hopes to overcome what seems a major danger in rhetorical criticism. The further the critic is removed by time and space from the subject of his study and from the ancient rhetoricians, the less meaningful his criticism may become.

———

Hitler's background and happenings of his day would seem to be the major rhetorical premise. If this is understood, later minor premises and conclusions expressed by Hitler can be more validly studied. Thus, a relationship is assumed which assigns no specific value to any part of the study, but states that all parts are necessary to complete understanding.

III. Introduction to a Rhetorical Study of Adolf Hitler

With the development of electronic equipment which makes possible the transmission of the human voice to millions of listeners, the study of oral communication has become more important than ever.

Among those who used their ability to sway the masses to accomplish their own ends was Adolf Hitler. Many attempts have been made to explain the enigma of Hitler and Nazi Germany. Some were content with saying that Hitler was a madman, despite the fact that those who knew him best steadfastly claimed that he was in full possession of his mental powers. Others sought to bring more light to the subject by saying that the German people are, and always have been, "militarists." However, this latter
group tended to overlook the fact that Germany was known some 150 to 200 years ago as the nation of "Thinkers and Poets," soldiers being relatively unknown among them at that time.

It remains the task of the rhetorical critic to search for clues in the happenings leading to Hitler's rule and eventual downfall.

Whatever else Hitler did, whatever else can or must be said about him, it is self-evident that his meteoric career helped to shape the world in which the writer finds himself today.

We must accept the fact that a purpose lies behind oral communication. The task of the rhetorical critic is to find this purpose by considering the four major elements of speech: the speaker, the language, the receiver, and the situation. The judgment he uses in considering these elements is the same as that used in the evaluation of any other art form. Thonnsen and Baird point this out when they state:

Like other creative workers, the public speaker achieves the end of his art through the resourceful use of reason, memory, imagination, and emotion. In other words, he relies upon the same psychological equipment to realize his
purpose as does the sculptor, the painter, or the literary craftsman.\textsuperscript{10}

Aristotle defined rhetoric as "... the faculty of discovering in the particular case what are the available means of persuasion."\textsuperscript{11} For the critic, the inversion of the original process is the task.

A. Critics of Antiquity

The field of inquiry. Critics of antiquity were less concerned with the excellence of the practitioners of the art of rhetoric. Their major concern lay with rhetoric as a field of inquiry.

However, Aristotle also concerned himself with a critical evaluation of oratory.

Underlying the entire study of rhetoric in its early days was the desire to deal with the discovery of the possible means of persuasion in any subject. The approach used by different men was the one best suited to their backgrounds and fields of interest, as indeed oral communication is not limited in its usefulness to one area or group of people. Plato wrote as a philosopher; Aristotle


\textsuperscript{11}Cooper, \textit{Aristotle's Rhetoric}, \textit{op. cit.}, 1355b, p. 7.
considered the field from the standpoint of a scientist; Cicero discussed rhetoric from his own background as an orator and statesman; Quintilian was concerned with rhetoric as an educator.

While the men mentioned are but a handful among the total number of people who wrote concerning the art of speaking, they are among the most influential.

Types of speaking. Among the types of speaking discussed by the men mentioned above, Cicero had a particular fondness for courtroom speaking. Deliberative speaking, or public speaking before larger groups with the purpose of swaying masses of people, also had a measure of importance to him, but could not compare to the former.

Cicero was not as much concerned with the rules of speech-making as he was concerned with the fact that oratory, in order to be successful, had to affect the listener. For this reason, he had little interest in the third type of speaking mentioned by most rhetoricians of his day: the epideictic, which had as a major purpose, praise or blame.

This emphasis has changed today, as Thonnsen and Baird explained:

While the case at law is important, it usually is of more temporary interest and has a more limited field of reference and
application than the matter of public expediency with which the orator deals in a deliberative assembly.¹²

The present study is an example of the importance and long-range impact of deliberative speaking.

**Style.** Generally speaking, ancient rhetorical critics were concerned with three major forms of style: plain, medium, and grand. Different names were given to these styles of speech by different writers, but the basic concepts remained almost the same. As to the ability to use them, some difference of opinion existed. For instance, Cicero believed that in spite of the existence of three styles, only a rich and impassioned one could move multitudes to action.

Quintilian, on the other hand, pointed out that the truly great orator will use, and use effectively, all three styles of speech.

The achievement of ability in this area is a much discussed subject among rhetoricians, and Thonnsen and Baird sum up the most commonly expressed ideas: "The trinity of nature, art, and practice serves as a tool for the determination of essential strength or weakness."¹³

¹²Thonnsen, Baird, op. cit., p. 333.

¹³Ibid., p. 160.
The orator. Cicero stated that there were two classes of good orators:

... of which the former are distinguished by the simple neatness and brevity of their language, and the latter by the copious dignity and elevation; but although the preference must always be given to that which is great and striking, yet, in speakers of real merit, whatever is most perfect of the kind is justly entitled to our commendation.  

Once more we find the matter of effect stressed. Whatever type of speaking is done, as long as it accomplishes the purpose a speaker sets for himself, it is worthy of our commendation. However, and by no means as an afterthought, it is well at this moment to point to the statement made by Quintilian, that the good speaker must be "... a good man, skilled in speaking." It is indeed an important challenge presented to all students of oral communication to consider this fact— that the aims and accomplishments of a speaker must not only be acceptable to his listeners, but also "to the gods."

Men have not always attained this goal for which they were to strive, which has been one of the main reasons for attacks leveled on rhetoricians since the days of antiquity.

14 Marcus Tullius Cicero, Brutus (Translated by E. Jones, IV).
We do not claim that rhetoric is bad in itself, even if it furnishes weapons for wicked men, but it does not indicate what use is to be made of the power it gives, so as to fit in with our principles of justice and honor. Rhetoricians are like pilots who have a good training, but may be bad men.\footnote{Harry M. Hubbell (trans.), "The Rhetoric of Philodemus," Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, No. 23 (September, 1920), p. 276.}

Certainly one cannot escape the importance of these statements in the light of historical evidence concerning the influence of Adolf Hitler.

Aristotle's methods of proof are closely related to the methods employed by speakers in impressing their listeners. He names three: ethical, emotional, and logical—the first referring to the person of the speaker, the second to the use of materials stirring the emotions of the listener, and the third basing its effectiveness on the power of facts and reasoning based on facts. This system of categorizing proof is closely followed by most ancient rhetoricians.

Setting up standards and examples which the "good" speaker was to follow consumes much of the space devoted by ancient rhetoricians to the study of their art. Because of the early impact of Greek culture, one additional factor can be noticed in ancient rhetoric, and that is the
reliance upon Greek models and examples. Longinus, for instance, in his treatise, "On the Sublime," sets up Homer as a standard of excellence. From a historical standpoint, one must mention the inadequacy felt by many Romans when it came to the perfection, artistry, and eloquence achieved by Greek culture.

**Systems for knowing and persuading.** Aristotle did much by lending his scientific turn of mind to the discussion of rhetoric to help assign a place to this ancient art: "Aristotle distinguishes three separate but related methodologies for knowing and persuading, scientific demonstration, dialectic, and rhetoric."  

The chart on the following page is an illustration of these three methodologies as developed by McBurney.  

**The training of others.** There is probably no better way to indicate the importance early rhetoricians placed on their ability to speak, and the training one had to undergo, than to quote one of them—Marcus Tullius Cicero:

... I had rather my "sentiments" on the qualifications of an orator should please you and Brutus, than the world besides; but as to my

---


17Ibid.
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"eloquence," I should wish "this" to please everyone . . . As to the truth and propriety of what I hear, I am indeed to judge of this for myself, as well as I am able; but the general merit of an orator must and will be decided by the effects which his eloquence produces.  

In a few words one can here find the entire scope of responsibility, training, and effect as the rhetorician sees it in relationship to himself, his audience, and his fellow-rhetoricians. Thonnsen and Baird add: "Rhetoricians generally agree that a sound training—a broad familiarity with the field of knowledge—is essential to the development of an effective speaker."  

To fulfill the obligation of a rhetorical critic, the student must consider carefully the background and education of any speaker. That mastery of the art of rhetoric is not an easy thing should not be overlooked in the present discussion. Plato made this clear when he stated: "... to strive for noble end, for whatever pain the effort may involve is also noble to endure."  

18 Marcus Tullius Cicero (Brutus), op. cit., XLIX.  
The speaker and his audience. One of the most basic concepts involved in the study of oral communication is the fact that a speaker intends to create a certain reaction in his listeners. Cicero commented: "For all men who wish to be approved of, regard the inclination of those men who are their hearers, and form and adapt themselves entirely to their opinions and wishes."

In the case of Adolf Hitler, one cannot help but wonder if a second requirement is not the ability of such men to shape and form public opinion until it suits their aims. Cicero seems to take this into account when he says:

For the man who can say nothing with calmness, nothing with gentleness; who seems ignorant of all; . . . if he does not prepare the ears of his hearers before he begins to work up the case in an inflammatory style, he seems like a madman among people in their senses, or like a drunken man among sober men.

This would certainly represent an interesting explanation for the difference of reactions to Hitler's speeches between the people of Germany and the people of other nations who had not been "prepared" as the German people were.

---


22 Ibid., p. 410.
Cicero, in his "De Oratore," says that the orator's functions are to inform, to conciliate, and to move the listeners, as well as the determination of a suitable style of delivery for each instance. This adaptability and concern with his varying speech situations and audiences was also discussed by Plato:

Unless a man estimates the various characters of his hearers and is able to divide existences into classes and sum them up in single ideas, he will never be a skillful rhetorician even within the limits of human power. And this art he will not attain without a great deal of trouble, which a good man ought to undergo, not for the sake of speaking and acting before men, but in order that he may be able to say what is acceptable to God and in all things to act acceptably to Him as far as in him lies. . . .

With this statement the circle is complete. "Effect" and "purpose" are indeed important to the rhetorician, as they are to the rhetorical critic. However, the "ethos" of the speaker forms an important part of any evaluation of the final effect oral communication has.

Plutarch placed a heavy responsibility also on the listener.

. . . A well-meaning, sincere hearer ought to pass by the flowers of an oration, leaving the gaudy show and theatrical part to

---

entertain dronish sophists and, diving into the very mind of the speaker and the sense of his speech, he must draw thence what is necessary for his own service . . .

One almost prophetic statement must be included here to relate statements concerning the speaker's and listener's responsibility in the oral communications situation to the power of Adolf Hitler in his totalitarian rule:

We find that the discourse of men always conforms to the temper of the times . . . In a state of polished society, where a single ruler sways the sceptre, the power of the mind takes a softer tone, and language grows more refined. But affectation follows, and precision gives way to delicacy . . . In other nations, where the first principles of the civil union are maintained in vigour; . . . where the spirit of liberty pervades all ranks and orders of the state . . . in such a state the national eloquence will be prompt, bold, and animated. Should internal dissension shake the public peace, or foreign enemies threaten to invade the land, eloquence comes forth arrayed in terror; . . . it is true, that upon those occasions men of ambition endeavour, for their own purposes, to spread the flame of sedition; while the good and virtuous combine their force to quell the turbulent, and repel the menace of a foreign enemy. 25

As will be seen in the further development of this study, Tacitus' experiences could be easily applied to the

24 Plutarch, Miscellanies and Essays (Boston: 1898), I, p. 445.

specific situation which arose in Germany before the ascension of Hitler. How times and circumstances influence the speaker has always been a concern of the rhetorician in the evaluation of methods and subjects. Rene Rapin, one of the later students in this area, demanded that the speaker should be "genteel and modest" in his total delivery.26 Both these terms are indeed born in the times in which Monsieur Rapin lived and communicated. Juan Luis Vives, probably the most important Renaissance rhetorician, was concerned over the corruptness of his times, and therefore encouraged "good" men to cultivate the art of rhetoric in order to counter-balance the influence of evil forces of his day. Cicero, according to Thonnsen and Baird,

... regarded men as molded by the age in which they lived; that they were shaped by their environment, and, as far as oratory was concerned, were to be judged by the criteria or standards of their period.27

The latter statement is of considerable concern to the rhetorical critic in a study such as the present one. Having lived in Germany through the entire period of

26 Rene Rapin, "Reflexions on Eloquence," in The Whole Critical Works of Monsieur Rapin (Translated by Basil Kennet and others; London: 1731), II.

Hitler's rule, the writer is more aware than most of the importance of considering the criteria and standards of the period and of the people dominated by Hitler. It would seem impossible to apply any other standards in the study of an orator, if a meaningful evaluation of his influence is to be the result.

The final test. Thonnsen and Baird stated: "Effect or response is all important." As we have seen, the determination of the effect cannot be fully carried through without an appreciation of the forces and conditions at the particular time a speech was delivered. Thus, the end and the object of a speech is determined by the audience, even in a totalitarian state. Even a dictator needs a certain amount of acceptance and cooperation from people before he can become a dictator.

To the rhetorician, this calls for the application of a critical process of evaluation which takes all previously discussed matters into consideration. The facts relating to a particular speech must be carefully studied. Definite criteria for appraisal must be formed in accordance with reasonable standards, resulting in a truly "critical" evaluation of the data collected.

28 Ibid., p. 9.
B. Rhetorical Criticism

Definition. To be truly critical of any oral communications effort, the critic must be willing to subject his data to the usual tests of logic. Thonnsen and Baird stated:

Rhetorical criticism can thus be defined as a comparative study in which standards of judgment derived from the social interaction of a speech situation are applied to public addresses to determine the immediate or delayed effect of the speeches upon specific audiences, and ultimately, upon society.29

It can be seen that the rhetorical critic attempts to retrace the steps taken by the original speaker by applying the standards of rhetoric previously discussed.

The question of "what does rhetorical criticism do?" is discussed by Thonnsen and Baird at some length. Their conclusion would seem to be that it helps to clearly define the theoretical basis of public address, that it helps to interpret the function of oral communication in society, and that it indicates the limits of present knowledge in the field of public speaking.30

In the case of a study of Adolf Hitler, or of propaganda, such criticism may be limited to a study of

29 Ibid., p. 16.
30 Ibid., p. 21.
speech as an instrument of control over collective opinion, when a mass management of human minds is attempted.

Franklin H. Knower, Ohio State University, is quoted by one of his students as giving the following definition of critical research in his course, "Areas and Techniques of Research":

Critical research is designed to bring the maximum use of systematic and mature critical capacities to bear on the evaluation of such matters as plays, acting, stage design, theatre production, speech, radio programs, interpretation of literature, and the principles and processes which are employed in their development or performance.31

One can only draw the conclusion that in form and application of methods, rhetorical criticism differs little or not at all from similar critical appraisals in other fields. As Thonnsen and Baird stated: "It flourishes in the atmosphere of free, spontaneous effort; and while not defiant of rule, it does not necessarily function by formula."32 As the writer heard Charles W. Lomas of the University of California at Los Angeles say during a class lecture: "There must come a time when criticism becomes 'value judgment.'"

---

31 Franklin H. Knowler, Ohio State University, October 25, 1957.
32 Thonnsen, Baird, op. cit., p. 295.
In a recent publication dealing with research in the area of speech, J. J. Auer points out that "Criticism is no longer judged by absolute standards; it applies the standards of the author's own environment." At the same time, one must warn against an abuse of the author's freedom, as John Dewey did:

Criticism is not fault finding. It is not pointing out evils to be reformed. It is judgment engaged in discriminating among values. It is taking thought as to what is better and worse in any field at any time, with some consciousness of why the better is better and why the worse is worse.

Rhetoricians continued to point to the broad training of a man attempting to sway people as a speaker. They spoke of his character, his background, his concern with ethical as well as aesthetic standards. It becomes clear that their rules apply equally to the work of the critic.

Rhetorical criticism and historical criticism. It should be evident to the reader that rhetorical criticism and historical criticism have much in common. However, often the historical critic has little or no interest in

---


the oral communications of an important historical figure. The importance of such communications cannot be overlooked. In the case of Adolf Hitler, his power can be almost entirely connected with effective oral communications. Practically the only way an UNKNOWN, such as Hitler, can become the leader of a nation in our times is by reaching the people with his speeches.

A. J. Croft believes that the main function of history and criticism is to show how propositions and audiences are connected by the way in which a speaker uses techniques to adapt his ideas to those of his audience at a specific time in history.35

This statement indicates the most ideal approach to a critical study of oral communication. Brightfield's comment that some information may be missing in an evaluation, and that such should be "... openly confessed ... qualifying all judgments drawn therefrom,"36 must also be included here. Even the most careful researcher will not be able to cover ALL the facts, even though he is trying to gather as many as possible.


The sources considered in this evaluation of the critical method certainly indicate that the critic needs an appreciation for the literary part, as well as the psychological part of his work. At the same time, a knowledge of history is indispensable. In the case of this writer, his personal contact with Hitler and knowledge of the German people and the German language should be a help with all three of these aspects of his study.

To summarize what has been said, one could turn to Thonnsen and Baird and the "judicial method" of critical studies they mention:

... it reconstructs a speech situation with fidelity to fact; it examines this situation carefully in the light of the interaction of speaker, audience, subject, and occasion; it interprets the data with an eye to determining the "effect." 37

Specific suggestions for meaningful rhetorical research. One of the greatest difficulties, faced by researchers in this area, is the establishment of authenticity of speech texts. James Bryce, in his biography of Gladstone, pointed this out. At the same time, he mentioned the fact that with the increased availability of recorded transcriptions of speeches, this difficulty will

37Thonnsen, Baird, op. cit., p. 18.
diminish. In the case of the present study, it is hoped that recorded material will be plentiful enough to compensate for inaccuracies which may exist in printed texts of speeches.

Richard C. Jebb had some suggestions to make which also apply to a study of Adolf Hitler, particularly since Jebb judged orators individually rather than by some arbitrary scale:

What is necessary to make it profitable is some idea of the world in which it was spoken. These orators who were not conspicuous actors in history must be read, not fragmentarily or in the light of notes which confine themselves to explaining what are termed "allusions," but more systematically, and with some general comprehension of the author and his age.38

Jebb's statement may not satisfy the reader who wishes to have a further distinction between a historical and a rhetorical study. Donald Bryant provides one answer: "Speaking generally, we may say that the rhetorical function is the function of adjusting ideas to people, and of people to ideas."39 Ideas and their expression are of less importance to the historical critic.

38 Chauncey Goodrich, Select British Eloquence (New York: 1853), Preface, iii.

One factor seemed very important to this writer. Aristotle and other ancient rhetoricians may, indeed, provide today's critic with a safe beginning point, but it is the critic's duty to consider his concepts in the light of the circumstances under which the speech was given.

Finally critics seek to answer the questions—as all must eventually do if they prepare comprehensive appraisals of the speakers—"What was the immediate effect of the speech upon the audience? What was the long range effect upon the flow of historical events?" It can be safely assumed that none of the ancient rhetoricians, and few of the more recent students of the field, could have imagined what influence speakers would have with the help of electronic devices commonly used today. This idea is further strengthened when one considers Nilsen's statement:

"The evaluation of effect should be a judgment about the contribution the speech makes, or the influence it exerts in furthering the purposes of the society upon which it has its impact." In the case of Hitler, a dual influence must be considered: that which he had on his own people and that which

---

40Thonnsen, Baird, op. cit., p. 291.

resulted in definite changes in the living patterns of all people through World War II. Certainly his "effects" as such cannot be denied when one considers recent history. The critic cannot escape making definite value judgments as to the nature of these effects. One is reminded of the statement which Aristotle made that no proof is as effective as the character of a speaker. Unfortunately, it may take a long period of time before the true character of a person becomes discernible.

This leads to another statement which Thonnsen and Baird included in their book *Speech Criticism*:

> The prospective aspect of logical analysis also is furthered by determining the premises from which the speaker argued. Did the speaker exercise wisdom in selecting the basic postulates upon which his reasoned case rests?\(^{42}\)

The necessity of going "behind the scenes" as an important function of the critic's work is thus stressed once more.

The questions asked by Thonnsen and Baird, "Was the speaker right as determined by an appeal to historical reality?" "Did his ideas result in good for the group as a whole?" and finally the statement, "The integrity of an idea can hardly be subjected to a more severe test than the practical fact that it worked, and in conformity with

\(^{42}\)Thonnsen, Baird, *op. cit.*, p. 337.
the speaker's predictions,\textsuperscript{43} take on an even deeper significance when one considers the history of Hitler's movement.

Some criticisms to be considered in rhetorical studies. The student of rhetoric must not overlook the fact that there are those who have approached rhetoric with a very negative attitude.

\ldots we must allow that all the art of rhetoric, besides order and clearness, all the artificial and figurative application of words eloquence hath invented, are for nothing else but to insinuate wrong ideas, move the passions, and thereby mislead the judgment; and so, indeed, are perfect cheats.\textsuperscript{44}

Ernest Wrage accepts the challenge presented by Locke and deals with it in the following way:

Speakers are brokers in ideas with considerable influence upon the intellectual history of an age. This seems incontestable, and the ideal critic is challenged by a view of speech as study in the strategy of ideas . . . If he responds to that challenge . . . he will at once be true to the controlling function of rhetoric. Conversely, . . . if he neglects or obscures what speech is all about, the communication of ideas, in favor of form and technique, he detaches himself from the main stream of human concern.\textsuperscript{45}

\textsuperscript{43}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 350.


Thus, responsibility is placed with the individual speaker or critic, not the method or the area of rhetoric as a whole. Thonnsen and Baird add their own warning to those already considered:

Assuming that the critic does not resort solely to statistical analysis, and that he does not lose sight of the total speech situation in his solicitude over arguments from authority or the nature of special figures of rhetoric, he can conduct a certain amount of analytical inquiry with profit.46

These, as well as many similar statements, stress the judicial use of available means of criticism in rhetoric.

The political speech and its evaluation. The Institute for Propaganda Analysis, perhaps more than any other single agency, has been concerned with the type of speaking associated with Adolf Hitler. Among its efforts was the development of a list of propaganda devices used by political speakers. For instance, name calling, glittering generalities, transfer of confirmed sanctions to something hearers are to accept, testimonials, "plain folks" device, card stacking through omission or distortion of facts, and the bandwagon technique.

46Thonnsen, Baird, op. cit., p. 326.
The most meaningful summary of ideas concerning the political speech, which the writer could find, was a statement by Albert von Ruville:

A political speech . . . which is something more than a mere piece of rhetoric upon a special occasion, must always keep an object in view, that of exciting other persons to political action . . . His intention is to make others subserve his own ideas, to strengthen his own scanty forces by means of the power others possess; and this, whatever the character of his efforts—be they selfish or unselfish, be they directed to securing the advantage of an individual, of a party, or of a state . . . A crowd of people is in most cases disinclined, and little competent, to undertake an accurate examination of the questions at issue, and the more incompetent it is, the greater will be the influence exerted upon it by clever oratory . . . To my thinking, the greatest danger of oratory consists in the fact that it forms an intellectual weapon, the efficacy of which is in no way dependent upon the purity of the aims pursued. Egoist, party leader, and patriot, all can use this weapon with equal success.

The necessity for the student of rhetoric to consider more than the obvious effectiveness of a speech is thus understood. He must broaden his concepts to include both short and long range influence of a man who happens to be an effective speaker.

---

As a member of a democratic society, the writer is aware of the fact that he is living in a "world of talk." To determine the goodness or the evil of such communications becomes the final function of the critic. This function can sometimes only be fulfilled after time has passed. At least it can then be fulfilled in a more meaningful fashion, as in the case of Adolf Hitler. Ralph Waldo Emerson once said: "Times of eloquence are times of terror." Both this statement and the one to the effect that an eloquent man has to be as one "drunk with an inward belief," find deep meaning in the life and communications of Adolf Hitler. According to Lambertson, Hitler possessed the knowledge of group action, showmanship, and public speaking to bring audiences under his control. He was able, perhaps because of his own "inward drunkenness with an idea," to induce mob hysteria by using emotional manipulation to dull the people's impulses to think.

The following pages, then, will be an attempt, on the basis of the factors discussed in this first chapter, on the basis of the factors discussed in this first chapter,


to describe and critically study Adolf Hitler, dictator and orator. A study of this type of speaking, for which rhetoricians have attempted to find at least some justification, is an important step in making possible the establishment of an empirical basis for the "ethics" of persuasive speaking.
CHAPTER II

A BIOGRAPHY OF ADOLF HITLER

I. Introduction

Thonnsen and Baird speak of the problems facing the rhetorical critic in discovering adequate background material concerning the social setting in which speeches were made. Yet this is a vital task as indicated by the following statement:

The crises in public life continue to reveal the mettle of speakers; tend to link anew, and on a wider scale, the men of the hour and the issues which periodically threaten nations.50

Finding such background material about Hitler led the writer to contact institutes and individuals in Germany. Replies from various sources indicated that most of the authentic material could be found in books written in the United States. In studying a variety of works in the English language, it was also seen that these same books were consistently quoted. Therefore, works by Chester Wilmot, Konrad Heiden, Stephen Henry Roberts, John Gunther,

50Thonnsen and Baird, op. cit., p. 314.
Frederick L. Schuman, and Walter Goerlitz will be most frequently mentioned in this chapter.

Few, if any, men have ever had as great an influence over the lives of so many people as had the Austrian-born leader of the German Third Reich, Adolf Hitler. As an Austro-German, he was able to use effectively the desire for unity which had always been an important consideration to the people of the original Germanic Empire of Charlemagne. When this unity was accomplished for the second time under Bismarck, it was hoped that it would last longer than the relatively short period from 1871 to the end of World War I in 1918.

It was left to Adolf Hitler to attempt to unite the people of Germanic origin once more, this time in an empire which was to last a thousand years, according to its founder. After more than fifteen years since the end of World War II the presence of Hitler seems to continue to plague the world, at least in the symbols and ideas he gave to the world or resurrected for its use.

The present chapter incorporates findings by many individuals, governmental offices, and other organizations. Those facts which have been consistently mentioned, 

and which have been sufficiently documented to make them valuable to the serious student, have been incorporated. The writer presents the impression of Hitler which seems the most accurate in the light of his personal experience and of the material he considered in writing this chapter.

II. Pertinent Biographical Facts

The family tree. Hitler's family background was undistinguished, at times even sordid. The grandfather of Adolf Hitler, Johann George Hiedler, born February 28, 1792, was an unemployed, wandering miller's apprentice or millworker, who married for the first time in 1824. Five months later a son was born, but both mother and child died. In 1837, while he lived in Doellersheim, a woman by the name of Anna Maria Schicklgruber had a son in the village of Strones. She named him Alois; his birthdate was given as June 17, 1837.

Five years later, at the age of 47, Anna Maria married the vagrant Hiedler, who at the time was fifty years of age. In 1847 she died and the miller vanished. Her son continued to use the name of his mother, and thus a boy by the name of Alois Schicklgruber grew up in the home of the brother of George Hiedler in Spital. This particular brother spelled his name Huetler. It might be
well to interject at this time that these different spellings of the same name are by no means remarkable. Illiteracy and personal preference often caused markedly different spellings of names in those days. Among the spellings of the particular name are found the following forms: Hiedler, Hittler, Hitler, Huettler, Huetler, Huedler.⁵²

Alois Schicklgruber became a shoemaker. At the age of eighteen, Alois "made something of himself," when he became a border-policeman. In 1864 he married Anna Glasl-Hoerer, who was the adoptive daughter of a customs official. While she was fourteen years older than he, it is generally conceded that this was a very advantageous marriage for young Alois, since it gave him both a financial and professional boost. There were no children born, and in 1880 the marriage was dissolved as far as Catholics are able to do so. Alois was described as being "hungry for education, and well versed in words and letter."⁵³

He took Klara Poelzl, the daughter of Johanna Huetler and Johann Nepomuck Huetler, into his home as a foster-daughter, although she actually was his cousin. This rather involved period is clarified further by

⁵³ Ibid., pp. 39, 40.
pointing out that while his first wife, Anna, was ill with tuberculosis Alois had relations with a young hotel cook called Franziska Matzelsberger, sometimes also called Mantelsberger, which probably led to the separation from his wife. During this time, Klara Poelzl went to Vienna. While his first wife was still alive, Franziska Matzelsberger bore Alois, Sr., his first son, also called Alois.  

A few months after he finally married Franziska in 1883, only weeks after his first wife's death, a daughter, Angela, was born. His second wife also died of tuberculosis after only one year of marriage in 1884. On January 7, 1885, he consummated his third and final marriage with Klara Poelzl, who was then twenty-three years younger than he.  

This rather involved and complicated family tree indicated one very important fact: While we cannot be entirely sure who was Alois Sr.'s natural father, it is certain that George Hiedler married his (Alois') mother in 1842, and that George Hiedler, at the age of 84, recognized his son officially at the Diocesan Court of Sankt Poelten in Lower Austria. By this time, he spelled his

55 Heiden, op. cit., p. 42.
name Hitler. A memorandum dated March 29, 1932, to this effect is available.\textsuperscript{56} In Doellersheim, on November 28, 1876, Josef Zahnschirm, parish priest, changed the name of Alois Schicklgruber to Alois Hitler in the baptismal record. Thus, it is clear that the name assigned so often to Adolf Hitler, Adolf Schicklgruber, is incorrect. On the other hand, one can hardly deny that the marriages of the Hiedler-Hitler family were of a rather strange nature, and that one might even claim incest in some cases. However, incest was not at all uncommon in the backward, illiterate families of the area then known as Lower Austria. Adolf Hitler's later concern with racial and family background may have its foundation in this confused family record.

Klara and Alois, Sr. had five children of whom three died: Gustav, Ida, and Edmund. The remaining two children were named Paula and Adolf, or Adolfus. In addition to this, a half-brother, Alois, Jr., and a half-sister, Angela, children of Franziska Matzelsberger, survived.\textsuperscript{57} According to all indications, Adolf Hitler's parents had a harmonious and friendly life, at least during their first years. Alois Hitler was the domineering

\textsuperscript{56}Ibid., p. 41.

\textsuperscript{57}Gunther, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 22.
force in the family, his wife being quiet and subjecting herself to his rule.  

Adolf Hitler's youth. Adolfus was born April 20, 1889, in Braunau am Inn. He spent the first years of his life with his family in the border city of Passau, at least some of it on German soil. Then the father moved to Linz, another small but somewhat culturally important city. The father retired at fifty-eight. After this, the family lived in Leonding, a suburb of Linz.  

Adolf entered school April 2, 1895, in the village of Fischlhem. Two years later, he went to the cloister school at Leonding. During the period in Lambach, at least one source reports him to have served as a choir boy, and that he dreamed of becoming an abbot. His report cards during this particular period of his life have only marks of "excellent" with an occasional exception in singing, drawing, and gymnastics.  

59 Heiden, op. cit., p. 44.  
62 Heiden, op. cit., p. 45.
devoted to his mother. However, the age difference between his mother and father was rather outstanding: Alois was sixty, Klara was thirty-seven at this time. His father was a harsh man, according to all accounts, who occasionally drank too much. Some authorities claimed this relationship later had an influence on the development of Hitler as a dictator.

Accounts of Adolf's exploits during this time differed. Most of them agreed, however, that he was a ring-leader, a big "Indian" chief, a roughneck, and an eloquent leader of boys, who planned a trip around the world. To indicate his father's attitude, Adolf could not tell him when he got a beating from his comrades, since he would have received another whipping from his father. The father was a strong Austrian, who had little sympathy for Germany. Adolf, on the other hand, was not very loyal to the two important forces of the day: Austria and the Catholic Church. As a matter of fact, there are reports that he brought some of Darwin's books, and similar material to school, to plague those of his teachers who were

---
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clerics. He appeared to be a consistent rebel in school.66

As a sidelight, it should be mentioned here that at this time in restless, tottering Austria, a movement began which had for its theme the slogan: "Home to the Reich," and which used the colors of the Napoleonic days of the German states: black, red, and gold. More interesting yet, this movement used a wheel-shaped symbol, like a swastika, as its insignia. At the same time, a strong spiritual uprising made itself felt which desired to move "away from Rome."67 Both these factors can be found consistently as parts of Hitler's later policies.

During this time, a severe struggle with his father developed over Adolf's desire to become an artist. To his father, this was not an honorable profession, and he attempted to force the son to become a customs official. In 1900 Adolf Hitler entered the secondary school in Linz, where he made very poor grades, in open rebellion to his father's wishes.68 On January 3, 1903, Alois Hitler collapsed on the street and died. The influence of these various forces in Adolf Hitler's life of necessity

66 Roberts, op. cit., p. 4.
helped to shape his later life. Goerlitz mentioned the fact that at the age of twelve Adolf saw presentations of "Lohengrin" and "Wilhelm Tell" by Wagner and Schiller, respectively. This made a lasting impression upon him.\(^6^9\)

Both these artists are known for a powerful, flamboyant style.

The family began to disintegrate after the death of the father. Adolf changed schools again and went to the secondary school in Steyr, but remained lazy. The last school report from the Staatsreal-Schule in Steyr on September 16, 1905, reads as follows:\(^7^0\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FIRST SEMESTER</th>
<th>SECOND SEMESTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MORAL CONDUCT</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DILIGENCE</td>
<td>unequal</td>
<td>adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELIGION</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERMAN LANGUAGE</td>
<td>inadequate</td>
<td>inadequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOGRAPHY, HISTORY</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATHEMATICS</td>
<td>inadequate</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEMISTRY</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICS</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOMETRY AND GEO-METRICAL DRAWING</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>adequate**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREE-HAND DRAWING</td>
<td>laudable</td>
<td>excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GYMNASTICS</td>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STENOGRAPHY</td>
<td>inadequate</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINGING</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTERNAL FORM OF WRITTEN WORK</td>
<td>displeasing</td>
<td>displeasing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*Repetitive examination permitted. **In consequence of repetitive examination.)

\(^6^9\) Goerlitz, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 32.

\(^7^0\) Heiden, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 49.
For three years Hitler continued to struggle through school while staying with his mother and his sister, Paula, in Urfahr, near Linz. At sixteen, he became violently ill with a lung ailment.\textsuperscript{71} His schooling was discontinued, and he was sent to Spital where he stayed with his aunt Theresa Schmidt. His physician, Dr. Karl Keiss, from Weitra, claimed that Adolf never would be healthy after this sickness.\textsuperscript{72} Considering his later strenuous activities, this seems an interesting fact. In 1905, Adolf left school without his final examination, thus making it impossible for him to enter any profession. He went for a few months to Munich, where he attended the private art school of Professor Groeber in the Blutenstrasse. According to his fellow pupils, he was reserved, quiet, almost shy, a sickly figure with a soft, round, smallish head, and the beginning of his famous lock of hair.\textsuperscript{73}

He spoke much with his hands and used short, angular, brusque movements of his head, so reminiscent of his later speaking habits. Most of the time he could be

\textsuperscript{71}Gunther, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 4.

\textsuperscript{72}Heiden, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 51.

\textsuperscript{73}Ibid.
found at home, doing nothing except browsing in the rather good library which his father had collected.

Vienna. After October, 1907, Adolf Hitler lived in Vienna, supported by his family. The purpose of this stay was preparation for entering the Academy of Fine Arts. He registered with the police at this time as a "student" and at least once he indicated he was studying to be a writer. In 1907-1908, he was rejected by the Academy.

Adolf Hitler, Braunau am Inn, April 20, 1889, German, Catholic. Father civil servant. 4 classes in Realschule. Few heads. Test drawing unsatisfactory.74

He was rejected again on his second try in October, 1908, on the drawings he brought. Supposedly he was encouraged to become an architect, but was unable to enter school because of his lack of education. Hitler continued throughout all of his life to be interested in the arts, and became an important sponsor of many artists.

For four years he did poster work under difficult circumstances in Vienna. "His products are precise stereotypes, rather geometric in effect, not always with a very happy distribution of light and shade."75 While one

74Ibid., p. 52.
75Ibid., p. 54.
could see a certain talent in his drawings, they lacked greatness and artistic development. It would have been difficult to recognize the future "Fuehrer" in those days. He was often unshaven, emaciated, running around in a long caftan-like coat, which some claim was given him by a Jew who took pity on him. It was stated that he did not look people straight in the eye, remained subservient, shy, except when he began to speak of politics.\textsuperscript{76} Political speeches seemed to be the only area in which he could succeed.

Hitler was impressed with the impoverished people as he saw them flooding into the capital city of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. It was during those days of rather sordid happenings that Hitler began to notice more than ever the work of organized labor, the Social Democrats, and of the Jews.\textsuperscript{77} The latter were, to him, of such a nature as to repel him completely, not being "German" enough, or even "human" enough in their appearance. The Social Democrats originated the idea of universal suffrage which probably added to Hitler's hatred, since he

\textsuperscript{76}Roberts, op. cit., p. 4. See also: Heiden, op. cit., p. 54.

\textsuperscript{77}Jarman, op. cit., p. 106.
believed in German dominance. All of these factors later formed a consistent part of Hitler's speeches.

It was during this time that he came in contact with a man by the name of Hanisch, with whom he worked, lived, and talked. He told Hanisch that he wanted to use the Social Democratic system as an example for his own idea of a Labor party. Hitler often made political speeches during those days which he spent in a Home for Men. Sometimes he was taken seriously, other times only laughed at, and Hanisch often had to console him. For three more years Hitler stayed in the Home for Men, living independently but rather miserably.

In November, 1909, because of financial problems, he was forced to give up his furnished room in the Simon Denk Gasse. For a while he slept on park benches. In November, 1909, he found a lodging house in Miedling, where he lived for several months with a number of other men. At the cloister in the Gumpendorfer Strasse he had free soup every day, and at the lodging at night he was given a crust of bread or horse sausage. On several occasions, he shoveled snow on the Danube Bridge, without an overcoat. At times he carried suitcases in front of the

---
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West-Station in Vienna. Finally, under pressure from a friend, he wrote to his half-sister, Angela, who mailed him fifty Kronen (about $10.00). This enabled him to move to a Home for Men in the Meldemann Strasse. During those days, Hitler developed a real hatred for labor, and he felt abused. He could not find or hold work, never having joined a union. He was wasteful of his money. Shortly afterwards, he left Vienna.

Munich. His life in Germany differed little from his experiences in Vienna. In a short time Hitler was thrown out of his room in the station quarter of Munich. A young engineer who took over the room took pity on him and permitted him to stay with him as his roommate. Hitler designed posters for business establishments which were still not very impressive. He was described during those days as being, "At first positively repulsive, somewhat nicer on further acquaintance." We know nothing of close friends or girl friends during this period.

Before groups, he still spoke of politics, often quite loudly, although with a certain precision and

80 Heiden, op. cit., p. 73.
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For three years he was virtually a "deserter" under the Austrian Military Service Laws. When he checked with authorities on February 5, 1914, he was declared unfit for service.

War. A picture showing a crowd on the Odeonsplatz in Munich listening to the announcement of the outbreak of war included Hitler. Heiden described his face as "shining, though sickly looking." He immediately volunteered for the Bavarian Army. In September of 1914, he was assigned to the I. Company Bavarian Reserve Infantry, Regiment 16, the famous "List Regiment." Hitler became an orderly to the new commander, Lieutenant Colonel Tubeuf.

Hitler did not complain, he did all jobs assigned him, and was considered a brave soldier. He showed no inclination to become a leader or an officer, which may have been due to the fact that he was an alien, and thus could not become an officer. He had once been wounded slightly in the left thigh in 1916. In October of 1918,

---

83 Heiden, op. cit., p. 76.
84 Roberts, op. cit., p. 5.
85 Gunther, op. cit., p. 3.
86 Heiden, op. cit., pp. 77-85.
he was gassed at Ypres, resulting in a blindness of several days. He was sent to the hospital at Pasewalk, north of Berlin. References to his war years abound in his later life. He was very much affected by the end of the war, which he experienced in the hospital. War seemed to provide Hitler with another opportunity to succeed in life.

He left the war with deep contempt for its leaders. In the trial of 1924, Hitler admitted that he had talked with a group of mutinous sailors who had come to the hospital, but had not reported them because he felt that it would be senseless to do so. On November 7, 1918, he decided to become a politician.

Hitler went back to Bavaria and lived for a time with his Replacement Batallion Traunstein. Later he stayed in the Infantry barracks in Munich. On May 2, 1919, every tenth man of this batallion was shot. This happened during the riots in Munich, which resulted in a short-lived Communist government. Throughout his
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political career he was a bitter enemy of Communism. Hitler became more than a follower when he served in the Political Department, a kind of propaganda and espionage center. For a time he was also a member of the "Iron Fist," a group of soldiers and officers which seemed to have as their major purpose the terrorization of followers of the republic regime. It was during this period that he ran across the "German Workers' Party (DAP)."  

The Party. On October 16, 1919, Hitler made his first public speech in the Munich restaurant called Buergerbraeukeller, in front of 111 people. This was the first in a long line of similar efforts. His subject was the Versailles Treaty, which was becoming more and more the favorite treatise of radical politicians. On January 5, 1920, he was appointed to the control of the propaganda section of the "Deutsche Arbeiter Partei (DAP)." Heiden quoted Hitler as saying:

In this year of 1919, my first struggle in the Party began. After long negotiations, I put through the acquisition of three rubber stamps.

---

92 Gunther, op. cit., p. 27. Consult also: Heiden, op. cit., pp. 88, 89.


On February 24, 1920, at the first major public meeting Hitler presented the party's program, but was only a secondary speaker after Johannes Dingfelder, a homeopathic physician. The leader of the party was its intellectual father, Anton Drexler. A twenty-five point program of the party had been written with the help of Hitler, which is included in Appendix I.

Another significant event took place when a small Munich weekly called the "Muenchner Beobachter," was bought, which became Hitler's political mouthpiece, the "Voelkischer Beobachter." Talking for hours to small groups in the council chambers of the Sternecker brewery and other places, Hitler organized the party. He was looking for a civil war, but not a foreign war. He needed to overthrow the government first. The pressures on Germany at this time, "killing" taxes, reparations, and seizures of land were issues no politician could overlook. He stood up during those days and, very much in the spirit of the day, stated: "We will incite the

95 Ibid., p. 91.
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people and not only cite, we will lash them to frenzy."  

On July 29, 1921, Hitler left the Party for three days, thus forcing members to make him their unlimited chairman. In Munich, where he was sure of success, he carried on with his speeches. He was convicted of breaking up a hostile political meeting by force, and sentenced to three months in prison, two of which were suspended. For ten years, he was afraid of deportation as a foreigner because of this sentence. Hitler was released from prison during a period of political problems and began more forceful agitation than ever. The despair of the people who sought for an answer to their problems helped Hitler. He stated: "Nobody wants to die for a business deal. But a man dies gladly for a political ideal."  

Then came the fateful day of November 8, 1923. He led his storm troopers into the Buergerbraeu-Keller in Munich, where he broke up a meeting with the shout, "The national revolution has begun." He waved a gun. He told General von Lossow, Reichswehr Commander in Bavaria,
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Lieutenant von Seisser, Munich Police Chief, and Gustav von Kahr, General Staatskommissar, that he had four bullets left, one for each of these officials, and one for himself. He forced the three officials into a pact. General von Ludendorff, respected World War I leader, was reported to support Hitler's movement. A march into the down-town area was to be undertaken the next day, November 9.101 Next morning it became evident that the "pact" had been broken. Hitler was rebuked by Seisser for having broken his word. Earlier Seisser had received a promise from Hitler that he would not start a putch. Hitler's answer had been: "Yes, I did. Forgive me, but I had to for the sake of the Fatherland."102

Ludendorff, meanwhile advised of happenings, joined the demonstrators the next day. The column faced police and troops. Ludendorff marched on, right through the lines. Then firing began. Several men in the front ranks of Hitler's column fell. Hitler himself was on the ground. He may have been afraid, or he may have been pulled by the man with whom he had linked arms. His associate, Max Erwin von Scheubner Richter, claimed his arm

101Pollock and Thomas, op. cit., p. 191.
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was dislocated by the fall. Sixteen men, followers of Hitler, were dead. Hitler was the first to flee, Dr. Karl Gebhard and Dr. Walter Schulz claimed.\textsuperscript{103} He fled by car to Dr. Ernst "Putzi" Hanfstaengel's home in Uffing, where Hanfstaengel's sister, Erna, took care of him. Hanfstaengel later became Hitler's prime adviser. This event put Hitler for the first time into the national limelight.

Prison. A few days later Hitler was under arrest. In court he defended himself. His speeches seemed to make some impression upon the judges, and the trial in February, 1924, gave him and his co-defendants much publicity.\textsuperscript{104} It went on for four weeks. Hitler attempted to prove that he had done what the government wanted him to do. Against everything the law indicated, the judges sentenced Hitler to five years in prison, and he served only eight and one-half months of that term. He was released from Landsberg Prison before Christmas of 1924. While in prison, he wrote Mein Kampf, with the help of Rudolf Hess and others to whom he dictated.\textsuperscript{105} Without this lenient sentence, Hitler could not have returned to his political
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activities at a critical moment in Germany's history.

People who knew him during his prison period described him as follows: Dr. Brinsteiner at Landsberg Prison judged him to be always in control of himself. Max von Gruber, specialist, found him during certain periods "madly agitated," and at the end giving "expressions of gratified self-esteem."\(^{106}\)

In 1925 Hitler's half-sister, Angela Raubal, came to keep house for him. With her came her daughter, Angela, a blond, blooming, stately girl, nicknamed "Geli." Hitler soon became the lover of his niece.\(^ {107}\) During those days, he lived on his income from the sale of articles to his party's papers, although these articles were much poorer than his speeches. He wrote much and left much of the party business to Gregor Strasser, who was a former officer.

In May, 1926, Strasser's power was broken, and the central power of the party became located in Munich under Hitler. Hitler received during those days the nickname "Manitou," when he used the "Blood flag," of the November 9 putch, to touch other flags to let its

\(^{106}\)Ibid., p. 378.
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"spirit" move into them. Hitler began to point towards the ultimate reason for the existence of a country as he saw it: "Death is the final goal of the scientifically drilled nation." Houston Stewart Chamberlain was the great exponent of the supremacy of the Germanic race, and originator of the Teutonic world domination saga which would finally permeate all of Hitler's doctrines, and Chamberlain had much to do with the attitudes which were formed during this period. Hitler said: "Our space is absurdly small, for a plane can cross over Germany in barely four hours."

In 1930 Hitler made himself supreme leader of his storm troopers. As financial difficulties in Germany increased, Hitler's power increased. On September 4, 1930, he had one-sixth of the German votes and 107 seats in the Reichstag. Many young people now flocked to his banners because they wanted a new faith.

Lord Rothermere, publisher of the "Daily Mail," first of the Englishmen with whom Hitler became acquainted, came to Hitler
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and spoke with him at Munich. The result was an article which stated: "If we examine more closely the shift of political power to the National Socialists, we find that it has all sorts of political advantages."\(^{112}\) For the first time, Hitler's influence over foreigners as well as Germans could be noticed.

By 1929 he was living comfortably at Outer Prinz Regenten Strasse in Munich, where he had a nine-room apartment, which he shared with his half-sister and "Geli." For the first time, he used his architectural talents by making designs for the party headquarters, the "Brown House." Many of the party insignias were also designed by Hitler, such as the well-known party button.

Personal contact with Hitler became increasingly difficult. He now was no longer addressed by the informal "DU," which even before this time only few had dared to use. He became fond of swearing oaths, but always managed to break them. Besides his relations to his niece, Geli, Hitler also had close ties with the Wagner family, being romantically linked with one of its members, Mrs. Winifred Wagner. Geli seemingly protested and decided she wanted to return to Vienna. Hitler refused after unpleasant

\(^{112}\)Heiden, op. cit., p. 354.
scenes. On September 18, 1931, she shot herself at the age of twenty-three. She was buried in Vienna. Hitler obtained permission to go there and spent a tearful evening at her grave.\footnote{Ibid., p. 388.} Tears always seemed to come easily to him.

An attempt was made to make Hitler a German citizen by appointing him a constable in a small town. The ensuing laughter caused him to refuse. He finally succeeded when the small state of Braunschweig gave him the long-forgotten position of its attache to Berlin.\footnote{Gunther, op. cit., p. 28.} His chances to become chancellor seemed to grow dimmer during the period from 1930-1933, as most of Germany's problems were solved peacefully. Hitler met much opposition from Communists as he traveled through such industrial cities as Elberfeld, Hagen, Dortmund, Duesseldorf, and the Ruhr section. Opposition to him seemed fairly general as late as July, 1932.\footnote{Pollack and Thomas, op. cit., p. 194.}

Der Fuehrer. On April 10, 1932, Hitler was beaten by von Hindenburg in the elections on which he had set his hopes. Chancellor von Papen was forced out as head of the
Cabinet. Hitler was offered the Chancellorship if he could get a majority and rule "constitutionally." He refused.116 Sometime during the involved and confused days of 1932, Hitler must have made a pact with representatives of powerful factions in Germany, which was directed against Chancellor Schleicher's government.117 He began his final move by concentrating on the small state of Lippe, where he spoke at eighteen meetings. Hitler's party, the NSDAP118 won over 40 per cent of the votes. On January 30, at 11:00 A.M., Hitler was named Reichskanzler by von Hindenburg.119 That night a huge torchlight parade celebrated Hitler's victory in front of the Berlin Chancellory in the Wilhelmstrasse. The writer can still recall the impression of the thousands of brilliantly red torches lighting downtown Berlin in their eerie glow.120

On March 28, 1933, the Catholic church's bishops met and recommended obedience to the legal authorities,
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118NSDAP: Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiter Partei. National Socialist German Worker's Party.
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and made peace with Hitler, thus ending a long-standing feud. On July 1, 1933, the Catholic church was to hear "Reich Chancellor Adolf Hitler still belongs to the Catholic church, and has no intention of leaving it."\(^{121}\)

On Sunday, March 5, the last real election was held in Germany. The NSDAP won 43.9 per cent of the total seats, but 81 Communists and 120 Socialists remained in parliament.\(^{122}\) The Communists were arrested, and the Nazis had complete control. With promises of tax relief, protection for millions of workers with no abuse of power, the new reign began.\(^ {123}\) However, on July 14, 1933, Hitler made the NSDAP the only political party in Germany.\(^ {124}\)

June 27, 1933, settled Hitler's party problems with the "Bloody Saturday." All of Hitler's opponents were purged; among them were such men as Gregor Strasser, Gustav von Kahr, Ernst Roehm, and hundreds of others. The correct number probably will never be determined. The immediate reason for the purge was the demand of the S. A. to be made part of the Armed Forces, and to have its
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own "revolution." Even Hindenburg seemed to have been pleased with this crushing blow against what he believed to be a danger to German freedom. Hitler thus proved he would stand for no interference.

August 22, 1934, Hindenburg died and with him a political era in Germany. Hitler, contrary to the constitution, merged the offices of chancellor and president. The heads of the three military services were called in and each swore an oath of allegiance to the Fuehrer personally. The Armed Forced followed with this oath:

I swear by God this holy oath: that I will render unconditional obedience to the Fuehrer of the German Reich and people, Adolf Hitler, the Supreme Commander of the Armed Forces and will be ready, as a brave soldier, to stake my life at any time for this oath.

The dictatorship of Adolf Hitler had been firmly established.

