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PREFACE

Although nearly three decades have elapsed since the end of World War II, interest in Nazi Germany has still not abated. This is evidenced by the continued publication of new volumes dealing with the rise of the National Socialist Party, its activities, and its leaders. The most popular of these books seem to be those dealing with Hitler and other major Nazi figures. Authors have also focused considerable attention on Nazi sub-leaders who were involved in the barbaric persecution of the Jews. Among the better known of these works are biographies of Adolf Eichmann and Reinhard Heydrich.

For unknown reasons, scholars have shown little interest in Julius Streicher, who was labeled the "Number One Nazi Jew Baiter," and was convicted and hung as a major Nazi war criminal. A few historical accounts dealing with the Nazi period have accorded Streicher one or two chapters. Most, however, dismiss him with a paragraph or a few lines.

In an attempt to shed light on Streicher's earlier years in politics, about which virtually nothing has been published, this study concentrates on his activities between November, 1918, and January, 1933. It involves the factual story of Streicher's rise from an obscure school-teacher to the most powerful Nazi political figure in Franconia. The progress of Streicher's career is traced through the development of three major themes which combine to make Streicher's rise sporadic, fraught
with petty quarrels, but eventually successful.

The first of these themes concerns Streicher's unusual personality characteristics which are vital factors in accounting for his racial fanaticism, his incessant quarrels and legal entanglements, as well as his emergence as a political leader.

Secondly, Streicher's emergence as Nazi leader in Franconia as well as the maintenance of his political authority as Gauleiter depended largely on his relationship with Hitler, whose career and personality paralleled Streicher's in some noteworthy ways. Although Hitler remained generally removed from Streicher's local activities, his support proved to be an invaluable source of strength to Streicher at crucial times in his career.

Finally, anti-Semitism, which Streicher found latent in many Franconians, was used by him as a base upon which he built a large and effective local party, and a financially successful newspaper. Yet, when combined with the worst of Streicher's personality characteristics, anti-Semitism developed into an overpowering obsession which led to fanatic and irrational behavior, and eventually his ruination.

Unfortunately, some important details concerning Streicher's personal and political activities and thoughts are missing in this study because of the lack of necessary resource material. An explanation for the scarcity of correspondence was offered by Streicher himself in a statement that he was too impatient to spend time writing letters. In addition, much more vital documentation may have been available to aid in this research if Streicher had not destroyed great quantities of papers as American troops were approaching the Nuremberg area in May,
1945. Streicher's second wife, Adele, testified to American military officers that she helped her husband burn bundles of documents for some fourteen nights just prior to their flight from advancing American troops.

In conducting the research for this study, I have received help and cooperation from a number of sources. I am especially indebted to Mr. Robert Wolfe, Specialist in German Records at the National Archives, Washington, D. C., with whom I conversed for long hours during the early stages of my research, and who provided me with valuable information about the location of certain vital research material. I am also grateful for the cordiality and assistance of Dr. G. Hirschmann, director of the Nuremberg Stadtarchiv; Dr. P. Lehnert, assistant director of the Nuremberg Stadtbibliothek; Dr. J. Zittel, director of the Munich Bayerische Staatsarchiv; the head archivist at the Munich Institut fur Zeitgeschichte; and Fraulein J. Kinder, assistant director of the Koblenz Bundesarchiv.

I have also had valuable help from the staff at the Library of Congress, Washington, D. C., and the librarians at The Ohio State University Library as well as the Columbus Public Library.

I was fortunate in gaining the cooperation of Dr. Benno Martin, former police president of Nuremberg, and Mr. Fritz Nadler, of Nuremberg, an author and journalist, who granted me long hours of their time in personal interviews. I also spent additional enjoyable hours conversing with many individuals in Munich, Koblenz, and Nuremberg, about questions dealing with this study.

I am also indebted to the faculty committee of The Ohio State University History Department for granting me assistantships to allow the
origination of the research work. The administrative officers of Urbana College have also shown me cooperation by granting two leaves of absence from my teaching duties to complete my writing. In addition, I owe a debt of gratitude to Mrs. Chrystal Bender, who assisted in the translation of hundreds of copies of documents from German archival sources.

Finally, this work could not have been completed without the patience and counseling of Dr. Andreas Dorpalen, who supervised the writing and revising of the text.

My wife, Helen, offered me countless hours of encouragement and help in reading and rereading drafts of the text.

The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

William P. Varga
Streicher's Franconia (Mittelfranken)
Chapter I

Before the Versailles Treaty

Julius Streicher was born of humble parentage on February 12, 1885, in Fleinhausen, a small village in Swabian Bavaria. He was the last of nine children. His father, Friedrich Streicher, was a teacher in the lower public schools. The elder Streicher was a man of monotonous habits who dominated those around him by his pedantry. In addition to his teaching duties, he served as regular acolyte at the masses celebrated in the village church.¹ Julius later stated that his father was more concerned with spiritual matters than with the needs of his family. The son never forgot the days of struggle against hunger and cold that darkened his childhood.² The father's influence on his children was evident when it came to choosing professions and spouses. Of the four Streicher sons who survived to adulthood, three became school teachers, as did one of the daughters. The remaining two daughters married school teachers.³

¹Stadtbibliothek, Nuremberg (hereafter cited as SBN), Manfred Ruehl, Der Stuermer und sein Herausgeber, 1960, p. 39. Friedrich Streicher came from a family of small craftsmen while the mother, Anna Weiss Streicher, was of peasant origin. Both were Catholic.
²Ibid.
³Ibid., p. 37.
During his formative years, Julius received his early education at the village Catholic school. He then successfully completed a two-year program at the Royal Bavarian Teacher's School at Lauingen an der Donau in July, 1903.4

In November, 1903, he was assigned his first teaching position at Irsee in the district of Truthaven as a substitute school teacher. He remained in that position approximately six months. He then fulfilled substitute assignments at two nearby village schools until he was transferred to a "Correction Boys' School" in Lauingen in December, 1906.5

In January, 1907, the district and local school inspectors visited the Lauingen School to evaluate Streicher's teaching practices. The report on this visitation was somewhat critical of the young teacher because the class did not meet the normal standards in reading, writing, and arithmetic skills. Because Streicher had taken charge of this class less than one month earlier, the report was doubtless intended to be as instructive as it was evaluative. Numerous suggestions on improved teaching techniques were listed before the notation that the previous teacher had performed inadequately. Because of this, it was mentioned that Streicher would have to make a special effort to bring the class up to academic standards. The report ended with the minor complaint that

4Ibid., p. 38. In a final school report, Streicher achieved grades of "passing" in effort and conduct; "almost perfect" for attentiveness and diligence; and "good" for degree of knowledge attained.

5Bayerisches Staatsarchiv, Personalakten Julius Streicher (hereafter cited as BSA, PAJIS), Vol. I, documents nr. 16 and 18. August 4, 1904 and November 19, 1906. Streicher's salary for the substitute assignments was 820 Marks annually. His salary for the Lauingen position was the same plus 100 Marks annually for living expense.
the young teacher should keep a more detailed daily record book.  

Streicher remained at Lauingen until October, 1907, when he took his state teaching examinations. That same month he began serving his one-year military obligation in the 6th Company of the 3rd Bavarian Infantry Regiment.

During this training period, Streicher was punished because he was not able to control his verbal outbursts. In later years he braggingly told of this experience in a public speech:

>Sergeant Weiss will confirm the truth of what I say. I served my one-year training period (1907 and 1908). I was locked up because I could not keep my mouth shut. On my discharge papers the following words were noted and underlined in red: 'Streicher is not a good candidate for non-commissioned officer status.'

Streicher's conduct here was the first open manifestation of abnormal behavior which was to become commonplace throughout his adult life. In order to understand his behavior it may be helpful to examine some of his psychological characteristics. Streicher's disciplinary infraction described above offers an opportunity to analyze one such characteristic. As this characteristic re-emerges it will become a more permanent facet of his total character structure and knowledge of it will aid in the explanation of future questionable behavior. Four or five psychological characteristics will be analyzed in like manner and used in this interpretive process.

---


SBN, Ruehl, Der Stuermer, p. 38.

There is no doubt that in some instances the conclusions drawn by the employment of psychological phenomena may be nebulous and questionable. One American historian, Peter Loewenberg, has stated recently that many scholars have refused to attempt biographical interpretations of certain Nazi leaders based on their character structure because their bizarre and abnormal actions are essentially incomprehensible to normal people.\footnote{Peter Loewenberg, "The Unsuccessful Adolescence of Heinrich Himmler," \textit{The American Historical Review} (June, 1971), p. 615.} Streicher's behavior was even more extreme and enigmatic than that displayed in most of his National Socialist peers.\footnote{Edward Peterson, \textit{Limits of Hitler's Power} (Princeton, New Jersey, 1969), p. 228.} His nationally known symbol was his riding whip, and he was known to fly into a rage at the slightest provocation. On the other hand, this same person was capable of merciful acts of personal charity.\footnote{Personal interview with Dr. Benno Martin in Munich, August 4, 1970. Martin was chief of police in Nuremberg during Streicher's years of political power there. He stated repeatedly in the interview that Streicher often helped needy people voluntarily.} He also painted nature scenes with a delicate touch in soft colors and loved and cared for animals with great gentleness.\footnote{Peterson, \textit{Limits of Hitler's Power}, p. 228.} Despite these wide behavioral discrepancies, an attempt to explain the workings of Streicher's mind will be made.

This is not an easy task. In his \textit{The Unsuccessful Adolescence of Heinrich Himmler}, Loewenberg was able to interpret Himmler's adult character structure by applying Freudian theories to facts of Himmler's
early life as set forth—or omitted—in a daily diary. In Streicher's case, however, this type of psychological analysis is not as applicable because of the dearth of information on his childhood and youth. There is a possibility, however, that a few of Streicher's adult personality traits may be attributed to his briefly mentioned childhood experiences. In most instances his adult character structure appears to have been molded by reactions to political conditions and social changes coupled with certain innate neurological weaknesses.

The first of these weaknesses emerged during his military training experience. Streicher's undisciplined conduct resulted from an undisciplined mind which refused to accept the tedious regimentation of a peacetime military training camp. An American historian, Edward Peterson, stresses this point as he describes Streicher's adult behavior. According to Peterson, Streicher would accept no orders from superiors, and, despite serious threats, he would not comply with the rules of a social system or political organization which in any way limited his impulses of the moment.

Upon completion of his one-year military training period in October, 1908, Streicher was released to reserve status and returned to civilian life. He immediately assumed the duties of his new civil service assignment as School Administrator in Mindelheim at a sizable

---

13Loewenberg, The Unsuccessful Adolescence, p. 615.

14Peterson, Limits of Hitler's Power, p. 228.
increase in pay. In view of his overall teaching and military-training performance during the previous two years, this promotion appears somewhat surprising. One possible explanation of this apparent contradiction might be that the young teacher enjoyed the favor of influential government administrators because of his family connections in the school system. It is also possible that military performance did not concern school authorities, or, more likely that Streicher's military records were not available to the school administrators at the time of the assignment.

Streicher remained at the Mindelheim post from October, 1908, until September, 1909, when he was transferred to the Nuremberg school system. Here he worked as teacher and administrator in the Volksschule at Lenaustrasse and Kupferstrasse, in the first and second classes of girls. He remained in this position until August, 1914.

Streicher later described these years in Nuremberg as his "years of political development." He said that living in the city put him in close contact with working-class families and the social inequities he observed prompted him to become interested in politics. Streicher's accounts of his first venture into politics are as vague as they are

---

15 BSA, PAJS, Vol. I, doc. nr. 25. Notice from Royal Bavarian Government to Streicher, September 11, 1908. Streicher's starting salary was to be 1,000 marks annually, with additional allowances of 120 marks for living expenses and 72 marks for old-age pension.

16 Ibid., Streicher was notified on September 11, 1908, to begin his new assignment at Mindelheim as soon as possible after his release from military duty on October 20, 1908.

17 SBN, Ruehl, Der Stuermer, p. 38.

18 International Military Tribunal, Trial of the Major War Criminals (hereafter cited as IMT), Vol. 12, pp. 307-308.
contradictory. In one interview he stated that in 1911 he joined the "Democratic Party." He had earlier referred to this group as the "Young Social Democratic Party," and the "Young Democratic Party." On the one hand he claimed that he was drawn into politics because of local social issues but later asserted that he often spoke on behalf of the party's unsuccessful Reichstag candidates and that on these occasions he usually discussed "nationalistic matters." The incongruity between his alleged interests and his actual speeches is puzzling. One can only learn from this testimony that Streicher was stressing the fact that he never spoke against the Jews in these meetings because he stated that he was not familiar with the racial question at that time.

For unknown reasons, Streicher disassociated himself from this obscure party in early 1914, when he and two other men, Otto Winternantel and Julius Nuremberger, organized a small political club called Young Progress (Jung-Fortschritt). This club existed only for a few months, and its accomplishments were negligible. Of interest, however, is the fact that anti-Semitism had not yet emerged as an issue in Streicher's political circle. Concerns of the club members at this time were reflected in the titles of the speeches delivered at meetings in February and April 1914: "The Development of the German Economy and the Tasks of

19Ibid.


21Ibid.

the Industrial Classes," "The Question of General Voting Rights of the Three Classes" and "Voting Rights and Voting Duties." There is no other record of Streicher's political views or activities prior to August, 1914.

At the outbreak of World I, Streicher joined the 6th Company of the 6th Bavarian Infantry Regiment. He was sent to the front lines in the Flanders campaign as a cyclist in a machine gun platoon. His performance as a combat soldier differed markedly from his earlier peacetime record as a military trainee. By September 6, 1914, he was awarded the Prussian Iron Cross, 2nd class, and four days later he was promoted to the rank of a non-commissioned officer. During the same month he was advanced to vice-sergeant of the reserves. On August 1, 1916, he was promoted to temporary officer rank and the following April was awarded the Austrian silver medal with crown. In July, 1917, he was officially named lieutenant of a machine-gun company. In January, 1918, the young officer was transferred to the Italian front where he remained until the end of the war and where he received two more decorations--the Bavarian Military Service Medal, 4th class, and the Iron Cross, 1st class.

Streicher's early decorations and promotions indicate that he entered the war with enthusiasm and thrived under battle conditions. To his superiors, Streicher seemed to possess an almost demoniac love for

---

23 Ibid.

24 Ruehl, Der Stuermer, p. 40. It is uncertain whether Streicher joined voluntarily or responded to orders as a reservist.

25 Ibid., which is also the source for the following.
fierce fighting. It was under the heaviest engagements with the enemy that he distinguished himself by his unflagging energy and fearless acts. Streicher's combat performance was discussed at a staff meeting of his battalion officers just before he was promoted to temporary officer rank. One officer speculated that perhaps Streicher acted so bravely because he wanted to erase his poor record as a military trainee. Another commented that if many soldiers followed Streicher's example in front of enemy fire the casualty lists would be staggering. It was decided, however, that the promotion could not be denied. In rendering this decision, the senior officer added that he hoped that more combat experience would shape Streicher into an inspiring, though more cautious leader.

There is no evidence to indicate that Streicher's enthusiasm for fighting waned after his promotion to officer rank. He received three more decorations with citations praising his "outstanding bravery in front of enemy fire."26 His activism and love of struggle became a personality characteristic which remained with him for decades after the war.

This trait by itself does not explain why Streicher constantly exposed himself to death on the battlefield. Such behavior was not normal for front-line soldiers. In Streicher's case it was a type of irrational fearlessness which developed into an attitude that his destiny was guided by fate. This belief was doubtless reinforced with each successive narrow escape from death. After the war he spoke openly and frequently about the fact that fate—or an "inner voice"—was the principal

26Ibid., p. 39.
motivating factor of his life and destiny, which, he claimed, was coupled irrevocably with the destiny of his country.\textsuperscript{27}

\textsuperscript{27}NAW, IAJS, testimony of Julius Streicher, September 1, 1945. Streicher testified that he made the following statement in a speech shortly after the end of World War I: "Destiny told me to fight to the death . . . for my country." Other verbal manifestations of the personality characteristic will be discussed subsequently.
CHAPTER II

POST WORLD WAR I POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

After the armistice, Streicher returned to his home in Nuremberg. By this time he was the head of a growing family. His wife, Kunigunde, whom he had married in late 1913, had borne him two sons during the war years. Lothar, the elder son was born on January 2, 1915, while the younger son, Elmar, was born on March 16, 1918. Streicher immediately resumed the teaching position he had left four years earlier. Before long he also became an active participant in political meetings. He later claimed that when he returned home in 1918 he had originally planned not to enter politics again. He said: "I intended only to stay in private life and devote myself to my profession."\(^1\) He contended that he was drawn back into politics because of the Socialist revolution that was sweeping Bavaria at that time.

In December, 1918, Streicher joined the growing opposition to the Socialist regime of the new Bavarian Republic by entering a local branch of the Society for Protective and Defense Action (\textit{Schutz und Trutzbund}).\(^2\) Formed "to counter the growing power of the Bolshevik Jews," the Society was bitterly opposed to the "Jewish" government of the

\(^1\)IMT, Vol. 12, p. 308.
\(^2\)Ibid.
Independent Socialist, Kurt Eisner, who was actually the only Jew in the government. Eisner had also led the uprising against the Wittelsbach dynasty in Bavaria in early November, 1918.³

Streicher became a regular speaker at the society's meetings. His topics generally reiterated most of Germany's present problems which, he claimed, were "all caused by the Jews and their friends."⁴ Streicher's campaign against the Jews began in a manner which reflected his explosive, undisciplined personality. Before and during the war he may have been concerned with racial issues, but there is no record that he spoke openly of them. After he returned to civilian life, however, he suddenly became the most virulent anti-Semite in the Nuremberg area. When questioned later about this dramatic shift in his political attitude, Streicher explained that his interest in anti-Semitism was kindled when he read Theodor Fritsch's Handbook on the Jewish Question during the closing months of the war. He added that after he had returned home, "something told him" that his life task was to fight the Jews.⁵

Streicher would offer no other reason for his sudden dedication to anti-Semitism besides this vague allusion to an inner voice which was obviously a reiteration of his belief that fate guided his destiny. The timing of this change, however, suggests that other factors reinforced this mystic "conversion" to a career dedicated to a violent struggle against all things Jewish. A man with a distinct flair for politics, he


⁵SBN, Ruehl, Der Stuermer, p. 43.
may have learned quickly that he could capitalize on anti-Semitism which became a popular movement in Germany shortly after the war. Many Germans believed at the time that the Jews were foremost among the villains who caused the humiliating loss of the war. For these reasons mentioned, and because it was a Jewish Socialist, Kurt Eisner, who had led a revolution in Munich during the closing days of the war, anti-Jewish feelings were particularly strong in Bavaria.6

Streicher's early speeches attracted large audiences and thrust him quickly into political prominence in the Nuremberg area. By early 1919 he had already outgrown the role of guest speaker at political meetings and began to schedule events where he was always the principal speaker. He later described one of his experiences in this role:

My first meeting in the Hercules Velodrome was crowded. Ten thousand people were standing in front of the assembly hall, and the crowd had to be kept in order by the police. I spoke at this assembly for three hours... Until the year 1921, I had a big mass meeting in Nuremberg every week. Besides that, I participated several evenings during the week in discussions. . .7

Within a few years he had become the most influential völkisch politician in Franconia, a Bavarian province of approximately 1.5 million people.8

(See Frontispiece.)

6Ludwig Wagner, Hitler: Man of Strife (New York, 1942), p. 95.
7NAW, IAJS, testimony of Streicher, September 1, 1945.
8SBN, Ruehl, Der Stuermer, p. 40. The word völkisch is an untranslatable term in German political language. It refers essentially to right-wing elements which sought to build a German political system on the basis of ill-defined racial, rather than legal affinities among the German people.
In addition to political power, his rabid anti-Semitism brought him a considerable income through his publications. In later years the income from his weekly newspaper, Der Stürmer, allegedly made him a millionaire.9

Another factor which undoubtedly reinforced Streicher's plunge into anti-Semitism was the spirit of struggle which he had developed during the war. This personality characteristic was so intense at times that Streicher, as stated earlier, was once described as possessing an "almost demoniac love for fierce fighting."10 After November, 1918, the Jews appeared to be the ideal substitute for the enemies of the war years. In his own words, Streicher said that when he returned home after the war, he saw that the Socialists and Jews were threatening to take over Germany, and already a "Polish Jew named Eisner Kosmanowsky" (Kurt Eisner) had seized the Bavarian government in the November revolts.11

The most unique aspect of Streicher's anti-Semitism was his fanaticism which became so extreme that he was often viewed with awe by National Socialists. In fact, Hitler once called Streicher the pioneer of the anti-Semitic movement.12 His unceasing diatribes often reached the point of blind, almost religious fervor and ultimately earned him the unsavory epithet of "Number One Nazi Jew-Baiter."13

---

9Peterson, Limits of Hitler's Power, p. 253.
10Ruehl, Der Stürmer, p. 41.
11IMT, Vol. 12, p. 308.
12Peterson, Limits of Hitler's Power, p. 226.
In an attempt to explain Streicher's extremism in the Jewish question, Edward Peterson hypothesized that Streicher might have been part-Jewish, and with the resurgence of the anti-Semitic movement after World-War I, he struggled to conceal his background in all conceivable ways. Peterson offers this hypothesis on the basis of information that the birth records of one of Streicher's grandmothers had been removed from the Bavarian Government Office of Vital Statistics upon Streicher's orders when he was the Gauleiter. Streicher's concern with his questionable heritage may have been indicative of his sensitivity on the subject, but other factors appear more relevant when the attempt is made to understand why he became such a fanatic anti-Semite.

While he was in the Nuremberg jail awaiting trial in late 1945, Streicher was examined by an international team of physicians and psychiatrists whose conclusions help to explain how and why he became such an unreasoning fanatic. After many tests, he was diagnosed as not insane, but definitely an obsessive neurotic on the race question. (In the case of obsessive neuroticism, according to Sigmund Freud, "a ceaseless struggle is being waged against what is being repressed, with the repressing forces steadily losing ground." In Streicher's case, the repressing forces were those fears or threats of punishment which restricted his irrational behavior. For example, when he acted irrationally in the military training camp, he was punished and thus his undisciplined mind was repressed for the time being. From 1908 to 1914

14Peterson, Limits of Hitler's Power, p. 225.
he lived and worked in a stable society that would not tolerate irrational behavior. During the years of World War I the repressing forces were weakened as Streicher was encouraged by decorations and promotions to act in an undisciplined manner in front of enemy fire.

When he returned to civilian life and became a racial activist, his irrationality was only occasionally restrained by fines and jail sentences. On the other hand these restraints weakened in the face of great financial and political rewards that his uninhibited activities provided. Streicher was encouraged to attack all things Jewish in a sensational and virulent fashion because these diatribes attracted the largest audiences and the most readers, and thus increased his income and political popularity in the 1920's.\textsuperscript{17}

Streicher's racial fanaticism was also nurtured by another personality characteristic--a strong desire to be complimented and admired. By Freudian definition Streicher suffered from a form of chronic ego-centricism, which, Freud says, is clearly recognizable "if the person seeks praise about his sex abilities, achievements, or organs."\textsuperscript{18} During his lifetime Streicher displayed all these symptoms.\textsuperscript{19}

It may be assumed that Streicher's racial outbursts became more rabid because of his insatiable appetite for praise and popularity. As

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{17}BSA, PAJS, Vol. I, folder 1730. Report to Bavarian Police Office from the Neustadt City Government, March 28, 1922. It was noted in the report that the meeting was over-crowded because Streicher had advertised to speak on a sensational racial topic.

\textsuperscript{18}Freud, The Basic Writings, p. 410.

\textsuperscript{19}Institut für Zeitgeschichte, Munich (hereafter cited as IZM), Göring Commission Reports, doc. nr. 1757 - P.S. The reports cited occasions where Streicher forced his chauffeur to admire his body as he lay naked. At other times he reportedly bragged about his sexual prowess.
\end{flushleft}
mentioned above, he had learned that his audience grew larger and more enthusiastic when his racial diatribes increased in virulence and sensationalism. His repeated references to sexual aspects of anti-Semitism attracted large crowds, especially women, who often praised him and brought him gifts or strewed his path with flowers. Un-doubtedly he was further encouraged to intensify his anti-Semitic attacks because his ego felt most gratified when he received praise for his "dedicated anti-Semitism" from Hitler—whom he looked up to as a god.21

In the early days political events seemed to play into Streicher's hands. Eisner, while well-intentioned and sincere, was a man without leadership qualifications and unable to cope with the innumerable problems that faced him. Badly defeated at the polls in January, 1919, he was assassinated a few weeks later—by a half-Jewish officer, Count Anton Arco-Valley, who by this deed wanted to prove himself a true German.22 A moderate Socialist government then took over, but was equally unable to assert its authority.23 It was temporarily superseded by a Communist regime which was also shortlived and removed by the

20BSA, PAJS, Vol. II, folder nr. 1731. Police report on a political meeting at the Geissmannssaal in Fuerth, March 15, 1924. This was one of many occasions where women comprised the majority of the audience and threw flowers in his path after heaping his rostrum with candy and cigars.

21Hamilton Armstrong, Thus Speaks Germany (New York, 1941), p. 47. Streicher is quoted here as asserting that it was not correct to compare Christ with Hitler because Hitler was far too big a man to be compared with one so petty.


military after a bloody struggle.\textsuperscript{24}

In the end, the pendulum of political authority swung to the extreme right. A deputation of the regular army, the police, and the volunteer free corps installed a conservative judge, Gustav von Kahr, as virtual dictator over Bavaria. Kahr had little political experience or imagination. He had been a Privy Councilor in the wartime government, and for unknown reasons was considered in some circles to be the "strong man" of Bavaria.\textsuperscript{25}

More important than Kahr himself were some of the key civil servants such as Ernst Pöhner, the chief of police, who was a rightist revolutionary at heart. When questioned by a politician about the growing number of political terrorist organizations in Bavaria, Pöhner answered: "Herr Representative, there are not nearly enough of them for me."\textsuperscript{26} Under Pöhner, Munich became a haven for radical rightists, such as disgruntled militarists, monarchists, conservatives, and a large mob of uprooted, unemployed war veterans. These groups formed political clubs and parties according to their interests which were generally aligned in their negative political opinions. They all shared a common hatred for the Weimar government, the Versailles treaty and the "worst enemy of all--the Jew."\textsuperscript{27}

As mentioned previously, a strong anti-Semitic movement began to spread rapidly throughout Bavaria. In late 1919 a police report noted

\textsuperscript{24}Frederick Schuman, \textit{Nazi Dictatorship} (New York, 1939), p. 13.
\textsuperscript{25}Schuman, \textit{Nazi Dictatorship}, p. 13.
\textsuperscript{26}Wagner, \textit{Hitler}, p. 106.
\textsuperscript{27}Ibid.
that there might be serious pogroms against Jews in the near future, and that many Jews had already left Munich because of this.28 The Kapp Putsch, in March 1920, caused a further reaction among Bavarian anti-Semites.29 Some political leaders, such as Kahr, began advocating secession from the Weimar Republic. Kahr publicly wrote and spoke against the "Jew-dominated Berlin government."30 A political newcomer, Adolf Hitler, was beginning to attract large audiences as he spoke against the national government and the "evil Jews."31 The Nuremberg Schutz-und Trutzbund held a large demonstration on January 20, 1920, and issued an official memorandum (Denkschrift) condemning "many Jewish practices."32

This, however, seems to have been an exceptional undertaking, for by that time Streicher was at odds with many members of the Nuremberg "Bund." He resented the fact that "they wanted to work only in small circles.33 These narrow goals were obviously not suited to his activism and fighting spirit. He resigned from the "Bund" in early 1920 and sounded out larger völkisch parties with more ambitious programs.34

28SBN, Mueller, Geschichte der Juden, p. 188.
29The Kapp Putsch was an abortive attempt by a right-wing element, backed by certain units of the Free Corps, to take over the German Government.
30SBN, Mueller, Geschichte der Juden, p. 189.
32SBN, Mueller, Geschichte der Juden, p. 190.
33SBN, Ruehl, Der Stuermer, p. 43.
34Ibid.
In April he joined a newly founded organization, the German Socialist Party (Deutsch-Sozialistische Partei) (DSP). This group was founded by an engineer, Hans Vey, and its political tone was anti-Catholic and anti-Semitic.\(^{35}\) In view of Streicher's Catholic parentage and upbringing it seems surprising that he would join an anti-Catholic party. The German publicist Manfred Ruehl explains that constant censure by rigid Catholic school inspectors during his early teaching years turned Streicher against the Catholic faith.\(^{36}\)

At the founding of the DSP at Hanover in April, 1920, it was decided that a party newspaper should be published. The need for urgency was noted especially because Reichstag elections were scheduled for June 6. A certain professor Bohneberg was named by the party's central committee as the official editor. When he procrastinated, Streicher seized the initiative, and on June 4 published the first official newspaper of the DSP, entitled the German Socialist (Deutscher Sozialist).\(^{37}\) In the first issue, devoted mostly to the elections, Streicher's name appeared as the first DSP candidate for a Reichstag seat. However, he did not win in this try.\(^{38}\) In his appeal to voters, Streicher authored articles reflective of DSP policies. Each issue included denunciations

\(^{35}\)Ibid., The Deutsch-Sozialistische Partei is not to be confused with the Deutsch-Sozialen Partei which was under the leadership of one Richard Kunze.

\(^{36}\)Ibid., p. 87.

\(^{37}\)BSA, PAJS, Vol. I, folder 1730. Report to the Middle Franconian Police Commissioner, August 2, 1920. Streicher eventually became the publisher and the business office was located in Nuremberg.

\(^{38}\)SBN, Ruehl, Der Stuermer, pp. 43-44. Out of 1,657,000 total votes, the DSP candidate polled only 2,351 in the election.
of certain Catholic Churches and Jewish leaders. Other major party themes included the unification of all German people and the allegation that all German families deserved a "piece of land and a little garden of their own." In subsequent issues of the Deutscher Sozialist, Streicher referred to himself as public spokesman of the party, but his articles mentioned party policies only rarely. His interests appeared to concentrate increasingly on racial issues. His articles on anti-Semitism became more numerous and rabid. For example, the first two issues of the Deutscher Sozialist published after the Reichstag elections were devoted almost entirely to the "evils of world Jewry." He claimed that it was Jewish money that had corrupted the voters and that an organization of international Jews planned to dominate the world. He further alleged that the Jewish "plan" included the de-flowering of all "Aryan virgins."

Streicher's attacks against the Jews in the Deutscher Sozialist became so base and bizarre that many of the members of the DSP began complaining openly that such radical journalism was ruining the respectability of their party. Streicher was urged to tone down his anti-Semitic articles but he adamantly refused and a series of violent arguments over this matter ensued. He openly defied this segment of the party in May, 1921, when he shouted to these men that the Deutscher

39 Deutscher Sozialist, nr. 1, June, 1920.
40 Ibid., nrs. 3 and 4, June, 1920.
41 Ibid.
42 BSA, PAJS, Vol. I, folder nr. 1739. Report to Middle Franconian Police Commissioner, July 21, 1921, which is also the source for the following.
Sozialist was his private paper and therefore he could write anything he desired. The newspaper had a circulation of almost 10,000 at this time, but lacking the support of many DSP members it began experiencing financial problems. This was noted in the following appeal to his readers which also illustrated Streicher's clever tactic of associating clean physical and moral habits with his anti-Semitic propaganda:

There are many ways to help (the Deutscher Sozialist): A saved drink, an unsmoked cigarette, a filthy cinema not visited. Get rid of these habits! You will make yourselves conquerors and feel filled with satisfaction. Recruit readers! Order blanks are available free of charge at the business office. Everyone should give as he can. Even a little becomes a lot by its number.

Despite such pleas, the Deutscher Sozialist continued to flounder financially until Streicher stopped its publication in September, 1921. At that time he also resigned from the DSP.43

He soon joined another political group, the "German Working Community" (Deutsche Werkgemeinschaft) (DW). This party was headed by a Nuremberg doctor, named Beck. Among the stated goals of the group were the creation of a "pure Germanic State;" a more equitable tax system; and the development of a strong rightist movement.44 Streicher became a very active DW member, and in October, 1921, published the first issue of its party newspaper, the German People's Will (Deutscher Volkswille) (DV). The financing of the new paper, like that of its predecessor, was accomplished in devious ways--by pocketing money.

43SBN, Ruehl, Der Stuermer, p. 103.
44Ibid., p. 47.
collected at party meetings; by begging and borrowing from friends; and by repeatedly changing printing houses instead of paying printing costs incurred. 45

The first few issues of the Deutscher Volkswille were somewhat subdued on racial matters, but Streicher's articles soon became as virulent as those of the Deutscher Sozialist. For example, one leading front page article was entitled: "Why the German People Must Break the Chains of Slavery to the Jews." In another issue he argued at length that Jews and other foreigners should "leave Germany or die." 46

These vicious anti-Semitic attacks were severely criticized by some members of the DW for the same basic reasons that certain members of the DSP had complained about in the earlier vitriolic racial articles. Despite these reprimands, Streicher soon became a leading voice of the party, whose membership had increased markedly. 47 An important reason for the sudden growth of the DW was the fact that many of the more radical members of the DSP left that organization and followed Streicher. Prominent among this group was Walther Kellerbauer, well known anti-Semitic journalist, who, with Streicher, led the powerful new radical wing of the DW. 48

After Streicher joined the DW he became increasingly active in politics and newspaper work. In December, 1921, he participated in the

45 Ibid., p. 103.
46 Ibid.
47 Ibid., Ruehl states that the membership of the DW was recognized as "much more sizable" after Streicher joined it.
48 Ibid.
founding of the "German House" in Nuremberg. This establishment developed into a central library of German books and other printed material specializing in nationalism and anti-Semitism. Lengthy articles written by Streicher appeared regularly in the Deutscher Volkswille. He usually wrote in a radical and sensational manner. Although his targets were mostly Jews, occasionally he also attacked non-Jewish public figures. In November, 1921, he wrote an article ridiculing General Erich Ludendorff for taking so long to understand "what others saw long ago, that the greatest people in the world, the German people, were being destroyed by the poison of the Jews." He also criticized large industrialists, such as the Krupp family, for their privilege and greed. Former Emperor William II was blamed for beginning and losing World War I because he had listened to the poor advice of "strangers."

DW meetings were always well attended when Streicher was the featured speaker. Contrary to Hitler's roaring voice and rapid delivery, Streicher spoke in low tones at a moderate pace. His speeches, however, were never well organized. He usually appeared to be reiterating the spontaneous thoughts of his undisciplined mind. Although his topic was almost always some form of anti-Semitic attack, his

---

49 The Ohio State University, Captured German Documents on microfilm (hereafter cited as OSU, CGD), series T-580, roll 306.

50 Deutscher Volkswille, November 11, 1921.

51 Ibid., April 4, 1922.

52 Ibid., May 10, 1922.

53 BSA, PAJS, doc. nr. 2217/22. Copy of legal brief from trial at Schweinfurt, September 5, 1922.

54 SBN, recording of speeches by Nazi leaders.
particular point was difficult to discern because he habitually confused
his theme by inserting irrelevant or erratic statements. For example, he
interrupted a long racial tirade in February, 1922, to make comments about
Hitler and Walter Rathenau, the Jewish foreign minister. He referred to
Hitler as "a former house painter who should be complimented because he
spoke well on the Jewish question." This statement was followed by the
remark that he (Streicher) was being accused by Jewish newspapers of
planning the murder of Rathenau. 55

In March, 1922, Streicher suddenly and unexplainably began dis­
playing the swastika, or Hakenkreuz, wherever he spoke. This created an
additional measure of agitation among segments of his audiences. At the
first public display of this symbol at a DW meeting in Neustadt, his
speech was interrupted frequently by hoots and catcalls. Streicher
described this chaotic meeting himself in the Deutscher Volkswille. He
claimed that the disturbances were caused by Jews and "Jew-sympathizers"
who resented his "truth" about Semitic evils. He further alleged that
the swastika added to the excitement and dissension of his "enemies"
because this symbol was already well known in southern Bavaria as a
banner of a growing anti-Semitic movement. He concluded his article with
the warning that in the future he would give these "Jews something to
think about."56

55 BSA, PAJS, Vol. I, folder 1730. Report on Nuremberg meeting from
files of Nuremberg police office, February 27, 1922; Wagner, Hitler, Man
of Strife, p. 113. At the time of this speech, Hitler was serving a jail
sentence for causing a riot in Munich. Although Rathenau was not murdered
until June 24, 1922, rumors in the Munich streets prophesied his as­sas­si­
nation some months earlier in threatening limericks sung aloud by volkisch
hoodlums.

56 Deutscher Volkswille, March 3, 1922.
Middle Franconia, complained to the government police office that Streicher had caused "great agitation" when he placed a large, red swastika over the door of the Electric Plant and made a fiery speech condemning all things Jewish.57

A few days after his introduction of the swastika at Ipsheim, Streicher spoke at another Franconian town, Schonungen, where the DW meeting ended in a bloody riot. In a long harangue he accused Jews of practicing ritual murder. He claimed that sixteen newspapers had told about the disappearance of some 100 German children before the Jewish Easter season of 1919, and that in Nuremberg, three young boys disappeared mysteriously at this time in 1920. Since none of them were ever found, Streicher concluded that they must all have been victims of the Jewish blood ritual. He explained that his reasoning was based on the teachings of the Talmud, which instructed Jews to kill Christians, especially children, and to drink their blood in a certain ritual during the Jewish Easter season. Streicher escaped unharmed from the ensuing riot but was subsequently sued by a group of Jewish men for openly insulting the Jewish religion.58

Streicher was brought to trial September 5, 1922, and the jury found him guilty of the charge. He was sentenced to fourteen days in prison.59 The case went to an appellate court, and the sentence was


58 Ibid. Report on the meeting at Schonungen in the files of the Nuremberg police office, March 16, 1922.

59 Ibid., doc. nr. 2217/22. Copy of legal brief from the trial at Schweinfurt, September 5, 1922.
reduced to a fine of 2000 marks and costs of the legal proceedings. The lighter sentence was imposed by an appeals judge who seemed to be sympathetic to Streicher and his strong racial feelings. Thus he stated in his verdict:

...that the defendant...is a very impulsive man and is anti-Semitic due to his German feelings. He fights the Jews as a race as he feels their existence is a threat to the people.60

In both trials the judges assumed that Streicher was sincere in his belief that the murder ritual was still practiced by some Jews. As evidence, Streicher had presented two books, written in the twentieth century. Yet both authors referred only to suspicions that the Jewish ritual might still be practiced. They also offered interpretations of the Talmud which, they claimed, made it "quite certain" that the ritual had been customary in certain Jewish sects during past centuries.61

Following up on this vague evidence, Streicher advanced his main argument; a story about an alleged conversation with the mayor of a small town in Italy during World War I. He claimed the mayor told him that he was sure that some Jews in Italy still practiced the murder ritual because each year, just before the Jewish Easter season, several children disappeared mysteriously from his village.62

After Streicher's Schonungen speech, he received much publicity which served to boost his reputation as a controversial, if not

60Ibid., doc. nr. 2207/22. Copy of legal brief accompanying verdict of appeals court at Schweinfurt, November 10, 1922.
61Ibid.
62Ibid., doc.'s nr. 2217/22 and 2207/22.
interesting political figure. On March 28, the Civil Director of the town of Neustadt refused to issue a permit for a DW meeting, saying he "did not want Streicher and his swastika and speech."63 In early April, Streicher was the featured speaker before large audiences during two successive weeks in Nuremberg. The first meeting was considered a success by attending police because there were no disturbances. At the second one, however, Streicher could only begin his speech before hecklers, presumably Socialists or Communists, created so much turmoil that police dismissed the audience.64 The police report stated that this meeting was disorderly because of Streicher's ominous words at the previous meeting. He had reminded his listeners that the season for Jewish murder rituals was coming soon and that he (Streicher) would inform his audience the following week how the Jews could be stopped from "gaining full power."65

By mid-summer, 1922, Streicher had fallen from favor with large segments of DW moderates too, who argued that he "always put too much emphasis on the Jewish question." Anti-Semitic radicalism was repulsive to these moderates, who saw the goal of the DW as a "more spiritual and cultural development."66 Because of this conflict, the Deutscher Volkswille was boycotted in the large district of Augsburg, which was the

---


64 Ibid., Vol. I, doc. nr. 2978 br. Reports to Bavarian Government Police Office, April 4 and April 11, 1922. Both meetings were held at the Herkules Velodrom, Nuremberg.

65 Ibid.

66 SBN, Ruehl, Der Stürmer, p. 104.
stronghold of the moderate faction. Streicher was also opposed in the DW because he had adopted the swastika as a political symbol without party consent. His insistence on its further use caused much irritation within party ranks that he was contemptuously dubbed "His Excellency Hakenkreuz" by some of his critics. Streicher and his fellow radical, Kellerbauer, became embittered over this increasing opposition, and after a violent argument in early October, both resigned from the party.

---

67 Ibid. Since the DW had approximately one-half their members in the Augsburg district, Streicher lost many subscribers by this edict.
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CHAPTER III
JOINING FORCES WITH HITLER

On October 20, 1922 Streicher made a speech in Nuremberg announcing that he had joined Hitler's National Socialist movement. He pledged his loyalty to Hitler and urged his followers to join local NSDAP groups which, he said, he would soon be forming throughout Franconia. This speech was the first public notice that Streicher had accepted Hitler's leadership. To some observers this move may have appeared somewhat sudden inasmuch as it came within a week after Streicher had resigned from the DW. Streicher was already noted for his tendency toward volatile and impetuous acts. In this case, however, he seemed to act more like a crafty and pragmatic politician. A resume of the relationship between the two men in the months prior to the merger points out that the decision to join Hitler was not made in haste.

The earliest meeting between the two "Volkisch leaders was described by Streicher as occurring "sometime in 1921" when he traveled to Munich to hear Hitler speak. In his testimony before the International Military Tribunal in 1946, Streicher told in mystical terms that he was "compelled inwardly" to attend this meeting and continued that he knew almost immediately that Hitler possessed superhuman qualities:

\[^{1}\text{SBN, Ruehl, Der Stuermer, p. 51.}\]
I went to the Munich Buergerbraeukeller. Adolf Hitler was speaking there. I had never seen the man before . . . I saw this man . . . after he had spoken three hours, drenched in perspiration, radiant. My neighbor said he thought he saw a halo around his (Hitler's) head; and I, gentlemen, experienced something which transcended the commonplace. When he finished his speech an inner voice bade me to get up . . . I approached him and told him my name.  

The exact date of this meeting was not mentioned; likely the incident occurred after July, 1921, when Hitler had consolidated his absolute control over all members and sub-leaders at a Nazi party congress.  

Streicher's 1946 description of his first meeting with Hitler appears more as the fantasy of an obsessively neurotic mind than a factual recollection. He used such terms as "superhuman" and "halo" in describing Hitler. He was even ridiculed openly for statements such as these by his fellow Nazi prisoners at the Nuremberg trials. If he had been so deeply moved by this god-like apparition in the Munich Beer Hall in 1921, it is more than likely that he would have succumbed to Hitler's charisma immediately. Other men, reputedly more stable emotionally than Streicher, were unable to resist dedicating themselves to Hitler after their first encounter with him. A typical example of such immediate transformation is the case of Kurt Ludecke, an ardent Nazi organizer in the "early days" of the party. After his first meeting with Hitler, Ludecke wrote: "I had found myself, my leader, and my cause . . . I

2IMT, Vol. 12, p. 309.
3Orlow, History of the Nazi Party, p. 29. William Shirer, The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich (New York, 1959), p. 46. It was strongly rumored that prior to this time Streicher was considered a political rival of Hitler.
4Gilbert, Nuremberg Diary, p. 301.
had given him my soul."^5

Apparently Streicher was somewhat impressed by Hitler's speaking ability at their first meeting, but the impression was not strong enough to cause Streicher to give up his independence. By late 1921 Streicher was the leading voice of the DW and owner of that party's newspaper, the Deutscher Volkswille. He was already known as a person who insisted on being the leader, or leading voice, in his various political affiliations. Streicher's personality also included a penchant for ego-centricity and for undisciplined behavior. It is understandable that he would not be anxious to bind himself to the rules of a larger party or endanger the popularity and prestige he enjoyed as a leading figure of smaller, local volkisch parties.

There exists one other possible factor which may have restrained Streicher from joining Hitler in 1921 or early 1922. This deals with a plot by a certain group of dissident NSDAP leaders and members who sought to deprive Hitler of much of his political influence in the party. While Hitler was in Berlin, in early July, 1921, this group negotiated an agreement which would lead to a merger of the NSDAP and the DW. It was felt that the influx of members from another volkisch group would stratify the leadership of the enlarged Nazi party.® Hitler heard of this plot and hurried back to Munich and immediately resigned from the party.® This move came as a shocking surprise to the "rebels." Within a few days they

---


®Orlow, History of the Nazi Party, p. 27.

®Ibid., p. 28.
realized the indispensibility of Hitler to the future of the party and
implored him to withdraw his resignation. At the ensuing Congress later
in July, Hitler became sole leader of the NSDAP and he promulgated a
new code of party regulations which provided among other things that no
other groups outside Munich were to be recognized until they had accepted
Munich's (Hitler's) leadership. There is no reliable evidence that
Streicher was an active protagonist in this plot. William Shirer, the
American author, indicates, however, that Streicher was an active partici­
pant in the intrigue and states further that Streicher was then a "bitter
enemy and rival of Hitler." Shirer's allegations are not documented and
thus can be considered only as a hypothesis. If this hypothesis is valid,
however, one might assume that after the plot was exposed and failed, and
after Hitler had taken complete control and promulgated the new Nazi party
code, Streicher had reason to feel that he was in Hitler's bad graces and
would be rejected if he applied for membership in the Munich movement.

It has been noted that Streicher adopted the swastika as his
political symbol in early 1922. This emblem, a red and white banner,
emblazoned with a black, hooked cross, had been designed by Hitler almost
two years earlier as the official insignia of the National Socialist
movement. There is no recorded explanation why Streicher began using
this banner some eight months before he joined Hitler's party. One can
only conjecture that it was because he saw no future for himself in the

---

8Ibid., p. 32.
9Shirer, Rise and Fall, p. 44.
10Deutscher Volkswille, March 3, 1922.
11Wagner, Hitler, p. 110.
DW and was laying the groundwork for associating with Hitler on the best possible terms.

A brief analysis of Streicher's financial and political position in the months immediately prior to the merger indicates that if he intended to avoid bankruptcy and political oblivion in Bavaria he had little choice but to join Hitler in October, 1922. By mid-summer that year his Deutscher Volkswille was in dire straits principally because it had been banned in the district of Augsburg, where nearly one-half of the DW members lived.12 After he resigned from that party a few months later, the financial future of his publishing business became hopeless.

The German author Manfred Ruehl, offers some evidence that Streicher's financial dilemma was an important factor in his decision to join Hitler. Ruehl discusses a letter that Streicher allegedly wrote to Hitler on October 8, 1922. The contents describe the hopeless financial position of the Franconian völkisch press organs. Ruehl's source of information was the Neuer Kurier, which featured an article in 1946 about the Hitler-Streicher relationship.13 According to this article, the letter had been discovered by the president of the Nuremberg police in 1935 or 1936, and subsequently turned over to the Franconian Nazi Archive. Shortly afterwards, however, this letter disappeared and it was intimated that Streicher was responsible for its mysterious disappearance because the contents, if disclosed publicly, would have been an embarrassment to him as political ruler of Franconia. The newspaper article offered no specific details of the letter, nor did it substantiate the intimation

12SBN, Ruehl, Der Stuermer, p. 104.
13SBN, Ruehl, Der Stuermer, pp. 50-51.
that a firm agreement was made between the two men before the merger was officially announced. Nevertheless, the Neuer Kurier concluded that Streicher did not agree to join forces with Hitler until he was promised handsome rewards—both financially and politically.¹⁴

Streicher's record during these early post-war years reveals his extreme activism in Bavarian völkisch politics. This began when he joined the Nuremberg Schutz und Trutzbund in December 1918. Since then he had become a leading voice in the DSP and DW. His membership with the former group had been terminated because of inter-party opposition to his extreme racial radicalism.¹⁵ By mid-1922 it must have appeared inevitable to Streicher that for the same reason his days with the latter group were numbered. It is likely that if he wished to continue his political activism he would be seeking a new political affiliation.

The American author Dietrich Orlow states that the NSDAP was expanding rapidly in Bavaria in September, 1922. By then the party had been outlawed in virtually every other German state.¹⁶ In early October, Hitler's agents were actively recruiting in the Nuremberg area. One of these agents was Kurt Ludecke, who, according to his memoirs, visited Nuremberg about this time and urged Streicher to join ranks with Hitler.¹⁷ Ludecke recalls that he accompanied Streicher to Munich where a stormy luncheon debate ensued. After this luncheon, Streicher indicated willing-

¹⁴Ibid.


¹⁶Orlow, History of the Nazi Party, p. 42.

ness to secede with his followers from the DN and join the Nazi party. Ludecke further remarked that he considered this a valuable luncheon because the Hitler movement had gained not only a powerful volkisch activist but 1500 of his followers as well. No details of the discussion at the luncheon were offered in this account. Ludecke merely added that Hitler subsequently agreed to a private meeting with Streicher to iron out details of the pending merger. Although there exists no documentary evidence of agreements concluded between the two leaders at the time of the merger, one can reasonably conclude that Hitler granted Streicher broad party authorities on the local level, because as soon as Streicher publicly accepted Munich's leadership he took full charge of Nazi organizational activities in Franconia.

At least two authors, the American, Shirer, and the German, Ludecke, state that a feeling of bitter rivalry existed between Streicher and Hitler in the months prior to October, 1922. Since neither of these accounts is documented they cannot be considered factual. Whether or not differences existed between the two men in the earlier days poses an unanswerable question of minor significance. Of far greater importance is the fact that after the rapprochement a long-lasting and unusually close relationship developed between the two volkisch leaders.

Almost from the moment of the merger, Streicher became fanatically loyal to Hitler, and remained so for the rest of his life. In his book,
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20Shirer, Rise and Fall, p. 44. Ludecke, I Knew Hitler, p. 99.
21Gilbert, Nuremberg Diary, pp. 301-302.
Mein Kampf, Hitler publicly acknowledged his warm feeling for Streicher. In reference to the merger, Hitler pointed out that he appreciated the unselfishness of "this individual who sacrificed his own party for a larger goal."22 In a further accolade to Streicher, Hitler continued that this voluntary contribution greatly aided the early development of the NSDAP because it had provided a "bridge to the north" for his party.23 This phrase suggests that Hitler felt that the merging of Streicher and his followers to the Munich party provided an important link which connected the south Bavarian Nazi movement to scattered National Socialist groups which existed in the north of Bavaria at that time. Hitler's friendly feelings toward Streicher were to be exhibited in many other forms. In addition to granting Streicher positions of privilege and honor, the Nazi leader also remained a loyal supporter even after Streicher had become an embarrassment to the party and to the Nazi government.24 Streicher was one of the very few persons permitted to use the familiar Du salutation in addressing Hitler.25

Another remarkable feature is the rapidity with which this personal relationship developed. It may be possible that this phenomenon occurred as it did because there existed a long-standing compatibility

22Adolf Hitler, Mein Kampf (Munich, 1925), p. 575.
23Ibid.
24William E. Dodd, Ambassador Dodd's Diary (New York, 1941), p. 106. Dodd warned the Nazi government that Streicher's violent anti-Semitic attacks were hurting business between the U. S. and Germany. Hitler not only refused to interfere, he complimented Streicher on his "effective writing."
25Peterson, Limits of Hitler's Power, p. 226. Peterson states this numbered six or less persons.
SBN, Ruehl, Der Stuermer, p. 70. Ruehl states that Hitler allowed this familiarity to only four persons--Streicher, Drexler, Esser, and Roehm.
between the two individuals that remained dormant until they began working together for a common cause. This possibility bears consideration in light of the unique parallelisms in the lives of the two men before October, 1922.

Both Streicher and Hitler were born of humble parentage within a few years of each other.26 Their fathers were civil servants of mediocre category and their mothers were from the lower classes.27 Streicher and Hitler were both suspected of Jewish ancestry and in later years these charges, although unproven, were used by some historians as a possible explanation for their rabid anti-Semitic attitudes.28 Both became interested in politics before World-War I and when that disastrous conflict finally erupted, they entered the fray with enthusiasm and both displayed outstanding dedication and bravery toward the war effort and were decorated numerous times.29 Both men adopted or developed an attitude of fatalism and often remarked that destiny guided their lives and that this destiny was directly connected to the fate of their beloved country—Germany.30 They were both extremely forceful in their political and social convictions and were generally in agreement on most crucial

26 All reliable sources agree on facts concerning their humble ancestry and that Streicher was born approximately four years before Hitler.


29 Shirer, Rise and Fall, p. 30. Streicher's bravery and military decorations have been cited in the previous chapter.

post-war German issues and attitudes, such as the Versailles Treaty, the Weimar Government, the organized Church, the Socialists, Bolsheviks, and, above all—the evils of world Jewry.

The two became leading speakers in their various volkisch parties and possessed the ability to attract and often mesmerize large audiences with sensational and marathon-length speeches. It was said that only Hitler could outlast Streicher in lengthy oratory. Both were men whose extreme emotionalism regarding political and social issues often led them to illogical or irrational decisions and actions. This weakness cost them political reversals and frequent court penalties and punishments. It is interesting to note that Streicher was not considered an agitator during the war. On the other hand, Hitler was not promoted beyond the rank of corporal because of his constant emotional harangues over social and political issues. This difference in behavior was probably due to the fact that Streicher's political and social ideologies were not yet firmly formed in his mind.

After the war, however, Streicher became increasingly emotional in his political speeches and newspaper articles. Eventually his emotionalism over racial topics so dominated his behavior that he was often blind to the matter of practical politics. Contrarily, Hitler, who was also a rabid anti-Semite, did not allow his emotions over this...


32 BSA, PAJS, Vol. I, folder 1730. Report from Nuremberg Police files (no date). A record of Streicher's arrests, trials, and convictions. He received sentences totaling eleven prison terms or heavy fines. Wagner, Hitler Man of Strife, p. 113. Ibid., one of the many accounts of Hitler's conviction for high treason and subsequent prison sentence because of the abortive Beer Hall Putsch.
issue to rule his mind. In the final analysis it was this ability—or inability—to control emotions that proved to be one of the important factors which ended the parallelisms in the lives of these two men and altered the destiny of their political careers.

Immediately after publicly announcing that he had joined Hitler's ranks, Streicher threw himself energetically into the task of organizing NSDAP groups in his district. The Nuremberg branch was founded officially the same day of his informative speech, October 20, 1922. Streicher assumed the chairmanship of this group and named Ferdinand Buerger, an ex-DW colleague, as vice-chairman. Streicher delivered the keynote address at the first meeting and outlined some of the basic party objectives:

The goal of National Socialism is a complete reformation of Germany; a revolution, not a slow, well-behaved, quiet build-up. We will fight to the extreme. The question of the Jews is, and will remain, the central purpose of our fight. The Werkgemeinschaft failed because of this (moderation). The German problem cannot be solved without solving the problem of the Jews.  

Eight days after the founding of the Nuremberg NSDAP a large public meeting was held in the Nuremberg Colosseum where Streicher spoke before a capacity audience. He urged all his followers from other volkisch parties to join with the National Socialist movement and he claimed that the first Franconian branch already had approximately 1,000 members. In this and subsequent NSDAP meetings in Franconia there were virtually no vocal dissidents. A local branch of the party militia (Sturm-Abteilung) (SA) had been formed at Hitler's direction. These

33SBN, Mueller, Geschichte der Juden, p. 191.
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burly, brown-shirted brawlers proved very effective in preventing disturbances. Their force was felt at the occasion of Streicher's founding of the NSDAP branch at Augsburg on November 4th. Some dissenters, mostly Communists, attempted to disrupt the proceedings and were roughly expelled from the assembly hall by over 100 SA men who efficiently swept through the audience.36

Within a few months after joining Hitler's movement, Streicher became very effective in organizing local Nazi groups in Franconia. By the end of 1922 he was credited with forming NSDAP branches in Hersbruck, Lichtenfels, Erlangen, Forchheim, Ipsheim, Amburg, and Regensburg, in addition to Nuremberg and Augsburg. By early 1923, he had also assisted in forming local Nazi groups in Hassfurt, Pappenheim, Straubing, Bayreuth, Uffenheim, and Gunzenhausen.37 Streicher's success as a party organizer was due in part to the constantly deepening crises which developed in Germany during these months. The French invasion of the Ruhr Valley precipitated a crippling general strike. A disastrous spiral of inflation began which obliterated the savings of millions of German citizens. The Weimar Government was at its nadir of popularity. All classes of people had reasons to be disenchanted with the republican regime in Germany. Political groups which opposed the national government had little trouble finding recruits to swell their ranks. Under the impetus of the economic collapse and the national humiliation of the French invasion, Nazi party membership grew from less than 10,000 in

36OSU, CGD, series T-580, roll 307.
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December, 1922, to over 70,000 by early autumn, 1923.\textsuperscript{38}

Streicher's organizational success was also due to his ability to attract large crowds to his meetings. As mentioned earlier, anti-Semitism was an increasingly popular subject in Bavaria in those years. By the time he began his work for the NSDAP he had improved his speaking technique. Instead of disorganized harangues, he now combined his racial attacks with specific interests of his audience. For example, when he addressed an audience in Nuremberg composed mainly of workers, he spoke as follows:

I see thousands of workers, poorly dressed, passing me after a hard day's work-carrying a pot of soup. They speak of their hard life and unbearable misery. But other people also pass me by—clad in valuable fur coats, with fat necks and paunchy stomachs. These people do not work... The whole German people works, but the Jews live at the expense of the German workers... The only victor of the World War was the international Jew... We know that Germany will be free when the Jew has been excluded from the life of the German people.\textsuperscript{39}

The following month he spoke in the large hall of the Cultural Society in Nuremberg. Posters announcing the meeting stated that its purpose was to protest against the ever-increasing destruction of the middle classes. A police report stated that the hall was filled to overflowing and that when Streicher appeared he was greeted with "stormy applause."\textsuperscript{40} After a preliminary complaint about unfair press reporting,  

\textsuperscript{38}\textit{Schuman, Nazi Dictatorship}, p. 33.  
\textsuperscript{40}\textit{BSA, PAJS}, Vol. I, folder 1730. Report from Nuremberg police to the Bavarian Government Office, December 15, 1922, which is also the source for the following.
he moved dramatically into his major theme for the evening:

The middle class is the source of all creative and state-supporting forces, which must be protected under all circumstances. Once this middle class has been destroyed, the state must collapse in its foundations.

To illustrate his point, Streicher referred to ancient history. He spoke about the fall of the Roman Empire and claimed that it was not the Germanic tribes, but the Jews who were responsible for the collapse of that great civilization. He went on to state that the Jews took advantage of the hospitality of the Romans by first grasping all local businesses and then carrying off all movable wealth:

... Then they moved on. That is how it happened, that this rich Roman Empire, where every citizen was firmly established and lived well, drifted more and more toward an economy with big landlords and that the middle-class disappeared completely with the years.

Streicher usually spiced these "special interest" speeches with at least one sensational story based on sexual or sadistic crimes by Jews. This hysterical sensationalism was perhaps the principal reason why crowds of people, faced with the drabness of everyday life and the worries of unemployment, flocked to listen to the irrational fanaticism of the zealous anti-Semitic orator. In one of his more lurid stories he brought up the case of a local Jewish lawyer who had recently been accused of murdering two working-class girls. Although the lawyer, named Rauh, was later acquitted, Streicher insisted that the girls had been raped by Rauh, then poisoned with mercuric-chloride pills, sold by a Jewish pharmacist. In dramatic fashion, Streicher then intimated that this was part of the Jewish murder ritual, but "since he was denied free speech--and was
recently sentenced to jail for telling the truth—he could not speak further about this despicable crime."41 The police report on this meeting concluded that Streicher's speech was received with "fanatical applause," and that "the speaker made a fascinating impression. The report stated further that Streicher "speaks extemporaneously and succeeds in winning the support of masses of the audience and that he appears as a highly spiritual and capable leader who is a popular speaker (Volksredner) in the real sense of the word."42

A few weeks after he began his career as NSDAP leader and organizer in Franconia, Streicher was subjected to attacks by both political opponents and fellow party members. In an open letter to Nuremberg NSDAP headquarters dated November 15, 1922, a city councilman named Giermann condemned the National Socialist movement and threatened to "march against Streicher's handful of Nazi's with 50,000 workers."43 Nothing came of this threat but in a speech, Streicher jeeringly praised Giermann's "courage" and added that he regretted the councilman's lack of enlightenment.44 In December a "palace revolution" against Streicher was initiated by Walther Kellerbauer, former radical volkisch colleague and one-time editor of the Deutscher Volkswille. Kellerbauer accused Streicher of planning that newspaper's extinction in order to deprive him
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(Kellerbauer) of a livelihood. An argument ensued which developed into bitter animosity and caused a split among Nuremberg's Nazi leaders. Joining Kellerbauer were Ferdinand Buerger, deputy chairman, and Wolfgang Pressl, prominent member of the executive committee. These three men sought to wrest the leadership of the Franconian NSDAP movement from Streicher. They issued a formal complaint to Munich headquarters, demanding Streicher's ouster on the grounds of his lax living habits and his embezzlement of party funds.

During November, 1922, rumors were spreading in Nuremberg that Streicher's personal moral behavior was becoming increasingly scandalous. Streicher referred to these rumors in a speech in the Nuremberg Colosseum on November 23. He claimed that these were all lies and that the rumor-mongers would be sought out and punished. A police report later stated that these rumors had been investigated, but no concrete evidence of wrong-doing could be found.

Kellerbauer and his colleagues demanded that Streicher be made accountable for money collected at local party meetings. Over Streicher's objections, Hitler sent Major Walter Buch, chairman of the party's investigation and mediation bureau, to check into this matter. After a few days, Buch reported to Hitler that he could find no dis-
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crepancies in Streicher's party financial records. No information is available to ascertain whether or not Buch's audit was thorough and impartial. The end result of the complaint and investigation was that Streicher was absolved of all charges and reaffirmed by Hitler as chairman of the Franconian National Socialist movement.\textsuperscript{51}
CHAPTER IV

THE YEAR OF THE PUTSCH

The year 1923 witnessed a series of crises which threatened the very existence of the young German Republic. Serious problems began in January, when French troops occupied the Ruhr industrial area over a reparations dispute. In reply to this action the Weimar Government proclaimed a policy of passive resistance. This led to a crippling general strike which accelerated the momentum of an inflationary spiral bringing about the total collapse of the German economy. Millions of middle class families were left penniless, thus undermining the foundations of this important component of German society. Further hardship and suffering was added to the existent problems of the working class. The Weimar regime was generally blamed for these dire circumstances, and as this chaotic year progressed, political parties openly opposed to the central government increased markedly in popularity and size.

In the early days of 1923, Streicher was busy participating in meetings of local Nazi groups. He made speeches throughout Franconia and began organizing "German Days." These were actually rallies which brought

---

1F. L. Carsten, The Rise of Fascism (Los Angeles, 1967), p. 108. In 1914 the German mark was valued at approximately four to one U. S. dollar. At the end of the inflationary spiral in late 1923, the ratio was 4,200,000,000 marks to one U. S. dollar.
many Nazi groups together at mass meetings. The largest of these held that year was in Nuremberg and was attended by over 100,000 people.\textsuperscript{2} This was the first of the large-scale "Nuremberg Party-day rallies" which grew to spectacular proportions after the Nazis seized full political power in Germany.\textsuperscript{3} Besides devoting much time to consolidating his sole leadership of the Franconian National Socialist movement, Streicher began a campaign to gain full political control of Nuremberg. A Dr. Hermann Luppe was the mayor of the city. He had been generally accepted as a respectable political leader by most Nuremberg citizens. Streicher opened a quarrel with Luppe when he publicly denounced the mayor for robbing the poor, because he had purchased a coat, in 1920, from a used-clothing store where items were donated for needy people.\textsuperscript{4} From this inconsequential charge, Streicher expanded his verbal attacks against Luppe to include virtually every aspect of his character, activities, and office.

The accusations usually were in the form of grossly exaggerated and personally insulting half-truths and were mostly proven groundless in subsequent court hearings. In the early years of the feud Luppe was at a disadvantage. He was not a native Bavarian and spoke a north German dialect. Although he was an efficient administrator he experienced difficulty in establishing rapport with some Nuremberg citizens, notably the working classes. After listening to Streicher, many Nurembergers
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began to believe that "something must be wrong in the mayor's office."5

Luppe, however, was intelligent and was determined not to be discredited by false charges. He countered Streicher's attacks in every way possible. In January, 1923, Luppe demanded that Streicher be dismissed from his teaching position. Since the previous November, Streicher's teaching practices had been questioned by certain of his political enemies who allegedly remarked that he often stressed his racial views and was otherwise unqualified as a school teacher— that he belonged in a lunatic asylum, not a schoolroom.6 As a result of Luppe's demands, an investigation was launched in February by government school inspectors whose reports offer interesting details concerning Streicher's teaching methods and habits.7 One of the earliest detailed reports noted that the teacher was ten minutes late and that the pupils conducted their morning prayers without him. The report continued: "Then one of the girls stepped forward and began to conduct the lesson in arithmetic." After the teacher arrived "he went on with the arithmetic and gave problems concerning percentages . . . taken from daily happenings and according to the daily situation."8 The reading lesson was criticized because the teacher's introduction took nearly the whole hour and was "a senseless talk around sometimes only the pictures." The general criticism

5Ibid.

6SBN, Ruehl, Der Stuermer, p. 53.


of Streicher's teaching methods in this report stressed his poor lesson preparation, and his tendency to stray off into "meaningless oratory." The report, signed by an inspector named Grim, ended with a statement that there was no trace of anti-Semitism in Streicher's teaching that day.  

Throughout the year, the most frequent complaint against Streicher as a teacher was his unauthorized absenteeism. The first incident of this nature was noted by the same inspector who had filed the above report and who appeared somewhat partial and condescending to Streicher. It happened that Grim observed Streicher's classroom activities on a Friday. He stated in his report that the words "Off Tomorrow" were written on the blackboard. The report continued:

I knew that there was a party-meeting in Munich . . . but not wanting to antagonize Mr. Streicher I just asked him if I was correct that there was a flag-inauguration on Saturday or Sunday in Munich.  

Grim added that Streicher finally admitted his desire to attend the Munich meeting but that an official from the Ministry of Culture had already rejected his request for a leave because "it was for political purposes." Grim then apparently agreed with Streicher that "an exception could be made in this case, because only two hours of lessons were to be taught on Saturday." He gave Streicher verbal permission to be absent on Saturday but reminded him to arrange for a substitute teacher. Streicher did not

---

9Ibid.  
do this, nor did he return to his classroom the following Monday and Tuesday.12

This infraction played into the hands of Luppe and others who were pressing for Streicher's dismissal. The Frankische Tagespost, a newspaper known to be friendly to the Nuremberg mayor, carried an article in February entitled "How Long Still?":

... (Streicher) uses his meetings to arouse his listeners to violence against the Jewish population; to insult the City Council and our Mayor, Dr. Luppe ... Either Julius Streicher is mentally sick, in which case he belongs in an institution instead of in a school as a teacher, or he is sane, in which case he should be responsible for his actions. How long is the (Government) court going to wait until they do something?13

The following month another newspaper, the Nuremberg Anzeiger, carried on this attack:

How can Streicher, the agitator, be also an educator of our youth? The poor children who receive instruction from such a person should be pitied. It is a case that the Government should look into ....14

In early March, a full report of the investigation of Streicher's teaching activities was forwarded by the Bavarian Government authorities to the Nuremberg School Board. A public hearing was conducted and the final decision was indicative of the leniency and almost sympathetic understanding that Streicher usually received from judges and other governmental officials. The first charge against Streicher centered
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about the free speech law, which allowed all public employees freedom to express their opinion, but only within certain limits. Luppe's attorneys argued that Streicher was unfit to teach because he could not stay within the limits of this law. As proof it was reiterated that Streicher had been convicted for this violation the previous year for insulting the Jewish religion. The judges dismissed this charge with the following rationale:

The Government is confident that teacher Streicher has learned enough from his experiences . . . and conviction to restrain himself in the future and will avoid trouble . . . Therefore because of this past incident they (the judges) feel that the conviction was enough punishment . . .

The most serious charge dealt with Streicher's recent unauthorized absence. He defended this act by stating that he had written a request on Saturday for leave the following Monday and Tuesday. He also argued that Grim had agreed to this request verbally. At the hearing, Grim stated that he "could not remember exactly" all the details of his conversation with Streicher that day. The issue was further clouded by the fact that the written request was forgotten by the teacher who was supposed to deliver it to the office and thus the appropriate official did not receive it until after Streicher's classes had been left unattended for two days.

The result of this confused evidence was that the Nuremberg school

---
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authorities were rebuked for poor supervision. Grim was reprimanded for his part in the affair and Streicher was "sentenced to a warning." The report expressed concern that the political work of Streicher "will remain a possible handicap to his duties as teacher." 

Streicher renewed his attacks on Luppe after learning of his "exoneration" by the Government School authorities. In a speech on April 11, he ridiculed Luppe as a "dupe of the Jews," and accused him of planning to demolish the Hans Sachs monument to please his Jewish bosses.

Luppe responded to this obvious fabrication by sending a copy of this speech to Dr. Huber, President of the Franconian Government. Enclosed in the same envelope was a plea by Luppe that Streicher was undermining the Nuremberg City Government and that he should be suspended immediately as a teacher. Huber rejected this plea on the grounds that Luppe had already filed a suit against Streicher in a city court on the same charge and thus nothing could be done until the civil case was completed in Nuremberg. Luppe was not satisfied with this answer and continued to demand Streicher's immediate dismissal as a teacher. The Government Office of the Interior Ministry informed Luppe in early June that "steps were being taken to investigate Streicher's continued insults of Nurem-
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berg authorities." The net result of this probe was another governmental refusal to act on Luppe's demand:

Relieving Streicher as a teacher would not stop his continuation of the insults. It would, on the contrary, due to his free time, give (him) more opportunity for agitation and insult . . . To dismiss Streicher from the school is not yet possible because enough facts are not in our possession.22

While Luppe pressed in vain for immediate Government action against Streicher as a school teacher, he was again attacked in speeches and newspaper articles by the Nazi leader. In a speech in May, Streicher accused the mayor of tax-fraud and general dishonesty. He also said that Luppe was trying to make it impossible for the NSDAP to hold meetings in the Nuremberg Central Hall. After a long harangue, he finally read a resolution asking for the removal of Luppe as mayor. This was approved and passed unanimously.23

The next month Luppe continued to urge official disciplinary action. In letters to Dr. Huber he expanded his charges, stating:

. . . besides his open insults there are severe complaints against his moral behavior . . . but due to my work (load) I am not able to take the matter into my own hands.24

One of these complaints involved rumors of illicit relations between Streicher and the wife of a physician, a Dr. Jung, of Ipsheim. This rumor was investigated by police authorities and proved without

22 Ibid., doc. nr. 90. Letter from Dr. Huber to Luppe, June 5, 1923.

23 Ibid., folder nr. 1730. Police report of a NSDAP meeting in Nuremberg, May 11, 1923.

24 Ibid., doc. nr. 96. Letter from Luppe to Huber, June 12, 1923.
foundation. According to the police report, nobody could be found to state positively that there had been sex relations between Streicher and Mrs. Jung. The report ended as follows:

I (the police inspector) feel that Mrs. Jung was very enthusiastic about Streicher who is often in the limelight and who is quite popular with women. Also Dr. Jung is a follower of Streicher.25

Complaints against Streicher's teaching habits continued throughout the year. Inspector Grim reported that he had heard criticisms from the parents' association regarding the behavior of Streicher and a teaching colleague, Else Huith. "Both did not take their teaching seriously" and also requested that students use the greeting "heil," as Nazi party members greeted each other.26

In addition to the above charges, the school principal also filed an official complaint. He noted that Streicher often left his classroom to talk politics in the hallway with other teachers. The principal further criticized Streicher for inviting eight young workers to the school in early February. He told his class that these men had "escaped" from the French occupied Ruhr area; described the deplorable conditions which had driven them from their homes, and then asked the children if they would be willing to help these refugees in their hour of need. He repeated this in ten different classrooms and received cash donations from the children which totaled 43,000 marks. According to Streicher's account to the principal, the pupils were so sympathetic to these men

25Ibid., doc. nr. 102. Report to the Government Office in Ansbach from the Uffenheim police office, June 20, 1923.

26Ibid., doc. nr. 132. Report for the file by Dr. Huber, December 7, 1923.
that in the afternoon they voluntarily set a large table loaded with food for the eight refugees. The principal concluded his report with the comment that while he admired Streicher's concern for these unfortunate men, this act must be considered a violation of the rules because Streicher had not requested permission before he brought visitors to the school.27

August and early September were weeks of school vacation. Streicher was busy most of this time organizing the first "Nuremberg Party-day Rally." He also attended many meetings in which plans were discussed for the coming "people's revolution." Sensing that the complete disintegration of German political and social life might be near, leaders of militant political parties and leaders of the Bavarian Government were immersed in plans to move against the Weimar Regime.28 At the Nuremberg rally in September, Hitler alluded to the coming revolution. In a speech entitled "The Time is Five Minutes Before Twelve," he repeatedly warned that change was necessary and imminent and that all listeners should be prepared for the political upheaval ahead.29 Hitler was referring to his plans for a national revolution which would result in a Nazi take-over of political power in Germany. At the same time political leaders in Bavaria were finalizing their plans for a revolt in the form of secession from

27Ibid. Because of the rampant inflation the actual value of the cash donated to the refugees by the children did not amount to more than a few pennies of U. S. money.
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the central republican Government.\textsuperscript{30}

These revolutionary plans both culminated in failure on November 8th and 9th in a series of events known as the Munich Beer Hall Putsch. This affair was later celebrated by National Socialists as one of the important milestones in the development and growth of the Nazi party.\textsuperscript{31} While there is wide disagreement to be noted between various general descriptions of the abortive Putsch, Streicher's activities during the two days are clearly described and well documented with the exception of a few minor incidents.

Streicher received a telegram from Hitler on the morning of November 8th. The message contained a terse order to report to Munich immediately. Without doubt, Streicher sensed the urgency of the order because he contacted his school principal, Krauss, at noon and announced that it was imperative that he leave for Munich within the hour.\textsuperscript{32} Krauss reminded Streicher that leaves of absence were not granted for political reasons, but Streicher argued that this was a matter of national importance and he would go with or without official permission. Krauss finally consented to grant the leave on condition that Streicher be in his classroom the next day.\textsuperscript{33} Streicher, still unaware of the specific reason for the urgent order, drove with friends that afternoon to Munich. When he
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arrived there he read in a newspaper that a large meeting was to be held that night in the Buergerbraeukeller, which was a large beer hall in Munich. Unable to locate Hitler, Streicher could only learn from Nazi headquarters that important things would be happening at the beer hall meeting that evening.

This meeting had been scheduled initially by Bavarian political and military leaders in order to gain support for their movement to separate Bavaria from the German Republic. Hitler had been invited to join forces with them because of his large civilian and para-military following. The Nazi leader arrived at the beer hall after the proceedings had begun. He had the building surrounded with S. A. troops. Then he burst into the crowded room; jumped on a table; fired a pistol shot to the ceiling, and announced that the national revolution had begun and it was he, Hitler, who was to be the leader of the new government. He managed to coerce the leaders of the secession movement into a side room to discuss his proposal. A timely entrance by General Erich Ludendorff helped Hitler convince the secessionists to join the Nazi revolution.34

Streicher arrived at the beer hall after Hitler had done all this. Gustav von Kahr, leader of the secessionist group, was just announcing that he and his colleagues were joining the Hitler Putsch. Streicher then learned that a large group of revolutionaries, principally Nazis, were to march from the beer hall to downtown Munich and seize important military, police, and government buildings the next day. Later that evening, Hitler commissioned Streicher to organize and carry out

34Bullock, Hitler, p. 108.
propaganda speeches before the march.  

On the morning of the 9th Streicher spoke to huge crowds from a truck in various places in Munich. According to reports, he repeatedly announced that a new government had been formed; that Jews and imposters would be hanged; that the stockmarket would be closed; and that Adolf Hitler "would give you bread and butter." He later returned to the beer hall where a crowd of about 600 men had gathered and were milling around. Hitler appeared nervous and vacillating. Streicher was reported to have organized the lines and started off the march at the head of the column. Hanns Hoffmann, German author, states that while Hitler looked as if he was going to change his mind, Streicher cried "Herausfahren" (start to march) and began marching. Hitler then started silently behind him. As the marchers crossed the bridge over the Isar River they were met by armed police and soldiers. Although words were exchanged, the Nazis were not halted until they reached the Feldherrnhalle, which was

---

35 SBN, Ruehl, Der Stuermer, p. 53; Frankische Tageszeitung, nr. 262, November 8, 1938. A copy of Hitler's letter of authorization read as follows: "Mr. Streicher is commissioned by the provisional national government to organize and lead the speaking program. The transportation section should consider it of primary importance to cooperate with Mr. Streicher and furnish him the necessary vehicles. All speakers of the party are subordinated to Mr. Streicher and will receive their instructions from him."

The National Government
Adolf Hitler

36 SBN, Ruehl, Der Stuermer, p. 59. Harold J. Gordon, Jr., Hitler and the Beer Hall Putsch (Princeton, New Jersey, 1972), pp. 334-335. In addition to description, Gordon includes a photograph of Streicher speaking from a truck in the Marienplatz, a very large square in Munich, which was jammed to capacity with people listening to Streicher.

37 Hanns Hoffmann, Der Hitlerputsch (Munich, 1961), pp. 200-201; SBN, Ruehl, Der Stuermer, p. 59.
a monumental edifice in downtown Munich. Here the march ended when gunfire erupted. Sixteen marchers were killed, but Hitler and Streicher were among those who scrambled for safety. There is no valid information to indicate the source of the first shot. It is generally assumed, however, that Streicher was instrumental in causing the gunfire to begin. One marcher, Robert Kuhn, agrees with two other witnesses that Streicher sprang out of the formation and tried to convince the police to lower their carbines just before a small arms shot rang out. On the other hand, two German authors, Konrad Heiden and H. R. Berndorff, state that Streicher leaped out of the ranks and tried to snatch a policeman's carbine and then the first shot rang out.

The volley of gunfire which scattered the ranks of the Nazis ended Hitler's dream of a forceful and illegal seizure of political power in Germany. For Streicher's political career, however, the abortive Putsch was to prove beneficial. News accounts of his role in the Putsch catapulted him to prominence as a leading Nazi activist and his activities before and during the march placed him in a position of special favor with Hitler.

Streicher was arrested on suspicion of high treason that evening while he was returning to Nuremberg. The next day he was released "for

38 SBN, Ruehl, Der Stue:mer, pp. 59-60.
39 Berndorff, General Zwischen Ost und West, p. 112; Heiden, Der Fuehrer, p. 198.
40 SBN, Ruehl, Der Stuermer, p. 61. When other party officials complained to Hitler about Streicher, they were told: "Perhaps Julius Streicher is an unpleasant character to some of you, but he stood by me at the Feldherrnhalle and for that I will never forsake him as long as he does not forsake me."
lack of sufficient evidence." On Sunday, the 11th, he was seen speaking in behalf of Hitler from his own car in the streets of Nuremberg.41 It seemed now that he was too excited about recent political events to return to the classroom. The next day he succeeded in obtaining a fourteen-day sick leave from his principal, Krauss. Mrs. Streicher had appeared at the school in the morning and pleaded that her husband could not attend to his school duties because he was suffering from nervous exhaustion. On November 26, Streicher asked for an extension of his leave because he was "still not strong enough to return to teaching."42 This request was accompanied by a physician's opinion, which stated that Streicher's illness "consists of a functional nervous disorder of the neurasthenic kind." The physician recommended a full rest of eight weeks as necessary for total recovery.43

Streicher's political activities in November brought renewed demands for his dismissal as a teacher. Another public hearing was held in early December to consider the latest complaints which had been lodged by Luppe's attorneys. The charges were prefaced by a statement that Streicher should be suspended as a teacher because he had been grossly neglecting his school duties, and had allegedly used the time of sick leave for political agitation purposes. It was also noted that the Government had suspected him of treason because of his actions at Munich.


42Ibid.

43OSU, CGD, series T-580, roll 310.
The major complaint, however, was that he had been seen recently speaking at political meetings even though he was on sick leave. These charges were found valid by the judges at the hearing, and a Government directive was drawn up which officially suspended Streicher as a teacher until further notice. A copy of the directive was delivered to him a few days after the hearing.44 This was followed by a notice of the decision to the Nuremberg School Board, with instructions that during Streicher's suspension his salary would be reduced by one-third, and his living expenses and local pay supplements would be withheld.45

Streicher protested the charges against him vehemently. He denied that he had done anything treasonous. He explained in detail that he had no advance knowledge of what was to transpire in Munich when he went there. He also argued that after he had arrived at the beer hall, Kahr and other high military and political officials announced before thousands of people that the new national government had already been formed under Hitler. Thus, he reasoned, when he spoke about the new government from the truck on the morning of November 9, he had no idea that this was not a true fact.46 His defense against the treason charge was stated in an earlier petition protesting his brief arrest on the 10th. In explanation of his allegedly treasonous words on the morning of the 9th, he was quoted as stating: "My friends and I were all absolutely convinced of the


46Ibid., doc. nr. 202/1, folder 1730. Protocol, signed by Streicher in defense of his innocence regarding events in Munich, November 8 and 9, December 13, 1923.
legality of the new government and therefore thought that we were within the law in what we were doing.\textsuperscript{47}

The day after he received notice of his suspension, Streicher wrote to the Government School officials denying the charges against him regarding his sick leave. He stated that he had been examined again on December 10, by a doctor who again stated that there was no doubt about his sickness and that his leave was "based on facts." Furthermore, he noted, his appearances at the Nuremberg meetings during his sick leave were as a guest, not as the main speaker. He said that he had no intention to speak at either meeting but that in the first instance he spoke only to quiet the crowd, and the second time he spoke only "a few short words to show his opinion."\textsuperscript{48} In this letter, Streicher also explained that he had refused all formal invitations as a speaker and had not given any political addresses during his sick leave. He also defended the charge that he was "too involved in politics" with the following statement:

\begin{quote}
Walter Rathenau has said five years ago that within 20 years the German people will only be a historical thought . . . that what was once called Germany will be a desert . . . Is it not the duty of every German to try to prevent that this prophecy comes true? . . . It seems unnecessary to remark that this work of reviving the feeling of honor for the fatherland is a patriotic duty.\textsuperscript{49}
\end{quote}

The last lines of this letter indicated that he was somewhat resigned to

\textsuperscript{47}Ibid., doc. nr. 201, folder 1730. Letter from Attorneys Kelber and Titus to the Nuremberg Police Department, November 14, 1923.

\textsuperscript{48}Ibid., doc. nr. 143, folder 1730. Letter from Streicher to Office of School District IV, Ansbach, December 11, 1923.

\textsuperscript{49}Ibid.
his suspension. He stated that he knew that his work after school during "these days of destiny" conflicted with some rules of the school, but "whoever wants to help the people also has to sacrifice, even if it means losing his job." And finally, just above his signature, he closed the letter with a Luther-like statement of unalterable conviction: "I do not feel guilty--what I did was to follow my conscience. 50

Streicher's activities in Nuremberg immediately after the attempted Putsch pose an interesting question regarding his personality. According to police reports, he acted entirely out of character. The excitement of the recent political happenings in Munich was reflected in the Nuremberg streets on the afternoon of November 10. Mobs of people were milling around, discussing the defeat of Hitler's Putsch. Streicher's car was stopped by the throngs in the early evening. He stood up, waved his arms in a quieting manner, and spoke:

German men and women, behave as befits Germans! Do not make it difficult for these men (the police). Do not cause a spectacle as in Munich, where German blood was spilled by German men. 51

Streicher then began to sing the national anthem, "Deutschland über alles," and the crowd joined with uncovered heads. The police report on this event concluded that at least four officers agreed that Streicher had a calming effect on the crowd that day, and that Streicher gave the chief inspector binding assurance that he would not talk in public in the near

50 Ibid.
future without police permission. The question of why he reversed his usual pattern of behavior to act in a calming and cooperative manner remains a matter of conjecture. He may have been actually afraid of the police after recently witnessing the bloodshed in front of the Felherrnhalle or else he shrewdly realized that the Nazi movement was temporarily discredited and it was time to regain respect for the party in the eyes of the law. Kahr had outlawed the NSDAP and its affiliates in Bavaria on November 10, and Hitler and other activists in the Putsch were either arrested or being sought by the police on the charge of treason. The latter conclusion seems more likely because Streicher's war record indicated his lack of fear under fire. Also, throughout his political career he occasionally displayed the capacity to conceal his customary crude and antagonizing personality, and at times he was known to act as if he possessed a keen sense of political insight.