Death. Years of bitter international struggle resulted in the Second World War. While a study of this period must be relegated to the student of history, one should take a look at the last moments of this man's life

---
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and the circumstances surrounding them. The last hours of his life found Hitler in the beleagured city of Berlin, where his companion of several years, Eva Braun, former secretary of Heinrich Hoffman, his photographer, had joined him. Hitler wrote his testament.  

He began by disclaiming all personal responsibility for the war and blamed the "ruling political clique in England, the tool of International Jewry." He married Eva Braun, then made dispassionate plans for the disposal of their bodies. They committed suicide on April 29, 1945. These orders were later carried out by his driver, Erich Kempka. His body and that of Eva Braun were burned on April 30, after they died by shooting and poisoning.  

As the end approached, Defense Minister Speer had warned Hitler to stop his war policy of the "scorched earth," but Hitler's reply may stand here as the final indication of the life of this man.

If the war is lost, the German nation will also perish. This fate is inevitable. There is no need to take into consideration the basic requirements of the people for continuing even a most primitive existence... Those who will remain after the battle are those who are inferior; for the good will have fallen.

---
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Nihilism in its most terrifying form thus was the final testament Hitler could leave his people.

Volumes have been written about this man, his deeds, his actions, his health, his family. Only in a broad outline form could his life be described on the preceding pages.

III. Conclusions

A difficult home life, many changes in his schooling, great difficulties in finding his place in organized society, love of mother and hate of father—all these factors helped to shape Hitler's life and personality. They, furthermore, helped to shape Nazi Germany. Again the reader is reminded of the fact that Nazi Germany was, in the truest sense of the word, Adolf Hitler's creation. He associated with his creation completely; thus, he considered himself to be Germany's true spokesman. From the beginning, on a small level, as he discussed politics in the "flop houses" of Vienna and Munich, to the final success before the masses of German people, Germany's experiences paralleled those of Hitler to an amazing degree. As World War I seemed inevitable to the emperor, it was a release for Hitler. As Germany collapsed so did he, a blinded man in a soldiers' hospital. When Germany
struggled through political deceit, rebellion, and betrayal, Hitler became a spy. In the political struggle which even overshadowed the financial and economic struggle of Germany, Hitler found his place. With him Germany overcame the period of confusion and was given a singular aim, though vague. Hitler burned himself out like a candle, once lit, having to burn until it had fulfilled its purpose, and so did Germany. When Hitler died Germany died, to begin her struggle all over again. The close connection between country and leader is vital to our understanding of Hitler as a leader, who used oral communication so effectively. Konrad Heiden explained further: "With unerring sureness, Hitler expressed the speechless panic of the masses faced by an invisible enemy and gave the nameless specter a name."\textsuperscript{130} Whether he called that specter "Jew" or "Bolshevism" was really of little importance, because it gave both him and his followers something tangible to work with.

The speeches begin always with deep pessimism and end in overjoyed redemption, a triumph and happy ending; often they can be refuted by reason, but they follow the far mightier logic of the subconscious, which no refutation can touch.\textsuperscript{131}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[130] Heiden, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 106.
\item[131] Ibid.
\end{footnotes}
It will be shown that Hitler's speeches followed the very experience the entire nation had to go through. That he was sick no one can doubt. He often needed medical attention. Whether he was normal, on the other hand, is strictly a question of interpretation, and as a critic the writer must certainly say that from his standpoint, Hitler was neither mentally nor physically "normal." The interrelationship of physical and mental health cannot be denied, and it is only to be determined in the Fuehrer's case which of the two had the most important bearing on the other, and which deteriorated first. Yet the very factors causing Hitler's sickness also caused the sickness of his country. It seems a truism to state that no normal person could have reached Hitler's position, and no normal historical happenings would have provided the chance. Beyond this fact, it must be seen that his nihilism and complete lack of contact with reality could only be the result of a mind which could not adjust to reality.

The present study deals mainly with the concept of ETHOS. It will be taken to indicate a type of proof which causes listeners to accept a communication because of three major constituent characteristics: intelligence, integrity, and good will.\(^{132}\) The basic division of this

study follows the lines set by Aristotle in his dual concepts of "artistic" and "non-artistic" proof. The former refers to anything pertaining to the art of rhetoric, while the latter deals with such concepts as the appearance of the speaker, physical and emotional habits, his previous reputation, and similar matters not an actual part of the spoken word.\textsuperscript{133}

Non-artistic proofs have been investigated in the previous chapter and will be further considered in the chapter which follows. Thonssen and Gilkinson indicated the inclusiveness of the concept of "ethos."

Ethical proof derives from the speaker himself, from his personality, from his attitude towards his hearers, and from the way he approaches his subject. It is a broad, almost omnibus, term. It embraces such characteristics as the speaker's manifest intelligence, good will toward the listeners, tactfulness, sincerity, honesty, and general agreeableness.\textsuperscript{134}

Sandford and Yeager give a comprehensive outline of the factors which the student must consider in his search for the persuasive forces of ethos.

A speaker should have the following qualifications, if he is to have the good will of an audience and through that good will to make

\textsuperscript{133}Ibid., 1355, b 30 ff.

the best use of his personal appeal: He should be popular and have a pleasing appearance and bearing; he should be known as a man of honor and integrity; he should be known as a qualified speaker on the subject; he should use the principles of effective speaking to their best advantage. He should have confidence in himself, the ability to think clearly, the ability to use tact, and should be enthusiastic about his speech problem.135

The writer considers the preceding background study of Hitler a most vital prerequisite to a rhetorical study. It represents part of the work a rhetorical critic must conduct in the area to which Aristotle referred as "Inventio." Baldwin summarized the meaning of the term by stating that "... it means, in Aristotelian language, the discovery of all extrinsic means of persuasion, or more simply, survey of the material and forecast."136

One factor which is consistently mentioned by those discussing rhetorical criticism is the idea that both the speaker and the speech must be placed in the proper time and environment in order to make clear what the speaker intended to achieve. Judgment of whether or not these aims were achieved would otherwise become impossible.


Auer\textsuperscript{137} and Griffin\textsuperscript{138} are emphatic in their statements that a rhetorical evaluation of a speaker's discourse is possible only if it is conducted against the background of his own times. The preceding chapter represents one such attempt.

As for the speakers themselves, the sources of our trust in them are three, for apart from the arguments there are things that gain our belief, namely, intelligence, character, and good will.\textsuperscript{139}

Thus, it became possible to overcome a danger in rhetorical criticism which is pointed out by Wichelns. "The date, the historical interest, the orator's intention are often lost from view; and criticism suffers in consequence."\textsuperscript{140} A mere study of WHAT Hitler has said thus cannot offer a sufficient explanation of his success or failure.
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CHAPTER III

RELEVANT CHARACTERISTICS

I. Introduction

Wichelns wrote, "The critic speaks of the orator as a public man whose function it is to exert his influence by speech." The psychological characteristics of a speaker form an intricate part of the study of a public man. However, Germany's propaganda machine succeeded in providing only limited information concerning Hitler's background and personality. Before the image will be discussed which the German people saw, a more critical analysis will be developed here.

A warning by Oliver indicates how important a study of physical and psychological factors really is.

Surely the results of studies by psychiatrists and social psychologists should provide ample warning against the mistake of considering persuasion as a neat and readily manageable

---

141 Wichelns, op. cit., p. 207.
process of interweaving selected arguments and emotional appeals.\textsuperscript{142}

Oliver stated, also, that persuasion indeed is a way of life. To him, the persuasive individual is one who could represent and transcend the accepted characteristics of the society to which he belongs. As a matter of fact, to Oliver, this would indicate that the concept of a "good man" speaking well must be considered both from a social and a moral standpoint.\textsuperscript{143}

\section*{II. Character and Personality}

\textbf{Definition.} Not content to deal merely with the historical setting of man's life, the rhetorician must delve into such matters as character and personality. In Hitler's case, this becomes of vital importance. On one hand, the German people received a common and public image of Hitler. On the other hand, this image resembled the historical character known as Adolf Hitler only slightly. It is well, at this point, to draw the distinction between the character and personality as Sarett and Foster did.

By "character" we mean those qualities--mental, physical, and emotional--which

\textsuperscript{142} Oliver, \textit{Persuasive Speaking}, op. cit., p. 10.
\textsuperscript{143} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 3, 4.
distinguish one man from another. "Personal­ity" is what others see or feel of what a man is. The character of an "able person" is the sum total of the attributes of his mind, body, and spirit. Personality is the sum of those attributes that other men see or feel.\textsuperscript{144}

The relation of ethos and character. There are varying views on the subject of character. Among those expressing them are Oliver\textsuperscript{145} and Thorpe.\textsuperscript{146} However, these many descriptions of character only are the result of varying characteristics of individuals, and the fact that an attempt is made to sum them up by the use of one term. The importance of all this is certainly indicated by Monroe.

People do not listen merely to a speech, but to a person speaking; and they are influenced quite as much by their confidence in the speaker as by what he says. . . . He influences his listeners by his own character -- by what classical writers used to call "ethical persuasion."\textsuperscript{147}

\textsuperscript{144}Sarett, Foster, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 27.


The basic dichotomy of the present study is revealed here once more. The modern dictator, such as Hitler, has the advantage of a carefully controlled machine which submits to the people a desirable image. However, in the following pages the opinions and reactions will be studied of those who knew Hitler as only few people could have known him. Brembeck and Howell clearly state the importance of this concern with the man as he really was.

The most stable and powerful ethos enjoyed by a speaker is that in the minds of his close associates. Here we have the closest relationship between goodness and persuasive effectiveness, for the people we live with come to know us as we are, and we would expect trusted personal acquaintances to be successful in persuading each other.\(^{148}\)

Sarett and Foster sum up the writer's contention when they state that a "speaker may be an able person and yet not a good man in the popular sense."\(^{149}\)


\(^{149}\)Sarett, Foster, *op. cit.*, p. 30.
III. The Personality of the Fuehrer

Introduction. Hitler's personality was overpowering in the truest sense of the word. General Jodl testified during the Nuremberg Trial proceedings:

Hitler's knowledge and his intellect, his rhetoric and his will power triumphed in the end in every spiritual conflict and over every adversary.\textsuperscript{150}

One word in this statement seems of major importance: "spiritual" conflict. Logic and reason played a very small part in the effect Hitler had on others. Roberts put it this way:

His triumph was that of emotion and instinct over reason; he represented a great upsurge of the subconscious of the German people.\textsuperscript{151}

It is, therefore, just as important to know what he did, how he impressed people physically, how he reacted intellectually and morally to existing situations, as it is to study what he said. Hitler assured the success of the entire National Socialist movement. His speeches were Hitler-centered because of the importance of his person, not because of what he said. The reaction of the people was Hitler-centered, not so much because of the ideas he had proclaimed, but because of who had proclaimed them.

\textsuperscript{150}Nuremberg Trial Proceeding, Part XIII, pp. 243, 244.

\textsuperscript{151}Roberts, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 37.
Ludecke probably spoke for the millions who stood before him and responded to this man.

His words were like a scourge, I felt ready to spring on any enemy . . . The intense will of the man, the passion of his sincerity, seemed to flow from him into me . . . I had given him my soul.\(^\text{152}\)

National Socialism thus was a movement of an almost religious nature. The references to faith, soul, God, and similar religious symbols will abound as this study is developed. Jarman said of Hitler's messages that they contained political ideas which bore the stamp of his personality, "... they are feelings rather than thought."\(^\text{153}\)

Three people who have written books concerning this man have had sustained and personal contact with him. These three were his secretary, his press chief, and his interpreter. For this reason, their works are quoted extensively.

The Fuehrer could have spoken on any subject he chose and could still have produced the same impressions of himself and his cause. As Roberts put it, "He was the greatest popular orator during a time of political chaos


\(^{153}\)Jarman, op. cit., p. 110.
and national depression..." Ludwig declared that Hitler talked himself into power. A German critic of the day provided an explanation of the Nazi approach to the same question. "With Hitler begins a new chapter in the history of eloquence."

The writer is an example of the fact that the German people knew little about the background of their Fuehrer. Though he was a leader in one of the Nazi organizations, only carefully selected information about Hitler's background was filtered to him.

After a lost war, the lowly soldier, Hitler, helped Germans gain new confidence and pride in a strong Armed Service. Motherhood was elevated in the thinking of the German masses, if only by the "production" of babies. He gave a feeling of accomplishment to the worker and farmer.

... Hitler was one of them (the people). His instincts were theirs, and the surety with which he could gauge those instincts... swept him into power.157

---

154 Roberts, op. cit., p. 23.
155 Ludwig, op. cit., p. 477.
156 Karl Kindt, Der Fuehrer als Redner (Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1934), p. 16 (Translation by this author). See Appendix IV, No. 1.
A revolution took place in Germany. It is significant that Kindt would not primarily think of ideas or logic, but would state: "This word is the most revolutionary power of the young German revolution." Kindt indeed thought of the German leader as being born forward by his "Hot Heart" having the power of a Cicero.

How strong this religious, emotional appeal of the man must have been becomes clear to the student of "Mein Kampf" and the stenographic records of conversations which party chief Martin Borman had kept during 1941. In reading both works, the critic had to draw the following conclusions:

1. A critical or logical analysis of Hitler's statements provided no basis for considering him the influential leader described above.

2. Hitler's ability to dismiss from his consciousness all factors not fitting his beliefs was outstanding.

3. The strange "scientific" concepts which he seemed to have collected from every crackpot theory in existence abounded.

4. The use of poor German, and at times of the language of the gutter, in everyday conversations around the dinner table was a very noticeable feature.

5. After reading approximately half the conversations recorded in one of the books, the writer predicted further statements by the Fuehrer.

158 Kindt, op. cit., p. 7 (Translation by this author). See Appendix IV, No. 2.
A. Physical Factors

Introduction. The following pages are an attempt to give an impression of the Fuehrer's physical appearance. Much of what Hitler had to say dealt with the supremacy of the German race. In the mind of the writer, there developed a definite image of the typical German. He was tall, blond, had blue eyes, and a well-proportioned body. This image was furthered by the constant use of pictures of such people in all propaganda efforts. Yet two authors gave an impression of Hitler's physical appearance to which the writer can attest from personal meetings. These impressions, furthermore, are supported by a series of fragmentary newsfilms the writer viewed in the University of California at Los Angeles historical film library. The Fuehrer's interpreter, Dr. Schmidt, described his first impressions of him in these words:

I noticed his coarse nose and undistinguished mouth with its little moustache. Sometimes his eyes blazed suddenly and then equally suddenly became dull as if in a fit of absentmindedness.159 Schmidt was surprised on first meeting him to notice how small a person he really was. Heiden went even further in
describing the impression the powerful leader of Germany made when one considered his physical features.

His exterior was without distinguishing mark, his face without radiance; there was nothing unusual in his bearing. He was one of those men without qualities, normal and colorless to the point of invisibility.\(^{160}\)

A number of political jokes circulated during the war in Germany found their meaning in the fact that Hitler could disappear in large crowds of people without ever being noticed. Roberts, in describing his appearance more positively, said that he was not German looking at all, but rather represented the Alpine type.\(^{161}\) Impressions which the average German never did receive were those of Hitler after an attempt on his life late during World War II, and during the last days of his life. There seems nothing more incongruous than the appearance of the man described in the following quotations as compared with the influence of his power over the entire world.

Slowly, heavily, stooping, he takes a few shuffling steps in my direction. He extends his right hand and looks at me with a strangely penetrating look. His handshake is weak and soft . . . His face and the parts

\(^{160}\)Heiden, op. cit., p. 34.

\(^{161}\)Roberts, op. cit., p. 52.
around his eyes give the impression of total exhaustion. All his movements are as those of a senile man. 162

The same writer met him again in April, 1945, shortly before his death, and he reported his impressions in the following words: "Now not only his body, but also his brain shows more and more traces of complete disintegration . . . He became hesitant and undecided." 163 To an undistinguished background, lacking education, and unsuccessful years of work, the student must add an unimpressive appearance and bearing. These were not the features which made Adolf Hitler an outstanding popular speaker. It was, indeed, something psychological.

When speaking of those things which were of concern to him, his physical appearance would become of much less importance. His reactions would tend to transform him, as Schmidt reported.

When he spoke about a matter of special importance, his face became very expressive; his nostrils quivered as he described the dangers of Bolshevism for Europe. He emphasized his words with jerky, energetic gestures of the right hand, sometimes clenching his fist. 164

163 Ibid., p. 37.
164 Schmidt, op. cit., pp. 17, 18.
Health and physical fitness. He was not a physically strong or well man, in spite of constant propaganda dealing with physical fitness. His secretary, who had a most consistent and close contact with Hitler, gave interesting information concerning his general health.

During the first few years Hitler had just one physician, Dr. Karl Brandt. Later two surgeons were added: Dr. Von Hasselback and Professor Werner Haase. During the war years, he was operated on for the removal of a growth in the general region of his larnyx. For some time it was thought he had cancer; however, the growth turned out to be not malignant.

Stomach and intestinal troubles seem to have been Hitler's most constant problems. His emotional outbursts did not help with the severe attacks of stomach cramps he was reported to have had. He did not like sports, he did not like horses, he hated snow, sunshine made him sick, and he did not like water. In other words, much-needed physical exercise never was a part of Hitler's life. In 1944 he was struck by an attack of yellow jaundice, and with this attack a man established himself in Hitler's

165 Albert Zoller, Hitler Privat (Duesseldorf: Droste Verlag, 1949), p. 61. All translations from Zoller by this author.
life who served him until the end: Dr. Morrell.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 70-71.} At all
times the German leader was very much aware of his physical
weaknesses and strove to be master of his body. He hated
the shaking of his left hand, which appeared very early in
his career and which he attempted to control under all cir-
cumstances.\footnote{Ibid., p. 33.}

He trusted his physicians as little as anyone else.
New medications and drugs had to be described to him; their
effects had to be minutely discussed before he would permit
them to be used. Yet, according to his secretary, he was
sure that he would reach a very old age.\footnote{Ibid., p. 69.}

\textbf{Physical habits.} Most consistent were his habits
of eating, but only in one respect: he never ate meat,
and special vegetable dishes had to be fixed for him by
special cooks. This was probably the result of his poor
health and delicate stomach.\footnote{Otto Dietrich, Hitler (Chicago: Henry Regnery
Company, 1955), p. 204.} Because it became a def-
inite part of his total personality makeup, one should
also mention that Hitler habitually never smoked or drank
alcoholic beverages. An occasional glass of champagne on New Year's Eve was the extent of his drinking. Herb-tea was the only kind of beverage he drank at his long tea parties. His eating habits are important from another standpoint, also. Mealtime was the opportunity for him to carry on his monologues which lasted often for many hours.

After a meal and a long talk, he would often take a cat nap while his entourage quietly talked on. At night he would get very little sleep, often working the night through. During the period of final physical deterioration, the Fuhrer's earlier delight in cake and cream puffs turned into a mania for cake and cocoa. He also seemed to have a strong aversion to having close physical contact with anyone. Not even his valet ever saw him partially unclothed.

Summary. His physical appearance was thus unimpressive, and his general health and habits were poor. Hitler, nevertheless, seemed to gain strength from any

\[170\] Ibid., p. 147. See also: Zoller, op. cit., pp. 48, 49.
\[171\] Zoller, op. cit., p. 150.
\[172\] Ibid., p. 75.
kind of political public display. Roberts mentioned his amazement at seeing Hitler during a parade one Sunday afternoon in 1933 when the endless columns of organizations passed him. No one else could stand up as long as he did. This effort was followed by travel and lengthy speeches almost without any rest whatsoever. \(^{173}\) It would seem evident that nervous or emotional power was back of his feats of physical endurance. The results were sleepless nights and stomach trouble which in a vicious circle resulted in more nervous and emotional reactions.

His effect and effectiveness were centered around his role as a speaker, and Hitler's voice was a factor often mentioned by writers of the day. To many who may not have heard him in actual speaking situations, his voice was harsh and somewhat unpleasant. Heiden, however, gave a more complete indication of its effectiveness.

His voice was the epitome of power, firmness, command, and will. Even when calm, it was a guttural thunder; when agitated, it howled like a siren betokening inexorable danger. It was the roar of inanimate nature, yet accompanied by flexible human overtones of friendliness, rage, or scorn. \(^{174}\)

His voice became the carrier of the message of his enthusiasm. It also indicated his awareness of the power

\(^{173}\) Roberts, *op. cit.*, p. 140.

\(^{174}\) Heiden, *op. cit.*, p. 34.
he had gained in controlling men through speech.

B. General Reputation

Hitler's record as a brave soldier has been discussed. What little we know about his earlier life indicates a man who was accepted, tolerated, but who was hardly able to build up a reputation. As an artist he had failed. Work records could not be discovered, thus making it difficult to find any facts indicating what kind of a reputation he had in that area. It would seem that his speaking ability, his fervor and "sincerity" were the only factors which carried conviction. One man, Otto Dietrich, who worked closely with him as his press chief, can at least give a personal evaluation of Hitler in retrospect. He spoke of him as a "winning roulette player who cannot stop while winning." Heiden, as did so many others, spoke of another important fact of Hitler's total personality which must be recorded. Heiden stated:

Hitler never wearied of studying his own experiences and the world about him to discover the secrets and conditions of this world. He did not have a plan and act accordingly; he acted, and out of these actions a plan arose.176

175 Dietrich, op. cit., pp. 43, 44.
176 Heiden, op. cit., p. 141.
Referring to his own statements in "Mein Kampf" (pp. 527, 530 ff.), Kindt also pointed out that Hitler was concerned with watching his audience and had to know mass psychology.

He made a very deep impression upon many people. On his walks he would often find thousands lining the area around his house, the Berghof. When he went for drives, thousands of people would come to be close to him. On these occasions he very often did not even have substantial guard units protecting him. Scenes abounded which described occasions when enthusiastic crowds almost mobbed him.

It must be considered part of Hitler's reputation to consider the large number of foreign visitors who came to him during the early days of his rule, before World War II. Reactions to him were generally favorable. Again, it is typical that these reactions were built on an evaluation of a personal contact with Hitler, rather than on other reasons. Only one of many who were impressed with the German leader was former British Prime Minister Lloyd George, who visited him in September, 1936. He was reported to have greeted his daughter on his return with

---

177Dietrich, op. cit., p. 189.
the Nazi salute, referring to Hitler as a "great man." The same author also recorded the fact that once visitors were out of his immediate presence, their opinions of Germany and its leader would change drastically.

C. Psychological Factors

Introduction. Hitler's intellectual habits, temperament, and moral traits will be considered here. Dietrich, who dealt with him often and closely, summed up most of what the others had to say: "In mind and soul Hitler was a hybrid creature--double faced." He finished his statement with references to Hitler's intellect with which he was impressed. Dietrich indicated that the Fuehrer had an eye for essentials, that he had an astonishing memory, remarkable imagination, and bold decisiveness.

One should compare this with a statement made by Heiden, who called him a man who was selected only because of the strange happenings of the period after World War I.

A human nothing, a gray personality even among soldiers; modest and for that reason

---

178 Schmidt, op. cit., p. 57.
179 Ibid., p. 37.
180 Dietrich, op. cit., p. 11.
inconspicuous as a superior has characterized him, not even German, but a homeless derelict from the Viennese melting pot.\textsuperscript{181}

Just as Adolf Hitler seemed to be classified psychologically, Heiden stated that he nevertheless had the basic contradictions of "all men of genius, such lack of distinction, such superhuman strength."\textsuperscript{182}

\textbf{Hitler's temperament.} The Fuehrer's secretary mentioned the strong suggestive powers of his personality.\textsuperscript{183} This again indicated the powerful influence centered around the one man. Probably his ability to make people feel that he had a personal interest in them had much to do with this. Reference was made to Hitler's Austrian personality. To any German this is a meaningful reference, since he thinks of his Austrian cousin as a man who walks around bending low from the waist, saying, "I kiss your hand." The softer and somewhat less distinct Austrian German seems to lend himself to this kind of charming, good-natured dealings with others. To give an example, the writer can remember how a column of Air Force cadets to which he belonged nearly broke up laughing when

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{181}Heiden, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 33.
\item \textsuperscript{182}Ibid., p. 35.
\item \textsuperscript{183}Zoller, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 27.
\end{itemize}
an Austrian sergeant attempted to bark out the standard German drill orders. Hitler had a very definite Austrian party personality, which contrasted with the impressions he gave on other occasions. Situations in which he could not feel secure were avoided by the German leader. Late in the war Hitler became concerned over the bomb damage in German cities, and when he finally returned to Berlin, he showed some signs of concern over the possibility of being harmed by bombs himself. He refused to visit the bombed cities and sent Goebbels or others to take his place. His old fear of being laughed at, of being found in a ridiculous situation, probably kept him from making these visits. His secretary indicated that he was very much aware of reactions by the public to his person and behavior, at least if it would have influenced his position or dignity. General Jodl testified during the Nuremberg trials:

The Fuehrer's H.Q. was a mixture of cloister and concentration camp . . . Apart from reports on the situation, very little news from the outer world penetrated into his holy of holies.

---

184 Ibid., pp. 28, 29.
185 Zoller, op. cit., p. 127.
186 Nuremberg Trial Proceedings, part XVI.
It was even suggested that the actions of the populace once kept the Fuehrer from going to war. Schmidt stated that the lacking enthusiasm of the citizens of Berlin towards an armored column of soldiers parading in front of the Chancellory may have caused Hitler to write Chamberlain a more conciliatory letter. He was willing to roll with the punches to have his way.\textsuperscript{187}

It is typical of his total psychological make-up that eventually he buried himself deeper and deeper in the negativistic teachings of Schopenhauer, while refusing to listen to his advisers. Earlier attempts at suicide and his death by suicide showed that he did not consider life to be worth living.\textsuperscript{188} Hitler reacted emotionally to everything with which he came in contact. Roberts speaks of him as a man who felt things so deeply that he frequently wept.\textsuperscript{189} His speeches represented his psychological make-up to Roberts because of their curiously rambling format, their abrupt endings.\textsuperscript{190}

\textsuperscript{187} Schmidt, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 109.
\textsuperscript{188} Zoller, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 17.
\textsuperscript{189} Roberts, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 17.
\textsuperscript{190} Ibid., p. 15.
Hitler's intellectual habits. Even his intellectual and work habits indicated this same lack of organization, clarity, and planning. He began his career by coming to his office every morning at 10:00 A.M., but this soon ceased. In general, his work pattern can be described in these words, "He was often incapable of coming to a decision." This is important because people were impressed with his lightning decisions which so often proved to be correct—at least as far as they could see. These decisions at times were made on the toss of a coin during his earlier campaigning and travel days. Few Germans ever knew of the fact that the man who had brought a new order to Germany actually found it quite difficult to bring order into his own life. No doubt his emotional nature and behavior were the main causes. Hitler always had trouble in his position as "Fuehrer" to distinguish between public and private life. He began to live his part as leader so much that it was impossible for him to separate his official functions in any way from the rest of his life. While there had been at first an ordered plan for every day, his co-workers and associates soon had to be ready to work with him, or at least listen to him at

\[191\text{Wilmot, op. cit., p. 164.}\]
all hours of the day or night. Important dictation was often reserved for night hours.\(^{192}\)

**Hitler's personality in action.** The many difficulties Hitler had after the war—with his superiors, with officers, and others of the "ruling" German classes, are a matter of record.\(^{193}\) He finally learned to "get along with them" by completely subjecting them to his will. However, he did not limit these actions to German nationals. Since he was not only the "Fuehrer" of the German people, but an international figure, one should also consider his attitude towards, and the dealings with, other nations and their representatives.

A few brief glances into the meetings with leading officials of foreign governments serve as an illustration of his total intellectual and emotional approach as he "represented" Germany.

On September 14, 1938, Chamberlain's famous telegram was sent to Hitler:

> Having regard to the increasingly critical situation, I propose to visit you immediately in order to make an attempt to find a peaceful solution. I could come to you by air and I am

\(^{192}\)Zoller, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

\(^{193}\)Goerlitz, *op. cit.*, p. 145.
ready to leave tomorrow. Please inform me of the earliest time you can receive me and tell me the place of meeting. I should be grateful for a very early reply. Neville Chamberlain.

The first talks about the Sudeten problem between these two men were private. The Fuehrer made it quite clear during those talks that he was not to blame: "Force!... Who speaks of force? Herr Benes mobilized in May, not I." Whereupon Chamberlain became excited and raised the question of why Hitler had let him come if he had already made up his mind. Hitler spoke of "self-determination of the people" and thus he calmed Chamberlain, who believed that all people should have this right.

When the possibility of war with Poland arose, Italy's Foreign Minister Count Ciano was told: "I am unshakably convinced that neither England nor France will embark upon a general war." Chamberlain again tried warning Hitler, who only deemed it necessary to reply:

I have therefore to inform Your Excellency, that if the military measures announced (by England) are carried out, I shall immediately order the mobilization of the German Wehrmacht.

Hitler no longer argued or talked; he now was ready to threaten. He wanted no one to "encourage" Poland. When the Foreign Ministers of England and France, Henderson and Coulondre, visited him, they only heard him raging against
the Poles. He said that he might regret the necessity of war, but he had to "protect German interests." The pattern was clear once more: The German leader was not at fault, action was being "forced" upon him. When Mussolini categorically stated Italy was not ready for war, the order to attack Poland had to be delayed. "The Italians are behaving just as they did in 1914," was Hitler's reaction. He spoke in Danzig later that year and Schmidt heard, for the first time, one of his speeches in its completeness. Hitler was "triumphant and uncompromising."194

In these dealings of international importance, Hitler's total psychological make-up seems revealed. Although his future activities had already been determined, he went through an entire series of excuses to justify them.

Hitler's "new" morality. All this was possible because he acted on the basis of a morality quite foreign to others. Again he "felt" what was right and gave these feelings words. Existing borders, beliefs, nations, and nationalities represented no problem to Hitler. With a

194 For the complete record of these events, see Schmidt, op. cit., pp. 90-163.
few bold words, he did away with them: "It is not impos-
sible that we have solved the problem of nationalities
under an even two hundred-year leadership." 195 To have
argued "right and wrong" with a man of these convictions
would have been less than futile; one would not even have
had a basis from which to argue.

Another author looked at the situation somewhat
differently. Frederick L. Schuman gave this explanation
for Hitler's success in working with others:

Hitler was always more or less sincere in
his promises, not in the sense of saying what
he believed, but in the sense of believing--
at the time--what he said. Later he would say
other things and believe them too, for he was
ever self-hypnotized by his own oratory. 196

Dietrich summarized the Fuehrer's use of the spoken word
in this way: "The essence of it (Hitler's method) was to
get the people into his grip by cunningly planting false
premises into their minds." 197 On these facts he then
built all his arguments. He always sounded "as if he
were speaking under inspiration from on high." 198

195 Henry Picker, Hitler's Tischgespräche (Bonn:
Athenaum Verlag, 1951), p. 47. Translations by this
author. See Appendix IV, No. 3.

196 Schuman, op. cit., p. 144.

197 Dietrich, op. cit., p. 126.

198 Ibid., p. 127.
Dietrich calls these speeches an "embodiment of Hitler."\textsuperscript{199} This is a highly significant statement in the light of information included in this chapter.

Again a religious term appeared: "inspiration" from on high. Once more the student of Hitler finds himself faced not with a logical reason for the impressions others had of Hitler, but with an emotional one.

Hitler showed the frustrated spirit of a simple man thrust out into a world where he had to follow in the footsteps of the giants who had lived and ruled before him. Only one who knows European history knows, for instance, of the obsession of European rulers to be remembered by posterity by the buildings and art treasures they left. These values, the "cultural values" of life, are of great importance to all Europeans. They are supposed to be the measuring rod one must apply to determine the true worth of a man. No wonder Hitler was so concerned with art and culture. Yet he resented the influence of anyone over his decisions.

A man of real political ability will refuse to be beadle for a bevy of footling cacklers; and they in turn, being the representatives of the majority . . . which means the dunderheaded multitudes hate nothing so much as a superior

\textsuperscript{199}Ibid., p. 141.
brain . . . just as 100 blockheads do not equal one man of wisdom, so 100 poltroons are incapable of any political line of action that requires moral strength and fortitude. 200

One could not ask for a clearer statement of the German leader's relationship to his fellow citizens. It was only a step from this concept to the one expressed in a speech: "We have to fight with ideas, but if necessary, also with our fists." 201

But in case of any revolution, he would have automatically shot all opposition leaders, all leading men of political parties, all people in concentration camps, and all criminal elements, whether free or in prison. Since German idealists were dying daily at the front, such a mass murder was to him morally more than justifiable. "One loses a war in the interior if one didn't take such decisive, quick, and brutal steps." 202 Thus, Hitler complained that often "The moral ethos, the idealism, disappears in an expedient idealism in which the border between

200 Adolf Hitler, Mein Kampf (2vols. in one; unpurgated English version translated by Hames Murphy, Hurst and Blackett, 1929), pp. 80, 81.


202 Picker, op. cit., p. 243. See Appendix IV, No. 4, for German text. Translations by this author.
idealism and egoism dissolves," forcing extraordinary action on such "traitors." One who approaches these doctrines with any other concepts than those the Fuehrer developed can only stand by in amazement. His reasoning is so unbelievably far removed from the morals of his time that it is difficult to believe. It was even possible for him to declare that his own nation could disappear for all he cared if it could not dedicate itself to self-preservation—as he saw it.

A final statement by Dietrich indicated how important speaking success was to Hitler. It represented his major influence over others. "Any criticism of his speeches, of which he was especially proud, was painful to his vanity." 204

Conclusions. Much of what has been said up to this point centered around Hitler and emotions. Roberts, who made a detailed study of the German leader's life, summed it up by stating, "Ten years earlier or ten years later Hitler would probably have remained in obscurity." 205 Catapulted into the foreground by events over which he

---

203 Ibid., p. 204. See Appendix IV, No. 5, for German text. Translations by this author.

204 Dietrich, op. cit., p. 142.

had little or no control, he was unprepared by his life and emotional background to handle the situation in any way but from the speaker's platform. One can think of him as Roberts does, as a dreamy little man who became big. He had a fiery "soul" and lived against the grandeur of a romantic frescoe which he had built like an enlargement of a Wagnerian backdrop. He was a romantic without education and the balance of philosophy, lacking in mental stature. 206

The artistic proof of rhetoric provided Hitler with the means of persuasion. Aristotle described these proofs as "those that may be furnished by the method of Rhetoric through one's own efforts." 207

206 Ibid., pp. 8-11.
207 Cooper, Aristotle's Rhetoric, op. cit., pp. 1, 2, 1355.
CHAPTER IV

ETHOS: THE PUBLIC IMAGE OF HITLER

I. Introduction

The discussion of Hitler's background, his personality, and his experiences in the preceding chapters which is so important to ethos is based on information now readily available to nearly anyone in the world. However, during his rule very few of these facts were known to the German people.

A review. The next step within the framework of the present study is to determine the ethical image people believed they saw. To summarize the difficult task of the National Socialist German Worker's Party, the following points should be remembered from preceding chapters.

1. The leader of the party, Adolf Hitler, was in the beginning a relatively unknown man who had never played a part in Germany's political life.208

2. Hitler for several years did not even possess German citizenship and had to fear deportation from the country which he had chosen as his new home.\textsuperscript{209}

3. His personality and his background were at best colorless and at worst repugnant.\textsuperscript{210}

4. The party had little or no money to carry out an extensive political campaign. While this was later remedied, it remained an important consideration for several years.\textsuperscript{211}

The present chapter. From these facts, certain basic questions can be developed which this chapter will attempt to answer.

1. How did the party and Hitler succeed in creating a positive and flattering ethical image of both the organization and its leader?

2. The major instrument available to a financially bankrupt party is the political speech. How successfully was it used in accomplishing this end?


\textsuperscript{211}Wheeler-Bennett, op. cit., pp. 383-384.
The present chapter, therefore, deals with the carefully developed factors resulting in Hitler's ethos, while a later chapter will evaluate his ethos on the narrower basis of the speaker-audience relationship.

An introductory appraisal of Hitler's task. Hitler seemed to be aware of the job of salesmanship which needed to be done. He stated on February 1, 1933, when power was within his reach, "May Almighty God take our work under his grace. . . . We don't want to fight for ourselves, but for Germany."212 On March 21, 1933, after he had been selected as Germany's chancellor, he made quite clear his desire to be accepted when in hard, clipped words he replied to President von Hindenburg in the Gedaechtniskirche in Potsdam:

On the fifth of March the nation decided and in its majority declared itself for us . . . restored the national honor in a few weeks, and thanks to your understanding, Mr. President, there was brought about the marriage of the symbols of the old greatness, and the young strength.213

212Heinz Garber and Hans Guenther Smarzlik, editors, Das Dritte Reich in Dokumenten (Freiburg: Christophorus Verlag Herder) Recordings. From a German language recording of a speech given on February 1, 1933, in Berlin. For original German text see Appendix IV, No. 6. Translations by this author.

213Ibid. From a German language recording of a speech given on March 21, 1933, in Potsdam. For original German text see Appendix IV, No. 7. Translations by this author.
To provide the cause and to give Germans a means and a need for unification was the major purpose of the image-builder, Hitler, who had to detract attention from his own background and to call attention to the future of Germany as he saw it. "The world persecutes us," he stated. "We wish peace; it turns against us; it does not want to recognize our right to life . . . thus we must become even more of a united force."\(^{214}\)

The basis for a study of ethos. To show how this image of the man whom Germany's millions saw in the speaker's stand again and again and heard over the nation's radio so often was transmitted is the purpose of this chapter.

Hitler, the speaker, indicated by his actions a great awareness of something which Charles Sears Baldwin summed up in these words:

The only art of composition that concerns the mass of mankind and is, therefore, universal in both educational practice and critical theory, is the art of effective communication by speaking and writing.\(^{215}\)

To the writer, mass control by means of oral and written communication indicated persuasion, and thus the

\(^{214}\)Ibid. From a German language recording of a speech given May 1, 1933, in Berlin. For original German text see Appendix IV, No. 8. Translations by this author.

\(^{215}\)Baldwin, op. cit., p. 6.
the study of all available means of persuasion. Rhetoric must serve this critical function which Baldwin summed up in accordance with the rules advocated by Aristotle:

> It (rhetoric) is the art of persuasion formulated by investigating the methods of successful address; and its object is to promote a habit of discerning what in any given case is essentially persuasive. . . . Thus rhetoric serves as a general public means: (1) of maintaining truth and justice against falsehood and wrong, (2) of advancing public discussion where absolute proof is impossible, (3) cultivating the habit of seeing both sides and exposing sophistries and fallacies, and (4) of self defense. 216

By its very nature, rhetoric is a critical method of evaluation. It tells us what a speaker should be, do, and say. While some of its methods can help a speaker to become effective, in the understanding of the rhetorician he will be little more than a sophist unless a definite consideration for ethical concepts backs up his words. As Thonnsen and Baird stated: "An effective address should bring out the moral and intellectual character of the speaker." 217 In the case of Hitler, we found a man who neither studied the methods of rhetoric, nor was he concerned with ethical concepts, but who will be shown to have succeeded in orally transmitting this powerful,

---

216 Ibid., p. 7.

217 Thonnsen and Baird, op. cit., p. 460.
ethical image. Ethos thus becomes, in the strongest sense of the term, the persuasion of the man.

II. Creation of a Positive Image through Ethical Persuasion

An attempt will be made to discover the factors which contributed to ethos in the case of Adolf Hitler. Subject matter, or extrinsic matters, and the intrinsic facts of the case, or techniques of making facts impressive, will be included on the basis of previous statements.

Critical evaluations of Hitler varied. Some claimed to have seen in him a scoundrel and a political vagabond, while others considered him a savior and a great leader. Because many lacked the information previously discussed,

\[218\] The latter idea was expressed as being widely noticeable among German audiences by AP correspondent, Louis P. Lochner, who covered most of Hitler's public appearances and has written widely on the subject in a personal letter to the writer dated June 4, 1960. For the original of this letter, see Appendix III. Translations by this author.

The former position is represented, among others, by Dr. Wanda V. Bayer, who, in a personal letter to the writer, explained the position taken by her in the work, "Hitler's Effect as a Speaker," that Hitler's rhetoric was extremely poor and that he stooped to psychological trickery. See Appendix III for this letter. Translations by this author.
Hitler's words in most cases persuaded the people of his time to form such opinions. The writer has had opportunity to converse with and write to many people who knew Hitler. In no case did he find an individual who had

219 Former associate of Hitler and former president of the German Reichsbank, Count Schwerin von Krosigk, stated this idea clearly in a letter to the writer dated August 11, 1960. See Appendix III. Translations by this author.

220 While searching for authentic sources in the United States by contacting the following collections and organizations, among others: The Hoover Library in Palo Alto, California; the University of Southern California; the University of California at Los Angeles; the Library of Congress; the various radio and television networks in the United States (NBC, CBS, and ABC), and the National Wire Services, a constant attempt was made to verify sources and to check with experts in the Federal Republic of Germany.

Most helpful, besides individuals already mentioned, were: Dr. Hans Buchheim and Dr. Anton Hock, of the Institute fuer Zeitgeschichte in Muenchen, which maintains one of the largest collections of historical data dealing with Hitler and his times in the world, and who helped in making contacts with individuals who supplied first-hand information concerning Hitler.

Also helpful in determining the accuracy of certain sources, were contacts made with various offices of the German government in the Bundesrepublik, the universities of Bonn, Berlin, Frankfurt, and Freiburg.

The West German radio stations in Cologne, Munich, Frankfurt, and Hamburg, helped in securing information concerning recordings of Hitler's speeches, as did the British Broadcasting Corporation in London. Further contacts with important individuals were made through the German wire-services and a number of German newspapers such as the "Frankfurter Rundschau," and the DPA (Deutsche
no comment, no opinion, or who had formed no attitudes concerning him. This alone would indicate the influence of the man. But the fact cannot be overstressed that in speaking of Hitler one deals with an "image," not with the factual information discussed in the preceding chapters. It will be shown that this image was developed in every possible way. Money bore the imprint of his

Presse Agentur, Hamburg).

Dr. Heinz Garber, co-editor of a recorded series of Hitler's speeches helped as a resource person in establishing authenticity and accuracy of recorded portions of Hitler's speeches. Dr. Raymond Fielding, of the University of California at Los Angeles, helped in the selection of and viewing of authentic film documents used in the study of Hitler as a speaker.

While this is merely a limited record of sources which were consulted and used, it indicates the four-pronged approach applied to the present study of Hitler, which made use of recorded, written, and visual materials, as well as personal experiences.

Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, former president of the Reichsbank under Hitler, took this position in a personal letter to the writer dated August 2, 1960, when he indicated that political conditions, party organization, and many other factors contributed to his success, rather than any knowledge the people may have had of him. See Appendix III for this letter. Translations by this author.

Letters by Lochner, Schacht, Schwerin von Krosigk, and Franz von Papen, former Chancellor of Germany, indicated this fact. See Appendix III. Translations by this author.
face, stamps showed him in various poses, and in most homes pictures, statues, and busts of him could be found. 223

Subject matter

Introduction. Aristotle stated that persuasion results "... when the delivery of the speech is such as to produce an impression of the speaker's credibility ..."224 In the case of a dictator like Hitler, however, it must be argued that the listeners and observers had been "worked upon" by the state-owned propaganda machine to such an extent that Cicero's broader view of influential factors seems more reasonable: "The morals, principles, conduct, and lives of those who plead causes, and of those for whom they plead, such as to merit esteem ..."225 Cicero named a person's dignity, his actions, and his character of life among the impressions persuading listeners. Thonnsen and Baird agree with this approach, since they stated:

It (the attitude of Aristotle) is, however, an artificial restriction, since the attitude of the audience toward the speaker--based upon


previous knowledge of the latter's activities and reputation—cannot accurately be separated from the reaction the speaker induces through the medium of speech.226

**Hitler's ethos.** Aristotle mentioned the following primary sources contributing to the ethical appeal of a speaker in any given speech: sagacity, high character, and good will.227 The Fuehrer used these means of building an image which he considered to be effective.

Some of the ways in which Hitler provided the image of **sagacity** will be considered first.

Absolute certainty of the fact that he had traveled the right course marked the Fuehrer's speeches. This was done in an attempt to provide people with a specific sense of security and safety and trust in his judgment. He said, for instance:

> Why should I change it (the party program)? It's history . . . If anything changes, it is life which undergoes modification. National socialism is not a medical weekly or a military weekly which constantly has to represent the newest state of knowledge.228

---


228 Picker, *op. cit.*, p. 149. For original German see Appendix IV, No. 9. Translations by this author.
Throughout his speaking career as the leader of the German people, Hitler furthered this feeling. For example, he used a special kind of logic to establish the righteousness and wisdom of his cause, by referring to its early success, and the failure of other systems.

(Because) Fate is very lenient and mild, and lets only that break down which is entirely rotten. If only one single strong sprout shows itself, fate would let it live. . . . One should not have pity for the people for whom fate has decreed that they should be annihilated.229

His followers, thus, were made to feel secure in their belief in Hitler's mission.

He furthermore explained his "call" in the following words, which established his high character:

I act according to what I realize and understand. . . . I am here because of a higher power, if I am necessary for something. . . . Only to him life is given who fights for it most forcefully. The law of life is: Defend yourself. . . .230

Hitler was convinced of divine guidance and thus provided his people with the image of a man who had truly the most supreme authority on his side.

The success of these methods is surprising when one remembers that his publicly expressed, lofty ideas did

229 Ibid., pp. 226-227. For original German see Appendix IV, No. 10. Translations by this author.
230 Ibid., p. 353. For original German see Appendix IV, No. 11. Translations by this author.
not prevent him from going against the basic morality deeply instilled in many Germans of the day. He thought that only such races as could positively contribute to the German race could be made "German" in several generations. Hitler, for instance, went so far as to send S.S. elite units into certain areas for purposes of controlled breeding. When he was attacked because many felt it would lower German morality, he said it would only influence the "untruthful morality of the upper 10,000." However, he carefully avoided such statements in public.

Since he assumed divine approval, Hitler believed he partook of the divine right to judge right and wrong. To his people he thus talked of himself as a merciless but just leader who only had their best interests at heart. Shouts of approval would follow the declaration of such concern for the decent people—meaning, of course, those who did as they were told.

Whoever turns against this society as such I shoot without mercy. The society which I am building is not subject to the broad masses. The others can bat against granite there. Every attempt to shake this state by force will be drowned in blood. But all that can be done to further the decent people, will be done from the standpoint of a high responsibility towards the entire body of the nation.\footnote{232}

\footnote{231}Ebenstein, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 105.

\footnote{232}Picker, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 201-202. For original German see Appendix IV, No. 12. Translations by this author.
Both high character and good will were established by such statements.

Having exalted himself, it became accepted that any one opposing Hitler, the man destined by God to rule Germany, had to be a scoundrel whom one could "trick" and defeat in any way possible. An image of a twisted kind of cleverness and good will was apparent.

In creating good will, Hitler was faced with the difficulty of being a man of the people while having to further the image of the strong individual, the man who stood alone. He seemed to think of himself as the lonely man on a high pinnacle who nevertheless needed and wanted love and concern from his people. The following statement is a strong plea for good will.

Against my will I became a politician. Politics is only a means to an end for me. There are people who believe it will be difficult for me to be no longer active as I am now. No! That will be the most beautiful day of my life when I leave politics. . . . Wars come and go. What remains are alone the values of culture. Therefore, my love of art. Music, architecture, are these not forces which show the way to coming humanity? When I hear Wagner, I feel as if these are rhythms of antiquity. 233

Fervor, interest, love for his people and his work, were positive images which he used to create good will and

---

233 Picker, op. cit., p. 415. For original German see Appendix IV, No. 13. Translations by this author.
to counterbalance the many negative concepts of his work in order to win support.

I began with all of my interest and love. After all, now all at once the opportunity offered itself to speak before a larger audience; and what I had previously always accepted from mere feeling without knowing it, now came true: I could speak.234

The original German terms, "Lust and Liebe," are really not sufficiently translated by the English words, "interest" and "love." They stand rather for the impression Hitler had of himself as engaged in an all-absorbing effort. This powerful image of himself he consistently attempted to give to others.

Summarizing the impression Hitler was intent on conveying, it was that of a lonely, just man, one of the people, but selected by higher powers to do a job which needed to be done for his nation. To help him make this image possible, he used effectively the emotions of the people. He frankly told them on September 13, 1935, "Reason must have dissuaded you from coming to me; faith alone gave you the command."235 While he made his chore


appear monumental, he nevertheless wanted to keep in close contact with the people, causing him to declare: "I myself was a labouring man for years in the building trade and had to earn my own bread."\(^{236}\)

Hitler was eminently successful in making his followers believe in the moral and character potentials of their leader. This can best be seen by the millions of Germans who went to their death for him. From his speeches and constantly repeated slogans the German people gained the impression that he was a genius who had solely dedicated his life to serving them. Ethical persuasion is successful if the listener receives the image desired by the speaker. The following section will consider the three major methods used in achieving the desired success.

Making Subject Matter Impressive

The preceding pages represent an attempt to understand how Hitler thought of himself, and how others saw him, and how this contributed to his ethical persuasion. Because of the nature of Hitler's totalitarian Germany, rhetorical studies of his speeches conducted during his rule are extremely rare. However, to find information

\(^{236}\)Ibid., p. 862.
which indicates what German's saw and heard when Hitler spoke, is of utmost importance in a study of ethos. One of the only two sources which the writer found after extensive search both in Germany and in the United States interpreted the impression Hitler wanted to give, and achieved by the use of his rhetoric.

Two forces out of his deepest nature, and two realizations of living experience have made Adolf Hitler a speaker of revolutionary effect. Two forces out of deepest nature (being). The first is called faith, faith in the controlling power of the Idea once seen as correct, faith also, however, in the own call to fulfill it and fight it through. The second force is called will. In an inexorable striving for the goal fighting with unconditional use of the own person, to prove the idea, to let it become reality, in a brave readiness for the end, which, where it must be, is a readiness to die. The power of these two forces is the secret of his effect as a speaker . . . (two factors of cognition are added) . . . "to lead, means to be able to move masses" (quoting from Mein Kampf, Bd. II, Chapter II) . . . "The broad mass of the people above everything always succumbs only to the power of the speech" (quoted from Mein Kampf, Bd. I, Chapter 3). 237

Pleadings. Certainly Hitler's rhetorical approach used in persuading his listeners with the seriousness of his efforts, are indicated in the above quotation. He said in Mein Kampf, "The effect which he (the speaker) has on the

237Dovifat, op. cit., pp. 135-136. For original German, see Appendix IV, No. 15. Translations by this author.
people, alone provides the meaning of the genius of the speaker."²³⁸ How much he was dedicated to the accomplishment of this purpose was stated by those around him who could see a man of whom his secretary wrote: "Hitler could speak, speak untiringly."²³⁹ Dovifat explained furthermore why Hitler was effective before the public by using a strong German term:

Adolf Hitler strongly and impressively "wirbt" (a German term which actually means "woos") his listeners, and he does not hide this fact at all! He is concerned with every single one among them, he speaks to each one, every one he wants to win, and he struggles for each one.²⁴⁰

Preparing himself for his later speeches, Hitler would use Rudolf Hess, his secretaries, and others on whom to try out the effectiveness of the pleas he wanted to make.²⁴¹

Teaching. Another of the scarce critics of Hitler's speeches, explained a second important facet of Hitler's ethos. Comparing Hitler to Luther, Karl Kindt stated that Hitler's effectiveness lay in his ability to become

²³⁸Hitler, op. cit., Vol. II, Chapter 6, Mein Kampf, quoted by Dovifat, ibid., p. 139.
²³⁹Zoller, op. cit., p. 44.
²⁴¹Zoller, op. cit., p. 8.
Germany's greatest schoolmaster next to Luther. No group of people has probably been as consistently respected in Germany, or has had as consistent an influence, as teachers.