Leading figures in the November 9th march, besides Hitler and Streicher, included ex-General Erich Ludendorff, SA leaders Ernst Rohm and Hermann Göring, Hitler's aide Rudolf Hess, and Hermann Esser, an active Munich NSDAP speaker and organizer. Streicher, Rohm and Ludendorff were among those arrested immediately. The ex-General and Streicher were freed pending further evidence. Rohm was jailed to await trial. Göring, Hess, and Esser escaped and soon left Germany. Hitler fled to


53SBN, Ruehl, Der Stuermer, p. 63.

54Personal interview with Dr. Benno Martin, dated August 4, 1970. Martin mentioned that Streicher often behaved like a crazy man, but was also capable of very shrewd thinking and behavior.
the nearby country house of a friend, Ernst Hanfstaengl, where he was arrested on November 11th, by a small contingent of state militia.\textsuperscript{55} Hitler was imprisoned in the fortress Landsberg am Lech to await trial for treason. He was locked in a cell by himself and was allowed virtually no visitors during his first weeks there.\textsuperscript{56} He was able to learn, however, that there had been an upheaval in the Bavarian Government. Kahr and his regime had been ousted and a new Government formed. The new prime minister Heinrich Held, and the new minister of justice, Franz Guertner, appeared eager to cooperate with the defendants in the trial, which was scheduled in the near future.\textsuperscript{57}

News of the coming legal proceedings caused wide interest. The new Government consented to full coverage of the trial by radio. Reporters from all parts of Germany as well as from several foreign countries were in attendance when the trial began on February 24, 1924. When it ended about six weeks later, Hitler received a sentence of five years in jail, but he had actually transformed defeat into triumph. He had discredited the former political and military leaders of Bavaria and had impressed the German people with his nationalistic fervor and his eloquence. His name appeared for the first time on front pages of newspapers all over the world.\textsuperscript{58}

\textsuperscript{55}Wagner, Hitler, pp. 128-129.

\textsuperscript{56}BAK, Streicher Nachlasse, diary of Streicher from January 18 to February 24, 1924. While in the same prison, Streicher was not allowed to see Hitler or to speak to him from outside the cell door.

\textsuperscript{57}Wagner, Hitler, p. 132. Guertner was quoted as saying: "After all, the National Socialists are flesh of our flesh."

\textsuperscript{58}Shirer, Rise and Fall, p. 75.
During the days of Hitler's imprisonment some of the leading National Socialists were trying to continue the activities of the party despite its prohibition. Some men, such as Esser, Drexler, and Alfred Rosenberg, came together in Salzburg, Austria, where they published propaganda leaflets and newspapers which were smuggled into Germany. In Nuremberg, Streicher was trying to keep the movement alive. It was reported that when he appeared in public he did not stress the racial issue as he usually did, but was making overt attempts to win back followers to the Nazi cause by agitating against present governmental policies. To win the working class he attacked government attempts to increase the working day beyond eight hours. To attract farmers, he spoke against unfair mortgage laws on farm land. Minor government officials lent a sympathetic ear when he castigated the Kahr administration for reducing the "normal staff" of the civil service. Prime Minister Kahr, not yet removed from power, was worried about growing political dissension in the State, and moved to silence the Nuremberg leader. On January 18, 1924, he issued orders that Streicher be arrested and taken into "protective custody" because he (Kahr) feared that civil disorders might break out.

Some interesting incidents of this arrest and subsequent confinement are revealed in a diary kept daily by Streicher during this period. He recorded that four criminal investigators came to his residence about

---


60 Ibid.

61 Ibid. No specific term of confinement was mentioned in this order.
noon on January 18 and notified him that Kahr had ordered his arrest. These investigators appeared apologetic and repeated that the arrest had not been ordered by the Nuremberg police. Streicher continued that after the initial surprise, he soon became calm, and that his wife Kunigunde, "smiled strangely." Lothar, the elder son, became very excited while the younger son, Elmar, struck out at the one investigator who tried to be friendly. Streicher was taken to a local police station where he dictated a protest which demanded that he be informed of the specific reasons for his arrest. He recorded in his diary that he spent that night in a jail cell, where he read a book entitled Atlantis, Earth and Bible, before trying to sleep.

Coincidentally, a junior police officer on duty that night was one Benno Martin, who later became head of Nuremberg police and who ultimately gathered evidence which was used to topple Streicher from political power in 1939. Martin stated later that he had always been treated respectfully by Streicher because of a trivial incident that happened in the Nuremberg jail that night in January 1923. Apparently it was cold where Streicher was trying to sleep. He asked for and received a third blanket from Martin who saw nothing outstanding in this act but concluded that Streicher appreciated small acts of kindness or understanding.

62 BAK, Streicher Nachlasse, Streicher's diary. It is not likely that Kunigunde smiled because she was happy about the arrest. Throughout her married life she remained loyal and dutiful to her husband.

63 Ibid.

64 Interview with Dr. Benno Martin in Munich, August 4, 1970.
Next morning Streicher was taken by train to the fortress Landsberg am Lech. There he was placed in a cell-block with other Nazis being held in "protective custody." It is obvious from his description of a "cool reception" by about one-half of these fellow National Socialists, that Streicher was not too popular in their circle. The diary describes the dull routine of prison life. In the daytime the prisoners were allowed to talk together, to play cards or chess, and to take routine walks. At night each was locked in an individual cell. As each meal is described it is evident that the food was plentiful and tasty. Almost every entry complains of the bitter cold in the cell. On January 21, Streicher was ordered to take a physical examination at a dispensary which was across the hall from Hitler's cell. There was an armed guard in front of the cell door. The peep-hole was covered with paper so no one could look into the cell. Streicher wrote that he was afraid to "call out a greeting because that was strictly against orders." On January 25, Streicher went to the dispensary again, complaining of a severe cold. This time there were two armed guards in front of Hitler's cell door. Streicher wrote that he was determined to see and talk to the famous prisoner. He said he paced in front of the guards, talking about the weather, and when he had distracted their attention he jumped to the cell door, lifted the paper from the peep-hole and shouted: "Heil Hitler, here is Streicher!" The guards quickly pulled him away from the door. He was reported for this infraction and later punished by losing some

65 BAK, Streicher Nachlasse, Streicher's diary.
yard privileges for a few days.  

During this prison term, Streicher's wife sent frequent letters and parcels. He noted in the diary that he suffered a severe case of bronchitis. His wife and sister were allowed to visit him on February 1, and they brought him medicine, food, and flowers. He made a special request to be able to have himself photographed so he could send his picture to his father as a birthday present.

On February 4 he was permitted to send a letter to a Dr. Kelber accepting an offer by the Franconian "people's group" to be a candidate in the next Bavarian Landtag (parliament) elections. On February 11, Streicher noted that many of those in "protective custody" were allowed to cast their ballots in local elections. The final diary entry was dated February 24, 1924, when his wife and son Elmar surprised him with a visit on the day of his release from Landsberg. They returned with him to Nuremberg. Nothing was noted in the diary or elsewhere that the much heralded trial of Hitler and others began on the same day. Soon after his return home, Streicher resumed publication of his newspaper, Der Stürmer, which had been banned since the attempted Putsch.

The first issue of Der Stürmer appeared in April 1923, after a quarrel between Streicher and other leaders of the Nuremberg NSDAP. At a meeting on April 14, 1923, Walther Kellerbauer, Ferdinand Buerger, and others had accused Streicher of embezzling party funds and leading an immoral life. At a meeting four days later, Streicher charged his

---

66 Ibid. Streicher noted that he accepted the disciplinary punishment and declared with a laugh that if he had another chance he would commit the same "crime" again.

67 Ibid.
accusers with the same transgressions. This meeting was poorly attended, so two days later he published these counter-accusations in a six-page leaflet entitled Der Stürmer, with the headline: "Streicher's Answers to the Accusers and Slanderers."68 (See illustration next page.)

The first Stürmer was one-half the size of a normal newspaper and was double-spaced. The heading took nearly one-fourth of the first page. Under the title in bold type was the phrase "Special Edition in the Struggle for the Truth." Almost the entire issue was devoted to Streicher's denunciation of Kellerbauer, Buerger, and other "former party members who went sour." The final section of this polemic was entitled "Why?" Here Streicher charged that the reason these men became "traitors" was because of a "strong attraction toward the Jews." At the bottom of the last page was a single line in bold type: "Friends--think of Hitler."69

The following week's edition began a five-week series of attacks on Dr. Luppe. Streicher often wrote leading articles in the first person, directly against Luppe, accusing the mayor of such things as misusing public funds, failing to help the poor, or causing the widespread unemployment. The most frequent charge was that Luppe "was owned by the Jews."70 In early July, Streicher announced the aims of the Stürmer in somewhat vague terms:

In the Bavarian-German manner (you) believe the truth about these scoundrels! Wake up and com-

---

68SBN, Ruehl, Der Stuermer, p. 96.

69Der Stürmer, nr. I, April 20, 1923. This phrase, with slight alteration, remained the byline of the Stürmer for 22 years.

70Ibid., April to November, 1923.
Wer sie sind!

1. Ferdinand Bürger.


First Edition of Der Stürmer

April 20, 1923
bat half-heartedness and weakness in our city. Help strengthen our hearts for the coming 'Fight of Deliverly'. . . This is what the Stürmer wants!"  

From its inception the Stürmer called itself "a paper in the fight (or struggle) for the truth." As its title implied it was a "fighting publication." This type of paper has been described as one which rises and falls with the rising and falling power of a political movement and the mobilization of the masses for fight. . . Everything that is the usual substance of a newspaper is subordinated to the political fight. . .  

It was not the intention of the Stürmer to publicize information about daily life and happenings. Streicher followed a goal later described by Joseph Goebbels, Nazi propaganda expert:

For us the goal of the publisher is printed propaganda. It forms conclusions about political happenings. It does not leave it up to its reader to form his own conclusions. It openly follows the goal of political influencing. . . (The reader's) thinking and feeling is to be pulled in a certain direction. . .  

By mid-summer Streicher was concentrating on the theme which he obviously felt was the most important contemporary political thought. This was, with slight alterations, the same for over twenty-two years: "The Jew and His Crimes." In a typical article during 1923 Streicher wrote a leading article headlined: "Who is the Villain?" He began by

71 Ibid., nr. 6, July, 1923.

72 English synonyms for the German word Stürmer include "stormer," "assailant," and "forward."

73 SBN, Ruehl, Der Stuermer, p. 98.

74 Ibid., p. 99. Ruehl stated that he took this excerpt from Goebbels's newspaper, Der Angriff.
discussing the acute economic problems of the times. Then continued:

Is the cause of these problems the French?, the English?, the Russians?, the Americans? No—it is a common group—the Jews—who aim to control the world.\textsuperscript{75}

The last section of this long article was headed "Down With Capitalism." This was directed to the workers and for added effect Streicher addressed them in the familiar "du" form. In summary he encouraged the workers to go forth and do battle against the devil--capitalism. He concluded: "When capitalism is defeated--then also the Jew will go under."\textsuperscript{76}

Other Nazi leaders were often as virulent as Streicher in their anti-Semitic attacks, but they usually used more subtle reasoning than he did. Streicher's Stürmer tirades were always lacking in educated phraseology. He used banalities in childish language to reach even the lowest classes of people. His shocking attacks on individuals attracted many who enjoyed "gutter sensationalism." Some critics have intimated that Streicher wrote as he did out of necessity; that low-class journalism appealed to the largest number of readers; and that Streicher was willing to do anything to make the Stürmer a financial success. They argued further that since the paper was owned privately and received no financial support from the party, it had to sell in large numbers to keep alive.\textsuperscript{77}

There is, however, little other evidence to support this argument. Streicher's rabid style of journalism in the Stürmer did not vary much from his earlier newspaper endeavors.

\textsuperscript{75}Der Stürmer, nr. 11, August, 1923.

\textsuperscript{76}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{77}SBN, Ruehl, Der Stuermer, p. 99.
CHAPTER V

THE NADIR YEAR OF THE NATIONAL SOCIALIST MOVEMENT

The National Socialist movement suffered a severe setback with the failure of the Putsch. The NSDAP and most of its press organs were outlawed by the Bavarian government. Many Nazi leaders were in exile and others were in jail or free on bail, awaiting trial for treason. Alfred Rosenberg, editor of the party newspaper, the Voelkischer Beobachter, claimed that Hitler had issued a document from Landsberg prison naming him as interim party leader to be assisted by Max Amann, Hermann Esser, and Julius Streicher.¹ The radical political views and behavior of these four men were unacceptable to many prominent National Socialists. Some questioned the validity of Rosenberg's claim, while others seemed reticent to accept or follow the dictates of Hitler while he was in jail. Ex-general Erich Ludendorff was especially reluctant to consider Hitler's wishes regarding the party's future. Considerable animosity had developed between the two men since the Putsch had ended in a fiasco. Ludendorff was piqued because he had not been consulted in advance of the attempted revolt, and Hitler, in turn, resented the fact that the old soldier's bravery at the Feldherrnhalle had put him to shame.

During his early days in Landsberg prison Hitler complained:

I depended on Ludendorff—that was my greatest mistake! He forced us into this unnecessary massacre and then like a hero, walked right through the police lines. If I had tried it, I would simply have been shot down like a dog. That's why I ran away in the automobile. Now Ludendorff is a hero, and I am nothing but a coward."

While Hitler castigated himself in jail, ranking Nazis, with varying aims and ambitions, sought to form new, legal successor organizations to the NSDAP. Because of the oncoming Bavarian Landtag elections, all these factions united temporarily under the banner of the Völkischer Block.3 The dominant section of the Block was the National-Socialist Freedom Party (Nationalsozialistische Freiheitspartei) (NSFP) which was formed in December, 1923, when Ludendorff and others organized a merger of some prominent south Bavarian Völkisch groups with several northern Nazi local parties, headed by Gregor Strasser, a pharmacist and leader of a moderate wing of the National Socialist movement.4 In principle, the Block endorsed most standard NSDAP policies and most leaders professed loyalty to Hitler, but many were more moderate and more parliamentarian in outlook than the imprisoned leader.5 Some "old line fighters" did not agree with these moderate principles but during the election campaign the fight against external foes overshadowed any differences within the

---

2Wagner, Hitler, pp. 130-131.


4SBN, Ruehl, Der Stuermer, p. 61.

5Ibid. Gordon, Beer Hall Putsch, p. 572.
volkisch ranks. Once the elections were over, this superficial unity was shattered.

Streicher was a candidate for a Bavarian Landtag seat but his campaign activities were interrupted when he was subpoenaed to appear in court in Nuremberg on March 5 to face slander charges lodged by Mayor Luppe. In the subpoena Streicher was accused of making false and slanderous public statements which continually offended Luppe. Some of the defamatory remarks allegedly made by Streicher either orally or in writing during the previous year were:

Luppe descends from Jews;
Luppe is not qualified to be a mayor;
Luppe's election was arranged by way of a 'horse trade';
Luppe is not a patriotic German.

At the first day's court session, Streicher apparently attempted to create the impression that he was a patriotic and sincere German citizen. He appeared in a gray, military-style jacket decorated with his most prized World War I medal--the Iron Cross, first class. His countenance was solemn and his initial responses were made in measured and subdued tones. He stated that it was his political conviction that the Jews prevented the national rise of Germany, consequently he felt he was not quarreling with Dr. Luppe as a person but rather with the political system of which Dr. Luppe was the highest local representative.

In the early days of the trial Streicher and his attorney, Dr. Kelber, established procedural tactics which often clouded the principal

6 "Frankischer Kurier, nr. 64, March 4, 1924.
7 Ibid., nr. 65, March 5, 1924.
8 Ibid.
issues and forced Luppe to act as the defendant in the case. Rather than attempt to deny the charges against himself, Streicher elaborated on old and new allegations against the mayor and his associates. More than two days of the first week centered about the old "coat-affair." This was a renewal of a previous charge made by Streicher that Luppe was a dishonorable public servant because he had purchased a coat from a used-clothing store established to sell only to needy people. Both Kelber and Streicher spent hours attempting to prove that not only Luppe, but other members of his administration, were guilty of "robbing" needy families by profiteering on items from this store. Luppe's attorneys took pains to produce many witnesses, including the store manager, to testify that these charges were untrue.

The next day, Luppe's attorney, Dr. Suessheim, opened proceedings by offering as evidence various issues of Der Stürmer to prove that Streicher had maliciously slandered the mayor. Streicher retorted quickly that his newspaper always spoke the truth about rogues and Jews. Suessheim, whose name indicated he was Jewish, then fell victim to an indirect attack when Streicher glared at him and talked about dishonest Jewish jurists. He referred to the case of a Jewish lawyer, named Rauh, who had recently been exonerated of a murder charge. When an exasperated judge asked what that had to do with this case, Streicher answered that it was important to note that Jewish jurists were not to be trusted because in the Rauh case the attorneys and judges were Jews and for this

---

9 For details of the "coat affair" see the previous chapter.
10 "Frankischer Kurier, nr. 65, March 5, 1924."
reason the guilty man was acquitted. 11

Dr. Suessheim ignored Streicher's vicious inferences. Instead he argued that he could prove that Streicher had continually tried to defame Luppe by slanderous and false public statements. For these reasons, Suessheim continued, Streicher was guilty of violating the law and should be punished to the maximum extent, which in this case would be two month's imprisonment plus paying the costs of the proceedings. He concluded, rather weakly, that Streicher's punishment should be severe because Luppe's reputation as an honest politician had been endangered. 12

Streicher's attorney, Dr. Kelber, then pleaded, as Streicher had done earlier that his client had not intended to attack the mayor as a person, but rather the corrupt system he represented. Therefore, Kelber concluded, Streicher should be acquitted because he did not intend to slander, but only to criticize. 13 This plea was followed by some statements by Dr. Krafft, second attorney for the defense, who noted Streicher's outstanding effort in re-instilling national pride in thousands of workers. Krafft stated further that Streicher's deep rooted, sincere convictions must be considered when judging his words and actions. 14 In his own concluding defense plea, Streicher declared that he considered himself a representative of idealism trying to defend Germany against all enemies and concluded that the future would prove his political opinions were

12 Fränkischer Kurier, nr. 72, March 12, 1924.
13 Ibid.
14 Ibid., nrs. 72 and 74, March 12 and March 15, 1924.
correct.

At the conclusion of the trial in mid-March, Streicher was found guilty as charged and sentenced to one month imprisonment with the provision that this part of the sentence would be waived if the defendant fulfilled terms of good conduct until April, 1927 and paid a fine of 1,000 marks for the benefit of poor children. The court also granted Dr. Luppe permission to publish this sentence in three newspapers at Streicher's expense and ordered that all available copies of the most objectionable Stürmer numbers be confiscated and destroyed.15

Streicher's light sentence was further evidence of the sympathetic attitude toward the anti-Semitic movement on the part of German public officials at that time. The judges' decisions may have also been tempered by the public support that Streicher received. Many well-wishers greeted Streicher each day as he entered and left the courtroom. Luppe and his attorney had produced irrefutable evidence that Streicher, in Stürmer articles, had made many slanderous and false statements against the mayor. Neither Streicher nor his attorneys made much of an attempt to deny these statements or to prove that they were true. Instead defense tactics had centered about diversionary issues, such as Streicher's patriotism and his deep concern for the welfare of the Nuremberg citizens. During the last day of testimony Streicher hinted that his defense had been weak. In his closing words he had stated that any punishment he received from the court would mean nothing to him because in this conscience he knew he

was innocent.  

The judges' verdict was that Streicher be placed under probation indefinitely with a warning to refrain from further derogatory remarks about Luppe. After hearing this sentence, Streicher appeared jubilant. As he left the court building a crowd of admirers were waiting and greeted him noisily. He returned these with a broad smile and "heil" salutations. Luppe and Suessheim appeared dissatisfied with the light sentence. They immediately filed for an appeal hearing. Streicher, perhaps to show his contempt for Luppe, instructed his attorneys to file a similar appeal request.

The mild terms of the probationary sentence offered further indication of the court's lenient attitude toward Streicher. Other than a warning to cease his anti-Luppe campaign, no specific limitations were placed on his post-trial activities. The very evening that the sentence was pronounced, Streicher led an election rally at nearby Furth. Elections were scheduled for early April, and since Streicher was a candidate for a Landtag seat he had been able to secure police permission for this rally even before the trial had ended. Posters announcing this event had been printed and displayed in prominent places since early March.

Streicher had ordered that this meeting be advertised as an "all-girl rally." This was a direct contradiction to the Nazi axiom that women had no place in politics. However, this seemed in keeping with some of
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Streicher's behavioral characteristics. He typically paid little attention to party rules or policies and followed his own convictions whether or not he was criticized. In addition, the experience of being the center of attention in a hall filled with women must have satisfied a certain craving of his ego-centric nature. It is impossible to measure the practical political value of holding political meetings where only women and girls were invited. It can only be assumed that a large percentage of those voting for Streicher in his election contests were females.

Since launching his political career, Streicher had successfully developed a wide following of ardently enthusiastic women and girls. This popularity was perhaps engendered by his self-assumed role as protector of German women's "aryan virtue." At the Furth meeting approximately 800 females greeted him with "loud heils" and presented him with baskets of flowers when he appeared on the stage.

He began his two-hour speech by discussing the Luppe lawsuit; stating that the trial gave him great satisfaction because he was able to "tell the truth about Luppe." Streicher then engaged in an impassioned tirade on the race question. In a long story, filled with fantastic, but untrue "facts," he referred to Jews as "Negroes with three kinds of blood," and stressed repeatedly that everyone should do everything possible to prevent "the bastards" from increasing. He added that German girls who go out with Jews should have their hair shaved and that the German man who goes out with a Jewess should have his private parts cut off. At the end of this harangue, Streicher asked everyone to "put oil on the fire," which he said "is finally started to get rid of the Jews."
To guarantee a large "fire" he concluded, "all you have to remember is to vote for the right man in the coming elections."

This meeting was described in an official police report which noted that Streicher's speech was followed by a loud and prolonged applause. The proceedings reportedly closed when a party official from Nuremberg, Herr Wiesenbacher, came forward and told the audience that the two best Germans were Adolf Hitler and Julius Streicher and it would be appreciated if everyone left a small offering in the collection plates at the exits. The report concluded that nothing illegal had transpired at the meeting and that at all times "good order" had been kept.

During this campaign Streicher demonstrated that his political popularity and authority extended from the radical to the moderate factions of the Volkischer Block. On March 25 he spoke to a gathering of "hard line," racist-oriented former Nazis at Langenzenn in the early evening and was cheered tumultuously at the end of a one and a half hour speech.19 He appeared later the same night at nearby Burgfarrnbach where he had been invited to a political meeting promoting "moderate" volkisch candidates for the coming elections. Streicher entered the crowded hall while a candidate for re-election to the Nuremberg City Council, Herr Teichmann, was speaking. The audience greeted the newcomer so noisily that Teichmann could no longer be heard. Almost immediately the chairman of the meeting turned the podium over to Streicher who then spoke for an hour--mostly about the injustices of the Luppe trial.20
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The Bavarian Landtag election, held on April 6, resulted in a considerable victory for the Volkscher Block candidates who captured one-fifth of all seats. The majority of the Block representatives were moderates whose principal sponsor was Ludendorff. Streicher and Hermann Esser headed the small contingent of radical Volkschisch members who had been elected. Esser had become leader of a Munich-based political group called the Greater German People's Union. (Grossdeutsche Volksgemeinschaft) (GVG) This party had been founded in February, 1924, by two lesser known Nazis--Arthur Dinton and Franz Schwarz. It was openly pro-Hitler and oriented to radical and activist Nazi policies.

Since his banishment to Landsberg prison in November, 1923, Hitler was instinctively avoided by many people of ability and importance. Many of these were members of the moderate faction of the Volkscher Block, striving with Ludendorff and Strasser, to bring respectability to the Volkschisch movement. While not openly opposing or criticizing Hitler, they also did not base their political endeavors on his reputation or his total political philosophy. In fact, many felt that Hitler's name was more of a liability than an asset in this attempt to create a new political image.

Of all Nazis, Streicher and Esser are said to have been the only ones totally loyal to Hitler during these months. Because of this loyalty, which often bordered on fanaticism, and because of Streicher's
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uncontrollable racist outbursts and contempt for parliamentary procedure, the two radicals soon became very unpopular with most Landtag representatives. At one early session, Esser irritated many moderate volkisch members in a speech stressing "the contemptuousness of those who pretend to be National Socialists yet do not admit to the leadership of Hitler." Equally irritating to all Landtag members was the patented answer often used by both Streicher and Esser to questions directed to them on the floor. In emotional tones they would shout: "We are nothing, but Hitler is everything!"

At the organizational meeting of the newly-elected Landtag, Streicher was asked to serve on a standing committee. He responded by launching into a long tirade on the subject of "Jewish Crimes." The chamber soon resounded with hoots and catcalls and members began leaving their seats. Streicher ignored the chairman's plea for order stating that he had constitutional immunity to say what he pleased. Raising his voice he continued this anti-Semitic tirade until he concluded with the words:

Most of you are not aware that the Jews have caused untold misery in our fatherland. We true National Socialists will never allow any other problem [to have] priority over the Jew-problem. This work is much more important to me than the trivial details you think are important. My on-going fight against the Jews leaves me no time to serve on your trivial committee.
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By late May, leaders of the moderate faction began attempts to oust the two radicals from the Volkscher Block. Strasser had stated at a political meeting that "the clown Julius Streicher" should be expelled from the movement. On another occasion Ludendorff and others referred to Streicher and Esser as "two dunghills who should be removed from the party." These insulting remarks brought a scathing rebuttal from Streicher. In a Munich speech he retaliated:

Among the first to be purged from the volksch movement should be the traitors, Strasser and Ludendorff. Not only are they guilty of trying to water down the real National Socialist program, they are also guilty of trying to steal Hitler's movement from him.

From his jail cell at Landsberg, Hitler stubbornly refused to heed any complaint from volksch moderates that Streicher and Esser be removed from the movement. Personal loyalty to these two "old fighters" was only a minor reason for this adamantine attitude. Hitler knew that dissident elements, such as Streicher and Esser, were apt to create divisions in the movement and thus prevent a strong and unified leadership to develop against him. He had learned, through newspapers, that his political position was being threatened by some of the leading volksch moderates. Hitler complained to one visitor that Ludendorff and others were "trying to steal my movement from me. . ." When Ludendorff and Strasser went to Landsberg in early summer they were told by a guard:
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"Herr Hitler is too busy to receive visitors today." Shortly afterwards he repeated a maneuver he had used earlier to thwart an attempt against his political leadership. He sent a letter to the rightist press announcing his resignation as leader of the National Socialist movement.  

Although this act seemed to play into the hands of Ludendorff and his colleagues, the old general became furious because he saw this as a repeat performance of a similar maneuver, in 1921, when Hitler's resignation forced the capitulation of Drexler and other members of the party's executive committee. Determined not to be intimidated in like fashion, Ludendorff countered Hitler's move by accelerating his efforts to gain hegemony over the various völkisch factions. He issued an appeal in Bavaria that personal differences should be forgotten or compromised for the sake of party unity and stated that he (Ludendorff) would be willing to lead this "united front."  

In response to this appeal, Streicher wrote a personal letter to the general stating that the latter's activities were highly objectionable—that he (Streicher) and others "had fought the völkisch cause" for a long time "while you (Ludendorff) had at best lost the World War."  

Several attempts were made to mollify Streicher and to win his support for the NSFP. In mid-July Dr. Stoecker, a founder of the German Workers Party (Deutsche Arbeiterpartei) (DAP), the parent organization of the NSFP, announced that a political meeting was scheduled for July 16; it was rumored that this would result in a settlement of the differences

---
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between Streicher and leaders of the NSFP. Stoecker also remarked that if this happened the volkisch cause would be strengthened immeasurably.\footnote{BSA, PAJS, Vol. II, folder nr. 1731. Report from Nuremberg police files, July 17, 1924, which is also the source for the following.}

In answer to Stoecker's announcement, Streicher immediately ordered large posters to be published stating that there was no truth to Stoecker's "rumor" and that he (Streicher) was organizing a Nuremberg branch of the GVG in opposition to the NSFP and that he was not bothered by any fragmentation of the volkisch movement because his ways were "the true Hitler ways." The posters, signed by both Streicher and Esser, also announced that there would be an organizational meeting of the local GVG that evening, July 17, in the Hercules Hall in Nuremberg.

At this first meeting of the local GVG, both Streicher and Esser were the featured speakers. They were greeted by an enthusiastic audience of approximately 2,000 people of both sexes. A report from the police files states that many former members of the Nuremberg NSDAP of all social classes, including members of the aristocracy were in attendance. Esser began by explaining that the goals of the GVG were essentially "Hitler goals" and the major purpose of organizing GVG groups was to keep the National Socialist movement alive until Hitler was freed from prison. When Streicher took the podium he revealed his inclination toward dictatorial political control. After stating his allegiance to Hitler, he launched into his central theme, which was the necessity that all National Socialists obey their leaders. He reminded his listeners that it was he (Streicher) who was organizing this group and that he was to be the "unquestioned leader," and further, that if anyone did not like his policies
he could leave; or if he (Streicher) did not like any member's actions he would be expelled without explanation. Near the end of this speech he stated flatly that he would never let the leadership "slip from his fingers." He closed this section of his speech with the words:

There better not be anyone else trying to take the lead from me. Our organization is like a train, but who runs this train is up to me to decide. I am in the locomotive and I blow the whistle.

Streicher's demand for absolute and unquestioned control of this political group was met with little or no resistance. He enjoyed large and enthusiastic audiences at all early GVG meetings. His dictatorial pronouncements were usually followed by noisy applause. Evidently his audiences were willing to submit to strong, authoritative political leadership. It was also indicative of the acceptance by many Nurembergers of Streicher as the leader of the local volkisch movement.

At some Nuremberg GVG meetings Streicher digressed from his standard anti-Semitic themes and dropped his overbearing attitude. Adopting the practice of a conventional politician, he would address himself to the problems of various professional or occupational groups. For example he scheduled a meeting in late July for which special invitations had been tendered to civil service employees.36 He opened his address with an "official" report on Landtag activities. Then he expressed his sympathy to the civil servants who had lost their jobs because of the recent Government policy to reduce expenses by cutting some employees from the payroll. He reminded his listeners that he was fully aware of the financial misery of many minor officials. He said he had seen the stacks

36 Ibid. Report from Nuremberg police files, July 30, 1924.
of petitions and letters begging for some supplemental income or for some work. He emphasized that unfeeling government officers had left most of these unanswered. He closed this speech with a promise that if it were in his power he would make every effort to satisfy these justified grievances and requests. Although Streicher did not explain how he would do this, his speech brought a loud and prolonged applause.  

By late summer, 1924, open hostilities between leaders of the NSFP and Streicher erupted in a series of public charges and counter-charges. This internal völkisch feud intensified with the publication of a special pamphlet by leaders of the moderate faction. This was in the form of a small leaflet distributed free to passers-by at street corners in Munich and Nuremberg. Its opening section noted that it was necessary to bring public attention to the conflict Streicher was causing in the völkisch movement. The first grievance noted was that Streicher purposely scheduled political meetings in Nuremberg on the same evenings that regular NSFP meetings were scheduled. This tactic may have been unethical, but it proved so effective that it became standard Nazi procedure throughout the years leading to their political takeover in 1933. Introductory sections of this attack on Streicher also complained that he consistently refused to apologize to some NSFP members he had slandered publicly.

Next, some pointed questions were directed to Streicher:

How can he (Streicher) assume that he is the plenipotentiary of Hitler and the 'Leader in Franconia' after Ludendorff has declared . . . all former authorities annulled? . . . How can he justify his race fanaticism when he
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himself is associating intimately with the brother-in-law of a very well-known Jew, the diamond dealer, Bornstein?

The body of the pamphlet was devoted to further castigation of GVG members and principles and explanations of the beneficial aims and objectives of the NSFP.39

In dealing with adversaries, Streicher customarily succeeded in placing them on the defensive by glossing over their accusations and attacking them vigorously in return. He answered this pamphlet in a special issue of Der Stürmer, and then repeated his words in a speech at a Nuremberg GVG meeting. He told his audience that he had recently received and read the NSFP publication, and when he had looked at the "watered down" goals of "this so-called people's group" he had almost fainted. He castigated their half-hearted stand against the Jews and Freemasons. He further accused the NSFP of yielding to the pressures of Jewish money and the Freemasons' anti-nationalism. Concerning the charges directed at him in the pamphlet, Streicher brushed them aside, stating that he was responsible only to his conscience and he would answer reproaches like these only before a court of law.40

In retaliation, the NSFP newspaper, the Voelkisches Echo, published an article entitled "The Dictator Who Fainted." It opened by acknowledging the recent speech, then continued caustically:

Now that Streicher has opened battle against the NSFP and specialized in personally slandering its leaders, we are sorry to realize that
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his nerves are so delicate... for the juicy
blows are yet to come... But while he con-
tinues the fight and renews it daily, he must
accept the fact that we shall defend ourselves.\footnote{Voelkisches Echo, nr. 56, July 22, 1924.}

Walther Kellerbauer, erstwhile colleague of Streicher, but now
editor of the rival \textit{Voelkisches Echo}, complained that Streicher had
instructed his audiences not to read the NSFP newspaper and to do every-
things possible to prevent others from reading it. He further accused
some Streicher followers of disrupting a recent NSFP meeting in Marktbreit
and beating the chairman with steel rods until he was unconscious. Inter-
estingly, Kellerbauer did not ask his readers not to read the \textit{Stürmer}.
Instead he continued, in defensive tones, to state that Streicher was
trying to destroy him personally:

\begin{quote}
I consider it my duty to paint the person and
deeds of the Great Julius as they are, not only
for the sake of our movement... but also for
the enlightenment of the people. The activities
of this agitator are [to be considered] danger-
ous... I also wish to defend my personal
honor, the name of my wife and my very existence
against the slanders, attacks, and attempts to
destroy me by Streicher and his followers.\footnote{Ibid.}
\end{quote}

Kellerbauer followed this statement with an unsubstantiated com-
plaint that one of Streicher's followers had tried to shoot him in
February, 1924. Then he charged both Streicher and Esser with breaking
up the unity of the \textit{volkisch} movement during Hitler's absence. Noting
that there were no basic differences in the programs of the NSFP and the
GVG, he seemingly lamented that earlier cooperation between the two groups
was destroyed because the GVG party had been founded in Nuremberg. He
concluded that this act violated an agreement, made earlier in 1924, that the Danube River would be the dividing line between the geographic areas of the two groups.\textsuperscript{43} Kellerbauer's allegation, that such an agreement had been concluded, lacks substantiation. There is no available document to this effect nor any other oral or written reference to it. Further, for obvious reasons, Hitler would not have sanctioned such arrangement, and it would have been out of keeping with the nature of either Streicher or Esser to agree to a limitation of their political plans and ambitions.

There is evidence that Streicher was viewed by his opponents in the \textit{völkisch} movement as an uncooperative but key political ally, even though violent and repugnant as a person. Another NSFP newspaper, the \textit{Deutsche Presse}, accused him of "doing all possible" to split the ranks of the \textit{Völkischer Block} during plenary sessions of the Landtag.\textsuperscript{44} As proof, the article related an occasion where Streicher allegedly refused to support a proposal by \textit{Block} leaders to establish the eight-hour working day in Bavaria. It claimed that Streicher had agreed earlier that this measure favored the workers and that he (Streicher) would support it. It was not stated that Streicher spoke against the proposal. But it was stressed over and over, that Streicher was to blame for its failure to win approval because he did not openly speak in favor of it.\textsuperscript{45} This article indicated that without Streicher's open cooperation, the \textit{Völkischer Block} was politically impotent in the Landtag.

The article in the \textit{Deutsche Presse} concluded with vague remarks
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about Streicher's "questionable" handling of money and his immoral personal life. A report from the Nuremberg police files elaborated somewhat on these remarks. It noted that leaders of the NSFP, in a special meeting, had discussed problems dealing with Streicher. As if grasping at straws, these men had framed a formal appeal to Hitler, begging that Streicher's authority be limited. Since Hitler had already officially removed himself from political affairs, this action indicated that these men recognized the fact that Streicher would heed the words of only one person—Hitler. As evidence of questionable financial dealings, they noted that Streicher's personal expenditures, as well as his deposits in the Middle Franconian Bank and the North Bavarian Bank, far over-balanced his known income. Therefore, the appeal reasoned, Streicher must be embezzling money collected at political meetings.\(^{46}\)

Included was an allegation that Streicher's immoral personal life was an embarrassment to the völkisch movement. This allegation alluded to Streicher's relationship with a Dr. and Mrs. Jung. An affair with Mrs. Jung supposedly began when Dr. Jung, a political admirer, loaned his car to Streicher to attend meetings. It was said that later Mrs. Jung was seen frequently riding with Streicher and accompanying him to public places in Nuremberg. The story concluded that Streicher's immoral conduct was also proved by the fact that Dr. and Mrs. Jung were divorced shortly afterwards. There was no substantiation to either of the two above charges.\(^{47}\) Nor is there any record that Hitler received the NSFP appeal
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document or gave any consideration to it.

Streicher retaliated to the attack in the Deutsche Presse in a lengthy speech during a Landtag session. He spoke on the theme: "Loyalty to Hitler." He accused Ludendorff, Drexler, Strasser, and others, of working openly to undermine Hitler's authority in the National Socialist movement. He stated that he (Streicher) was the true Hitler representative in the Landtag, and that these men were against him and trying, even in parliamentary sessions, to disgrace him and oust him from the movement. In attempting to prove this statement, he argued that no völkisch member had supported his bid to serve on a committee.48

As was his custom, he did not broach any substantive issue of politics, or party ideology, but rather launched into an attack on the personalities of his political adversaries. For example, he questioned the sincerity of Anton Drexler, founder of the Munich völkisch party. Although Drexler was not even present, Streicher levied pointed questions at him:

Is it true, Mr. Drexler that you . . . are a salesman for a Jewish shirt manufacturer in Berlin? Is it true, Mr. Drexler, that you tried to betray Mr. Hitler . . . in 1921?49

A few days later he spoke in the same vein against Ludendorff at a political meeting in Nuremberg. After reiterating the shortcomings of the old general he challenged his audience with a trite political ploy: "And if the time should come when General Ludendorff opposes me (in Nuremberg) by whom will you then stand?" Mechanically the listeners answered:
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"We will stand by Streicher!"\(^{50}\)

While Streicher's open feud with leaders of the NSFP continued, his political power in the Nuremberg seemed to increase. Perhaps emulating Hitler and his SA, Streicher had organized an armed body guard called the *Landsturm*, which became known as the official police unit of the Nuremberg GVG.\(^{51}\) There is very little information available concerning the details of the type of people involved in this organization or the amount of time they spent in this activity. It was evidently a temporary para-military group used by Streicher in the absence of the SA, which had been outlawed during these months. Among the few references to this armed troupe is a Nuremberg police report of a GVG meeting in late August which noted that approximately seventy *Landsturm* security men were in evidence. They were clad in white ski-caps, red windbreakers, and white arm-bands, stamped with the letters, "GVG."\(^{52}\) More than likely members of this group were ardent political followers of Streicher and were paid a small percentage of the receipts collected at meetings they attended.

In September, Streicher expanded the Nuremberg GVG further with the formation of local *völkisch* women's clubs. These organizations were known as auxiliaries of the GVG. Members were required to pledge loyalty to Hitler and Streicher upon joining.\(^{53}\) Since no documentation is avail-
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able it can only be assumed that because of Streicher's popularity with females (as stated earlier) these groups enjoyed a wide following. They probably functioned as any other women's political auxiliary functions—in fund-raising and political propaganda activities. Streicher also succeeded in forming new GVG local parties in Bamberg, Rahl, and Regensburg that month.54

During the later months of 1924 Streicher became mildly involved with local Communist groups and individuals. This was initially exposed in a description of a Nuremberg GVG meeting in September. A police report noted that a long, heated discussion resulted from Streicher's announcement that he was attempting to reach a closer understanding with local Communist groups. Some GVG members began questioning the "true program of the party." The report concluded that because of strong objections, the leadership (Streicher) promised a stronger stand against the Communists.55 Despite this promise, Streicher held a meeting the following month in conjunction with about 100 local Communists. Streicher spoke about an eighteen year-old boy named Elmer Ansel, who had recently hanged himself. He claimed that "the Jew Kromwell," who had been Ansel's employer for three years, was the actual cause of the suicide because he had swindled the young man.56

The podium was then turned over to a Communist leader named Gerber, who spoke for about one-half hour. He sympathized with the Ansel
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family and added: "This sad case clearly shows the impossibility of the capitalist system." Following these introductory remarks, he explained some of his Communist ideas. At the end of the speech Gerber invited Streicher to the next local Communist party meeting where, he said, the NSDAP was to be discussed. Streicher accepted the invitation and commented that he felt Gerber's views were made "from the deepest feelings in the heart but still were rather disordered in thought." The meeting was closed with the audience singing the "Hitler-song" and the "Internationale."

The true motives for Streicher's association with Communists at this time are unclear. He may have been attempting to win more members for the GVG from the ranks of workers and others who opposed the republican form of government. He also may have been trying to arrange a truce or compromise in order to gain allies against his favorite political target—the "capitalist Jew." This (latter) conjecture is suggested by Streicher's conversation with Gerber after the above meeting had closed. He asked the Communist leader if he would be willing to meet with him in the presence of two witnesses on each side so that "some kind of political compromise" might be reached. Gerber, however, failed to respond to this invitation.