Support for Hitler's ethos. The leadership of the party could not afford to base its hopes only on any possible ethical persuasion caused by the "Fuehrer's" statements. Therefore, the speaking appearances of Hitler were carefully planned, and the Fuehrer's entire propaganda machine was used in developing a new image. In a speech made by Goebbels during a later period of the Nazi rule over Germany, this is illustrated. It was available to the writer in a collection under the title of Das Dritte Reich in Dokumenten. On March 19, 1938, Goebbels in the presence of Hitler addressed functionaries of the party in Berlin. Within a few weeks the plebiscite on the Fuehrer's decision to take over Austria would be decided in his favor by a ninety-nine per cent vote. However, during this particular speech it became readily apparent that Goebbels did

\[242\text{Kindt, op. cit., p. 13.}\]

\[243\text{Heinz Garber and Hans-Guenther Smarzlik, editors, Das Dritte Reich in Dokumenten, a collection of recorded speeches, Christophorus Verlag Herder, Freiburg.}\]
his best to further the image people might already have had of their leader and to bolster his cause in every way possible. Four thousand copies of a special film had been made and were being circulated to every village, town, and city in Germany to help people make the "right" decision. Specific instructions concerning receptions for Hitler in various communities were given. The "major" weapon of the party, the political speaker, was repeatedly stressed by Goebbels throughout the speech. Such items as the effectiveness of small paper Nazi flags distributed to the population during political rallies were not forgotten. Party headquarters had them printed and made available to all regional offices which wanted them. Newspapers were forbidden for several weeks before the plebescite to carry any items which would detract from the coming event or in any way disturb the people. Thus, the political masterminds of the Nazi party planned every step to assure a favorable image of Hitler and a success of the program he had planned.

III. Hitler's Ethos as Interpreted by His Contemporaries

To give a clear impression of the effect of Hitler's ethical persuasion, the following sources were used: (1) the writer's personal experiences and observations, since
he attended many of Hitler's speeches and was often quite close to him; (2) a two-hour showing of newsreels and similar fragmentary films belonging to the University of California at Los Angeles, which served the writer as a means of recalling his own impressions of Hitler; (3) a number of personal letters from men who were leading figures in Germany during Hitler's rise to power; and a letter from a leading American correspondent who was close to Hitler during much of the latter's reign over Germany; and (4) a number of references from both foes and supporters of Hitler, selected from books, which indicate the persuasive force of the man, Hitler.

The negative image others saw. One of the Fuehrer's co-workers, Otto Dietrich, had a more direct contact with him and thus commented:

The dangerous man, writes Carlyle, is the man who follows his fancies and misunderstands the nature of the things with which he is dealing; called to a high position, such a man was Hitler.244

Yet it was typical of the force Hitler exerted that only after his death, Dietrich dared to refer to the Fuehrer's mania for "excess." Thus, we see a man whose image of superiority (which he himself had created) could very

244Dietrich, op. cit., p. 198.
easily have driven him into his almost pathological restlessness. This duality of nature found expression in many of Hitler's speeches, but could be noticed clearly only by those who came into such close contact with Hitler as Dietrich did.

While the German people had an image of Hitler which was filtered through the carefully staged public speaking events, those who worked with him could actually judge his morality and character. "In mind and in soul Hitler was a hybrid creature--double faced."245 His private secretary added to that another image, namely that Hitler never really laughed deep down, or sincerely.246 In reality, this may have been only one more way in which Hitler persisted in keeping people aware of his serious task in life. In the writer's memory, smiles are only associated with meetings between Hitler and children or young girls.

In a personal letter to the writer, dated July 30, 1960, Franz von Papen, former Chancellor of Germany, associate of Hitler, indicated his impressions:

The influence of his speeches on his listeners has always remained impossible for me to understand. They were neither impressive in

245 Ibid., p. 11.
246 Zoller, op. cit., p. 33.
delivery nor were they of considerable mental conception—but used hundreds of times in repetitions. His influence over the masses, therefore, must be attributed to other psychological properties.\textsuperscript{247}

Von Papen does not agree with statements made by other individuals who will be named later, but on the other hand he indicated the many other factors which helped to shape the Fuehrer's strong ethos. It could easily be true that we see in von Papen the discouraged political leader who had to suffer much because of his affiliation with Hitler. If one disregards the image which Hitler tried to build up of himself, and deals with his individual speeches from the standpoint of logical persuasion, von Papen's reaction is also justified.

**Reasons for the positive image others saw.** Graf Schwerin von Krosigk, Finance Minister under Hitler and during the days of the Republic, looked more deeply into the ethos of Hitler as conveyed during his speeches. In a letter dated August 11, 1960, he wrote:

Hitler suited his speeches exactly to his listeners. He was only concerned with the impression, the success, which he desired. He could speak before the Reichstag like a wise statesman, before a circle of industrialists like a man of tolerant views, before women like a good father who loved children, before a mass

\textsuperscript{247}See Appendix III for the original letter. Translations by this author.
of people like an unchained volcano, before his old party comrades like one of the truest and bravest, who required sacrifices and promised to sacrifice himself. But he was neither loyal nor brave . . .

Hitler's gift of speech was the pre-requisite and the foundation for his political successes. Only as a speaker did he climb to the height (he reached), only thus did he make his party into a mass movement and has beyond the party pulled individuals into the circle of his influence. In demagogery, which as a speaker he could fully develop, he was an unequalled master. Without his talent as a speaker, he would have remained an unknown Bohemian.248

Schwerin von Krosigk certainly gave in sweeping words an impression of a man who was able to use ethos as a power for his communicative success. The writer remembers a statement by Gray and Wise which becomes even more significant because it employs a German term, "Wir Gefuehl."

Speech, then, creates a feeling of belonging, a "Wir Gefuehl," a "we-feeling," which is of great significance for the continuance of a group.249

Hitler's success depended upon his ability to create this feeling, and the fact that others would accept him as their leader. The power of Hitler's ethos is indicated also by the fact that not only Germans were impressed with Hitler's ability to express himself in such a way as to find "favor

---

248 See Appendix III for the original letter. Translations by this author.

249 Gray and Wise, op. cit., p. 25.
with all men." Louis P. Lochner, American Press correspondent, in a letter to the writer, gave his impressions of the persuasive powers Hitler held over others. Mr. Lochner served as a foreign correspondent in Germany.

He was all things unto all men. I once followed him around during a whole day at a Nuerenberg rally. He successively made the women's auxiliary, the "Politische Leiter" (POLITICAL LEADERS IN THE PARTY ITSELF), the armed forces, the S.A., the Hitler Jugend, and the S.S. feel that he drew his strength solely from the group he was addressing. This is ethical persuasion carried to its extreme. However, the question as to how this man accomplished his feats is not fully answered yet. Several other statements shed light on the effectiveness of Hitler's attempt to radiate in his speeches a feeling which consisted of a mixture of conviction, faith, trust, hope, and strength. Besides saying that "Hitler suited his speeches to his listeners," which is often a difficult task with mass audiences, Schwerin von Krosigk explained more clearly what took place:

The listener had the feeling that here spoke a speaker out of innermost conviction. He permitted himself to be drawn along by the glowing stream of a faith and drowned in it, he forgot all contradictions which morality and mind could have made, and felt well in the drunkenness into

---

250See Appendix III for the original letter.
which he was translated. That was the famous magic, of which one has spoken so often. Who, however, did not become subject to this magic, felt sickened by this deeply lying pathos. Because Hitler permitted himself indeed to be driven by his own passion, but at the same time he directed it with a cold mind. That perhaps was the astonishing gift of this born VOLKSREDNER (popular speaker), this mixture of fire and ice. 251

The force of emotion, strengthened by expectation and an almost constant contact with the images of their leader which he and his government leaders had created, stood Hitler in good stead. To see and hear him was finally relief, almost salvation, and release for long penned-up expectations created by the propaganda machine.

A personal image. The writer has a very definite image of him in mind which summarizes much of what has been said, in visual form. The picture of Hitler he has never forgotten is one which he saw as a boy in a German movie theater as part of a newsreel. At one of the party congresses in Nuremberg, Hitler appeared after the elaborate preparations had been completed. Across a vast field, so large one did not know where to look first, masses of humanity had been drawn up in the rigid cadres of the political organizations of Hitler's regime. Divided into

251 From a personal letter to the writer. See Appendix III. Translations by this author.
huge blocks stood the columns of the S.A. in their brown uniforms, the black-uniformed S.S., the other groups representing Hitler's political power. In the center of these groups a wide, flagstoned passageway had been left. Amid the waving flags and rigid men, all of a sudden with the shouts of "Heil" appeared one lonely figure. A man in a brown uniform, his left hand clasped over his belt buckle, his right hand again and again raised in the Nazi salute was seen. His only decorations were the black and silver Iron Cross First Class, his party button, and the decorations for wounds he suffered in World War I. His face was solemn, deeply absorbed, determined. Slowly, without any hurry, he walked through the masses assembled, each individual straining to have a look. A wave of human emotion swept around him, almost as if he was a high priest who bestowed blessings by his very presence. Then several steps behind him followed, side by side, his closest advisers and members of his government. Yet it is significant that the writer cannot remember a single man who walked behind him that day, while the face of Hitler seems as clear today as it was then. Hitler was enough.

The man of the people. To remain close to the people, it was necessary that amidst all the splendor and magnificence, an image had to be seen which gave Hitler
strength—that of a simple man. Dietrich said he had "no
taste for personal pomp."\textsuperscript{252} As a matter of fact, the
trappings of elegance such as the diplomatic tail coat made
Hitler look ridiculous. A man who worked with him at many
receptions, his translator, Dr. Schmidt, said: "Hitler
never looked at ease in tails."\textsuperscript{253} The simply dressed man
whom the people would finally see mounting the speaker's
stand again would have the power of ethos on his side be-
cause of an image created throughout the years.

Hitler's secretary reported that he never had much
interest in clothes. The writer can remember pictures of
a campaigning Fuehrer with an aviator's cap and a trench
coat. He can remember Hitler in short leather pants during
imprisonment at Landsberg. He can also recall pictures
furthering the image of the "man of the people," of Hitler
and government leaders eating a simple vegetable soup for
Sunday dinner. As part of the Fuehrer's aid program to the
underprivileged, the "Winterhilfe," once a month such a
simple meal was to be taken by all Germans. But those who
knew him intimately could not be fooled by this powerful
image. The journalist, Dietrich, for instance, claimed

\textsuperscript{252}Dietrich, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 14.

\textsuperscript{253}Schmidt, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 25.
that "Hitler was bothered by inferiority complexes." Unfortunately, the majority of the people could only judge him by his powerful and effective words. When the war was over, Germans began to understand the true nature of the man of whom they only caught occasional glimpses in person, and whose personal life was a carefully guarded secret. Just how important the image of Hitler as a strong, capable, divinely-guided celibate had been can best be seen by the fact that Germany collapsed with him. When Hitler spoke less and less frequently to the German people after 1943, the strength of the entire nation started to decay.

Another personal experience will illustrate the strength of the images Hitler had successfully instilled in the mind of the writer. As a fourteen-year-old Hitler Youth Leader, I had listened to many of Hitler's speeches, and had read the slogans which dealt with purity. One night while on guard duty at a local headquarters of the Hitler Youth movement, I became aware of the immoral acts going on in its offices. I felt that those engaged in them betrayed the "Fuehrer."

The close ties existing between Hitler and Hitler's Germany have to be explained more fully later. He was nothing and had nothing, except for his ability to

---

254Dietrich, op. cit., p. 249.
speak. The next chapter will show how Hitler in the speaker's stand helped to make possible the creation of a new Germany.

In their class struggle, the officers were forced (after World War I) by circumstances to create a worker's army; they found their leader in the lowest mass of their subordinates, and commanded him to command. . . . A human nothing, a gray personality even among soldiers; modest and for that reason inconspicuous, as a superior has characterized him "not even a German, but a homeless derelict from the Viennese melting pot."255

IV. Summary

(1) Much of Hitler's influence was due to the "ethical persuasion" of an artificially created image.

(2) The influence of this ethos was not limited to German nationals. Even people who could not speak German would fall prey to the stage setting, the personal impact of Hitler, and their expectations. An unpublished picture in the possession of the writer shows this quite well. After the Olympic Games of 1936, Hitler received all winners in the Chancellory and talked to them. This particular picture shows the faces of the foreign athletes, most of them unable to understand what Hitler said, yet their faces indicated absorption with his speech. One can only gather

255 Heiden, op. cit., p. 33.
that the overall impact of Hitler's persuasiveness can be sought in an impression of "sincerity." Hitler was able in his speeches to convince people that he believed what he said, while he said it. This was his strength.\textsuperscript{256} (3) The next chapter will further clarify how pathos was made a factor contributing to the ethical powers Hitler held over his German listeners while making use of the techniques of pleading and teaching. The Fuehrer became a means of interpreting Germany's goals, values, and aspirations. In the vainglorious language of National Socialism there are found statements which indicate to those who neither speak German, nor came under the direct influence of Hitler, what was responsible for his strong persuasiveness. It should be remembered that these are statements written at a time when Hitler was just beginning his meteoric ascent as the leader of Germany.

Here is everything BUT mere eloquence; here the German soul itself is given a mouth to accuse and to confess, the despairing cry of a 60-milion nation becomes articulate speech, that is HITLER . . . (p. 21)

God's call seeks our people in this great hour of its history. And one is among us, who as it were, hears for all of us as our delegate. He hears the instructions which the World-Spirit gives to the German nation at this moment, and passes them on to the millions who hang on his

\textsuperscript{256}Goerlitz, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 139.
lips. Germany again has a prophet; a prophet of her destiny . . . (p. 6)

Not in the least in his anger is the Fuehrer a real revelation of German nature. . . . This anger originates in a final sense of responsibility to his people, out of a sense of mission. . . . Only out of this sense of mission, can be explained the strong self-confidence, which we know from all of Hitler's speeches. . . . Such a messenger speaks the TRUTH without consideration. . . . The Fuehrer knows no compromise, no capitulation. . . . He puts his "fire-soul" entirely into the cause. . . . (He) is carried by the enthusiasm of the people . . . But also on the other hand, the German people hears in the voice of the Fuehrer, the beating of its own heart. . . . The new state is education; education through propaganda, the new policy is propaganda through and through, activation of the people's life through the creative word. (pp. 22-25)

In this study, the close connection between ethos and pathos becomes evident. Irving J. Lee helps to make clear the distinction between the two when he names the former as the moral states which the speech represents, while the latter represents the emotional states which have been developed in the audience. However, even in the specific application of subject matter contributing to ethos, one finds that Hitler used all sources mentioned by

---

Kindt, op. cit., pp. 6, 21-25. For original German see Appendix IV, No. 19. Translations by this author.

Aristotle: sagacity, high character, and good will. In the speaker's stand, it was Hitler's strength to deal with the problems of the day. Almost anything he could have said which assured people their problems would be dealt with, would have been interpreted as a sign of sagacity. The establishment of high character was also a consistent feature, mainly accomplished by showing the seemingly successful endeavors of his movement. Attacking his enemies while linking them with that which could not be considered virtuous, as in the case of "degrading" democracy, furthered this impression. Creation of good will, according to all the comments given in this discussion was accomplished by Hitler's becoming all things unto all men. Only few people could evaluate the truthfulness of this image by more than their emotional reactions.

[259Aristotle, Rhetoric, op. cit., pp. 10, 11. (Weldon translation)]
CHAPTER V

HITLER'S DELIBERATIVE ORATORY

I. Introduction

Thonnsen and Baird outline some interests of the student of rhetoric as follows:

Although rhetoric may be employed to develop a point on any subject, it is, because of its practical nature, devoted mainly to a small number of considerations. This seeming paradox arises from the fact that the majority of speech situations involve attempts by speakers (a) to establish the justice or injustice, the true or false, of an action or a condition; (b) to praise or blame someone or something; or (c) to urge that a course of action be or not be followed. Even the last division, dealing with deliberative speaking, is more sharply limited as to the principal matters of discussion than we might surmise. . . . Hence, we see that a speech situation is confined, not as to possible subject matter, but as to the range of effective choice within the various fields of thought.260

The German Fuehrer was primarily interested in action and in the cooperation of his countrymen in the schemes he developed. Thus, the present chapter deals in some detail

260Thonnsen and Baird, op. cit., p. 7.
with the major type of speaking in which Adolf Hitler engaged: deliberative oratory.

In keeping with the statement made by Thonnsen and Baird, the student must consider the effective choice Hitler made within the various fields of thought available to the deliberative speaker. Cicero presented a noticeable challenge to anyone who would attempt to persuade the masses to follow him when he stated:

A knowledge of a vast number of things is necessary, without which volubility of words is empty and ridiculous ... and all the emotions of the mind, which nature has given to man must be intimately known, for all the force and art of speaking must be employed in allaying or exciting the feelings of those who listen.\(^\text{261}\)

Hitler's impact as a deliberative speaker will therefore be studied from these two standpoints:

1. How effectively did he use the material acknowledged by ancient rhetoricians to be in the area of deliberative speaking?

2. How much was he aware of emotional factors which help a speaker in persuading audiences to participate in desired activities or actions? With such a challenge before him, the student of rhetoric is reminded of the statement made by Quintilian:

Rhetoric would be a very easy and small matter, if it could be included in one short body of

\(^\text{261}\) Cicero, *De Oratore*, I, V.
rules, but rules must generally be altered to suit the nature of each individual case, the time, the occasion, and necessity itself ... 262

In the case of Hitler, as this chapter will show, the rhetorical critic is faced with a man who masterfully used the canons of rhetoric. Furthermore, he must acknowledge the superb adaptation of these rules to the German audience. However, it will also become readily apparent that the subject matter was violated at every turn by the master mind of the German National Socialistic system. He covered subject matter, as Aristotle discussed it, but made his own strange and unusual application of the matters which are commonly accepted as being within the realm of rhetoric.

Baldwin summed up the approach used in a majority of Hitler's speeches. He indicated that the orator using the deliberative form of speaking is concerned with concrete matters of dispute and doubt. 263 In keeping with the ancient cannons of rhetoric, the speaker deals with good or bad, in an effort to convince his audience of the presence or absence of these values. In order to accomplish this type of speaking which is in the area of politics, the

262 Quintilian, Institutes of Oratory (Watson translation), II, xiii, 2.

263 Baldwin, op. cit., p. 16.
orator has to be familiar with the means of establishing or determining happiness among his listeners and must have a knowledge of special subjects such as law, politics, war and peace, and also the forms of government. Although Hitler was untaught in the art of rhetoric, these factors clearly formed the major concepts of his persuasive use of deliberative oratory.

II. Types of Deliberative Speaking

As Aristotle and Plato dealt with the speaker and the speech of their time, thus the student of Hitler must study his speeches from his German background. Exhortation and dissuasion are the two major divisions in this area which Aristotle considered. In the case of the German speaker of Hitler's day, these types of persuasive oratory are important concepts.

The German concept of exhortation and dissuasion. It is necessary here to consider the two German terms, "REDE" and "REDNER." Dovifat stated that there was a distinct difference between the German words "REDE" and

\[264\text{Ibid.}, I, 3, 17.\]

\[265\text{Cooper, Aristotle's Rhetoric I. 6, 30-42; I; 3, 17; 5, 24-29; I. 4, 21-23; I. 8, 44, 45.}\]
"VORTRAG." The latter, which could also be translated as "lecture," was of no real concern to him, it needed no "conviction," it did not include the purpose of the "Rede" to sway people. The concept of a speech to entertain, thus, was entirely foreign to the German mind, at least while considering the term "Rede" as used for political speeches. A "Rede" was a serious thing, it had to result in action. Thus the "Redner" (speaker) was an important, serious person who could not waste his time with mere entertainment or discussion; he had to lead towards action as quickly as possible.

Dovifat quoted: "Ex abundantia cordis os bene loquitor," out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaks. This is an indication of the emotional impact of the political speech which did not necessarily use the support of facts or was undergirded by ethical and moral considerations. To people living during the period in which Dovifat wrote in Germany, a "Rede" (speech) to be merely a "talk" was an impossibility. Cicero was quoted as an example of what a speech really should accomplish:

266Dovifat, op. cit., pp. 34, 46. See Appendix IV, No. 20 for original German. Translations by this author.

267Ibid., p. 46. See Appendix IV, No. 21 for original German. Translations by this author.
"Tribus rebus omnes ad nostram sententiam perducimus: aut conciliando, aut docendo, aut permovendo." These three "attacks" were considered to be the truly sound ways to approach an audience; win them, teach them, then move them along by your convictions. Dovifat was quite emphatic in his statements that the speaker stood above the "grammatical" rule, the mere rhetorical rule. He only wanted "truth," "reality," which by no means indicated concern with truth as the rhetorician speaks of it.

The aims of the orator. Two quotations may show which ends the Nazi speaker sought.

According to the Roman rule of speech it was stated that only the good, the virtuous could master the speech. "Nemo orator, nisi vir bonus." Correctly understood that is right. Only he who sincerely desires, is completely filled with his mission, a speaker entirely surrendered to his people wins the fullness of perspective, the view of the contexts, the inner view of the souls of those who hear him. . . .

268 Ibid., p. 52. See Appendix IV, No. 22, for original German. Translations by this author.

269 Ibid., pp. 61-63. See Appendix IV, No. 22, for original German. Translations by this author.
To the "vir bonus," the "noble good man" belongs ultimately also always that, which must be a supposition for every speaker of political power: He lives his word with his entire person, and is ready to sacrifice his life for it at any time.270

No moral or ethical concepts entered into this discussion. Conviction and power to sway were the only ways in which the "good" man could be judged as an effective speaker. Speech was strictly speaker centered. However, the world had already judged Hitler before his death: To be a "vir bonus" required more of him than he was willing or able to give; he could exhort and dissuade his listeners, but he could not control himself equally well.

Kindt, a writer of Hitler's early days, explained his views on the general ends Hitler tried to attain:

    When Hitler defines "leadership" as "ability to move masses," we may assuredly add: not in the least through the creative word. . . . Such rhetoric is in the highest sense edification, up-building of a new German Spirit.271

The result. This lip service to lofty ideals is in keeping with rhetorical teachings; it must, however, be condemned because of the practical applications Hitler made

270Ibid., pp. 70, 71. See Appendix IV, No. 24, for original German. Translations by this author.

271Kindt, op. cit., p. 25. See Appendix IV, No. 25, for original German. Translations by this author.
in his dealings with his fellow men. Kindt closed with a statement with which the rhetorical student of Hitler can heartily agree: "... The history of eloquence in the grand style, of political leadership through the power of the word has been enriched by a powerful choral director."²⁷² Probably no nation has had a more eloquent and powerful choral leader who directed it in its own funeral hymn.

Here, then, has been described by two German writers the concern of Hitler with exhortation. Dissuasion from those ends which Hitler did not consider valid or important was the natural antithesis to this type of speaking.

III. Subject Matter of Hitler's Deliberative Oratory

The ends of Hitler's speaking followed the ancient rules laid down for deliberative speaking, requiring a discussion of that which is expedient and that which is not.²⁷³ As a matter of fact, in the sense of rhetoric, Hitler did not let pure facts speak for themselves.²⁷⁴

²⁷²Ibid., p. 30. See Appendix IV, No. 26, for original German. Translations by this author.

²⁷³Cooper, Aristotle's Rhetoric, I, 3, 18.

²⁷⁴Ibid., I, 1, 1.
His arguments were interpretations of a basic rule of his life: Life is a struggle for existence, anything which served that purpose was expedient:

All these things one has to consider, in order to deal with them even correctly in peace, as a matter of principle, from the standpoint of war. Because war as a struggle for life and death has its own laws and lets peaceful points of view step into the background entirely.\(^{275}\)

How important this concept was can be seen by the fact that it established the right, to Hitler's way of thinking, for an absolute rule over his people. People want leadership and decisions from leadership. They are willing to forgive mistakes as long as definite leadership can be seen. Therefore, it isn't possible that the highest leadership should permit a criticism of its actions from below. Rights of this kind the people as such do not want, but only grumblers among the people.\(^{276}\)

**Hitler's use of the expedient.** Before the world the Fuehrer explained his convictions without hesitation "also one could without fear throw into their teeth the fact that we in our struggle for life or death would ally ourselves even with the devil in order to win."\(^{277}\)

---

\(^{275}\)Picker, op. cit., p. 291. See Appendix IV, No. 27, for original German. Translations by this author.

\(^{276}\)Ibid., p. 283. See Appendix IV, No. 28, for original German. Translations by this author.

\(^{277}\)Ibid., p. 88. See Appendix IV, No. 29, for original German. Translations by this author.
and rhetorical devices in general came to be a means to an end in the case of the Nazi leader. A battle had to be won, and any effective rhetorical device to help him in his struggle was more than welcome. Franz Six, who was vitally interested in this phase of the work of his party, was thus quite right when he stated that through Adolf Hitler and the National Socialist party the spoken word was "raised to a valued and feared weapon of politics."^78

When one listens to recordings of Hitler's speeches and compares them to political addresses by his opponents, one becomes immediately aware of the effectiveness of this man. By rhetorical standards already mentioned, Hitler was a powerful orator. Germany had never known such a powerful political popular speaker before. The replies of Social Democrats in the Reichstag to Hitler's attacks, the speeches by von Hindenburg, and even speeches by other Nazi leaders lacked the vitality, the awareness of a mighty weapon in the hand of the skilled.^79 This weapon was handled so well by Adolf Hitler that subject matter became of little importance, and the man as well as the moment became of supreme


^79From German language recordings.
significance. The Fuehrer's strength lay in the fact that he made whatever he said sound expedient.

**Rhetorical methods.** As the rhetorical critic studies Hitler, he is made dramatically aware of the highly effective methods the Fuehrer used. It would be difficult to deny that he was a powerful and influential speaker. Such effectiveness is, however, one of the examples mentioned by so many critics who see in rhetoric merely a device, readily available to any charlatan, and used to foist all manner of evil upon the people.\(^{280}\) If one were concerned only with the speaking technique of a man, this would indeed hold true. However, this writer would defend the attitude also expressed by Schrier:

> What those who condemn rhetoric and rhetoricians fail frequently to realize is that speech is a tool, and that it may therefore be both used and abused; it may be employed in worthy cases or towards evil ends.\(^{281}\)

Hitler chose to use this tool effectively but towards evil ends.

\(^{280}\)Quintilian, *Institutes*, II, XVI, 6 (Watson translation).

The ends of expediency. While the struggle for new concepts to be given to his people or to be made part of their lives went on, Hitler outlined his basic concept of the results he wanted.

Also one would first have to educate the German people if it wants and should be able to take a world position, to be honest only to itself, and to pretend as convincingly towards others (as for instance towards the Czechs) as the English, instead of making themselves disliked everywhere because of their honesty.  

Hitler's immature mind developed some of the goals which he considered to be important to his nation, among them a position of international importance. When it came to the question of how to implement his plans, Hitler's lack of wisdom added significantly to the problems other world leaders may have had to face to convince their nations of the necessity of a supreme effort. He used the same approaches any persuasive speaker would use. To judge him on the basis of his technique alone thus becomes at best difficult. The major difference lay in the fact

---

282 Picker, op. cit., p. 75. See Appendix IV, No. 30, for original German. Translations by this author.

283 See also Quintilian, Institutes, II, XXI, 4, 15, "The man who can really play his part as a citizen and is capable of meeting the demands both of public and private business, the man who can guide a state by his counsels, give it a firm basis by his legislation and purge its vices by his decisions as a judge, is assuredly no other than the orator of our quest."
that he carried to the extreme something many accept as justifiable.

Most people agree that sometimes the end justifies the means—but men disagree as to when this point is reached.²⁸⁴

Hitler would accept no limitations on the means used to accomplish the political ends he had set for himself.

Sources of happiness. Striving for happiness constitutes one of man's basic desires. Thus, Aristotle demanded discussion of this subject from the rhetorician.²⁸⁵

It was Hitler's task in his deliberative speaking to develop his own image of happiness for his people. Appealing to strength, he spoke of:

How radiantly the eyes of my boys often looked at me then, when I explained to them the necessity of their mission, (and) assured them again and again that all the wisdom of this earth remains without success, if strength (power) does not join its service, overshadows and protects it, that the mild goddess of peace can only walk by the side of the god of war, and that every great deed of this peace needs the protection and help of strength (power).²⁸⁶

²⁸⁴ Schrier, op. cit., p. 483.
²⁸⁵ Cooper, Aristotle's Rhetoric, I 5, 24-29.
²⁸⁶ Adolf Hitler, Mein Kampf (Muenchen: Verlag Franz Eher Nachfolger, 1931), p. 550. See Appendix IV, No. 31, for original German. Translations by this author.
Making use of his supposed knowledge of history, which consisted only of a very personal interpretation of the facts, Hitler could further appeal to his people's desire for strength:

And not through assassination did it come about, not deserters and duty shirkers were the founders of the State of Bismarck, but the regiments of the front. This unique birth and baptism of fire alone already wove around the Reich a glimmer of an historic fame, such as was but rarely the lot of the oldest states.287

From a rhetorical standpoint, this approach was sound and highly effective. It certainly showed that the Fuehrer realized that all persuasion has certain factors in common:

The popular orator, the editorialist, the propagandist, does not persuade by opposing and changing people's views; rather he expresses in highly emotional symbols what the people are already thinking and feeling.288

Hitler's almost uncanny awareness of the desires rampant among his people permitted him to use the most persuasive means of leading them in the way he had chosen. For his purposes he could even sacrifice man's desire to be free, usually a basic source of happiness. "We have done away

287 Ibid., p. 245-246 (Mein Kampf, Verlag Eher German original). See Appendix IV, No. 32, for original German. Translations by this author.

with the concept that it is part of political freedom that everyone can express (in the newspapers) what he likes."\(^{289}\)

To accomplish the end of giving his people an impression of security, he thought himself fully justified in stating that under Amann the Nazi paper "Voelkischer Beobachter" had helped to create men who "in the influence on public opinion were aware of their mission as servants of the state."\(^{290}\) After all, to Hitler freedom of the press meant only that certain rascals wanted to do what they liked, rather than follow his directions. As he admitted, sometimes he had to make a one hundred and eighty degree turn in policies, and only a fully controlled press could be trusted to make the turn smoothly enough with him. These private expressions of the feelings, attitudes, or beliefs backing up his public speeches are of utmost importance in understanding the impact of Hitler's speeches. Reputation, another source of human happiness, was important to him, but only if he could determine the basis of it. The previous statements as well as many other similar ones show clearly that the Fuehrer had developed his leadership by means of

\(^{289}\)Picker, op. cit., p. 269. See Appendix IV, No. 33, for original German. Translations by this author.

\(^{290}\)Ibid., p. 281. See Appendix IV, No. 34, for original German. Translations by this author.
the spoken word, to a fine art. This is summed up well in the following statement:

Hitler's greatest art as a politician was seemingly to simplify all that was difficult; without consideration for objective perceptions and insight; to bring everything into convincing formulae; to flatter the dissatisfaction as well as the wishes of most people, and to offer to their ideals, as hazy and immature as they might be, rich sustenance. 291

The moral and normal citizen or political leader stands helpless before the onslaught of such ideas. His only weapon is truth, and perhaps logic. But the much mightier weapon of the moment, emotion, and the lie told with persuasive power, may make his struggle appear futile.

Rhetorical application of the principle. Hitler's slogans were much too manifold to mention all of them here, but in the writer's memory those appealing to reputation, honor, children, beauty, strength, and health are best remembered. "Kraft durch Freude," strength through joy, was a Body Beautiful movement in which a slogan turned into a major effort. "Stop decadence in art," meaning particularly that modern art should be stopped, was another favorite subject. "Keep the race pure" was a third slogan well

291 Hans Buchheim, et. al., Der Fuehrer ins Nichts (Rastatt/Baden: Grotesche Verlagsbuchhandlung, K. G., 1960), p. 72. For original German see Appendix IV, No. 35. Translations by this author.
remembered. Indeed, reasoned speech held little importance for Hitler. One can sum up all rhetorical criticism in this area of Hitler's speaking with the words of Clark:

And that is persuasion--so to focus the attention of the people on certain ideals, goals, drives that they forget or minimize all others, so that they accept the plan of action which harmonizes with those ideals and reject that which runs counter to them.\textsuperscript{292}

Thus Kindt judged other speakers and speeches of the day in the following words:

With biting sarcasm, which is so characteristic of him, Hitler has characterized the style of the burgeois (buerglich) political speech, that professorial "tripe," those spoken dissertations, which made a similar impression upon him, as did cod-liver oil in his youth.\textsuperscript{293}

Virtue creates happiness: A special, national-socialist kind of virtue was also preached by Hitler. Speaking of this virtue, another of the concepts mentioned by Aristotle, he dealt with the values in life which his people should espouse.

Since, however, true idealism is nothing more than subjection of the interests and the life of the individual to that of the entire group, and since this in turn represents the prerequisite for the formation of organizational forms of all types, it represents most fundamentally the ultimate will of nature. It alone leads men to

\textsuperscript{292}Clark, op. cit., p. 267.

\textsuperscript{293}Kindt, op. cit., p. 11. See Appendix IV, No. 36, for original German. Translations by this author.
a voluntary acceptance of the prerogative of power and strength and thus lets them become a particle of that order which forms and makes up the entire universe.294

A virtuous life was established as one which contributed to the honour of the nation by sacrificing man for its existence.295

**Good birth.** In keeping with rhetorical constituents of happiness mentioned by Aristotle, Hitler also thought of good birth as an important factor. The values were twisted, but they were clearly established. The VOELKISCH (national group, folk) concept, separated mankind into races of superior and inferior quality. This was the result of "the iron law of the necessity and the right of victory of the best and strongest"296 and subordination of the inferior and weaker. Aristotle also mentioned good birth as a fit subject for discussion of happiness.297 In Hitler's scheme of things, good birth consisted of birth into the Aryan family of man. The

294Hitler, op. cit., p. 327, 328 (Mein Kampf, Verlag Eher, original German). See Appendix IV, No. 37, for original German. Translations by this author.

295See also Cooper, Aristotle's Rhetoric, I, 4, 25-29.

296Hitler, op. cit., p. 316 (Mein Kampf, Verlag Eher, original German). See Appendix IV, No. 38, for original German. Translations by this author.

Fuehrer saw happiness for the Aryan in the achievement of domination over others:

Thus the road which the Aryan had to travel was clearly marked. As conqueror he subjected the lower (classes, groups) of human beings and then regulated practical activity under his orders, according to his will, and for his goals.  

Hitler's use of good and bad. Aristotle stated that the deliberative speaker deals with good and bad. Unfortunately, he gave only a limited basis of evaluation to the student of a dictator who set out to change the concepts of these values among his people. As already has been said, "good" and "happiness" of his people are two factors closely related in Hitler's appeals.

In opposition to this we National Socialists must hold immovably to the goal of our foreign policy, namely to secure for the German people (Volk) the territory (Grund und Boden) which it is due . . . State frontiers are established by human beings, and are changed by human beings. . . . Never forget that the most sacred right on this earth is the right for the soil which one wants to cultivate himself, and the most sacred sacrifice the blood, which one spills for this soil.

---

298 Hitler, op. cit., p. 324 (Mein Kampf, Verlag Eher, original German). See Appendix IV, No. 39, for original German. Translations by this author.

299 Ibid., pp. 739, 740, 754, 755 (Mein Kampf, Verlag Eher, original German). See Appendix IV, No. 40, for original German. Translations by this author.
As one enters the even more abstract area of "good and bad," judgment or even criticism becomes more difficult yet. Unless specific moral or religious values are introduced, even such warped ideas as were expressed by Hitler take on the guise of truth. Indeed, the Fuehrer followed rules of persuasion quite well.

What then is the problem of persuasion in speaking? Obviously, to take a belief at any level whatever that may be, and make the belief dynamic, that is, lift it to the level of action, so that it may operate to influence behavior to the utmost. Such influence, and such action, cannot be denied him in the light of historical happenings. If one were to give a definition of good under these circumstances, one could only indicate that Hitler saw good in the achievement of the "rights" of the Aryan people. These were the dominion of others combined with possession of all things necessary to their own happiness. One could not trust Hitler's statements, of course, which makes it only more difficult to analyze the attitudes expressed in his speeches. Indeed, one can do little more than to point to statements which have rhetorical importance at a given moment in his life. For instance, Hitler did consider friends to be an

---
important part of the "good" he wanted. If he did not make this sufficiently clear in his public speeches, he at least privately attempted, for instance, to "woo the coy Brittania."\(^{301}\) As a matter of fact, referring to World War I and the struggle between Germany and Great Britain, Hitler stated at that time in 1936, "That must never happen again." But the conflicts between honor, power, and friends often were too strong, and not being guided by ethical concepts, the more immediate "good" won over the long-range goals he may have had.

What comes then, is the other world, in which we shall let the Russians live as they want. Only that we will rule them . . . Europe is not a geographic concept, but one determined by blood.\(^{302}\)

Nowhere does Hitler's approach to the values of good and bad become clearer than in his dealings with other nations. His complete misunderstanding of his own position and theirs is difficult to believe. So sure was he of the justice of his own cause that he could watch a political trial in France and comment with the following words:

"It is remarkable that the French in the Riom Trial retreated from the obvious question to their old war-mongers: "Why have you insti-

\(^{301}\) Schmidt, op. cit., p. 55.

\(^{302}\) Picker, op. cit., pp. 44, 45. See Appendix IV, No. 41, for original German. Translations by this author.
gated the war in spite of the honest assurances of peace and offers of the German leader which he kept exactly to the dot on the i.”303

IV. The Use of Deliberative Speeches

The use of emotion. In the long run, what he said was of little importance. Significant was Hitler's major method of making his oratory successful, which was based on an attempt to lead the German people back to some of the basest motives known to man. He used interaction of the group to assure greater support. Dietrich noticed this ability in Hitler when he stated he had the "power to ignite broad masses of listeners by its (the message's) simplification."304 The reader should also consider Appendix II which gives a concise and brief synopsis of the National Socialist doctrines, outlining the basic appeals Hitler used.

Emotional appeals thus were always a part of Hitler's speeches. A good example is the following statement, seemingly directed to a third party, yet effective

303 Ibid., pp. 53, 54. See Appendix IV, No. 42, for original German. Translations by this author.

304 Dietrich, op. cit., p. 144.
in persuading the German listeners that he was only interested in the good of the oppressed.

I can only tell the representative of these democracies that, if these tormented creatures (the Sudenten Germans) cannot themselves obtain justice and help, they will receive both from us.305

Hitler thus literally fulfilled Quintilian's requirements, stated in the latter's *Institutes of Oratory* that if we had philosophers for judges, there would be no need for orators to arouse passion, but as it is, they must do so to advance truth.306 However, he violated another rule by the same writer:

The first essential for the perfect orator is that he be a good man, and consequently we demand of him not merely the possession of exceptional gifts of speech but of all the excellence of character as well.307

Hitler may have spoken of "justice," a subject fit for any rhetorician but the meaning he ascribed to the term was far different from the one Plato, Aristotle, or Cicero may have given it.

**Appeals to audience values.** It should also be noticed how appeals to the values originally held by the people whom he ruled were prevalent in his earlier

---

305Schmidt, *op. cit.*, p. 89.
speeches. Hitler said that obedience to the law of the land would be his first consideration. He spoke, for instance, of "honest cooperation" with the church, and considered himself in agreement with the struggle of the church against materialistic views, and for a real national community. For this reason, Hitler even called on God himself for help, as can be seen in excerpts from two speeches.

0 Lord, thou seest that we have become different, that the German nation is no more a nation without honor, a nation covered with shame, a nation at war within itself, a nation of little courage, a nation of little faith. No, Lord, the German nation is strong again in its own will, strong in perseverance and strong to make every sacrifice. Lord, we will not let thee go! Bless our fight for freedom, and bless our German people and fatherland. (May 1, 1933)

In this hour I pray that the Almighty will give his blessing in the years to come to our work and action, to our judgment and to our strength of resolution; that He may guard us from all false pride as from all cowardly submission; that He in His providence has allotted to the German people; and that He always give us the courage to do right and never to waver or weaken before any force or danger. (February 20, 1938)308

A peculiar mixture of belief in a Supreme Being, and a knowledge that many German people were deeply religious, probably produced these statements. A man who thus

308Adolf Hitler, Speeches 1933-1938 (Berlin: Terramare Publication, 1938), English translation, No. 8-10.
addressed himself to Almighty God could not be "all wrong" in the thinking of his followers.

**Acceptance of Hitler's values.** Within the framework of his own twisted aims and purposes, the Fuehrer was successful in using his speeches to create a strong following among the German people. The basis for action by the people was the immensely strong motivating force Hitler represented. The following statement explains the use of this method.

Motivation is essentially a process of setting up a system of adequate rewards in the minds of the listeners. These rewards may neither be logical nor acceptable to anyone living in the United States of American in the year 1961, but they certainly were more than adequate in the Germany of Hitler's day.

The rhetorical device which both his propaganda machine and the Fuehrer's speeches employed to assure success in teaching the German people was that of setting the stage or creating a mood. Hunt shows this to be an important means used in persuasive speaking.

If the aim of rhetoric is to persuade by means of logical, ethical, and pathetical

---

309Gislason, op. cit., p. 177.
proofs, it is only a variant on this to say that rhetoric should produce a mood.\textsuperscript{310}

In an almost tearful appeal to some of man's most basic emotions, Hitler, for instance, asked of his followers a question about their past:

Was this the sense of the sacrifice which the German mother made for the fatherland, when she let the most precious of boys leave, never to see them again? Did all this happen that now a gang of despicable criminals could lay hands on the Fatherland? . . . Had the German soldier persevered . . . for this?\textsuperscript{311}

Some might have had doubts that Hitler was the man who could provide Germans with both happiness and, from a philosophical standpoint, the "good" that they desired. Hitler attempted to settle the question once and for all, as in the case of one of the most extreme questions, the race problem:

Thus I believe to be acting in the sense of the Almighty Creator: By warding off the Jew, I am fighting for the handiwork of the Lord.\textsuperscript{312}


\textsuperscript{311}Hitler, op. cit., p. 224 (Mein Kampf, Verlag Eher, original German). See Appendix IV, No. 43, for original German. Translations by this author.

\textsuperscript{312}Ibid., p. 70. See Appendix IV, No. 44, for original German. Translations by this author.
By association with the justice of Almighty God, Hitler attempted to establish the justice of his own cause.

Judging "good and bad." The following quotation is an attempt to give a summary reason for all of his thinking on the subject of good and bad as it found expression in the Fuehrer's speeches and his writings. Only someone who was absolutely convinced of the superiority of one race over another could state:

Every manifestation of human culture, every product of art, science and technical skill, which we see before (our eyes) today, is almost exclusively the product of the Aryan creative power. This very fact permits the not entirely unfounded conclusion that he alone was the founder of superior humanity; therefore, he represents the arch-type of what we understand by the term: MAN.313

Good and bad are terms which may cause spirited discussion even under normal circumstances. To prevent any opposition to his own line of reasoning, while providing the people with new values, Hitler used a method which Lambertson identifies in the following statement:

To the degree that feeling is intensified, reason is paralyzed. In general, strong emotion inhibits the intellectual process.314

313 Ibid., p. 317. See Appendix IV, No. 45, for original German. Translations by this author.

V. Special Topics used in Deliberative Oratory

Aristotle indicated that the deliberative speaker also must be familiar with a number of important special subjects such as war and peace, legislation, etc. In consistent fashion, Hitler's references to these areas abound in his speeches and private talks. His times demanded attention to such subjects, and as the effective deliberative speaker Hitler was, he could not overlook opportunities for persuading his people by referring to these subjects.

Fortunately for him, there was probably no time in his nation's history when so many dissatisfied people could be found.

Treaties. While eventually indicating an unwillingness to co-exist with the churches of his land, he had earlier stated his position on their existence.

The Government, being resolved to undertake the political and moral purification of our public life, is creating and securing the conditions necessary for a really profound revival of religious values, it regards the two Christian confessions as the weightiest factors in the maintenance of our nationality.

By concluding a concordat with the Catholic Church, the Party has sought to establish a

---

315 Cooper, Aristotle's Rhetoric, I, 4, 21-23.

316 Lambertson, op. cit., p. 125.
state of affairs which would be beneficial to both sides and which would be of a permanent character.\textsuperscript{317}

The effect the vengeful Versailles Treaty had on the German people has been discussed earlier. The lack of action on the part of most political parties in his day gave Hitler a ready-made issue to discuss. No one could possibly refer to this treaty as fair and helpful to the general condition of the world. But it remained for Hitler to use it for his own ends.

The born leader faced the crises with a positive course of action which gave direction to the energies of the masses.\textsuperscript{318}

Familiarity with the established ways of concluding treaties demanded by Aristotle cannot be denied in Hitler's case; yet, one must also remember the ease with which he broke treaties. Dealings with his enemies had to suit his own purposes at all times. When Roosevelt demanded an unconditional surrender of Germany, Hitler was quick to jump to the opportunity of saying:

You can see for yourself . . . that we would get nothing but a demand for unconditional surrender if we tried to come to terms with our opponents.\textsuperscript{319}

\textsuperscript{317}Hitler, \textit{op. cit.}, No. 8-10 (Speeches-Terramare).

\textsuperscript{318}Lambertson, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 126.

\textsuperscript{319}Schmidt, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 262.
Hitler could speak of treaties as well as anyone, but his performance differed noticeably from anything he might have said.

War and peace. The question of war and peace was of major importance in the life of Hitler. Representing his basic concept of struggle, he felt it to be a necessity. Realizing his existence in a world which held to certain moral and ethical rules, he used the other man on whom to put the blame. For instance, Hitler attempted a "deal" with Czechoslovakia through Great Britain, which was entirely unacceptable to the Czechs. When he was informed by Chamberlain that he had been refused, Hitler stated wildly, rushing out: "There is no point at all in going on with negotiations." Not having his way was to Hitler the greatest insult. When he had made his final ultimatum, his interpreter, Dr. Schmidt, reported that it was impossible to reason with him.

If France and England want to unleash war (in support of Czechoslovakia), they can do so. It's a matter of complete indifference to me.  

Lying, cheating, pressuring foreign countries were only part of the total actions of Hitler. Once having

---

320 Ibid., p. 103.
321 Ibid., p. 104.
decided on his course of action, he only made a token show of concern over negotiations with others. In this particular area, the rhetorical critic finds himself perhaps in the most peculiar situation of all. The writer is reminded of a statement made by Schrier.

... each case of persuasion must be judged in the light of the particular instance, and according to the prevailing standards of ethics of the community or of the individual. *322*

If one were to judge Hitler strictly on the effectiveness of his persuasion as a speaker, the results are clear and readily evident. World War II speaks adequately of the powers of persuasion Hitler developed. On the basis of known facts concerning the ethical and other standards prevailing in Germany at the time, it is even possible to say that from a rhetorical standpoint Hitler did an outstanding job. The result of this supreme achievement in persuasion, however, was a world conflagration, and the eventual ends thus achieved must provide the rhetorical critic with his reasons for a negative judgment of Hitler's abilities as a persuasive speaker.

The Fuehrer's interpretation of the factors leading to peace and war is perhaps best illustrated by two quotations. When Hitler spoke to his Armed Forces on September

---

*322* Schrier, op. cit., p. 477.
1, 1939, his interpretation of the situation showed that once this man had decided an issue, all further details were brought into agreement with his thinking.

... A number of border violations, impossible to bear by a great power, prove that the Poles are no longer willing to respect the border of the German Reich. In order to bring to an end this mad undertaking, I have no choice but from now on to use force against force. The German Armed Forces will carry through the fight for the honor and basic rights of life of the resurrected German people with hard decisiveness. I expect that every soldier, remembering the great tradition of the eternal German military, will do his duty to the last.

Always be aware of the fact in all situations, that you are the representatives of the national socialist Great Germany. Long live our people and our Reich!323

When he had the war, which he considered to be impossible to avoid, Hitler would state: "It is too bad one has to conduct war because of Churchill, instead of serving the works of peace, as for instance art."324

Whenever it seemed convenient, his opponent's supposed beliefs concerning war would also serve Hitler well. Claiming that England had taken what was hers by force, he stated repeatedly that the British had learned the lesson that one should not return by democratic means.

---

323Adolf Hitler, Der Grossdeutsche Freiheitskampf, Reden Adolf Hitler's Band, I-III (Muenchen: Franz Eher Verlag Nachf., 1943-1944), Vol. III. For original German text see Appendix IV, No. 46. Translations by this author.

324Picker, op. cit., p. 133. See Appendix IV, No. 47, for original German. Translations by this author.
what one had taken by force. "Whosoever has shed blood also has the right to exert the rule."\textsuperscript{325} Hitler recognized force as the most important cause of national unification. To Hitler, the use of weapons was neither wrong nor undesirable. War would bring change, the change of all values. Whenever something did not suit his purposes, he would interpret it in accordance with preconceived ideas, or throw it out altogether as being prejudiced.

\textbf{Ways and means.} Order did exist only in Hitler's mind. "In this case one must not allow existing political frontiers to distract one's attention from the frontiers which exist by eternal principle."\textsuperscript{326} To Hitler, the question of justice posed no problem since HIS Germany was the only just cause.

If new territory were to be acquired in Europe it must be mainly at Russia's cost, and once again the new German Empire had to set out on its march along the road of the former Teutonic Knights, to acquire soil for the German plough by means of the German sword and to provide the nation with its daily bread.\textsuperscript{327}

\textsuperscript{325}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 50. See Appendix IV, No. 48, for original German. Translations by this author.

\textsuperscript{326}Hitler, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 152 (\textit{Mein Kampf}, Verlag Eher, original German). See Appendix IV, No. 49, for original German. Translations by this author.

\textsuperscript{327}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 154. See Appendix IV, No. 50, for original German. Translations by this author.
While supposedly such conquest was intended to provide bread for his nation, this idea almost seemed to come like an afterthought. More than that, he seemed to feel a certain amount of satisfaction with his "shrewd" observations of world affairs as exemplified by the next statements:

The Frenchmen, for instance, shall keep their (political) parties, the more social revolutionary movements they have, the better. It is quite right the way we are doing it now, many Frenchmen will not look forward to our leaving Paris. They are, because of their connection with us, suspected by Vichy Frenchmen.328

After he destroyed Russian industrial centers, he gloatingly pointed out that "America would not be able, even if it worked like mad for four years, to replace what the Russian Army had lost up to now (afternoon, September 10, 1941)."329 America, in Hitler's opinion, had no real desire to help anyone at all. In the case of America, she was only waiting to take over from Great Britain after the war had sufficiently weakened her.

I will not experience it, but I am glad for the German people that they will see some day how Germany and England will stand united against

328 Picker, op. cit., p. 44. See Appendix IV, No. 51, for original German. Translations by this author.

329 Ibid., p. 46. See Appendix IV, No. 52, for original German. Translations by this author.
America. Germany and England will know what one must expect of the other.\textsuperscript{330}

Thus he had determined in his mind all of the means of achieving his own ends. In his speeches Hitler discussed ways and means of fulfilling Aristotle's demands for coverage of the subject.\textsuperscript{331}

\textbf{Law.} Hitler made clear his attitude towards his own people and the administration of law when he spoke before the Reichstag for the first time on March 23, 1933.

Theoretical equality in the eyes of the law cannot be extended to the toleration of an equal basis of those who scorn the laws on principle, or indeed to surrendering the nation's freedom to them on the basis of democratic doctrines.\textsuperscript{332}

To him it was a small matter to fit the law into his general scheme of things. As a matter of fact, law was something he created, not something he obeyed. Thus, the letter of Aristotle's instructions was once more followed but all intentions of dealing honestly with the law were violated.

\textsuperscript{330}\textit{Ibid.} See Appendix IV, No. 53, for original German. Translations by this author.

\textsuperscript{331}See also Chapter VII.

\textsuperscript{332}\textit{Ebenstein, op. cit.}, pp. 69, 70.
History. In the discussion of the life of Hitler reference was made to his broad education background, which probably included a rather indefinite acquaintance with history, law, and politics. However, it must be clearly stated here that from the foregoing statements one conclusion can be drawn, namely, that information gained from other sources never deterred Hitler from traveling the road on which he alone decided. Justification for the statements can be seen in a personal evaluation of his life's work.

The National Socialist Party has performed an epic achievement. . . . Today we are merely witnessing the initial stages of the results of that work; only the generations that come after us will be able to appreciate its full significance. 333

Hitler's sense of values furthermore had much to do with the interpretation he would give to certain historical facts.

In World History there have been so far only three battles of annihilation: Cannae, Sedan, and Tannenberg. We can be proud of the fact that two of these were won by German armies. 334

Government. In order to have long-range plans and interests, it would seem necessary for any speaker to have a realistic impression of one's own position. So confused

333 Hitler, op. cit., No. 8-10 (Speeches-Terramare).

334 Picker, op. cit., p. 45. See Appendix IV, No. 54, for original German. Translations by this author.
was Hitler's thinking that he would have challenged anyone who would not have considered him truly the elected leader of the German people. The following quotation from Hitler's conversations explains, however, how he thought of such elections:

1. The chances not to call a total idiot to the leadership of the state are greater in a free election than vice versa . . .
2. In the selection of a chief of state a personality must be looked for which assures in human estimation a certain stability of direction in state affairs over a long period of time . . .
3. It will have to be made certain that the leading man of the state will be independent of the influence of the economic system and couldn't be forced to certain decisions by means of economic pressure.335

Hitler went further than this, and in his strange way drew certain conclusions concerning the future of Germany.

1. The German Reich has to become a republic. The Fuehrer should be elected. He should be equipped with absolute authority.
2. As a collective, a people's assembly has to remain, which could support the leader, or—if necessary—could step in.
3. The election of the leader should not be made by representatives of the people, but through the senate. The senate would have to be equipped with limited powers.
4. The execution of the leader's election should not take place before the eyes of the people, but behind closed doors . . .
5. Within three hours after completion of the election, party, army and state officials have to be sworn in on the new leadership.

335 Ibid., p. 221. See Appendix IV, No. 55, for original German. Translations by this author.
These last statements probably represent the clearest
definition on Hitler's part, of political life as he saw it.

VI. Conclusions

His major areas of interest were summed up by
Hitler's secretary as having been art, technology, and
history, while he was lacking information in the areas of
law, constitution, and finance. This could have resulted
in the fact that he left much of the actual control of the
country to others.336 Where Hitler was strong or felt
strong, Germany showed singleness of purpose. Hitler's
speeches contributed to this feeling of unity. What he
had learned previous to his rule became evident in his
work. After he began his reign, he learned little more.
No new ideas, no new areas were opened up by him, and thus
incessant repetition became the rule in his communications.
One can conclude, on the basis of all that has been re-
corded, that Hitler was extremely successful as a deliber-
ative speaker. He used the methods of rhetoric well, and
covered the subjects considered by the ancient rhetoricians.

336Zoller, op. cit., p. 43
This was true in spite of the fact that rhetoric was not a subject he or his followers ever studied formally.

It seems never to have occurred to any Nazi rhetorician to study classical treaties of rhetoric.337

But Hitler was able to apply these methods in a way which showed outstanding awareness of human motivation.

When one wishes an emotional response from his audience, he tries to arouse extensive physical responses; he tries to generate attitudes rather than decisions; he wishes to involve the present case with considerations of a general nature, or with general concepts, such as freedom, manliness, patriotism, fair play, etc.338

In conclusion, it is also the responsibility of the rhetorical critic to point out that in spite of these effective methods, Wilson's challenge still remains true.

People are responsible for the acts of their government.339

Therefore the German audience had to share in the responsibility for accepting Hitler's statements merely on the basis of their existence rather than any valid criterion.


339 Woodrow Wilson, New York Times, September 5, 1919. From a speech given in Columbus, Ohio.
Summary. The following important factors were determined in the preceding chapter.

1. Hitler used deliberative oratory almost to the exclusion of all other types.

2. The German concepts of exhortation as related to the term "REDE" were of such a nature as to make Hitler's speeches highly acceptable to German audiences.

3. Self-aggrandizement and strengthening of his own cause, as he had developed it, were the only aims of Hitler's deliberative oratory.

4. While probably not being consciously aware of their existence, Hitler nevertheless used all of the subject matter Aristotle considered to be in the area of deliberative oratory.

5. Adherence to the forms of rhetoric by no means meant adherence to underlying principles or ethical usage of speech materials, in the case of Hitler.

6. Hitler had developed his own standard of happiness, expedience, the good, etc., and argument with his sources for these attitudes must be sought outside the realm of usual speech evaluations. It lies within the area of philosophy and even religious concepts.

7. Since Hitler established what was "right," every time he agreed within himself this "right" was further undergirded.
8. Hitler's propaganda machine as well as political conditions of his day provided a setting in which pathos became the preparatory force leading to the acceptance of the powerful ethical appeal of the "Fuehrer" or leader-principal.

9. Hitler was a highly effective deliberative orator.
CHAPTER VI

HITLER AND HIS AUDIENCE

I. Introduction

The preceding chapters have contributed valuable considerations and findings, particularly if one cites the summary of Chapter V which indicates Hitler's usage of important rhetorical devices in his deliberative oratory. The fact that the German leader was able to use such devices effectively also forms one of the major findings of a recent master's thesis.\textsuperscript{340} Among the effectively used devices the following were mentioned: Identification with the audience, flattery, startling statements, rhetorical questions, deductive syllogisms, general enthymemes, metaphors, comparisons. This indeed represents an impressive list, attesting to the fact that even the untrained person who accidentally comes upon the devices of rhetoric can be an effective speaker.

The writer has pointed out Hitler's ability to speak effectively, but he is still dissatisfied with explanations given so far. Tens of millions of people followed an image, but what was the underlying cause of it all? This is the question which still remains to be answered. The present chapter is an attempt to supply that answer.

II. Hitler: Unique Leader in German History

Twenty years of study of German history on the part of the writer, concentrated in recent years upon German speakers, has by the very absence of materials lent credence to the following observations.

1. Hitler represented a most unique phenomenon in German history. At no time in the history of that nation did it produce what could be called a truly popular speaker. The author can name no one who would fit the American concept of a popular speaker, or, as Germans would call him: "Volksredner."

2. Hitler represented a special type of "pleader," a figure quite unknown in German history. This undoubtedly was the result of political and religious conditions in that nation. Under the American
system both in politics and in the area of religion such speakers were produced. In German history such people are spectacular only by their absence. On a small, local level they may have existed, but they never influenced the development of the country as a whole, or any large segment thereof. The strongly emotional, spiritualistic, and patriotic oral appeals are thus absent from German history before Hitler.

While negative findings of this type are important, further support was needed. For this reason, the writer contacted Dr. Paul Tack, present head of the German Speech Association at the University of Bonn in Germany, and his reply supported these contentions. 341

341 The following excerpts are taken from Dr. Paul Tack's letter of March 13, 1961. For the original see Appendix III. Translations by this author.

"... You are quite right with all four of your statements (AS THEY APPEAR SUMMARIZED IN THE PRECEDING MATERIAL OF THIS STUDY). The new, original about Hitler's appearance has certainly increased his effectiveness.

After the revolution of 1918 speakers certainly also went out into the street and public places. But all this remained very closely tied to party politics and then decreased.

There were to be sure also a few popular preachers, but they remained confessionally limited. A certain exception was perhaps the Catholic clergyman
3. To Germans, Hitler thus held a very special appeal. He was indeed unique. For the first time Germans had a "Volksredner." They came under the influence of his propaganda machine, and the appeals of the noisy carnival "shell artist" who dazzled the eye of the beholder, as well as the experience of hearing someone express publicly ideas which otherwise were relegated to poet's books and the family dinner table.

The following quotations taken from actual recordings of his speeches indicate this approach very clearly. Casting his words into the form of the Bible, he uttered these words:

It was the most difficult decision of my own life, I have dared it because I believed that it

---

Dr. Carl Sonnenschein who was sent out from the central office of the Catholic Socialwork in Moenchengladbach, and who there—as much as I know—also had influence on the young Josef Goebbels (he was born in Moenchengladbach). Dr. Sonnenschein looked then for the larger area, and went to Berlin, where he, in the 20's became a popular figure, also as a speaker, (known) far beyond the circle of confession.

When Chancellor Bruening made use for the first time of the modern communications medium of broadcasting, and in political speeches addressed himself to all of the people, it was almost considered to be constitutionally dangerous. As a type, however, the ascetic Bruening was not at all a 'popular speaker.' (Public) speaking has had in Germany (before Hitler) always a tendency towards the academic. The high regard for the "professor" is related to this fact."
had to be. . . . I cannot separate myself from the faith in my people. . . . I cannot separate myself from the love to this my people . . . the new German empire of greatness, honor, power, and justice. Amen. 342

With a voice breaking with emotion, raised in a fury of sound, he had shouted earlier, upon his selection as Chancellor of Germany:

. . . German people, give me four years time, then condemn and sit in judgment over us. German people, give us four years time and I swear to you as we, as I, entered this office, I will then leave. I did not do it for pay, and not for reward; I did it just for you. 343

One can almost see in the mind's eye the rapt faces of his listeners, the tears they wiped away when the man whom they had "chosen," a man of the people, one like them, made these heart-rending pleas. Even the radio reporter to whom the writer listened as he gave his reports on the happenings of March 21, 1933, copied the grand and eloquent style of the Fuehrer. He spoke of a Germany which was "strong and unconquerable because it has found itself again." It was

342 Recording of a speech made on February 10, 1933, in the Berlin, Sportpalast. For the original German see Appendix IV, No. 56. Translations by this author.

343 From a German language recording of a speech given February 10, 1933, in Berlin. For original wording see Appendix IV, No. 57. Translations by this author.
evident that he copied even the peculiarities of Hitler's style of delivery.

Listening to President von Hindenburg and his heavy, slow soldier's speech, made even more cumbersome by an East German accept and Hitler's sharp, clipped, determined voice pleading for his acceptance, was a study in contrasts. Hitler declared upon his acceptance of the post of chancellor: "Out of farmers, workers, and city dwellers there shall be again a German nation." Later he declared that it was his desire for the German people to be "Honest friends of a peace which shall finally heal the wounds from which all suffer." How he could pack a moment with emotion, how he could challenge all those who had never heard speech used as a means of fighting political battles, is best illustrated by his defiant challenge to the Socialist minority which tried to stop him in his first parliament. He had thrown their leaders into concentration camps, now they were struggling for their very lives, but he completely cowed

344 From a recording of Hitler's speech in the Potsdam Garnisonskirche, March 21, 1933. For original wording see Appendix IV, No. 58. Translations by this author.

345 Ibid. See Appendix IV, No. 59. Translations by this author.
them into accepting the Enabling Act which gave Hitler absolute powers. He stood up and screamed in their faces: "May you, gentlemen, now decide for peace or war." How ineffectual were the words of the Social Democrats' leader Weis in reply to this challenge: "Freedom and life one can indeed take from us, but not honor." Hitler now entirely sure of himself taunted his enemies, questioned their honor and their convictions, called them cowards and crushed them with the announcement that his party would have indeed faced them even in open battle if that's what they wanted: "The courage to fight you also in other ways (NOT IN PARLIAMENT, BUT IN THE STREETS) God knows, we would also have had." The final clash of ideologies, and a clear indication of the approach Hitler wanted to use was exemplified by his screaming denunciation of the Socialists: "Germany shall be free again, but not through your efforts. . . . I don't want at all that you will vote for it (THE DICTATORIAL ENABLING ACT)." The noisy acceptance of his speech by members of the parliament showed that he had struck the right note again, made the right plea.

4. How much Hitler changed concepts can be seen in the fact that the term "Volksredner," at least before

---

346 From a German language recording of a speech before the Reichstag on March 23, 1933. See Appendix IV, No. 60. Translations by this author.
his time, had a definitely negative meaning among German people. It was almost synonmous with the term demagogue. However, the Fuehrer changed all that. How important this change of concepts was can again be illustrated by the unique place Hitler took in German history. Even the leaders of his party had to admit that there were no precedents in the history of the German race for great speakers.\textsuperscript{347} The leading German apologists and teachers of his system had no way in which they could invent outstanding speakers in Germany's past, in spite of the fact that this method was often used to give credence to their claims.\textsuperscript{348}

5. This man could stand before his people as the unique leader to whom the masses, in amazement and with an almost religious shudder running down their spines, could listen when he said:

\begin{quote}
\ldots there is no one in a responsible position in this state who doubts that I am the authorized leader of this empire and that the nation through its trust has
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{347}Joseph Goebbels, Der Fuehrer als Redner, Unser Wille und Weg, IX, April, 1939, p. 75. As quoted by Scanlan, "The Nazi Rhetorician," p. 432.

given me the mandate to represent it everywhere and in every place.\textsuperscript{349}

Another indication of the uniqueness of this man was given in a recent German book which dealt with Hitler, the LEADER INTO OBLIVION, in the manuscript of a radio symposium. Hans Buchheim in his paper, "Hitler as a Politician," interpreted the approach he used by saying that he was willing to make an absolute out of every action he took, willing to risk for it everything he had accomplished to that time.\textsuperscript{350} Edith Eucken Erdsiek in her study, "Hitler as an Ideologist," included in the same book, probably put her finger on the entire problem when she stated that Hitler was a half-educated person, but one with enthusiasm.\textsuperscript{351} Why his audience followed him and accepted him was indicated by Edith Eucken Erdsiek when she stated that he had the antennae of an extremely sensitive hysteric which enabled him to respond to all emotions rampant at any one time in his audience.\textsuperscript{352}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{349}From the recording of a speech given February 20, 1938, in the Reichstag, Berlin. See Appendix IV, No. 61, for original text. Translations by this author.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{350}Hans Buchheim, et. al., Der Fuhrer ins Nichts, (Rastatt Baden Grotesche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1950), p. 15.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{351}Ibid., p. 27. \textsuperscript{352}Ibid., p. 30.
\end{flushright}
Throughout the discussion by the four participants in the aforementioned radio panel, one idea appeared again and again: Hitler could not really be compared to anyone in German history, particularly not his approach as a speaker and leader of his audience.

Thus the relationship of Hitler to his audience will now be studied to show how this man was able to build for himself as unique an audience as German history has ever known. To return to the ancient rhetoricians, one should quote Book II of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* which deals with the reception of the oration by the listener. He stated:

Since rhetoric is for judgment—for even deliberative speeches are judged, and forensic is (concerned with) judgment—we must see to it not only that the speech shall be convincing and persuasive, but also that the judge shall be in the right frame of mind. For it makes a great difference in persuasion, especially in deliberative speeches, but also in forensic, how the speaker strikes the audience—both how the hearers think he regards them, and in addition how they are disposed toward him.353

Hitler's audiences will be studied from these standpoints. The power of the dictator probably was nowhere better seen than in the speaker-audience relationship. It is also an important purpose of the present chapter to show that

---

there was no organized audience except the one Hitler had created and molded.

III. Hitler's Relationship with His Audience

Gray and Wise can state only in weak terms the power of a man like Hitler:

Frequently, if not usually, a speaker will gain in persuasive power if he succeeds in identifying his own interests with those of his listeners.\(^{354}\)

This attitude would presuppose that an equal part is played by the audience in oral communications. However, the German leader did not see things that way. "We have done away with the concept that it is part of political freedom that everyone can express (in the newspapers) what he likes."\(^{355}\) Respect for his audience never was part of his dealings with his countrymen. "How lucky for the rulers that people don't think. Thought only exists in the giving or ful-

\(^{354}\)Gray and Wise, op. cit., p. 412.

\(^{355}\)Picker, op. cit., p. 269. See Appendix IV, No. 62 for original German. Translations by this author.
fillment of an order. If it were different, human society could not exist."356

The use of the German audience. The critic must go further yet, because another comment indicates quite clearly the basis on which German audiences were used.

One shouldn't value individual existence so highly. If its continuance were necessary, it wouldn't perish . . .357

Audiences were sounding boards; they provided the background, nothing more. "The leader preaches, announces, he does not want to supply material for discussion."358 He accomplished this end because, according to Dovifat, he had learned "simplification," and thus he could teach others "simply."359 This meant that audiences had to accept Hitler's statements on anything but the basis of reason.

356Ibid., p. 198. See Appendix IV, No. 63 for original German. Translations by this author.

357Ibid., p. 347. See Appendix IV, No. 64 for original German. Translations by this author.

358Kindt, op. cit., p. 20. See Appendix IV, No. 65 for original German. Translations by this author.

359Dovifat, op. cit., p. 139. Appendix IV, No. 66 for original German. Translations by this author.
Ethos and pathos. As stated earlier, the close relationship of ethos and pathos becomes quite apparent in this study of Hitler's efforts. The critic must remember Croft's challenge:

But the important point is that the rhetorical form is only an aid in evaluating the success with which a speaker selected and established the most appropriate idea relationships in the speech.  

Thousands, and even millions caught a glimpse of the speaker Adolf Hitler as he addressed the mass rallies of his party. However, the situations in which Hitler spoke were previously determined by the world which he himself had created. In the strange counterbalance of dictatorships, Hitler had created a world of his own, and then had to respond to the world of his making. A consideration of the philosophy of life of Hitler's Germany, for this reason represents to the rhetorical critic an opportunity to study further the factors distinguishing Hitler's total audience.  

While conducting his campaign of simplification in an attempt to stir up the physically oriented motives among the people, he had to find ways and means of creating a

---


361 See also Appendix II.
common basis on which to work. Identification with the motives of the German people who desired freedom from foreign rule, recognition, and security, provided such an opportunity. A lost war, economic distress, enemy interference in internal affairs, supplied Hitler with his ammunition. Pride in the religious and cultural achievements of their forebears made Germans easy prey for appeals to motives of self-aggrandizement, because of a general feeling in the world that they were no longer worthy members of human society. To direct the force of pathos to the strengthening of his own ethos, Hitler therefore was never loathe to praise his political success to obtain more followers. On February 20, 1938, he made the following statement:

In the fifteen years of a struggle for power amid constant persecution and oppression on the part of our adversaries, there was a steady increase not only in the Party's inner moral strength but also, still more important, in its outward capacity to resist.

Hence we succeeded in the course of fifteen years in growing from the smallest beginning into a political organization such as Germany had never before witnessed. And only as a result of this fact was I able to make use of the results of the process of selection produced by years of struggle in choosing the men who should lead the Party.\footnote{Hitler, op. cit., No. 8-10 (Speeches, Terramare).}
A mere classification of the audience in Hitler's case would tend to cause the student to miss the entire point. The power of the man and his ideas was central. Goering, later to become Hitler's announced successor, was one of those who indicated that he was almost hypnotized when he heard Hitler for the first time make a brief statement at a public meeting.  

The basis of the Nazi audience. Kohn explained, and gave a clearer impression of the forces moving Hitler and the audience he created:

Thus we find that Fascism regards the national or racial state as an end in itself, its totalitarian character a permanent feature, based upon the expectation of a never-ending bitter struggle of nations and races, a permanent conflict for which all resources, especially all moral and mental resources, must remain mobilized forever . . .

National socialism--this is the fundamental difference between Bismarck's and Hitler's power--politics has therefore no limited goals, it can never become satiated, it will always be driven by its dynamism, even at the risk of self-destruction. But from its combination with Prussianism it gains a hybrid character which makes possible its flexibility, its lack of clarity and definiteness, and its associations with most representative figures of the German past--although frequently only by the falsification or elimination

---

of some of their essential attitudes and thoughts. 364

The success of Hitler's venture depended on his ability to develop a nation which would blindly, emotionally, follow one man and one idea.

**Speech as audience stimulation.** The German concept of "Rede" (speech) also gives an indication of what formed the basis of audience reactions. Dovifat wrote of its function as a mass medium:

> The speech (REDE) is the most beautiful and the most effective means of leading a people. . . . And still it is and remains the strongest power, to awaken faith, to harden convictions, to destroy that which is descending, to lift up that which is ascending, and to tear the masses out of their old ways of thought into the avenues of new hope. 365

Kindt, basing his ideas on a similar concept as quoted above, indicated the power of such a speech. "Sentence after sentence is thus 'built' into the German soul." To him, Hitler's speech before the court which condemned the latter to Landsberg prison, "means the first (new) break-

---


365 Dovifat, op. cit., p. 7. For original German see Appendix IV, No. 67. Translations by this author.
through of the Logos Germanikos." 366 Thus, the critics of the Nazi reign provide us with the means of understanding that Hitler produced something new and rhetorically important: A carefully prepared national audience. The individual was dead. Long live the state and the mass concept as means of speaker stimulation.

They spoke from the beginning to the entire nation, and in doing so, they formed a new type of speech. They caused fear and indignation among those, who had developed the speech (REDE) always only for certain groups, classes, or parties. They overlooked that here became a reality what Aristotle had already required of the popular speech: It was to be like the scenery in the stadium. The larger the wide circle, the wider and coarser the line, the larger the mass of observers, the crasser the color, the further the mass of the people stretches, the more brilliant the light, the blacker the darkness. For every new thousand of the observers greater simplification, coarser outline of the picture. Thus also the application of the popular speech: In wishing to touch the very last one, it has to make sense to the very last, and especially to him. 367

The aims of audience stimulation. The speaker had two aims in stimulating his audience: to make himself a political power and thereby lead his listeners to action. The stimulus presented in the "REDE" is one leading to

366 Kindt, op. cit., pp. 25, 26. For original German, see Appendix IV, No. 68. Translations by this author.

367 Dovifat, op. cit., p. 14. For original German see Appendix IV, No. 69. Translations by this author.
action. No other objective could be seen by the German of Hitler's day. There was, furthermore, no other reason for the existence of the political speech. Dovifat thus could write that the feeling within the speaker is the beginning of it all, he feels a combination of power and consecration. How he controls this feeling is difficult to determine, since action is all he seeks. How, furthermore, the audience can thus be led into rhetorically acceptable channels is another question of grave doubt. This is a danger in spite of the mouth service rendered by Dovifat "... to let glitter and success of the speech retreat before that which political wisdom and the welfare of all the people requires." 368 Every public speech was turned into a "heart-to-heart" talk, resulting not in the Roman "oratio" but in "actio." One can summarize this approach to the audience in the following words: "It is the unification of the duality of speaker and listener into the unity of the faith and will, with the goal of the deed (action)." 369 "Faith" and "will" became the sources of all stimuli in this chain of reasoning. The intellectual may have turned

368 Ibid., pp. 16 and 19. For original German see Appendix IV, No. 70. Translations by this author.

369 Ibid., p. 33. For original German see Appendix IV, No. 71. Translations by this author.
away in disgust, the rhetorical critic of today may be concerned over this application of Aristotle's ideas, yet the effectiveness of the method is recorded by history. Probably in no other case does the rhetorical critic become as keenly aware of the problems facing him than in the study of a dictator. On the one hand he has to acknowledge the outstanding success Hitler had in applying the methods of rhetoric in his speeches. On the other hand, he must search for a basis on which to judge the Fuehrer's speeches adequately. Hitler, in this writer's opinion, brings to a focus a problem which exists in all of human life.

There are those who insist upon a higher standard for speech than they themselves exercise in everyday life. . . . These people should remember that if speech has in some instances its problems of ethics, they are no more than a reflection of the problems of everyday life.370

It is quite possible that Hitler's success in dealing with the audience of his day was in part due to his ability to appear the master rather than the slave of the standards of his day.

The relationship of speaker to audience. To Germans, Adolf Hitler represented celibacy, strength, physical and mental capabilities, and divinely guided purpose. As the image of the man collapsed with increased knowledge, the image of a secure Germany collapsed. In this sense of the word it could be indeed written:

Hitler was one of them (the people). His instincts were theirs, and the surety with which he could gauge those instincts... swept him into power.371

The rhetorician is faced with an instinctive rather than a reasonable relationship between speaker and audience. Hitler's strength lay to some extent in the fact that he supplied his audience with a shallow feeling of security. "Hitler was able in his speeches to convince people that he believed what he said, while he said it. This was his strength."372 But he had to come a long way from his first major speaking attempt in the "Circus Krone" on February 3, 1921, which only represented a first test of his ability to bring together the 6,500 people it took to fill the circus.373 Later he showed another trait, his ability to adjust to the needs of his audience, as in January of 1932.

371 Roberts, op. cit., p. 36.
372 Goerlitz, op. cit., p. 139.
373 Ibid., p. 156.
He needed the support of the industrialists, and is supposed to have gained it in conferences with groups of them in the cities of Duesseldorf and Krefeld, in spite of the fact that they were at first against him. In a personal letter to the writer, former Chancellor von Papen furthered the total impression of an audience shaped after Hitler's will:

The influence of his speeches on his listeners had always remained impossible for me to understand. They were neither impressive in delivery nor were they of considerable mental conception.

External aids to success. World War I had provided Hitler with a starting point from which he could develop his total system and his audience. An adequate means of influencing listeners could be found in the political and economic suffering of the German people after World War I. France and England had seen to it that Germany was crushed. Political forces of various nature had further divided Germany. Fear of complete anarchy was to be found among many thoughtful German people. It did not seem that any one force could lead Germany back on a safe road. At the

---

374Dovifat, op. cit., pp. 141-142.
375For original text of letter, see Appendix III. Translations by this author.
same time, democratic processes and discussions seemed to help little. Then appeared a savior: HITLER.\textsuperscript{376}

The Fuehrer at first had no power backing him up. The only weapon at the disposal of his party, which was without funds, was the spoken word. Hitler had to become as effective as possible in using his speeches in the situation which then existed in Germany. Fortunately for him, anyone who discussed, for instance, the unfairness of the Versailles Treaty, or gave any hope of helping Germany in her economic distress, could be assured of a group of listeners. A rhetorical critic of the day referred to this fact when he wrote that Hitler brought something new to inflationary Germany where:

\begin{quote}
We also suffered from an inflation of words. 
. . . Watch Hitler during a speech: The entire man is WORD, through the entire man the logos wants to reveal itself. . . . Hitler knows of that magic of words. . . . The word of the passionate, however, becomes a weapon in interior as well as foreign politics. . . . Hitler has accomplished in these nine months of his chancellorship more with his words, than some "statesmen with their "deeds" in years. . . . Hitler's speeches acted as if a bird of prey swoops down on a flock of ducks, which disintegrates quacking, in all directions. . . Every speech was a political battle.\textsuperscript{377} . .
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{376}See also Chapter II.

\textsuperscript{377}Kindt, op. cit., pp. 26-28. For original German see Appendix IV, No. 72. Translations by this author.
To understand the thinking of the German people as they came face to face with the new National Socialist doctrines, a philosopher's interpretation of their reactions should be considered.

Fascism, on the other hand, represents a form of nationalism which the claims and happiness of the individual are entirely subordinated to the national prosperity and even more to national aspirations for power. War with its complete subordination of the individual to the state, now becomes a part, and a very important part, of the normal history of the nation. The nation, transcending the brief limits of the individual life, represents the true and permanent foundation of the life of the individuals, who now become cells in the organic body of the state.

Fascist dictatorships are founded on three principles, the state, authority, and the leader. All three are believed to be permanent, since they are held to correspond to unalterable elements in human nature. Dictatorship is therefore an essential part of Fascism.

The aim of dictators like Mussolini and Hitler was not social revolution but personal power through a more powerful integration of the nation, and the means by which they hoped to achieve this was to fuse all classes into a disciplined whole to make the nation the supreme loyalty of every man, the foundation of his life, the mainspring of his personal and social actions. The people must become a docile and pliable instrument in the aims, the maintenance of his own power and the aggrandizement of his nation.

The Messianic expectation of Fascism reposes on the carisma of the individual leader, the superman who by mystic identification embodies and represents the nation. Carismatic dictatorships work upon emotions
that are bound up with the particular feelings and modes of thought and the historical memories of a nation.378

The uniting force of emotion. Hitler's strong personal influence, combined with the absence of individual rights and power, provided him with a highly homogeneous audience. Then he gave his nation a political success, which it hoped might eventually enable Germany to raise its head again in the world. However, there was no internal issue to unite Germans in a strong, warlike effort at a time when foreign policy was still insecure, and the Nazis did not dare to strike against the real enemies, England and France. Thus Hitler developed the racial issue, particularly the Jewish question. His speeches clearly showed the emotional nature of the contact with his audiences which he desired.

The speeches begin always with deep pessimism and end in overjoyed redemption, a triumph and happy ending; often they can be refuted by reason, but they follow the far mightier logic of the subconscious, which no refutation can touch.379

As in all other instances, Hitler was a master in applying the concepts of rhetoric of which Cicero spoke, when it came

378Kohn, op. cit., p. 46.
379Heiden, op. cit., p. 106.
to pathetic proof. Such emotions as fear, love, desire, hope, hatred, joy, grief, and virtue formed the repertoire he used in building his audience into a closely-knit, emotion charged body of listeners.\textsuperscript{380} Louis P. Lochner, well-known AP correspondent, and student of Adolf Hitler, who spent many years in German close to Hitler, also offers support for this impression:

1. He always came late, so that expectations had been raised to the highest point and the feeling engendered that this man who carries all Germany on his shoulders and foregoes sleep, was really doing something wonderful in taking time out to address the crowd. (He, as a matter of fact, loved nothing more than to harangue a crowd!)

2. While he was thus keeping the crowd on tenter hooks, the indoor or outdoor managers of the event (usually Goebbels himself) so kept the masses entertained with stirring marches, blood curdling songs sung by "das Volk" and emotional slogans painted on canvases throughout the hall or along the periphery of a sports field, slogans like "Juden 'raus!" (JEWS GET OUT), "Ein Volk, Ein Reich, ein Fuehrer" (ONE NATION, ONE EMPIRE, ONE LEADER), and "Deutschland fordert seine Kolonien zurueck" (GERMANY DEMANDS HER COLONIES BACK), that by the time Hitler arrived, the climate was fully prepared for the sort of talk he was wont to give.\textsuperscript{381}

These were the final, practical steps he took to build an audience for his speeches.

\textsuperscript{380}Cicero, \textit{On Oratory}, B-2, C 44.

\textsuperscript{381}From a personal letter to the writer. For the original see Appendix III.
The total audience. Hitler was not only effective in fact to face situations, but the impact of his messages was equally effective in his use of the air-waves. Powerful sensory stimulation was provided by various means. Newspapers would carry pictures and important headlines telling of an impending speech. Radio programs would be interrupted, sometimes a day in advance of the actual broadcast, and the population could not forget that Hitler was going to speak on a certain day. For the last election under the Hitler regime, on November 12, 1933, Hitler used a device which resulted in a feeling of unity and "belonging" among the German people. At noon of a certain day all work stopped all over the country. Every German had to listen to Hitler. The streets were filled with the sound of loudspeakers. Every citizen was thus made a part of the powerful speech which, according to a film from the UCLA historic film library, was held in the Dynamo Halle. Hitler had again succeeded in giving a common purpose, a common aim, and common action to his people. The individual was absorbed by the mass concept.

V. The Persuaded Audience

The speech critic can find much that was technically wrong with Hitler's speeches. Theoretically, this could
have contributed to a possible audience rejection of the speaker, but other factors completely counterbalanced these inadequacies.

The man who understood people. One of Germany's former leaders, Schwerin von Krosigk, sums up the writer's own impressions quite adequately:

Hitler was convinced that constant repetition, only in somewhat different form, would finally weaken even the stubborn listener. Thus his speeches were often, or in most cases, a collection of varied platitudes. They read badly, they were only effective when he himself delivered them. And just as monotonous were his gestures; the most common the rapidly descending fist, which underlined powerful words. He had an ugly organ (DISPLEASING VOICE) and a breaking voice. He often pronounced foreign words incorrectly and in spite of that, a surprising impression came from the man, which brought him in contact with his listeners, so that they forgot all these shortcomings, and against which even those often had to fight who did not want to surrender to his magic. Hitler understood how to sense what moved people inwardly, and to give this a specific clear expression. Then his listeners felt understood and they melted into a union with the speaker. Therefore he had always quicker contact with masses moved by emotions than with intellectuals who followed their mind. He furthermore had the gift to appeal both to the good and the bad in man at the same time. He set up idealistic demands and at the same time awakened the bad instincts. Here too the art of mixing fire and ice was remarkable.382

382From a personal letter to the writer. For the original see Appendix III. Translations by this author.
The result was the presence of an outstanding persuasive force in his speeches and a merging of the powers of ethos and pathos. The Fuehrer was able to fulfill the requirements of which Schleiniger wrote:

Every nature is responsive to a distinct set of emotions. One orator feels himself more easily attracted to tender emotions, another to the vehement kind. If an orator wishes to impress his hearers, let him in this matter follow his own impulses, and allow his own nature to speak and act.  

It is this writer's conviction that Hitler's audiences worked so closely with him because, in a political world making much use of sham and pretense, he was "outspoken," "frank," and unashamed to voice his feelings. This provided the audience, which had been carefully prepared for the occasion, with an opportunity for similar "frank" expressions of its emotions. It resulted in the frequently recorded outbreaks of mass hysteria during and after the Fuehrer's speeches.

Youth: A part of Hitler's audience. Hitler's strong appeal to German youth must not be overlooked. The writer can act as an authority here. To those of us who followed Hitler in his Youth Movement, the very youth and newness of his movement held a compelling attraction. More than that,  

it had been traditionally true that only the old could assume a position of leadership in Europe. The only time young people could prove themselves was in war. Hitler made use of both of these factors and told the young people of his country that he would give them a purpose: Service. If one could only get youth to believe, Hitler, stated, its potentials would act like sour-dough. It would find new followers for the party on its own, and would work for its basic ideas without being influenced by the actions of the old people.384

While watching a number of films showing Hitler during public appearances, two American observers were with the writer. They seemed aware of the superbly carried out staging of all events depicted in the films, and the strong influence of Hitler over anyone who ever watched him in action. The words of the Fuehrer's interpreter explained well what was seen in those films:

It was as though at the sight of him, mass intoxication had seized the untold thousands along the way. . . . One felt one had to keep a grip on oneself in order not to be carried away by the jubilation . . . even some hardboiled journalists were shaken to the core.385

384Picker, op. cit., p. 98.
385Schmidt, op. cit., p. 69.
When his architect and minister of defense, Speer, testified at the Nuremberg trials, he also indicated that the people were in Hitler's spell, blindly subservient to him, possessing almost no will of their own. Speer, as had others, felt exhausted and with no will of his own after he had been in his presence for any length of time.

Personal experience permits the writer to add his own outline of what usually happened before one of Hitler's speeches. Days before the actual event, important looking papers traveled the long road of command positions down, until they reached the individual Hitler Youth member. It seemed always important to Hitler and the organizers of his political rallies to have large numbers of young people present because of their enthusiasm and because during the war years they were much more readily available. A time and meeting place had been set, usually close to a transportation hub, such as an elevated train station in the city of Berlin. The meeting was arranged many hours before the actual appearance of Hitler. Boys approached from all directions. Usually several groups met in the same locale. A general holiday mood prevailed, although it was controlled by the exacting and detailed rules of military behavior which had been drilled into the boys. The last boys hurried to their respective columns drawing up on the street. Orders were shouted. Roll calls were carried through. Brief drills
were performed to get the group welded together into a unit. Smaller units reported to leaders of larger units. Strict protocol was observed. Finally, the leader of the largest unit which had assembled received salutes and reports from all commanders of smaller units.

Leaders returned to their units, new orders were shouted. Fife, bugle, and drum corps struck up martial music, the arms were raised in unison to the Nazi salute, solemnly the flag of the unit was unfurled. Then more orders were given. The total unit wheeled and marched. In cadence, rhythms were shouted out. Orders for singing came through the line. Often units within the larger unit would sing different songs, each trying to outdo the others. Salutes of other flags marching past were executed by the leaders. The units then converged upon the railroad station. A train sped the youngsters to the center of the city. From thousands of similar places units converged upon the major meeting place which had been designated. As the train stopped repeatedly, other units, both of Hitler Youth and other party groups, entered the train. Trains became packed. Comrades recognized each other from camps, meetings, and sports events they had attended. Rival units exchanged jocular comments. In the streets below marching units could be seen, music could be heard. A feeling of something great and important about to happen seized the
young people. They were to have part in an important event.

As the final station came close, expectations rose and grew. Orders were barked as the units left the train. Down the stairs and into the streets they went. There was still some marching to be done, since meetings were always arranged in such a way as to require marching in units and singing, to weld the groups yet closer together. Larger units now formed. The total process of military precision and orders as well as ritual was followed again, until step by step units now numbering into the thousands were lined up in the streets, getting ready. The questions, "When do we get going?" and also the "When will he speak?" usually began to be asked about this time. Finally, with a pride and elation which only a crowd of people with a similar purpose can produce, the columns marched out. Each unit tried to outdo the other in exactness, the effectiveness of its flag displays, and the music sung and played. Thus, thousands converged upon the place of meeting. An overwhelming feeling causing participants to loose more and more the concept of self and see only the total impression came over everyone. Flags, huge banners, red and black or golden slogan banners, appeared in profusion. Uniforms became more splendid. Almost with pride the boys would notice certain decorations, insignias of rank which they had been taught to
recognize and which they now were able to point out to one another. More reports, more orders caused the groups assembled before the place of meeting to spend more time.

A whirling mass of events caused usually a strange mixture of fatigue and elation which seemed to drench the entire situation in an unrealistic light. Before the war, torchlight parades would be formed, or bonfires would help to give a feeling of eeriness to the total event. Covered lights and strict rules of blackout during the war would make the entire situation even more mysterious. After what seemed hours, the units would enter the huge hall. Inside glaring lights, almost blinding, a carefully and tastefully arranged stage with flowers, slogans, heavy furniture, heavy gold eagles. Cadres of boys and girls making up choirs and drum and bugle corps would line the walls. One did not dare to look because military precision had to mark each unit as it proudly entered. Yet the overwhelming importance of light, color, and sound forced the eyes of the boys to look around. One did not know where to look first. With great precision thousands found their seats. Each new unit was greeted by bugle calls. With each bugle call expectation rose—was it the Fuehrer? Time passed. Party battle songs were sung. Girls and boys sang the hymns of the party. The entire group worked itself into a state near to collapse. Often no one had eaten for many hours, refresh-
ments were not served. And then--almost as the point of final endurance had been reached--a roar went up. The Fuehrer was coming. It seemed like mighty ocean waves rushing up. Indistinguishable shouts rose up, "Heil, Heil." Where only individual groups and bugles had played before, a crescendo of sounds seemed to lift the roof off the building.

Among his most colorfully uniformed leaders, Hitler would walk slowly down the center aisle. Faces and eyes would be strained looking, trying to pick out some of the well-known faces, attempting to catch a glimpse of the man everyone had waited for, attempting to guess what he would say. With a final blare of fanfares and glare of search-lights pointed at the stage, Hitler would mount, almost majestically walk to the center of the stage and would begin, "Volksgenossen, und Volksgenossinnen . . ."

Absolute and complete silence dropped over the audience, and emotions strained to the breaking point would be looking for release, for moments in which the crowd could shout, could agree, could respond. Invariably these moments would come. One was too tired really to listen. One could hardly distinguish all the words which poured out of the mouth of this man standing before us and speaking--but he was OUR LEADER. What he said had to be important, or the total situation could not have been developed as it had
been. The speeches would go on and on and on, some of them lasting for two or three hours. With the final shout of acclaim, Hitler would walk out. Arms would be raised in the Nazi salute, the national anthem would be sung again, followed by the party battle song, the "Horst Wessel Lied." Arms nearly dropped off after the long exertion. New orders were shouted, and when one or two hours later boys would finally disband their units and catch the street car home, there seemed often hardly anything but a great weariness and emptiness left. BUT we had been a part of something great and important.

It would go far beyond the scope of this study to discuss all the colors, all the fantastic variety of symbols and forms which constantly accompanied Hitler and his speeches, but they were undeniably an important part of the total situation.

A short newspaper notice among material in the writer's files shows the response among the young people of Germany to Hitler's speeches. The name of the paper has been lost, but the brief article quoted below was taken from a local newspaper in Berlin-Koepenick on December 12, 1943.

Youth-Film-Hour in Koepenick

Last Sunday the local Hitler Youth Group of Koepenick conducted in the Union-Theatre of Koepenick a Youth-Film-Hour, in which the film "Kadetten" (A MOVIE DEALING WITH CADETS OF THE DAYS OF FREDERIC THE GREAT, AND THEIR SUFFER-
ING DURING THE RUSSIAN INVASION OF BERLIN) was shown. After the flag parade and several pieces of martial music, played by the musicians of the "Musical Unit Koepenick" of the Hitler Youth, the leader of the program Faehnleinfuehrer (LEADER OF ABOUT 300 OF THE YOUNGER HITLER YOUTH BOYS), Casmir, made a few introductory remarks, in which he made a comparison between the youth of today of the fifth year of war, and the youth of the great king of Prussia. He proved that today's youth is being carried by the same spirit as the youth of that period, and that in this a renewed foundation for our victory could be found. After this introduction the main feature started, which was followed by the boys and girls with great interest. Also the newest film "Young Europe" and the "Deutsche Wochenschau (A NEWSREEL) completed this Film-Hour, which became a great experience for all the boys and girls.386

No clearer indication could possibly be given of the influence Hitler had over his audience than the statements and actions assigned to the writer at a time when he was a boy of fourteen.

Success of Hitler's methods. The Fuehrer's dealings with his audience could be summed up in the words of Jones:

Success is based upon great fundamental psychological and ethical principles... He who understands human nature and how to

---

386 Translation of a German language news release from the files of the writer, dated December 12, 1943. See appendix III for the original. Translations by this author.
work upon it, becomes the master in spite of vocal or bodily defects.\textsuperscript{387}

The young, more susceptible to emotional appeals than older people, for this reason formed an important part of Hitler's audience at all times. This is also the reason why any judgment dealing at this late date with Hitler's voice, structure of his speeches, his appearance, and other similar factors may be condemned to failure. Perfection of certain techniques might have been helpful, but they were of strictly secondary importance if one considers the forces of ethos and pathos which were on Hitler's side.

The participants of a radio panel recently conducted in Germany supported this idea when one of them said, "Thus Hitler became the manipulator of masses, not of individuals," and when the same person pointed out that the magnetism of the Fuehrer's messages produced a "sacred shudder" among his listeners.\textsuperscript{388} Two of the participants stated:

(Something) similar is true of agitation, which is always superior to reasonable considerations, because it is directed towards wishful thinking, (but) permits complex reality to


\textsuperscript{388}Buchheim, et. al., op. cit., pp. 77, 74. For original German see Appendix IV, No. 73. Translations by this author.
simply exist on its own merits. ... And what disturbed him the least was the insult of the human intelligence. Because he soon found out how much it impresses if it is only declaimed proudly enough.  

VI. Summary

The following factors concerning Hitler's audience were established in this chapter.

1. Whenever possible the Fuehrer dealt only with mass audiences.

2. He considered the individual to be of little value, and thought little of the mental abilities of his listeners.

3. Psychological preparation for Hitler's speeches was extensive and provided him with a well-prepared audience.

4. Emotional appeals and language were the major means of convincing his listeners of the importance of any statements he cared to make.

5. The emotionally immature youth of Germany was often used as a background, or even claque, to further his aims.

389 Ibid., pp. 21, 29. See Appendix IV, No. 74 for original German. Translations by this author.
6. There was no audience except the one developed by Hitler's propaganda machine, and used by the German dictator. All other groups were too disorganized to be considered audiences.

7. Adolf Hitler, the "Volksredner," represented a truly unique phenomenon in German history, thus having the appeal of novelty on his side from the beginning.
CHAPTER VII

A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS

I. Introduction

The previous chapters have included many of the factors which made Hitler the successful speaker who led his nation within a short time to a position of international prominence. It was shown that Hitler had the ability to sense the needs of the people and to respond to the basic emotional drives and desires of his nation.

In studying the available means of persuasion, the writer has considered many political, sociological, psychological, and religious factors which provided the setting for Hitler's speeches. In accordance with the outline provided in Chapter I, both the man and the situation have been studied. The culmination of all efforts on the Fuehrer's part, as well as on the part of his propaganda machine, were his speeches. They represent the combination, in oral form, of specific factors contributing to ethos and pathos. Regardless of the personal magnetism of the Fuehrer, and regardless of his ability to speak, many other points had to be
considered before some of his speeches could be meaningfully studied.

The present study thus is divided into four major parts: (1) a basic outline of factors involved in a study dealing with "all the available means of persuasion" in Hitler's case (Chapter I); (2) the study of the speaker (Chapters II and III); (3) the study of the total speaking situation and the use to which Hitler put it (Chapters IV, V, and VI); and (4) consideration of two specific speeches in a detailed rhetorical analysis (Chapter VII).

Both speeches in this chapter will be studied on the basis of the following considerations: (1) the type of speech Hitler used, (2) an analysis of the audiences which Hitler addressed in each case, (3) the occasion both immediate and general in which the speech was given, and (4) detailed consideration of the text of each of the two speeches.

The following factors are of importance in a rhetorical study of this type: (1) the statements contributing to pathos, an important consideration in previous chapters; (2) the statements which contributed to ethos in these speeches; (3) the style Hitler used; and (4) the use of speech materials, considered on the basis of the speaker's background, knowledge, and previously discussed attitudes.
II. The Selected Speeches

The first address was delivered on November 23, 1937, at the Ordensburg Sonthofen before a group of young elite members of the party system who were being trained for positions of responsibility in the party. It was entitled "About German history and German fate." The original German text was available in the previously quoted book, Hitler's Tischgespraeche.390

The reasons for selecting this particular speech can be summed up as follows: (1) It represents one of the few recorded speeches involving Hitler in a limited communications situation. While the Fuehrer generally is considered only as a speaker addressing millions, he also spoke to select, small audiences. (2) In this speech Hitler addressed a small and select group of young people. These boys and young men were being trained in the carefully planned "Germanic" surroundings of an "Ordensburg." This was a special type of political school, which even in its architecture provided a constant reminder of Germany's historical background and her importance to European culture. (3) The very title of the speech indicated that Hitler used this oppor-
tunity to discuss many of the underlying concepts of his movement and ideology. (4) The speech was given at a time when Germany was riding the crest of internal economic and political development. In Spain, German armies had engaged successfully in their first test of armed preparedness. Hitler, while not generally accepted, was respected and had found many followers not only in Germany but also in foreign countries.

The second speech selected for this analysis was delivered on January 30, 1941, in Berlin. Its German text was available to the writer in a book previously quoted, entitled Der Grossdeutsche Freiheitskampf.391

The following reasons were decisive in selecting this particular speech. (1) It was given before a mass audience in Berlin, carried by radio, and widely reported by newspapers. (2) Germany had successfully passed through one-and-a-half years of war. She was now riding a crest of international success as well as internal satisfaction with the general turn of events. (3) This is one of the longer speeches presented by Hitler, giving the student ample opportunity to study in detail the ideas and the style

391 For the original German text see Appendix IV, No. 76. Translations by this author. An attempt is made to copy Hitler's less than perfect style and grammar to give a more correct impression of his manner of speaking.
Hitler used in harranguing his large audiences. (4) It represents an opportunity for comparison with the first speech because of its evident difference in situation and audience.

III. The First Speech

Indicating the fact that his audience was well prepared and in basic agreement with his ideas, the Fuehrer plunged almost immediately into the subject of his speech, attempting to establish a need for his discussion of Germany's history and its fate. "The relative position of our people towards the known surroundings has continuously deteriorated in the last 300 to 400 years." To him, this was made evident by the fact that in no other nation there existed as crass a contrast between its cultural and political importance.

Citing Germany's comparatively small size, or landholdings in Europe and the world, Hitler began to work on the impressionable minds of his listeners. His device was very simple. Size is an important consideration to most people. The size of a nation thus could easily be made to look as if it were of major importance in international affairs. He stated that Germany with her "mere" 540 000 qkm. of territory, represented the "terrible result of
century old developments, since there was a time, when Germany was the predominant white power."

However, it was not his wish to preach complete gloom. A way of escape had to be shown. Therefore, he continued: "There is no reason for despondency if one but turns attention from space for existence and number of inhabitants to the underlying powers of the people of the state." With this, Hitler really began the major theme of his speech. It was his purpose to create a need. Germany, by definition, existed in an intolerable position for such an important nation. The peace treaty after World War I which robbed Germany of even more of her "lebensraum" was well remembered by the older generation, and the younger people had been adequately informed of the loss of territory to Poland and France. However, the time for German conquest had not yet come. The war with Poland was almost two years away. The odds against winning out over nations which had already divided up the world were enormous. Thus, the Fuehrer had to show that within the German people there were latent powers which no other nation could match, that Germans indeed were a very special sort of people and that this was the result of a "scientific process" of selection.

The first proof he gave of the fact that a country's size is not important, and that the number of inhabitants is relatively insignificant, ran as follows: "All these
enormous structures (COUNTRIES) are controlled, in some instances by almost unnaturally small racial cores." Among his examples was the United States, which had such a "core" of not quite twenty million Anglo-Saxons. According to his reasoning, these Anglo-Saxons had to be the "rulers" of the other, lesser, national groups in the U.S.A. Compared to this, Hitler found eighty-five million Germans in Europe alone, indicating to him a new low in national status because of their relative political weakness.