Streicher then began to conduct a series of meetings which he advertised as "instructional for understanding National Socialist beliefs." Posters announcing these meetings noted that Communists would be especially welcome. In these sessions, Streicher usually opened proceedings by calling up a person from the audience who was supposedly "politically neutral" to act as discussion moderator. This tactic, however, proved to
be a meaningless gesture, because free discussions never occurred at these meetings. For example, at one of these sessions, in early 1925, a male student was called up to act as moderator. Streicher opened the session with greetings to all factions in the audience. He then launched into a long monologue on his anti-Semitic beliefs. The second portion of his speech was directed at the "inconsistencies and errors" of many Communist doctrines. After Streicher finished speaking, the student rose and asked if there were any questions. Perhaps intimidated by the presence of uniformed Landsturm forces, no one spoke up. Streicher again rose and delivered the final words of that meeting:

... The right man with the right thought at the right time always has the right word, but I am sorry that... no one takes the floor in contradiction of my arguments.

Streicher was not as consistent in his views and actions toward Communists as he was toward Jews. During his months as a leader of the Nuremberg GVG, he had associated with them sometimes at political meetings. In later years he went out of his way occasionally to do special favors for some Communist political prisoners. Between 1933 and 1938 he transported busloads of Communists each Christmas season from the Dachau concentration camp near Munich to Nuremberg where they were served large dinners with their families and were then allowed to spend a few days at their homes. On at least one occasion, he arranged for the marriage of
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a Nuremberg Communist while the latter was serving a prison sentence at Dachau.60

When party proceedings were initiated against him in 1938 for these and other violations of Nazi rules, he was questioned by some party officials about these acts of kindness toward known political enemies. Streicher defiantly retorted that these people were good German citizens from his district and he felt at the time like doing "something humanly good."61

There is no indication that at any time in his political career Streicher was in any way sympathetic to Communist doctrine. Apart from the few exceptions that have been mentioned, he considered Communists bitter foes throughout his rise to become political dictator of Franconia. Typical of this attitude is the following excerpt from a speech in the mid-1920's:

Next to the Jews, the Communists are our worst enemies. . . We must strike them all down like snakes before we reach our ultimate victory.62

Streicher's isolated acts of kindness to individual Communists after the Nazi seizure of power, perhaps indicate that he felt the "ultimate victory" was accomplished by this time and there was no longer a threat from Communists in his political territory.

60Personal interview in Nuremberg, March, 1971, with Fritz Nadler, author and former Nuremberg newspaper reporter. Nadler verified Streicher's acts of kindness toward Communist prisoners during holiday seasons. Nadler also related to story of his friend, Herr Umlauf, a former Communist, whose marriage at Dachau was arranged by Streicher.


Streicher's contacts with the Communists in the brief period beginning in late 1924 brought no known criticism from NSFP leaders. It may have been that they also had been associating with Communists in order to win more members, or to affect some type of political compromise. However, the NSFP passed a resolution, in late October, expelling both Streicher and Esser from the "official" Bavarian völkisch movement. The resolution declared that both of these men had brought too much dissension into the movement with their "continuous unpatriotic heckling." When Streicher was told about the resolution he jeered: "How can I be expelled from something I never belonged to?"63

This action by the NSFP had little effect on Streicher's political activities. A few weeks later he held a meeting of the GVG in Nuremberg attended by approximately 2,000 people.64 As if indicating his contempt for the NSFP, he made no reference to the recent expulsion resolution. Instead he concentrated his attacks on Dr. Luppe. No action had yet been taken by the courts on the appeals petitions filed at the conclusion of the trial earlier that year.65 This time he again charged that the mayor was dishonest and only "a tool of the crooked Marxists and Jews."66 He also charged that the present city council had withheld money from needy war widows so they could give it to Luppe and the Jews. At the conclusion of this tirade, he mentioned the coming elections for
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city council seats. Announcing his candidacy for city council, he asked for support for himself and other GVG candidates in the coming elections.67

The elections were held on December 7, and resulted in Streicher and five other GVG members winning seats on the Nuremberg city council.68 The first meeting of the newly elected body was scheduled for January 1, the date that the mayor was traditionally installed. Luppe had barely begun to speak to the councilmen about their rights and duties when he was rudely interrupted. Streicher rose and declared that he and his friends refused to be welcomed by a chairman who "has called members of the council psychopaths." This declaration referred to a charge that Luppe had allegedly made about Streicher during the recent campaign. The mayor was unable to quiet his heckler and soon all members of Streicher's group began to shout insults at the other members of the council and the mayor. The audience, made up mostly of GVG members, joined in the shouting. Epithets such as "traitors to the workers" and "servants of the Jews" drowned out every attempt by Luppe to bring the meeting back to order. Streicher was said to have shouted the loudest. In the midst of this confusion the session was closed less than a half-hour after it had started. In subsequent months some of Streicher's colleagues were dismissed from the council for unethical practices. Streicher, after the first few sessions, attended very infrequently.

Streicher's record as a member of the Nuremberg City Council and the Bavarian Landtag shows that he had no sincere interest in the proper functions of these bodies. He never offered positive contributions to
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either of these parliamentary groups. This raises the question of his real motive for seeking these positions. Initially, the monetary factor may have been some inducement. He received monthly stipends of 450 RM as a Landtag representative, and 50 RM as city councilman. These amounts totalled approximately 65 percent of his known income.69

Secondly, he may have sought these positions to further his political goals. As a Landtag representative his political constituency could broaden, his personal prestige might be enhanced, and he would have an opportunity to air his political views, before an official State body. As a Nuremberg City Councilman he was in a better position to undermine Dr. Luppe and possibly dethrone him as mayor of the city.

A third motive may have been his desire to further the interests of his newspaper, Der Stürmer. His experiences in the campaigns and in these elected positions could provide valuable propaganda material for editorial content. More important to Stürmer interests, perhaps, was the possibility that circulation would be increased because membership in these public bodies would add respectability and public recognition to its proprietor and editor.

By the end of 1924, the Stürmer had become an effective political propaganda instrument. Since its reappearance in March it was enlarged in size, but still consisted of only six pages. The title and subtitle remained the same, but under this heading there were added the words: "Julius Streicher, Editor." At the bottom of the front page between two

69BSA, PAJS, Vol. II, folder 1731. Letter from Huber to Nuremberg School Board, May 12, 1925. In addition to these incomes, Streicher received 288 RM monthly as a suspended teacher. There is no record of his income from political activities or from his publications.
heavy black lines the Stürmer slogan "The Jews are our Misfortune" appeared for the first time. The lead articles were usually begun in the left column of the front page and continued on inside pages. The right side of the front page began to feature large, ugly cartoons signed by "Fips," a man whose proper name was Philipp Rupprecht. This cartoonist designed and created that caricature known later as the "Stürmer Jew." With variations the faces featured a sinister expression with dark, beady eyes, an exaggeratedly hooked nose, and protruding lower lip. (See illustration next page.)

In 1924 and 1925 these cartoons appeared only occasionally, but after November, 1925, Rupprecht joined the Stürmer staff and became the regular illustrator of the leading articles, which were usually repulsive and unfactual stories about the crimes of the Jews. Rupprecht later contributed cartoons that made up a "comic sheet" on the last page. As early as 1924 these illustrations were labeled pornographic by many critics of Streicher.

A review of hundreds of Stürmer issues reveals that the cartoons were not pornographic as the word is understood in the Western world today. There were no pictures of totally nude persons or acts of a sexual or lascivious nature. In rare cases, sex acts were suggested or attempted. One such example shows a young blond woman struggling with

---

70 SBN, Ruehl, Der Stuermer, p. 106. This slogan was printed in the same place in all subsequent issues; Ibid., pp. 20-21. Ruehl points out that Streicher did not originate this phrase. It had first been used by the historian, Heinrich von Treitschke in the Preussische Jahrbücher, 1879-80.

71 SBN, Ruehl, Der Stuermer, p. 106.
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Weltverschwörer
Die enthüllten Geheimnisse der Weißen von Zion

Das große Messer

1938 war eine Zeit der Hoffnung. Der Dritte Reich, über die Weltgeschichte, wurde durch den Sieg über die österreichische Armee in den Kämpfen der Weltkriege. Die Aufnahme des Sieges durch die Welt war der Beginn einer neuen Ära.

Das ausgewählte Volk

Deutscher Kollegen!


Militärpaar in Spanien?


Die Juden sind unser Unglück!

A Stürmer Issue Illustrating the Typical Stürmer Jew
a fat man who is obviously a Jewish doctor. She is striking him while he is attempting to disrobe her. Her dress is torn partially and one of her breasts is exposed. In another example, in an issue during World War II, a young German soldier is standing in the doorway, staring in disbelief at a bed where a young blond woman is lying in bed next to a "Stürmer Jew." Under this frame is the caption: "This is what the Jew does to your women while you are at the front!"

In most instances, however, cartoons with sexual connotations focused on crimes allegedly committed by Jews against non-Jewish women. Typically the cartoon would include the victim (usually a blond girl) and one or more men with "Stürmer Jew" features. The girl would be lying in a pool of blood, or in a casket, and the men would be lurking in the background, whispering or rubbing their hands. It would be made evident, by picture and word, that the girl had been raped and murdered in a brutal manner, or else she had committed suicide out of fear of rape. There would be other verbal indications that tragedies like this occur regularly because Jews are sexually perverted.

Aside from occasional cases where other Nazi enemies, such as Bolsheviks or masons, were lampooned, the theme of the cartoons was always anti-Semitism. Jews were portrayed, in all conceivable ways, as a despicable, greedy race, with plans and ambitions to rule the world. The sexual aspect was used mainly to add sensationalism to this theme.

73 Der Stürmer, nr. 25, December, 1925.
74 Ibid., nr. 18, October, 1941.
75 SBN, Ruehl, Der Stuermer, p. 120.
Entsehnelches Verbrechen
in der Roterkammer der Bauerngasse ausgesetzt
Ausbeutung und Schändung deutscher Mädchen und Frauen
Der Jude Schloß verhaftet

A FIPS PORNORAPHIC CARTOON
Rupprecht's cartoons were not confined to the Stürmer. His work was also published in two other Bavarian newspapers, the Fränkische Tagespost and the Fränkische Tageszeitung, and later also in a Spanish Falangist newspaper, Arriba.76

The main contents of the Stürmer were articles written by Streicher or members of his staff. Even though several new reporters were now contributing articles, the journalistic style had not improved since the previous year. Streicher insisted that his writers initiate his type of simple, but sensational phraseology. Perhaps to insure that this was carried out, Streicher remained editor, or co-editor, most of the years of the Stürmer's existence. During the first fifteen years, this position was shared intermittently with Karl Holz, a radical völkisch ruffian, who spoke and acted as a prototype of Streicher. The editorship was shared out of necessity because during these years one or the other of these men were usually involved in a court procedure or serving a jail sentence.77 Major articles, in early years, dealt almost exclusively with castigation of Streicher's political enemies (such as Kellerbauer and Luppe) and the on-going anti-Semitic campaign. Between these articles were inserted slogans, such as: "You Get to Know the Jewish Problem Through the Stürmer," or "Only Go to German Doctors and Lawyers!"78

In writing about his political enemies, Streicher used defamatory, and mostly untrue, phrases, as described in the case of Dr. Luppe.

76Ibid., p. 114.
77Ibid., p. 111.
78Der Stürmer, nr. 25, December, 1925.
Further, he usually brought his principal theme, anti-Semitism, into these attacks. An example was his accusation, brought out in the trial, that Luppe was a descendant of Jews, and that Luppe works for Jewish interests. 79

A survey of Stürmer anti-Semitic articles shows that their purpose remained as it had been since mid-summer, 1923—to prove to the reader that the Jew was the root of all political, social, and economic evils in Germany and the whole world. Parallel to this theme was the patent insistence that this evil must be feared, hated, and eventually destroyed.

Until the mid-1930's, political problems attributed to Jews were usually linked to one of Streicher's specific political targets, such as the Weimar government. One such attack entitled "Who Are the Real Villains?" appeared in 1925:

> The Jews are the real villains. They stabbed Germany in the back in 1918, so that they could end the war and control our government . . . as they are now doing in Berlin. . . . 80

In later years, Stürmer articles levied vicious charges about Jewish political power and influence in foreign nations to justify Hitler's conquests. 81

Stürmer articles discussing economic and social problems normally included arguments to prove a distorted theory about the parasitic nature of Jews. A typical passage is from a 1927 article entitled "Deathly Enemy of Humanity:"

79Ibid., nr. 10, March, 1924.

80Ibid., nr. 21, October, 1925.

81Ibid., nr. 37, September, 1938.
The Jews are not settlers . . . they do not build villages . . . they cannot support themselves. You see the Jew where he can grab the fruit of work; the property of non-Jews. You can see the Jew as a thief, usurper, and a parasite.\textsuperscript{82}

To prove the depravity of Jews, Streicher always insisted that they were a biologically inferior race. He referred to them as "sub-humans, worse than Negroes." He warned continually that any non-Jewish woman who had intercourse with a Jew would have the germ of this sub-human permanently implanted in her bloodstream.\textsuperscript{83} In later years, articles of this type became so bizarre that the Nazi government ordered certain issues confiscated and destroyed.\textsuperscript{84}

The Stürmer carried many detailed accounts of rightist political meetings. Streicher's speeches were always printed verbatim, with favorable comments on the topic and the enthusiasm of the audience. Rival völkisch party meetings were usually reported, but always in derogatory tones and with critical comments. As a rule, activities of other rival political groups, such as the Social Democrat and Communist parties, were ignored. National political events of special interest to Streicher, such as a Nazi party-day rally, usually merited a "special edition" which included larger headlines and more pages than normal issues.\textsuperscript{85}

Included in almost every issue of the Stürmer was a section in the inside pages devoted to letters from the readers. Generally the

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{82}Ibid., nr. 20, May, 1927.
  \item \textsuperscript{83}Ibid., nr. 24, June, 1927.
  \item \textsuperscript{84}SBN, Ruehl, Der Stuermer, p. 125.
  \item \textsuperscript{85}Ibid., p. 107.
\end{itemize}
letters were those of admirers of Streicher and sympathetic to the anti-Semitic cause. The contents were mainly some form of compliment about the good work being done by the Stürmer or some complaint about misdeeds done by Jews. A typical example was a letter from one Jean Adam, who reported on his experiences in Switzerland. He wrote that Jewish landlords in Basel and Zurich terrorized Christians by buying their houses and then throwing the Christians out into the street. He also complained that Swiss Jews continually "deflowered Christian girls."86

Continuing the policy adopted since its inception, the Stürmer contained little of the material which is generally included in standard newspapers. It published no news of national and local business events, serialized stories, news of social happenings, (except for propaganda purposes) and reports on sports activities. News concerning world or foreign affairs was also omitted until shortly before World War II. The Stürmer reader thus had to content himself with political and social propaganda as conceived by Streicher and his colleagues.

The subject of anti-Semitism comprised 60 to 75 percent of the total space in the Stürmer (excluding the advertising section). It was normal practice the Stürmer writers to attempt to add "authenticity" to their stories by documentation from so-called "Jewish literature" which Streicher had collected in his personal library.87 However, contemporary

86OSU, CGD, series T-580, reel nr. 268. Excerpt from Der Stürmer, October 4, 1924.

87SBN, Ruehl, Der Stuermer, p. 116. This library survived the destruction of Nuremberg in World War II. It contained over 8,000 volumes. Streicher collected these volumes by confiscations from Jewish homes and by donations from readers who responded to Stürmer articles requesting books thought, or known to be Jewish literature.
Jewish scholars exposed the fact that these citations were not taken from books written by Jewish authors, but from anti-Semitic literature, dating back to the early eighteenth century. One basic source of this literature was a book entitled Judaism Discovered, written by one Johann Eisenmenger and published in 1700. Eisenmenger, a German scholar, had quarreled violently with a Dutch Rabbi over the question of Christians converting to Judaism. As a result, he swore to gain revenge on the Rabbi and on the Jewish religion. With his Judaism Discovered, Eisenmenger sought to discredit the Jews and to prove that they regarded the entire Christian religion with hatred and derision. To accomplish this he blasphemed the Jewish religion by re-interpreting Jewish holy writings in a pseudo-scholarly fashion. In one example, he paraphrased and interpreted one passage of the Talmud to mean that all Jews were instructed to take part in a murder-ritual at least once a year. Although Eisenmenger's views were proved false shortly after publication, and later banned by the Holy Roman Emperor, his interpretations have served as the basis of much anti-Semitic literature to modern times.

In addition to the editorial content, slogans and cartoons, the Stürmer contained an ad section. This had begun, in modest fashion, at the bottom of the last page, where the publisher, W. Haerdel, advertised certain books for sale. The first full-page ad section appeared in

88Schlomo Gliksman, My Lawsuit Against Julius Streicher and Co., and the Forgeries and Falsifications in Anti-Semitic Literature (Cleveland, Ohio, 1941), p. 25.

89Ibid., p. 27.


91Der Stürmer, nr. 6, July, 1923.
April, 1924, on the last page. All the ads were small and seemed to be oriented to the lower-middle class. Advertisers were independent stores and small businesses, such as stores selling clothing, shoes, music, confectionaries, and furniture. At the bottom of the page were two blank application forms for Stürmer subscriptions. (See illustration next page.) Later in the year ads included announcements of GVG political meetings and some appeals from workers seeking employment. These were mostly from people who had lost their jobs because of their political opinions (obviously strongly völkisch) and who stated they were seeking employment with a völkischen firm.

Most early Stürmer advertisers seem to have been members of the Nazi party or, at least, sympathetic to its racial doctrine. In addition to advertising their own products, business forms began promoting the NSDAP and anti-Semitism. Some ads were decorated with the swastika emblem. Others claimed the proprietor was a member of the National Socialist party. Some establishments advertised Hitler shirts, Hitler pictures, and Hitler writing pads. One restaurant ad noted that it did not welcome any Jewish guests. All NSDAP meetings were advertised with cordial invitations for everyone but Jews to attend. Ads for the Nazi newspaper and magazine, the Voelkischer Beobachter and Saar-Deutscher, appeared regularly.

With few exceptions, the ad section of the Stürmer was limited to two pages or less; it contained only small-sized ads of individuals, small

92Ibid.
93Ibid., nr. 17, September, 1924.
94Ibid., nr. 13, August, 1925.
95Ibid., nr. 20, October, 1925.
Die sicherste und beste Kapitalanlage
ist und bleibt ein Sparbuch

der Stadt Sparkasse Coburg

aus der Filiale Nürnberg-A

mündlicher mündlicher

Ausgabe von Heimge- 

büchsen und Sparuhren 
zur kostenlosen Benützung

Schaustunden: montags bis samstags 8.00 - 12.00 Uhr

Samstags 8.00 - 12.00 Uhr

---

Schenkt nützlich!

Schuhe

nur aus Schuhhaus

Günstig!

Theresienplatz 4

Ecke Bindergasse

---

Der Stürmer, Nürnberg, Nr. 10

Werbt neue Bezieher!

Beitragen Sie mit,

Der Stürmer, Nürnberg, Nr. 10

Werbt neue Bezieher!

Beitrag: Nicht

Datum:

Stichwort:

---

Stürmer Advertisement Page

April, 1924
businesses, or political activities and organs. Ads for nationally-known businesses or heavy industry did not appear until 1933. There is no evidence that the Stürmer staff made any effort to solicit ads from large and prosperous firms. Streicher seems to have ignored the normal business practice of developing such an advertising clientele to serve as the principal financial support of the newspaper. Instead, he seemed to view the Stürmer ad section as a means to popularize his political beliefs and to strengthen his following by offering low-cost ads (three-fourths one RM per column inch) to a large number of small businesses and individuals sympathetic to his political beliefs.96

In the early years of publishing the Stürmer, Streicher experienced periodic financial difficulty, but somehow always managed to satisfy his creditors. In 1924 the price of the regular editions were twenty pfennig and the maximum circulation that year was approximately 6,000.97 Outside subsidies were needed because sales income and advertising revenue did not balance publishing costs. One author mentions that some Bavarian industrialists were rumored to have paid Streicher to discredit Jewish competitors, and some large landowners allegedly paid handsomely for Streicher's fight against proposed Socialist land reforms.98 Another method allegedly used by Streicher to increase his income was to blackmail non-Jewish, as well as Jewish businessmen, by threatening to print scandalous articles about them unless they paid him large sums.99

96 SBN, Ruehl, Der Stuermer, p. 161.
97 Ibid., p. 155.
98 Ibid., Ruehl adds that this information could not be substantiated by valid documentation.
99 Ibid., p. 156.
allegation is reinforced somewhat by a police report which noted that Streicher employed approximately twenty private investigators in 1924. It is a fair assumption that most of these investigators were used to gather the defamatory information that was used in this blackmail enterprise.

Toward the end of 1924, Streicher was informed by his circulation manager that many Jews bought up large quantities of *Stürmer* issues in order to curtail its circulation. After this, his anti-Semitic articles became more radical and aggressive. It was noted in one account that Streicher often boasted that it was this type of Jewish "help" that enabled the *Stürmer* to stay alive in the early years.

---


101 SBN, Ruehl, *Der Stuermer*, p. 156.
CHAPTER VI
THE REJUVENATION OF THE NATIONAL SOCIALIST PARTY

On December 21, 1924, Hitler was released from Landsberg prison. He traveled by auto directly to Munich where he found conditions greatly changed since the previous year. No longer visible were the wheelbarrows filled with paper money. The hordes of unemployed loiterers had virtually disappeared from the streets. Political proclamations on signboards were crowded out by advertisements for food and other consumer goods. Since food and jobs were more plentiful, the desire for political change seemed far less urgent. The improved economic conditions contributed, in part, to the severe setback suffered by the volkisch movement in the December 7 Reichstag elections. Total votes for volkisch candidates dropped from 2,000,000 the previous May, to 900,000, and the number of volkisch candidates elected dropped from 32 to 14. Political observers saw these election results as a definite sign that the movement was headed for oblivion. Hitler, apparently not totally disheartened, began planning quietly to rebuild and to rejuvenate his National Socialist party.

1Wagner, Hitler, p. 141.
2Ludecke, I Knew Hitler, p. 261; Shirer, Rise and Fall, p. 123.
3Ludecke, I Knew Hitler, p. 261.
The Nazi leader spent the holiday season loitering in various cafes. He talked with his friends cautiously because his prison release had been probationary and he knew that was under close scrutiny by the police.\(^4\) By government decree, he was not allowed to make any speeches, to put up any posters, to hold any meetings, or to promote the interests of the NSDAP, which had also been outlawed.\(^5\) The only possibility for Hitler to re-enter the political arena was to obtain a repeal of all these bans from the Bavarian government, under the leadership of Prime Minister Heinrich Held.

Early in January, 1925, Hitler persuaded a former political patron, Dr. Franz Guertner, to arrange an audience with the Prime Minister. The meeting took place on January 4. Held received Hitler in a cool and formal manner. Hitler began by apologizing for the "mistake of November, 1923," and continued that the National Socialist movement, under his leadership, would henceforth remain strictly within the law.\(^6\) Later in the conference, Held questioned the recent rightist attacks against the Catholic Church which had been initiated by Ludendorff. Hitler seized upon this opportunity to discredit Ludendorff and, at the same time, to appear as a champion of Christianity:

\[\text{I have all due respect for General Ludendorff's military genius, but I must deeply deplore the fact that he is not equally gifted as a politician. I beg you to believe that the National Socialist movement is in no way identified with Ludendorff's stand against the Catholic Church... my party stands for positive Christianity.}\]

\(^4\)Orlow, History of the Nazi Party, p. 51.

\(^5\)Wagner, Hitler, p. 142.

\(^6\)Ibid.
Our only enemy is Jewish Marxism, against which your party is also waging a decisive battle. Hitler concluded his pleadings with a promise that in the future, the National Socialists and the Catholics would stand together in the "common battle against Jews and Marxists." By the end of the interview, Held appeared relaxed. He politely dismissed Hitler with the assurance that the government would act on Hitler's request to repeal existent bans against the NSDAP "as soon as possible." 

During these days of behind the scenes political maneuvering, Streicher had been in close contact with Hitler. At least one author states that Streicher was the first person visited by the Nazi leader upon his release from prison. Although this statement was unsubstantiated, there is reliable evidence that Streicher was well informed by Hitler about the pending negotiations with Held. A police report described a GVG meeting in Nuremberg, January 21, where Streicher was the featured speaker. Addressing an audience of close to 1,000 people, mainly völkisch oriented, Streicher began by leveling some vicious charges against Jews in public office. Then he berated Mayor Luppe for allegedly throwing him (Streicher) out of the first city council meeting. Next he launched into the main topic of his speech, which dealt with the requested re-legalization of the NSDAP. He reiterated Hitler's pledges to Held that in the future the National Socialist party would cooperate with the Government in 

7 Ibid., p. 143.
8 Ibid.
9 Ibid.
10 Peterson, Limits of Hitler's Power, p. 226.
upholding the Catholic Church, and in waging a battle only against the
common enemy—Jews and Marxists.11 He then chided the Prime Minister
for his vacillation in granting the release Hitler had petitioned. After
speculating on some possible reasons for this delay, Streicher ended his
speech with the pointed question: "Is it possible that this request is
still not granted because Luppe has good friends in the Prime Minister's
office?"12

There is no reason to believe that Streicher's Nuremberg speech
would have effected a Bavarian government decision, yet it is interesting
that the next day an announcement came from Held's office that all
restrictions against Hitler and the NSDAP were tentatively removed.13

The fact that Hitler had made his peace with the Catholic Bavarian
Government increased the complaints of Ludendorff and other moderate
völkisch leaders, who were outspoken enemies of the Church.14 In addition
to publicly criticizing Hitler for betraying National Socialist principles
regarding the Church, these leaders continued to insist that the radical
GVG leaders, Streicher and Esser, be ejected from the völkisch movement.15

Hitler largely ignored the complaints regarding his departure from
established völkisch church doctrine. He was, however, outspoken in his
defense of Streicher and Esser. Since his release from prison he had

11BSA, PAJS, Vol. II, folder 1731. Police report of GVG meeting
in Nuremberg, January 21, 1925.
12Ibid.
13Wagner, Hitler, p. 142.
14Bullock, Hitler, p. 128.
15Ibid., p. 129.
determined that the GVG was the logical nucleus around which the National Socialist movement was to be rebuilt. His two trusted henchmen controlled most of what remained of the true Nazi movements in Nuremberg and Munich. In addition, a leading member of the Munich GVG, Max Amann, now headed the firm that published the official Nazi newspaper, the *Voelkischer Beobachter.*

On February 25, 1925, this party organ reappeared for the first time since late 1923. It featured a lengthy editorial by Hitler, entitled "A New Beginning." In this article, Hitler answered those who still objected to Streicher and Esser:

> I do not consider it to be the task of a political leader to attempt to improve upon, or even to fuse together, the human material lying ready at his hand.

Also included in this issue of the *Voelkischer Beobachter* were several announcements that Hitler was holding an important political meeting on the evening of February 27, at the same place the ill-fated Putsch had originated—the Munich *Bürgerbrau­keller.*

The occasion of Hitler's first public speech since his trial created a stir of excitement in volkisch circles. Although the meeting was not to begin until 8 PM, the first visitors began lining up at the doors of the beer hall in mid-afternoon. At six the police closed the hall. Three thousand persons had found room inside and another two

16*Orlow, History of the Nazi Party*, pp. 52-53.

17*Bullock, Hitler*, p. 129.

18*Wagner, Hitler*, p. 143.
thousand had to be turned away.\textsuperscript{19} When Hitler finally appeared he was greeted with much enthusiasm. He began to speak quietly of his recent prison experiences. He then spoke louder about "some traitors" who had been working against him during his confinement. Next, almost shrieking, he emphasized the major point of his speech:

\begin{quote}
I will allow no one to circumscribe my authority! As long as I am the leader of the party, I will make all the decisions. . . . After a year you shall judge for yourselves! If you are with me then - fine. If not, I will resign. But until then, I alone am the leader.\textsuperscript{20}
\end{quote}

This reaffirmation of strong leadership stirred the audience into frenzied action. Leaders of various rival \textit{völkisch} factions rushed to the platform to shake Hitler's hand and publicly demonstrate their loyalty to him.\textsuperscript{21} Some witnesses said later that this part of Hitler's speech "swept away all doubt—that most listeners believed sincerely that all quarrels between various \textit{völkisch} factions were ended.\textsuperscript{22}

After this interruption, Hitler reverted to moderate tones. He stated that in the future there could be only one enemy--the Jew as a person and Marxism as an object. But he added that under the guise of one enemy, several might be recognized. In other words, he would brand as "Marxists" anyone whom he wished to fight, including the State.\textsuperscript{23}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{19}\textit{Orlow, History of the Nazi Party}, pp. 53-54.
\textsuperscript{20}\textit{Wagner, Hitler}, p. 144.
\textsuperscript{21}\textit{Ibid.}
\textsuperscript{22}\textit{Ibid.}
\textsuperscript{23}\textit{Bullock, Hitler}, pp. 130-131.
\end{flushright}
screamed his concluding sentence:

    Either the enemy will march over our corpses,
or we over his. May the swastika banner be
my shroud if next time the battle lays me
tow!24

This statement was brought to the attention of Bavarian Government
officials, who then accused Hitler of violating his recent promise. He
was asked how he intended to march over the corpses of his enemies and
remain "strictly within the law" as he had vowed to Held. Since Hitler
had no ready answer to this question, he was told by the Bavarian minister
of the interior that a decision on some form of punitive action would be
announced in several days.25

Seemingly unperturbed by this news, Hitler motored, on March 2,
to Nuremberg with Streicher, who had arranged three political meetings
there for that evening. These had been advertised simply as NSDAP "re-
organizational" meetings.26 It is likely, however, that Streicher
envisioned these meetings as accomplishing more tangible results than
merely their advertised purpose. The Nazi party treasury was badly in
need of funds. It would be a feather in his cap if gate receipts would
provide enough money for him to make a handsome contribution for Hitler
to take back to Munich. Undoubtedly he also hoped for a large turn-out
so that he could impress his leader with proof of his (Streicher's)
successful efforts in developing and maintaining a large and enthusiastic
core of Hitler followers in the Nuremberg area. In addition, he must

24Wagner, Hitler, p. 144.
25Ibid., p. 145.
meetings, March 2, 1925, which is also the source for the following.
have realized that Hitler's appearances with him that evening would add to his prestige with local party members. He could take full credit for the fact that Hitler had chosen Nuremberg as the first city, outside of Munich, to visit after his release from Landsberg.

Events at the three meetings must have been gratifying to both Streicher and Hitler. A police report noted that approximately 4,700 persons crowded into the three halls and paid the "high admission price of one mark." The report continued that all halls were filled to capacity by 6 PM even though proceedings were not scheduled to begin until 8 PM and later. As the two leaders made their appearance at each meeting place, the crowds outside, as well as those inside the halls, broke into spontaneous and tumultuous greetings and cheers. All three audiences seemed keyed to a high emotional pitch and responded with shouts of approval and loud applause to almost every phrase uttered by the speakers. The same general format was followed at each meeting. Streicher took the podium first, and after welcoming those in attendance, stated his unconditional subordination and loyalty to Hitler. In each address, he included attacks on Dr. Luppe in his opening remarks. At one meeting he ended this section of his speech with the statement: "Luppe must be fought first of all because he is the tool of Jews and the head of Marxism!" This remark brought a loud and prolonged applause. In a display of political showmanship, Streicher bowed his head and waited until the hall was quiet. Then, in reverent tones, he said: "Now let

---

27 Since the 1924 currency stabilization in Germany, the highest admission fee to any Nuremberg GVG meeting had been 80 pfennig. At most meetings there was no admission fee charged. The audience was requested to contribute what they could as they left the hall.
the soul of the child speak, for children tell the truth." Two little girls, aged five and seven, approached Hitler and recited a poem lauding his greatness, then presented him with a bouquet of flowers. After this, Streicher delivered some remarks concerning NSDAP goals, noting that he felt obliged to make these statements since he, as a member of the Bavarian Landtag, possessed parliamentary immunity and thus could speak more freely than Hitler. In each of these dialogues he included a virulent anti-Semitic threat. For example:

One of the basic goals of the new party is to keep the blood of the Aryan race pure. . . . we must fight with all strength against the alien race of the Jews. Merciless war is to be declared . . . (against those) who plot to conquer us. . .

He concluded each of his speeches with warm words of welcome to Hitler, whom he then introduced as the next speaker. Each time the Nazi leader took the podium, the audience applauded wildly and began singing the "Hitler-song." Hitler spoke in a relaxed fashion, rather vaguely about future plans for the NSDAP. In his second speech he digressed into reflections on the name of his movement. He noted that he had received complaints regarding the words "Socialist," and "worker" in the party title. He explained that the first word was necessary because of the social goal of the party, which was the social brotherhood of true-blooded Germans. He stated further that he insisted on retaining the word "worker" because this was a "word of honor," not designating classes, since "a worker is anyone who is ready to serve his fatherland with his hands or his head." Hitler climaxed his last speech that evening by proclaiming his admiration for Streicher:
... I must relate something that I will always carry in my heart. On November 9, 1923, at one o'clock, when the volkisch soldiers faced death... a man stepped up to me, his chest bared to the guns, ready to die for his banner. This same man was the first to come up to me after my release from prison and put himself unconditionally at my disposal; this man is Julius Streicher and I will never forget his actions that day.

Then, as if speaking directly to Streicher's moderate volkisch enemies and critics, Hitler concluded:

Even though Streicher may have his faults, a man who acts as he does is loyal!... To these people who still have doubts about Streicher, I shout: 'Ask yourselves whether you were ever willing to give up your life for the movement!'

Before stepping down from the platform, Hitler announced that as a reward, he was appointing his true friend, Streicher, as Gauleiter (district party leader) of Franconia.²⁸

The evening of March 2, 1925, must be considered a landmark in Streicher's political career. Never before, or after this time, could he be considered closer or more valuable to Hitler. Since the ill-fated Putsch the circle of important associates had largely melted away from the Nazi leader. For a short time after his release from prison, Hitler could look to only a few trusted followers, such as Streicher and Esser, to help him re-invigorate his movement. This period was to last only until more talented and nationally known figures pledged (or repledged) loyalty to Hitler. In his efforts to rebuild his party on a national basis, Hitler desperately needed to expand his movement northward, out of

²⁸Ibid.; SBN, Ruehl, Der Stuermer, p. 67. The term Franconia, as used in connection with Streicher's area of political influence, is actually the Bavarian province of Mittelfranken. (See map—frontispiece.)
Munich. He realized that Streicher controlled the largest and most active group of hard-core Nazi followers in this direction. Until more northern groups could be organized and developed by trusted leaders, Streicher remained Hitler's most valued colleague outside Munich. The high point of this brief period for Streicher was Hitler's public display of friendship and gratitude that March evening in Nuremberg.

After his appearance in Nuremberg, Hitler returned to Munich where he was informed subsequently that the Bavarian Minister of Interior had issued a ban on his (Hitler's) public speaking for an indefinite period. Hitler reacted furiously. He claimed that the newspapers had misinterpreted his speech and he issued a violent protest to the government officials. This proved futile. Within a few days many other German states, including Prussia, Württemberg, and Baden, also outlawed Hitler's public activities. In frustration, Hitler withdrew to a lodge in Berchtesgaden, where he continued his writing and attempted to direct the affairs of his little party.²⁹

The official silencing of Hitler seriously impeded the rejuvenation of the NSDAP. The Nazi leader was a much more gifted as a speaker than as a writer. With his pen alone he found it impossible to control rival National Socialist factions from developing, especially in distant places. Yet, when crucial issues arose which threatened his leadership position, Hitler managed to emerge victorious. In March, the choice of a candidate for the April presidential elections created a dilemma. A strong northern volkisch faction endorsed the Lord Mayor of Duisburg,

²⁹Wagner, Hitler, p. 148. In early 1925 the Nazis were one of the smallest political parties in Germany, with a membership of approximately 17,000.
Karl Jarres, the candidate of the rightist parties. Somewhat surprisingly, Hitler proclaimed Ludendorff as his choice. This move proved to be a master stroke of political ingenuity. In nominating Ludendorff, Hitler publicly displayed his respect for the old soldier, while at the same time Ludendorff's defeat (which appeared certain) would document his political impotence. Above all, this move forced sub-leaders to make a choice between his candidate, Ludendorff, and Jarres. Thus Hitler was able to isolate the core of his loyal followers.

In the elections, Ludendorff suffered a disastrous defeat, polling only 211,000 votes out of the approximate 27,000,000 votes cast. As a result of this disclosure of Ludendorff's political weakness, Hitler's stature increased in some völkisch groups. As no candidate obtained a clear majority, a second election was held a few weeks later. This time Hitler abandoned Ludendorff and supported Field-Marshal Paul von Hindenburg, who was the eventual winner.

Perhaps because of the mutual animosity which had developed during the past year between Ludendorff and Streicher, the Stürmer did not mention that Hitler supported the ex-general in the first election. However, after the results were tabulated, Streicher published a long polemic on the "obvious inadequacies" of Ludendorff. In the days before the second election, at least three articles were published in the Stürmer relating some of the past glories of Field-Marshall Hindenburg, and advising

30 Orlow, History of the Nazi Party, p. 61.
31 Bullock, Hitler, p. 132.
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33 Der Stürmer, nr. 10, April, 1925.
(not urging) readers to "vote with Hitler--for Hindenburg." After the election, some northern völkisch factions openly criticized Hitler for endorsing Hindenburg. They complained that the new President was totally unsympathetic to most völkisch policies.

By mid-1925, it appeared that the center of gravity of the NSDAP was shifting from south to north Germany. Gregor Strasser had founded seven new district Nazi groups and had held 180 meetings in the Berlin area during the past six months. These new northern groups, known collectively as the Strasser faction, continually issued demands to Hitler. Among other things they renewed the insistence that Hitler disassociate himself from the southern radicals, meaning Esser and Streicher, as well as Rosenberg and others.

Rosenberg had returned to his job as editor of the NSDAP newspaper, the Voelkischer Beobachter, while Esser was still one of Munich's outstanding Nazi speakers. Both of these men sided with Hitler in fighting the Strasser faction openly. The greatest dispute between the two groups was the question of the so-called "Princes Compensation." Since November, 1918, large land holdings of ruling families were being held by state governments, pending a final settlement. Left wing parties were leading a movement to expropriate this property. Hitler had taken the opposite view—that this property legally belonged to the noble families, and if it were not returned to them they should receive a fair and equitable compensation. The Strasser faction sided with the left-wing parties in this argument.

34 Ibid., nr. 11, April, 1925.
35 Wagner, Hitler, p. 149, which is also the source for the following.
Streicher did not involve himself in this quarrel. Aside from a few short Stürmer articles stating that he sided with Hitler in this matter, he concentrated his efforts on anti-Semitic attacks, local political questions, and personal affairs. This was in keeping with his customary political practice. To him, no political issue over-shadowed the Jewish question and local political affairs were always more important than national issues.

In April, Streicher scheduled a NSDAP meeting in Nuremberg where he was to be the featured speaker. A police report noted that approximately 800 persons of both sexes and mainly Nazi party members or sympathizers, attended this meeting. His speech was entitled "The Corruption of the November Republic." This title was misleading because Streicher did not mention the national government at any time that evening. Instead he concentrated his efforts on his fight with Dr. Luppe and on a recent local government directive prohibiting him (Streicher) from publicly discussing affairs of the Mayor or the Nuremberg city council. He had recently been denied a permit to hold a meeting where his speech topic was scheduled to be "What Goes On In the Luppe-City Council?" This time he had secured a permit by changing the speech title, however, he did not change the original speech contents.

In his opening remarks, Streicher referred to the recent local government order regarding public statements about Luppe and the city council. He complained about the recent denial to hold a meeting simply because of the advertised speech title. He said that certain government

---

36BSA, PAJS, Vol. II, folder 1731. Police report on NSDAP meeting in Nuremberg, April 21, 1925, which is also the source for the following.
officials had warned him that this was a forbidden topic—that divulging city council affairs was illegal, and that he would be subject to arrest and prosecution if he violated the government order. Voicing his disagreement with this order, he stated that he had the right to speak on all incidents which concern the German people because he was a Landtag representative. He then delivered a lengthy polemic about the evils of world Jewry. After this, he defiantly launched into the topic of Luppe and the city council:

The leftist members of the city council are merely tools of Mayor Luppe, who himself is a tool of the Jews... All of us who oppose Luppe in the council are constantly ignored and mistreated and we cannot get any help for the poor war widows...

He continued speaking in this fashion about this topic without interruption until he concluded some thirty minutes later.

Fifty extra state police officers had been ordered to supplement the regular law enforcement contingent at this meeting. Despite the numbers of police present, no attempt was made to stop Streicher after he began discussing the forbidden topic. It is a fair assumption that no police action was taken because the officer-in-charge was sympathetic towards Streicher. This assumption is evidenced by statements in the report of that officer. In explaining why attending police failed to stop Streicher, he rationalized:

... such drastic measure (stopping the speech) would have been out of proportion with the significance of the affair... Besides Streicher had obeyed the Government prohibition for the entire first part of his speech.

Perhaps influenced by the recommendations of the officer-in-charge at the meeting, the Franconian Government did very little to punish
Streicher for his flagrant violation of the recent prohibitive decree.\textsuperscript{37}

After this, however, Streicher was frequently denied permits to hold political meetings. Each time this happened, Streicher repeated his complaint that the denial was unfair because as a Landtag deputy he had constitutional immunity to speak as he pleased. In the early months of 1925, Streicher took increasing advantage of this Landtag fringe benefit. He had interpreted this constitutional privilege to mean that he could speak and write as slanderously as he pleased without fear of criminal and disciplinary action.

Streicher's attacks against Dr. Luppe had continued unabated since the trial the previous spring. After January, 1925, these attacks became increasingly vicious. Perhaps this was because Streicher had learned about a letter written to Luppe by the Franconian Government President, Dr. Huber, in which the latter revealed Streicher's invulnerable position. Luppe had complained in early 1925 that the Government Discipline Office was too slow in arranging the appeals trial in his case against Streicher. He quoted some recent Stürmer article to prove that Streicher had not ceased slandering him since the previous trial. In response, Huber defended the Disciplinary Office, stating that no official investigation of Streicher was possible without specific permission from the Landtag.\textsuperscript{38}

Luppe was adamant however, and refused to accept this answer. He complained again to the Franconian Government in March. This time he

\textsuperscript{37}Ibid. Report on Court Hearing in Nuremberg, April 30, 1925. Streicher was fined ten marks for this violation.