The powerful appeal Hitler used is clear. He worked strongly on the emotions of his listeners. No man likes to find himself in a losing position. Convince him that he is not living up to his potential and he will put up a fight. Hitler was the "savior" in a desperate situation for which no one else seemed to know the answer. He supplied it at this point: "The question is: Are we Germans unsuited to such a politically powerful position? Through history this is disproved." The students to whom he was speaking were a product of Europe in general and Germany in specific. Tradition and history have always been important to Europeans. To the beaten nation of Germany after World War II, the successful periods of long ago often were the only ray of light in an otherwise gloomy world. The Fuehrer used this desire to project a glorious past into the present. He needed to tie historical events clearly and powerfully to
the German nation and therefore stated: "Without German blood, there would be neither a Russian State nor the other Eastern States, because they owe to it their organizational, political, and cultural form."

Pathos became the dominant force at this point. National pride and pride of accomplishment mingled. The Fuehrer himself was still left out of the picture. To strengthen the image further, he spoke of the fact that "The entire British Empire has not even been made with as much blood as we had dead just in the first World War."

In passing, the poor structure of the sentence and the expression "has been made with so much blood" should be noted. The powerful style of delivery Hitler used made such slips into poor German seem insignificant. According to Hitler, Britain lost two and a half million people in the building of its empire, while at the same time Germany lost twenty-three million. Then Hitler made one of his sudden and strange references to history, so common in his speeches. He referred to the "fact" that in the Thirty Years War, Germany's population sank from 18,500,000 to 3,600,000. Since this war did not really involve Germany at all, was forced upon her, and resulted in no territorial expansion and no German empire was built, the reference seems rather nebulous. But it further helped to establish Hitler's ethos by creating the image of a knowledgeable and well-
educated man. Then followed a list of reasons which Hitler held responsible for the plight of his nation. He began to build clearly towards the moment when he could provide the solution for the entire dilemma. "First, we Germans, from the standpoint of a race/people (HITLER USED THE TERM "VOELKISCH" HERE, WHICH REFERS TO THE PEOPLE MAKING UP THE NATION) became a nation only late." Again he referred to history showing how long it took the Germanic tribes to unite. He indicated that in the "torrent of migration of the nations there was almost not to be found any more the politically organic structure, which four hundred years earlier, in the sense of a higher unity of people of the same blood, had promised to make German history." The sentence was studded with high-sounding terminology in German, and started with words loaded with the "r" Hitler liked to roll while using his southern German dialect. Where probably no one else could have seen the promise of a coming German empire, Hitler assumed it.

Even Christianity had to help him make his point when he claimed that it became an important force for his people in a

... period of a truly Christian mission in which Christianity takes the place of innumerable divergent ideals, interests, languages (better: dialects) created slowly a certain common foundation.
Hitler then began faintly, but clearly, to indicate what he was leading up to. While acknowledging that the attempt of certain German rulers to "force" individuals into a larger national structure was painful to these individuals, it was nevertheless necessary, for "Without it we presumably would not even exist anymore today." Clear and forceful, if not logical, is the conclusion which provided salvation from the entire dilemma he had shown to exist:

Thus: the forceful uniting (ACTUALLY HE MADE THIS STATEMENT STRONGER YET WHEN HE SPOKE OF A "FORCEFUL ATTEMPT TO FORCE THE UNITING OF GERMANS") of Germans was necessary, if one did not wish to do without this valuable humanity altogether.

There was no attempt made to explain, no attempt to prove the special value of Germans. The statement carried conviction because of the obvious desire of every one of his listeners to belong to an outstanding and important people. Hitler considered the importance of the early blood ties uniting the German people, but stated that the step from strictly political unity, when finally achieved, to national unity, was not accomplished. Why this was so, he either could not or did not care to explain. He simply stated that this resulted in many political divisions. According to him, this had to result in a lack of national pride in the case of Germans who left their homes and became citizens of another nation. Having established the importance of his nation, he had to consider such an action despicable. Once
more he began to give an impression of where the solution had to be sought:

Looking upon the developing new German political greatness, and strength of the Reich, they began to resist the attempt of assimilation, a giving up of the German thought and the German sense of belonging.

From this total, somewhat confusing historical interpretation, the Fuehrer drew the next almost inevitable conclusion. It could not be a mere state, it could not be a mere organization, it had to be a "Volk":

Laughably small tribes, small lands, states or dynasties cannot appear as conquerors of the world, but only races. A race, however, we must first become, at least in the conscious sense.

There lay the answer. Germany did not have the position of predominance which belonged to her. She had to achieve it. This could be done only by a "race" and it had to be achieved through conquest. Hitler had again shown the necessity of struggle, conquest, and war to assure his importance to his nation.

His second major point was the statement that at a time when the world was divided easily among the conquering nations, Germany herself was divided into small political and also religious splinter-groups, making it impossible for her to get her "share." Having assigned part of the responsibility to religion, Hitler moved on to another of his favorite subjects, mentioned earlier: biology. Part of the
trouble was the fact that Germany's elected emperors eventually turned into a dynasty which passed on the rule from father to son, thus biologically weakening the once vital force.

The argument Hitler used in this case showed again the image of the man who brooked no interference, who set up the rules, and according to his own definition informed his people of the reasons for all things. Forcefully, though rather lacking in logic, he stated:

Generally speaking, we can notice that the law of hereditary monarchy brings about very terrible representatives. That cannot be replaced by loyalty, dedication, and tradition. In the long run a world is conquered only through powerful action and energy. Attachment and loyalty, on the contrary, help to stabilize weakness.

Once again, the Fuehrer left the subject just as he seemed ready to supply the answer to the problem. He was not quite ready to provide real ease for emotions which were being pent up more and more. He was building his case skillfully and slowly. Indicating the weakness of the monarchy he drew the conclusion that the goal of World War I had been "idiotic," because a number of Eastern European monarchies were to be incorporated into the German Empire. This had to spell doom, he assured his listeners, because the rulers of these nations would soon become more concerned with their own empires than with the total German idea.
At this point Hitler must have felt that within his audience there was building up a feeling of dejection. They must have asked themselves: "What is the use? We just don't seem to be able to accomplish the feat!" He responded to this need when he declared:

In spite of all this, we already had Europe once. We only lost it because we lacked that energy of leadership, which was necessary... not only to retain but to enlarge our position.

Another strong appeal was thus added which actually consisted of two factors: (1) it was not just enough to maintain what was once great, or to achieve it again, one had to go on, far beyond what once seemed possible; and (2) the only problem in achieving this goal was leadership, and from its past the German nation could learn what type of leadership was needed.

At this moment the specific group with which Hitler dealt had to be considered. He began to speak of the "new" state which saw in the unity of the people and of the race its primary function and responsibility. Hitler then brought glorious release to the pent-up emotions. "We complete today, what two thousand years before us have brought together in building stones, thoughts, ideas, and in part even as far as power is concerned." All objections are done away with by the use of a sweeping statement, "If thus we consider our German history in its widest scope, from
our grayest prehistoric times until today, then we are the richest nation in Europe . . ."

If things were that simple, however, there would still be comparatively little need for Hitler. The Fuehrer had not yet reached the point where he was willing to include himself in the great plans he had for his country. Just as he seemed to bring release and salvation, he added to the burden of emotions when he stated another problem: the relationship of births and food supply. "A crop failure of only ten per cent thus makes the feeding of our nation already insecure for one month." What he said could be summed up in these words: We have a certain historical assurance of greatness, we are finding ourselves a nation, BUT WHAT IF WE DON'T HAVE ENOUGH FOOD? More than that, he struck a note familiar to every German of the day: more food required more room to grow food. But where in a crowded nation could one find such room? "If Germany is still active as a people (voelkisch) today, that is true because it is filled with an immeasurable faith that things to be sure will be different some day." One can almost feel the emotionally charged atmosphere. It had to be thrilling to be part of such a brave and strong nation. However, Hitler did not yet let up. "Our lacking space then will result in a national death." Desperation could grip listeners after these repeated attempts to lead them to the brink
of what seemed salvation, of showing them how their country could be secure, respected, powerful, even though it was a latecomer to the arena of world politics. Having skillfully maneuvered them to this point, the final part of the speech was now ready for delivery. Almost imperceptibly he took the step from pathos to ethos. "If I (AND IN ONE WORD, GERMANY'S LEADER STEPS INTO THE SCENE, SETTING UP THE SOLUTION TO ALL PROBLEMS) consider a solution to the problem . . . ." This solution was based on all things previously stated plus the assumption that Germany was facing possible annihilation as a nation. Only one way seemed open, "Therefore: absolute enmity against all appearances of a past which do not wish to positively respond to this united nation, which do not completely subject themselves." The step seemed to be too great yet, and thus Hitler put himself even more into the position of the man who could carry any burden:

I would much rather take every difficulty upon myself in this time in order to leave to posterity a strong people, which has learned to live and think uniformly, and thus to leave a strong Reich.

Quietly he showed the means for accomplishing this task—two years before World War II was to begin. "It simply is true that the last right always lies in might. And might resides (while) nations exist in the unity of nations." He asserted that in his day Germany had received adequate
leadership. In typical fashion, Hitler immediately went on to another idea. Abruptly changing to one of his other favorite subjects, he discussed his concept of such leadership. More in wording than anything else does this abrupt change take place. In times past, he asserted, Germany had no leadership of the people. But rather the church, particularly the Roman Church, held the leadership of the people and kept them in line with religious moral concepts. This had changed under Hitler.

Today we demand the leadership of the people, that means we alone have the right to lead the people as such—the individual man, the individual woman. We regulate the human relationships of the sexes. We form the child.

If there was any doubt in the minds of his listeners, he categorically dispersed it, assuming his leadership role forcefully.

Today the realization of the importance of blood and race is lifted above a humane concept of the world. No education can take that out of the world any longer. That is a conquering idea which today sweeps like a wave across the entire world.

Stylistically, the weakness of Hitler's speeches came to the fore once more at this point. While it is frustrating to the rhetorical critic, it can be only understood if the total erratic nature of Hitler is remembered. The discussion of religion which followed was the result of his almost casual mention of the part the church used to play in
the regulation of human affairs. He then went into a dis-
cussion of the nature of religion. He pointed out that the
position of the church had changed, that with increasing
knowledge and understanding came the realization that there
were many concepts of God.

As far as the churches want to deal with
supernatural, transcendental, and metaphysical
matters, we grant them absolute freedom of action.
No one knows anything for certain here.

But a clear division of authority had to be acknowledged.

The churches may have control over the
German being in the world to come, but control
(over the German) in this life is exercised by
the German nation through its leaders.

While there seemed absolutely no reason for it, a further
emotional appeal followed—strange at this point because
religious education and training did not form part of the
process which political leaders at the Ordensburgen under-
went—"We National Socialists are from the bottom of our
hearts believers in God." He admitted that the world which
was clear to him in its outward appearances was not simi-
larly clear to him when it came to its final destination.
It could be that Hitler's common references to God were
intended to provide him with a means of escape, a final
declaration that "fate," or "God," was, after all, in charge
of all affairs. The following statement would contribute to such a belief:

And here humanity has humbly bowed down before the conviction that it stands before something tremendously powerful, something Almighty, which is so unbelievable and deep that we humans cannot grasp it.

He declared that this was good because it made man rely upon something besides himself.

The next paragraph brings Hitler back to his original thought, however, and here may be found the reason for his seeming lack of a clear-cut organization for his speech. "Our people was not created by God to be torn assunder by priests." The difficult and challenging problem of religion thus seemed to be dealt with adequately. God's existence had to be admitted, but the forces assuming the right to interpret God in this world could not be permitted to stand in the way of his plans. All smaller cells had always to be considered from the standpoint of the total scope of his endeavor, "The highest principle of this leadership of the people is: the people as a whole are not able to consider their total problems of existence."

Hitler then took the final and most important step as far as his specific audience was concerned. Speaking to the future elite of his party, he began to point to the way
They had to travel. In a lengthy and involved sentence, Hitler stated his concept of the party leadership.

Therefore a leadership has to be built which pulls out of a people primarily those elements, which believe to possess a certain ability in this direction, and then builds out of these elements an organization, which causes them to develop upward into a solid unity not only of form but also of mental concepts.

With his usual sweeping lack of concern for the original meaning or usage of terms, Hitler then simply spoke of the ideas on which his "democracy" was built. Two points were made: (1) Every position was given to someone chosen by those above, not elected from below. (2) Everyone had absolute authority over those below, and absolute responsibility to those above him.

Pride must have filled his listeners when the Fuehrer told them that the NSDAP was the greatest organization the world had ever seen. Necessary humility and assurance of obedience was taught them by the fact that they had to accept humbly their own great tradition, the "law," which the party started. Repeating an earlier statement, Hitler stated that this law was absolute obedience and absolute authority. For those who had doubts about the efficacy of such a system, Hitler provided his own reasons. He stated that no one in their system had to worry because talented people could be recommended and promoted without fear that afterwards, by democratic processes, they would be deposed
by a fickle majority. One bit of amazing "reasoning" should be mentioned here, which, in the light of the final collapse of Germany and the National Socialist system, indicates what a man can accomplish who will state his convictions forcefully enough, although they are not borne out by the facts.

If leadership and people are united, a mistake is of no importance, since there is always just one way, and thus a mistake is a thousand times better than two ideas according to which everyone can do as he likes, or, better than impetuosity of all.

The final portion of the speech became more confusing than the first portion in its wording. The conclusions were not clearly developed; however, the Fuehrer indicated that on the basis of thousands of years of experience, the total nation, the needs of all, had to be considered above those of any individual. The young political leaders of the future thus had to become heroes, just as much as soldiers, they had to be brave, be ready to fight at any time for their beliefs. Becoming repetitious in wording, he drove hom his final points.

The decisive factor is that we build an organization of men who are persistent, tough, but also, when necessary, consider ruthlessly the interests of the nation. That is the decisive factor.

With one final spurt of energy, he told his listeners that if they could use the blood which Germans were
willing to sacrifice for their state, they could hope to build the "weapon's state" which he dreamed of. "... not only because everyone carries the weapon from his youth into old age, but is also armed and ready in his mind to use the weapon if necessary." Action had to be the result of what Hitler said. He wished to make sure that his listeners did not merely engage in an intellectual exercise, but that they realized there would come the time when, inevitably, action had to follow words.

On the contrary: we want to lead our people to the very forefront! Whether they will love us is all the same to us! ... If they hate us it doesn't matter to us, if they only fear us!

The reference was not quite clear. It probably referred to non-Germans, but it certainly permitted wide application to everyone in Germany who would oppose these political leaders, as well as in the case of international action which began to loom in the future. How important the moment, his political movement, his own person were to everything he said, and how his own ethos and the present contributed to these ideas can be seen by the very last statement he made:

We must not take the position: The young generation will do a better job. We have to do everything already which is necessary. Then this youth, too, will at some time fulfill its duty, as we have shown it to them.
Summary. This speech was neither fully satisfying from the standpoint of good usage of the German language nor from the standpoint of clear outlining, but it took into account the audience and the situation in an effective way. Speaking to a group of young men who were preparing themselves for political leadership in his party, Hitler had a threefold job to do: (1) develop an historical need and state the hope of seeing Germany take her "rightful" and powerful place in the community of nations; (2) establish the fact that he represented the fulfillment of Germany's historical needs, and that in his person could be found the answer to the overwhelming problems Germany had previously faced; (3) indicate that perpetuation of the idea required perpetuation of leadership. Such leadership had to be, to a certain extent, the responsibility of his listeners who needed to know Germany's "history" and their own place in this new "democracy" which Hitler had developed.

These purposes were fulfilled. Strong emotional needs were developed and fulfilled through the supposed information and understanding residing in the person of the speaker. As the emotional needs were fulfilled, the person of the Fuehrer became more and more important and ethos became the convincing force.

The basic structure of the speech is very simple. First, the introduction is kept to a minimum and the major
theme of the speech is almost immediately attacked. Second, the body of the speech makes up by far the major portion of Hitler's address. It follows a basically chronological order, beginning with earliest German history and progressing to his own time. However, breaks occur, and Hitler feels free to interject ideas which do not help to carry the speech forward as rapidly as would have otherwise been possible. Finally, the conclusion is also very brief. It consists mainly of a short emotional appeal indicating his own expectations of the work before him and the young generation.

The outline of this speech is psychological in that Hitler (1) developed a definite historical, social, and psychological need for action, (2) illustrated this need by a number of examples, (3) indicated the possibility of action and described the action already taken, and (4) called for further action, involving himself and his audience. While there was a minimum of identification with his audience in this case, it must be remembered that Hitler stood before a select group, already dedicated to the party. Furthermore, he represented very forcefully to them the leader principle and thus had to do little to establish his own ethos.
This type of persuasive, argumentative speaking thus is basically of a problem-solving type, using strong emotional appeals.

IV. The Second Speech

The speech of January 30, 1941, was delivered in the huge arena of the Sportspalast in the city of Berlin, and represents to the writer one of Hitler's oratorical masterpieces. He heard the speech over the radio, together with millions of Germans, and remembers many of the phrases which made it one of the better-known addresses that Hitler gave. In addition to that, recorded portions of the speech were available to the writer. The elation, almost frenzy of the audience by the time the Fuehrer reached the end of this speech, gave ample evidence of its importance. Several factors should be considered to support these statements.

1. The speech was given on the occasion of the eighth anniversary of Hitler's ascension to power, the so-called "Machtuebernahme." This in itself was an important day for the party members assembled in Berlin.

2. Hitler had reached the zenith of his power. He would remain for a short while on the plateau he had reached, but within one year the situation would slowly begin to change. Germany had conquered virtually all of Europe with
the "help" of its ally, Italy. The battle for France had been brought to a successful end. Hitler's prestige was enormous. All of his predictions seemed to have come true, and his own ability as a leader of Germany's armies was undisputed at that moment. The Battle of England had begun, an invasion seemed imminent. No mention was made of Hitler's oldest enemy outside of the Jews: the USSR. Yet within a short time Germany's armies would cross the borders of Nazi Germany's newest ally, Soviet Russia.

3. The speaker was more confident than at any other time in his career. His speech was full of ridicule, invective, and seemed to drip with derision. On the other hand, Hitler's ethos was never at a higher point, and he did everything in his power to further the impression of the all-wise, all-knowing, magnificent, loving leader of his nation:

4. This was one of the longest speeches Hitler made in public. It contained information concerning the Fuehrer's attitudes on almost every major subject of interest to the student of Hitler and his day.

Introduction, body, and conclusion of the speech seemed to be parts of a continuous whole. Hitler used once more a psychological type of outline which consisted of the establishment of a need, description of the existing
situation, a call for action, and description of effective steps already taken.

His very first word represented his attempt to call for immediate and complete attention: "Changes of government . . . have already taken place often in history . . ." However, it seemed evident to him that no change had ever been as deep, far-reaching, and important as that which took place in Germany eight years before this speech. In typical fashion, he then preached doom to make the salvation which he had to offer an even more forceful appeal.

. . . really everything had already been lost, and in the eyes of those most favorable (to us), this could be perhaps a final attempt; in the eyes of those ill-disposed (towards us)--the entire nationalsocialistic movement would through it be condemned to suffer shipwreck for all times.

Using strong German terms, he indicated that only a catastrophe could be expected and that the situation he found could only be solved by a "miracle." He put the blame for that state of affairs squarely on the first World War which Germany lost and the moral, political, and military collapse of his country. This indicated to him how important it was for the German people to think back to those days. Indeed, it was important for him because by contrast this great moment of his personal triumph had to become a major factor contributing to Hitler's ethos.
The next step after thus catching his audience's attention, was the usual historical, argumentative discussion which was part of every one of the Fuehrer's speeches which the writer remembers hearing or reading. "What was the reason for World War?" In rather logical and well-organized fashion Hitler proceeded to show that the German people did not provide the reason for this war. As a matter of fact, he quoted a study conducted by American "doctors" supposedly ordered by President Roosevelt, showing that World War I was not the result of any unilateral action on the part of Germany. He proclaimed: "The reason lay deeper..." Among the reasons showing that Germany could not be blamed, he cited the form of state which resembled that of all other governments of the time. A change in Germany's earlier political disunity could have been the reason. With the empire a semblance of unity and strength came about which probably caused England to worry about the so-called "balance of power in Europe." With this, Hitler gave the first indication of an argument he used extensively in this speech: The reason for most wars in Europe was, supposedly, England's desire to establish and keep a balance of power in Europe, making it impossible for anyone to become too mighty. Hitler's arguments were a strange mixture of fact and fiction. He stated enough of the generally accepted facts or historical theories to make people go with him the
rest of the way. Hitler thus stated his belief that Germany's economic growth and the danger it represented to Britain's financial interests, was the main reason for its hatred of Germany. With this, Hitler gave a reason for England's actions which no German would accept. To fight for territorial expansion they could understand, but to fight for financial gain was despicable. Concerning Germany's economic growth, he stated: "And thus we come immediately to the state which considered this interference intolerable: England." However, he was by no means through with this enemy yet. A considerable portion of his speech was spent indicating what kind of "democracy" Great Britain really was.

Not formed by the free will or harmonious declaration of the intentions or views of those involved, but for three hundred years this world-wide empire has been welded together only through power.

To him, democracy was only a mask; to him, the oppression of nations stood behind the term "democracy." His own intentions and actions seemed to play an unimportant part in such a discussion, but the thousands of Irish, Indian, and Egyptian patriots who were suffering in British prisons provided him with a good basis for attack. To indicate further the despicable nature of his enemies, he quoted what he referred to as a "saying"—"When the Englishman speaks of God, he means Cotton..." He attacked almost
viciously the supposed religious nature of his enemies and stated, "Seldom has human hypocrisy developed to such a record performance, as it is the case with today's Englishman." At this point, the Fuehrer began to pull his listeners into the charmed circle.

This is important, that we cry this into the world again and again, my dear comrades . . . This British world-empire has on the road to its formation left only a stream of blood and tears.

He powerfully reiterated his former stand: how "low" the British really were, by indicating that they accomplished their deeds not just through the power of an idea, or simply power, but because of capitalistic or economic interests. No wonder he could refer to it as "this peculiar development of the British Empire." What had happened to Germany meanwhile? While the British merely spoke of God and thought of money, the German people carried their zeal for religion to such a fanatic point that it caused divisions and disagreement among them. Thus Hitler gave a reason for Germany's insignificance, but it was at least a "valid" reason--one which a German could excuse, while at the same time making sure that it would never happen again. This, then, was one of the reasons for England's ability to "bring together by robbery" the many parts of its empire.

Another important factor in this particular speech was Hitler's rather frequent mention of his allies. Both
Italy and by inference Japan were mentioned as having suffered the same indignities. Hitler made sure that his future actions would be supported by his neighbour to the south, and the one which he hoped would help to keep America in check.

Here the Fuehrer returned to the balance of power idea "that is in reality a disorganization of the European continent in favor of the British Island Empire." Just as they spoke of cotton when they said God, Hitler claimed the British also meant disorganization of Europe when they said balance of power. Hitler's ability as a speaker came to the fore here. Having earlier quoted a saying which he calmly accepted as truth, he now used this "evidence" already introduced into his speech to "prove" a second point as dubious as the first.

The next question is also an important one. Hitler considered himself to be a leader of the people and he wanted the simple people on his side. He proceeded to show that the fault lay with the "comparatively small and thin top layer . . . and the Jewish clique which is in league with this upper class." Guilt by association thus was established to help Hitler's cause. None of the party leaders and few of the German people doubted by this time that International Jewry was ready to wage war against Germany in an attempt to destroy her.
In reality, Hitler pointed out, England was not Lord of the World, but much rather, probably the most socially backward country in Europe. Millions of people had no part in the blessings of the system which belonged merely to the upper class. "The country which for a few is a paradise, is for many--that is, for the masses--in reality only a continuous misery."

Hitler had proof provided for him. He quoted a British secretary of labor who indicated that after the war social reforms would have to be carried through. In the general mood of the speech, he derided the poor man as a "member of the opposition, paid by the government." And defiantly he shouted, "Here this has long been done." Then he continued, "It is for us very interesting, because it is a confirmation of our claim that England, in reality, is socially the most backward country in the world." No better illustration of Hitler's use of facts could be found. First England had a problem, and then England in this speech ended up being the "most backward country in the world." Hitler's sentences at this point became more involved, as he seemed to add afterthoughts--a habit consistently found in his speeches.

After this derision of his enemies' position, the Fuehrer stated that Britain's attempts no longer worked. What he called "the awakening of the peoples" had taken care
of it. Only the negative relationship of Britain to Germany had to be established, and responsibility laid at Britain's doorstep. Hitler accomplished this in one long sentence:

Since 1871, since the German tribes began to organize and to be constituted under the leadership of a highly gifted, great statesman again an empire, that means, since the national rebirth of the German nation, which had already slowly announced itself, found its governmental unity, since then England began to persecute this new structure with its hatred.

The sentence was no less involved in German, a rather typical example of reasoning which became part of Hitler's speeches once he became involved in the explanation of ideas. Bitterly he then attacked the enemy which he had thus clearly revealed and called the persecution of Germany the work of "a very small group of international unscrupulous vagabonds." At their doorstep he laid the responsibility for the war; they were the ones who agitated for it.

If this was such a small group of despicable individuals, why then did Germany not win the first war? Hitler had an answer for that one, too: "... Germany really was not conquered." In an understatement which brought a smile to the face of the reader, the Fuehrer declared, "I do not want to be a critic of the past, if I haven't done something better." Hitler was now ready to build further the image of the great leader Germany had in him, because he calmly stated that personal inability on the part of all German
leaders resulted in the horrible failure of the first World War. Coyly, he did not yet go all the way. As in the first speech, he seemed almost to toy with his audience's emotions. He thus permitted his audience to share in his eventual glory: "And in spite of it, this land and also the German soldier withstood the onslaught of a hostile world." Pride must have welled up within his listeners at that point. The people were good; the people were strong; only those on top, the leaders, had failed. More than that, those poor trusting German people had to suffer under the terrible betrayal of the "democratic" nations which took advantage of their simplicity. And while his audience was already in an emotional state, the flames of hatred were thus more easily fanned by Hitler.

The battle cry now became: They have broken their word! They cannot be trusted! He said of his enemies' attempts to propagandize the German nation: "... they have forgotten nothing, but they also have, to their own misfortune, learned nothing." Hitler declared he didn't want to appear "small"; after all, there had been a few other occasions when people had broken their word (did he remember his own broken treaties and promises?). But the years 1918, 1919, 1920, etc., represented an "assembly line of broken promises." And then the Fuehrer raised the outcry of a much maligned people in highly emotional terms:
"... and what did they then do to our people! Pillaged them and extorted everything from them." The decadent "democratic system," its "lying" words and promises, thus were experienced by Germany in its own "body." But out of this time "finally emerged the national socialistic movement."

With this statement Hitler moved closer to his own times and to his own work. He next answered the question why he created such a completely new system. Out of all previous discussions the answer could only be, "Because the old one had failed so pitifully." Using his own type of humor, he then destroyed any hope that anyone might have had in Germany's own type of democracy. He lumped the "forty or fifty parties" together by showing that their concern ranged only from the level of a "bicycle club" to the interests of home owners. Hitler then became the great, forgiving, successful man and leader when he stated that after all one could have forgiven the internal failure of this "miserable internal democratic monster," if it had only succeeded internationally. After all, what was it but a "joke" in Germany? If the outsiders would only have taken it seriously. But those horrible people thought of it, also, as a great big joke.

The Fuehrer was directly leading to one of his major points. This was an idea which kept persistently
cropping up in his speeches. It had been his favorite theme even before he came to power. The mistreatment of Germany had to be proven; the fact that the "democracies" had no idea of treating Germany as an equal had to be proven. It was the last straw, which in Hitler's own day, broke the proverbial camel's back.

He now stepped into the picture clearly and simply. "When I returned home in 1918 . . ." It became clear to him that the existing political powers could not bring about a regeneration of Germany. She used up her power internally, and when she hoped for understanding and kindness (?) on the outside, she reaped instead "... the naked egotism of the most brutal, meanest financial interests which now began to plunder her wherever there was something to be plundered." In strong terms, Hitler whipped up the resentment of many who still remembered Germany in her days of weakness. The division inside of Germany thus HAD TO BE OVERCOME. Unity on the inside would provide strength against those on the outside. It would be Germany against the world; that's what the world had wanted.

"Today, my comrades, when under the banner of this unity, millions and millions are marching, this seems to be natural." But just think back, he called to his listeners. In 1918 and 1919, poor Hitler was ridiculed for these
ideas and they were at most thought of as the "creation of a sick imagination; at best they felt sorry for me." But it was lucky, too, because otherwise he might have been killed for it, and that would have been really bad. "Thus it was perhaps fate, willed by nature, or even willed by God." While he kept his statements general, everything he said at this point obviously was intended to secure his own position further and contribute to his ethos. The building of his party, the sowing of the seed, the first glimpse of things to come, he therefore called without blushing "... an almost unbelievable historic phenomenon ..." Having included his listeners, his "Volksgenossen" in the total process, this bragging appraisal of happenings undoubtedly was accepted much more readily. Only a second state could claim a similar growth, Italy. With a deep philosophical ring to his words, Hitler gloated: "Such a rebirth of a nation is truly a wonderful event, an event which requires more faith than, for instance, a so-called abstract, scientific knowledge." The reference is by no means clear, but it must have carried conviction because it sounded good.

His followers, the "little people" now came in for backslapping. Here was the salesman, the man who needed public acclaim, who needed following for his leadership. From everywhere came the poor, the little people because
they "believe in their future." Around them gloom had spread—the Fuehrer did not hesitate to remind them what exactly it was he saved them from. No income, no jobs, no plans, no future, financial irresponsibility of a system which had no firm position. One day there was one government, the next day another. Thus, he appealed strongly to the people's need for security. With Hitler there was but one government, and this indicated firmness, security, jobs, direction, clear and happy futures. Nor did he permit his followers to forget that it was not merely a question of money and jobs, because of the "affectionate, and humane prophecy of the great French democrat, Clemenceau, that we had twenty million too many people, (and) that this prophecy was being made a reality."

Under Hitler, it was thus shown that a way of salvation and strength was opened up. He chose the way between the two "extremes," which he himself defined as the liberal, individualistic concept of placing the individual in the center of all things, and the theory of a universal mankind. His own way was that of "... the people (DAS VOLK), in which we see a bodily and spiritual community, which providence (VORSEHUNG) formed and thus desired, into which we have been placed, and in which alone we can master our existence." With the proof of providence, and with the discarding of the other two theories—
accepting the possibility of any others--Hitler had again managed a typical feat of simplification. Problems melted away before the onslaught of his emotional and erratic discussion of what he thought of Germany and its people. It must have felt good to give over the rational ability to discuss problems, to this witchery of words which let everything fall so easily into place. To Hitler it was clear that:

... above individual freedom and above the initiative of the individual there stands the common interest, and that this common interest is the regulating (force), the determining (factor), if necessary, the restraining (factor), and if necessary also, to be sure, the commanding.

His earlier discussion of the brutal attempts by the democracies to conquer the world had by no means been forgotten. Proudly he mentioned the fact that in fifteen years he had conquered the German people. "I have in this (struggle) always taken the position that we win my fellow citizens." Instead of force, there was found in Hitler's Germany the power of the idea. After all, he had to call them from all kinds of different walks of life, but he did not hold their old convictions against them. "... That means we have convinced and conquered them all, by winning them inwardly." He called it the "greatest struggle for souls" in German history. His means were the forces of the "mind": speech, conviction, and writing. Hitler thus was
very much aware of the tremendous force the spoken and written word had. Speaking success was not an incidental thing to him, it was the planned result of planned communication.

How wonderful a weapon this was to him could be seen by the fact that he stressed several times the idea that he had gained power by use of men's minds, and that in this struggle for the mind he used "legal means." He referred, of course, to his appointment by von Hindenburg as Chancellor of Germany.

He stood before his people not as a dictator, but as their chosen leader. He had been proven right, he had to fear no opposition, and the wording of this particular speech showed it. If he attempted to teach in the first speech, at this time he gave reasons, he argued, he even pleaded and made nearly tearful statements about his faith in what he was doing: "And I would be without honor and I would deserve to be stoned, if I had retreated or would retreat even one step from this program." It was thus put on a personal level. The program he had carried through was no longer important; what was important was trust in Hitler and support of his person.

As everywhere, here, too, I went the way of teaching, training, and slow conformity. Because it was my pride to carry through this revolution (POLITICAL AS WELL AS ECONOMICAL) without destroying even one window pane in Germany, a revolution which leads to the greatest
changes the world has ever seen, and which does not destroy the smallest thing, but only changes everything gradually, which adjusts switch by switch in the new direction, until this entire great community has found its new way.

The fact that this "gradual" change did not correspond to his bragging attempts to show in how short a time he created a new Germany did not seem to bother Hitler.

Internally, he had thus accomplished his aim. In foreign policy, the problem he had referred to in an earlier portion of the speech had to be dealt with: the Treaty of Versailles.

More often, no man has declared it and no man has written down what he wants (more) than I have done, and I wrote again and again: Elimination of (THE TREATY OF) Versailles.

At this point Hitler began to strengthen his ethical image further. Until now, he had been the man who had been fair and dedicated as far as his own people were concerned. Now he showed himself to be fair in dealing with other nations. He declared it was not merely a political device to get him into power when he promised to do away with the treaty. He had to go through with it:

Thank you, my Lord, that you have brought me to the point where I can finally make my program a reality.

"BUT," and this is indeed a big but--"But, here, too, I didn't want to make this program a reality through (the use of) force ..." Then began a tirade against his enemies which is among the most outspoken emotional
attacks Hitler ever made. "What offers I made to them! How I have begged them to be reasonable, and not to limit a great people's possibility of existence and life." He argued with them, reasoned with them that there was no advantage to their plan to hurt poor Germany. Why did they refuse him? To Hitler, the answer was simple and clear and thus was stated before the assembly on that day: "But it was true that every proposal which came just from me was enough to immediately excite a certain Jewish-International clique .. ." The forceful use of the facts by Hitler is an outstanding feature of his effectiveness. At the right moment he understood it was wise to let someone else speak to support his own contentions. "And that this treaty was a mean document, even its authors admitted in the end .. ." Here, then, lay the right for Hitler to do away with it. In the League of Nations, German representatives, according to Hitler, begged—they "crawled on their knees, literally, in front of this international forum--and requested: 'Give us the revision; give us the revision!' It was all in vain."

The Fuehrer was, of course, different. "I have, as a national socialist, seen after a few months that nothing was to be won in this forum." After all, his was a new Germany which was no longer willing to "receive kicks," which had no "inferiority complex" before its enemies.
Everything Hitler said was related to his preaching of hatred for Germany's enemies, particularly England. The enemies were out to destroy his country, they were cruel, they plotted. Without caring to go into detail, all his major statements supported an idea in Hitler's own mind. "They have at that time (World War I) forced us down through a deception and through a lie." Pride, that's what he wanted his people to feel; and he contributed further to this strong emotional concept by stating, "I have never forced myself upon anyone in all my life. Whoever does not want to talk with me, doesn't have to. I need it even much less." There could be little doubt in his listeners minds when he stated: "Thus, we were forced to travel the road we took."

Those who may have had doubts about Hitler's honesty in this case were silenced when he reminded them that at one time, "... it almost seemed to succeed: with France." He referred to the referendum in the Saar. Out of the kindness of his heart, Hitler declared he wanted no further revisions in the west, but this did not keep the imperialists and the capitalists and the Jewish hate-mongers from lying about Germany and causing trouble. He had to remain true to his oath: "We shall compromise no interests (STATED UNDER HIS PROGRAM)." The strong, resourceful leader—which was as he wanted to appear before
his people--was clearly shown in a phrase used in connection with this discussion: "On the contrary, I am dedicated from the beginning not to retreat one step."

Hitler built a strong case showing that he had been ridiculed when he warned of his strength. France entered the war "really without any reason." His enemies developed as a figment of their imagination the idea to destroy his empire. "Simply childish, all of this." What about England? "I stretched out my hand to England, again and again." He wanted only one thing from them: in time, he wanted Germany's colonies back. These statements were all intended to show that his enemies had no reason to hate either him or Germany. Much rather, the international clique to which he kept referring had long ago made up its mind to destroy Germany. Therefore, Hitler truly had to be a savior who helped his beloved country in its hour of undeserved need.

Wehaven't demanded anything from them, haven't asked anything. . . . They hate this state here, it makes no difference how it looks, whether imperial or national socialistic, democratic, or authoritarian. And, secondly: they hate above everything the social ascension of this Reich.

Hitler's speech was no longer a carefully organized address. Ideas were thrown together. They all contributed to his desire to establish a need for action, a
need for dealing with the enemies of his people. He heaped illustration upon illustration.

How despicable his enemies really were was shown by the Fuehrer when he claimed that their lust for power was coupled with the "lowest egotism towards those on the inside." Hitler claimed that his enemies were indeed not simply fighting him, but the social revolution of the people whom they had held oppressed for so long. Again, this statement was intended to support his contention that his struggle was one for just and righteous matters. The financial interests of the ruling classes among his enemies were responsible for the whole problem. He even ridiculed British labor leaders because of the "new" ideas:

    ... they are so hackneyed and ancient, that I can only say: Put them back in the box; that is already material discarded by us, already long surpassed, gentlemen."

However, these happenings were helpful to him and he used them; they represented the kind of proof he wanted. "But this is only proof that there, too, the people are beginning to stir." He kept on making fun of the British, and stated that eventually they would probably send a committee to take over his entire program. At times the Fuehrer was beginning to use poor German. The structure of his sentences became less and less clear. References often did not seem to be clearly to the point, and an outline did not seem to exist any more at all.
His enemies, particularly the British, had to be orally trampled into the mud as much as was possible. After the war against Poland, Hitler claimed to have again stretched out the hand of friendship. "I didn't demand a thing, neither from France nor from England." To all his kindness, his enemy responded only in a terrible way; one can almost feel how Hitler's listeners felt hate rising within them. "Fuming and fussing awaited me. They literally spat at me." Hitler pulled all stops at that moment. His sentences became short and his words clipped, his expressions uncouth and vindictive. The guilt had to lay with his enemies. "The blood of the peoples has to be put into the service of the money of the very small interest group again."

At a time when the people of Germany may have been weary of war, or at least hoping that no further contests would be demanded of them, Adolf Hitler seemed to have fulfilled his major purpose to convince his listeners that further war was not his choice, because those who hated Germany would not rest before she was destroyed. "Thus the first fight came about, and thus this fight will just have to continue." England tried to cut him off from iron ore bases in Norway; thus he had to get there first. They mobilized his enemy in the east against him, whom he took care of in a few weeks. The attempt to get to the Ruhr
through Holland and Belgium collapsed in a few days.
France went the same way. England was chased off the continent. Almost as an anti-climax the list of successes spelled out the fact that Germany was indeed succeeding under the guidance of providence.

The future was bright for Hitler at this moment. Whatever would happen, he had shown himself to be the man who had succeeded in the past. If England hoped for help from America, "I can only say one thing: We have considered every possibility beforehand." At the time this must have, indeed, both from an emotional and ethical standpoint been a very strong statement. Hitler answered, as it were, a ticklish question before it was put to him. How wrong he had been took several years to find out. His fuming went on almost to the breaking point: "If, however, these financial hyenas want a fight, and perhaps have the aim to extinguish the German nation, they'll get the surprise of their lives." He ridiculed his enemies' attempts to split up German-Italian alliances and to influence the German people to betray him. He claimed to see in it the hand of German traitors now writing and speaking for the British, and said that it only showed "the sick lack of mentality of the people who concoct such stuff in England."

After all, both he and the Duce (Mussolini) were men of honor, and since their handclasp was a sign of honor among
men, they could not be split up. To further his own ethos, Hitler restated his convictions that everything had been taken into account, and he appealed to his own comrades who, after all, had known him "for so many years as a careful man, who always looks ahead; every situation which is possible we soberly weighed and took into account. At the end stands our victory."

Reading the tirade which then followed was almost too much, but to his audience it was the response to their own frenzy, their own desire to be more and more reassured, to be whipped into a desire for new action. He spoke of the "idiots" and their "idiotic" attempts to drive a wedge between him and his allies or his people. He bragged about his people and his propaganda which would never respond to such hackneyed attempts. The people whom the British "borrowed" from Germany, he claimed, were the same stupid individuals who made idiotic attempts in Germany, particularly through the "Vossische Zeitung," to fight him. How sure he was by this time of success is shown by a statement which, in a way, represented a summary of his own ethos:

They can be assured: The German people will do everything which in its own interest is necessary. It shall follow its leadership ... It knows that today there stands not a man at the head of its government who also has a package of stocks in his pocket, who has other interests.
At the highest pitch of excitement, Hitler shouted out his defiance of any hope that others could take the German people away from him. "This German nation—I know that, and I am so proud of it—is dedicated to me and goes through thick or thin."

The last fact his enemies could have cited, namely that he made mistakes, was now simply wiped out by a joke. Certainly he had made mistakes, his enemies had counted seven, and in return he had counted 4,385,000 on their part. "If we make as many mistakes this year as in the last, I shall thank my Lord God at the end of this year on my knees that he let me make only seven mistakes." "We," "you," and "I"—these pronouns were becoming confused in Hitler's speech at that point, probably because a feeling of complete oneness was permeating the entire meeting and thus the speech itself. Hitler seemed to respond to emotional reactions, to audience sympathies and doubts, more than on the basis of any particularly well-prepared ideas. If he planned his speech in exactly this way, it would be an indication of his tremendous knowledge and understanding of the audience he found.

The final section of the speech is almost anticlimactic. He simply reiterated his belief in the strength of the German armed forces, bragging about their numbers and equipment. All he had said spelled to him the ful-
fullment of his final and greatest prophecy: "The year, 1941, of that I am convinced, will be the historical year of a great new European order."

One final "swift kick" at the Jews was brought to bear at this point. He reminded his listeners of a statement made in a speech on September 1, 1939, before the Reichstag, that the war into which he had been forced would spell the end of the Jews in Europe. It was his expressed hope that all nations would eventually recognize that their greatest enemy was within their own ranks, and would stop laughing at his declarations. By this time the "final solution," as it was called, of the Jewish problem was being considered in Germany. Hitler was convinced of the terrible role International Jewry played behind the scenes. In addition to earlier, fleeting mention of the Jews with his other enemies in this speech, he wanted to remind people that he had not forgotten the important role of the Jew. Ever since his early days in Vienna, this hatred of the Jewish people had become an obsessing force which was the basis of much of his thinking, while certainly not of his reasoning.

Only briefly and in passing he referred to the fact that many sacrifices had to be made; and while he expressed concern for those who had lost loved ones, he made clear that these sacrifices were small compared to what had been
accomplished. He praised women for taking the place of men, and praised every single German for making sacrifices. The speech almost seemed to disintegrate slowly. With one final burst, however, he brought it to an abrupt ending:

That this idea (OF GERMAN UNITY, OR UNITY OF THE PEOPLE) may be kept strong for us in the coming year, that be the wish of this day. That we win victory for this community (united nation), that is our trust. And that the Lord God may not leave us in the struggle of this coming year, that shall be our prayer. Germany, Sieg Heil!

These last words still linger in the mind of the writer. He can remember how they brought tears to his eyes when he heard Hitler. His parents who had been long doubtful about Hitler, at this point felt that maybe he was, after all, what he claimed to be. Only when Germany struck against Russia did many begin to wonder if Hitler was the savior of Germany after all.

Summary. 1. The speech had a minimum of organization, except for an underlying psychological method which set up a need and worked through illustrations to a point where further action was demanded on the basis of earlier performance and achievements.

2. It was an argumentative, persuasive speech, making use of a great number of emotional appeals such as desire for acceptance, security, understanding, strength, and dignity. These factors were shown to exist in Hitler's
plans and in Hitler's Germany, while they were shown to be absent both among his enemies and in earlier types of German governments.

3. Hitler's form of government was shown to be the result of, and the only possible solution to, earlier political and economic mistakes.

4. Germany's enemies were clearly identified as a small ruling class in England and France who were under the influence of Jewish capital. The idea of money behind all the actions taken by Hitler's enemies was reiterated many times, because this represented a despicable reason to Germany for engaging in a war.

5. Hitler used highly emotional terms, and often chose words which were almost of the "gutter" variety, in order to attack, villify, and ridicule his enemies.

6. In the absolute feeling of success, Hitler did everything in his power to further his own ethical image as a wise, benevolent, careful planner of Germany's future.

7. The speech was long and many sentences were involved and lacking in clarity, particularly after the first half of the speech was completed. However, the near frenzy of his audience, which could be determined by listening to recordings of this speech, made such technical considerations of minor importance.
8. Compared to the first speech, the second was much more emotional, less closely reasoned, considerably longer, and much more concerned with the development of a strong ethical image of the speaker.
CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study has shown that a number of very complex and important facts were responsible for Hitler's influence as a political leader. Whatever success he achieved was due mainly to his outstanding use of deliberative oratory, and his unique position in German history.

I. Why was Hitler Successful in Persuasion?

In summing up the previous discussion of the subject and the evidence presented, it could simply be stated that: An image was created. Three reasons were shown to be responsible for the success of this undertaking:

1. Political reasons
2. Hitler's ability as a speaker
3. The support of Hitler's propaganda machine

These points will be summarized in order.
Political reasons. It was seen that concern with history and politics is absolutely necessary in any study of Hitler. Dietrich pointed out that:

Hitler told the people that national recovery would be achieved only by social measures, and that socialist aims could be attained only upon a nationalistic basis. 392

1. Causes. This political approach was shown to be rhetorically effective for a number of reasons. Huge reparations bills, a sense of guilt because of the treaty of Versailles, the loss of colonies, the high number of unemployed, the failure of the republic, and finally a very severe inflation all contributed to the effectiveness of Hitler's speeches. As Lambertson indicated, and as he was quoted earlier, Hitler could take advantage in his speeches of the vast number of people who were dissatisfied with some facet or other of the national situation. Thus he strengthened also his own powers of ethical persuasion. "He described to them their misery and in vivid words portrayed a vision of a long-suffering people coming into its own." 393 Another author indicated the very same idea:

The message was a simple one, "You have suffered thus and thus, but as you have suffered,

392Dietrich, op. cit., p. 22.

so shall you rejoice. And the height of your rejoicing shall be as the depth of your suffer-
ing."394

2. Hitler's use of the situation. One of the closest associates of Hitler's early days of struggle pointed to Hitler's outstanding ability to make use of the political situation:

I have been asked many times what is the secret of Hitler's extraordinary power as a speaker. I can attribute it to his uncanny intuition, which infallibly diagnoses the ills from which the audience is suffering.395

3. The result. Material and even spiritual needs of a nation were thus used by Hitler to assure his own power and ethos and to assure himself of a group of listeners at all times.

Personal drive. In preceding chapters Hitler appeared as a man of action.

1. The representative of Germany's drive forward. Anyone who has ever listened to Hitler's voice can tell that he was able to give the impression of a dedicated man serving his nation with all of his force. German writers of

394 Roberts, op. cit., p. 38.

395 Otto Strasser, Hitler and I (Boston: David & Mosbacher, 1940), p. 66.
the day spoke of their Fuehrer as the representation of all that Germany stood for. Kindt wrote that early in his struggle before the court which sent him to Landsberg prison, the defense speech made by Hitler was the first indication of the "tremendous apologia," which to him indicated the "first breakthrough of the Logos Germanikos." Thus Germany's first truly "popular" speaker appeared on the scene.

2. Drive finding expression in speech. Hitler was shown to feel that the power which he desired over his audience could only be shown in one concrete way: Through the influence of the spoken word. "The effect which he (the speaker) has on the people, alone provides the meaning of the genius of the speaker." As he was able to drive himself to almost complete exhaustion, it was also true that Hitler could speak untiringly. Constant sessions at his headquarters tended to wear out his listeners but provided him only with the much-needed audience on which he could try out his ideas. Kindt felt that Hitler's dynamic nature showed up best in his speeches when he could use all the "genera discendi," and would surprise his audience with a

397 Hitler, op. cit., Volume II, Chapter 6, Mein Kampf (as quoted by Dovifat).
display of all the devices a speaker could use, even laughing and crying at times. It could actually be stated that with Hitler began a new chapter in eloquence.398

3. Personal drive as a stimulant for urgent action. Hitler drove himself to the very last moment of life. Action was the one thing he desired, and in the speaker's stand he assured himself of howling mob approval. Hans Krebs, writing his Redner Fibel (Speaker's Primer) for the Nazi party, indicated the importance of the type of speech the Fuehrer delivered. He wanted an individual style, one which was ruled by will and a strong sense of urgency; this would then be the style of the "Volksredner" (popular speaker).399

In one of the most significant books recently written in Germany, Der Fuehrer ins Nichts (Leader into Oblivion), a group of well-known German writers, historians, and psychologists dealt with Hitler. Hans Buchheim indicated the same reaction, previously discussed:

This man (Hitler in September, 1919, during his first speech before the party of which he was not yet a member) could speak; he convinced, because he was convinced himself, tore to shreds

398 Kindt, op. cit., p. 16.
the arguments of the opponent and represented the nationalistic cause with unusual certainty and lack of compromise.400

4. Personal drive without direction. Yet, behind all the personal drive and dynamism, the Fuehrer suffered from a split personality. As was repeatedly pointed out, he was by no means as sure of his plans, by no means as clear of the direction which he wished to give to his movement as many have thought. Buchheim put it well when he stated, "In spite of all of his Prussian phrases, Hitler was by nature Bohemian (lacking in discipline)."401 A feeling of urgency was behind all of Hitler's acts, which showed clearly in the delivery of his speeches. Gauleiter Albert Kreb's explanation of Hitler's drive is significant:

Towards such a mixture of fear of death and realization of one's mission, truly developed into a sickness, all advice which insisted on restraint and patience had to remain ineffective.402

400 Buchheim, et. al., op. cit., p. 7. For original German, see Appendix IV, No. 77. Translations by this author.

401 Ibid., p. 11. For original German, see Appendix IV, No. 78. Translations by this author.

402 Ibid., p. 17. For original German, see Appendix IV, No. 79. Translations by this author.
Speaking ability. The writers who were considered in this study agreed that one of the major factors in Hitler's rise to power, if not the major factor, was his ability to speak persuasively.

1. Hitler was Germany's first popular speaker. His influence as a speaker was the result of an almost complete absence of popular speakers of any stature in German history. Ross Scanlan explained an interesting result of this situation in a footnote to his article, "The Nazi Rhetorician."

The persistent lack of interest in the rhetorical theories of other people may be explained in three ways: Many Nazi propagandists regarded Hitler and Goebbels as sufficient fountain-heads for all theory; many regarded themselves as practical men who apart from their debt to Hitler and Goebbels, learned all they needed to know from their own practical experience as party speakers, and all were imbued with the basic Nazi doctrine that their people and their time in history required unique operation. In any case, it does not seem to have concerned them greatly that there might be certain universals in rhetoric which other cultures could teach them.\(^{403}\)

The new and "unique" order of state Hitler had developed had no great speaker tradition to look back upon. Goebbels stated that fact in an essay.\(^{404}\) Krebs stated plainly, "We

\(^{403}\) Scanlan, op. cit., p. 432.