\textsuperscript{38}Ibid. Letter from Huber to Luppe, January 9, 1925. Parliamentary immunity is provided in Article 39 of the Bavarian Constitution.
wrote as an officer of the Nuremberg Education and Cultural Ministry. He insisted that Streicher's conduct should be considered in a stricter manner because a teacher had a special obligation of loyalty to the State. He also criticized the public prosecutor's action in stopping the investigation of treason charges in connection with Streicher's role in the November, 1923, Putsch attempt. Luppe stated further that he felt it was incorrect to suspend court proceedings against Streicher because of his "so-called immunity." Finally, he urged that the "red tape be cut" so legal action against Streicher might be taken. With the help of some of Luppe's friends, these complaints eventually reached the floor of the Landtag. After a long debate (in the absence of Streicher) a majority voted, on June 17, 1925, to repeal Streicher's right of parliamentary immunity. With this development, Luppe again pressed the Government Disciplinary Office to set a date for the appeals trial. He was informed that the court could not hear the case until November or December because of pending unfinished business and because of the coming annual vacation period.

A week after the vote to repeal Streicher's right of parliamentary immunity, a Landtag meeting was scheduled to debate a bill dealing with an increase in taxes for educational purposes. Streicher made a surprise appearance at this session. Totally immersed in local affairs, such as his publishing business and reorganizing Franconian NSDAP groups, he had

---
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neglected his Landtag duties since before Hitler's release from prison. At this meeting, Streicher asked for the floor as soon as the session was called to order. He spoke for over one hour, but made no reference to the recent Landtag vote denying him the immunity privilege. This omission was typical of Streicher's practice of not admitting publicly to any defeat or setback unless it could be twisted to his political advantage.

Streicher began this Landtag speech in his usual fashion, castigating the Jews. He rambled for over one-half hour on this topic. He reminded his listeners that the Jews consider themselves the master race, while they view the Germans as cattle. Then he referred to the French Negro soldiers who were part of the Rhine occupation force. These, he said, were a different race of people, just as the Jews were a different race. In a rare reference to the deity, he stated that God had made a distinction of the races. He concluded his vague point by stating: "The motto for the future should be--not all that has a human face is the same!"

Alluding to the intended topic of discussion for that Landtag session, Streicher next addressed himself to the Bavarian Minister of Public Worship and Education. He criticized the existing school system because it allowed Jews to influence German youth. He said that the Ministry should create "pure German schools and academies" where the ary an youth could be educated in the proper manner. Raising his voice, Streicher elaborated on this point:

We demand that German schools be transformed into National German Institutes of Education, and these schools must teach racial doctrine!

42U. S. Office for Prosecution of Axis Criminality, Nazi Conspiracy, Vol. VIII, doc. nr. M-30, pp. 16-17. Speech by Julius Streicher at Landtag session, June 25, 1925, which is also the source for the following.
Continuing his discourse on education, Streicher stated that the present system of differentiating between Catholic and Protestant children in confessional schools was antiquated:

To my mind, a good German is also a good Christian. Instead of continuing a system which divides Christian children and teaches them different religious beliefs, we should unite our teaching and our educational goals. Let them all learn together that our worst enemy is the Jew.

Aside from the fact that Streicher had indicated, for the first time, an ecumenical movement within the Christian religion, the speech offered nothing beyond his usual racist views, and fell on the deaf ears of virtually all Landtag members, who either left the hall or sat whispering among themselves until Streicher had finished.

The repeal of his parliamentary immunity was not taken lightly by Streicher. Almost overnight he ceased his campaign of slanderous and illegal attacks on Dr. Luppe and the Nuremberg city council. He did not mention this subject in his Landtag speech and he avoided direct reference to this forbidden topic in his political speeches for the duration of the year. Until the Luppe-appeals trial began in late November, Stürmer articles mentioned Luppe only infrequently and then in statements which could not be construed as slanderous.

During late summer and early autumn, 1925, Streicher concentrated his efforts on the task of reorganizing and expanding the NSDAP in Franconia. As an indication of his success in these endeavors a direct attempt was made, by rival northern Nazi leaders, to restrict Streicher and other southern activists. The Strasser faction formed the National Socialist Working Association (Nationalsozialistische Arbeitsgemeinschaft) (NSAG) and began publishing an internal party organ, the National Socialist
Letters (NS-Briefe). The formation of this organization and its publication was described as "a direct attempt to curb the growing power and influence" of Streicher, Esser, and other southern radicals. The northern group stated publicly that they hoped, by this means, to unfetter Hitler from these "unprogressive" advisors and thus enable him to endorse wholeheartedly the northern "revolutionary" party line. Briefly, this party line stressed such leftist reforms as public expropriation of landed estates and seizure of controlling interest in all vital industries.

In early September the NSAG held a meeting in Hagen, which resulted in a renewed demand for the dismissal of Streicher and Esser. In addition, the NSAG stated its firm opposition to the NSDAP's participation in elections. In obvious response to the Hagen resolutions, Streicher scheduled a meeting later that month in Furth, and invited only NSDAP members. A police report noted that a capacity crowd of 500 person attended and that there were representatives from many different party districts throughout Germany. An orchestra group and several vocal soloists entertained the crowd until Streicher arrived at 8:30 PM. He was received with applause and loud "Heil" greetings as he made his way to the podium. After welcoming the audience, he began speaking about the growing Nazi party. He described several nearby villages where subtle, but noticeable changes were taking place. "More and more, he said, "the swastika is appearing

---
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on houses, roofs, and walls." He explained that these were signs that the roots of the National Socialist movement were growing deep not only in cities but in rural areas. Then, in an obvious challenge to the Strasser faction he drove home the main point of his speech:

... the true Hitler movement is built on a religious foundation. ... He who does not have confidence and trust in Adolf Hitler, and wants to cheat and undermine him will be judged without mercy!

After this he digressed into a lengthy anti-Semitic polemic.

Then he concluded his speech with a rebuttal to a part of the Hagen resolutions:

... If Adolf Hitler says we are going into the Government as elected officials ... we will go into the Government as National Socialists. ... We understand now the road we took (in the Putsch attempt) was the wrong road. ... Today we see clearer.

Streicher was followed to the podium by a Dr. Buttmann, who had recently switched allegiance from the Strasser to the Hitler faction. He spoke briefly about his disillusionment with the northern group and stated that he now knew that "the Hitler way is the only true way." He ended with an apology for his "past mistakes" in fighting with Streicher and Esser.

Shortly after Buttmann's brief address, Hitler arrived at the meeting hall. His appearance brought a thunderous applause. After quiet had been restored, he began to speak about the on-going inter-party feud. He said he felt confident that his faithful followers possessed the moral strength to overcome the present opposition from the so-called National Socialists in the north. He continued that since they had opened the fight, he would take the challenge and end the differences in
peace on all sides. He then pointed out that Buttmann was just one example of how "they would all soon come to their senses." He closed his speech with the assurance that it was possible for völkisch members to be enemies today and comrades tomorrow. The police report stated that the meeting had been orderly and ended at 11:30 PM after Hitler and Streicher left amidst loud cheers and applause.

During the early autumn months, Hitler had made no official response to the dictates and demands of the Strasser faction. In mid-October, however, he took the northern leaders by surprise by issuing a directive prohibiting dual memberships in the NSDAP and NSAG.⁴⁷ Strasser immediately sent an apologetic note to Hitler, stating that he only wanted to strengthen the party program and in no way intended to challenge his (Hitler's) leadership or his final program-making authority.⁴⁸

Hitler obviously doubted the sincerity of this message. The following week he left Bavaria with Streicher to witness two Strasser-sponsored NSDAP meetings in Essen and Dortmund. In addition to gaining first-hand knowledge of this group's activities, Hitler perhaps also hoped to win some leaders and members of this faction to his side. However, he was to be denied this opportunity. The police stopped Hitler at the Prussian border and refused him permission to attend these political meetings.⁴⁹ As a result he sent Streicher ahead as his official representative. At the Essen meeting Streicher was received coldly and was
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not invited to the podium. The next evening, at Dortmund, an open street battle with Communists took place in front of the hall before the meeting began. The featured speakers at both meetings were Strasser and his protege, Dr. Josef Goebbels, an intellectual, who was often called the brains behind the Strasser movement. Both men directed their addresses to the proletariat class, advocating anti-capitalistic reforms. Streicher was invited to speak at the Dortmund meeting. There is no record of what he said, however, his words must have been displeasing to northern leaders. Goebbels, perhaps reflected the general reaction to Streicher's speech that evening. He noted in his diary that Streicher spoke—"like a sow."

Relations between the two Nazi factions were strained further at a November conference in Hanover arranged by Strasser. At this event the principal discussions centered about the general question of official party policy and the specific question of the princes' compensation. In the end an overwhelming majority voted against the restoration of the princes' property and voted to replace Hitler's 25-point NSDAP program of 1920 with Strasser's vague leftist policies.

Hitler made no public reply to this mutinous action. As if conducting a war of nerves, he remained quiet for almost three months, waiting and planning for the proper moment to crush this northern threat and re-establish his authority over the national Nazi movement.

50Heiden, Der Fuehrer, p. 287.
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During this crucial period, Streicher could offer little help or support to Hitler. His party activities were forced into the background by legal proceedings which occupied him until the end of the year. The second Luppe-Streicher trial finally began on November 17, 1925, at the Nuremberg Palace of Justice. Dr. Suessheim and two other lawyers represented Luppe, while Dr. Krafft appeared as Streicher's legal representative. The case was tried before a jury—probably because Luppe and his attorneys had insisted on a jury trial since judges had shown too much partiality to Streicher in previous trials.

The district attorney opened proceedings by reading the plaintiff's charges, which consisted basically of the same complaints that initiated the earlier trial. Streicher was then given the opportunity to answer. Resorting to his customary tactics, he did not attempt to explain or deny his alleged discretions. Instead he again launched into a verbal tirade against his adversary, Luppe.53

After this, the mayor took the witness stand and stated that he felt compelled to force this lawsuit to protect himself and the city administration. He noted that the work in the municipal council had been hindered for a long time by a hostile faction led by Streicher.54 Luppe was then followed by a number of witnesses who testified to the mayor's honesty and integrity.

53 Fränkischer Kurier, nr. 319, November 17, 1925.
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Throughout this trial, Streicher usually raised the same issues and used the same tactics as in the previous trial. There were, however, several noteworthy exceptions. On the fifth day, Streicher made the bold statement that he now had proof of Luppe's Jewish ancestry. When the court asked for the proof, Streicher could only produce a letter from one of his Stürmer readers stating that it was rumored that Luppe's wife had a Jewish ancestor. The presiding judge then lectured Streicher sternly on the nature of valid evidence. Obviously confused and embarrassed, Streicher left the witness stand shouting:

> Whether or not my reproaches against the chief administrator of Nuremberg can be classed as valid . . . what is important is that Luppe is no good . . . he does not feel or act like a völkisch person!55

In another exceptional instance, Streicher was forced into a defensive position by Dr. Suessheim. When he was left without further words to defend himself, Streicher could only resort to a vulgar and false tirade:

> . . . How can anyone consider seriously any evidence from a lawyer who is a Jew and who uses the spittoon in his office for a urinal?56

According to a newspaper account, the most exciting event of the trial occurred when Adolf Hitler appeared as a surprise witness to testify in Streicher's behalf. Taking the stand, Hitler declared that Streicher's fight against Luppe was approved as official NSDAP action. To substantiate this statement, Hitler attempted to explain that the struggle against
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Luppe was symbolic of the National Socialist struggle against the corrupt German government system. The presiding judge remained passive as Hitler then answered some inconsequential questions posed by Dr. Suessheim. Hitler left the witness stand and shortly afterwards departed for Munich amidst loud "heil" greetings from a crowd gathered outside the building.57

Streicher's belief in the justification of his case seemed to be reinforced by Hitler's court appearance. Even after the trial had adjourned for the day he acted somewhat transfixed, as if Hitler's approval surpassed any other judgment and eclipsed any possible consequences. In excited but quiet words he remarked to his attorney:

Hitler's words today have justified my actions completely. I do not care about a sentence anymore... and if I were in Luppe's place I would go home and shoot myself dead!58

Dr. Krafft created another stir of excitement the next day when he asked the trial president to stay the proceedings against Streicher until it was ascertained whether or not Luppe had committed perjury in some of his testimony. The court was then adjourned so that this matter could be considered. The following morning the presiding judge announced that the court could not stay proceedings as requested because it was beyond the function of this trial to determine this type of issue. Dr. Krafft objected that Luppe himself had admitted, under cross-examination, that there might have been some contradictions between certain of his recent statements and some made during the first trial. The judge seemed sympathetic to Krafft's argument but pointed out that in this case it was up

57Ibid., nr. 336, December 4, 1925.
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to the jury to decide on the merits of the evidence presented. He noted further, however, that after the conclusion of this trial, either side had the right to file perjury charges, which would be heard at some future time. 59

After seventeen days of testimony, final pleadings began. The district attorney stated that he accepted Streicher's fight as a political fight. However, it had been proven conclusively that he had exceeded the bounds of legality and decency many times in his continual slanderous and false attacks on Luppe. He concluded that Streicher should receive the maximum sentence of six month's imprisonment without probation. Luppe's attorneys added little to the final pleadings. In general, they reiterated the views of the district attorney.

The next day Dr. Krafft spent seven hours repeating and emphasizing points previously mentioned in the vain attempt to prove that Streicher's allegations against Luppe were justified. In a lengthy address to the jury, he pleaded that Streicher's unfailing patriotism should be a key factor in their final deliberations. 60

On December 17, the jury announced its verdict. Streicher was found guilty as charged and the presiding judge, following recommendations of the jury, sentenced Streicher to two months' imprisonment without probation. In addition, Streicher was to pay for the costs of the proceedings, including Luppe's attorneys' fees. The mayor was given permission to publish, at Streicher's expense, the results of the trial in the Frankfurter Kurier and several other local newspapers. Also the most offensive
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issues of the *Stürmer* were to be confiscated from libraries and archives, and destroyed. Of the eleven incriminating issues since 1923, only one was dated in 1925. This is interesting because it tends to disprove Luppe's claim that Streicher's vicious attacks against him had continued unabated since early 1923. Further, it denotes that Streicher's earlier loss of parliamentary immunity had a sobering effect on him for at least the balance of the year.

After pronouncing the sentence, the presiding judge complimented the jury and made some unofficial comments on the case. He said that he felt the verdict and sentence justified because Streicher had not succeeded in proving that most of his attacks on Luppe were either true or justified. Another factor detrimental to Streicher's case was his record of continued attacks of this nature after the probationary sentence levied at the first trial. Surprisingly, the judge also commented that Streicher was not given the maximum sentence because the court felt that Luppe's administration was not honest and efficient in all respects. There was no elaboration on this point.

Streicher made no formal response to the sentence. He voiced his displeasure, however, to his attorney as they left the courtroom. Further, he quietly instructed Dr. Krafft to file perjury charges against Luppe as soon as possible. A small band of well-wishers greeted Streicher as he walked out of the building. His half-hearted attempt to return these greetings also indicated that he was unhappy with the results of the trial. At the same time, Luppe and his attorneys appeared dejected

---
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evidently because they had hoped for the maximum sentence.\textsuperscript{63}

A few days after the conclusion of the Luppe trial, Streicher was in court again as defendant in another slander trial. This had been initiated by two Nuremberg attorneys named Dr. Gallinger and Dr. Kohn, who charged that Streicher had publicly and falsely accused them of sexually assaulting a stenographer employed in their office.\textsuperscript{64} Several witnesses testified that on October 14, 1925, they had attended a political meeting where Streicher had accused Gallinger and Kohn of this crime. Evidence also offered to support the case against Streicher was a September, 1925 issue of Der Sturmer. This carried a front-page article entitled "The Secret of the Jewish Law Office," which detailed sordid accounts of the alleged assault. The alleged victim, Mrs. Klein, as well as the two attorneys, swore under oath that Streicher's charges were untrue. It was further proven that Mrs. Klein never worked alone while her employers were in the office. In a countercharge, the plaintiffs accused Streicher of collaborating in this lie with Mrs. Klein's husband, an NSDAP member who was estranged from his wife.

Streicher's defense was weak. He denied this latter accusation, but could not disavow what he had said in the October speech. He claimed that he did not write the offensive Stürmer article, and, as editor, he had obliterated several defamatory lines, but that the printer had included them by mistake.

\textsuperscript{63}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{64}BSA, PAJS, Vol. II, folder 1731. Copy of court proceedings of Nuremberg Juror's Court, December 30, 1925, which is also the source for the following.
As a rebuttal the prosecuting attorney pointed out the recent guilty findings in the Luppe case to emphasize that Streicher must now be classed as an habitual slanderer. At the conclusion of this trial, the court found Streicher guilty of defamation and slander and sentenced him to two months' imprisonment without probation. Because of pending perjury charges against Luppe, Streicher's prison sentences were detained for approximately ten months.

Streicher's political activities were virtually halted during the last six weeks of 1925. Involvement in the two slander suits had left him no time to hold meetings or attend to normal party business. In many respects the Franconian Hitler movement seemed to have lost its momentum. Stürmer issues during this period focused on the trials and made no mention of local political activities or membership increases in the parties Streicher had organized. When the news of Streicher's prison sentences was published many people felt that the leadership of the Nuremberg area Nazi movement would be weak for an extended period. Since the previous March, when Hitler had publicly announced in Nuremberg that Streicher was to be the Nazi Gauleiter in that area, there had been no challenge to Streicher's leadership position. As local party head, he had authorized only Karl Holz to act for him on political matters. Holz, however, was not an imaginative or popular political leader. In addition, while Streicher was occupied with legal proceedings or a prison term,
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Holz was usually very busy with the editorship of the *Stürmer*.

In a bold move to capitalize on Streicher's absence and to extend their influence southward, the Strasser faction scheduled an NSAG meeting in January, 1926, in the heart of Streicher's territory—Nuremberg. Willy Liebel, a local NSAG member who was usually in disagreement with Streicher, was placed in charge of arranging the details of this event. As a meeting place, Liebel chose the Kolosseum, traditional site of Streicher's large and important political activities. In order to attract a large audience, Liebel flooded the town with posters inviting everyone "who was sympathetic to the völkisch cause." Liebel was careful not to mention, in public announcements, that the sponsor of the meeting was the Strasser-led NSAG, and that the main purpose of the meeting was to promote cooperation between that party and Hitler's NSDAP. Instead the event was billed as a celebration in honor of the founding of the "German-Völkisch-Officers' Association." Ludendorff was scheduled to deliver the first official address of this newly formed organization, which appeared to some observers as merely a ploy to popularize the NSAG by venerating Ludendorff and other army officers who were mostly members of that party. Liebel also published notices that Hitler had been invited, and "in all likelihood" would assist in the first installation of the association's officers.

Liebel's promotional efforts proved very successful. A police report noted that approximately 2,500 persons paid one mark each to

---

68 BSA, PAJS, Vol. II, folder 1731. Police report on völkisch political meeting, Nuremberg, January 18, 1926, which is also the source for the following.
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attend. Although Hitler did not attend, he named Streicher as his representative. Liebel, as master of ceremonies, opened the meeting by welcoming everyone present. Next, he introduced the important guests by name. Interestingly, the report stated that the loudest and most prolonged applause followed the introduction of Streicher. Liebel then engaged in a lengthy dialogue on the past achievements of Ludendorff. Eventually the meeting was turned over to the ex-General who, for unknown reasons, insisted on speaking from his seat. The first section of his speech was an attempt to convince the audience that there were no important differences between the various völkisch factions in Germany. Ludicrously he pointed to Nuremberg as an outstanding example of a place where all völkisch groups worked in harmony. This statement led him into the major point of the meeting:

... I recognize the excellent cooperation between local völkisch groups in Nuremberg and other cities. ... I predict that this [cooperative] attitude will soon be so widespread ... that an acceptable compromise of all existing differences in the national völkisch movement ... will be possible.

After dwelling further on this point, Ludendorff discussed the need to build a great and united German nation. He criticized Bavaria because of its traditional opposition to German unity. He voiced (again) his bitter animosity toward the Catholic Church. He concluded with the statement that some time in the future Austria would be a part of the "Third German Empire."

Ludendorff's speech brought only scattered and unenthusiastic applause. Following this, a ceremony was conducted which began with a parade in the aisles, of military men carrying flags to the front of the hall, where officers of the newly formed association were installed by
a participant in the Munich Putsch, Captain Kriebel. After this ceremony Streicher rose, nodded to Ludendorff, and began walking toward the exit. In a display of genuine admiration, a majority of the crowd stood and applauded loudly until he disappeared from view. The meeting continued, however, with several short speeches by some undistinguished military men. At 11:30 the program was concluded and Ludendorff led the visiting guests out of the hall. Audience reaction, as noted in the police report, indicated that most persons were admirers of Streicher, but were perhaps attracted to the meeting by Ludendorff’s name. They were undoubtedly disappointed in the ex-General’s uninspiring manner of speech as well as his insincere words.70

Two weeks after the NSAG intrusion in Nuremberg, Hitler moved toward a showdown with the northern group. For the first time since his release from prison, he called a meeting of all top Nazi leaders from north and south Germany. This was scheduled to be a secret party conference at Bamberg, in northern Bavaria. Ostensibly, Hitler chose this site because it was geographically closer to northern Germany than Munich. More crucial to Hitler’s political purpose, however, was the fact that Bamberg was part of Streicher’s Gau (political territory), and solidly pro-Hitler in political sentiment. During the past year, both Hitler and Streicher had been particularly solicitous about the Bamberg party organization.

70BSA, PAJS, Vol. II, folder 1731. Police report on völkisch political meeting, Nuremberg, January 18, 1926. Closing sentences of the report noted that many people left the hall grumbling, and that Ludendorff left the premises practically unnoticed.
Invitations listed a tentative program beginning on Saturday and Sunday, February 13 and 14, with welcoming ceremonies, mass parade, receptions, and group caucuses. Business sessions were scheduled to begin on Monday. Shrewdly, Hitler arranged these dates so that most northern leaders would be unable to attend the week-day business sessions because of their jobs. In the south, the Nazi leader had made high party positions, such as Gauleiter, salaried offices, thus leaving these men free to attend solely to party business.

Monday's meeting was totally dominated by Hitler, who achieved one of his most brilliant political successes. He spoke for five hours and ended by refusing to debate any of the controversial points he had discussed. In summary, he mythologized his own person into the party's "true" program. Then he forced all those present to choose between rejection of his leadership or acceptance of his self-deification.

Streicher and the other southern representatives, composing the overwhelming majority present, stood and cheered loudly after Hitler had finished. The northern leaders were left stunned and confused. The conference ended in total victory for the southern Nazi contingent. No one had disputed Hitler's emphatic reaffirmation that his leadership and program were immutable. Also very significant in the long run was the subsequent capitulation of Goebbels, who soon became a leading force in
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Hitler's Nazi movement.\textsuperscript{74}

In addition to the above gains, the Bamberg Conference resulted in a general upsurge in efforts to rejuvenate Hitler's National Socialist party. Prior to Bamberg, rival völkisch groups, such as the NSAG, had been expanding their membership and political territory virtually unopposed. A few days after Bamberg, Streicher led a demonstration of strength in Munich which signaled that this situation would no longer be tolerated. The NSAG had previously scheduled a rally there. Hitler, Streicher, and a group of southern Nazi stalwarts entered the meeting hall just as the program was beginning. While Hitler remained standing in the rear, Streicher led a small contingent of followers to the platform. There he shouted to the startled assemblage that this meeting was illegal and constituted a breach of faith to Hitler. Brandishing a fist, he threatened that blood would flow if proceedings were not halted. The meeting broke up immediately and about one-half the persons present left the hall. Hitler then came forward smiling and acknowledged the "heils" of those who had remained.\textsuperscript{75}

The following week, Hitler issued a series of decrees designed to tighten the line of organizational centralization in the party and to curtail the trends toward regional and local autonomy that had developed. Throughout the early spring months the Gaues were ordered to hold congresses to acquaint sub-leaders with Hitler's Bamberg policy statements. Further, all local party leaders received instructions to enlarge their membership

\textsuperscript{74} Shirer, \textit{Rise and Fall}, pp. 128-129; Payne, \textit{Life and Death}, p. 217.

\textsuperscript{75} Orlow, \textit{History of the Nazi Party}, p. 70.
rosters. In accordance with this latter directive, Streicher scheduled an NSDAP meeting in Nuremberg on March 20.

Posters and newspaper advertisements announced that this meeting was open to NSDAP members and others interested in the Hitler movement. The main speakers were to be Streicher and Goebbels, who was to make his initial public appearance in Nuremberg. The scheduled discussion topic was: "What Does Adolf Hitler Want?" A police report stated that a very large crowd of 1,200 to 1,400 persons of both sexes filled the spacious Hercules auditorium well before the program began and greeted the arrival of Streicher and Goebbels with stormy and prolonged applause.

The meeting was opened by a Nazi city councilman, named Herr Gradl, who delivered a short welcoming address and then introduced Streicher as the first speaker. Amidst boisterous "heils," Streicher took the podium and began speaking about the recent plebiscite in which the petition to expropriate the estates of the landed aristocracy was defeated. Illogically, he argued that this measure failed mainly because leftist groups learned that some land-hungry Jews were strongly supporting the petition. Next, he defended Hitler's position of fighting in favor of the nobility. He said that these people had inherited this property legally, therefore no one had the right to take it from them. Streicher concluded his rather brief speech with one of his typical anti-Semitic polemics. In closing, he summed up this part of his speech:

... As I have been saying for years ... the Jew is the cause of all our misery and Germany

76 Ibid., p. 71.

will not be strong until we get rid of these pests. ... At Bamberg Hitler told us the same thing ... in different words. 78

Before leaving the podium, Streicher introduced Goebbels warmly, as a new and valuable asset to the Hitler movement. Goebbels responded to this introduction with a Nazi salute, a broad smile, and an extremely friendly handshake. To the audience it seemed that any differences which might have existed between them were now totally forgotten. Privately, however, Goebbels' low opinion of Streicher had not changed since the previous October, when he had compared Streicher's speech to the noises of a sow. 79 Further, Streicher must have resented Goebbels more than ever because he was one of the new leaders that was crowding him (Streicher) out of Hitler's inner circle. 80 The personal relationship between Streicher and Goebbels typified the rivalry and animosity which constantly existed between Nazi leaders who looked only to Hitler for their political existence, and whose public display of friendship was a charade, played for the sake of outward party unanimity.

After Streicher's introduction, Goebbels took the stand and spoke, in eloquent tones, about a wide range of topics; from an evaluation of the Dawes Plan and Locarno Treaty, to problems of the itinerant factory worker. His main theme, however, was Hitler, whom he portrayed as a fearless demigod—the only one capable of recreating a strong and united Germany. The police report noted that Goebbels' speech was followed by
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enthusiastic applause, and that this concluded the evening's program, which had been orderly and interesting.81

Throughout the spring months, Streicher concentrated his efforts on his anti-Semitic campaign and the NSDAP membership expansion program. Stürmer headlines and articles again revived the Jewish murder-ritual myth. Lists of missing children from each Franconian village and city were published in successive issues. Repetitious and unsubstantiated articles then pointed out that these children were doubtless kidnapped by Jews and chained in dungeons awaiting the annual Easter season Jewish blood ritual.82 Stürmer anti-Semitic attacks varied only occasionally from the general themes of previous issues. It seemed evident, however, that many people never seemed to tire of reading these repetitious stories. Since early 1924, Stürmer circulation had increased from 6,000 to 10,000 average weekly issues.83

In one interesting exception, Streicher related that a Jewish doctor, named Marcuse, had presented a proposal to the Bavarian Landtag to repeal the law against abortions. Emphasizing that he agreed with Hitler that abortion was a criminal act of murder, Streicher wrote that Marcuse's proposal only added proof that Jews want the bodies of German girls made available to them legally.84 In another issue, Streicher castigated the recent popularity of short hair styles for women. He

82Der Stürmer, nrs. 10 and 11, April, 1926.
83SBN, Ruehl, Der Stuermer, p. 155.
84Der Stürmer, nr. 11, April, 1926.
wrote a long editorial charging that the Jews had promoted this hair style so they could purchase the shorn hair to make into expensive wigs. He ended this bizarre article stating: "The man who goes with a short-haired girl is not a German man!" After each of these "new" anti-Semitic stories appeared in the Stürmer, Streicher repeated them several times in the numerous political speeches he delivered during these months.

Since Bamberg, Streicher held political meetings throughout his Gau two and three evenings each week in a diligent effort to increase membership in local Nazi groups. There are no available statistics to evaluate the results of this membership drive, however, the vigor of these political endeavors was reflected in the amount of money collected as admission fees. During these months, Streicher's Gau was credited as one of the leading providers of funds to the national party treasury.

The culmination of the early 1926 Nazi organizational and re-consolidation campaign came in May at a national membership meeting at Munich. The membership meeting, not identical with the national congress, was scheduled annually only to satisfy the requirements of German laws governing associations. This meeting, however, proved more than the usual perfunctory affair. Hitler managed to gain sweeping approval of a by-law which, among other things, legalized his power to expel individuals

85Ibid., nr. 12, May, 1926.
87Heiden, Der Fuehrer, p. 292.
and entire local organizations from the party. For the first time, the position of a Gauleiter was formally included in the organizational structure of the party. Hitler also announced a variety of measures to gauge the performance of the individual Gauleiters. Among these measures, the collection of money and money management ranked high as a basis of evaluation. In discussing this subject, Hitler noted Streicher's record as consistently leading all other Gauleiters in providing party funds:

If all my Gauleiters were as efficient in raising money as my old fighting comrade, Julius Streicher . . . half of my worries would disappear immediately. . . .

Shortly after the May meeting, Streicher, obviously flushed with pride at Hitler's praise, unwittingly bragged to some Munich party officials that his success as a fund raiser was due to his ability to supplement his regular source of receipts from political meetings with large private contributions. As an example, he noted that he had recently received a large sum from a wealthy party comrade whose wife was his (Streicher's) mistress. Eventually this information reached the ears of Hermann Esser, who was presently Gauleiter of Upper Bavaria and Swabia. Esser, perhaps goaded by Hitler's recent stress on the importance of money, opened a feud with his erstwhile friend over this matter. He complained to Hitler that without Streicher's interference, he (Esser) could

---
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have extracted even more money from this source. Hitler, perhaps partial to Streicher, chastised Esser for overstepping the bounds of his authority. As punishment, Hitler forbade Esser to address him henceforth in the familiar du form.91

Hitler's efforts to re-establish his authority and to reconsolidate his movement at Bamberg and Munich had proven eminently successful. By July he felt his position strong enough to hold a mass rally to demonstrate publicly the restored unity of the NSDAP. The Voelkscher Beobachter announced that a national "party-day rally" would be held in early July, at Weimar, in Thuringia, one of the few states in which Hitler was still allowed to speak in public.92 Arthur Dintner, Gauleiter of Thuringia, was named as official host and chief organizer of preparations for this rally which was to be the first since September, 1923, when Streicher had originated the mammoth-scale "party-day" rallies in Nuremberg.93 Because of his experience in organizing and staging the Nuremburg rally, Streicher was asked by Hitler to give Dintner "every possible assistance" in planning for the Weimar Congress.94 Accordingly, Streicher was busy throughout June in this endeavor. While Dintner and his staff arranged parade routes, housing facilities, and meeting places, Streicher concerned himself mainly with printed material, such as programs, timetables, and lists of regulations. Paradoxically, Streicher who was usually

91Ibid., p. 293.
92Payne, Life and Death, p. 217; Bullock, Hitler, p. 139.
94Voelkischer Beobachter, July 3, 1926.
contemptuous of rules and regulations, demanded the strictest adherence to his timetables and long list of regulations which governed the minutest details of the rally. On the cover of the program, Streicher warned all participants that the precise timetable for all events would be strictly followed; that all regulations were to be obeyed unconditionally; and that special guards, in uniform and in plain clothes, were authorized to eject anyone who did not conform to all the rules.95

The Weimar rally was attended by approximately 5,000 uniformed storm troopers and an equal number of National Socialists out of uniform. Events of the afternoon and evening of July 3rd featured demonstrations of enthusiasm welcoming arriving dignitaries and torchlight parades.96 The next day, ceremonies began at 6AM and continued until early evening. Streicher was one of the featured speakers to address the entire assemblage in the late afternoon. His speech lasted less than one-half hour and centered on the growth and development of the Nazi party since Hitler was released from prison. Streicher then introduced Hitler, who delivered the keynote address of the rally.97 Hitler thanked Streicher and capitalized on his words to emphasize the major point of his address. He noted that the party membership had increased from 27,000 to 35,000 in the past six months. The principal reason for this remarkable gain, Hitler said, was that the party was no longer weakened by dissident groups and feuding members and now presented a unified organization of

95Ibid.
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loyal members. Referring to the Bamberg conference, Hitler stated that the "new image" of the unified party had become possible because he had insisted, at a winter conference, that all leaders and members of the movement must recognize him (Hitler) as the absolute and unquestioned leader. Hitler continued for an additional forty-five minutes discussing rudimentary elements of his concept of leadership—the Fuhrerprinzip.98

At the conclusion of his speech, Hitler left the rostrum amidst the loud and prolonged cheers of his followers. Streicher was the first to shake his hand. As Hitler accepted congratulations from many other leading party members, the entire audience seemed charged with excitement and enthusiasm. The sea of faces reflected an unwavering belief in their charismatic leader and in the future of the Nazi party.99

98Voelkischer Beobachter, July 5, 1926; Orlow, History of the Nazi Party, p. 74.

99Payne, Life and Death, p. 217; Burden, Nuremberg Rallies, p. 35.
Hitler's success at Weimar was, without question, of cardinal importance to the survival and future of the Nazi party. Yet, to national political observers in mid-1926, the rally was little more than a documentation of Hitler's charismatic power over a small group of right-wing radicals. With a membership of 35,000, the party was insignificant amidst the approximate 15.6 million voting Germans. In addition, possibilities for growth seemed remote for a party which had always preached resentment and whose major program was total negation of the present. By now the Republic showed positive signs of economic and political stabilization. Unemployment was declining, real wages and salaries were increasing, and at the head of the government stood the nationally respected war hero, Field Marshal Paul von Hindenburg.

At Weimar some of the delegates in caucuses had mentioned these changes and noted that perhaps now the party needed a more positive program to gain mass support. Some discussions centered about suggestions for changes in propagandistic direction and programmatic emphases. Hitler evaded direct response to these questions, stating merely that any substantive decisions in these matters must be postponed until the proper
time. "For now," he said, "we can only consolidate our strength--and wait."  

Streicher and other southern delegates returned to their homes armed with no new or different party policies or directives. Other than renewed enthusiasm for Hitler, these local leaders were left virtually to their own devices to carry on party work and attempt to expand their memberships. Streicher did not alter his schedule of endless local meetings where he continued emphasizing the same topics—the greatness of Hitler, and the evil of the Jews.

Somewhat remarkably, Streicher continually attracted large crowds at these meetings. Police reports note that empty seats were seldom in evidence. In most cases, the front section of the hall would be filled by a group of Streicher's loyal followers who attended most of his meetings, and cheered him at every opportunity. Aside from an ever-present scattering of political opponents and hecklers, the balance of those who attended occasionally, or for the first time, consisted mainly of young persons, students and workers under twenty-five years old, or older men who had lost savings and other holdings during the inflation. Persons in these groups may have had jobs, but they apparently were still disillusioned, or lacked faith in existing conditions and institutions, especially the Weimar Government. They all seemed to be searching for something other than their present--drab existence.

2Ibid., p. 78. These questions were more in the form of arguments for and against a definitive commitment to support only left-wing causes.

Streicher's success in continually drawing large audiences during this period cannot be attributed to any intelligent or enlightening quality of his speeches. Even his closest followers must have been bored by many of his monotonous repetitions. However, he had a facility for theatrics which even some Communists found entertaining. Perhaps purposefully, Streicher always managed to create an element of drama at some point in his speech. In hushed or thunderous tones he would relate some lurid or sensational story about his enemies—usually Jewish people. During these dramatic moments audiences reportedly became alive breaking out in smiles, whistling, or shouting "heils!" 4

Undoubtedly, there were other reasons why large numbers of Streicher's listeners found pleasure in this gutter-sensationalism between 1926 and 1929. A few may have been amused by the element of ludicrousness. Others appear to have enjoyed listening to the degradation and belittling of other humans. These people evidently liked this appeal to their baser instincts and were drawn to the swastika because of the coarser aspects of National Socialism.

After the Weimar Congress, there was little change in the usual format of Streicher's political meetings or the general themes of his speeches. Since these have already been thoroughly discussed, further reference to meetings and speeches is pointless, and will be minimized or omitted except for unusual or outstanding cases.

The first of the exceptions occurred a few days after Streicher returned from Weimar. At a Nuremberg NSDAP meeting he spoke on "Hitler's

4Ibid.
Storm Army In Weimar." Paying only lip service to this topic, he devoted most of his speech to a prison term he was soon to serve. He began by berating the Landtag for voting to uphold a recent court order committing him to prison for three and one-half months. For the balance of his speaking-time he dwelled on the injustice of the "Jew-filled" legal system and repeatedly professed that he was innocent of doing anything other than telling the truth about certain "enemies of the State." This meeting adjourned shortly after the conclusion of Streicher's speech.

As for the court order which Streicher assailed at that meeting, it noted that he had been found guilty and sentenced to a total of four months in prison in the two slander trials the previous winter. Further, the order stated that an ensuing investigation into the perjury charges against Luppe had revealed some minor discrepancies in his own testimony, but not of "such consequence as to constitute perjury." Concluding, the order cited these discrepancies as the reason for reducing the sentence to three and one-half months—to be served from August 23 to December 8, 1926. The judges' rationale for reducing the original sentences is not clear and probably was due only to their bias in Streicher's favor. Understandably, the plaintiffs in both cases were highly critical of this unjustified leniency. Luppe complained to Dr. Huber, the President of the Franconian Government, that the court had no legal grounds for reducing Streicher's sentences. In addition, Luppe wrote that Streicher should have been ordered to serve extra time because he had violated his

5Ibid. Police report of NSDAP meeting in Nuremberg, August 10, 1926, which is the source for the following.

6OSU, CGD, series T-580, reel nr. 267. Court order to Streicher from the President of the Nuremberg Common Pleas Court, August 8, 1926.
parole conditions countless times since the first trial. Huber evidently did not wish to interfere in the court's decision. There is no record that he answered Luppe, or that Streicher's reduced sentence was discussed further in official circles.

Shortly after the announcement of the court order, demonstrations and newspaper articles began appearing in Streicher's behalf. Some of these demonstrations were in the form of mass protests, which because of their nature and size, were considered highly unusual by local authorities, who were accustomed to witnessing the unceremonious imprisonment of many political agitators. These demonstrations were probably organized by some of Streicher's close associates, such as Holz. The enthusiasm with which thousands of people participated in them was indicative of Streicher's popularity. In one instance, the police reported a mass-protest meeting which took place in a large hall in Nuremberg on August 15. Announced only twenty-four hours earlier, the meeting was attended by an overflow crowd of more than 2,000 persons. After several speeches condemning the threatened imprisonment of their leader, the Nuremberg National Socialists unanimously approved a resolution demanding the immediate suspension of Streicher's sentence. After the meeting, some members of the audience participated in a torchlight march to a nearby square, where a few extemporaneous speeches, extolling the virtues of Streicher, were delivered.

---
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In addition to the *Stürmer*, which mentioned little else during these days, many other Nazi newspapers came strongly to Streicher's defense. Among these was the official party organ, the *Voelkischer Beobachter*, which in a typical article, pleaded that Streicher's sentence should be suspended because "he has throughout his whole life served the State and the German people."\(^{10}\)

These demonstrations and protests failed to bring any official indication of a last-minute sentence suspension. In fact, it is unlikely that Streicher was anxious now to be relieved of his punishment. The mass protests and newspaper headlines had suddenly thrust him into the limelight as a martyr to the Nazi cause. As a political opportunist, he capitalized on this means of gaining renewed and additional popularity. He appeared at most of the demonstrations and spoke only after the strong urging (perhaps staged) of the crowds. As a general theme, he stressed the injustice of his forthcoming punishment, but always added that he was willing to pay this price because it would offer clear evidence that Jews controlled the courts as well as the local and national governments.\(^{11}\)

Taking fullest advantage of this martyr image, Streicher planned extensive "farewell" ceremonies for August 20. Advertised in the *Stürmer* as Streicher's last public appearance for four months, the program was planned to produce strong emotional impact.\(^{12}\) Events began at 11 AM in the Lorenz-Church, where a certain Pastor Weigel delivered a eulogy about

\(^{10}\) *Voelkischer Beobachter*, August 18, 1926.


\(^{12}\) *Der Stürmer*, August 18; August 20, 1926, which is also the source for the following.
Nazi heroes who had fallen and those who were then suffering hardships on behalf of the party. The Pastor then consecrated the Nazi flags of a Nuremberg SA company. Following this, a parade, consisting of Hitler youth groups, uniformed SA units, and hundreds of party members, was led by Streicher through the downtown streets of Nuremberg.

Evening festivities shifted to the spacious Hercules Auditorium. A police report noted that the crowd seemed highly enthusiastic and that the entrance doors were barred at 6 PM because the hall was already overcrowded with approximately 4,000 persons. At 8 PM, amidst loud cheers, Streicher, accompanied by Hitler, led a group of dignitaries to the stage. It was generally known that the personal visit to a Gau by Hitler was one of the highest possible awards to a Gauleiter. To many Nuremberg Nazis, his appearance with Streicher this evening was the most impressive of the day's events. After the meeting was opened with some remarks by Pastor Weigel, Hitler addressed the audience briefly, noting that by government decree he was not permitted to speak publicly, but as party leader addressing party members, he felt within the law in expressing support and appreciation for his "friend and old fighting comrade, Julius Streicher."

Following Hitler's address, Streicher took the podium and spoke for little over an hour. At his dramatic best, he began by thanking all those present, especially Hitler and Pastor Weigel, noting that the latter was an outstanding churchman and that he was the first in Nuremberg to join the Nazi movement. He then mentioned the flag consecration and said

\footnote{\textit{Ibid.} BSA, PAJS, Vol. I, folder 1732. Police report on NSDAP meeting, August 20, 1926, which is also the source for the following.}
that this ceremony would enable him to enter the prison with an easy mind. Most of his talk, however, centered on the injustice of his sentence. Perhaps attempting to emulate Martin Luther, he intoned that although he had been unfairly judged, he would rather suffer in prison than "recant a single word" against the enemies of the true German people. He concluded his speech with the announcement that in his absence, Karl Holz would take over the leadership, and that his orders should be obeyed promptly. After a few more speeches and some songs, the meeting ended.

On the evening of August 23, Streicher was driven by friends to the Nuremberg city jail on Fürtherstrasse. There are strong indications that he spent his three and one-half month's confinement in relative comfort. The Socialist-oriented newspaper, Die Bombe, complained:

Streicher is not being punished... He occupies a room, not a cell... and is allowed visitors at all hours... His meals are served to him with all the beer or wine he desires.14

There is no reliable evidence available to confirm or deny these statements. Stürmer editorials, by Holz and others, offer no details of Streicher's prison life. They only stressed that their leader was being punished unjustly and he was bearing his martyrdom like a good soldier. The Stürmer carried numerous articles written by Streicher in jail, but these were mainly polemics about current political and racial injustices.15

Regardless of his treatment, Streicher may well have considered his imprisonment as a sanctuary from ongoing attacks against him. On August 30, the Franconian Office of the Bavarian Interior Ministry, at

14Die Bombe, September 5, 1926.
15Der Stürmer, August 26 to December 1, 1926.
Luppe's urging, brought legal action against Streicher in the Nuremberg Provincial Court. In a lengthy plea, the plaintiff cited all of Streicher's past legal transgressions and convictions and sought to prove him unworthy as an educator. The purpose of all this was to cancel Streicher's remuneration as a suspended teacher. As an added argument, the prosecuting attorney pointed out that Streicher's family would suffer no hardship if this were done, because his monthly gross income from the Stürmer was now averaging over 15,000 marks. After hearing this plea, the judge halted the proceedings because, he said, a matter of this nature could not be settled in the absence of the defendant. He then announced that the case was postponed until some unspecified future date.

In early September, Streicher was notified that he was named as defendant in two additional legal proceedings. One was another suit filed by Mayor Luppe, charging slander in several recent Stürmer articles. This case was scheduled for September 15, but it was later postponed because Streicher was not available for trial. The other case stemmed from an article published in Die Bombe, entitled: "Streicher Unmasked as a Seducer of Girls." Subsequent findings revealed that the title and contents of the story were apparent falsifications intended to discredit


17Ibid. This figure is an estimate taken from the undocumented statement that 17,000 to 20,000 copies per month were sold at 90 pfennig per month.

18BSA, PAJS, Vol. I, folder 1732. Letter from Nuremberg Common Pleas Court to Streicher, September 5, 1926; Der Stürmer, September 17, 1926.
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Streicher. According to the article, Streicher was guilty of raping the twenty-one year old wife of a certain Kurt Hennsch, of Munich. Because criminal procedures were pending against Streicher, President Huber ordered the Nuremberg police to investigate this matter and report at a court hearing on September 29. Although he could not appear at this hearing to defend himself, Streicher was completely exonerated. The police produced a sworn statement by Mrs. Hennsch that the charge was untrue and that it had been falsely made by her husband who was a jealous and vindictive man whom she was presently in the process of divorcing.

Many times during his confinement, Streicher must have been gratified at the encouragement and support of Munich party officials, who wrote numerous articles in the Voelkischer Beobachter demanding his early release. Despite these demands, Streicher was held for the full term of his sentence and released at 8 PM, December 8, 1926. A police report noted that a crowd of over 1,000 well-wishers had gathered to celebrate his return to freedom. Evidently pleased at this reaffirmation of his popularity, Streicher smiled broadly at this reception and returned some of the handwaves and "heils." He was then escorted to the lead car of a motorcade which eventually drove through the downtown section of Nuremberg while Streicher stood in the open car and acknowledged the greetings of

---
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some 2,000 people who stood at the curbs, shouting and waving. After a stop at a downtown hotel, where he ate and talked lengthily with Holz and other colleagues, Streicher eventually made his way home, to be reunited with his family.

During the days spent at home, Streicher did little else than sleep, eat, and brag about his recent political exploits. As a rule, he spent very little time with his family. There are no indications that he ever concerned himself with household affairs or bothered with family outings or vacations. His wife, Kunigunde, had no influence on his political ideas or activities. Devoted to her motherly duties, she concentrated her attention on her two young sons, Lothar and Elmar. She seemed to accept complacently the axiom that women had no place in the political or ideological world of National Socialism. A shy woman, she had little in common with her husband, who, because of his dictatorial temperament, doubtless dominated and intimidated her. This, coupled with the oft-publicized stories of his marital infidelity, must have caused her a great deal of unhappiness and mental anguish. Most likely, this constant strain brought on her nervous breakdown in the late 1930's. She spent her last years in a mental sanatorium in Rottenmünster, where she eventually died.

After the year-end holiday, Streicher returned to his routine political and publishing work. Until late in 1929, his political topics were confined to anti-Semitism and personal and local issues. In addition, his political activities rarely extended beyond the Nuremberg


25Peterson, Limits of Hitler's Power, p. 84. She died in 1943.
area. Aside from special or annual events, such as the party-day rallies and Gauleiter meetings, he had little to do with national party affairs. There were several reasons for this. Hitler's close circle of top party aides now included men such as Goebbels and Strasser, who were more intelligent and politically knowledgeable than Streicher and other southern radicals who, in the months after Landsberg, were Hitler's only trusted comrades. Because of Streicher's fanaticism and volatile nature, members of this new "inner circle" were generally hostile and, on several occasions, urged Hitler to get rid of the Nuremberg Gauleiter. Hitler, however, was steadfast in his loyalty even though he admitted at least once that he realized the limitations of Streicher's political abilities:

I do not wish to forgo Streicher's work within the bounds of his capabilities just because he does not agree with everybody in his disposition, and in the shape of his head...26

Although Streicher may have displayed ambitions, in earlier years, to become a national leader in the volkisch movement, there is no evidence that he now resented his exclusion from Hitler's "inner circle" and from national party affairs. This changed attitude may have resulted from Hitler's lavish praises of Streicher's accomplishments in the anti-Semitic fight and in organizing and maintaining a strong Nazi group in the Nuremberg area.27 Also, since becoming Gauleiter, Streicher had been allowed virtually a free hand in Franconian party affairs. Most likely he found contentment in this role because it provided him many opportunities to satisfy his psychological needs—to bask in personal popularity and to

27Der Stürmer, August 26, 1926; Also see footnote 26, Chapter VI.
behave with a minimum of restraint.

Finally, Streicher had become so totally involved in day-to-day business, that he had little or no time for affairs outside his Gau. At least two days each week were taken up with promotion and publication functions for the Stürmer. Besides numerous discussions with small groups, he organized and participated in at least two large, local political meetings each week. The balance of his time was fully occupied dealing with the growing list of his political enemies--outside, as well as inside the Nazi party.

Streicher's enemies were countless. Since entering politics, he had built his reputation mainly by villifying thousands of persons individually and the Jewish community collectively. As a natural consequence, he was, in turn, subjected to endless attacks--or counterattacks. As a rule he considered these as petty nuisances, and displayed an almost arrogant personal insensitivity to the charges and made little attempt to deny them. For unexplainable reasons, however, he reacted in the opposite manner when charged with illegal or illicit sexual behavior. He referred to most of these charges as vicious attempts at character assassination and denied them with vehemence.

Streicher's testimony at the Nuremberg trials illustrated his sensitivity on this subject. In a somewhat incoherent plea he alluded to his reputation as a sex criminal and tried to convince the court that he was a man of honor--that in this matter he was an innocent victim of

28Der Stürmer, January 21, 1927; June 7, 1927; July 10, 1929.
29See footnotes 9, Chapter V; 53, Chapter VI.
international propaganda.  

Attempting to prove his innocence, Streicher often argued that he was never found guilty of sex offenses with which he was formally charged. This argument, however, does not vitiate the judgment voiced by historians that he was, in fact, a sexually immoral person.  

In the formal cases, Streicher was exonerated because his alleged victim, or partner, denied complicity in the affair. This type of evidence was rejected by many of his opponents, who pointed out that most women would be naturally inclined to deny such a charge in order to protect their reputation. It is ironic that Streicher himself provided the most conclusive evidence of his disreputable morality by boasts which have been attested to by his aides and other individuals.

The most celebrated case of Streicher's sexual misconduct was the Madame Douchet affair. It was first reported in Der Bombe in December, 1926 and shortly afterwards reprinted in another opposition newspaper, Nuremberg-Fürther Morgenpresse. Briefly, the articles related that in 1916 Streicher had attempted to rape a teacher, named Madame Douchet, in the French village of Atis. The charge was based on a signed affidavit by a war veteran named Georg Schmidt, who allegedly witnessed the

\[\text{30}^{\text{IMT, Vol. 12, p. 308.}}\]

\[\text{31}^{\text{Hannah Arendt, Totalitarianism (New York, 1951), p. 36; Dutch, Hitler's Twelve Apostles, p. 175; Shirer, Rise and Fall, p. 26. These are only a few of the many references of this nature.}}\]

\[\text{32}^{\text{Heiden, Der Fuehrer, p. 292. Streicher bragged to party colleagues that he obtained large donations from the husband of one of his mistresses. IZM, Goring Commission Reports, doc. nr. 1757-PS. Written affidavits by former Streicher employees that Streicher often bragged to them about his sexual exploits.}}\]
attempted crime and helped prevent it.  

Immediately after the articles were published, Streicher filed a slander suit against the newspapers. At a preliminary court hearing in late January, 1927, Streicher insisted the charge was false and on his request the case was postponed to provide time for him to prove his innocence. Meanwhile, a Nazi city councilor, named Ertl, journeyed to France and obtained a written statement from Madame Douchet absolving Streicher of all guilt. This statement was signed, but it was not notarized, and may well have been a forgery. In overruling defense attorneys' objections, the court accepted Ertl's sworn assurances that the statement was valid. It proved to be the decisive evidence in favor of Streicher. At the conclusion of this hearing, the court levied a fine against the newspapers. In a final hearing the next month, Schmidt was found guilty of perjury and sentenced to one year in prison.

For weeks after the conclusion of these hearings, newspapers capitalized on the scandal and its outcome. For example, the Nuremberg-Fürther Morgenpresse published a series entitled: "What is Going on in the Nuremberg Palace of Justice?" These articles pointed out several reasons why Streicher should have been found guilty. They repeatedly accused Streicher and his friends of bribing the French teacher or forging
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33 Die Bombe, December 20, 1926; Nuremberg-Fürther Morgenpresse, December 23, 1926.


35 Nuremberg-Fürther Morgenpresse, June 14, 1928.

the statement allegedly signed by her. Inasmuch as either of these two accusations may have been correct, they were perhaps justified in hinting that the court showed partiality to Streicher.37

On the other hand, the *Stürmer* turned the entire affair and its outcome into "another righteous victory" for Streicher over Jews who had supposedly paid Schmidt 300 marks to defame Streicher.38 Although this story was most likely a fabrication, it is interesting that Streicher repeated it under oath at the Nuremberg trials in 1946.39

Months before the Madame Douchet affair was settled, Streicher became embroiled in a feud with the Nuremberg *Landsturm*. This group, formed in 1924 by Streicher as his bodyguard and police unit of the GVG, lost its official function in 1925 when the local SA company was organized. Although most members joined the re-formed NSDAP, *Landsturm* leaders, claiming that they did not wish to lose their group identity, refused to merge with the SA unit.40

In mid-1926, hostilities erupted when Streicher, in a *Stürmer* article, castigated them for not joining the SA.41 In retaliation, the *Landsturm*'s leader complained to Munich party headquarters that Streicher was pocketing their dues payments.42 This quarrel dragged on until
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37 *Nuremberg-Fürther Morgenpresse*, July 18, 1928; August 30, 1928.

38 *Der Stürmer*, July 17, 1928.


41 *Der Stürmer*, August 18, 1926.

October, 1927, when Streicher ended it by issuing an official directive which effectively dissolved the group. In summary, the directive outlawed simultaneous membership in the Landsturm and the NSDAP. 43

The Landsturm incident might have ended sooner if Streicher had not been engaged in more important matters throughout the summer months of 1927. In early May, Nazi headquarters had announced that the national party-day congress would be held August 20, 21, and 22 at Nuremberg. Planning sessions began a few days later with Hitler presiding. He announced that the prime objective of the congress, or rally, was to demonstrate the strength and solidarity of the National Socialist movement. 44 According to an American historian, Dietrich Orlow, Hitler's objective for the congress could best be achieved at Nuremberg because it had not only a "well organized local party, but also contained a large body of sympathizers who found Julius Streicher's pornographic anti-Semitic harangues peculiarly appealing." Orlow continued, that the enthusiastic group of National Socialists there would provide rally visitors with an illusion of Nazi success and popularity that could not be found in any other city. 45

Streicher stated in a Stürmer article that Hitler had chosen Nuremberg as the congress site because the 1923 rally had been such an outstanding success. He added boastfully that this gave him great satisfaction because it was he (Streicher) who had suggested to Hitler that

43Der Stürmer, October 5, 1927.
44Orlow, History of the Nazi Party, p. 113.
45Ibid.
Nuremberg would be the ideal city for that rally. Another American scholar, Alan Wykes, confirms this claim. Wykes states that Streicher told Hitler (in 1923) that Nuremberg was the ideal city to hold the rally because "the National Socialist life breathes in the ancient walls and gable and moat."  

Streicher, with the help of two party officials, was in charge of the extensive preparations for this congress. This work involved not only attending to hundreds of details of the three-day program, but involved also logistics problems connected with accommodating the expected 160,000 visitors and rally participants. Despite some confusion and a few inconveniences, the congress was considered overwhelmingly successful by most Nazis.

The most spectacular event of this rally was the massive torch-light parade of some 30,000 uniformed Nazis through the streets of Nuremberg and past a downtown hotel where Hitler saluted the columns with a raised torch. Thousands of spectators paid as much as twenty marks for seats to watch this parade.

To some observers, the most interesting aspect of all the events was the content of some of the speeches. For example, Arthur Dintner,
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46Der Stürmer, May 13, 1927.
48Ibid., pp. 98-99; Burden, Nuremberg Party Rallies, pp. 38-39. The figure of 160,000 visitors is questionable. Some opposition newspapers estimated total attendance at less than 10,000. It is likely that the correct number is somewhat less than that cited by the Nazis. There was no official estimate made by attending police.
49Burden, Nuremberg Party Rallies, p. 39.
Thuringian party leader, outlined, for the first time, a systematic anti-Semitic doctrine that foreshadowed the Nuremberg Laws of 1935. Other speeches predicted the alliance of Germany and Italy and urged withdrawal from the League of Nations. Streicher's speeches were among the least interesting. At the opening session of party leaders he delivered a brief welcoming address. Later that day, he spoke as the fifth and final speaker on the afternoon program. The relative unimportance of this speech is evidenced by the fact that Hamilton Burden, an American author who chronicled these events, did not even mention that Streicher spoke that afternoon. In a Stürmer article, however, this speech was printed verbatim. It was evidently not one of the rally's major speeches inasmuch as it was unusually short (about 30 minutes) compared to Streicher's normal two to three hour harangues. It was mainly an anti-Semitic tirade in which he praised Dintner's words but said nothing else that he had not discussed many times previously.

In early January, 1928, Streicher was faced with a legal attempt to force him to leave Nuremberg. This action was instigated by Dr. Luppe, who, as head of the Nuremberg School Board, had been pressing intermittently for the conclusion of the disciplinary procedure initiated against Streicher after he had been temporarily suspended from his teaching duties for absenteeism in late 1923. On previous occasions, Luppe had formally requested that the Nuremberg disciplinary court for non-

\[\text{Der Stürmer, Special Issue, August 21, 1927, which is also the source for the following.}\]

\[\text{See footnote 44, Chapter IV. BSA, PAJS, Vol. I, folder 1732. Letters from Luppe to the Nuremberg disciplinary court for non-judicial officials, March 10, 1925; June 13, 1926.}\]
judicial officials render final judgment in this matter. In his petitions, he noted that the only solution satisfactory to the local school board would be the outright dismissal of Streicher as a teacher. Various court officials had set these petitions aside for over four years. Although Streicher's popularity may have had something to do with these delays, Luppe was informed repeatedly that it would be a waste of the court's time to seek such stringent punishment on the grounds of a few day's unexcused absence.52

The January hearing was granted because Luppe had altered his previous pleas. He no longer insisted that Streicher be permanently dismissed. Instead, he cited numerous reasons why Streicher should be transferred to a school system some distance from Nuremberg.53

Streicher acted dumbfounded as he heard the reading of this plea. He was obviously not prepared for an eventuality as serious as this. It was one of his rare court appearances without an attorney. In his own defense, he could only utter disjointed phrases concerning his innocence and his need to stay in Nuremberg. Later he listened helplessly as his hated adversary, Dr. Suessheim, reviewed Streicher's good war record. As if rubbing salt into a wound, Suessheim also quoted passages from favorable reports on Streicher's classroom activities and added that these talents should not be wasted. Concluding that political circumstances prevented Streicher from using these gifts effectively in Nuremberg, Suessheim recommended, with emphasis, that the only viable solution was to transfer

52Ibid. Letter from Nuremberg disciplinary court for non-judicial officials, June 25, 1926.

53Nuremberger-Burger-Zeitung, January 13, 1928, which is also the source for the following
Streicher back to Mindelheim, where he had taught before moving to Nuremberg in 1909.

Perhaps the most interesting aspect of this legal procedure was the total lack of sympathy shown Streicher by court officials. Streicher later charged that the judges were prejudiced against him because all three members of the panel were of Jewish descent. There is no evidence that any of the judges were Jews, but Streicher, of course could not admit that these men were acting impartially in the interest of justice. On the second day of the hearing, the verdict was rendered. The panel followed Suessheim's recommendation, that Streicher be transferred to the Mindelheim school district. In addition, he was sentenced to pay a fine of 500 marks for publicly insulting Luppe, his superior school administrative official. Before leaving the hearing room, Streicher, on advice of his attorney Dr. Krafft, notified the judges that he could not comply with the order to be transferred; instead he would appeal this sentence to the State Ministry for Education and Culture in Munich.

Streicher's appeal was heard on May 23, 1928, before the disciplinary court for non-judicial officials in Munich. The verdict showed clearly that officials of this court were biased in Streicher's favor. Officially, the appeal was rejected. Because of his refusal to be transferred he was to be discharged and his salary was to be dis-

55 Nuremberg-Bürger-Zeitung, January 20, 1928; Der Stürmer, nr. 3, 1928.
56 Völkischer Beobachter, May 25, 1928; Der Stürmer, nr. 22, May, 1928, which is also the source for the following.
continued. However, the court ordered that he receive the full pension to which he would be entitled if he were retiring at the time of his discharge. Also, in case of his death, his survivors would be entitled to full support.

The pension, as ordered by the court, amounted to 3,374 marks annually. This lifetime income, together with the support clause for his survivors, was a better arrangement for Streicher than his temporary partial teaching salary which had fluctuated since his suspension between 3,000 and 3,500 marks.57

Shortly after publication of Streicher's disciplinary sentence in January, a palace revolution against the leadership of the Nuremberg National Socialist party was initiated. Although never mentioned, the timing of this revolt suggested that it was connected with Streicher's expected transfer from Nuremberg. At a clandestine meeting in early February, some 80 Nuremberg Nazis organized a movement to oppose and/or prevent the continued party leadership of Streicher or "any of his henchmen."58 The group was composed of men, such as former Landsturm members, who disliked Streicher, mainly because of his overbearing mannerisms. The spokesman at this meeting was a former deputy party leader, named Käfer, who, for unknown reasons had been recently demoted by Streicher. In listing grievances, Käfer insisted that Streicher misused party funds because he refused to account for money collected at party meetings.


58Ibid. Report from Nuremberg police files on meeting at Breidenbach's Department Store, Nuremberg, February 5, 1928, which is also the source for the following.
Käfer reminded his listeners that the annual election of local party chairman was scheduled for next month, and urged everyone present to enlist support for the candidacy of a certain Conrad Weber, who was a relatively obscure local party member. To make the fight more effective, Käfer said, an opposition newspaper, the *Deutsche Volkszeitung*, would soon begin weekly publication.

This newspaper, which first appeared in late February, existed only for a few months. It merits attention because it illustrated the feelings and major frustrations of some of the more intelligent and independent-minded Nuremberg National Socialists who organized revolts against Streicher during the decade after the Munich putsch. It also revealed that Hitler may have followed a policy of non-intervention in these insurrections, leaving Streicher to his own devices to prove his ability to weather storms within the local Nazi party.

The *Deutsche Volkszeitung* opened its campaign by charging Streicher with dishonest handling of party funds.\(^{59}\) Articles in the first two issues accused him of persistently pocketing most of the money collected at meetings, and bleeding money from the national party treasury by submitting forged bills for such items as flag material used at the party-day rallies. In most cases little attempt was made to back these accusations with records or figures; instead they were based on speculation and the fact that Streicher stubbornly refused to account for any of these funds in question. One incident, which seemed to be in keeping with Streicher's undisciplined nature, was cited to typify his uncom-

\(^{59}\) *Deutsche Volkszeitung*, February 24; March 4, 1928, which is also the source for the following.
promising attitude in this regard. When asked about the distribution of certain local party receipts, Streicher allegedly retorted: "What I do with the money is none of your damned business!"

Subsequent editions of the Deutsche Volkszeitung continued to express frustrations related to Streicher's questionable money practices. The only other major complaints centered about his unsavory colleagues and his disreputable moral habits. It is notable that his fanatic anti-Semitism, which became an embarrassment to many party officials, was not criticized. Instead, Streicher's paranoid attitude concerning the Jewish question was apparently adopted also by some members of the opposition group as reflected in the following excerpt:

Like a wild river floods fertile fields and meadows through a broken dam, so the Jew came from the east; flooded our home-city and settled in all streets and businesses ... with cold, cruel greed he stole all he could from trusting citizens ... With sadistic pleasure he satisfied his lust in wild orgies with blonde women and girls in Nuremberg. . . .60

Considerable space in the Deutsche Volkszeitung was also used in arguments attempting to prove that Streicher's anti-Semitism was insincere --that he pretended it only to further his political and financial fortunes.

Almost every edition of the Deutsche Volkszeitung included statements to the effect that Hitler supported the fight against Streicher. One week before elections were scheduled for local party officers, a circular, signed by one of the editors of this newspaper, was mailed to all Nuremberg party members. In soliciting support for the movement

60Ibid., March 11, 1928.
against Streicher, it proclaimed, in bold print, that this movement was sanctioned by Hitler because he now realized that Streicher was unfit as a Nazi leader. While these claims were not substantiated, they pose an intriguing question: Why did Hitler not come to his Gauleiter's defense in the face of these obvious untruths? Perhaps, as suggested earlier, he remained silent purposely; to test, or evaluate Streicher's political strength in Nuremberg at this time.

The election, or re-election, of officers was held annually by most local Nazi parties. To many observers these were not taken seriously, but considered as formalities to comply with the law and to add a degree of legitimacy to officeholders who had been hand-picked by Hitler. Since there was no outside supervision, these democratic exercises actually amounted to little more than demonstrations of the political control possessed by the incumbent leaders.

According to police witnesses, the annual election of the Nuremberg NSDAP in mid-March left no doubt about the absolute control of the Streicher faction over the local party. The police report noted that SA guards checked the credentials of each person entering the meeting hall on election night. All persons known to be antagonistic to Streicher, as well as all former Landsturm members, were refused admission on the
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grounds of faulty membership cards. A Nazi city councilman, named Gradl, acted as election official. After reading the names of the present officers, Gradl asked for a show of hands to approve re-election of the entire slate. Only three men failed to raise their hands. Gradl then called these three to the stage where they were subjected to an embarrassing body-search by SA guards, and forced to remain there while another city councilman, named Nagel, hurled a tirade of personal insults at them. Following this, Streicher made a short "acceptance speech," in which he thanked everyone for supporting the party leadership. He concluded this brief address with a warning that in the following year, any sign of disloyalty by any member would result in immediate dismissal from the party.

The precautionary screening measures employed at the Nuremberg meeting suggest that Streicher felt that an undisputed election was of critical importance. He must have realized that this show of strength was needed to reaffirm Hitler's faith in his (Streicher's) political abilities. Also, only a decisive victory would bring on the collapse of the organized opposition group and possibly silence its abrasive organ, the Deutsche Volkszeitung. With these problems out of the way, Streicher could now devote all his energies to the political work ahead--that of running the campaign for the national and regional elections scheduled for May 20.

According to Stürmer accounts, Streicher left local party matters in Holz's hands between April 1 and May 20, and concentrated on campaign activities throughout Franconia. Besides planning and organizing countless political programs, he participated in an average of five campaign
rallies each week. He appeared in the dual role of Landtag candidate and local sponsor for Bavarian Nazis running for Reichstag seats. It is not clear why Streicher did not run for a Reichstag seat himself. Perhaps he felt that at this time it was more important for him to stay close to home and take care of his many political and publishing affairs. But since the decision on the final slate of candidates was up to Hitler, it would also seem that he might have thought it wiser to keep this uninhibited rabble rouser out of the Reichstag at this time.

Two candidates, both ex-army officers, Franz von Epp, and Walter Buch, often came over from Munich, and appeared at rallies with Streicher. These men were inexperienced speakers and had difficulty holding the attention of the audiences. While the presence of Epp and Buch added dignity and prestige to the rallies, it was Streicher who provided the necessary ingredient of showmanship. By clever use of lighting effects, music, and flags, he generated and maintained audience enthusiasm. The programs were usually concluded with one of Streicher's long speeches, which always featured some sensational anti-Jewish story, related in a dramatic fashion.

With few exceptions, Franconian audiences responded favorably to Streicher's brand of anti-Semitism. An example of one of these exceptions was a meeting on May 12, at Furth. According to a police report, two to three hundred workers had gathered at the rear of the hall and began waving little red flags and interrupting Streicher as he spoke. Eventu-
ally physical violence erupted between these hecklers and some SA men and the meeting was dissolved by the attending police. A Stürmer article capitalized on this disturbance in order to illustrate the rowdy and undisciplined nature of Communists.

After the election results were tabulated, Streicher had reason to be highly pleased with his campaign efforts. Nationwide, the Nazis suffered disastrous defeats at the polls. Altogether, the party received only 810,000 votes and twelve seats in the Reichstag; a loss of nearly 100,000 votes and two seats in comparison with the NSFP showing in December, 1924. Franconia, however, was one of the few districts where Nazis scored a genuine political victory by accounting for over 100,000 votes, or one eighth of all votes cast for the party in Germany. Streicher was re-elected to the Landtag by a wide margin, while his campaign-partners, Epp and Buch, were among the twelve Nazis who win Reichstag seats. Streicher's easy victory could only be attributed to his popularity as a leading Nazi and anti-Semite. His Landtag record was very poor, since he had attended but a few sessions in the past two years. Most likely he disliked attending because he had a strong distaste for parliamentary procedures. Moreover, he probably felt that the sessions were a waste of his time because he was not able to influence Landtag

---


66 Der Stürmer, nr. 18, May, 1928.
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decisions. He probably ran for the Landtag because it added prestige to his name and also provided a steady income of some 60 marks monthly. In general, the Nazi victory in Franconia is to be attributed to two key factors--anti-Semitism and fear of an agricultural depression. Anti-Semitism was historically more deeply rooted and widespread in Franconia than in any other electoral district in the nation.69 Stressed over and over again by Streicher, this issue became very much alive and perhaps dominated the minds of thousands of Franconian voters as they entered the polls on election day.

Analysis by party statisticians revealed that people in areas such as rural Franconia were almost totally dependent on farming for their economic life, and had not benefited materially by the recent industrial boom as much as city dwellers.70 More tradition-bound by nature than their urban counterparts, the rural population had little confidence in the republican government. Their concerns were summarized in a *Voelkischer Beobachter* article by a reporter who had conducted a series of post-electoral interviews in the Franconian towns of Langenzen and Veitbronn:

... These people are greatly concerned that the prices of agricultural products will become so cheap that it will not pay to plant crops.
... The feeling here is that the government cares only for large industries and railroads and has no concern for the situation among farmers. ... 71

71 *Voelkischer Beobachter*, June 3, 1928; *Der Stürmer*, nr. 21, 1928.
It was only after the election that Hitler and his advisors realized that they had seriously underestimated the possibility of a wide base of support in the rural districts. Considering these as political backwaters, they had been concentrating mostly money and efforts on urban centers where Nazi election losses were recorded as the heaviest.72

Responding to this lesson, Hitler soon embarked on an organizational revolution. He ordered the so-called "urban plan" discontinued and initiated sweeping changes so that organizational efforts could be concentrated more on outlying farming communities.73 Primarily because of financial reasons, he cancelled the annual party-day rally, and in its place scheduled a leadership conference in Munich to explain and promulgate his organizational reforms.74

Streicher was one of the principal speakers at the opening session of the conference on August 2.75 Taking his cue from Hitler's opening address, Streicher spoke first about the need for the party to follow up its rural triumphs. He could not resist repeating the already well known election results in the rural areas of Franconia. Although he had never previously shown consideration to farmers, he now talked as if he had always been aware of their problems and fears. He concluded with the statement that he fully agreed with Hitler's new organizational plans

72Orlow, _History of the Nazi Party_, pp. 129-130.
73Ibid. The urban plan was an organizational scheme, followed between 1926 and early 1928, to attempt to win the urban masses to the Nazi cause.
74Ibid., p. 135; _Der Stürmer_, nr. 21, June, 1928.
75Der Stürmer, nr. 32, August, 1928; _Voelkischer Beobachter_, August 3, 1928.
and that he (Streicher) was pledging himself to "work unceasingly" in this direction.

In the course of the three-day conference, Hitler's new plan became an organizational reality. Perhaps as a reward for his successful campaign work, Streicher was named to an ad hoc executive committee. This committee held several long sessions framing recommendations for realignment of Gau personnel and boundary lines. However, as soon as he was assured there would be no recommendations for changes in Franconia, Streicher lost interest in the tedious deliberations.76

Following the Munich conference, Streicher began directing more of his publishing and political efforts towards the farming communities in his Gau. The Sturmer initiated a series of articles dealing with current, local agricultural problems. There was little originality in these articles, however, most of the pertinent information was in the form of quotations from or references to agricultural magazines or other newspapers.77 Streicher also revised his schedule of speaking engagements to include more appearances at political meetings in rural areas.

In the early weeks of this rural campaign, he spoke in vague terms, attempting to prove that the major cause of all agricultural economic problems was the "greedy Jew."78 These arguments, however, failed to generate much enthusiasm because many of the men in the audiences seemed to be seeking more specific answers to their mounting agricultural prob-
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lems. For example, at one meeting, in the town of Iphofen, attending police noted general disgruntlement when Streicher glossed over a question from a young man concerned with falling livestock and grain prices. By December, the declining Stürmer circulation and reduced attendance at meetings indicated that the rural population was losing interest in Streicher.

Streicher was facing a dilemma which was new to him. A large portion of his rural audiences was now preoccupied only with problems concerning agriculture and sought specific answers or information dealing with these problems. These people reportedly found little satisfaction now in Streicher's usual diatribes which had always appealed to rural and urban crowds prone to prejudices and disturbed about a combination of economic, social, and political problems. Streicher had no background in agriculture and could say very little about the problems facing farmers. More to his disadvantage, there were very few Jews connected with farming and the farm business, and consequently Streicher had been unable to convince many farmers of his favorite argument—that the Jew was the cause of their misfortune.

In February, 1929, Streicher stumbled across information which not only enabled him to solve the above dilemma, but also gained him considerable national publicity as a protector of small farmers. By a routine investigation, a Stürmer staff member learned that a Jewish man, August Bauernfreund, conducted a large meat packing business in the Würz-


80 Ibid. Police report on NSDAP meeting at Schwabach, December 15, 1928.
burg area. Streicher jumped at the lead, and within days obtained several signed affidavits from Würzburg farmers charging that Bauernfreund, by monopolistic and illegal practices, was driving local livestock producers to financial ruin.81

As might be expected, Streicher capitalized on the Bauernfreund case to the fullest possible extent. By April, Stürmer circulation in rural areas increased again and Streicher was speaking to capacity audiences at political meetings in rural areas in spite of admission fees as high as one mark.82

In early June, Streicher made one of his rare Landtag appearances to speak about new developments in this case. Here, he leveled the sensational charge that two highly placed officials in the Bavarian Ministry of Agriculture, Dr. Fehr and Dr. Niklas, were implicated in the illegal operations of the "sausage Jew." He noted that Fehr was formerly member of the board of directors of the packing firm, and claimed that both Fehr and Niklas were currently receiving free gifts from Bauernfreund in return for illegitimate licenses and other favors.83

After Streicher’s speech, the Bauernfreund case became national news. While most newspapers made light of Streicher’s claims and emphasized the denials of the accused men, Nazi newspapers turned the story to their own political advantage.84 All public mention of the case died

81 Der Stürmer, nrs. 6 and 7, February, 1929.
82 Ibid., nr. 14, April, 1929.
83 Ibid., nr. 23, June, 1929; Voelkischer Beobachter, June 10, 1929.
84 Der Stürmer, nr. 25, June, 1929; Voelkischer Beobachter, June 30, 1929; Fränkischer Kurier, June 28, 1929.
out within a few days, however, when the injured parties obtained a court injunction ordering a cessation of charges and countercharges until legal proceedings could be arranged to establish the truth.

Although this matter dragged through several courts for over two years, and Streicher was eventually found guilty of malicious slander, the Bauernfreund story was a vital factor in the success of Streicher's rural campaign. It provided ample material for the countless sensational articles and speeches which brought overflow crowds to party meetings in many rural areas. In turn, these meetings fostered interest in the National Socialist movement, and most likely contributed to the record number of new members attracted to the party in 1929.

The unprecedented increase in party membership in 1929 was attributable only in part to the concentrated political campaign in rural areas. A more important factor was the economic depression which, by late summer was beginning to affect all segments of German society. To a considerable extent the NSDAP was a direct beneficiary of the slumping German economy. The depression produced widespread fear, especially among members of the lower middle class who were as fearful of the loss of social status as they were about future economic hardship. By the tens of thousands, members of this class flocked to join the Nazi party.

---

85 BSA, PAJS, Vol. IV, folder 1733. Report from Nuremberg police files. Criminal proceedings in the provincial court, Nuremberg, September 26, 1931. Streicher was sentenced to a fine of 500 marks and ordered to pay for the publication of an apology in three local newspapers.

86 Manvell and Fraenkel, Inside Adolph Hitler, p. 76. While party membership figures for Franconia are unavailable, the following statistics for overall membership year by year show that increases for that year doubled the increases of the previous year: 1927 - 72,000 members; 1928 - 108,000 members; 1929 - 178,000 members.
because it combined familiar appeals to traditional values with promises of immediate relief.  

While the depression was taking root, many Nazi leaders were optimistically preparing for the third Nuremberg party congress, scheduled for early August. Hitler had initially announced his preliminary ideas for this congress at a conference of Nazi officials in January. Unaware that economic circumstances would greatly enhance Nazi fortunes and provide ample reason for optimism, he attempted to instill confidence in his leaders at the January meeting. He told them to forget the disappointments of earlier years—that among other things, the success of the rally depended upon a great deal of day-to-day enthusiasm to prove that great changes had taken place in the National Socialist movement.

During the spring months, Streicher was deeply involved in a series of detailed planning sessions held in Nuremberg in preparation of the party congress. This congress was planned as a spectacular theatrical production on a scale to dwarf all past Nazi events. The new propaganda chief, Goebbels, was placed in charge of the overall program, while Streicher was to direct all local logistics arrangements.

Although the program was to be far more elaborate and was to involve many more people than the previous rally, Streicher, because of his experience, had little difficulty fulfilling all his responsibilities satisfactorily and on time. By putting in long hours throughout the

---


89 Wykes, *The Nuremberg Rallies*, pp. 103-104.
summer months, he managed this organizational work without neglecting his local publishing and political endeavors.90

The congress opened at 11 AM on August 2, in the main hall of the Nuremberg Kulturvereinshaus. With Hitler and other party dignitaries present, Streicher, as official host, began proceedings with a brief welcoming address.91 This was followed by a number of speeches by other Nazi officials. The most important of the new issues discussed that day was the so-called Young Plan,92 which was condemned for numerous reasons. Streicher delivered the last speech of the afternoon session. His main topic, as usual, was anti-Semitism. For emphasis, he singled out the Bauernfreund case and stressed its significance in awakening the local rural population to the menace of the Jews.93

Further details of the 1929 party congress need not be discussed here. In impressionistic theatrical extravagance, as well as in sheer numbers (of participants, visitors, and onlookers) its success must have surpassed even the expectations of its planners.94 Its lasting historical importance, however, was not that it outshone all previous rallies in propagandistic intensity, but rather that it symbolized a crucial milestone in the history of the National Socialist movement. As the

---

90Der Stürmer, nr. 25, June, 1929.
91Burden, The Nuremberg Party Rallies, p. 49.
92So called after American banker, Owen Young, who headed a committee of international banking experts to determine Germany's future reparations payments. The committee signed a report on June 7, 1929, setting Germany's payments at a lower amount, and extending them over a longer period of years than originally specified.
93Der Stürmer, nr. 31, August, 1929.
The final program ended with the crowd singing the national anthem. Hitler, Streicher, and other Nazi leaders may have sensed that this congress marked the end of the years of waiting and of petty fighting, and heralded the beginning of the final struggle for political dominance over Germany.\footnote{Ibid., p. 55; Orlow, History of the Nazi Party, p. 166.}
CHAPTER VIII

ASCENSION TO POWER

Shortly after the Nuremberg congress, Hitler announced, in the Voelkischer Beobachter, that he had committed the Nazi party to cooperate with other rightist groups in a campaign to prevent the acceptance and promulgation of the Young Plan. Although most National Socialist leaders were opposed to the principles of the Plan, many, for other ideological reasons, were also opposed to an open alliance with these right-wing groups, led by wealthy businessmen, industrialists, and landholders. Streicher, while disavowing Socialism, had consistently championed the cause of the exploited "victims" of the moneyed classes. Like other party militants, he was probably stunned to see the picture, in the Voelkischer Beobachter, of Hitler (also an erstwhile champion of anti-capitalism) side by side with one of the nation's leading capitalists, Dr. Alfred Hugenberg, head of the German National Peoples' Party.

Most party functionaries, including Streicher, apparently had no knowledge of the underlying motives prompting Hitler to form this partner-

1Voelkischer Beobachter, September 7, 1929.
3Voelkischer Beobachter, September 7, 1929.
ship. Yet, Hitler's authority was so well established that he had no difficulty engaging his Gauleiters and other leaders overnight in this political effort.\textsuperscript{4} Streicher's reaction was typical of many others who were inwardly opposed to Hitler's sudden and unexplained move. In a speech at a political meeting a few days after the announcement in the \textit{Voelkischer Beobachter}, he said:

\begin{quote}
He (Hitler) must have his reasons to join hands with these strangers to our cause. . . . He has always proved to be a true and wise leader. . . . We must not ask questions . . . but wait to hear what he has to say . . . he will, no doubt, explain everything when the proper time comes. . . .\textsuperscript{5}
\end{quote}

Within a week, Streicher was called to Munich to attend a \textit{Gauleiter} briefing session on the Young Plan referendum campaign. Hitler opened this session by urging everyone present to do "all possible" in this national effort. Then, in strictest confidence, he revealed the financial and political benefits to be realized by the party from this campaign whether or not it succeeded.\textsuperscript{6} Besides providing the party with badly needed funds and thus enabling it to generate further discontent with the Weimar Government, Hitler said he hoped to win nationwide political respectability for the party and gain continued backing from the industrial and banking community, as well as large-scale support from

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}
the more substantial, well-to-do portions of the middle classes. Even after Hitler's explanation, Streicher showed no great enthusiasm for this referendum campaign, nevertheless he made some sincere efforts to cooperate in the overall attempt to defeat the Plan.

In late September, Streicher began to align some of his publishing and political efforts with a national Nazi anti-Young Plan campaign. The overall strategy was directed from Munich headquarters where staff writers provided themes, published in the Voelkischer Beobachter, to be followed and emphasized weekly in each Gau. The Stürmer reprinted most of these articles and Streicher discussed some parts of this information in his speeches. During this campaign, Streicher followed the Munich organizational schedule to the degree that his speech titles and opening statements were usually taken from the weekly themes. According to police reports on two of these meetings, his discussions were little more than racial polemics. Using vague references, he attempted to prove that both the Dawes and Young Plans were conceived by an organization of international Jews to bring on the ruin of Germany.

In the absence of statistical evidence, it can only be assumed that the referendum to defeat the Young Plan failed as dismally in

---

7Orlow, History of the Nazi Party, p. 174;
Bullock, Hitler, p. 149;
Ludecke, I Knew Hitler, p. 341.

8Der Stürmer, nr. 36, September, 1929.

9BSA, PAJS, Vol. IV, folder 1733. Police reports on NSDAP meetings in Nuremberg and Rothenberg, September 30; October 5, 1929; Der Stürmer, nr. 36, September, 1929; nr. 37, October, 1929.
Franconia as it did throughout Germany. \(^{10}\) As suggested by the above police reports, Streicher's arguments against the Plan were probably weak and appealed only to certain confirmed anti-Semites. In addition, his schedule of meetings was interrupted in the middle of the campaign by an enforced court appearance, and he became preoccupied with local elections near the end of the campaign.

In early November, Streicher and Holz were subpoenaed to face trial on charges of slander and blasphemy of the Nuremberg Jewish community. \(^{11}\) The charge stemmed from some recent Stürmer issues, featuring front page allegations of the Jewish murder ritual in words, as well as ghastly cartoons. An example of this type of cartoon, from a later Stürmer issue, may be seen in the illustration on the next page.

Among other claims, the articles stated that the Talmud sanctioned these bloody rituals. On the witness stand, Streicher repeatedly tried to confuse the issues of the case by random discussions concerning his political and racial beliefs. The trial lasted ten days and ended in convictions and prison sentences for both defendants. Holz, because he authored most of the articles, was sentenced to a prison term of three months and fifteen days, and Streicher, because he was editor of the Stürmer, was to serve a two month prison term. In addition, the court ordered that all remaining copies of two issues of the Stürmer, numbers

\(^{10}\) Bullock, Hitler, p. 148;
Ludecke, I Knew Hitler, p. 341. Of the 21 million votes needed in the referendum, the Hugenberg-Hitler factions polled less than six million.