Germans have always cultivated the art of speaking very poorly.⁴⁰⁵ So great was the contrast when Hitler finally came on the scene that sheer force of novelty helped make him an outstanding speaker.

2. The German concept of deliberative speaking aided Hitler. With his dynamic approach to speech, it was little wonder that only the deliberative, political "Rede" could be considered by Hitler and his followers to be worthy of their efforts. Krebs compared two types of speaking, mentioned earlier in this study: "Vortrag" and "Rede." The former was addressed to understanding, had no emotional excitation, was brief and to the point. The latter, however, was spontaneous, delivered in a stirring manner, and had to reach beyond understanding to the feelings of the listeners.⁴⁰⁶ This was the type of speech Hitler could deliver so well. The spoken word thus became the mark of distinction in the Nazi party. As Bosmagian put it:

Dr. Joseph Goebbels re-emphasized it and lesser Nazis followed the leader and consistently


⁴⁰⁶Ibid., pp. 7-8.
echoed the superiority of the spoken word over the written word.\textsuperscript{407}

One of the modern German writers quoted by Bosmagian (Stark), gave his own interpretation of this force which was unleashed on the unsuspecting and rather unprepared German masses: "The speaker is the propagandist of the Idea, who sacrifices his time, strength, health, and material values for the movement..."\textsuperscript{408} Germany, indeed, became so dependent upon Hitler and his force as a speaker that towards the end of the War when his speeches became more infrequent, she was threatened with extinction merely because the leader's influence was no longer being felt. Goebbels stated during those days, "It is high time the Fuhrer delivers a long speech in public to instil courage in the German people."\textsuperscript{409}

3. Power was a result of speech. Ludwig wrote that Hitler talked himself into power.\textsuperscript{410} Roberts made quite clear his belief that Hitler was "... the greatest


\textsuperscript{408}F. G. Stark, Moderne Politische Propaganda (Munich: Franz Eher, 1930), p. 18.


\textsuperscript{410}Ludwig, op. cit., p. 477.
popular orator during a time of political chaos and national depression.  .  .  ." Kindt indicated his tremendous power over his adversaries, and that he simply knocked his opponents to pieces. Strasser stated, "He believes what he says, carried away by a mystic force, he cannot doubt the genuineness of his mission." Mowrer wrote of him not merely as a speaker but as a man who used speech to persuade masses, "In this field he is, so far as I know, unequaled." Similar references abound wherever one turns. Hitler's power over the masses of his listeners was described by one witness as follows:

... yet the crowds in front of me no longer seemed to regard anything as impossible; they were ready to believe anything the voice said; for action was not limited to the one person...

Herman Rauschning quoted Hitler as stating that he was aware of his extraordinary powers as a speaker, "I am conscious that I have no equal in the art of swaying the masses."  

---

411 Roberts, op. cit., p. 23.
412 Strasser, op. cit., p. 127.
413 Edgar A. Mowrer, Germany Puts the Clock Back (1933), p. 258.
4. The persuasiveness of emotion was widely used. Hitler appealed to the most primitive motives and desires of man. Thus, his ethos was used to develop a strong feeling of pathos in the audience. His work was shown to consist mainly of a program of simplification which permitted him to bring everything to the level of a few simple formulae which applied to all of life. Lambertson put it this way: "The mob has given over all rational control and is dominated by the most primitive emotions." 

Rauschning again gave an indication of how Hitler felt about this attempt at seducing the masses:

I can lead the masses only if I tear them out of their apathy. Only the fanatic mass can be swayed. A mass that is apathetic and dull is the greatest threat to unity.

Once robbed of their ability to think clearly, Hitler then swayed and molded the masses in any way he saw fit. Lambertson goes so far as to explain that the unique and distinctive feature of Hitler's ability as an outstanding orator was that he could dominate the attention of his hearers and to "place both himself and them in a hypnotic state." After studying Hitler and his life, the story

---

\(^{416}\) Lambertson, op. cit., p. 128.


\(^{418}\) Lambertson, op. cit., p. 130.
of a man who had no outstanding mental abilities to recommend him, and who physically and mentally was by no means a giant, the writer looks at the audience he persuaded and states with Schrier, "... it is a patent fact that audiences are not moved to accept a course of conduct merely by having a reason presented for it." 419

5. **Persuasion beyond the usual limits.** As Lambertson pointed out, 420 Hitler used exactly the same methods any other persuasive speaker would use. It was shown that the ways in which he attracted crowds are the ways now being used by most persuasive speakers. Thus, the matter of degree was introduced. Oliver wrote concerning the human motivation that a pseudo-psychological appeal is acceptable, based on the reasoning of the speaker, and the emotions of the audience, IF the objects of the speaker are socially justifiable. 421 The methods which Hitler used fit into this category, but the destruction, misery, and suffering he brought into the world because of the success of his methods cause this writer to condemn him.

---

419 Schrier, op. cit., p. 477.
420 Lambertson, op. cit., p. 130.
421 Oliver, op. cit., p. 71.
6. The Nazi leaders realized the importance of speech. Goebbels stated in Unser Wille und Weg, one of his monthly publications:

As little as a church can afford to forego the constant dissemination of its doctrines from the pulpit, so little can National Socialism forego the immediate and striking effect of speeches in ever renewing faith in the Movement and new strength for the unending struggle . . .

Hitler pointed out forcefully how important he considered speech to be:

The power, however, which has always started the great historical, religious, and political avalanches rolling, has from time immemorial been only the magic power of the spoken word.

This "magic" to which he referred was the combination of the powers of ethos and pathos studied in preceding chapters.

Hitler's delivery. In this study, which dealt mainly with Hitler's ethos and pathos, only little has been said about his delivery. The following pages will briefly summarize Hitler's appearance in the speaker's stand, on

---


423Hitler, op. cit., p. 111 (Mein Kampf [Verlag Eher, original German]). For original German, see Appendix IV, No. 80. Translations by this author.
the basis of information contained in previous chapters. It was shown that the personal influence the Fuehrer exerted once he appeared before an audience, depended to a large extent upon the previous preparation of his listeners.

1. **The voice.** Hitler's voice appeared harsh, even unpleasant to those who were not part of the immediate audience. He rolled his r's very noticeably, partially because of his Austro-Bavarian background. He even seemed to lose control over his voice on certain occasions.

2. **Bodily actions.** The impression one had of him when looking carefully was that of a fairly heavy man with undistinguished features, who had a way of ending many of his gestures close to his body. In the speech Hitler made at the Dynamo Halle, which was mentioned earlier, his typical gestures were already established. There was the rapidly hammering fist, underlining important points, and also the strained mouth and face when he began to shout out his defiance of his enemies. One of his favorite gestures was the hand pointing to the right side, far outstretched, returning in a waving motion until the entire arm clasped the body, the left arm joining in this "hugging" motion.

The films which the writer watched at the University of California at Los Angeles showed that gestures which consistently marked his later speaking appearances were also
quite apparent during the early days of his power. He used the tense gesture of two clenched fists raised high in front of his chest. Often he would place both his hands on his hips and stand, speaking to his audience, with a slight rocking motion. The crossing of arms over his chest was another of his gestures which seemed to begin or end close to his body. While many of these gestures, particularly before large audiences, seemed to reach far out, they always returned to his own person.

The early speech at the Dynamo Halle was typical of others seen later, and all the speeches the writer can remember. They consisted of a mixture of relaxation and drive. Hitler would attempt to establish close contact with his audience, speaking much of the time in a relaxed and personal way, smiling, establishing audience contact with his eyes. Then, in important parts of his speech, his body would tense, leaning slightly towards his audience or the speaker's stand, his face would become tense, his voice shrill, and he would "pound" his words into his audience.

Another typical part of Hitler's repertoire of gestures was, of course, the Nazi salute. During parades and military events, Hitler would stand straight, his left hand clasped over his belt buckle, and the formal salute with immobile face would be rendered, his right arm straight in front of him or a little to the right side. As units
passed by him in parade, the arm would be slowly drawn back in a sweeping circle, the hand would slowly be closed and the salute finished. In crowds, more personal meetings, or at receptions, Hitler would angle his arm farther back in a much more relaxed manner, with an open hand, bringing the arm more smartly down.

3. **Appearances.** In later years, Hitler, though getting somewhat heavier and developing the beginnings of a double chin, was much more carefully dressed in his smart uniform, styled boots, highly polished leather belt. Even the simple gray uniform he wore during the war years was considerably better cut than his earlier clothes. His face was consistently serious and when a smile on certain occasions would break through, it would be kind, attentive to those whom he was meeting at the time (usually children or young girls). Hitler would bend forward to meet individuals being introduced to him, pulling them into his sphere of influence. One motion picture made after his visit at the Langemarck battlefield of World War I, where thousands of young German volunteers had died, showed him with the deeply concerned face of a man who had just had a deep and impressive experience. Consistently his face appeared interested, kind, not stoic but rather open and responsive to happenings around him. Considering pictures of most other European
politicians of the times, this kind of responsiveness, even though at times he may not have controlled his voice and face sufficiently, was probably more effective than the expected stoic reactions of a political leader. Little things were important, such as a noticeably shorter haircut during his visit to the Western Front during the war with France. At a time when most Germans were soldiers and required to have a short haircut, this could easily have been a well-planned move on Hitler's part. The low peak of his uniform cap often seemed to hide Hitler's eyes, putting those who watched him and talked with him at a disadvantage, but giving the total scene more of a feeling of intensity. Pictures showing Hitler signing photographs of himself, and accepting gifts such as flowers and baskets of fruits, are numerous and they show how closely he came in contact with the people. One of the most amazing things was the many pictures showing the crushing crowds which were around him so often until the Russian campaign. Few or no guards were visible and hands of well-wishers constantly reached into his car, slowing down motorcades. The impact of Hitler's personality could even be felt after many years while watching films of these events.

Summary of impressions. A personal letter from the man who took over from Count Schwerin von Krosigk as Germany's finance minister and president of the Reichsbank, a
financial genius of his own rights, Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, will be quoted here in part. It summarizes the impressions which a member of Germany's intellectual elite had of Hitler:

I have only heard him speak once at a big rally. There he spoke freely (WITHOUT NOTES). Wherein his influence over his listeners lay, I never fully understood. He spoke with a voice which was only little pleasant, but he always gave the impression as if he was himself controlled by what he talked about.

A specific plan for his popular speeches, Hitler probably never followed, except for the constantly repeated slogans. His gestures underlined these slogans considerably. The entire success of Hitler, in my opinion, is less to be attributed to his speeches than to the then existing general political pre-requisites such as lack of work, moral discrimination against Germans, general animosity of the foreign nations, etc. The second reason for his success was the exceptionally good organization of his party politics.\(^{427}\)

1. From all the comments studied, it is evident that Hitler made a lasting and important impression on the people of his day. Until one can understand and scientifically indicate all factors which are important to an effective and influential personality, until we truly know what personality is, the final answer to the question why Hitler was so effective may have to be delayed.

\(^{427}\)Translation of excerpts from a personal letter to the writer by Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, dated August 2, 1960. See Appendix III. Translations by this author.
2. A man who impressed others with his sincerity and interest has been shown. On the surface it would have been extremely difficult to determine that Hitler was neither sincere nor honest. Only later happenings and a basic concern for a morality which went beyond national boundaries could judge Hitler meaningfully.

3. Hitler was the voice of a people who finally saw a means of acting, of forcing others to accept them and respect, or at least fear, them. While using endless repetitions, Hitler nevertheless understood it to plant ideas, and to make them grow and develop in the minds—and, one could say, the hearts—of his people. Only consistent failure, the obvious lack of a lasting basis for Hitler's experiment, could eventually prove him wrong. Hitler stands before the student as a perfect example of an outstandingly successful speaker who must be judged on more than the immediate success of his speeches.

II. Preparation for Hitler's Speeches

1. Planning for Hitler's speeches was complete. One of the major purposes of the propaganda ministry under Goebbels was to build and strengthen the image of Hitler.
2. Factors of preparation. As Lambertson summed it up, five definite facts were the result of all preparation preceding Hitler's speaking appearances: (1) a feeling of expectancy (which resulted in seeing Hitler over and over again as a kind of "savior," at least from the pressures of the moment), (2) a narrowed focus of attention, (3) an increase in emotional responses, (4) decrease of rationality, and (5) an impulse to act.428

3. Hitler's own abilities served him well also. Josephson stated, "He planned the circus gatherings, the parades, the banners, the atmosphere to the last detail, like a first-class stage director."429

III. Conclusions

On the basis of all the material considered by the writer, these basic facts emerge.

1. Hitler came to power because of a number of fortunate political and economic factors, which prepared the way for him.

428Lambertson, op. cit., p. 124.

2. Hitler had been able to bring the complicated affairs of the world and the problems of individuals down to certainly highly simplified formulae which he constantly used and applied whether they fitted or not.

3. Hitler was a gifted speaker. Without formal study of the canons of rhetoric, he was able to employ the devices which are successful in persuading audiences.

4. Hitler had the aid of a highly intricate propaganda machine which constantly kept his image before the people, and permitted only the impression of a person with strong powers of ethos.

5. Hitler had no moral or ethical concepts which, in any way, could have interfered with his aims, which permitted him to deny the importance of the individual and think only of the state as he imagined it. On the basis of this fact, it must be said that Hitler had to be judged not merely from the standpoint of his ability to persuade, which he did most effectively, but from the standpoint of fulfilling the requirement of a GOOD MAN. Hitler was shown clearly and without argument to be everything but a good man, and thus in the final analysis judged not to be "a good man speaking well."

6. Hitler was unique as a popular speaker in German history. This factor of novelty helped him to develop attentive audiences.
The following quotation from *Der Fuehrer Ins Nichts*, a symposium of men and women who have studied the life of Hitler in detail, helps to summarize this study:

... he brought life into the organization, formulated impressive goals, understood it to address the unspoken desires of his followers and to feel out the weaknesses of his enemies. ... Hitler was willing to make any cause of the moment of such absolute necessity that he was willing to endanger for it everything he had accomplished to that time ... he was not capable of giving duration to that which his struggle had gained, and in the end he was a destroyer.  

Hitler's own statement stands as a confession as written in *Mein Kampf*: "I had to learn only little in addition to what I once created for myself; I needed to change nothing." He was a small man with tremendous drive, dedication, and conviction, who had the times and an unusual personal dynamism on his side. The historical German ideal of the paladin, the dedicated follower, provided him with the necessary precedent for developing his own nation, and his unique speaking appeal provided the means.

---

430 Buchheim, et. al., op. cit., pp. 7-20. See Appendix IV, No. 81, for original German. Translations by this author.
IV. Future Research

The following areas are suggested for further study to bring about better understanding of Hitler's influence as a speaker.

1. The writing of Hitler's speeches, including the possibility of ghost writers, should be considered.

2. Comparisons of Hitler's speaking methods with those used by other political leaders in the Germany of his day.

3. Comparison of Hitler's speaking methods with those employed by German speakers of other periods.

4. A comparison of Hitler's methods of speaking with those used by Benito Mussolini, and probably other dictators of the same period.

5. Psychological studies, attempting to determine possible relationships between Hitler's habits of speech and behavior in front of audiences, to personality traits.

Background studies, or studies in limited and specific areas would seem to be most important. Rhetorical analyses of specific speeches can then be carried out more meaningfully.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX I

DOCUMENTS

The following documents and excerpts from documents represent a collection of statements which outline in bold strokes the policy of Hitler's party during the early years of his life.

The first of these statements is the complete text of the program of the National Socialist German Workers' Party, which was drawn up on February 24, 1920 by Gottfried Feder. It was proclaimed on February 25, 1920 in the Munich Hofbrauhaus.

The programme of the German Workers' Party is limited as to period. The leaders have no intention, once the aims announced in it have been achieved, of setting up fresh ones, in order to ensure the continued existence of the Party by the artificially increased discontent of the masses.

1. We demand the union of all Germans, on the basis of the right of the self-determination of peoples, to form a Great Germany.

2. We demand equality of rights for the German People in its dealings with other nations, and abolition of the Peace Treaties of Versailles and St. Germain.

3. We demand land and territory (colonies) for the nourishment of our people and for settling our superfluous population.

4. None but members of the nation may be citizens of the State. None but those of German Blood, whatever their creed, may be
members of the nation. No Jew, therefore, may be a member of the nation.

5. Anyone who is not a citizen of the State may live in Germany only as guest and must be regarded as being subject to Alien laws.

6. The right of voting on the leadership and legislation is to be enjoyed by the citizens of the State alone. We demand therefore that all official appointments, of whatever kind, whether in the Reich, the provinces, or the smaller communities, shall be granted to citizens of the State alone.

7. We demand that the State shall make it its first duty to promote the industry and livelihood of the citizens of the State. If it is not possible to nourish the entire population of the State, foreign nationals (non-citizens of the State) must be excluded from the Reich.

8. All further non-German immigration must be prevented. We demand that all non-Germans who entered Germany subsequently to August 2, 1914, shall be required forthwith to depart from the Reich.

9. All citizens of the State shall possess equal rights and duties.

10. It must be the first duty of every citizen of the State to perform mental or physical work. The activities of the individual must not clash with the interests of the whole, but must proceed within the framework of the community and must be for the general good.

We demand therefore:

11. Abolition of incomes unearned by work.
   Abolition of the Thraldom of Interest.

12. In view of the enormous sacrifice of life and property demanded of a nation by every war, personal enrichment through war must be regarded as a crime against the nation. We demand therefore the ruthless confiscation of all war profits.

13. We demand the nationalization of all businesses which have (hitherto) been amalgamated (into Trusts).

14. We demand that there shall be profit-sharing in the large industries.
15. We demand a generous development of provision for old age.

16. We demand the creation and maintenance of a healthy middle class, immediate communalization of wholesale warehouses, and their lease at a low rate to small traders, and that the most careful consideration shall be shown to all small purveyors to the State, provinces, or smaller communities.

17. We demand a land-reform suitable to our national requirements, the passing of a law for the confiscation without compensation of land for communal purposes, the abolition of interest on mortgages, and prohibition of all speculation in land.

18. We demand ruthless war upon all those whose activities are injurious to the common interest. Common criminals against the nation, usurers, profiteers, etc., must be punished with death, whatever their creed or race.

19. We demand that the Roman law, which serves the materialistic world order, shall be replaced by a German common law.

20. With the aim of opening to every capable and industrious German the possibility of higher education and consequent advancement to leading positions, the State must consider a thorough re-construction of our national system of education. The curricula of all educational establishments must be brought into line with the requirements of practical life. Directly the minds begin to develop the schools must aim at teaching the pupil to understand the State idea (State sociology). We demand the education of specially gifted children of poor parents, whatever their class or occupation, at the expense of the State.

21. The State must apply itself to raising the standard of health in the nation by protecting mothers and infants, prohibiting child labour, and increasing bodily efficiency of legally obligatory gymnastics and sports, and by extensive support of clubs engaged in the physical training of the young.
22. We demand the abolition of mercenary troops and the formation of a national army.

23. We demand legal warfare against conscious political lies and their dissemination in the Press. In order to facilitate the creation of a German national Press we demand:
   (a) That all editors of and contributors to newspapers employing the German language must be members of the nation.
   (b) That special permission from the State shall be necessary before non-German newspapers may appear. These need not necessarily be printed in the German language.
   (c) That non-Germans shall be prohibited by law from participating financially in or influencing German newspapers, and that penalty for contravention of the law shall be suppression of any such newspaper, and immediate deportation of the non-German involved.

It must be forbidden to publish newspapers which do not conduce to the national welfare. We demand the legal prosecution of all tendencies in art and literature of a kind likely to disintegrate our life as a nation, and the suppression of institutions which militate against the above-mentioned requirements.

24. We demand liberty for all religious denominations in the State, so far as they are not a danger to it and do not militate against the morality and moral sense of the German race.

   The Party as such stands for positive Christianity, but does not bind itself in the matter of creed to any particular confession. It combats the Jewish-materialistic spirit within and without us, and is convinced that our nation can achieve permanent health from within only on the principle:

   The Common Interest before Self Interest.

25. That all foregoing requirements may be realized we demand the creation of a strong central power of the Reich with unconditional authority of the politically central Parliament over the entire Reich and its organization in general.
We demand the formation of Diets and vocational Chambers for the purpose of carrying out the general laws promulgated by the Reich in the various States of the Confederation.

The leaders of the Party swear to proceed regardless of consequences—if necessary at the sacrifice of their lives—towards the fulfillment of the foregoing Points.

Munich, February 24, 1920.

On March 23, 1933 an Enabling Act gave Hitler's government dictatorial powers for a period of four years. This law came into effect only a short time after the fire in the Reichstag Building. Its title was: THE LAW TO COMBAT THE CRISIS OF PEOPLE AND STATE.

The Reichstag has enacted the following law which, with the consent of the Reichsrat, and in view of the determination that the requirements for laws changing the constitution have been complied with, is hereby promulgated:

**ARTICLE 1**

National laws can be enacted by the national cabinet as well as in accordance with the procedure established in the constitution.

**ARTICLE 2**

The national laws enacted by the national cabinet may deviate from the constitution insofar as they do not affect the position of the Reichstag and the Reichsrat as such. The powers of the Reich President remain untouched.

---

ARTICLE 3

The national laws enacted by the national cabinet are prepared by the chancellor and proclaimed in the Reichsgesetzblatt. They take effect, unless otherwise specified, upon the day following their publication.

ARTICLE 4

Treaties of the Reich with foreign states which relate to matters of national legislation do not require the concern of the bodies participating in legislation. The national cabinet makes the necessary provisions for the execution of these treaties.

ARTICLE 5

This law becomes effective on the day of its publication. It becomes invalid on April 1, 1937; it further becomes invalid if the present national cabinet is replaced by another.432

National socialist attitudes towards "non-Aryans" took the form of a decree passed on April 11, 1933, shortly after Hitler assumed power. The following extract from the FIRST DECREES FOR THE EXECUTION OF THE LAW FOR THE RESTORATION OF THE CIVIL SERVICE, APRIL 11, 1933, helps to define this stand.

All those counted as non-Aryans who are descended from non-Aryan, particularly Jewish parents or grandparents. It suffices if one parent or one grandparent is non-Aryan. This is especially to be accepted if one parent or one grandparent professed the Jewish religion.433


Control over the minds of people was an important factor in the rule of the Nazi government. Thus on June 30, 1933, the tasks of the Ministry for Public Enlightenment and Propaganda with Dr. Paul Joseph Goebbels as its head, were defined. Goebbels also coordinated all aspects of Germany's cultural life.

DECREE CONCERNING THE TASKS OF THE MINISTRY FOR PUBLIC ENLIGHTENMENT AND PROPAGANDA, June 30, 1933

Based on the decree of the Reich President of March 13, 1933, I (Hitler) decree, in agreement with the minister of foreign affairs, the minister of the interior, the minister of economics, the minister for food and agriculture, the minister of communications, and the minister for public enlightenment and propaganda, the following:

The minister for public enlightenment and propaganda is competent to deal with all measures of spiritual influence upon the nation, publicity for the state, culture, and business, instruction of the public within and without the nation concerning the above, and the administration of all arrangements which serve all these purposes.

Consequently, the following are transferred to the jurisdiction of the minister for public enlightenment and propaganda:

1. From the jurisdiction of the foreign office:
   Intelligence reports and publicity in foreign countries, art, art exhibits, film and sport matters in foreign countries.

2. From the jurisdiction of the ministry of the interior:
   General domestic political enlightenments
   The Hochschule für Politik
   Establishment and celebration of national holidays and state celebrations, with the participation of the minister of the interior
   The Press (with the Institute of Journalism)
   The Radio
   The National Anthem
   The Deutsche Bücherei in Leipzig
Art (but not including the Art-Historical Institute in Florence, copyright for works of literature and art, the index of the valuable national works of art, the German-Austrian treaty on the exportation of art, protection of art objects and monuments, protection and care of the landscape and natural monuments, game and forest preserves, the preservation of buildings of special historical significance, the preservation of national monuments, the Association of German Societies for Folklore, the national honor-monument)

Music cultivation (including philharmonic orchestras)
Theatrical affairs
The Cinema
Combating of trash and obscenity.

3. From the jurisdictions of the ministry of economics and the ministry for food and agriculture:
Business publicity for exposition, fairs, and other advertising matters.

4. From the jurisdictions of the ministry of posts and the ministry of communications:
Travel publicity
All radio matters which in the past were dealt with by the ministry of posts are transferred from its jurisdiction insofar as they do not pertain to the technical administration outside the National Radio Corporation and the radio corporations' buildings. In matters of technical administration for public enlightenment and propaganda is so participate insofar as is necessary for the execution of his own duties, especially in the determination of conditions for lease as radio-plants and the regulations of their dues. In particular, the representation of the Reich in the National Radio Corporation and in the radio corporations is transferred completely to the minister for public enlightenment and propaganda.

In the designated fields the minister for public enlightenment and propaganda is at the head of all matters, including legislation.
For participation by the remaining national ministers, the general regulations apply.\(^{434}\)

Other political parties represented a menace to the National Socialists, thus they had to be eliminated. This was accomplished in a decree dated July 14, 1933.

THE LAW CONCERNING THE FORMATION OF NEW PARTIES
JULY 14, 1933

The National Socialist German Workers' Party is the only political party in Germany. Whoever undertakes to maintain the organization of another political party or to form a new political party is to be punished with confinement in a penitentiary up to 3 years or imprisonment in a jail from 6 months to 3 years unless the act is punishable by a higher penalty under other provisions.\(^{435}\)

To keep the "race" pure, was one of the major concerns of Nazi leaders. How far the party would go in making sure its racial philosophies would be successful was indicated by a law passed on July 14, 1933, of which important extracts are given here.

THE LAW TO PREVENT THE PERPETUATION OF HERITABLE DISEASES, JULY 14, 1933

(1) Whoever suffers from a heritable disease may be made unfruitful (sterilized) through surgical means if, in the experience of medical science, it may, with great likelihood, be expected that his descendants will suffer from serious heritable physical or mental defects.


\(^{435}\) Ibid., pp. 682-683 (Germany, Reichsgesetzblatt, Vol. I, No. 86, July 25, 1933, pp. 529-531).
(2) Whoever suffers from one of the following ailments is considered to be heritably diseased within the meaning of this law:
1. congenital feeble-mindedness
2. schizophrenia
3. manic-depression
4. congenital epilepsy
5. heritable St. Vitus's dance (Huntington's Chores)
6. hereditary blindness
7. hereditary deafness
8. serious heritable malformations

(3) Further, anyone suffering from chronic alcoholism may also be made unfruitful.

2

(1) Entitled to request (sterilization), is he who is to be made unfruitful. If he should be incapacitated or under guardianship because of feeble-mindedness or not yet 18 years of age, then his legal representative is empowered to make the motion. In the other cases of limited capacity the request must be consented to by the legal representative. If the person is of age and has a nurse, the consent of the latter is necessary.

(2) The request is to be accompanied by a certificate from a physician accredited by the German Reich stating that the one to be sterilized has been enlightened regarding the nature and consequences of sterilization.

(3) The request for sterilization is subject to recall.

3

Sterilization may also be recommended by
1. the official physician
2. the official in charge of the institution in the case of inmates of a hospital, sanitarium, or prison.

4

The request is to be presented in writing to, or put into writing by the business office of, the Health-Inheritance Court (Erbgesundheitsgericht).
The facts underlying the request are to be certified to by a medical document or in some other way authenticated. The business office of the court must notify the official physician.

7

(1) The proceedings before the Health-Inheritance Courts are secret.

10

... (3) The Supreme Health-Inheritance Court has final jurisdiction.

11

(1) The surgical operation necessary for sterilization may be performed only in a hospital and by a physician accredited by the German Reich. ...

18

This law becomes effective January 1, 1934. 436

Extracts from the hereditary farm law will serve as an indication of how strongly Nazi leaders felt concerning the importance of small farms and farmers. This law involved landholdings of about 5 to 310 acres.

The national government desires to preserve the peasantry, through the surety of the ancient German mode of inheritance, as the blood source (Blutquelle) of the German people.

436 Ibid., pp. 683, 684 (Germany, Reichsgesetzblatt, 1933, Vol. 1, No. 86, July 25, 1933, pp. 529-531).
The farms shall be protected against excessive debt and division during the process of inheritance, so that they may remain permanently as heritages of the clan in the hands of free peasants.

Efforts shall be made to bring about a healthful partition of the large landed estates, inasmuch as the existence of a large number of prosperous small and medium-sized farms distributed as regularly as possible over the entire country offers the best guarantee for keeping the people and state vigorous.

The national government has therefore decided upon the following law. The fundamental thoughts of the law are:

Land and forestry property of a minimum size of one soil subsistence (Ackernahrung) and a maximum of 125 hectares (308.8 acres) constitutes a Hereditary Farm, if it belongs to a person competent to be a peasant.

The owner of a Hereditary Farm is called peasant (Bauer).

Only he can be a peasant who is a German citizen, of German kindred blood, and who is honorable.

The Hereditary Farm passes undivided to the heir-apparent.

The claims of the joint heirs are limited to the remaining property of the peasant. Descendants not classed as heirs-apparent receive a vocational training and establishment commensurate with the capabilities of the farm; should they fall into want through no fault of their own, then they are entitled to find sanctuary at home.

The Hereditary Farm is inherently inalienable and unattachable.\(^{437}\)

With the death of President von Hindenburg a most dramatic change took place in German political affairs. Hitler now stood as Fuehrer and Chancellor of what was to become known as the "Third Reich."

THE LAW CONCERNING THE HEAD OF THE GERMAN REICH
August 1, 1934

1

The office of Reich President is united with that of chancellor. Hence the authority hitherto exercised by the Reich President passes to the leader chancellor, Adolf Hitler. He appoints his deputy.

2

This law becomes effective from the moment of the death of President von Hindenburg.438

Under General Wilhelm Goering the so-called Four Year Plan began to dominate all of Germany's planning and development. The following extracts from Hitler's proclamation show the importance he attached to this economic plan of recovery and development.

PROCLAMATION TO THE FOUR-YEAR PLAN AT THE EIGHTH PARTY CONGRESS, NUERNBERG, SEPTEMBER 9, 1936

... I (Hitler) therefore today present the following as the new Four-Year Plan: In four years Germany must be wholly independent of foreign areas in respect of those materials which can in any way be produced through German ability, through our chemistry and machine industry as well as through our mining industry! The re-creation of this great German raw-material industry will also gainfully employ those masses released by the completion of the rearmament. ...

... The execution (of the plan) will take place with National Socialist energy and vigor. But independently thereof, Germany cannot forego the solution of its colonial demands. The right to live of the German people is as great as the (corresponding) rights of other nations. ...

The realization of this plan therefore becomes merely a question of our energy and determination. As National Socialists we never have known the word "impossible" and hence we do not in future want to take it up as an enrichment of our vocabulary. . . .

Internal affairs were no longer in the foreground of Hitler's thinking. As he turned his attention to international affairs, Austria, his old home land, was of major importance. On March 12, 1938, German troops occupied this small country. A brief law summarizes the happenings. Major extracts are recorded here.

THE LAW ON THE REUNION OF AUSTRIA WITH THE GERMAN REICH, MARCH 13, 1938

ARTICLE 1

Austria is a state of the German Reich.

ARTICLE 2

On Sunday, April 10, 1938, there will be a free, secret plebiscite of all German men and women of Austria over 20 years of age on the reunion with the German Reich.

ARTICLE 3

A majority of the votes cast determines the plebiscite.

---

ARTICLE 5

(1) This federal, constitutional law is effective on the day of its proclamation.\textsuperscript{440}

Using an old "weapon" of democracy, Hitler gave the German people a chance to agree with his actions in Austria. Included was the state of Reichstags--Representatives selected by Hitler. An affirmative vote of 99.07 per cent in a total valid vote that represented 99.59 per cent of the qualified electorate of Great Germany was recorded.

DECREES ON THE BALLOT FOR THE PLEBISCITE AND GREAT-GERMAN REICHSTAG ELECTIONS, APRIL 10, 1938

BALLOT

Do you agree to the reunion of Austria with the German Reich carried out on March 13 and do you vote for the (Reichstag) list of our leader, Adolf Hitler?\textsuperscript{441}

Extracts of a new decree passed on April 26, 1938, give a clear impression of the deteriorating position of Jews living in Nazi Germany.

THE DECREES ON JEWISH-OWNED PROPERTY
April 26, 1938

A decree of April 26, 1938, required all Jews in Germany who possessed property worth more than 5000 marks to report their belongings to the state. Article 7 of the decree appeared to tie up the measure with the Four-Year Plan.

\textsuperscript{440}Ibid., pp. 700-701 (Austria, Bundesgesetzblatt, fuer den Bundesstaat Oesterreich, Oesterreichische Staatsdruckerei, Vienna, Jahrg. 1938, St. 25, Nr. 75).

\textsuperscript{441}Ibid., p. 703 (Austria, Gesetzblatt fuer das Land Oesterreich, Oesterreichische Staatsdruckerei, Vienna, 1938, St. 16, Nr. 49).
ARTICLE 1

Every Jew . . . shall report and evaluate in accord with the following instructions his entire domestic and foreign property and estate on the day when this decree goes into force. Jews of foreign citizenship shall report and evaluate only their domestic property.

The duty to report holds likewise for the non-Jewish marital partner of a Jew.

Every reporting person's property must be given separately.

ARTICLE 2

. . . Property does not include movable objects used by the individual or house furnishings as far as the latter are not classed as luxury objects.

ARTICLE 3

. . . No report is necessary when the total worth of the property to be reported does not exceed 5000 marks.

ARTICLE 4

. . . The report is to be presented on an official form by June 30, 1938, to the administrative office responsible at the place of residence of the reporting individual. When such a report is not possible by this date the responsible office can extend the period. In such case, however, an estimate is to be presented by June 30, 1938, together with a statement of the hindering grounds.

ARTICLE 5

The reporting individual must report, after this decree goes into force, to the responsible office every change of said individual's total property as far as it exceeds a proper standard of living or normal business transactions. . . .
ARTICLE 7

The Commissar for the Four-Year Plan is empowered to take such necessary measures as may be necessary to guarantee the use of the reported property in accord with the necessities of German economy.

ARTICLE 8

Whoever with purpose or through carelessness does not fulfill his duty to report and evaluate ... or does not fulfill it correctly or promptly or who acts contrary to the measures under Article 7 will be punished with imprisonment and a fine or one of the two said punishments. ... A delinquent is likewise punishable when the crime was committed abroad. An effort to commit such a crime is equally punishable.

Besides the punishment provided above, confiscation of the property can also be imposed as far as said property was involved in a punishable action. When no definite individual can be prosecuted, confiscation alone can be imposed when the prerequisites for confiscation are demonstrated.442

Unlike the Italian fascists, nazi theorists had ample time before the party took power to formulate a body of doctrines fairly convincing to the German mind. Their principal apologists, E. R. Huber, F. A. Beck, and Arthur Rosenberg, created little that was original, obtaining their ideas in large part from idealists, race theorists, biologists, and economists of the nineteenth century such as Herder, Hegel, von Humboldt, List, Gabineau, H. A. Chamberlain, and others. Cleverly selecting ideas generally accepted by the German masses, these writers gave powerful aid to the expansionist aims of Germany, and the desire of the people for efficient political leadership and strong government. Among their most important doctrines may be listed:

THE DOCTRINE OF THE "FOLK". Nazism based its theory of organic nationalism upon a blood relationship rather than upon a spiritual unity of the people. To the Nazis, the "Folk" (National Community) is the basic human
entity whose members are linked together in blood brotherhood (tribal concept). Out of the "Folk" emerges the State which functions as an instrumentality for securing the ends of the "Folk". A product of emergent evolution based upon race, soil, and cultural changes, the "Folk" has a single will and is aware of its solidarity of purpose. The blood link makes all Germans everywhere a part of the German "Folk" regardless of their legal membership in other states.

THE PRINCIPLE OF RACIAL SUPREMACY. According to Nazi doctrine, races vary greatly in their native capacities and adaptability to modern culture. These natural distinctions necessitate the assigning to each race its place according to its capacities. All indications, nazi writers assert, point to the Aryan race as the master race. Among all Aryans, the Germans are the most intelligent, efficient, and culturally superior. Other Aryan races may be classed as associates but non-Aryans are definitely inferior and should be prohibited from intermarrying with Aryan stock. Racial inferiors should be relegated to their proper status by law if residing within Germany. Those inhabiting territory needed by the master race for lebensraum should be destroyed or subjected to the will of their racial superiors. Of all non-Aryans, the Jews were looked upon as the lowest and most despicable, good only for deportation, degradation, or slaughter. The race theory
was designed by nazi apologists to nullify the Marxian theory of world brotherhood of the workers while the attack upon the Jews was intended to shift working-class hatred for the employers to the Jews. Programs against Jews were also used to justify German expansion into so-called Jewish-dominated states and National Socialist attacks upon the Christian Churches whose creeds were drawn from Jewish sources.

THE LEADERSHIP PRINCIPLE. The nazi doctrine of a supreme leader conformed to German traditional ideas. Dictatorship was rationalized by making the Fuehrer the living embodiment and expression of the basic aims and purposes of the "Folk". His declarations expressed the will of the "Folk" and, hence, were always right and entitled to unquestioning obedience.

THE PRINCIPLE OF HIERARCHY. In the nazi ideology, political society must be organized hierarchically with the leader at the top, and descends through various levels of authority until the masses of the people are reached. This idea, too, was in accord with German ideas of strong and orderly government. Both army and civilians readily accepted the idea which, when implemented in fact, gave the nazis an unbreakable hold on power.
THE PRINCIPLE OF AN ELITE. Nazi doctrine sponsored a trinity of people, party, and leader or, functionally speaking, supporting class, leading class, and creative class. In this threefold relationship, the party furnishes the connecting link between people and leader. In theory selected for their loyalty and demonstrate zeal for their task and unquestioning obedience to the leader. The two principal functions of the party were to (1) furnish political leadership and (2) regiment the masses behind the leaders. As rationalized by nazi spokesmen this meant promoting in the people an interest in political affairs, teaching the principles of nazism, and securing full support for the purposes of the "Folk" as stated by Hitler. The importance of these tasks explains why the party was placed above and independent of the state and yet able to direct it into proper channels.

THE STATE AS A TOTAL UNITY. Hierarchy, in nazi thinking was not enough. The state must be organized in such a way as to achieve a total effort carried to the point of maximum efficiency. This meant the removal of all hindrances, the subordination of all political, economic, and social categories within the state and the organization of the state as a total unity to secure the ends proclaimed by the leader. After the nazi revolution, Hitler dedicated himself to securing this totalitarian state in preparation
for the larger objective to come later.

THE ENDS OF THE STATE. These were for nazi purposes adequately expressed under the broad term of welfare of the "Folk". This included, however, social and economic well-being to be secured through proper utilization of resources immediately available and expansion of territory to permit securing of additional resources, thus permitting a rise in the standard of living. This doctrine definitely stated the nazi purpose to seize territory of the neighbors of Germany. The justification for it could be found not only in the welfare doctrine but in the doctrines of racial and cultural superiority. However, nazi aims did not stop with acquisition of adjacent territory. Their goals were conquest of Europe and the world.

NAZI IDEOLOGY

NATIONALISM. The National Socialists (Abbreviated to Nazis) of Germany were more nationalistic than socialist. They went beyond the older nationalistic parties in their patriotic fervor, and were able to supplant them by promising social reforms to remedy economic conditions of the lower middle class and the unemployed workers. The older nationalistic parties composed of Junkers, militarists, and industrialists were too conservative in their economic doctrines to have a popular appeal. The Nazis,
on the contrary, while opposing the internationalism of the Russian Communists, espoused some aspects of their socialist reforms. Nationalism led the Nazis to desire a supremely powerful military state capable of suppressing all internal dissensions, of restoring Germany to a dominant position in Europe, and of conquering territory commensurate with the size of German population.

The National Socialist movement began without clearly defined political doctrines. Like fascism in Italy, it was at first a sprawling movement of resentment and confusion, growing out of the defeat of war, the economic chaos that came in its wake, and the ineptitude of a nascent republican government established in Germany by the victorious Allies. Unlike fascism, however, nazism was a frantic crusade that lasted for twelve years before being sobered by the responsibility of governing Germany. During this time of demagogic campaigning, the Nazis had ample opportunity to learn all the tricks of propaganda. They learned how to play upon the demoniac emotions of a people depressed by hunger and unemployment and demented by the humiliation of defeat.

Following the First World War, one of Hitler's missions for the Reichswehr at Munich was the investigation of Anton Drexler and his German Workers' Party. The program of this rather insignificant party was a strange mixture
of militarism, nationalism, and socialism, but it greatly attracted Hitler. In July, 1919, he joined the party, which had only forty members at the time, and soon became its leader. As the chief orator of the party, his speeches were long harangues against the Jews, Communists, and the victorious Allies. Under his leadership the party adopted in 1920 a specific program consisting of twenty-five points. This program was designed to win the favor of the nationalists, workers, and peasants. All who hated the Versailles Treaty were given encouragement to join the party. The primary point of the new program was the creation of a strong state to incorporate all Germans. Race was made the basis of the new state; consequently, non-Germans, especially the Jews, were denied citizenship.

Many promises of social reforms were made to the disinherited masses. The bonds of "interest slavery" were to be broken by National Socialism. Demands were made for the nationalization of trusts, for profit-sharing in large industries, and for the extension of old age pensions. The new program even provided the death penalty for the crimes of usury and profiteering. However, the socialists phase of the nazi program were never pursued with vigor. It was soon discovered that, to secure the financial support of the powerful industrialists, their suspicions had to be allayed. Hitler assured them by a speech made in August 1920 that industrial capital would remain untouched, except
that belonging to the Jews. However, this did not appease all the capitalist hostility to the nazi program. Point XVII which required the confiscation of land for public benefit continued to raise doubts among the conservatives. Finally, in 1928, Hitler alleviated their anxieties by explaining that the "expropriation of land" clause was directed only to the Jewish companies speculating in land. Thus, socialism was almost wholly deleted from the nazi program.

THE TOTALITARIAN STATE. A salient feature of the German ideology was totalitarianism. The German state as conceived by Hitler, was supremely dominant over the minority groups as well as over the individual. Following precedents established in Italy, he waged relentless warfare against all political parties, labor unions, fraternal orders, youth organizations, and even against the churches. The state governments, too, had their power strictly curtailed. A law for the reorganization of the Reich, promulgated in January, 1934, transferred the political rights of the states to the central government, abolished the popular assemblies of the states and subordinated the local officials to the Reich Minister of Interior. Like absolute anarchists and Oriental despots who had previously crossed the stage of history, Hitler eliminated one by one the checks upon his arbitrary power and used the Gestapo to destroy
any effective opposition to his regime.

The absolutism of the state over the individual was implemented by the Law regarding Labor service, promulgated in June, 1935. This law provided compulsory labor for all German youth of both sexes from nineteen to twenty-five years of age. The objectives of the organization were the training of young people in the doctrines of National Socialism and the performance of work for the public welfare. Any effort to escape compulsory labor was penalized by thirty days' imprisonment. Members of the group were not permitted to marry without official consent. To enter any professional career, business enterprise, or public office, required official permission. Salaries received and income from property during the years of compulsory labor were regulated by the Reich Labor Service.

The pattern of organization was cut out along military lines. Supreme command resided in Der Fuehrer and was extended downward to the last subordinate official. The Reich Minister of Interior, who was directly responsible to Hitler, had authority over all front-line officials, the Reich Labor Leaders. So long as the individual was a member of the Reich Labor Service, he was subjected to a thorough military training and discipline.

All German workers, as well as the young people, were regimented by the Nazis. The Labor Front comprising
twenty million workers replaced the trade unions. Through this mammoth organization hours, wages, and conditions of work were regulated. Its prime purpose was the establishment of industrial peace by the elimination of both strikes and lockouts. Labor "trustees" were appointed to arbitrate wage disputes and to enforce the settlement reached. The mystical leadership principle was introduced in industry. The manager or owner of the business was made the leader and the workers were made followers. It was the duty of the leader to manage his affairs for the benefit of the state and of workers to follow him in that undertaking.

All economic life was divided into five estates, agriculture, industry, trade, labor, and transportation. At the head of each estate was a supreme leader who derived authority directly from Hitler. Each leader delegated and sub-delegated authority in military fashion; so that the whole economy was regimented. Production was directed from above by a Four-Year Plan designed to make Germany self-sufficient. In addition, there was an enormous public works program which provided employment for everybody able to work. Such extensive planning required the regulation of imports and exports, the determination of prices and the volume of productions, and the establishment of priorities for both materials and labor. Nazi economy was controlled rigidly as it had been in World War I and was motivated
by the urgency of a national crisis.

Private property and individual initiative were nominally retained although they were hedged about by numerous restrictions. The bulk of German industry remained in the hands of the entrepreneur and the great estates of the Junkers were not confiscated. The smaller farms, however, were brought under the Hereditary Estate Act of 1933. According to this law, the farms were inherited by the eldest son and could not be sold or mortgaged. The size of each farm, depending upon the fertility of the soil, was designed to support one family. By 1939 approximately 37 per cent of the land had been divided into hereditary estates. The ideological basis of this program was the creation of a strong peasant class to redress the unbalance between industry and agriculture.

The totalitarian state could brook no opposition, not even from the Protestant and Catholic Churches. Many Nazis repudiated Christianity openly and completely because of its Jewish origins and preferred the Nordic pagan rites and deities of their ancestors. The national policy pursued by the Nazis, however, was to force uniformity upon the Protestants and to reduce the educational powers of the Catholic Church. The leadership principle was applied to religious affairs: there was to be one comprehensive national church under one supreme leader.
MILITARISM. The totalitarian state was made possible in Germany by the use of secret military police at home and the preparation for foreign aggression. The Nazi Party was animated by the spirit of violence and brutality. It perpetuated the wartime techniques and strategies into the peacetime political affairs of Germany. One element within the party was the Free Corps, a voluntary group consisting of professional soldiers and officers, who were imbued with the ideals of Prussian military traditions. Fanatical haters of Communists, Socialists, and democrats, these militarists rallied to the support of anyone opposing the German republic. Even members of the Reichswehr, the small but well-trained army, had open contempt for the republican leaders and were willing to bargain with Hitler to overthrow the government which they were sworn to defend. Armed bands were formed to fight the Jews and Communists and to defend the political meetings of the Nazis. The Brown Shirts (Sturmabteilung), a voluntary militia, were used at home to beat down all opposition, and were aided by the Black Shirts (Schutzstaffel), Hitler's personal Guard.

Militarism was justified by a perversion of Darwin's biological concepts of the struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest. Darwin spoke of the survival of the species, but Hitler spoke of nations. Those nations, he contended, which had the strongest will for self-preservation have survived. Politics he defined as
a people's struggle for survival, an eternal battle for existence on the earth. Reduced to its simplest terms, war meant man's struggle for daily bread; and since the supply was insufficient, some must perish. War was nothing more than the struggle for existence, using other weapons than the plow and reaper. Because productive soil was scarce, strong nations must take it from the weak, and only those strong nations were worthy of survival which could conquer and hold the land. Thus, the natural drives for self-preservation and the propagation of the race have made the earth a battlefield of competitive struggle.

There was no place in the nazi doctrines for pacifism or international co-operation. The result of conciliation would be the deterioration of race and the voluntary enslavement of all peoples. Nor could differences of opinion be settled in a court of arbitration; they must be settled by ordeal of battle. Reason and justice were the instruments of the strong used only to subject the weak to their own will. History was read by the Nazis as a struggle between the strong and the weak, and the victory always went to the strong.

DER FUHRER. The leadership principle was a military aspect of the National Socialist state. The entire nation had one commander; it was for him to give orders and for the nation to obey them. Every member of the army and the government took an oath of fidelity to Hitler. He stood
at the apex of the political hierarchy giving commands but never taking them. He dominated both party and state as the racial soul of the German people. The Nazi propagandists celebrated him as a military hero, their defender and victor in battle. They exalted him above the level of mortal man, and ascribed to him the qualities of genius and divine infallibility.

Hitler's authority rested upon racial and religious mysticism. He was the German Messiah with the special mission of saving the Aryan race. He assumed the role of the typical German who represented no special group or class. His only claim to distinction was his strong racial instinct which enabled him to interpret the destiny of the Aryan race. He undoubtedly ruled Germany with the consent of the great majority of the people, for he shared their humiliation in the defeat of World War I. In the midst of political confusion and economic chaos, he promised them deliverance, gave them hope, and pointed the way to national recovery. He gave them an easy explanation of their woes by making the Jews responsible for defeat in war and for all the ills which overtook Germany. Those who wanted German expansion and world domination could readily accept him as their leader, and those who hated the Jews needed little persuasion in believing the myth of Aryan superiority.\footnote{Floyd D. Cave, \textit{The Origins and Consequences of World War II} (New York: Dryden Press, 1948), pp. 293-294, 318-322, used by permission of the author.}
APPENDIX III

PHOTOCOPIES OF ORIGINAL LETTERS

BY: Franz von Papen

Count Schwerin von Krosigk

Dr. Hjalmar Schacht

Dr. Paul Tack

Dr. Wanda v. Baeyer

Mr. Louis P. Lochner
M. Fred. L. Casimir
Assistant Prof. Dep-ef Speech
1121 West 79 th street
LOS ANGELES, 44. Calif.

Sehr geehrter Herr Casimir;


Einen bin ich überbeschäftigt und ferner auch gar nicht in der Lage, diese Fragen zu beantworten.

Ich weiß nichts über die Vorbereitungen, die Hitler seinem Reden angedeihen ließ.
Wenn diese Reden staatspolitischer Art waren, hat er sich ganz an sein Konzept gehalten.
Der Einfluß dieser Reden auf seine Zunahme ist mir selbst stets unverständlichen geblieben. Sie waren weder eindrucksvoll im Vertrag, noch von beträchtlicher geistiger Konzeption - aber von künstlerischen Wiederholungen.
Sein Einfluß auf die Massen ist m.E. daher anderen psychologischen Eigenschaften zuzuschreiben.

Mehr kann ich zu diesem Thema nicht sagen.

Mit vergeblicher Hochachtung

[Unterschrift]

F. Von Papen
OBERBAACH ÜBER ACKERN/BADEN

dem 30. 7. 1960
Sehr geehrter Herr Baedeker!

Um Ihrer bei Ihrer Arbeit zu helfen, will ich gern versuchen, die Einzelheiten im Brief von 27. Juli gestellten Fragen zu beantworten:

1) Über die Vorbereitungen Ihres für seine Reden kann ich aus eigener Kenntnis nicht sagen. Für Zahl- und sonstige Volksveranstaltungen hat er die Reden nie im einzelnen vorgeplant, sondern sich lediglich auf der Gesamtheit des Gepflegten und daher ein paar Stichworte notiert. Für Reden, bei denen es u.U. auf den Textzusammenhang, wie in Reichstagen und auf der Bühne, kommt, hat er einen Vorvortrag erstellt, den er einer Sekretärin diktierte, und die dann völlig ungeändert gehört hat. Bis er die Reden selbst, die sich wohl Unterreden über die vorgelegten Reden, beschäftigt trugen alle seinen Bedenken teilweise mit ein und waren unverändert.