\(^{11}\) SBA, Ruehl, Der Stuermer, pp. 187-188.
BSA, PAJS, Vol. IV, folder 1733. Report from Nuremberg police files. Criminal proceedings in Nuremberg Common Pleas Court, November 13, 1929, which is also the source for the following.
Jüdischer Mordplan
gegen die nichtjüdische Menschheit ausgedacht

Das Mordepreis

Der Judenmord an der gesamten Menschheit durch die Juden selbst. So hat das Judentum, das sich die Juden selbst als die Verfolgten und die Opfer des Judenmordes darstellt, die Möglichkeit, sich durch die Ausführung dieses Mordes an sich selbst die Bedeutung des Mordes an sich selbst zu beweisen. So hat das Judentum die Möglichkeit, sich durch die Ausführung dieses Mordes an sich selbst die Bedeutung des Mordes an sich selbst zu beweisen.

Judenopfer

Die Juden sind unser Unglück!

A Stürmer Issue Describing the Jewish Murder-Ritual Plan
19 and 20, June, 1929, be confiscated and destroyed. Before leaving the courtroom, Streicher's attorney filed appeals for both sentences.

After the trial, Streicher held most of his political meetings in the immediate vicinity of Nuremberg. Elections for city councilmen were scheduled for mid-December, and Streicher headed a list of seven National Socialists seeking council seats. Since 1925, he had won re-elections to this office with little or no effort, however, this year he felt the need to campaign actively. This may have been because Mayor Luppe had initiated a series of newspaper articles, in late October, publicizing Streicher's poor record as a councilman for the past five years. Of all complaints cited, the most repeated was Streicher's poor attendance at council meetings. It averaged less than ten percent annually.

Some political opponents questioned Streicher's motives for seeking an office which was apparently of no interest to him. Luppe brought out the charge that Streicher was only interested in the 1300 marks in annual salary this position provided. Streicher ignored questions and charges such as these. However, in a speech at a Nuremberg NSDAP meeting in early December, he explained his reason for continued absenteeism from council sessions:

We tried at first to bring honesty into the city government by removing Luppe as mayor... but we were outvoted... Since we

---

12 After the Nazi seizure of power, Streicher allegedly reprinted some of these confiscated issues. The illustration on the preceding page, which may have been one of these reprints, shows the gruesome nature of these issues.

13 Der Stürmer, nr. 42, November 29, 1929.

14 Ibid., nr. 45, December, 1929.
continued to be outvoted there was no purpose of wasting time at those meetings.\textsuperscript{15}

In this speech Streicher also stated that he hoped the coming election would produce a Nazi majority in the council so that the "mess in the city hall could be cleaned up." Other than the vague and unlikely hope for a Nazi majority, Streicher offered no other reasons why he should be re-elected to city council.

On the eve of the election, political observers had reasons to give Streicher little chance for re-election. Yet, after the votes were tallied, Streicher was easily the leader of the four Nazis who won seats on the city council.\textsuperscript{16} This outcome suggests that in the minds of many of those casting ballots, the issue was not a matter of qualification for a city council seat, but rather a matter of increasing dissatisfaction with the existing political system.

Streicher's easy victory in the city council elections reflected a new wave of National Socialist voter appeal evidenced throughout Germany. In the last weeks of 1929, communal and provincial elections were held in most districts and the Nazis scored unprecedented victories at the polls. The size of the vote (for National Socialist candidates) exceeded the party's most optimistic expectations.\textsuperscript{17} Post-election analysis revealed that the Nazis not only increased their rural support, but showed remarkable relative gains in urban areas. This new urban support, however, did not come from the working class districts, but from

\textsuperscript{15}BSA, PAJS, Vol. IV, folder 1733. Police report on NSDAP meeting in Nuremberg, December 10, 1929.

\textsuperscript{16}\textit{Der Stürmer}, nr. 46, December, 1929.

\textsuperscript{17}Orlow, \textit{History of the Nazi Party}, p. 176.
the same group joining the party in record numbers—the lower middle
class, that feared the adverse social, as well as economic consequences
of a serious depression.18 This fear had been heightened with the event
of the October stock market crash.

Streicher did not seem to recognize that the new wave of Nazi
popularity was largely the result of economic circumstances. At least
he made no mention of it in Stürmer articles or in political speeches in
late 1929. In his remarks about Nazi electoral victories, he usually
referred to the growing awareness, among the German masses, of outstanding
Nazi leadership, or the party's realistic programs and ideology.19 In a
special election issue of the Stürmer the day after the city council
elections, he bragged that he had never doubted that he would win handily.
He stated further that if there were "six more Streichers" in Nuremberg,
the Nazis would control city hall.20

Streicher's words indicate that he may have become somewhat
intoxicated with a sense of added self-importance. There were also
indications that after his easy electoral victory he may have become
determined to attempt elevating his political image. This would not have
been unusual during this period. According to Dietrich Orlow, many Nazi
leaders were embarked on an image-building program during these months.
Orlow notes further that by late 1929 the newspaper had become the main

18Ibid., p. 177.
19Der Stürmer, nr. 47, December, 1929;
BSA, PAJS, Vol. II, folder 1735. Police report on NSDAP meeting
in Nuremberg, December 23, 1929.
20Der Stürmer, special issue, December 17, 1929.
status symbol for the Gau. Streicher's subsequent actions lead to the assumption that he was one of the Nazi leaders that Orlow referred to in his comments.

A few days after the Nazi electoral victories were announced, Streicher moved to establish a monopoly of all National Socialist newspapers in the Nuremberg area. Since mid-1923, Willy Liebel, former local leader of the Strasser NSDAP faction, had been publishing a weekly Nazi newspaper in Nuremberg, entitled Die Flämme. Liebel's editorials and articles were never hostile to Streicher or critical of the Stürmer. In their personal relations, both men had mended their past political differences and seemed to be on friendly terms. Yet, a week before Christmas, Streicher suddenly ordered Liebel to stop publication of the Flämme, and ordered SA guards to be posted at newsstands to threaten anyone who tried purchasing the paper.

After Streicher's unexpected action, Liebel, already badly in debt, sold the Flämme to Gottfried Feder, long-standing associate and former advisor to Hitler, and presently a member of the Reichstag and Reichsleitung, the national party leadership staff. Since Feder outranked him in the Nazi hierarchy, Streicher was now faced with a greater problem than before. Streicher had been covertly jealous of Feder's influence over Hitler, who in earlier years had not only appropriated much of Feder's political philosophy, but also his style of moustache.

\[\text{Orlow, History of the Nazi Party, pp. 192 and 237.}\]
\[\text{Wagner, Hitler, p. 101.}\]
This jealousy perhaps resulted in Streicher's determination to oust Feder from the newspaper business in Nuremberg as soon as possible.

Feder unwittingly added to Streicher's determination by stating in the first issue of the new Flamme that Hitler had given his blessing to the purchase and also agreed with the Reichsleitung that the Flamme should be known as the "NSDAP mouthpiece of Franconia," and be entitled to carry the official party emblem—the swastika, on its front page. There was no evidence besides Feder's words that Hitler indeed had done so.

After this first issue of the new Flamme, Streicher, disregarding Feder's superior rank, moved directly to drive Feder out of business. First, he issued a threat in the Sturmer, urging readers to boycott all merchants who advertised in the Flamme. Then he warned all news vendors that if they carried the Flamme, he would stop their supply of the Voelkischer Beobachter, over which he (Streicher) held a sales monopoly. As a final measure, he ordered SA personnel to be stationed at all newsstands to note any violations of his warnings.

By mid-March, Feder, who despite pleas, had received no support from Hitler in this affair, was on the verge of bankruptcy, and was forced to discontinue the Flamme. Streicher's ruthless tactics with Hitler's silent consent not only solidified his image as the highest Nazi

24 *Der Stürmer*, nr. 2, January, 1930.


26 *Der Stürmer*, nr. 10, March, 1930.
authority in Franconia, but also served as a warning to other ranking Nazis who might have been inclined to meddle in Nuremberg-area political and publishing affairs.

Perhaps encouraged by his success in the Flamme affair, Streicher continued concentrating on extending his personal fortunes by devising and implementing programs and schemes to benefit him financially as well as politically. The first of these was directed toward increasing the circulation and advertising income of the Stürmer. With no prior publicity, Streicher attempted to implement a rather flimsy scheme at a large NSDAP meeting in Nuremberg.27 As each of the approximate 2,200 attending members entered the hall they were handed one red, and one green, small leaflet, or coupon. Streicher opened the meeting with a few introductory remarks, and then began issuing instructions on the use of the coupons. The red handouts were marked on one side with a swastika, and on the other side with the following sentence: "A National Socialist has just made a purchase from you!" The green handouts were marked on one side with the words, "Der Stürmer," and, on the other side with the following paragraph:

The Social Democrats and Communists are buying from department stores and cooperatives, and thus destroy the German businessman's existence. National Socialists buy only from the German businessman and because of this you should support the weekly Stürmer!

Streicher urged everyone to take a supply of these coupons at the door and always leave one of each at the store wherever a purchase was made. He also warned his audience that it would be considered an act of

27 BSA, PAJS, Vol. I, folder 1734. Police report on NSDAP meeting in Nuremberg, March 7, 1930, which is the source for the following.
baseness if anyone took these coupons and failed to use them properly.

Except for demonstrating Streicher's resourcefulness, the coupon plan amounted to virtually nothing. Initially, only a few persons attending the meeting received or asked for a supply of the leaflets. In the next Stürmer issue, Streicher urged all members to pick up a quantity of the coupons at certain Nuremberg business places.28 For two successive weeks after this, Stürmer notices complained that stacks of the coupons were still available.29 Following this, no further mention was made of the coupons. It can only be conjectured that this plan failed because most members resisted acting as promoters for the Stürmer, or because of economic circumstances, were more conscious of prices than politics when they went shopping.

Seemingly not perturbed by the failure of the coupon scheme, Streicher next turned his attention to plans for the construction of a Franconian NSDAP headquarters building. He disclosed his preliminary ideas in an April Stürmer issue. The principal reason stated for this decision was that a choice building lot had been donated to the local party by a wealthy member in 1928, and that it was time to make use of this lot.30 Although not mentioned at the time, Streicher's later remarks suggest that his decision may have been prompted by the desire to elevate his political image, especially since he had recently heard Hitler announce his plans to remodel an old mansion in Munich into a sumptuous party headquarters, to be known as the Brown House.

28 Der Stürmer, nr. 19, March, 1930.
29 Ibid., nrs. 20 and 21, March and April, 1930.
30 Ibid., nr. 22, April, 1930.
In May, Streicher scheduled an NSDAP meeting in Nuremberg to elaborate on his plans for the local headquarters building. In his speech he stated that he had appointed a building committee to engage an architect and to approve preliminary sketches. He stressed, however, that since he was paying for most of the architect's fees, he reserved the right of final approval on finished blueprints. He then talked about the need for the proposed building, noting that present party office facilities and staff needed to be expanded greatly to keep up with the rapid growth of party membership and activity. In addition, he said, the Franconian National Socialist movement, next to the Munich movement, was the most venerated in Germany, and deserved an official home in keeping with this standing.

Next, he launched into some of his promotional schemes to finance the building. In proposing these, Streicher revealed the characteristic of many self-centered Nazi leaders, who valued the fulfillment of their personal ambitions far more than the welfare of their followers. Many local party members were doubtless hard-pressed to make ends meet at this time, yet Streicher contrived and insisted on a variety of schemes to bleed as much money as possible from them to finance his prestigious building. The first of these plans was the building-stone project. He said that he had located piles of building stones at a nearby abandoned quarry. These stones were to sell for 50 pfennig, one mark, and five marks, and each party member was expected to buy at least ten of them and sell at least ten more to friends and relatives with the understanding

31 BSA, PAJS, Vol. i, folder 1734. Police report on NSDAP meeting at Nuremberg, May 11, 1930, which is also the source for the following.
that all the stones be donated to the building project at a future ground-breaking ceremony.

Streicher introduced the next scheme, feigning concern that National Socialists needed to devote more time to cultural development. This would now be possible, he said, because negotiations had been completed to rent the Intimes Theater in Nuremberg on Sunday mornings and Monday evenings for special showings of "good German plays and movies." Tickets were to sell for 50 pfennig to two marks, and Streicher said that he expected all members to "show their loyalty" by bringing their friends and buying seats for two marks.32

In the last money-raising scheme presented that evening, Streicher announced that Hitler was scheduled to speak in Nuremberg in July. Tickets for that meeting would be sold in advance and each member was expected to purchase at least two tickets at two marks each. As a special inducement, Streicher added, members who sold three or more tickets would be admitted free.33

Before stepping down from the podium, Streicher referred briefly to the appeals trial scheduled for the following week. This was in connection with the sentences levied against Holz and him the previous November for slanderous Stürmer articles against the Jewish religion.

32The building project was started later in the year, but for unexplained reasons (probably shortage of funds) it was not completed until late 1933. The theater project was dropped after two months for lack of attendance.

33Stürmer issues in May and June advertised and promoted all these schemes but did not mention the degree of success of any of them. Hitler's speech was cancelled later, but ticket holders were not refunded their money. Instead, they were told that the tickets would be honored the next time Hitler spoke in Nuremberg (which was in April, 1932).
Streicher spoke about cases of missing children who had doubtless been victims of the Jewish blood ritual during the past Jewish Easter season. He expressed hope that the judges in the appeals trial would be aware of these atrocities in reconsidering the November sentences.

On the request of Streicher's attorney, Dr. Krafft, the appeals trial was conducted in the superior court in Munich. This request was based on the assumption by Streicher, that Munich courts were generally the most sympathetic of all Bavarian courts to National Socialist members. In this case, however, this assumption proved largely incorrect. Neither Streicher nor Holz or Dr. Krafft could produce new evidence to alter the facts of the case. After three days of hearings, the panel of three judges upheld the findings of the lower court. In imposing the sentence, however, the judges yielded to a plea by Dr. Krafft that Holz and Streicher serve successive prison terms so that Streicher's political and publishing affairs might be carried on uninterrupted, under competent leadership. Holz was sentenced to serve from June 10 to August 25; and Streicher from August 25 to October 25, in the Stadelheim prison.

It developed later that the date of Streicher's prison term would interfere with important political events. In mid-July, Chancellor Heinrich Brünинг dissolved the Reichstag, and set national elections for September 14, 1930. Hitler moved at once to take advantage of this opportunity to capitalize on the mood of resentment sweeping the nation. As evidenced by the nearly three million unemployed, the depression was becoming more severe and people of all classes were lavishing the blame for...
their misfortunes on the Weimar Government. The Nazi organization launched a massive campaign to saturate both the cities and rural areas with National Socialist propaganda to win votes.35

As in the 1928 national elections, Streicher was named campaign manager for the Franconian district. On July 27, he was called to Munich to attend a two-day national campaign planning conference directed by Hitler. As in the Young Plan referendum, direction of the entire campaign was to remain centralized in Munich. All district managers were instructed to conduct their campaign activities according to directives to be issued each week by the Reichsleitung, which would make final decisions on all matters ranging from the size of posters to propaganda issues to be stressed in the urban and rural sections of each district.36

Stürmer accounts of Streicher's activities in this campaign are not clear on the degree to which he conformed to the weekly Munich directives. It seems, however, that he followed the general campaign plan as outlined in several issues of the Voelkischer Beobachter.37 There were to be two major thrusts in the campaign, one directed to the outlying areas, to make deeper inroads in the rural and farming electorate, the other to be concentrated in the cities, aimed especially at the masses of uncommitted young voters, and at the middle classes hit by the de-
Perhaps aided by his previous experience, Streicher felt at home campaigning in the rural areas. His election rallies were always well attended and the enthusiasm of the crowds was even greater than in previous campaigns. In Nuremberg, and other cities, however, he often encountered strong opposition from the Communists when appealing to uncommitted young voters as well as to blue and white collar workers disenchanted with the traditional parties. This opposition by the Communist party (KPD) was viewed by Streicher as a direct challenge to his efforts, and led to frequent physical clashes.

In keeping with his volatile nature, Streicher seized on every chance to best the local Communists in displays of brute force. As campaign manager, he must have at least encouraged the gangs of Nazi ruffians that engaged in street brawls with KPD members almost daily. On several occasions he lured KPD leaders into holding joint meetings by challenging them to debates on various campaign issues. Most often, these meetings ended in physical violence.

Typical of these, was a joint meeting reported by Nuremberg police held at the Hercules auditorium on August 13. A crowd of over 2,000 persons, mostly between the ages of 20 and 27 years, attended this

---

38 *Voelkischer Beobachter*, August 1; August 4, 1930; *Bullock, Hitler*, p. 159.
40 *Der Stürmer*, nr. 31, 1930.
The police report estimated that approximately one-half of the audience supported the Nazis; approximately one-third supported the Communists, while the remainder of the crowd seemed undecided in their political preference. According to prearranged agreements, Communists and Nazis were to speak for one hour each, followed by an open forum conducted by a joint panel of opposing leaders. Almost as soon as the program opened, Streicher and a group of his followers who were seated near the front of the hall, began hurling insults and contradictions at the Communist speaker. These interruptions continued until objects, such as beer mugs, were flying at the Nazi hecklers. Soon Streicher strode to the platform, seized the speaker by the coat lapels, and began shaking him and shouting in his face. The police broke up the scuffle and ordered everyone out of the hall.

It is questionable whether Streicher's crude behavior succeeded in winning many votes from intelligent or sensitive people, especially students, who were swayed between the extreme left and right parties in this campaign. Consciously or not, Streicher was recruiting the support of those who admired, or were willing to submit to, strong and ruthless leadership. Streicher had become accustomed (as Hitler did) to carrying a riding whip to symbolize not only his personal authority, but also his favorite political axiom: "What counts is will, and if our will is hard and ruthless enough we [the Nazi party] can do anything."  

Ibid. 
BSA, PAJS, Vol. I, folder 1734. Police report on joint political meeting in Nuremberg, August 13, 1930, which is also the source for the following.  

Bullock, Hitler, p. 160; Peterson, Limits of Hitler's Power, p. 227.
Streicher's campaign activities were halted on August 25, when he began serving his two-month prison sentence. Perhaps due to the coming elections, there was no series of large protests and ceremonies as there had been in the weeks prior to his 1926 jail term. This time, there was only one demonstration, but from the spontaneous emotion and genuine affection displayed towards Streicher it was apparent that he had lost none of the grass-roots appeal evidenced in most of the more organized demonstrations four years earlier.

At 4:30 PM. Streicher was escorted to the prison by Nazi dignitaries and friends in a long caravan of autos. A large crowd of men and women, gathering since noon, was waiting near the entrance gates. As Streicher approached, a loud cheer arose and women strewed flowers in the path of the cars. Hermann Esser, as official representative of Hitler, delivered a farewell address, which may have reflected the feelings of many of those present:

> The only thing that may reconcile him [Streicher] with his fate in his cell is the certainty of being a hero and martyr of one of the mightiest movements in world history, and the conviction of having pushed this wonderful movement one more step ahead through this sacrifice. . . .

Just before entering the prison gate, Streicher turned to the crowd and spoke a few somber words of farewell. Many women and some men wept openly as they attempted to cheer and shout farewells. The women showered Streicher with flowers, and everyone began singing the battle hymn of Nazi martyrs--the Horst Wessel song.

---

43Voelkischer Beobachter, August 27, 1930, which is the source for the following.
Perhaps the worst aspect of this prison sentence for Streicher was that he could not share in the celebration following the landslide victory in the elections on September 14. That evening, most Bavarian Nazi officials gathered at an election headquarters in Munich to await results. As the night progressed, they toasted each other repeatedly as spectacular gains were recorded for the NSDAP in all districts. Some time after midnight, as final results were being announced, Hitler appeared in person to lead the celebration. The Nazi vote had jumped from 810,000 in 1928, to 6,400,000; and the number of the Reichstag delegation from 12 to 107. Hitler announced that he was immensely pleased; that he had hoped at most for only 50 or 60 seats.44

Aside from the important overall political implications of this stunning victory, it is significant that with this election, Franconia lost its position as the leading district of Nazi electoral support. In the May, 1928 Reichstag elections, Nazi candidates had received slightly over 100,000 votes which amounted to 8.1% of all votes cast in Franconia.45 In terms of percentages, Upper Bavaria-Schwaben, had been next with 6.2. Other districts showing appreciable Nazi support had been: Weser-Ems, South Hanover, and Schleswig-Holstein.46

In the September, 1930 elections, the percentage of votes cast for Nazis in Franconia was approximately 35. While this gain was remarkable, many other districts registered even greater gains. Of all electoral

45See Chapter VII, footnote 68.
46Orlow, History of the Nazi Party, p. 130.
districts, Franconia ranked in the middle, between a high percentage figure of 44, and a low of 21. The change in voting pattern between 1928 and 1932 can be partially illustrated by comparing results in Franconia and the four districts mentioned above:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>May, 1928 Percent</th>
<th>September, 1930 Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Franconia</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Bavaria-Schwaben</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weser-Ems</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hannover</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schleswig-Holstein</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In attempting to analyze Franconia's drop from its position as the leading Nazi-supporting electoral district, some observers may have considered Streicher's untimely departure to prison as a pertinent factor. However, this consideration was not valid, because after three succeeding Reichstag elections, the percentage of votes cast for Nazi candidates in Franconia remained virtually the same as in September, 1930. It seems most likely that Nazi campaigns were more successful in some districts because of other factors, such as the religious composition of the electorate, and campaign issues emphasized, such as nationalism and economic problems, which appealed to a broader segment.

47 James K. Pollock, "An Areal Study of the German Electorate, 1930-1933," American Political Science Review, XXXVII (Feb. 1944), pp. 90-91. The percentage figures cited were an average of the four Reichstag elections between September, 1930, and January, 1933. However, the author infers that there were only minor variances between elections in the relative Nazi support in the various districts.

of voters than anti-Semitism—always the central issue in the Franconian campaigns.49

Streicher's release from prison on October 25 was marked by incidents resembling a comic-opera. The Stürmer and the Voelkischer Beobachter carried announcements that a large celebration was planned to welcome Streicher as he left the prison at 4:30 PM.50 However, the jail warden, evidently wishing to avoid this commotion, attempted to frustrate these plans by ordering the prisoner to be released at 10 AM. When informed of this, Streicher became irate and refused to leave until the scheduled hour. After a bitter, but fruitless argument, he attempted a sit-down strike which ended at noon when guards unceremoniously evicted him from the prison.51 Not to be outdone, Streicher hid in a nearby house as crowds gathered in the streets during the afternoon. He telephoned some of his friends and informed them of his release but asked them to proceed with the celebration as planned. Later, he joined the caravan of Nazi dignitaries as it approached and got into the lead-car, carrying Hitler, and was driven near the prison gate where he greeted everyone and delivered a two-hour speech on the injustices of the Bavarian legal and prison systems. After this, Hitler addressed the crowd briefly, eulogizing Streicher as a hero and a martyr.52


50Voelkischer Beobachter, October 20, 1930; Der Stürmer, nr. 43, October, 1930.

51Voelkischer Beobachter, October 28, 1930

Streicher returned to Nuremberg the following day and quickly resumed his busy round of political activities. On October 30, he was the featured speaker at an NSDAP meeting, attended by some 2,500 persons. He spoke about the harsh treatment of inmates at the Stadelheim prison, which apparently showed no partiality to Nazi political prisoners. Streicher stated that he was allowed visitors only one day a week; that he was forced to spend all of his time in a small cell, except for meals (which were tasteless), and for exercise periods, where all prisoners walked in a circle, and were punished if they stepped out of line. He ended this discussion on a gleeful note, joking about the way he had outsmarted the prison warden on the day of his release.

Streicher then began one of his infrequent discussions about outside political affairs, which is notable because it not only revealed that he had some interest in foreign matters, but also because it tended to contradict his basic political philosophy. For over a decade he had been stressing that Jews had corrupted and weakened all segments of German (and European) society, and that one of the major goals of an efficient Nazi government would be the ridding, or stripping of power, of all Jews and Jewish interests. Yet he spoke at length in praise of Mussolini, who had carried out many beneficial reforms in Italy with little or no prejudice against Jews. Streicher detailed several of the economic and social improvements Mussolini had initiated. He stated that the Italian leader was setting an example in his country which was

53BSA, PAJS, Vol. I, folder 1734. Police report on NSDAP meeting at Nuremberg, October 30, 1930, which is also the source for the following;  
Der Stürmer, nr. 44, October, 1930, which is also the source for the following.
bound to help the Hitler movement in the long run. But for the present time, he added, the German masses were still suspicious of the military intentions of Mussolini, and were "too stupid to see that he is holding out his hands in friendship over the Alps."

Following this, Streicher mentioned the recent elections, noting that Hitler was pleased not only with the election results, but also with the fact that thousands of new members were joining the party now because of its recent rise to prominence. Holz then made some concluding remarks, closing the meeting with a request for generous donations to the Nuremberg party headquarters building fund.

By the end of 1930, Nazi party members totaled nearly 400,000, and new membership applications were still pouring into Munich headquarters so rapidly that special clerks were working a second shift to process them.54 Hitler sensed that many of these new members were only "emotionally attracted" to the party and might soon lose interest if the NSDAP could not present them with immediate solutions to their economic and social problems. He expressed fear that the party would not be able to attract a sufficient following to win control of the government if it could not hold the bulk of the members enrolling now. The Reichsleitung was set to work formulating a plan to foster the interest of members associated with various economic and social groups.

The plan they developed featured a process that became known as

54Orlow, History of the Nazi Party, pp. 188-189. The membership figure is approximated from Orlow's figures cited on page 239
Gleichschaltung. This was to be organized nationwide as a major effort to hold enlisted members and also to win new members and followers. This expansion called for capable leaders, considered experts in each of the many interest groups. These leaders were to be appointed by the Gauleiter, who was to oversee the mushrooming network of affiliated organizations.

In most districts, the Gauleiter position and function expanded as this new bureaucratic structure grew. This was not to be the case with Streicher, who would "not let himself be squeezed into the limited confines of a bureaucrat." He was one of the few Gauleiter not to become nominal governmental president of his district. With few exceptions, which will be noted, he avoided most Gleichschaltung bureaucratic and organizational work, and concentrated his efforts, with increasing fanaticism, on his anti-Semitic crusade.

One of these exceptions was Streicher's appearance in mid-February, 1931, at a meeting of the Erlangen branch of the National Socialist Student Association. This meeting was part of a nationwide drive initiated by the Reichsleitung to extend party influence into the national union of German student groups, the German Student Diet, by accelerating the growth of its Nazi affiliates, such as the Nazi Erlangen Student Association.

55 Orlow, History of the Nazi Party, p. 193. Gleichschaltung, briefly described, is a process to coordinate non-Nazi organizations and institutions with the Nazi regime by replacing the elected leaders with loyal Nazis and running the organizations according to Nazi principles.

56 Ibid., p. 207.

57 Peterson, Limits of Hitler's Power, p. 253.

58 BSA, PAJS, Vol. I, folder 1734. Police report on meeting of Erlangen National Socialist Student Association, Erlangen, February 15, 1930, which is the source for the following.
Typical of Nazi propagandistic efforts, a flag-consecration ceremony opened the proceedings. Streicher, the featured speaker, addressed the young men in a sincere manner, praising the students who came to Nuremberg's aid, "in the hour of need" when leftist mobs threatened to take over the city after the World War. He then spoke with empathy about the frustration of university students, preparing to graduate with little chance of a successful future. Next, he discussed the greatness of Hitler, noting that he alone was able to lead the German people to dignity and freedom. The speech continued in this vein for little over an hour, and was received with a standing ovation by most of the students. By his restrained--almost dignified manner of speech, and his moderate remarks on Jews, Streicher seemed totally out of character. This may have been an isolated instance of his conforming to Munich directives. More likely, it was one of the few speeches where his instincts were correctly reacting to the interests and intelligence of the particular audience.

In April, Streicher was asked to speak before a large group of coal miners in Essen, at a meeting in which Nazi organizers were attempting to promote certain candidates for official posts in a coming union election. According to a police report, he spoke about two hours on the Jewish question. Towards the end of his speech, Streicher mentioned that Walter Rathenau, the late foreign minister, had also been a Jew, and that it was a good thing he was dead, because he had betrayed the German people. Streicher's reputation as an agitator and slanderer

\[59\text{Ibid. Police report on union meeting at Essen, April 14, 1931, which is the source for the following.}\]
must have preceded him here, because several police officers stood near the front of the hall listening intently to everything he said. As soon as he made the remark about Rathenau, two policemen came to the podium and ordered him to stop speaking. Before stepping down, Streicher protested this action and said it was discouraging to see police officers who were not capable of understanding what was being said. Following this meeting, the police filed slander charges against Streicher. However, the Bavarian Landtag refused a request by the Prussian Ministry of Justice to prosecute this case.60

In May, Streicher came into minor conflict with Munich headquarters over his lack of cooperation in Gleichschaltung organizational efforts. This was evidenced in correspondence between Gregor Strasser, the head of the Reichsleitung, and Streicher, about the implementation of the program. On May 6, 1931, Strasser had reprimanded Streicher on the grounds that Franconia was the only Gau in Germany that had failed to submit a list of experts recommended to become leaders of affiliated special interest groups.61

Streicher answered this reprimand on May 27 with the promise that he would furnish the list at his first opportunity. He complained that he was experiencing difficulty finding the properly qualified personnel.62 While this may have been true, Streicher did not attempt to apologize for his tardiness or even show concern that his local problems might be im-

60 Ibid. Official memo from the Prussian prosecution councilor to the Nuremberg Police Office, September 21, 1931.

61 Ibid. Official Nazi party notice from Strasser to Streicher, May 6, 1931.

62 Ibid. Letter from Streicher to Strasser, May 27, 1931.
peding the progress of the overall program. When he finally sent Strasser the requested list two weeks later, on June 9th, it was incomplete. He had no recommendations for three positions, and three men were recommended to double in filling six other positions. Streicher's letter of May 27 is interesting in other respects. It helps explain the almost total absence of existent Streicher correspondence. Perhaps because he was always too busy with political affairs or with writing anti-Semitic articles, he found no time for letter writing. In the opening paragraph to Strasser, he mentions this weakness, but attributes it to laziness:

You already told me to my face that you consider me extremely lazy as far as writing letters is concerned. I always welcome such frankness, especially when it is true. Now... this letter, as an exception, confirms the rule... .

This letter also points out that Streicher was capable of trying soft-soap tactics, even on his known political enemies, in order to cover his mistakes or inadequacies. Rather than express regret that his tardiness may have caused an inconvenience, Streicher, in pseudo-poetic fashion, attempted to ingratiate himself with Strasser, who was still recuperating from a near-fatal skiing accident:

... I was in the vicinity of Oberstaufen recently and was reminded of the days when the terrible news of your accident was reported.... So many people had already given up hope! The fact that you survived... proves that you were born under a lucky star. May you soon regain your robust freshness....

---

63Ibid. Letter from Streicher to Strasser, June 9, 1931.
64Ibid. Letter from Streicher to Strasser, May 27, 1931.
65Ibid.
These words could not have been sincere inasmuch as the two men were long-standing political enemies and had frequently denounced each other publicly. 

While Streicher distained the bureaucratic details of the Gleichschaltung, and cooperated in its organizational work only when asked, he needed no prodding to assist in its promotional work as long as it held special interest for him, or dealt directly with anti-Semitism. A typical instance of this occurred in mid-July, 1931, when Streicher expanded his anti-Semitic efforts to include special news articles and programs for children. The timing of these new efforts coincided with the recent reorganization of the Hitler Youth group (Hitler-Jugend) (HJ). The newly named HJ leader was Baldur von Schirach, a rising young Nazi official, who credited Streicher with arousing his interest in a National Socialist political career. Under the reorganizational plan, the HJ program was broadened to attract a younger group, ten to fourteen years old. Streicher had always shown interest in German youth. He displayed an affinity for young people when he chose teaching as a profession. According to the German historian Arnd Mueller, Streicher enthusiastically supported the founding of the HJ, and it was he who suggested the title of the group to Hitler. Lacking clear evidence, it can only be assumed that Streicher favored the reorganization of the HJ. It appeared that he voluntarily (and perhaps enthusiastically) began to assist Schirach by

66 For examples, see Chapter V, footnotes 32 and 34. On these occasions Strasser referred to Streicher as a clown, and Streicher called Strasser a traitor.

67 Kelley, 22 Cells in Nuremberg, p. 87.

68 Mueller, Geschichte der Juden, p. 130.
instituting programs to indoctrinate young minds in the anti-Semitic facet of Nazi ideology.

These programs were initiated and announced with little fanfare in a July, 1931 Stürmer issue. An inside page carried an article announcing the Reichsleitung reorganization plan for the HJ. In an apparent attempt at aloofness from Reichsleitung decisions, which were not mentioned, the account was written as a factual report, without editorial comment. The article included a brief biographical sketch of Schirach, and concluded with a statement that the Stürmer and its publisher would make every effort to cooperate with this new plan by "becoming more attentive to the needs of our youth." The same page of this Stürmer issue included an article entitled "What is the Intention of the Jew?" It was the first of a long series of Stürmer anti-Semitic articles aimed at children. Written in terms compatible with adolescent mentality, this article opened with a description of the facial features of the Stürmer Jew. This was followed by a general discussion about alleged Jewish treachery. The bulk of this article (and those that followed) was devoted to "case histories" which most likely were fabricated stories of Jews committing base crimes against children. These stories contained warnings that Jews were untrustworthy, corrupt, and vicious. The major thrust, however, was to instill fear of Jews in the minds of the youthful readers.

The following passage, in condensed form, from the above article,

69 Der Stürmer, nr. 28, 1931.

70 Articles of this nature appeared irregularly in the Stürmer until the mid-1930's.
illustrates the gist of a typical Stürmer "case history:"

... Heinz saw his kitten on the porch of a large house. ... His mother had warned him to stay away from that house because a Jew lived there. But Heinz could not resist going after his kitten. ... While he was on the porch the door opened. ... The man, who was a dirty Jew, pulled Heinz inside. ... Just as the Jew raised his knife to stab Heinz and drain out his blood, Heinz darted out of his grasp. ... He found his way outside. ... Later Heinz told his mother that he would never go near a Jew, or a Jew's house again. ...

Stories of this nature were probably written by Streicher himself, and they continued to appear intermittently in the Stürmer through 1934. After this, a writer named Ernest Hiemer joined the Stürmer staff and was responsible for these articles. Later, Hiemer compiled and edited a number of these "case histories" and they were published by Streicher as a children's book, entitled Der Giftpilz (The Poison Mushroom) which was circulated widely in Germany during the Nazi years.72

The ad section of the same July Stürmer issue included an announcement that an NSDAP meeting would be held Friday evening, July 24. Parents were invited to bring all their children over ten years old, to be admitted free. The program was to feature a dramatic presentation that could be understood by people of all ages.73 This meeting was to be the first of a series of Friday night "special meetings," which continued intermittently for the balance of 1931.74 These all featured an element

71 Der Stürmer, nr. 28, 1931, which is also the source for the following.

72 SBN, Ruehl, Der Stuermer, p. 113.

73 Der Stürmer, nr. 28, July, 1931.

of drama. The thrust of the presentations was the same as the Stürmer case histories—to instill the fear of Jews in children, who usually comprised approximately one-fourth of the audience.75

The July 24th meeting was typical of most of these "special meetings." According to a police report, the meeting was attended by some 2,000 persons, of whom approximately 500 were children of adolescent age. Streicher opened the proceeding with an anti-Semitic story, told in simple language. He then retired behind a black curtain which was drawn across the stage. An organ began playing a selection of religious music. After this, the house lights dimmed, and the curtain opened. The stage was shrouded in black cloth, and Streicher, dressed in a black costume and eye-mask, sat at a table under a spotlight. He rose slowly and began intoning passages from the Protocols of the Wise Men of Zion, which was allegedly a secret tract, written by Jews, to stipulate how the world eventually would fall under Jewish domination.76 Streicher paraphrased some of the passages, and explained them in terms that children would understand. The police report noted that Streicher's performance as high priest of Judah was impressive; some of the audience, especially the children seemed to shudder, and their faces seemed to reflect an expression of deep fear. At the end of his so-called sermon, Streicher removed his mask, walked down the aisle, waving and smiling at the children that were

75Ibid. Police report on NSDAP meeting in Nuremberg, July 24, 1931, which is also the source for the following.

76Heiden, Der Fuehrer, pp. 4-6. The Protocols were propagandized by the Nazis as an authentic tract, discovered in Moscow in 1917, but supposedly written by a group of Jews in Switzerland, in 1897. It was actually written by a French lawyer, Maurice Joly, as a satire against Emperor Napoleon III, and published in 1863.
present.  

While Streicher displayed his theatrical abilities and vivid imagination in this performance, it seems likely that the desired emotional effect (on the children) was lost as he sought to present a friendly image in the closing minutes of the meeting. He may have realized this, because he refrained from participating in further stage performances after this meeting.

Streicher presented these "special meetings" in different locations in his Gau each Friday evening except for certain interruptions, such as the Munich conference for Gauleiters and SA leaders in mid-September. The major purpose of this conference was to reorganize the territorial jurisdiction of the SA, in order to prevent further mutiny by dissident leaders and factions. Since September, 1930, two open revolts had been initiated in Berlin by Walter Stennes, former SA leader for eastern Germany. Hitler had dismissed him in April, 1931, but Stennes had joined with other disgruntled ex-Nazis and reportedly continued to foment agitation against present SA and other party leaders.

According to Stürmer accounts, Streicher seemed disinterested in the discussions at the conference, and had little or no voice in the final reorganizational decisions. However, he reportedly expressed resentment with another Franconian delegate, Wilhelm Stegmann, a wealthy landowner, and ambitious Nuremberg-area SA Commander. Stegmann


78 Der Stürmer, nr. 36, September, 1931; Orlow, History of the Nazi Party, p. 233.

79 Bullock, Hitler, p. 184.
allegedly made some insinuating comments in Munich about Streicher's handling of SA funds, and also interrupted Streicher several times during the routine report on NSDAP affairs in Franconia. Stegmann's actions in Munich initiated a feud which later developed to revolutionary proportions in Nuremberg.

A few days after his return from Munich, Streicher announced in a Stürmer article that Hitler was planning a gigantic SA demonstration in mid-October, in the city of Brunswick. The alleged purpose of this event was to maintain the spirit of the party's national congress, which had not been held for two years. In actuality, however, Hitler intended it to be a display of strength to impress, and possibly intimidate rival political parties and their supporters. Streicher, perhaps on Hitler's orders, traveled to Brunswick several times in early October, to assist in preparations for this demonstration. This work involved the usual planning for housing, eating, transportation facilities and timetables.

The Brunswick demonstration on October 17 featured a massive, colorful parade of over 100,000 uniformed SA and SS men, marching past Hitler at the saluting base. This was a show which symbolized the new strength of the National Socialist party, whose members totaled approxi-

80 Der Stürmer, nr. 36, September, 1931.
81 Peterson, Limits of Hitler's Power, pp. 228-229.
82 Der Stürmer, nr. 38, September, 1931.
83 Ibid., nr. 40, October, 1931.
84 Orlow, History of the Nazi Party, p. 236; Bullock, Hitler, p. 189; Der Stürmer, nr. 42, October, 1931.
mately 450,000 by this time.\textsuperscript{85} This formidable para-military display was undoubtedly disturbing to thousands of anti-Nazis. At the same time, many National Socialists became imbued with confidence that the final ascent to political control of Germany was at hand.

The air of self-assurance instilled in Nazi leaders at Brunswick was more than a temporary exhilaration. As the new year approached, various events and circumstances sustained, and even boosted this confidence. As an example, the Nazis registered overwhelming gains in the November provincial elections in Hesse, where they more than doubled the votes they had won there in September, 1930.\textsuperscript{86}

Streicher's confidence at the end of the year was expressed in a cartoon entitled "On to the Last Round," which was featured on the front page of a special New Years \textit{Stürmer} issue.\textsuperscript{87} (See illustration next page.) The cartoon suggested that 1932 would be the year during which the National Socialists would come to power in Germany. To judge by the picture of the unattractive looking Jew in the cartoon, Streicher, as usual, was totally preoccupied with anti-Semitism. Perhaps the cartoon also meant to indicate that the only remaining obstacle to assure a complete Nazi victory was the destruction, or degradation of the Jews, who stubbornly clung to positions of economic and political influence.

\textsuperscript{85}Orlow, \textit{History of the Nazi Party}, p. 239. The party membership figure is noted by Orlow to be an educated, but reasonable guess. Lacking official documentation, this figure was used because there were 129,563 members registered on September 14, 1930; and 719,446 at the end of January, 1933.

\textsuperscript{86}Bullock, \textit{Hitler}, p. 190.

\textsuperscript{87}\textit{Der Stürmer}, special issue, January 1, 1932.
A Front Page Cartoon in the Special New Years 1932 Sturmer Issue
Streicher's action in early January was reminiscent of a prize fighter throwing caution to the wind as he moved to destroy his opponent. His opening 1932 anti-Semitic speeches became so frenzied that he repeatedly disregarded warnings by authorities and transgressed legal restrictions. At an open meeting in Furth on January 7, he launched into a diatribe about the Jewish murder ritual and was stopped twice by police with warnings that this was a forbidden topic. Within ten minutes after the second warning, he brought up the subject again and the police not only stopped him, but dissolved the meeting.88

The following evening, at a meeting in Rothenberg, he opened his speech with a denunciation of the "stupid police authorities in Furth," and again launched into the same forbidden topic. On this occasion, members of the Bavarian state police (previously alerted) stopped him immediately and dismissed the meeting with a warning to Streicher that further violations of this nature would result in more drastic action.89

Obviously unconcerned with this warning, Streicher spoke with increased fanaticism at Schwabach on January 17. In his opening statements, he denounced the Jews with exceptional venom, spewing terms such as "Jordan Waders," Jericho Pilgrims," and "Galician Garlic Pencils." He then mentioned the names of several police and civil officials who were beholden to Jewish money. At this point police again stopped him and


89Ibid. Police report on NSDAP-sponsored meeting at Rothenburg, January 8, 1932.
dismissed the meeting.90

Two days later, Streicher received an official notice from the President of the Franconian Government that, effective immediately, he was forbidden to speak in public until March 1, 1932. The notice cited repeated violations of legal statutes and continued disregard of police warnings as the main reasons for this decree.91

Streicher reacted to this order in surprising fashion, offering only mild objections and appearing somewhat embarrassed by it. In a brief Stürmer article, he mentioned the speaking ban without detailing the events leading to it. He only noted that if attending police had listened carefully to his words, this "misunderstanding" could have been avoided.92 In a telephone conversation with the Nuremberg police office on January 20, he agreed that he would obey the order, but requested that it not be mentioned in every permit issued for NSDAP meetings.93 This was customary in many provinces of Germany in those years. The police agreed to Streicher's request on condition that he make no attempt to disobey the order. Both parties lived up to the terms of this verbal agreement.