2) Darum für Reden ließ er sich von der Leidenschaft fortsetzen und für solche, die sich auf seine Notizen, anders war es, dann er eine vorbereitete Rede hielt. Aber selbst dann liess er sich im Reden von neue im Gepflegt, da er neue Zitate vehemente wählte. Für Reden bei denen Reden hielt, da er "versehentlich", der Grund, dass er "vereinheitlicht" wurde, konnte er in der Tat nicht decken, dass er sich von einem jeglichen Gehorsam in seiner Reden zu erreichen versuchte. Im der Tat hat er sich darauf konzentriert, und war ein großer Schriftsteller.

3) Der Vater hatte im allgemeinen die Vorlesungen, die er hielt, in der Regel von einem besonderen Augenblick fortgesetzt, und die Notizen unter, verglich alle Einzelheiten, die vorher und vor ihm hatten sich ergeben, und stellte sich vor, wie er sich von der Betrachtung, in die er verabredet wurde, die war die berühmte Rede, von der wir nicht nur reden, was nach dieser Vorlesung nicht unterliegt, sondern auch nicht unterliegt, was nur sich selbst verdienten.
Pathos. Denn Hitler ließ sich zwar von seiner Leidenschaft selbst hinreißen, aber zugleich dirigierte er sie mit kaltem Verstand. Das war vielleicht die erstaunlichste Gabe dieses geborenen Volksredners, die Mischung von Feuer und Eis.


5) Hitler war überzeugt, daß ständige Wiederholung, nur in etwas anderer Form, auch den widerstreitenden Hörer schließlich mürbe machen müsse. So waren seine Reden vielfach — oder meist — eine Häufung ständig variiert der Plattheiten. Sie lasen sich schlecht; sie wirkten nur, wenn er selbst sie vortrug. Und ebenso monoton waren seine Gesten; die häufigste die niedersaunde Faust, die das Kraftwort unterstrich. Er hatte ein Hübsches Organ und überschrieb sich. Er sprach Fremdworte oft falsch aus; und trotzdem ging von diesem Mann ein erstaunliches Fluidum aus, das ihn in Kontakt mit den Hörern setzte, das sie alle diese Mängel vergessen ließ und gegen das oft auch diejenigen ankämpfen mußten, die seiner Magie nicht unterliegen wollten. Hitler verstand es herauszufühlen, was die Menschen innenherlich bewegte, und den einen prägnanten Ausdruck zu geben. Dann fühlten sich die Hörer verstanden und ergriffen, sie verschmolzen mit dem Redner zu einer Gemeinschaft. Deshalb hatte er immer rascheren Kontakt zu der emotionsbestimmten Masse als zu den dem Verstand folgenden Intellektuellen. Er hatte weiter die Gabe, zugleich an das Gute und das Böse im Menschen appellieren zu können. Er stellte ideale Forde rungen auf und weckte zugleich die schlechten Instinkte. Auch hier war die Kunst der Mischung von Feuer und Eis erstaunlich.

6) Hitlers Rednergabe war die Voraussetzung und die Grundlage seiner politischen Erfolge. Nur als Redner ist er in die Höhe gekommen, hat er die Partei zu einer Massenbewegung gemacht und über die Partei hinaus Menschen in seinen Bannkreis gezogen. In der Demagogie, die er als Redner voll entfalten konnte, war er ein uner-
reichter Meister. Ohne seine rednerische Gabe wäre er ein unbe-
kannter Bohemien geblieben.

Mit vorzüglicher Hochachtung

Graf Saxe-Hornigk
Herrn
Fred L. Casmir
Assistant Prof. Dept. of Speech
Pepperdine College
1121 West Seventy-Ninth Street
Los Angeles 44, California

Sehr geehrter Herr Casmir,


Mit bester Begrüssung

[Unterschrift]
Deutscher Ausschuß
für Sprechkunde und Sprecherziehung
1. Vorsitzender: Dr. Paul Tack
DONN, Friesenweg 19


Sehr geehrter Herr Kollege Fred L. Casimir


Aber auf die einzige Anfrage vom 7. März will ich Ihnen antworten.

Sie haben vollkommen recht mit allen vier Behauptungen. Das neue, Erstmalige von Hitler's Afferten hat sicher seine Wirkung gesteigert.

Nach der Revolution von 1918 sind freilich auch Redner auf die Straße und die öffentliche Fläche gegangen, aber das blieb doch allein eine parteipolitische Sache und ebte dann auch ab, wo wohl einmal

Da auch volksethische Prediger aber die blieben Konfessionelle Liess sich die vorher der Katholischen Kirche, von der Sonnenschein, der von der Zentralen katholischen Sozialschule Mönchengladbach ausging, und der dort soviel ich weiß, Einfluß auf den jungen Josef Gotsche gehabt hat (Mönchengladbach geboren) Dr. Sonnenschein suchte sich erst im größeren Raum und ging nach Berlin, wo er in den Jahren eine volksethische Gesellschaft als Redner wurde weit über den Kreis der Konfession hinaus.

Aber so etwas ist eine Ausnahme gewesen.


Mit freundlichen Grüßen

Paul Tack
Sehr geehrter Herr Casmir,

Ihr Brief an meinen Verlag wurde mir weitergegeben. Es ist sehr begrüßenswert, daß eine Arbeit über Adolf Hitler als Redner in Angriff genommen wird und ich bin gern bereit dabei zu helfen. Meine eigene Auffassung dazu finden Sie im entsprechenden Kapitel meines Buches "Hitlers Wirkung als Redner" sowie in den vorauffliegenden Kapiteln "Mengenerlebnisse".

ausser rhetorischen Hilfsmitteln zuzuschreiben sind.

Von Hitlers Reden gibt es Schallplattenaufnahmen, die über das Institut für Zeitgeschichte, München zu erhalten sein dürften. Übrigens ist Hitlers erste Kanzler-Rede, die auch seine letzte gemässigte Politische Rede ist, nicht von ihm, sondern vom Auswärtigen Amt formuliert. Er hat von dieser Möglichkeit, sich seine Reden durch die Fachministerien schreiben zu lassen, aber nur dieses eine Mal Gebrauch gemacht.

Zu weiteren Auskünften stehe ich Ihnen gern bereit.

Mit den besten Wünschen für Ihre Arbeit

[Unterschrift]

(Dr. Wanda v. Baeyer)
June 4, 1960

Professor Fred L. Casmir,
Pepperdine College,
1121 West 79th Street,
Los Angeles 44, Calif.

Dear Professor Casmir:

Your letter of May 27, sent to the L.A. Bureau of the A.P., has just reached me. Hence the seeming tardiness of my reply!

I believe that most of what I know about Adolf Hitler was written down quite some time ago, when I still had all my notes and my encounters with the self-styled Führer were still fresh in my memory. I have since donated almost all my material dating back to those times to the Mass Communications History Center started two years ago by the State Historical Society of Wisconsin in conjunction with the University of Wisconsin, my alma mater. Occasionally, as I dig through old stuff, additional scraps of paper turn up, which I keep forwarding to Madison as I come across them.

I must therefore resort to the immodest suggestion that, as far as my being able to throw light upon your very interesting subject for research, you consult the following books of mine, even though I nowhere dealt specifically with an analysis of Hitler as a speaker:

WHAT ABOUT GERMANY? Dodd, Mead & Co., 1942 (full of typographical errors, as it was a hurry-up job; I suggest especially Chapter IX, "Heil Hitler," where I deal considerably with his oratorical efforts and his attitude toward speaking);

THE GORBELIS DIARIES, Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1948 (frequent references to Hitler speeches, also criticisms by the "kleine Doktor" — see index under Hitler);

ALWAYS THE UNEXPECTED -A BOOK OF REM WISCENSES, The Macmillan Company, 1956 (especially p.244; I doubt whether any of the other references to Hitler in that book can be of value to you).

For good measure you might want to look at:

TYCOONS AND TYRANT -- GERMAN INDUSTRY FROM HITLER TO ADENAUER, Henry Regnery Company, 1954. All of Chapter Four is devoted to "Hitler's Industrieklub Speech" (title of the chapter).

In my library I have some suggestive titles of books which I either read or at least perused through them, which I suppose you know and which should at least be in the Hoover Library at Stanford if nowhere else in the Far West. These include (taken at random as my eye falls upon them):

Lang and Von Schenck, MEMOIRS OF ALFRED ROSENBERG, Ziff Davis & Co., 1949;

Konrad Heiden, DER FUHRER, Houghton Mifflin & Co., 1944;

Edgar Ansel Mowrer, GERMANY PUTS THE CLOCK BACK, London, John Lane the Bodley Head Limited, 1933 (chapters on Hitler as Leader, Showman of Genius, and Organizer);
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LOUIS P. LOCHNER
32 BUENA VISTA AVENUE
FAIR HAVEN, NEW JERSEY
Beyond that, I suggest that you will find many copious extracts (authorized versions) of Hitler speeches in the six volumes that appeared entitled DAS Dritte Reich, and a sixth, DAS GROSSE DEUTSCHE REICH, by Gerd Ritter, with the subtitle Dokumentarische Darstellung des Aufbaus der Nation mit Unterstützung des Deutschen Reichsarchivs, Hummel-Verlag, Berlin. Each volume is replete with photographic reproductions, which means you catch Hitler in all sorts of oratorical poses.

Also, there is a big non-illustrated set of twelve volumes, extending from the beginning of 1943, entitled, DOKUMENTE DER DEUTSCHEN POLITIK, published by the Junker & Dünnhaupt Verlag, Berlin, the later volumes being herausgegeben by Prof. Dr. F. A. Six, the earlier ones by someone else.

In my humble opinion Hitler’s influence (which was widespread; I had to attend many a rally as Associated Press correspondent and can only say that, although he did not impress me, he almost hypnotized his audience, as a speaker, despite his raucous voice, his incorrect grammar, and the boring length of his harangues, derived from certain basic techniques:

1. He always came late, so that expectations had been raised to the highest point and the feeling engendered that this man who carries all Germany on his shoulders and foregoes sleep, was really doing something wonderful in taking time out to address the crowd. (He, as a matter of fact, loved nothing more than to harangue a crowd!)

2. While he was thus keeping the crowd on tenterhooks, the indoor or outdoor managers of the event (usually Goebbels himself) so kept the masses entertained with stirring marches, blood curdling songs sung by “das Volk” and emotional slogans painted on canvases throughout the hall or along the periphery of a sports field (slogans like “Juden raus,” “Ein Volk, ein Reich, ein Führer” and “Deutschland fordert seine Kolonien zurück”), that by the time Hitler arrived the climate was fully prepared for the sort of talk he was wont to give.

3. Wherever possible he poured scorn upon his adversaries and stirred the lowest emotions, whether his pet peeve was Roosevelt or Benes or whoever else. In other words, hate propaganda!

4. He was all things unto all men. I once followed him around during a whole day at a Nürnberg rally. He successively made the crowd’s auxiliary, the “politische Leiter,” the armed forces, the S.A., the Hitler Jugend, and the S.S. feel that he drew his strength solely from the group he was addressing.

I hope that with these thoughts and leads I may have been of some help. If you have more questions you think I can answer, come again!

Cordially yours,
Jugendfilmfreunde in Köpenick.


O. J. B.
APPENDIX IV

ORIGINAL GERMAN TEXTS

1. Mit Hitler beginnt ein neues Kapitel in der Geschichte der Beredsamkeit.

2. Dies Wort ist die revolutionärste Kraft der jungen deutschen Revolution.

3. Es ist nicht ausgeschlossen, dass wir bei einer gleichmaßigen zweihundertjährigen Führungs das Nationalitätenproblem gelöst haben.


5. Das moralische Ethos, der Idealismus, versackt in einem Zweckidealismus, in dem die Grenze zwischen Idealismus und Egoismus verschwindet.

6. Möge der Allmächtige Gott unsere Arbeit in seine Gnade nehmen ... denn wir wollen nicht kämpfen für uns sondern für Deutschland.

7. Am fünften März hat sich das Volk entschieden, und in seiner Mehrheit zu uns bekannt ... hat es in
wenigen Wochen die nationale Ehre wiederhergestellt, und Dank Ihres Verstehens, Herr Reichspräsident, die Vermaßlung vollzogen, zwischen den Symbolen der alten Große, und der jungen Kraft.

8. Die Welt sie verfolgt uns, wir wollen den Frieden, sie wendet sich gegen uns, sie will nicht unser Recht zum Leben anerkennen . . . dann müssen wir umso mehr zu einer Einheit werden.


10. Denn das Schicksal sei sehr nachsichtig und milde und lasse nur das zusammenbrechen, was restlos morsch sei. Wenn auch nur ein einziges kräftiges Reis sich zeige, lasse das Schicksal es leben . . . Man dürfe kein Mitleid mit Leuten haben, denen das Schicksal bestimmt habe, zugrunde zu gehen.

11. Ich handle entsprechen dem, was ich erkenne und begreife . . . Ich bin auf Grund hoherer Gewalt da, wenn ich zu etwas noetig bin . . . Es wird nur dem das Leben gegeben der darum am staerksten ficht . . .
Das Gesetz des Lebens heisst: Verteidige Dich!


14. Ich begann mit aller Lust und Liebe. Bot sich mir doch jetzt mit einem Male die Gelegenheit, vor einer grosseren Zuhoererschaft zu sprechen; und was ich
früher immer, ohne es zu wissen, aus dem reinen Gefühl einfach angenommen hatte, traf nun ein: ich konnte reden.


17. Hitler konnte sprechen, unermuendlich sprechen.
18. Adolf Hitler wirbt stark und eindringlich um die Hoerer und macht daraus gar kein Hehl! Er beschaeftigt sich mit jedem einzelnen unter ihnen, jeden spricht er an, jeden will er gewinnen, und um jeden ringt er.

19. Hier ist alles andere als blosse Eloquenz; hier bekommt die deutsche Seele selbst einen Mund anzuklagen und zu bekennen, der Notschrei eines 60-Millionen Volkes wird artikulierte Rede, das ist Hitler! ... Gottes Ruf sucht unser Volk in dieser grossen Stunde seiner Geschichte. Und einer ist unter uns, der gleichsam stellvertretend fuer uns alle hoert. Er hoert die Weisungen, die der Weltgeist in diesem Augenblick der deutschen Nation erteilt, und gibt sie weiter an die Millionen die an seinen Lippen haengen. Deutschland hat wieder einen Propheten, einen Propheten seiner Sendung.

Nicht zuletzt in seinem Zorn ist der Fuehrer eine echte Offenbarung deutschen Wesens ... Dieser Zorn stammt aus einer letzten Verpflichtetheit seinem Volk gegenueber, aus dem Sendungsbewusstsein ... Nur aus diesem Sendungsbewusstsein erklart sich das starke Selbstbewusstsein, das wir aus allen Reden Hitlers kennen ... Ein solcher Gesandter sagt ruecksichtslos die Wahrheit ... Der Fuehrer kennt kein Kompromiss, keine Kapitulation ... Er legt seine Feuerseele ganz
hinein in die Sache . . . laesst sich tragen vom
Enthusiasmus des Volkes . . . Aber auch umgekehrt: das
deutsche Volk hoert in der Stimme des Fuehrers das
Klopfen seines eigenen Herzens . . . Der neue Staat
ist Erziehung, Erziehung durch Propaganda; die neue
Politik ist Propaganda durch und durch, Aktivierung
des voelkischen Lebens durch das schoepferische Wort.

20. Eine echte Rede wird niemals vorgelesen. . . .

Eine abgelesene Rede ist nie eine Rede. Sie ist
eigentlich eine Unverfrorenheit gegen die Zuhoerer.

21. Das Herz macht den Redner. "Ex abundantia os bene
loquitur" . . . man sollte mit der Rede nur fuer eine
grosse Sache kaempfen . . . vor dem Zuhoerer steht der
ehrlich hingegebene, ehrlich glaubende, von seiner
Sache ganz entflamme Mensch.

22. In drei Anlaeufen zwingen wir alle zu uns: wir
gewinnen sie, wir belehren sie, und dann reissen wir
sie alle in unsere Ueberzeugung.

23. Sein Charakter, seine ganze Persoenlichkeit tritt aus
dem Rhythmus seiner Sprache viel eindrucksvoller
hervor, als sie der Federzug des Schriftstellers je
zeigen kann. . . . Dem grossen Redner stehen alle
diese Rhythmen zur Verfugung, einen aber uebt er bevorzugt. Der gibt ihm das rednerische Gesicht . . .  
Nein, das ist nicht 'schoen' nach rhetorischem Regelwerk, aber es ist echt und wahrhaftig . . . Des Redners Sprache ist also oft regellos und fast nie ohne Fehler und Missbildungen.


25. Wenn Hitler "Fuehrung" definiert als die Faehigkeit, "Massen zu bewegen," duerfen wir getrost hinzufuegen:
nicht zuletzt durch das schoepferische Wort . . .
Solche Rhetorik ist im hoechsten Sinne Er-bauung, Auf-erbauung eines neuen deutschen Geistes.

26. . . . die Geschichte der Beredsamkeit grossen Stils, der politischen Fuehrung durch die Macht des Wortes ist um einen gewaltigen Chorfuehrer bereichert worden.

27. All diese Dinge muesse man, um sie bereits im Frieden richtig zu behandeln, prinzipiell vom Standpunkt des Krieges beurteilen. Denn der Krieg als Kampf auf Leben und Tod habe seine eigenen Gesetze und lasse Gesichtspunkte des Friedens restlos zuruecktreten.

28. Denn das Volk wolle gefuehrt sein. . . . Das Volk verzeihe einer Fuehrung eher einen Fehler, den es ausserdem in den meisten Faellen garnicht sehe, als eine gewisse Unsicherheit in der Fuehrung selbst . . . Es gehe infolgedessen nicht an, dass die oberste Fuehrung eine Kritik ihrer Massnahmen von unten zulasse. Rechte dieser Art wolle auch nicht das Volk an sich, sondern nur der Querulant im Volk.

30. Auch das deutsche Volk müsse man, wenn es eine Weltstellung einnehmen wolle und solle, erst dazu erziehen, nur sich selbst gegenüber ehrlich zu sein, anderen Völkern gegenüber (z.B. den Tschechen gegenüber) aber ebenso treuherzig zu heucheln, wie die Engländer, statt sich durch seine Ehrlichkeit überall unbeliebt zu machen.


32. Und nicht durch Meuchelmord war es geschehen, nicht Deserteure und Drückerberger waren die Begründer des Bismarckschen Staates, sondern die Regimenter der Front. Diese einzige Geburt und feurige Taufe allein schon umwoben das Reich mit dem Schimmer eines historischen Ruhmes, wie er nur den aeltesten Staaten-selten-zuteil zu werden vermochte.
33. Wir haben aufgeräumt mit der Vorstellung, als gehöre es zur staats-politischen Freiheit, dass jeder (in der Zeitung) aussprechen kann, was er Lust hat.

34. . . . in ihrer Einflussnahme auf die öffentliche Meinung ihrer Mission als Diener des Staates bewusst seien.

35. Hitler's größte Kunst als Politiker war es, alles Schwierige scheinbar zu vereinfachen; dabei keine Rücksicht auf objektive Erkenntnisse und Einsichten zu nehmen; alles auf überzeugende Formeln zu bringen; der Unzufriedenheit wie den Wünschen der meisten Menschen zu schmeicheln und ihren Idealen, so verschwommen und unreif sie sein möchten, reiche Nahrung zu bieten.

36. Mit beissendem Sarkasmus, der für ihn so charakteristisch ist, hat Hitler den Stil der bürgerlichen politischen Rede charakterisiert, dies professorale Gewäsch, diese gesprochenen Abhandlungen, die einen ähnlichen Eindruck auf ihn gemacht hätten wie in seiner Jugend der Lebertran.

37. Da aber wahrer Indealismus nichts weiter ist als die Unterordnung der Interessen und des Lebens des einzelnen unter die Gesamtheit, dies aber wieder die
Voraussetzung für die Bildung organisatorischer Formen jeder Art darstellt, entspricht er im innersten Grunde dem letzten Wollen der Natur. Er allein führt die Menschen zur freiwilligen Anerkennung des Vorrechtes der Kraft und der Stärke und lässt die so zu einem Staubchen jener Ordnung werden, dass das ganze Universum formt und bildet.

38. ... das ehere Gesetz der Notwendigkeit und des Rechtes des Sieges des Besten und Stärkeren.

39. Damit aber war der Weg, den der Arier zu gehen hatte, klar vorgezeichnet. Als Eroberer unterwarf er sich die niedersten Menschen und regelte dann praktische Betaetigung unter seinem Befehl, nach seinem Wollen, und für seine Ziele.

40. Demgegenüber müssen wir Nationalsozialisten unverrückbar an unserem aussenpolitischen Ziele festhalten, namentlich dem deutschen Volk den ihm gebührenden Grund und Boden auf dieser Erde zu sichern ... Staatsgrenzen werden durch Menschen geschaffen und durch Menschen geändert ... Vergesst nie, dass das heiligste Recht auf dieser Welt das Recht auf Erde ist, die man selbst bebauen will, und das heiligste Opfer das Blut, das man für diese Erde vergießt.
41. Was dann kommt, ist die andere Welt, in der wir die Russen leben lassen wollen, wie sie es wünschen. Nur, dass wir sie beherrschen ... Europa ist kein geographischer, sondern ein blutsmaessig bedingter Begriff.

42. Es sei doch auffallend, dass die Franzosen im Riom-Prozess von der naheliegenden Fragestellung an ihre alten Kriegstreiber abwischen: "Warum habt Ihr trotz der ehrlichen Friedensversicherungen und Angebote des deutschen Fuehrers, die dieser bis aufs I-Tuepfelchen genau eingehalten hat, den Krieg vom Zaun gebrochen?"

43. War dies der Sinn des Opfers, das die deutsche Mutter dem Vaterlande darbrachte, als sie mit wehem Herzen die liebsten Jungen damals z_ehen liess, um sie niemals wiederzusehen? Geschah dies alles dafuer, dass nun ein Haufen elender Verbrecher die Hand an das Vaterland zu legen vermochte?

    Hatte also dafuer der deutsche Soldat ... aus-geharrt?


45. Was wir heute an menschlicher Kultur, an Ergebnissen von Kunst, Wissenschaft und Technik vor uns sehen,
ist nahezu ausschließlich schöpferisches Produkt des Ariers. Gerade diese Tatsache aber lässt den nicht unbegründeten Rückschluss zu, dass er allein der Begründer höheren Menschentums überhaupt war, mithin den Urtyp dessen darstellt, was wir unter dem Worte "Mensch" verstehen.

46. ... Eine Reihe von für eine Großmacht unerträglichen Grenzverletzungen beweist, dass die Polen nicht mehr gewillt sind, die deutsche Reichsgrenze zu achten. Um diesem wahnwitzigen Treiben ein Ende zu bereiten, bleibt mir kein anderes Mittel, als von jetzt ab Gewalt gegen Gewalt zu setzen.

Die deutsche Wehrmacht wird den Kampf um die Ehre und die Lebensrechte des wiederaufgetauchten deutschen Volkes mit harter Entschlossenheit führen.

Ich erwarte, dass jeder Soldat, eingedenk der großen Tradition des ewigen deutschen Soldatentums, seine Pflicht bis zum letzten erfüllen wird.

Bleibt Euch stets und in allen Lagen bewusst, dass Ihr die Repräsentanten des nationalsozialistischen Grossdeutschland seid!

Es lebe unser Volk und unser Reich!

47. Es sei schade, dass man Churchills wegen Krieg führen müsse, anstatt Friedenswerken—so der Kunst—zu dienen.
48. Wer Blut vergossen hat, hat auch das Recht, die Herrschaft auszuüben.

49. Man darf in diesem Falle sich nicht durch politische Grenzen von den Grenzen des ewigen Rechtes abbringen lassen.

50. Wollte man in Europa Grund und Boden dann konnte dies im grossen und ganzen nur auf Kosten Russlands geschehen, dann musste sich das neue Reich wieder auf der Strasse der einstigen Ordensritter in Marsch setzen, um mit dem deutschen Schwert dem deutschen Pflug die Scholle, der Nation aber das tägliche Brot zu geben.


52. Amerika wuerde-und wenn es vier Jahre wie wahnsinnig arbeiten wollte-das nicht zu ersetzen vermöegen, was die russische Armee bis jetzt verloren hat.
53. Ich werde es nicht mehr erleben, aber ich freue mich für das deutsche Volk, dass es eines Tages mit ansehen wird, wie England und Deutschland vereint gegen Amerika antreten. Deutschland und England werden wissen, was eins vom anderen zu erwarten hat.

54. Es hat in der Weltgeschichte bislang nur 3 Vernichtungsschlachten gegeben: Cannae, Sedan, und Tannenberg. Wir können stolz darauf sein, dass zwei davon von deutschen Heeren erfochten wurden.

55. 1. Die Chancen, nicht einen totalen Idioten zur Staatsführung zu berufen, seien bei der freien Wahl größer als umgekehrt. . . . 2. Bei der Auswahl des Staatschefs müsse eine Persönlichkeit gesucht werden, die nach menschlichem Ermessen eine gewisse Stabilität der Staatsführung auf längere Dauer verbürgen. . . .
3. Es müsse dafür gesorgt werden, dass der führende Mann des Staates von Einflüssen der Wirtschaft unabhängig sei und nicht durch wirtschaftlichen Druck zu irgendwelchen Entscheidungen gezwungen werden könne.

56. Es ist der schwerste Entschluss meines eigenen Lebens gewesen. Ich habe es gewagt weil ich glaubte, dass es sein muss . . . denn ich kann mich nicht lossagen von dem Glauben an mein Volk . . . (das) neue deutsche
Reich der Groesse, und der Ehre, und der Kraft, und der Herrlichkeit, und der Gerechtigkeit, Amen.

57. Deutsches Volk gib' uns vier Jahre Zeit, dann richte und urteile ueber uns. Deutsches Volk, gib uns vier Jahre, und ich schwoere dir, so wie wir und so wie ich in dieses Amt eintrat, so will ich dann gehen. Ich tat es nicht um Gehalt, und nicht um Lohn, ich tat es um deiner selbst willen.

58. Aus Bauern, Arbeitern und Buergern, muss wieder werden ein deutsches Volk.

59. ... aufrichtige Freunde sein eines Friedens, der endlich die Wunden heilen soll unter denen alle leiden.

60. Moegen Sie, meine Herren, nunmehr selbst die Entscheidung treffen ueber Frieden oder Krieg.

Freiheit und Leben kann man uns nehmen, die Ehre nicht.

Den' Mut uns auch anders mit Ihnen auseinanderzusetzen, den haetten wir, wahrahtiger Gott, gehabt.

Deutschland soll frei werden, aber nicht durch Sie ... ich will auch gernicht, dass Sie dafuer stimmen.

61. ... es gibt niemand an einer verantwortlichen Stelle in diesem Staat, der daran zweifelt, dass der
authorisierte Führer dieses Reiches ich bin, und dass mir die Nation durch ihr Vertrauen das Mandat gegeben hat, sie überall und an jeder Stelle zu vertreten.

62. Wir haben aufgeräumt mit der Vorstellung, als gehöre es zur staatspolitischen Freiheit, dass jeder (in den Zeitungen) aussprechen kann, was er Lust hat.

63. Was für ein Glück für die Regierenden, dass die Menschen nicht denken! Denken gibt es nur in der Erteilung oder im Vollzug eines Befehls. Wäre es anders, so könnte die menschliche Gesellschaft nicht bestehen.

64. Man soll auch das Einzelleben gänzlich so hoch bewerten. Wenn sein Bestand vonnoeten wäre, würde es nicht untergehen.

65. Der Führer predigt, verkündigt, er will nicht Diskussionsstoff liefern.

66. Hitler sagt es in grosser einleuchtender Vereinfachung so, dass auch der letzte Volksgenosse versteht.

67. Die Rede ist das schönste und wirksamste Mittel der Volksführung . . . Und doch ist sie und bleibt sie die stärkste Kraft, Glauben zu wecken, Überzeugung zu erhaerten, Niedergehendes zu zerschlagen, Aufgehendes hochzubringen und die Massen aus alten
Denkpfaden herueberzureissen in die Strassen neuer Hoffnungen.

68. Satz um Satz wird so hinein "gebaut" in die deutsche Seele.

Die Schlussworte dieser gewaltigen Apologie bedeuten den ersten Durchbruch des LOGOS GERMANIKOS nach langen Jahren tiefster Erniedrigung. . . .

69. Sie sprachen von vornherein zum ganzen Volke, und indem sie das taten, praegten sie eine neue Form der Rede. Sie loesten Schrecken und Empoerung aus bei denen, die bisher die Rede immer nur fuer bestimmte Gruppen, Zirkel und Parteien gepflegt hatten. Sie uebersahen, dass hier in Aktion trat, was schon Aristoteles von der Volksrede gefordert hatte: sie sei wie das Buehnenbild im Stadion. Je groesser die weite Runde, je breiter und groeber die Linie, je weiter die Volksmenge sich dehnt, je leuchtender das Licht, je schwaerzer das Dunkel. Fuer jedes neue Tausend von Zuschauern groessere Vereinfachung, groebere Bildzuege. So auch die Anlage der Volksrede: indem sie den Letzten fassen will, muss sie auch dem Letzten und ihm besonders kraeftig eingehen.

70. Der Redner hat nur ein Ziel: politische Kraft zu sein, zur Tat zu fuehren. . . . Ziel jeder Rede ist die
politische Tat. . . . In jedem Redner liegt der unbaendige Zwang sein Volk zu führen . . . Er ist eine Verbindung von Machtgefühl und Hingabe . . . den rednerischen Glanz und Erfolg zurücktreten zu lassen vor dem, was die politische Klugheit, was das Wohl der Gesamtheit fordert.

71. Sie ist die Vereinigung der Zweiheit Redner und Zuhörer zur Einheit des Glaubens und Wollens mit dem Ziel der Tat.


73. So wurde Hitler zum Massenbehandler, nicht zum Menschenbehandler.
... entfalten einen sakralen Schauer... 

74. Ähnliches gilt für die Agitation, die der vernünftigen Erwägung immer überlegen ist, weil sie auf das Wunschenken abgestellt ist, die komplexe Wirkung dagegen auf sich beruhen lässt... Und was ihn am wenigsten störte, war die Beleidigung des gesunden Menschenverstandes. Denn er fand bald heraus, wie sehr sie imponiert, wenn sie nur stolz genug vorgetragen wird.

75. ANHANG

GEHEIMGEHALTENE REDE HITLERS VOR DEM POLITISCHEN FÜHRENACHWUCHS
AUF DER ORDENSBURG SONTHOFFEN (ALLGÄU) AM 23.XI.1937
ÜBER DIE DEUTSCHE GESCHICHTE UND DAS DEUTSCHE SCHICKSAL

Die relative Lage unseres Volkes der bekannten Umwelt gegenüber hat sich im Lauf der letzten 300 bis 400 Jahre fortgesetzt verschlechtert. Bei keinem Volk der Welt ist der Gegensatz zwischen der rein volklichen Bedeutung einerseits und der politischen andererseits so krass wie beim deutschen Volk, man setze nur den natürlichen Lebensraum unseres Volkes von heute in Vergleich
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zu den Lebensräumen anderer Völker.


Dennoch ist kein Grund zum Verzweifeln gegeben, wenn man den Blick von den Lebensräumen und der Gesamteinwohnerzahl auf die tragenden volklichen Kräfte der Staaten lenkt.

Wenn man absieht von der nicht definierbaren Masse ostasiatischer Bevölkerungskonglomerate und sich den

60 bis 65 Millionen Angelsachsen, 60 Millionen Grossrussen, 39 Millionen Franzosen, 40 Millionen Italiener, 17 Millionen Polen, 7 Millionen Tschechen stehen in einem geschlossenen Siedlungsgebiet 85 Millionen Deutschen allein in Europa gegenüber. Das zeigt, wie sehr wir macht- und raumpolitisch gesunken sind und wie sehr wir nach wie vor die allererste Voraussetzung zu wirklicher Weltmacht, zu einem wirklichen Weltreich besitzen, und zwar mehr wie jedes andere Volk.

Es ist die Frage: sind wir Deutsche unfähig zu einer solchen machtpolitischen Stellung?Das wird durch die Geschichte widerlegt. Denn wir waren einmal vorherrschende weisse Macht und Rasse und haben grosse europäische Lebensräume zivilisiert und kulti- viert. Ohne deutsches Blut gäbe es weder einen
russischen Staat noch die anderen Oststaaten, denn ihm verdanken sie die organisatorisch staatliche und kulturelle Form.

Das deutsche Volk hat auch den Drang zu einer solchen Mission in sich, denn alle seine organisatorischen Massnahmen in anderen Völkern sind diesem unbewussten Drang nach Erweiterung der Machtposition zuzuschreiben. Es hat uns auch nicht der Mut zu den härtesten Konsequenzen gefehlt: Das ganze britische Weltreich ist noch nicht einmal mit soviel Blut gemacht worden, als wir im ersten Weltkrieg an Toten hatten. In derselben Zeit, in der Britannien zum Aufbau seines Weltreichs 2,5 Millionen Tote hatte, hat Deutschland über 23 Millionen Tote gehabt. Allein im Dreissigjährigen Krieg ist es von 18,5 auf 3,6 Millionen gesunken.

Die Ursachen unseres Schicksals sind andere:

1. Wir Deutsche sind nur sehr spät volklich eine Nation geworden. Die ersten offiziellen Berichte über das Auftauchen Deutscher zeigen ein Gemengsel einzelner Stämme, kommend und vergehend, erobernd und besiegt werdend, heute Herr, Morgen wieder einem anderen unterworfen. Stämme, die ersichtlich nicht die Züge eines einheitlichen, tragfähigen, staatlich formbaren Volksgedankens besassen, die sich nicht mehr
zusammengehörig fühlten wie heute Deutsche und Engländer oder Deutsche und Skandinavier. All die Stämme, die in der Zeit Hermanns des Cheruskers in Erscheinung treten, waren 300 Jahre später als Stämme fast spurlos verschwunden. Im Brausen der Völkerwanderung ist fast nichts mehr auffindbar als politisch organisches Gebilde, was 400 Jahre vorher im Sinne einer höheren Zusammenfügung gleichblütiger Menschen deutsche Geschichte zu machen versprach.

Wenn damals einzelne deutsche Eroberer mit Gewalt einzelne Stämme unter eine größere Gemeinschaft zwangen, so vielleicht schmerzlich für die jeweils Betroffenen, für die gesamte deutsche Entwicklung war es die Voraussetzung zur Formung einer deutschen Nation. Ohne dem würden wir heute vermutlich überhaupt nicht mehr existieren, sondern vom Osten, von Asien erdrückt und überschwemmt sein.

Also: die gewaltsame Zusammenzwingung der Deutschen war notwendig, wollte man nicht überhaupt auf dieses kostbarste Menschengut Verzicht leisten. Denn in seiner heillosen Zersplitterung, in seinem grossen Überindividualismus der einzelnen wäre ein Halten auf die Dauer gar nicht möglich gewesen.

Sind wir so auch sehr spät zu einer staatlichen Formung gekommen, so konnten wir den Sprung von der staatlichen zur volklichen doch leider nicht finden. Denn da dieses erste Gebilde nur staatlich war, musste sich auch jede Erschütterung sofort in der Bildung neuer staatlicher Splitter auswirken. Es ist die Tragik unserer Geschichte, dass zu der Zeit, da auf brutalstem Wege ein französisches Volk entstand, das deutsche aufhörte, Ansätze zur Volksbildung zu verwirklichen und wieder zurückfiel in eine staatliche Zersplitterung, die sich z. T. sogar stammesmässig
auszuprägen begann. Noch heute versucht man ja in Österreich, eine Staatsidee gegen die Volksidee zu setzen. Wir sind zu spät gekommen als Volk.

Wenn wir—entgegen dem inneren Wert unseres Volkes—keine analoge Bedeutung in der Welt hatten, so, weil nicht lächerliche kleine Stämme, Ländchen, Staatsgebilde oder Dynastien weiterobernd auftreten können, sondern nur Rassen. Rasse müssen wir aber—zumindest im bewussten Sinne—erst werden.

2. In der Zeit, in der an sich durch die Erfindungen besonders auf verkehrstechnischem Gebiet eine Erschliessung der Welt stattfand, in der man mit verhältnismässig geringem Bluteinsatz grosse Lebensräume erwerben konnte, ist Deutschland innerlich am meisten zerfallen, nicht nur in Stämme, sondern außerdem noch in religiöse Gruppen.

Dieser religiöse Konflikt, den wir fast 100 Jahre fanatisch durchkämpften, den andere Völker teils überhaupt nicht hatten, teils sehr schnell überwanden, hat uns in einer Zeit beschäftigt, in der der grösste Teil der übrigen Welt zur Verteilung reif war und verteilt wurde. Außerordem kam, als aus der religiösen Spannung heraus die letzten staatlichen grossen Bildungen zerrissen, das Auflockern des Reichs in unsere kleinen Dynastiegebilde und damit jene heillose staatspolitische und machtmässige Zersplitterung, die erst ein paar hundert Jahre später langsam wieder überwunden wurde.
Hier kommt vor allem etwas: Deutschland, das einst in seiner ganz grossen Zeit irgendwie doch eine Republik war, wenn auch mit germanischer Auffassung, hat sein Wahl-Kaisertum im Laufe von Jahrhunderten gänzlich, auch ideenmässig, preisgegeben und sich zur sogenannten Erbmonarchie bekannt.


Bei uns wäre solch konzentrierte Energie notwendiger als anderswo, da wir auf Grund unserer europäischen Lage
unter einer viel tragischeren Belastung stehen. Auf
uns drückt eine Umwelt herein, die an sich schwach,
dadurch stark wurde, dass wir sie wie die ganzen
Oststaaten gleichsam erst geboren oder zumindest doch
organisiert, also mit jenem Druck hervorgerufen haben,
der dann auf uns selber lastete.

Wie wahnsinnig war deshalb die Kriegszielsetzung
des Jahres 1915. die Absicht nämlich, bei erfolgreichem
Kriegsausgang eine Reihe der Oststaaten mit deutschen
Dynastien zu beglücken! Kein Zweifel, dass diese
sogenannten deutschen Fürsten in ganz kurzer Zeit ihre
deutsche Nation genau so vergessen haben würden wie so
viele andere: sie wären Litauer, Esten, Polen geworden.
Wir haben es so oft erlebt, dass deutsche Fürsten
irgendwo hingehen und im Moment, in dem sie auch nur
den Fuss auf ihre neue Erde setzen, bereits prok-
lamieren, dass sie sich nun mit dieser neuen Erde ver-
mählt und dem neuen Volk verbunden fühlen. Folge? Die
baltischen Staaten, die auf Grund dessen, was sie heute
besitzen, gar nichts sind, wären etwas geworden unter
deutscher Führung und unter dem Zufluss jenes Blutes,
das eine solche deutsche Führung die ersten 100 Jahre
erfahrungsgemäß immer mit sich nimmt. Das hätte
Staaten organisiert und um uns herum einen ganzen
Gürtel von lauter neuen Schweizen gebildet. Der Selbs-
terhaltungstrieb erweist sich bereits in kurzer Zeit
als größer als die Erinnerung an die höhere Aufgabe, an die höhere Gemeinsamkeit. Da es im Völkerleben nur natürliche, nüchterne Interessen gibt, ist in ihm weder auf Dankbarkeit noch auf verwandtschaftliche Beziehungen zu bauen. Verwandtschaftliche Beziehungen haben Preußen und Österreich ebensowenig am Krieg gehindert wie Deutschland und England.

Wir haben in Europa schwerere Hemmungen zu überwinden, als sie beispielsweise England gegeben waren, das nur seine Seeherrschaft brauchte und dann große Lebensräume mit verhältnismäßig geringem Bluteinsatz besetzen konnte.

Trotzdem: Wir hatten Europa schon einmal. Wir haben es nur verloren, weil uns jene Tatkraft der Führung fehlte, die notwendig war, um--auf die Dauer gesehen--unsere Stellung nicht nur zu behaupten, sondern zu vermehren. Von den aus der Erbmonarchie gekommenen Führern der Nation konnten die wenigen glanzvollen Namen nur das korrigieren, was die zahllosen anderen schlecht gemacht hatten. Und diese Korrektur erreichte in Jahrhunderten nur einen Bruchteil dessen, was Unfähigkeit oft in einem Jahrhundert beseitigt hat. Was wir in den letzten 100, 150 Jahren erreichten, war nur ein Bruchteil von dem, was einst war und durch die Unfähigkeit dieser Führungen
zugrunde gegangen ist.

Monarchien sind höchstens geeignet, Erobertes zu bewahren. Weltreiche werden nur aus revolutionären Kräften geboren. Die bange Gesinnung, die in alternenden Monarchien immer zu finden ist, genügt im günstigsten Fall, ein schwaches Gebilde noch irgendwie weiterzukonservieren, aber nicht, um einer ungenügenden Stellung in der Welt abzuhelpen, ein Reich zu vergrößern und eine neue Stellung zu erobern und zu sichern.

Der einzige Vorteil, den unsere Monarchien hatten, ist der, dass sie allmählich Staatsgebilde schufen, die sich nicht mit unseren Grenzen der Stämme deckten. Sie haben mitgeholfen, die Stämme zu überwinden. Ihr Zusammenbruch hat die Voraussetzung geschaffen zur Bildung eines deutschen Volkes.

Heute vollzieht sich eine neue Staatsgründung, deren Eigenart es ist, dass sie nicht im Christentum, nicht im Staatsgedanken die Grundlage sieht, sondern in der geschlossenen Volksgemeinschaft das Primäre sieht.

Es ist daher entscheidend, dass das "Germanische Reich Deutscher Nation" diesen tragfähigsten Gedanken der Zukunft nun verwirklicht, unbarmherzig gegen alle Widersacher, gegen alle religiöse Zersplitterung, gegen alle parteiimäßige Zersplitterung. Denn auch dies war tragisch, dass wir in der Zeit, in der wir vielleicht
doch noch manches hätten nachholen können, ausser unserer allgemeinen staatlichen unzulänglichen Führung, begründet in der nicht richtigen Organisation, auch noch gehemmt waren durch die Parteien, die sich anschickten, das Erbe der Konfessionen und der Dynastien zu gleicher Zeit zu übernehmen.

Wir vollziehen heute, was 2000 Jahre vor uns an Bausteinen, Gedanken, Ideen und teils auch schon an Macht zusammengetragen haben. Alles, was währenddem geschehen ist, ist deutsche Geschichte, außer die wir Grund haben, stolz zu sein. Wir dürfen daher ein neues Reich nicht datieren von 1933, genau so wie es wahr- sinnig war, ein früheres Reich etwa vom Jahre 1871 zu datieren oder deutsche Geschichte unter preussisch- hohenzollernscher oder habsburgisch-österreichischer Perspektive zu sehen. In unserer Walhalla kann jeder einzelne Deutsche Platz finden, der in unserer Vergangenheit mitgewirkt hat, die Voraussetzungen zu schaffen, auf denen wir nun heute stehen. Wenn wir unsere deutsche Geschichte so ganz gross auffassen, aus unserer grauesten Vorzeit bis heute, dann sind wir das reichste Volk in Europa. Und wenn wir dazu in grösster Toleranz alle unsere grossen deutschen Herren aufmarschieren lassen, alle unsere grossen Führer der Vergangenheit, alle unsere grossen germanischen und
deutschen Kaiser--ausnahmslos, wie sie auch waren--dann muss England vor uns versinken.


Wenn Deutschland heute noch volklich aktiv ist, so, weil es von einem unendlichen Glauben erfüllt ist, es wird einmal schon anders werden. Sonst würde unsere volkliche Aktivität genau so absinken wie in Österreich aus der Erkenntnis der Aussichtslosigkeit und Hoffnungslosigkeit der politischen Lage. Wehe uns dann! Denn dann gibt man nicht mehr diesen ungedeckten Wechsel, den jedes Kind heute darstellt, aus. Vor allem, wir leben jetzt in einer großen Epoche, die
die Menschen mobilisiert, ihr Vertrauen erweckt, ihre Zuversicht stärkt. Das kann nicht ewig aufrechterhalten bleiben, wenn nicht eines Tages eine Einlösung dieser Hoffnungen erfolgt: Unser Raummangel wird dann die Folge eines Volkstodes haben.

Das einzige Plus, das wir den Feinden rings um uns gegenüber besitzen, die größere geschlossene Volkszahl, darf nicht sinken, da die Volksziffern um uns herum infolge der grossen Lebensräume zu steigen vermögen und Frankreich allmählich den schwarzen Kontinent mobilisiert, der auch Soldaten gibt. Über allen Einzelerfolgen des Alltags, in denen man sich sonnen möchte, darf man daher die absolut trostlose Generallinie nicht vergessen, die die Änderung des Raumproblems verlangt.

Wenn ich eine Lösung des Problems ins Auge fasse, so zunächst eins: Was wir auch tun, alles hat erfüllt zu sein von der Erkenntnis, aus diesem Konglomerat deutscher Stämme, deutscher früherer Länder, der Konfessionen, ehemaliger Parteien-Angehöriger müssen wir eine Gemeinschaft formen, schon Musserlich sichtbar. Daher: absolute Feindschaft gegen alle Erscheinungen einer Vergangenheit, die diese gemeinsame Nation nicht bejahen wollen, die sich nicht restlos unterordnen. Ich nehme lieber jede Schwierigkeit in der Zeit auf mich, um der Nachwelt ein starkes Volk, das einheitlich
zu leben und zu denken gelernt hat, und damit ein starkes Reich zu hinterlassen.

Erst diese Zusammenfassung der deutschen Nation gibt uns die moralische Berechtigung, mit Lebensansprüchen vor die Welt zu treten. Es ist nun so, dass das letzte Recht immer in der Macht liegt. Und die Macht liegt im Völkerleben in der Geschlossenheit der Völker.

Heute hat die deutsche Nation endlich das bekommen, was ihr jahrhundertelang fehlte, nämlich eine Organisation der Volksführung.


Der Staat von einst hatte keine Volksführung. Sie lag in sittlich-moralischer und letzten Endes auch in politischer Hinsicht ganz im Sinne der Bildung des deutschen Nur-Staates primär bei der Kirche. Das Christentum, die römische Kirche, hat weder erlaubt noch geduldet, dass die Volksführung ihr irgendwie entwunden wurde. Sie hat immer gesagt: "Der Staat bekommt von uns als Lehen die Erlaubnis, die Staatsgeschäfte wahrnehmen zu dürfen!" und auch dadurch zugleich primär
ihren Einfluss gesichert.

Heute beanspruchen die Volksführung wir, d. h. wir allein sind befugt, das Volk als solches--den einzelnen Mann, die einzelne Frau--zu führen. Die Lebensbeziehungen der Geschlechter regeln wir. Das Kind bilden wir!

Allmählich haben die Kirchen aufgehört, in puncto Volksführung diese tragende Rolle zu spielen, da
1. ihrer zu viele geworden waren,
2. viele ihrer Ideale im Lauf von Über 1000 Jahren verblasst waren und
3. neue Ideale und Erkenntnisse aufgekommen waren.

Über einen humanen Weltbegriff erhebt sich heute die Erkenntnis von der Bedeutung des Blutes und der Rasse! Kein Unterricht kann das mehr aus der Welt schaffen. Das ist eine siegende Idee, die heute wie eine Welle über die ganze Erde hinwegströmt.

Insoweit sich die Kirchen mit Überirdischen, Über-sinnlichen und metaphysischen Dingen beschäftigen, geben wir ihnen absoluten Spielraum. Niemand weiss hier etwas ganz genau. Es sind ihrer aber zu viele, die behaupten, dass sie es ganz genau wüssten. Und darin liegt das Bedenkliche. Im Altertum war der Blick in die Vergangenheit als auch in die Umwelt begrenzt. Da konnte man sehr wohl glauben, dass in einem bestimmten Volk die dortgepredigte oder gepflegte
Gottesvorstellung die richtige, und zwar die alleinrichtige sei. Allein, heute ist der Blick sowohl geschichtlich in die Tiefe als auch in die Breite unendlich erweitert. Wir wissen nun, dass es sehr viele Gottesvorstellungen gibt, dass in jeder Gottesvorstellung Priester tätig sind, dass die Priester überall behaupten, sie allein wären diejenigen, die das genau wüssten und nur das wäre das Richtige, was sie wüssten. In einer solchen Zeit beginnt die Wirksamkeit nicht etwa der Gottesvorstellung, sondern bestimmt ausgeprägter Definitionen zu verblassen. Heute müssen wir daher sagen: Wir geben Euch unbedingte Freiheit in Eurer Lehre oder in Eurer Auffassung von der Gottesvorstellung. Denn wir wissen ganz genau: wir wissen darüber auch nichts.


Wir Nationalsozialisten sind in unserem tiefsten Herzen gottesgläubig. Eine einheitliche Gottesvorstellung hat es im Laufe vieler Jahrtausende nicht gegeben. Aber es ist die allergenialste und erhabenste Ahnung des Menschen, die ihn am meisten über das Tier
heraushebt, nicht nur die Erscheinung aussen zu sehen, sondern immer die Frage des Weshalb, des Warum, des Wodurch usw. aufzustellen. Diese ganze Welt, die uns so klar ist in der Musseren Erscheinung, ist uns ebenso unklar in ihrer Bestimmung. Und hier hat sich die Menschheit demütig gebeugt vor der Überzeugung, einem ungeheuren Gewaltigen, einer Allmacht gegenüberzustehen, die so unerhörnt und tief ist, dass wir Menschen sie nicht zu fassen vermögen. Das ist gut! Denn es kann dem Menschen Trost geben in schlechten Zeiten, vermeidet jene Oberflächlichkeit und jenen Eigendünkel, der den Menschen zu der Annahme verleitet, er--eine ganz kleine Bazille auf dieser Erde, in diesem Universum--würde die Welt beherrschen und er bestimme die Naturgesetze, die er höchstens studieren kann. Daher möchten wir, dass unser Volk demütig bleibt und wirklich an einen Gott glaubt. Also ein unermesslich weites Feld für die Kirchen, sie sollen daher auch untereinander tolerant sein.

Unser Volk ist nicht von Gott geschaffen, um von Priestern zerrissen zu werden. Daher ist es notwendig, seine Einheit durch ein System der Führung sicherzustellen. Das ist die Aufgabe der NSDAP. Sie soll jenen Orden darstellen, der Über Zeit und Menschen hinwegreichend die Stabilität der deutschen Willensbildung und damit der politischen Führung garantiert. Sie muss
bewusst die lebendige Verbindung zum Volk, d. h. zu den Millionen Männern, Frauen und auch den Kindern als dem werdenden Volk besitzen. Das oberste Prinzip dieser Volksführung: das Volk in seiner Gesamtheit ist nicht fähig, seine gesamten Lebensprobleme zu überblicken. Wie soll ein Mensch, der in irgendeinem kleinen Ort steht, Lebensfragen überblicken, die über Kontinente gehen, die Sein oder Nichtsein einer Nation in 20 oder 30 Jahren betreffen. Das will das Volk auch gar nicht behaupten, dass es das kann, es ist ja auch niemand, der nicht ein Automobil fahren kann, beleidigt, dass ein anderer es fährt und nicht er.

Es ist ganz klar, dass die Führung eines Volkes, d. h. seine Gesamtlebensgestaltung eine Aufgabe ist, die mehr als ein Schneiderhandwerk bedeutet. Es ist daher eine Führung aufzubauen, die jene Elemente aus einem Volk primär herauszieht, die in dieser Richtung an sich eine bestimmte Befähigung zu besitzen glauben und aus diesen Elementen dann eine Organisation aufbaut, die sie steigend in einen festen Verband nicht nur der Form, sondern auch der geistigen Auswirkung nach bringt.

Unsere Demokratie baut sich dann auf dem Gedanken auf, dass

1. an jeder Stelle ein nicht von unten Gewählter, sondern ein von oben Auserlesener eine Verantwortung zu
übernehmen hat, bis zur letzten Stelle hin;

2. dass er unbedingte Autorität nach unten und absolute Verantwortung nach oben hat, zum Unterschied von sonstigen Demokratien, die jeden von unten aussuchen, nach unten verantwortlich sein und nach oben mit Autorität ausgestattet sein lassen--eine vollkommen wahnsinnige Verkehrung jeder menschlichen Organisation.

Die NSDAP ist die größte Organisation, die die Welt je gesehen hat. Sie umfasst alles in allem 25 Millionen Menschen und hat 300 000 Funktionäre. Es ist ganz klar, dass eine Organisation, die 18 Jahre alt ist, seit ihrer Gründung nicht das sein kann, was sie nach 100 Jahren wäre. Entscheidend ist aber, dass wir ihr das Gesetz mit auf den Weg geben, nach dem sie angetreten ist und das ihr bleiben soll. Wir haben hier den Grundsatz des absoluten Gehorsams und der absoluten Autorität. Ebenso wie die Armee--die Waffe--micht ohne dieses Gesetz der absoluten Autorität jedes einzelnen Vorgesetzten nach unten und seiner absoluten Verantwortung nach oben bestehen kann, kann es auch nicht die politische Führung dieser Waffe. Denn letzten Endes, was Waffen schaffen, wird politisch verwaltet, und was die politische Verwaltung will, muss die Waffe besorgen. Auch die Volksführung früher, die Kirche, kannte nur dieses eine Lebensgesetz: blind Gehorsam
und absolute Autorität.

Dies Lebensgesetz ist richtig, denn wenn die Besseren zur Führung ausgesucht werden, werden die Untergebenen häufiger und leichter irren als die Führer und, da das ganze Leben eine fortgesetzte Fehlersammlung ist, sind alle geschichtlichen Erfolge ja nichts anderes als eine geringere Zahl von Fehlern gegenüber den anderen.

Wenn überhaupt irgendwo das Talent zu der ihm gebührenden Rolle kommen kann, dann nur in solch einem autoritären Regime, da jeder in ihm weiss, dass er--wenn er einen talentierten Mann fördert--nicht selbst durch eine Abstimmung der Mehrheit aus dem Sattel gehoben wird. Die Demokratie im üblichen Sinne dagegen ist der Todfeind aller Talente, da die Mehrheit stets untalentiert ist und daher stets Angst vor dem Talent hat. In ihr läuft der Ortsgruppenführer, der ein Talent heranholt, Gefahr, dass dies Talent die Ortsgruppe mobilisiert und eines Tages die sogenannte Generalmitgliederversammlung einberuft, die den alten Ortsgruppenführer im Wege der Abstimmung heraussetzt. Ähnlich haben wir ja die Demokratie mit der Demokratie besiegt.

Wenn Führung und Volk geschlossen sind, spielt ein Irrtum keine Rolle, da es immer nur einen Weg gibt und damit selbst der Irrtum tausendmal besser ist als zwei
Erkenntnisse, nach denen jeder tun kann, was er will, also besser als die Zügellosigkeit aller.

Von der rein organisatorischen Seite der Volksführung abgesehen, kommt es vor allem darauf an, die Kunst der Weisheit oder die Weisheit der Kunst der Volksführung zu lehren. Zu erziehen in dieser Weisheit, die auf Grund tausendjähriger Erfahrungen unter Berücksichtigung aller menschlichen Schwächen, Stärken und Leidenschaften am Ende stets das zu erreichen weiss, was im Interesse der Erhaltung einer Volksgemeinschaft erreicht werden muss. Das sind ewige Erkenntnisse, die die Stabilität grosser Staaten bedingen.

Wenn das alte Deutschland gestürzt ist, weil es nicht den nötigen fanatisch-blinden Willen, die Ruhe, Sicherheit und Zuversicht besass, das neue Deutschland wird siegen. Denn ebensowenig, wie man aus einem patriotisch-bürgerlichen Verein plötzlich eine Kämpftruppe von Heroen machen kann, so wenig aus der NSDAP einen bürgerlichen Verein. Das ist deshalb die Hauptaufgabe dieser Schulen, später die Mutproben dauernd einzuführen, d. h. zu brechen mit jener Meinung: tapfer habe nur der Soldat zu sein. Wer politischer Führer ist, ist stets Soldat. Und wer nicht tapfer ist, kann das nicht sein. Er muss bereit sein, jederzeit sich einzusetzen. In der früheren Zeit, da musste der Mut
schon von vornherein die Voraussetzung sein, um den Weg zur Partei zu finden. Heute müssen wir nun künstliche Hindernisse einbauen, künstliche Sprunggruben, über die einer nun drüber muss. Denn wenn er nicht tapfer ist, taugt er für uns nicht.

gewappnet und bereit ist, wenn notwendig, die Waffe zu gebrauchen

Noch eine besondere Aufgabe haben wir: die Beseitigung all jener Minderwertigkeitsempfindungen, die in unserem Volk waren, ihm künstlich angezüchtet wurden, da die früheren Regierungen sie notwendig benötigten und brauchten. Wir sind Todfeinde der sogenannten halben, weil falschen Bescheidenheit, die da sagt, wir wollen uns etwas zurückhalten, man braucht doch nicht immer so in den Vordergrund zu treten, wir wollen nicht immer von uns reden und alles Übertrumpfen, wir wollen bieder bleiben und nicht Übel auffallen, man soll uns mehr lieben, die anderen sollen uns nicht mit schiefen Augen ansehen. Im Gegenteil: wir wollen unser Volk ganz nach vorne führen! Ob sie uns lieben, das ist uns einerlei! Wenn sie uns nur respektieren! Ob sie uns hassen, ist uns einerlei, wenn sie uns nur fürchten.

Wir dürfen uns nicht auf den Standpunkt stellen: die junge Generation soll es einmal besser machen. Wir haben schon alles zu tun, was notwendig ist. Dann wird auch diese Jugend einmal ihre Pflicht erfüllen, so wie wir ihr das gezeigt haben.
Meine deutschen Volksgenossen und -genossinnen!


In der Folge musste die damalige Situation, wenn es nicht gelang, das deutsche Volk wie durch ein Wunder zu retten, einen katastrophalen Ausgang nehmen. Denn schon fünfzehn Jahre vorher war der Weg nach unten ein ununterbrochener. Allerdings war diese Situation selbst ja nur das Ergebnis des Weltkrieges und des Ausganges des Weltkrieges, unseres eigenen inneren
politischen, moralischen und damit auch militärischen Zusammenbruchs.

Es ist daher gerade an einem solchen Tage wichtig, uns wieder zurückzubesinnen auf die Ursache dieses ganzen nationalen Unglücks.

Was war der Grund zum Weltkrieg? Ich möchte das nicht auf das persönliche Gebiet schieben. Darüber ist zuviel bereits an Abhandlungen geschrieben worden. Amerikanische Doktoren haben im Auftrag des derzeitigen Präsidenten Roosevelt die Ursache des Weltkrieges untersucht und dabei festgestellt, dass es sich nicht um ein deutsches Verschulden handeln konnte. Persönlichkeiten spielen in so großen zeitgeschichtlichen Augenblicken nur dann eine Rolle, wenn sie wirklich als Überragende Erscheinungen in den Bannkreis der Umwelt treten. Das war damals nicht der Fall. Weder auf der deutschen noch auf der anderen Seite befanden sich Persönlichkeiten von Überragendem Format. Es konnte also der Grund an sich gar nicht im Versagen oder auch nur im Wollen einzelner liegen, sondern die Ursachen waren tiefer.

Keine Ursache zum damaligen Kriege konnte zunächst die deutsche Staatsform sein. Denn Deutschland war schon eine Demokratie, und zwar was für eine! Streng kopiert nach den Vorbildern des Auslandes, des Westens, eine Kompromisslösung zwischen Monarchie und
parlamentarischer Demokratie, also sogenannte konstitutionelle Monarchie mit praktisch parlamentarischer Führung. Dieser Staat also konnte in seiner Staatsform wirklich nicht die Ursache zum damaligen Krieg der Demokratien gegen das damalige Reich sein.

Deutschland als politischer Faktor gesehen, der Welt gegenüber, konnte schon mehr Grund abgeben, denn nach jahrhundertelanger Zerrissenheit und damit gleichbedeutender Ohnmacht haben sich endlich die deutschen Stämme und Staaten, wenn auch mehr äusserlich gesehen, zusammengefügt zu einem neuen Staat, zu einem Reich, und haben damit in Europa naturgemäß ein neues Kraftelement dem sogenannten Gleichgewicht der Kräfte eingefügt, das verständlicherweise als Fremdkörper empfunden wurde.

Noch zwingender war vielleicht die Abneigung gegenüber dem damaligen Reich als wirtschaftlichem Faktor. Während jahrhundertelang Deutschland seine wirtschaftliche Not zu beheben versuchte, indem es entweder die Menschen allmählich verhungern liess oder sie zur Auswanderung zwang, begann das damalige Deutschland nunmehr steigend mit der Konsolidierung seiner politischen Macht sich auch zu einer wirtschaftlichen zu entwickeln, d. h. statt Menschen zu exportieren, Waren zu exportieren und sich damit die notwendigen
Absatzmärkte auf der Welt sicherzustellen. Ein Vor-
gang, der, von unserem Standpunkt aus gesehen, natür-
lich und recht war, vom Standpunkt anderer allerdings
als ein Eingriff in ihre heiligsten Domänen empfunden
wurde. Und wir kommen dann gleich zu dem Staat, der
diesen Eingriff als unerträglich empfand: England!

Dreihundert Jahre lang vordem hat England allmäh-
lich sein sogenanntes Weltreich gebildet. Nicht
gebildet durch den freien Willen oder durch die
Übereinstimmenden Kundgebungen der Absichten oder
Anschauungen der Betroffenen, sondern dreihundert Jahre
lang ist dieses Weltreich zusammengeschmiedet worden
nur durch Gewalt. Krieg um Krieg wurde geführt, Volk
um Volk wurde seiner Freiheit beraubt, Staat um Staat
wurde zerbrochen, um endlich dieses Gebilde zu
schaffen, das sich britisches Imperium heisst.

Dabei war die Demokratie überall nur eine reine
Maske. Hinter der Demokratie steht in Wirklichkeit die
Völkerbeherrschung im grossen und die Menschenunter-
drückung und Knebelung im einzelnen. Dieser Staat kann
es heute nicht wagen, seine Glieder wirklich abstimmen
zu lassen, ob sie jetzt nach jahrhundertelanger Bear-
beitung etwa bereit wären, freiwillig Glieder dieser
Weltgemeinschaft zu sein. Im Gegenteil! Ägyptische
Nationalisten, indische Nationalisten, sie wandern zu
Tausenden in die Kerker und in die Gefängnisse.

Wenn wir uns dieses sonderbare Entstehen des britischen Weltreiches vor Augen halten, dann wird der Prozess selbst nur verständlich durch die Tatsache des vollkommenen Ausscheidens des europäischen Kontinents als geschlossener Faktor dieser Entwicklung gegenüber. Und dieses Ausscheiden wurde vor allem dokumentiert durch das Ausscheiden des Deutschen Reiches. Dreihundert Jahre lang hat es ein Deutschland praktisch nicht gegeben. Während die Briten wohl von Gott redeten, aber ihre wirtschaftlichen Interessen im Auge hatten, hat das deutsche Volk aus einer Überspanntheit religiöse Streitfragen zu einer solchen Bedeutung
erhoben, dass es da für jahrhundertelang blutige Kriege führte, etwas, was mit die Voraussetzung war für die Möglichkeit der Entstehung des britischen Weltreiches. Denn in eben dem Masse, in dem die deutsche Nation ihre Kraft im Innern zu verbrauchen begann und allmählich praktisch damit auch als Machtfaktor nach aussen ausschied, in eben dem Mass konnte selbstverständlich England, basierend auf dieser neu sich bildenden europäischen Umordnung, in aller Ruhe sein Weltreich zusammenräubern.

Aber nicht nur Deutschland war in diesen drei Jahrhunderten praktisch ausgeschieden vom Wettbewerb auf dieser Erde. Das gleiche galt auch von Italien. Ähnliche Erscheinungen wie in Deutschland, dort weniger religiöser Art, dafür aber staatlicher Art, dynastischer Art. Und wieder aus anderen Gründen auch das Ausscheiden einer weiteren großen Nation in Ostasien, die ebenfalls seit nun fast vierhundert Jahren sich von der übrigen Welt allmählich abzusetzen begann und den eigenen Lebensraum nicht mehr als wesentlich beachtete und sich in eine freiwillige Zurückgezogenheit versenkte.

So entstand besonders in Europa eine Kräfteordnung, die England als sogenanntes Gleichgewicht der Kräfte bezeichnete, das heisst in Wirklichkeit eine Desorganisation des europäischen Kontinents zugunsten des

Und dieses sogenannte Gleichgewicht der Kräfte, das heisst die wirkliche innere Ohnmacht Europas, hat es England ermöglicht, immer wieder von Fall zu Fall und je nach Bedarf Staat gegen Staat auszuspielen und dadurch die europäischen Kräfte stets in inneren Kämpfen zu verzeihen, um seinerseits nun in aller Ruhe in verhältnismässig widerstandsarme Räume der Übrigen Welt vorzustossen.


Und wenn heute plötzlich ein britischer Arbeitersekretär, der aber nebenbei als "Oppositioneller" von
Staats wegen bezahlt wird, wenn der nun auftritt und sagt: "England wird nach diesem Krieg, nach seinem Sieg, beginnen müssen, soziale Fragen in Angriff zu nehmen und soziale Probleme zu lösen; wir werden uns auch um die breite Masse kümmern müssen", -- dann kann ich diesem Sekretär nur sagen: Das ist bei uns schon längst geschehen!

Es ist nur für uns interessant, weil es eine Bestätigung unserer Behauptung ist, dass England in Wirklichkeit das sozial rückständigste Land der Welt ist. So ist also zunächst nach innen gesehen dieser gigantische Reichtum nach aussen eigentlich ein unfruchtbarer, wenn man von einigen wenigen Menschen absieht und die breite Masse zum Vergleich heranzieht.

den Versuch des Ausspielens anderer Kräfte dort ihre Stellung zu halten versuchen. Das heisst also, sie muss schon jetzt versuchen, das sogenannte Gleichgewicht der Kräfte in Europa zu einem Gleichgewicht der Kräfte der Welt zu erheben, mit anderen Worten, Weltstaaten gegeneinander auszuspielen, um noch den Schein wenigstens einer Weltmacht aufrechtzuerhalten.


Seit 1871, seit sich die deutschen Stämme zu organisieren begannen und unter der Führung eines genialen grossen Staatsmannes wieder ein Reich bildeten, seit also die an sich schon langsam sich ankündigende nationale Wiedergeburt des deutschen Volkes die staatliche Einheit fand, seitdem begann England dieses neue Gebilde mit seinem Hass zu verfolgen. Schon 1871, ja schon 1870, sofort nach der Schlacht von Sedan,


Und wenn nun heute Engländerr kommen und glauben, dass es genügt, die alten Propagandawalzen des Jahres 1917/18 wieder in das Grammophon einzulegen, um eine neue Wirkung zu erzielen, dann kann ich nur sagen: sie haben nichts vergessen, aber auch leider oder zu ihrem Unglück nichts gelernt! Und darin unterscheiden sie sich nun vom deutschen Volk. Das deutsche Volk hat seitdem gelernt, und es hat aber auch nichts vergessen. Wir wollen dabei nicht kleinlich sein. In der Geschichte sind einzelne Wortbrüche in der Vergangenheit schon oft geschehen. Was aber im Jahre 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921 usw. stattfand, war nicht ein Wortbruch, sondern das waren Wortbrüche am laufenden Band! Nicht ein Wortbruch, sondern kein Wort hat man gehalten! Es ist eine grosse Nation noch nie so betrogen worden wie damals das deutsche Volk. Was hat man uns zugesichert, was hat man diesem gutgläubigen Volk versprochen—und was haben sie dann mit unserem Volke getan! Es ausgeplündert und ausgepresst. Man hat sich dabei eines fremden Staatsmannes bedient, eines Amerikaners, um eine grossere Gläubigkeit beim deutschen Volk zu erzielen. Und vielleicht war das ja wohl auch die Ursache, warum das deutsche Volk auf diese ganzen Manöver hereinfiel. Allein, das ist daher auch in dieser Hinsicht nun immunisiert worden
gegen alle ähnlichen Versuche der Zukunft. Das deutsche Volk hat Jahr für Jahr damals Gelegenheit gehabt, über die Ehrenhaftigkeit demokratischer Zusicherungen, Versprechungen, demokratischer Worte und demokratischer Staatsmänner nachzudenken und Vergleiche anzustellen und das praktisch am eigenen Leibe nun zu prüfen. Und aus dieser Zeit ist ja endlich die nationalsozialistische Bewegung hervorgegangen!

Wenn man nun sagt: "Warum haben Sie sich auf eine ganz neue Ideologie gestürzt?" Weil die alte jammervoll versagt hat. Nicht nur im Innern. Gott, die Demokratie war bei uns ein miserables Gebilde. Wenn so vierzig, fünfzig Parteien konkurrieren mit ihren gewaltigen Weltanschauungsinteressen, die vom Besitz, aus dem Niveau von Radfahrervereinigungen bis zum Hausbesitz usw. fortgehen, dann ist das schon an sich ein sehr schlechtes Bild. Aber davon ganz abgesehen--., wenn wir wenigstens für diese erbärmliche innerdemokratische Missgestaltung unseres Lebens nach aussen hin belohnt worden wären, dann könnte man noch sagen, gewiss, im Innern hat das Zeug ja versagt, aber nach aussen, ihr habt doch wenigstens dafür eine anständige Behandlung bekommen. Im Innern war das ganze natürlich ein Witz, aber man hat euch wenigstens nach aussen hin ernst genommen, man hat wenigstens so getan, als
wollte man euch ernst nehmen. Man hat euch wenigstens etwas erfüllt von dem, was man euch versprach, wenn ihr brave Demokraten nach dem Vorbild der anderen sein wollt.—Wenn wenigstens das der Fall gewesen wäre. Aber wen haben sie denn fünfzehn Jahre lang ausgeplündert, wen haben sie denn betrogen, wen haben sie denn erpresst, wen haben sie denn ausgeschunden? Etwa den nationalsozialistischen Staat? Die deutsche Demokratie!

anfingen, wo etwas auszuplündern war. Man durfte nichts anderes erwarten.

Aber nun, die Würfel waren gefallen. Eines schien mir klar zu sein: Jeder Wiederaufstieg konnte überhaupt nicht von aussen seinen Anfang nehmen, sondern nur von innen. Erst musste die deutsche Nation eine Konzeption erfahren ihres inneren politischen Kampfes, die es ermöglichte, die ganze Kraft Deutschlands wieder zusammenzufassen, und zwar vor allem die idealistische Kraft. Und diese idealistische Kraft, sie steckte, wie die Dinge lagen damals, ja nur in zwei Lagern, im sozialistischen und im nationalistischen. Gerade die beiden Lager, die sich auf das tödlichste befehdeten und am schärfsten bekämpften, diese beiden Lager mussten zusammengeführt werden zu einer neuen Einheit.

Heute, meine Volksgenossen, da im Zeichen dieser Einigung Millionen und Millionen marschieren, scheint das so selbstverständlich zu sein. Im Jahre 1918 und 1919 erschien das als Ausgeburt einer kranken Phantasie. Man bemitleidete mich höchstens. Vielleicht aber, meine Volksgenossen, war das ein Glück! Hätte man mich damals ernst genommen, dann würde man mich wahrscheinlich vernichtet haben. Denn die Bewegung war ja viel zu klein, um einer solchen Vernichtung
einen Widerstand entgegensetzen zu können. So war es vielleicht naturgewollt oder auch gottgewolltes Schicksal, dass man uns damals auslachte, verspottete und dass schon damals eine gewisse Propaganda sich über uns nur lustig machte und uns nur als einen Witz ansah. So gelang es allmählich, den ersten Keim und damit Kern einer neuen Volksgemeinschaft zu bilden in unserer Bewegung—eine fast unglaubliche geschichtliche Erscheinung—, eingeleitet durch lauter unbekannte Menschen, Anhänger zu gewinnen in erster Linie aus der breiten Masse, aus dem Volke selbst.

Bewegung, das liess damals diese kleinen Menschen, die aus den Betrieben, aus den Fabriken, aus den Bergwerken, von den Bauernhöfen, von den Kontoren usw. kamen, das liess diese kleinen Menschen glauben an ihre Zukunft, an die Zukunft dieser Idee, dieser Bewegung und an den späteren Sieg.

Wir haben eine Erkenntnis damals vertreten: Wenn die deutsche Nation nicht ihre Stellung der Welt gegenüber repariert, d. h. wieder ein Machtfaktor wird, dann wird Deutschland tatsächlich in kurzer Zeit zwanzig Millionen Menschen weniger haben. Denn das konnte man ja ausrechnen: die Erwerbslosigkeit griff Jahr um Jahr um sich. Es kam damit erst recht die Ziellosigkeit und Planlosigkeit der nationalen Konzeptionen, der wirtschaftlichen Planungen. Der ewige Wechsel des Regimes verhinderte jede Voraussicht auf längere Zeiten. Projekte über zwei, drei Monate Dauer hatten keinen Sinn mehr, weil der Betreffende von vornherein wissen konnte, dass er in drei Monaten nicht mehr regieren würde. Der eine sagte: "Warum soll ich das wegräumen, was andere schlecht gemacht haben?"--und der andere sagte: "Warum soll ich etwas besser machen, damit sich ein anderer dann hier hineinsetzt."--Es wurde kein Grund mehr gefunden, überhaupt zu durchgreifenden wirklichen Lösungen zu schreiten. Damit aber
musste die nationale Ohnmacht zwangsläufig zunehmen, der wirtschaftliche Verfall sich ausdehnen, die Zahl der Erwerbslosen sich vergrößern, die Zahl der im Erwerbsleben Stehenden sich vermindern, die Belastung auf diesen Schulsxtern immer noch mehr zu erhöhen, ihre Tragfähigkeit damit vermindern, und endlich musste darüber ein Zusammenbruch kommen, dessen Ende nicht abzusehen war. Aber es war schon anzunehmen, dass die gemütvolle und humane Prophezeiung des grossen französischen Demokraten Clemenceau, dass wir zwanzig Millionen Menschen zuviel hätten, dass diese Prophezeiung verwirklicht würde. So entstand demgegenüber damit das Programm einer Zusammenfassung der deutschen Kraft mit der Zielsetzung, unser Lebensrecht nach allen Seiten hin zu wahren.

Wir haben damit einen Weg gewählt, der zwischen zwei Extremen lag. Vorerst waren wir einem Extrem schon verfallen, dem liberalen, individualistischen, das das Individuum in den Mittelpunkt nicht nur der Betrachtung, sondern auch des ganzen Handelns stellte. Auf der anderen Seite stand lockend vor unserem Volk die Theorie der Menschheit als universaler Begriff, die den einzelnen allein verpflichtet. Und zwischen diesen beiden Extremen stand nun unser Ideal: das Volk, in dem wir eine seelische und körperliche Gemeinschaft
erblicken, die die Vorsehung gestaltet und damit gewollt hat, in die wir gesetzt sind und in der wir allein unser Dasein meistern können. Und wir haben nun bewusst alle unsere Gedanken diesem Ziele untergeordnet, die Interessen diesem Ziele angepasst, alle Massnahmen in Übereinstimmung mit diesem Ziel gebracht. So entstand die nationalsozialistische Gedankenwelt, die eine Überwindung des Individualismus darstellt, nicht etwa in dem Sinne, dass sie die individuelle Fähigkeit beschneidet oder die Initiative des einzelnen lähmt, sondern nur in dem Sinne, dass über der individuellen Freiheit und über jeder Initiative des einzelnen das gemeinsame Interesse steht, dass dieses gemeinsame Interesse das Regulierende, das Bestimmende, wenn notwendig das Hemmende, wenn notwendig aber auch das Befehlende ist.

In den Reihen meiner Partei marschierten ja doch nur Deutsche, die früher bei anderen Bewegungen waren. Hunderttausende Männer meiner SA, meiner SS waren früher Kämpfer in anderen Organisationen gewesen. Das heisst, wir haben sie alle überzeugt und erobert, indem wir sie innerlich gewonnen haben. Es war der grösste Seelenkampf, der je in unserer Geschichte vielleicht ausgefochten worden war. Denn ich konnte ja keinen zwingen, mit mir zu gehen, in meine Organisationen einzutreten; sie alle mussten innerlich überzeugt werden, und nur aus ihrer inneren Überzeugung heraus haben sie dann die grossen Opfer auf sich genommen.

Dieser Kampf sollte wirklich mit dem Geist, d. h. mit der Kraft der Rede, des Wortes, der Schrift und damit der Überzeugung geführt werden. Und nur dort, wo ein böswilliger Gegner sagte: "Im Geiste kann ich euch nicht widerstehen, aber ich bin stärker als ihr. Und weil ich euch im Geiste nicht widerstehen kann, werde ich euch mit der Gewalt Widerstand leisten",--nur dort allerdings, da habe ich als einstiger Frontsoldat auch die Antwort gewählt, die der Gewalt gegenüber allein am Platze ist: Gewalt gegen Gewalt!

So entstand die streitende Bewegung, die mit dem Geiste focht, solange der andere bereit war, ebenfalls
mit geistigen Waffen anzutreten, die aber auch nicht
davor zurückschreckte, sofort auch an die Gewalt zu
appellieren, sowie der andere seinerseits glaubte, mit
der Gewalt den Geist töten zu können.

Wir hatten dabei die Gegner, die uns auch nach
außen immer entgegengetreten sind: Eine Verschmelzung
aller international führenden, denkenden und handelnden
Personen aus allen Lagern. Wir kennen die damaligen Koalitionen, die gegen uns antraten, und ich
darf heute schon sagen: In diesem Geisteskampf sind
wir ihrer überall Herr geworden, denn als ich endlich
zur Macht gerufen wurde, da kam ich unter der Präsiden
tenschaft des Generalfeldmarschalls von Hindenburg
als Reichspräsidenten auf legalem Wege, infolge der
stärksten Bewegung, die hinter mir stand, zur Macht!

Das heisst also: Die sogenannte nationalsozialis
tische Revolution hat in der Demokratie mit der Demo-
kratie die Demokratie besiegt!

Sie hat sich auf streng legalem Wege alle Macht-
mittel gesichert. Auch heute stehe ich vor Ihnen auf
Grund des Mandats der deutschen Nation, und zwar eines
Mandates, das umfassender ist, als es irgendein
sogenannter demokratischer Staatsmann heute besitzt.

Als ich nun 1933 zur Macht kam, war unser Weg klar
vorgezeichnet. Er war im Innern genau bestimmt durch

Dieses Programm besagte, gesellschaftlich gesehen: Herstellung der deutschen Volksgemeinschaft, Überwindung aller Klassen und Standesvorurteile, Erziehung des deutschen Menschen zur Gemeinschaft, wenn notwendig Brechung des Widerstandes derjenigen, die sich dieser Gemeinschaft nicht fügen wollen.

Wirtschaftlich: Aufbau einer deutschen Nationalwirtschaft, die unter Anerkennung der Bedeutung der privaten Initiative doch das gesamte wirtschaftliche Leben dem allgemeinen Interesse unterstellt und unterordnet.

Und, glauben Sie mir, auch hier ist eine andere Zielsetzung nicht mehr denkbar. In Zeiten, in denen die Völker gezwungen sind, auf den Schlachtfeldern zur Verteidigung ihrer Interessen anzutreten und dabei keine Ausnahme machen können zwischen solchen, die viel, oder solchen, die wenig zu vertreten haben, in solchen Zeitläufen sind wirtschaftliche Vorteile oder Vormachtstellungen zuungunsten der Interessen der
Allgemeinheit nicht mehr aufrechtzuerhalten.

Wie überall, so ging ich auch hier den Weg der Belehrung, der Erziehung, des langsamen Anpassens. Denn es war mein Stolz, diese Revolution durchzuführen, ohne dass in Deutschland auch nur eine Fensterscheibe zerstört wurde, eine Revolution, die zu den größten Umwälzungen, die jemals auf der Erde geschehen, führt, und die nicht das geringste zerstört, sondern nur allmählich alles umstellt, die Weiche um Weiche neu ausrichtet, bis endlich diese ganze grosse Gemeinschaft ihren neuen Weg gefunden hat. Das war unser Ziel.

Und genau so war es auch aussenpolitisch. Und hier habe ich ein Programm aufgestellt: Beseitigung von Versailles. Man soll heute in der anderen Welt nicht blöde tun, als ob das etwa ein Programm wäre, das ich im Jahre 1933 entdeckt hätte oder 1935 oder 1937. Die Herren hätten bloss über mich, statt dass sie ihr blödes Emigrantengeschwefel anhörten, einmal lesen sollen, was ich geschrieben habe, und zwar tausendmal geschrieben habe. Öfter hat es kein Mensch erklärt und kein Mensch niedergeschrieben, was er will, als ich es getan habe, und ich schrieb immer wieder: Beseitigung von Versailles. Und zwar nicht, weil wir uns das so in den Kopf setzten, sondern weil Versailles das größte Unrecht und die niederträchtigste Misshandlung eines grossen Volkes war, die je in der Geschichte stattfand,
und weil ohne Beseitigung dieses Zwangsinstruments der deutschen Vernichtung jede Lebenserhaltung unseres Volkes unmöglich gewesen wäre.


Aber ich wollte auch hier dieses Programm nicht mit Gewalt verwirklichen, sondern ich habe geredet, was ein Mensch nur reden konnte. Meine Reichstagsreden, die nicht irgendein demokratischer Staatsmann wegschwindeln kann vor der Geschichte, die sind Zeugnis dafür. Was habe ich ihnen für Angebote gemacht! Wie habe ich sie angebettelt, Vernunft anzunehmen und einem grossen Volk nicht die Lebens- und Existenzmöglichkeiten zu beschneiden. Wie habe ich ihnen nachgewiesen, dass das für sie selber gar keinen Zweck hat, keinen Nutzen in sich trägt und sinnlos ist, ja, ihnen

Und dass dieser Vertrag ein niederträchtiges Dokument war, das haben doch seine Verfasser am Ende selbst zugegeben, ja sie gaben sogar selbst zu, dass die Möglichkeit einer Revision offengehalten werden sollte. Sie haben dafür den Völkerbund bestimmt, das heisst also, sie haben den Bock zum Gärtner gemacht.
Dieser Völkerbund, der auf der einen Seite dazu da war, zu verhindern, dass dieser Vertrag revidiert wurde, der sollte auf der anderen Seite dann wieder für seine Revision zuständig sein. Zunächst waren wir nicht im Völkerbund, und später war die deutsche Teilnahme im Grunde genommen nichts anderes als eine Ablieferung von jährlichen Zahlungen. Das war das einzige Positivum, das sich für Deutschland bemerkbar machte. Aber im Übrigen war ja Deutschland noch eine Demokratie. Und diese Demokraten von Berlin haben doch gebettelt, sie rutschten doch in Genf buchstäblich vor diesem internationalen Forum auf den Knien und baten: "Gebt uns die Revision, und die Revision!" Es war alles vergeblich.

Ich habe als Nationalsozialist nach wenigen Monaten gesehen, dass vor diesem Forum nichts mehr zu gewinnen ist. Ich habe dann allerdings die Konsequenz gezogen. Denn ich muss schon sagen, unsere Gegner, die haben uns anscheinend auch immer verwechselt mit den Leuten, mit denen sie seit dem November 1913 zu tun hatten. Mit diesen Leuten hat weder das deutsche Volk, noch haben wir etwas gemein. Das war nicht Deutschland! Das waren ein paar von Engländern und Franzosen und anderen Leuten ausgehaltene miserablen Subjekte, die sie bezahlt haben. Das war aber nicht das deutsche Volk! Das deutsche Volk hatte mit denen nichts zu tun. Und uns
damit in Verbindung zu bringen, ist eine Beleidigung für uns!


Für uns war es also klar und für mich, dass, wenn

Und hier sind fünfundachtzig Millionen Deutsche, und diese Deutschen brauchen es auch nicht, denn die haben eine gewaltige geschichtliche Vergangenheit. Die waren schon ein Weltreich, als England noch eine ganz kleine Insel war. Und etwas länger als dreihundert Jahre.


Nun allerdings war mein Entschluss auch feststehend: unter keinen Umständen von seinen Rechten etwas preisgeben; denn man gibt hier nicht Theorien preis, sondern
man gibt das Leben von Millionen Menschen in der Zukunft preis. Ich opfere nicht irgendeinen Programm­punkt eines Parteiprogramms, sondern man opfert in so einem Fall die Zukunft einer Rasse. Und dazu ist niemand berechtigt, ausser er tritt vor ein Volk hin und sagt: Ich kann deine Interessen nicht mehr vertreten. Dann muss eben ein anderer kommen.


Als ich daher sah, dass in England die alten Kriegshetzer des Weltkrieges ihre verbrecherische Tätigkeit wieder aufnahmen, als die Herren Churchill und Eden und Duff Cooper und Hore Belisha usw. und
Vansittard, unser großer alter Freund, und dann Chamberlain und Halifax, als diese alten Männer nun genau wie damals wieder mit ihrer Hetze begannen, da war ich mir darüber klar, dass es den Leuten nicht darum zu tun war, eine gerechte Verständigung mit Deutschland zu finden, sondern dass sie wieder glaubten, auf eine billige Weise, und zwar je schneller um so leichter, Deutschland niederbrechen zu können. Was dann geschah, das wissen Sie nun, meine Volksgenossen.


wir einmal aushandeln. Auch die Zeit, ich setzte gar keine Zeit fest. Für England sind sie zwecklos, die Kolonien. Sie haben 40 Millionen Quadratkilometer, was machen sie damit? Gar nichts. Es ist nur der Geiz von alten Wucherern, die etwas besitzen und es nicht hergeben wollen, krankhafte Wesen, die sehen, dass ihr Nachbar nichts zu essen hat, selber das, was sie besitzen, nicht gebrauchen können, es ins Meer hinein­schütten, wenn notwendig, aber krank werden bei dem Gedanken, sie könnten ihm etwas abgeben. Noch dazu, ich habe nichts verlangt, was den Engländern gehört hat, sondern nur das, was sie uns geraubt und gestohlen haben im Jahre 1918 und 1919, und zwar geraubt und gestohlen gegen die feierliche Zusicherung des Herrn amerikanischen Präsidenten Wilson! Wir haben nichts von ihnen gefordert, haben nichts verlangt. Immer gab ich ihnen wieder die Hand, und trotzdem war alles vergeblich. Die Gründe sind uns klar: es ist eben doch die deutsche Einigung an sich. Sie hassen diesen Staat hier, ganz gleich, wie er aussieht, ob kaiserlich oder nationalsozialistisch, demokratisch oder autoritär. Das ist ganz gleichgültig. Und zweitens: sie hassen vor allem aber den sozialen Aufstieg dieses Reiches.

Und hier, da verbunden sich wirklich Herrschsucht auf der einen Seite mit gemeinsstem Egoismus auch nach innen. Wenn sie sagen heute: "Mit dieser Welt können
wir uns niemals verständigen"; -- das ist die Welt des erwachenden sozialen Gewissens, mit der sie sich nicht verständigen können. Da kann ich diesen Herren herüben und drüben über dem Ozean nur eines sagen: diese Welt wird am Ende die erfolgreiche sein! In allen Völkern wird das soziale Gewissen zu schlagen beginnen. Sie können Kriege führen für ihre kapitalistischen Interessen, aber die Kriege selbst werden letztendes die Wegbereiter sein der sozialen Erhebungen innerhalb der Völker.

Es ist unmöglich, dass auf die Dauer Hunderte von Millionen Menschen nach den Interessen von wenigen einzelnen ausgerichtet werden. Auf die Dauer wird hier das größere Interesse der Menschheit über die Interessen dieser kleinen plutokratischen Geschäftemacher siegen. Wir haben Beweise dafür, dass es auch in den anderen Ländern auf diesem Gebiete heute bereits zu kriseln beginnt; wenn englische Arbeiterführer jetzt plötzlich mit "neuen" sozialen Gedanken kommen, so abgedroschen und uralt, dass ich nur sagen kann: Legen Sie sie wieder in die Kiste zurück, das ist bereits abgelegtes Material von uns, schon längst überholt, meine Herren. Wenn Sie da wissen wollen, wie man so etwas macht, dann dürfen Sie nicht Programme nehmen, die bei uns in den achtziger oder neunziger Jahren etwa modern waren, sondern müssen Sie kommen und jetzt
studieren bei uns, da können Sie etwas lernen, meine Herren, wie man das macht.

aufregen, doch nicht darüber, dass das einer jetzt
dummerweise ausspricht im Kriege. Bei uns aber, wenn
sie etwas lernen wollen, ist das schon längst behoben.
Sie haben uns allerdings vor kurzem noch nachgewiesen,
dass unsere Offiziere und Generale nichts taugen, weil
sie alle zu jung sind und etwas angekränkelt vom
nationalsozialistischen Gedankengut seien, also auch
ein etwas etwas mit der breiten Masse zu tun haben. Un-
terdes hat ja die Entwicklung schon gezeigt, wo die
besseren Generale sitzen, da drüben oder bei uns. Wenn
der Krieg noch länger dauert, wird das ein grosses
Unglück für England sein. Denn man wird dann noch
allerhand erleben. Plötzlich werden die Engländer
überhaupt eine Kommission schicken, um unser Programm
zu übernehmen. Das wird das Ende ihres ganzen Kampfes
sein. Dieses soziale Deutschland ist es, was diese
Clique, gemischt aus Juden und ihren Finanzleuten da
drüben und ihren Geschäftemachern, am meisten hasst.

Demgegenüber steht unsere Aussenpolitik und unsere
Innen- und unsere Wirtschaftspolitik eisern klar fest.
Es gibt nur ein Ausrichtungsziel, das heisst: das Volk.
Alle Wege, die wir betreten, müssen am Ende dort mün-
den. Wir sind uns dabei darüber klar, dass, wenn man
nicht alles zerstören will, man nur mit vielen, vielen
Kompromissen, mit vielen Nachsichtigkeiten diesen Weg
betreten, beschreiten und einhalten kann. Aber die


So kam es zum ersten Kampf, und so wird nun dieser Kampf eben weitergehen. Ich darf aber doch zurückweisend schon eines sagen: schon das Jahr, das hinter uns liegt, und der letzte Teil des vorvergangenen Jahres haben praktisch diesen Krieg entschieden.
Der Gegner, den sie zuerst im Osten gegen uns mobili-
sierten, wurde in wenigen Wochen beseitigt. Der Ver-
such, uns von Norwegen, von den Erzbasen, abzuschneiden
und eine Angriffsbasis gegen Nordostdeutschland zu
gewinnen, wurde in wenigen Wochen desgleichen erledigt.
Der Versuch, über Holland und Belgien die Ruhrgrenze
und Ruhrzone zu erreichen, brach nach wenigen Tagen
zusammen. Frankreich ging den gleichen Weg. England
wurde von dem Kontinent weggejagt. Ich lese einige
Male jetzt so, dass die Engländer die Absicht haben,
mit einer grossen Offensive jetzt irgendwo zu beginnen.
Ich hätte nur den einen Wunsch, wenn sie mir das vorher
mitteilen wollten. Ich würde dann das Gebiet in Europa
vorher räumen lassen, damit sie kommen. Ich würde sehr
gern ihnen die Schwierigkeiten der Landung ersparen,
und wir würden uns dann wieder vorstellen und noch ein-
mal aussprechen, und zwar mit der Sprache, die sie wohl
allein verstehen!

Sie haben nun Hoffnungen, denn sie müssen Hoffnun-
gen besitzen. Was erwarten sie sich nun? Wir stehen
hier auf diesem Kontinent, und wo wir stehen, bringt
uns niemand mehr weg! Und wir haben bestimmte Basen
geschaffen, und wir werden, wenn die Stunde kommt, zu
den entscheidenden Schlägen ausholen. Und dass wir die
Zeit dafür genützt haben, das werden die Herren in
diesem Jahr geschichtlich zur Kenntnis nehmen.

Und man soll sich über eines keiner Täuschung hingeben: Wer glaubt: England helfen zu können, muss eines auf alle Fälle wissen: jedes Schiff, ob mit oder ohne Begleitung, das vor unsere Torpedorohre kommt, wird torpediert!

Wir sind in einem Kriege, den wir nicht gewollt haben. Im Gegenteil! Öfter kann man dem anderen nicht die Hand hinhalten. Wenn aber diese Finanzhyänen den Kampf wollen und etwa das Ziel haben, die deutsche Nation auszurotten, dann werden sie ihre blauen Wunder erleben. Dieses Mal trifft man nicht auf ein ermatetes Deutschland wie im Weltkrieg, sondern dieses Mal stösst man auf ein in höchstem Grade mobilisiertes und
kampffähiges und kampfentschlossenes Deutschland.


Vielleicht hoffen sie auch auf den Balkan. Ich würde auch darauf nicht viel geben, denn das eine ist sicher: Wo England in Erscheinung tritt, werden wir es angreifen, und wir sind stark genug dazu.

Vielleicht haben sie die Hoffnung auf andere Staaten, die sie noch hereinziehen. Ich weiss es nicht, aber ich kann ihnen, meine Parteigenossen und Parteigenossinnen, die Sie mich nun seit so vielen Jahren kennen, als einen besorgten Mann, der immer vorausblickt, nur die eine Versicherung geben: Jede
Möglichkeit, die überhaupt denkbar ist, haben wir nüchtern abgewogen und in Rechnung gesetzt. Am Ende steht unser Sieg!

Sie hoffen dann vielleicht noch etwas--nicht mehr so stark--auf den Hunger. Wir haben unser Leben organisiert. Wir wussten von vornherein, dass es im Kriege einen Überfluss natürlich nicht geben kann. Aber verhungern wird das deutsche Volk niemals--niemals! Eher das englische! Da können die Herren überzeugt sein.


Es könnte nur eines dann noch sein: nämlich, dass sie wirklich glauben, durch ihre Lügen und Propaganda, durch ihre Phrasen das deutsche Volk noch einmal benebeln zu können. Und da kann ich nur sagen: sie hätten nicht so lange schlafen sollen! Sie hätten sich ein klein wenig um die innere Entwicklung des deutschen Volkes wirklich kümmerlich sollen. So wie sie jetzt diese Idiotie unternommen, das italienische Volk dem Duce entfremden zu wollen--ein britischer Lord steht auf und appelliert an das italienische Volk, dass es nicht mehr dem Duce, sondern Seiner Lordschaft folgen soll! Es ist idiotisch, wenn man so einem Schafskopf so etwas überhaupt glauben soll.
Dann steht wieder ein anderer Lord auf und ermahnt das deutsche Volk, Seiner Lordschaft zu folgen und sich von mir abzuwenden. Ich kann diesen Männern nur sagen: das haben schon ganz andere in Deutschland versucht. Die haben eine Vorstellung von dem deutschen Volk, vom nationalsozialistischen Staat, von unserer Gemeinschaft, von der Armee unserer marschierenden Massen in unserem Volk! Die haben eine Ahnung von unserer Propaganda!

Sie haben sich, weil sie selbst anscheinend nicht so ganz überzeugt waren von der Tüchtigkeit ihrer Gedanken, ein paar Kräfte ausgeliehen aus Deutschland. Aber das sind gerade die Kräfte, die hier jammervoll versagt hatten, nämlich die Emigranten, die hier den kürzeren zogen. Das sind ihre Berater! Wir sehen das sofort an den Pamphleten. Wir wissen genau: das hat der gemacht, das hat der gemacht——genau so blöde wie damals hier. Nur dass damals der Stempel "Vossische Zeitung" darauf stand, und jetzt steht "Times" darauf oder so etwas. Und die Leute bilden sich ein, dass so eine alte, alte, alte Sache, die bei uns schon von der "Vossischen Zeitung" nicht mehr zog, jetzt wieder ziehen wird, wenn plötzlich von der "Times" oder vom "Daily Telegraph" irgend so was kommt. Es ist eine wirkliche Gehirnerweichung in diesen Demokratien ausgebrochen! Sie können beruhigt sein: Das deutsche Volk
wird alles das tun, was in seinem Interesse notwendig ist. Es wird seiner Führung folgen. Es weiss, dass seine Führung kein anderes Ziel hat. Es weiss, dass heute an der Spitze des Reiches kein Mann steht, der auch ein Aktienpaket in seiner Tasche hat, der andere Interessen verfolgt. Diese deutsche Volk---das weiss ich, und ich bin so stolz darauf---ist mit mir verschworen und geht durch dick und dünn.

In diesem Volk ist jetzt wieder ein alter Geist lebendig geworden, der uns schon einmal lange Zeit begleitet hat: dieser Fanatismus der Bereitwilligkeit, alles auf uns zu nehmen! Jeden Schlag, den wir empfangen, wir werden ihn mit Zins und Zinseszins zurückgeben! Uns wird er nur härter machen! Und was sie auch gegen uns mobilisieren. Und wenn die Welt voll Teufel wäre', es wird uns dann doch gelingen.

Und wenn sie dann als letztes sagen: "Ja, aber die Fehler, die sie machen!"---Gott, wer macht keine Fehler? Ich habe heute früh gelesen, dass ein englischer Mister---ich weiss nicht, aus was---aber durch ein Verfahren ausgerechnet hat, dass ich im vergangenen Jahre, also im Jahre 1940, sieben Fehler gemacht habe, sieben Fehler! Der Mann hat sich geirrt, ich habe es nachgerechnet: ich habe nicht sieben Fehler gemacht, sondern 724. Aber ich habe weiter gerechnet: und meine Gegner haben 4 385 000 Fehler gemacht! Er kann mir
das glauben! Ich habe es genau nachgerechnet.


So gehen wir jetzt in das neue Jahr hinein mit einer gerüsteten Wehrmacht wie noch nie in unserer deutschen Geschichte.

Zu Lande sind die Zahlen der Divisionen gewaltig vermehrt worden. Ihr Kampfwert wurde verbessert, die ungeheure einmalige Kriegserfahrung bei Führer und Mann verwertet und ausgewertet. Denn es ist gearbeitet worden und wird unentwegt gearbeitet. Die Ausrüstung ist verbessert, unsere Gegner werden sehen, wie sie verbessert wurde.

Zur See wird in diesem Frühjahr der U-Boot-Krieg beginnen, und sie werden auch dort dann bemerken, dass wir nicht geschlafen haben in diesen sechzehn Monaten!

Und die Luftwaffe wird desgleichen ihre Vorstellung besorgen. Und die gesamte Wehrmacht wird die Entscheidung so oder so erzwingen!
Unsere Produktion ist auf allen Gebieten eine gewaltig gesteigerte.

Was andere planen, ist bei uns Wirklichkeit. Das deutsche Volk aber steht gefasst hinter seiner Führung, im Vertrauen zu seiner Wehrmacht und bereit, das zu ertragen, was das Schicksal nun einmal von ihm fordert.


Und endlich wird dieses Jahr mithelfen, dann wirklich die Grundlagen für eine Völkerverständigung und damit eine Völkeraussöhnung zu sichern.

ergreift, und ich hoffe, dass auch die Völker, die heute noch in Feindschaft gegen uns stehen, eines Tages ihren größeren inneren Feind erkennen werden, und dass sie dann doch noch in eine große gemeinsame Front mit uns eintreten werden: die Front einer arischen Menschheit gegenüber der internationalen jüdischenAusbeutung und Völkerverderbung!

Dieses Jahr, das seit dem 30. Januar nun hinter uns liegt, war das Jahr größter Erfolge, allerdings auch vieler Opfer. Wenn auch im gesamten die Zahl der Toten und der Verletzten klein ist gegenüber allen früheren Kriegen, so sind doch für jede einzelne Familie, die davon betroffen wurde, die Opfer schwer. Unsere ganze Zuneigung, unsere Liebe, aber auch unsere Fürsorge gehört denen, die diese Opfer bringen mussten. Sie haben das erlitten, was Generationen vor uns immer auch bringen mussten. Opfer brachte aber auch sonst jeder einzelne Deutsche. Gearbeitet hat die Nation auf allen Gebieten, gearbeitet hat im Ersatz des Mannes vor allem die deutsche Frau. Es ist ein wunderbarer Gemeinschaftsgedanke, der unser Volk beherrscht.

Dass dieser Gedanke in seiner ganzen Kraft uns im kommenden Jahr erhalten bleibe, das sei der Wunsch des heutigen Tages. Dass wir für diese Gemeinschaft arbeiten wollen, das sei unser Gelöbnis! Dass wir im
Dienst dieser Gemeinschaft den Sieg erringen, das ist unser Glaube und unsere Zuversicht! Und dass der Herrgott in diesem Kampf des kommenden Jahres uns nicht verlassen möge, das soll unser Gebet sein!

Deutschland Sieg Hail!

77. Dieser Mann konnte reden; er überzeugte, weil er selbst überzeugt war, zerpflückte die Argumente des Gegners und vertrat die nationale Sache mit ungewöhnlicher Unbedingtheit und Kompromisslosigkeit.

78. Trotz aller preußischen Phraseologie war Hitler eine Bohème-Natur.

79. Solcher, nun wirklich ins Krankhafte gesteigerte Mischung von Lebensangst und Sendungsbewusstsein gegenüber mussten natürlicherweise auf Maßigung und Geduld draußen Ratschläge unwirksam bleiben.

80. Die Macht aber, die die grossen historischen Lawinen religiöser und politischer Art ins Rollen brachte, war seit unendlich nur die Zauberkraft des gesprochenen Wortes.

81. ... er brachte Schwung in den Laden, formulierte einprägsame Ziele, verstand seine Anhänger auf ihre unartikulierten Sehnsüchte anzusprechen und die
Schwächen der Gegner zu erspüren . . . Hitler . . .
derart verabsolutierte, dass er schlechthin alles
bisher Errungene dafür aufs Spiel zu setzen bereit
war . . . dass er nicht fähig war dem Errungenen
Dauer zu verleihen, und letzten Endes ein Zerstörer
war.
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