The contrite attitude displayed by Streicher after the official speaking ban was imposed contrasted sharply with his hostility and

90Ibid. Police report on NSDAP-sponsored meeting at Schwabach, January 17, 1932.


92"Der Stürmer, nr. 4, January, 1932.

93BSA, PAJS, Vol. II, folder 1735. Report from Nuremberg police files regarding Streicher's speech prohibition, which is also the source for the following.
belligerence which led to it. This attitude differed from his normal behavioral pattern. Usually when subjected to punishment by the authorities, he appealed the sentence, pretended martyrdom, or criticized the sanctioning officials. In this case he may have recognized that the punishment was perhaps more lenient than it might have been under the circumstances. Streicher may have also realized that he had misjudged Dr. Huber and other Franconian officials, expecting them to close their eyes to his legal transgressions in order to curry favor with the political party that in his opinion would soon control Germany.

In addition, it possible that Hitler's attitudes and actions during January had some influence on Streicher. On January 6, the Nazi leader received a telegram from Berlin inviting him to participate in some top-level government discussions. According to the historian Konrad Heiden, Hitler erroneously interpreted this telegram to mean that the Weimar administration was finally yielding to Nazi pressures, and that he (Hitler) and his party would soon attain control of the Government. Heiden notes that, after Hitler read the telegram he indicated this interpretation with a purr of triumph, exclaiming: "Now I have them in my pocket!"94

While this incident was not mentioned in the newspapers, Streicher may well have learned of Hitler's exuberance by word of mouth. Coupled with Streicher's existing confident attitude about the future of the party, this news may have prompted the impetuous Gauleiter into his unrestricted anti-Semitic attacks without concern for the "triviality" of provincial legal restrictions.

94Heiden, Der Fuehrer, p. 433.
It is interesting that Streicher began this series of speeches on January 7, the same day that Hitler defiantly rejected a proposal by Chancellor Brüning to cooperate in the postponement of the coming Presidential elections. In subsequent negotiations, Hitler's defiance melted away when his attempt to dislodge and replace Brüning as Chancellor was rebuffed unceremoniously by President Hindenburg. By January 19, the date of the imposition of Streicher's speaking ban, Hitler was nervously debating whether or not to openly oppose Hindenburg as a rival candidate in the coming elections.

After considerable vacillation, Hitler finally agreed, on February 22, to become a candidate in the Presidential elections scheduled for March 13. Even before this announcement was made, propaganda chief, Josef Goebbels, had designed a massive saturation campaign, which was outlined in a conference of Nazi leaders in Berlin, on February 24. Streicher attended this meeting accompanied by Holz, who was to handle Streicher's speaking assignments until March 1. After his arrival, Streicher learned that he was to share the responsibility of this campaign in Franconia with Willy Liebel, his bitter opponent. Streicher protested to Hitler about Liebel's appointment the next day. However, Hitler appeared unconcerned, telling Streicher that there would be plenty for everyone to do in the days ahead, and that the Reichsleitung handled

95 Heiden, Der Fuehrer, pp. 434-435; Bullock, Hitler, pp. 192-193.
96 Heiden, Der Fuehrer, p. 436; Bullock, Hitler, p. 194.
97 Orlov, History of the Nazi Party, p. 250.
matters such as this.\textsuperscript{98}

It is of course possible that the speaking ban imposed on Streicher may have had some bearing on the appointment of Liebel, signed by Strasser, as an associate campaign chief. It has been pointed out that Streicher was not on good terms with certain Reichsleitung members. His recent heavy-handed tactics in the Flamme affair must have left Liebel, Feder, and others embittered and frustrated. Streicher's inability to make speeches provided an ideal opening for his foes to justify to the Liebel appointment which, in effect, was a blow to Streicher's political prestige.

This Presidential campaign lasted a little over two weeks, and featured the linking of Hitler's name with Germany's emotional and material desires. In Franconia, a master schedule of campaign activities, drawn up in Munich, was followed closely. This schedule was worked out in detail for each district, providing for rally locations and dates, as well as local and outside speakers, speech topics, poster design, and size. Local campaign leaders were assigned speaking duties and were involved in minor organizational affairs, such as making arrangements for music, hall decorations, and program printing.\textsuperscript{99}

Beginning on March 1, when he could speak again, Streicher appeared at more than 20 afternoon and evening meetings. On one occasion, he acted as host and introduction speaker to Hitler, who spoke for over two hours at
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the crowded Hercules Auditorium in Nuremberg. After Streicher resumed his public speaking, he was careful to stay within the law. Police reports on two of his early March rallies noted that Streicher seemed conscious of legal limitations. As always, however, his speeches turned into anti-Semitic attacks.

Similarly, Stürmer front-page cartoons and articles continued to feature anti-Semitic themes. On two occasions, Hitler was included in the major cartoon, shown as a conquering hero, although outnumbered by Jewish criminals. Stürmer campaign coverage, on the other hand, appeared on the inner pages. Yet while there were only synopses of speeches by Hitler and some other officials, Streicher's speeches were reported verbatim.

Despite unprecedented party efforts, Hitler did not win on March 13. However, the Nazis made considerable inroads, especially among the middle-class voters, and kept Hindenburg from gaining a majority. Then a runoff election became necessary. Nationally, the Nazi vote had increased from six and one-half million in September, 1930, to nearly eleven and one-half million. This total gave Hitler approximately 32 percent of the votes cast in Germany. The national average was exceeded somewhat in Franconia, where 36.6 percent of the voters supported
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Hitler. This figure, however, was only one percent more than the votes cast in Franconia for the Nazis in September, 1930.

The result of this election emphasizes the consistent pattern of Franconian voters. As pointed out earlier in this chapter, the percentage of votes cast for Nazis in Reichstag elections after September, 1930, remained virtually the same, at approximately 35 percent. Further, it was postulated that Franconian support for Nazis in Reichstag elections did not rise beyond this percentage figure because of several factors, especially that the central issue in the campaigns was always anti-Semitism. In this campaign, however, anti-Semitism was only one of many topics covered by visiting speakers, who saturated Franconia with a broad spectrum of Nazi propaganda. Yet, the percentage of votes cast for the Nazi ticket still remained almost unchanged. This phenomenon suggests that there was a plurality of 60 to 65 percent of Franconian voters who, for various reasons, consistently refused to support the National Socialist party or its leaders.

The runoff elections were scheduled for April 10, and the campaign again was preceded by a leadership conference, which was held on March 19 and 20, in Berlin. Many leaders, including Streicher, appeared discouraged, and Hitler bent all of his efforts toward instilling in them a new spirit of optimism. Although there is no record of a meeting between Streicher and Hitler, a revised campaign organization list issued the second day of the meetings suggests that they may have discussed Streicher's

---
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previous complaint about sharing the Franconian campaign leadership with Liebel. On the new list, Liebel's name was deleted, and Streicher was named as sole chairman, with Holz designated as his assistant.107

The NSDAP's campaign strategy for the runoff election was essentially a repetition of earlier methods, with the exception that leaders were advised that more meetings would be scheduled in larger towns and cities where propagandists could concentrate their appeals on middle-class voters who had cast ballots previously for Hindenburg. Streicher again worked tirelessly and followed Munich's directives generally as before. In the effort to garner more middle-class support, he spoke mostly in urban areas. A review of four Stürmer issues during this campaign finds him again obsessed with anti-Semitism in speeches and articles. However, there were some indications that he may have attempted to appeal to middle-class voters and, at the same time, to capture some more workers' votes. In each of these four speeches he digressed to the subject of Communism, accusing both Lenin and Stalin of Jewish parentage, and blaming them for the misery of workers in Russia. He also emphasized that the first aim of Communist leaders was to eliminate all class distinctions. Following these remarks, he usually noted that Hitler would fight the Communists, whereas Hindenburg coddled them.108

Although the Nazis again expended all available energies in this campaign, Hindenburg emerged the victor, with a comfortable majority. Hitler had increased his vote by more than two million, mainly at the expense of the Nationalists, who had withdrawn their candidate. In per-
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percentage figures, Hitler's vote had increased to 37.3 percent nationally, while in Franconia, the voters again exhibited their consistency by supporting the Nazi ticket with approximately 36 percent of the votes cast.\textsuperscript{109}

During this second Presidential campaign, Nazi SA and SS forces had caused an extraordinary amount of civil disruption and bloodshed. Mainly because of this misbehavior, the newly invigorated Brüning Government had Hindenburg issue a decree on April 14, dissolving these groups as organizational entities and prohibiting the display of their uniforms.\textsuperscript{110} Although this edict was to remain in force for only three months, it not only placed considerable limitations on Nazi political activities, but also served to increase discontent and dissension, which was already existent in certain SA circles for a number of reasons.\textsuperscript{111} One of the leading dissidents at this time was SA Commander Stegmann, of Nuremberg, who had been quarreling intermittently with Streicher about many SA matters, especially the disbursal of funds, which Streicher had controlled for years.\textsuperscript{112}

Almost immediately after the second Presidential elections, Streicher became involved in the upcoming Bavarian Landtag campaign. After Hitler's failure to capture the presidency, Nazi leaders became determined to achieve as much political power as they could by winning parliamentary majorities in elections scheduled for April 24 in Prussia, Bavaria, and several other states. In fact, the Reichsleitung had been
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laying plans for these elections even before Hitler had decided to become a Presidential candidate. Streicher was notified in January to prepare a list of names recommended as viable Landtag candidates from Franconia. Typically procrastinating in administrative responsibilities, he had not prepared the list until April 12, when he was called to Munich to attend a Bavarian Gauleiter meeting to finalize the official slate of Nazi candidates and to work out campaign strategy. In addition to his own name, Streicher recommended Holz, and two Nazi city councilmen, Gradl and Ertl.

The Munich meeting was headed by Strasser, who found it impossible the first day to complete the official Bavarian list to the satisfaction of all Gauleiters. On the second day of the meetings, Strasser announced that there would be no more arguments about the choice of candidates; that the Reichsleitung would make the final decisions which could be appealed only to Hitler.

Streicher may have been tired, or preoccupied with matters at home, because he offered no objections to Strasser's abrupt announcement, and made no comment when he learned that Holz's name had been omitted from the official slate of candidates. During the next ten days, Streicher again emersed himself in political campaigning. According to Stürmer accounts, there were only slight variations in the organization of this campaign compared to the two that preceded it. Except for the fact that the incumbent Bavarian Government was the major political target (after the Jews) Streicher's speeches and Stürmer articles in this campaign con-
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tained nothing that he had not mentioned in the previous campaigns.115

Election results in Bavaria as well as in other states proved disappointing to the Nazis. Although the number of their deputies increased in all cases, the National Socialists still did not approach a majority in any major state legislative body. Adding to this disappointment was the fact that the Nazis did not poll a percentage of votes in any state to equal the national average in the second Presidential election. At 32.5 percent, Bavaria ranked highest among all states involved in this election.116 Inasmuch as there is no available statistical breakdown by districts in Bavaria, it can only be assumed that Franconian voters responded about the same as the state average, which would have been slightly under their usual voting pattern, as described above. According to an article in a post-electoral Stürmer issue, Streicher again proved his popularity by emerging with the most Nazi votes in Franconia. The Stürmer article was generally vague, and did not state the specific number of votes won by any of the candidates. It mentioned, however, that both Gradl and Ertl were elected Landtag deputies.117

After the Bavarian elections, Streicher was able once again to concentrate on his local publishing and political affairs. For the first time since early 1932 he managed to spend at least a few hours each day in his newspaper office. Unlike most owners, Streicher left the bulk of the administrative affairs of his newspaper up to others, while he con-
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cerned himself with editorial questions. Because of his many enforced absences, however, the entire staff was organized to function with or without Streicher present. While there is little doubt that Streicher contributed articles and editorials to certain issues when he could, it is interesting that unless specific inferences were included, these were indistinguishable from the balance of the issue's literary content. This was because Streicher established a style of writing which he used consistently, and forced all Stürmer writers to imitate. In addition, the authorship of all Stürmer articles and editorials, for unexplained reasons, was always kept confidential. Despite this anonymity, there was never a reason to doubt that the Stürmer's literary content through the years reflected Streicher's basic political and racial beliefs.

The format, editorial style, and general content of the Stürmer, as it was established by the mid-1920's, has been previously described. Until 1932 the newspaper remained much the same but with a few changes or trend-variations noticeable. Anti-Semitic articles and editorials, which continued to dominate the literary content, became more radical beginning in 1929, as the political popularity of Streicher and the Nazi party increased. Despite many law suits and jail sentences, Streicher seemed more determined to prove the validity of sensational charges, such as the Jewish murder ritual.

Until 1925, almost all non-racial literary content was devoted to Streicher's political meetings and speeches, or to Streicher's personal feuds with individuals such as Walther Kellerbauer or Mayor
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Luppe. Since then the political horizon of the Stürmer broadened somewhat. There was less coverage of personal vendettas and more space allotted to Nazi party activities and national happenings as summarized below.

In 1925 and 1926 many articles and editorials dealt with the struggle to eliminate dissident party factions, such as the Strasser wing, and to unify the Nazi movement under the single leadership of Hitler. Events such as the Bamberg Conference, and the Weimar and Nuremberg Rallies also received broad coverage, as did elections after May, 1928, when Streicher and the Nazi party began to achieve national recognition with their victories. After early 1929, the depression was mentioned frequently, but these articles made no attempt at sophisticated analysis of outside causes. Instead, increasing unemployment and falling prices were discussed as examples of inept government officials or corrupt Jews. After the Gleichschaltung program was initiated, Streicher occasionally addressed himself to some of its efforts in articles, or series, about student associations, labor unions, or the Hitler Youth organization. After the Nazi party effectively entered the national political scene in early 1932, the Stürmer began publishing some articles lambasting prominent national political figures, such as Chancellor Brüning and Franz von Papen, who succeeded Brüning as Chancellor.

The Stürmer ad section remained virtually unchanged until 1929, when the depression started and the Nazi party began to increase rapidly in popularity and political influence. While there was no noticeable increase in the numbers of business ads, which continued to be sponsored by almost the same group of local merchants whose ads appeared in earlier issues, there was more emphasis on bargain prices and more appeal to
völkisch patronage. Frequently these ads stressed that prices listed were the "lowest in town," or they devoted much space to "special sales." Mention was usually included about the Nazi affiliation of the proprietors, or references were made about the "good völkisch quality" of the wine, food, or clothing. One variation of the usual consumer product advertisement was the appearance of large sized ads by enterprising Nazi promoters promising huge profits for party members who invested in male and female pairs of fur-bearing animals, such as mink or marten.

Beginning in 1929, this section was enlarged by approximately one-half page because of increasing numbers of personal ads and political announcements. The personal ads were usually inserted by individuals with Nazi affiliation, seeking employment in a völkisch household or business place. There were also numerous ads of houses for sale, or rooms for rent, by "good völkisch people." Frequently there appeared ads by young women seeking the companionship of a man, with detailed specifications, such as age, height, and social interests, carefully listed. Some of these specified preferences for an SA, or SS member.

Stürmer political announcements prior to 1929 normally centered about Streicher's political activities and other local party functions. As party membership and activities began expanding rapidly in 1929, these announcements increased approximately fourfold, and included such events as election rallies; Hitler Youth meetings; SS and SA affairs; speeches by nationally known Nazis; Nazi-sponsored local movies, as well as notices of most of Hitler's activities throughout Germany.

The Stürmer (as the Nazi party) profited from the deepening depression. Besides the slight increase in income from more personal ads
seeking employment, the circulation increased from some 20,000 in the late 1920's to approximately 25,000 copies per week by mid-1932. Although Streicher made no comment about this, it seems most likely that the increase in circulation resulted from the party's rise in membership which had been caused mainly by the depression. In addition, Streicher's popularity and/or notoriety increased as the circle of National Socialist supporters expanded. This may have led many readers out of curiosity, or personal interest, to follow his activities, which were described more fully in the Stürmer than in any other newspaper.

In early May, Streicher turned again to local political affairs. Among other activities, he organized 10 to 15 NSDAP meetings each week and participated as the main speaker in at least three of them. Aside from the usual anti-Semitic harangue, his speeches included references to the recent elections and remarks aimed at re-instilling the spark of enthusiasm which many party workers seem to have lost after the recent strenuous campaigns. These attempts to create an optimistic mood about the party's future were noted in a police report which stated that Streicher's opening statements in three consecutive May meetings included the phrase: "Now is the time for us to regroup our forces; strengthen our faith in Hitler, and organize ourselves for the final battles which lie ahead!"
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After all the promises and glowing predictions heard by Nazi speakers during the recent campaign and the consequent failures of the party to achieve its anticipated goals in any of the elections, there was not much more that Streicher could say to local members in his attempt to reinstate and maintain party morale. According to all indications, Streicher was generally unaware of the high-level negotiations transpiring in and around Berlin during these summer months. There is no record that he had the slightest knowledge of the secret negotiations that occurred in May between Hitler and General Kurt von Schleicher, who at that time was Hindenburg's chief advisor. Streicher appeared as surprised as most party members when Chancellor Brüning resigned on May 30 and was replaced by Papen. He appeared equally surprised to hear that the new Chancellor dissolved the Reichstag on June 4, and scheduled new elections for July 31.

Streicher was called to Munich to attend an important leadership conference on June 8. The major purposes of this three-day conference were to outline strategy for the coming elections and to select a slate of candidates. Goebbels and Strasser were the principal speakers during most of the sessions. Streicher appeared surprised to see his name included on this list of over 500 candidates. Although he had previously expressed no desire to become a Reichstag deputy, he made no objection to being named as a candidate this time. This change in attitude may have
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resulted from his disinclination to dispute Hitler's judgment.

Inasmuch as this campaign, as well as Streicher's participation in it, was similar in most respects to the previous campaigns this year, there is little to be gained by discussing it. One factor, which aided the Nazis considerably, and bears mentioning, however, was that by secret agreement between Hitler and Schleicher, the ban against the SA and SS was lifted just when the campaign got underway.\(^{125}\)

When the election results were announced, it seemed to many Nazis that a great victory had been achieved. With 13,745,000 votes and 230 seats in the Reichstag, the National Socialists were now the largest party in Germany.\(^{126}\) However, more sobering facts later dampened this initial exuberance. In percentage figures, the Nazis had garnered 37.4 percent of the total vote, which indicated practically no relative gain since the second presidential election.\(^{127}\) In addition, the 230 Reichstag seats fell far short of a majority, and there was still no visible means for the Nazis to control the legislative branch of the Government.

\textit{Stürmer} accounts of this election were lacking in detail. Streicher was declared an easy winner but there was no indication of how he ranked with other Nazi deputies selected. Among other Franconian candidates who succeeded in this election was SA Commander Stegmann. In percentage of all votes cast in Franconia, voters again remained consistent in supporting the Nazis with slightly under the national average,
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at 37.1 percent. 128

Streicher attended the one meeting of the Reichstag that fall. This occurred on September 12 and was the first and last full session of the deputies elected in July. In a surprise move, the Communist bloc opened proceedings by presenting a motion for a vote of no-confidence in the Papen Government. Following the orders of the Nazi delegation's leaders, Streicher cast his vote to support the Communist proposal. This action resulted in the immediate dissolution of the Reichstag. This meant that there would be yet another election that year. 129

While Nazi cooperation in this move was ordered by Hitler, and the Reichstag dissolution may have been beneficial to his overall political strategy, it did nothing to appease the drive for action by certain SA factions. Already angered and frustrated in August by the party's continued inability to achieve political power by the democratic process, many activist SA leaders had been urging "substantial military actions" to take over the Government by force. By mid-August, the SA's frustration exploded into numerous localized revolts against the existing Nazi leadership. 130

One of the most bitter and long-lasting of these revolts erupted in Franconia and was led by SA Commander Stegmann, whose dissatisfaction with Streicher's leadership was of long standing. This revolt developed into the most serious challenge yet faced by Streicher, and was to demand
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his full attention, with a few exceptions, during the final six months of
the Nazi ascendance to power.

Stegmann initiated open hostilities with Streicher in early August
with the publication, in Nuremberg, of a newspaper called Der Nazi-
Spiegel.131 The first edition of this newspaper declared that its intend-
ed purpose was to expose the corruption of Streicher. Among his charges,
Stegmann alleged that Streicher continually embezzled party funds. This
allegation, however, was made as a sweeping statement with no specific
proof offered. In one of many complaints listed against Streicher,
Stegmann voiced his resentment that in recent years the Nuremberg SA had
become nothing more than Streicher's bodyguards, poster-hangers, and rally
ushers. In summary, all of Stegmann's charges and demands (whether true
or untrue) served as supporting evidence that the local SA should be freed
from Streicher's jurisdiction.

Streicher retaliated in the Stürmer with numerous charges against
Stegmann, which attempted to prove the SA commander's unworthiness as a
Nazi.132 This newspaper feud continued until after the Reichstag dis-
solution. Stegmann returned home from Berlin, called a meeting of the
local SA, and announced that he was declaring himself free of any and all
future subordination to the Gauleiter. At the end of his short speech,
Stegmann threatened all present with expulsion from the SA if they followed
Streicher's orders instead of his.133
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Not to be outdone, Streicher spoke at an NSDAP meeting a few days later, in Nuremberg, and threatened expulsion from the party of all SA members who disobeyed his orders. He added that he expected every SA man to march in the parade which he had organized for the following Sunday, September 28.134

Despite this latest ultimatum, the rank and file of the local SA chose to support Stegmann. In effect, the entire local SA company refused to march in the parade as ordered by Streicher.135 It is noteworthy that most men testified later to a special party headquarters investigators that this decision was not based on their feelings about Streicher as Gauleiter, but on the principle that the SA should act independent of any civilian party official except Hitler.

By early October the Streicher-Stegmann feud had divided the vicinity of Nuremberg into two hostile camps and many instances of bloody fighting were reported by the police and in the Sturmer.136 A local doctor, who later wrote an account of these events stated that Stegmann was caught in the middle of one of these fights and forced into a basement by several of Streicher's "henchmen" and beaten unconscious.137 The serious nature of this situation in Nuremberg was noted in an official report by the Bavarian police to the President of the Franconian Government:
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The dispute between the forces of Streicher and SA leader Stegmann is the most significant event within the party. . . . The Social Democrat press is capitalizing on this dispute to its heart's content. . . . 138

While this report may have exaggerated the national significance of the problems in Nuremberg, it pointed out factually that political opponents could use this intra-party squabble to considerable advantage against the Nazis in the campaign now under way for the November 6 Reichstag elections. Whether or not Streicher realized this is uncertain. At any rate, on October 10 he apparently dismissed the Stegmann problem from his mind temporarily. He now began devoting all his energies to the campaign as he had done four times previously that year. 139

The results of this election were bitterly disappointing to the Nazis, who lost two million votes and 34 seats in the Reichstag. 140 Despite these nation-wide losses, Franconians again displayed their consistent voting pattern by supporting the Nazi ticket with approximately 35 percent, which was two percent above the national average of total votes cast for the Nazis. 141

The account of how Hitler overcame this discouraging political reversal and emerged as the German Chancellor is a well-known story which need not be repeated here. In the weeks following the election, Streicher played no part in the developments leading up to Hitler's appointment, and
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remained largely uninformed of the concurrent political maneuverings.

In Nuremberg, the Stegmann revolt had developed into something of a civil war by January, 1933. Streicher had demanded Stegmann's resignation as an SA officer and Nazi party member. Stegmann not only ignored this demand, but stepped up his attack on Streicher in the Nazi Spiegel and in special meetings. Street fights turned into skirmishes between armed gangs. After several men on both sides were killed, Nuremberg police arrested over 20 Nazis on suspicion of murder. In one incident, an SA gang, attempting to capture and perhaps kill Streicher, stormed his office building, but Streicher was saved by timely police intervention. This insurrection was ended abruptly by Hitler, who flew to Nuremberg on January 24, fired Stegmann, and berated the remaining SA officers for disobeying their Gauleiter.

The Stegmann incident illustrates the vulnerability of Streicher's position, and reveals the real source of his power within the party, namely Hitler. One week after his authority in Franconia was restored, Streicher had ample reason to celebrate the naming of Hitler as the new Chancellor of Germany.
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The Stegmann revolt was perhaps a fitting climax to Streicher's political career during the Weimar period. Among other things, it characterized and highlighted the turbulent nature of his political activities. Streicher displayed a penchant for conflict that was rare even among Nazi leaders. He was constantly involved in legal entanglements, intra-party factional squabbles, and personal feuds. With few exceptions, these quarrels were originated, or intensified by Streicher's volatile and antagonistic behavior.

The effort has been made in this study to explain Streicher's unusual behavior by examining certain psychological characteristics as they emerged in his daily activities. It has been pointed out that some of these characteristics emerged more frequently than others, however, no attempt was made to examine the overall affect of these dominant psychological traits as they may have motivated a number of Streicher's volatile and antagonistic deeds.

Among the most consistent behavioral traits displayed by Streicher was his rebellion against authority. As described earlier, this personality characteristic was initially evidenced in his undisciplined and rebellious action while serving his one-year's military obligation. His
refusal to obey the orders of his superior officers resulted in a jail sentence as well as a negative notation on his discharge record.

It has also been pointed out that this rebellious attitude was displayed during his early years in Nuremberg politics and in his school-teaching career. He repeatedly quarreled with leaders of two völkisch parties because of his refusal to conduct himself in accordance to rules and policies established by older leaders. His consistent defiance of these policies and leaders led to his banishment, or requested resignation from both of these groups. As a schoolteacher, Streicher frequently defied, or ignored orders from school authorities. Most notable of these incidents were his prolonged absences in direct violation of superiors' orders, which led to his suspension as a teacher.

One of the most publicized of Streicher's attacks against authoritative figures was his unending slanderous campaign against Dr. Luppe, who was not only Nuremberg's Mayor, but also Streicher's superior in the school administration. As discussed in earlier chapters, this long-lasting feud resulted in costly court trials and fines as well as a prison sentence for Streicher.

While only a few of the many occasions that Streicher displayed this rebellious trait are outlined above, it is notable that in almost every case, his actions resulted in some form of punishment. Additionally, in most cases, arising from Streicher's rebellious action, it was mentioned that disciplinary measures against him were levied only after repeated warnings. The fact that he continued his rebelliousness in these cases with full knowledge that he faced punitive results points out a second dominant psychological trait--reckless disregard for the consequences of his behavior.
This recklessness was first clearly evidenced in his battlefield performance during World War I, as discussed in an earlier chapter, he received many decorations for fearless bravery in the face of enemy fire. His promotion to officer status was delayed because it was feared that his disregard for danger would result in many additional casualties.

It has been postulated in this study that Streicher's reckless behavior on the battlefield, followed each time by miraculous survival, created within him an attitude that his role in life was foreordained—that he was destined to fulfill a special mission, and thus his actions were guided by fate, or some other supernatural force. This attitude, or sense of mission, remained with him permanently as shown in his testimony in 1946 during the Nuremberg trials. Excerpts from his statements about various activities in his adult life illustrate his firm conviction that he was guided by supernatural forces:

> I must therefore have been fated to become later on a writer and speaker on racial politics. . . . An inner voice sent me onto the platform and I spoke. . . . Destiny made of me what international propaganda thought it had made. . . . Gentlemen, I told you how I was fated to be drawn into. . . .

In addition to the above comments, there were further references in early chapters noting that Streicher seemed preoccupied with his sense of mission from the outset of his postwar political career. This belief not only reinforced his rebelliousness, but perhaps also motivated him to many acts of recklessness such as those mentioned in preceding paragraphs as well as others.
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The combination of these behavioral traits may have also caused Streicher to seek out, or invite trouble with political enemies, other Nazi leaders, and even his closest party collaborators. The following are examples of the many quarrels initiated or incited by Streicher which have been discussed in this study: Early in his political career, Streicher's closest radical völkisch collaborator was Walther Kellerbauer. Because of a trivial argument, Streicher turned this relationship into bitter enmity overnight when he denounced Kellerbauer as a traitor in Stürmer headlines. Then Streicher initiated and kept alive the prolonged Luppe feud by constantly goading the Mayor with inflammatory articles in his Stürmer. Even after trials and convictions, Streicher seemed intent on inviting further legal entanglements by often stepping up his slanderous attacks on Luppe. Later in his career, Streicher seemed to go out of his way to promote quarrels and bitter feelings with fellow party leaders Willy Liebel and Gottfried Feder, when he ruthlessly moved to suppress publication of their newspaper, Die Flamme.

In many of these quarrels, it seemed that Streicher's opponents were overwhelmed by the force of his arguments, and could offer little, or no resistance against him. For instance, as described in a previous chapter, Liebel made no attempt to oppose Streicher, but gave in almost immediately when ordered by him to stop publication of his newspaper. Kellerbauer was one of the many who resisted Streicher's initial attacks somewhat, but later made futile gestures, mainly by flattery, to pacify Streicher, and end the animosity.

The irrationality of Streicher's behavior may have also overwhelmed some court officials and left them convinced that he was beyond
normal judicial consideration. This may explain why some of the judges seemed partial to him in their sentences. It has been pointed out in earlier chapters that in most of Streicher's legal entanglements the courts appeared to favor him, and in these cases the bias was perhaps due to the judges' sympathy with Streicher or the Nazi cause. However, the possibility exists that some of these judges were not actually sympathetic, but sentenced him lightly because they felt he was so fervent in his beliefs that stiff punishment would be useless—that it would not alter his behavior. While this possibility lacks clear evidence, it is suggested in the following report by a government official after an investigation of a complaint about Streicher's hostile and irrational behavior:

Relieving Streicher as a teacher would not stop his continuation of the insults. It would, on the contrary, due to his free time, give (him) more opportunity for agitation and insult. . . .2

Streicher's sense of mission was reflected above all in his obsessive anti-Semitism. As discussed early in this study, the origins of his racist activities stem from the days immediately after World War I, when he became almost overnight an avid anti-Semitic spokesman. Although he claimed that he was guided to this task by some mysterious force, the timing of his "conversion" suggests that he was most likely motivated as many other Nazis, including Hitler, by some degree of political expediency. When the war ended, anti-Jewish feelings were particularly strong in Bavaria because it was the Jewish Socialist, Kurt Eisner, who had led the revolution in Munich. Streicher must have learned quickly that he could attract large audiences by denouncing the Jews.

2BSA, PAJS, folder 1730, doc. nr. 90. Letter from Dr. Huber to Dr. Luppe, June 5, 1923.
From the time Streicher achieved his first successes as a racist speaker in late 1918, he became vitally interested in anti-Semitism. He made it into his life's work and concentrated on this subject perhaps more intensely than any other individual in the twentieth century. To him, anti-Semitism was the central issue that dwarfed all others in history. He seemed convinced that all of the major problems and tragedies of civilizations dating back to the early Romans, were caused by Jews.

Streicher approached anti-Semitism with a religious fervor, apparently convinced that his fight against the Jews was the same as a religious crusade—a righteous struggle for the truth. More than any other Nazi racist, Streicher concentrated his attacks on the philosophic and religious aspects of anti-Semitism. In attempting to prove the degradation of the Jews, he focused his arguments, which were repeated again and again, on interpretations of Hebrew scriptures. In his testimony at the Nuremberg trials, Streicher alluded to his scholarly format:

"In Der Stürmer no editorial appeared written by me . . . in which I did not include quotations from the ancient history of the Jews, from the Old Testament or from Jewish historical works of recent times."

While Streicher may have been sincere in his endeavors toward the scholarly approach, he was consciously, or unconsciously dealing in falsehoods, or pseudo-philosophy. It has been pointed out in this study that most of the Jewish historical works he used as references were little more than forgeries or distortions of earlier Hebrew scholarly writings.

---

3IMT, Vol. 12, p. 320.
authored by seventeenth and eighteenth century anti-Semites.  

In his efforts to become thoroughly acquainted with the subject of anti-Semitism, Streicher gathered all the available material dealing with Jews that he could find and stored it in a library that he had established. After the Nazi seizure of power, this library became the repository for all the valuable books and manuscripts that Streicher ordered to be salvaged from Jewish homes and synagogues being demolished in the Nuremberg area. From them he selected the rarest manuscripts and finest volumes of authentic Jewish works. This library survived the war, and while the majority of its holdings consisted of anti-Semitic tracts, and pornographic propaganda material, Streicher's collection of authentic Hebrew writings preserved for posterity a large share of the worthwhile and rarest literature of the German Jews.

To Streicher the Jewish question was the only part of the Nazi program that was of importance. As mentioned repeatedly in this study, his political speeches, as well as his Stürmer articles concentrated almost exclusively on the racial issue. In his testimony at the Nuremberg trials, he insisted that he had no interest in any party program beyond anti-Semitism. He added that he did not even think about a party policy when he joined Hitler in 1922. In the same vein, he stated that he did not attempt to familiarize himself with Hitler's programs and policies later--that he read nothing else in Mein Kampf except passages about the Jewish question. He continued in this vein when questioned about his knowledge of the Nazi
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^Gliksman, My Lawsuit Against Julius Streicher, p. 25.

^Kelley, 22 Cells in Nuremberg, p. 144; SBN, Ruehl, Der Stuermer, p. 116. This library contained over 8,000 books and manuscripts.
party program during the early years of the party:

I did not need a party program. I admit frankly that I never read it (Mein Kampf) in its entirety. At that time programs were not important, but mass meetings...

Streicher made the promotion of anti-Semitism his life's work, and capitalized on it both politically and financially. The racial issue was the source of his political popularity in Franconia, and with it he built the solid following that earned him a reputation as an outstanding Nazi political figure. While Streicher's political success was generally confined to the Nuremberg area, it offers a clear example of how one man operating in the local level could use anti-Semitism to spearhead the development of one of the strongest Nazi groups.

However, Streicher's success in this respect was aided immeasurably by historical factors and the coincidence of timing. Streicher's racist views were popular and found broad support in the Nuremberg area partially because anti-Semitism was more deeply rooted and widespread in Franconia than in any other part of Germany. Moreover, in the years following World War I, anti-Semitism was widely accepted in Germany mainly because the Jews could serve as scapegoats that could be blamed for the loss of the war and all the hardships that followed it.

In his political speeches, Streicher attracted large crowds on the strength of his own style and forcefulness as a speaker. He seemed to understand the problems of his audiences in an area suffering from chronic economic crises. In blaming the Jews he offered a simplified
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explanation for the major cause of their troubles. Streicher combined passion with what seemed to his audiences to be a vast amount of knowledge on the Jewish question.

Apart from his political gains, Streicher also derived certain psychological benefits from these speeches. A man of unusual egocentricism, Streicher must have received much needed gratification from the knowledge that he could again and again attract large audiences, including many women, and fire them with enthusiasm that inevitably resulted in prolonged applause.

Streicher's ego may have also been boosted by the fact that he did not have to cultivate wealthy people as Hitler did for financial support, but was able to realize handsome financial profits almost solely from the promotion of anti-Semitism. The chief source of Streicher's income was his anti-Semitic publications, which, in addition to his weekly Stürmer later included children's books and other newspapers. Revenue from this source enabled Streicher and his family to live comfortably, even in the depression years. Mainly through his publishing business, Streicher managed to accumulate a fortune estimated at one million dollars by 1940.

While Streicher always managed to attract crowds at his political meetings, and was able to generate political support in Franconia on his own initiative, his standing within the Nazi party organization, as pointed out in the Stegmann affair, depended mainly on Hitler's continued support. Inasmuch as most other Nazi leaders owed their positions solely to Hitler, this fact, in itself, is not unusual. Streicher's case, however, was
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different because he stood alone as the one leader most disliked, or despised, by almost every ranking Nazi. Because of his hostile and aggressive nature, Streicher had quarreled with many of these men over trivial party matters. Also some leaders, including Gregor Strasser, often asked that Streicher should be banned from the party because of his immoral private life and his association with ex-criminals.9 Kurt Ludecke, a one-time supporter of Hitler, who was in close contact with most of the important Nazi officials during those years, later remembered that long before 1932, many Nazis were horrified by Streicher's racial fanaticism and immorality, and were repelled by his psychological obsessions. Ludecke continues: "Streicher is unquestionably a pathological case, apart from the fact that he is a man of one-sided and limited intelligence."10

There is little doubt that Hitler was aware of at least some of Streicher's deficiencies. On one occasion during a Reichsleitung meeting, he stated that he knew about Streicher's disagreeable disposition and limited capabilities.11 In his table conversations, Hitler discussed Streicher's deficiencies on at least two occasions. He said that he realized that Streicher had many weaknesses; that he was a poor administrator, and that he possessed some abnormal personality traits.12 Yet Hitler consistently defended Streicher when other Nazis criticized or
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9Dutch, Hitler's Twelve Apostles, p. 175.

10Ludecke, I Knew Hitler, p. 526.

11Dutch, Hitler's Twelve Apostles, p. 175.

condemned him, and remained loyal to Streicher from the time they merged their political forces. The question that is of vital concern here is the same question that confounded many Nazi leaders in those days: "What reasons lay behind Hitler's determination to defend and support Streicher as he did?"

Some authors have stated that Hitler favored Streicher and refused to listen to complaints about him because of a personal friendship which developed after Streicher voluntarily joined forces with Hitler in 1922. This conjecture is highly improbable because it contradicts what is known about Hitler's personal relationships. Most of his contemporaries and biographers agree that although Hitler disliked being along, he was unable to form any personal friendships. While he may have been attracted more to some individuals than to others, he was a practical-minded politician. If he showed favoritism or partiality toward anyone, it was usually because that person was of some value, or had made some valuable contribution to the Nazi movement. Streicher therefore may have earned Hitler's support at least partially by contributions to the National Socialist movement such as these:

When Streicher joined forces with Hitler in 1922, he reportedly brought with him a following that immediately doubled the membership of the party. More importantly, Streicher's merger established for Hitler a strong National Socialist base in northern Bavaria which served as a connecting link to scattered northern groups in existence at this time.

---


14 Ibid.
During the next year Streicher organized many new local Nazi groups and formed them into a relatively strong Franconian party. Years later, in his table conversations, Hitler, perhaps exaggerating somewhat, stated more than once that without Streicher, Nuremberg would not have been won over to National Socialism. Hitler also stated that he felt Streicher performed a particularly valuable service not only in popularizing the Nazi movement in Nuremberg, but also in placing himself and his followers in his (Hitler's) service in 1922.15

Streicher's worth to Hitler was perhaps never greater than during the three years following the Putsch. While Hitler spent a year in prison, his party was outlawed and eventually broken into splinter groups headed by men who attempted to usurp the leadership of the völkisch movement. Streicher was one of the very few local leaders who remained totally and outspokenly loyal to Hitler. In maintaining a large segment of his Franconian movement intact and alienated from rival völkisch groups, Streicher was able to preserve for Hitler an active nucleus of loyal followers from which he was able to rebuild his party.

While Hitler was in the process of reorganizing his party and unifying it under his sole leadership, he could always depend on Streicher to cooperate loyally and to the best of his ability. Although Streicher's contributions to the national political development of the party were minimal, his Gau was the first to function well and served not only as a good organizational example, but also as the leader in furnishing badly

15Hitler, Secret Conversations, pp. 168-169; 393.
needed funds to Hitler during this period of reconstruction.16

By mid-1926, the rebuilding of the Nazi party was completed. Hitler had now surrounded himself with an "inner circle" of highly qualified administrative officials and Streicher's contributions to the overall development of the party were limited to organizing occasional party rallies and conducting election campaigns in addition to his involvement in provincial affairs and the promotion of anti-Semitism.

It is of course possible that Hitler felt attracted to Streicher also because he sensed in the latter some similarity in basic experiences and behavioral patterns. These were interesting similarities in their social origins and childhood upbringing. As mentioned in earlier chapters, they were born within a few years of each other of humble parentage and reared under fathers who were minor civil servants, strongly authoritarian towards their children, and generally preoccupied with matters that caused them to neglect their families. When World War I erupted, both Hitler and Streicher fought bravely. Both developed a sense of mission; Streicher apparently then, and Hitler somewhat later, which led them to believe that their lives were guided by destiny—which was connected directly to the fate of Germany.

Until the end of the war, neither seems to have been particularly emphatic about his anti-Semitic beliefs. Shortly after the war, however, both became well-known in local circles for their outspoken anti-Semitism. As discussed earlier, Streicher claimed that he was converted to this cause by some mysterious force, however, it was also postulated that perhaps both

Streicher and Hitler became avid anti-Semites because this was a general trend in Bavaria after the war. They both soon became leaders of separate völkisch parties and popular demagogues with a reputation for emotional tirades that often violated the law. In addition, they were alike in their inability or disinterest in performing administrative detail work. They were also both imbued with a restless nature. Both, above all, were rebels against established authority, but here the similarities end.

While Streicher seems to have fought the powers that were in a childish, immature way, primarily for the sake of rebellion, Hitler viewed the established authorities as representatives of what he considered a decadent, dying order that must be replaced by an entirely new one.

It is also likely that Hitler found a certain personal attraction in Streicher's fanatic anti-Semitism. The American historian Arthur Peterson, stresses the fact that Hitler was greatly impressed by Streicher's rabid racism. Peterson states that Streicher's anti-Semitic fanaticism "was his strength with Hitler, who regarded him with awe as the pioneer of the movement."17 This statement may be somewhat exaggerated, but it also bears much validity inasmuch as there is considerable evidence indicating that Hitler admired Streicher's dedicated fight against the Jews. For example, in at least two of his speeches, during the 1920's, Hitler praised Streicher as the one person he could depend on to keep the anti-Semitic movement alive in Bavaria.18 In his later table conversations, he complimented Streicher's anti-Semitic efforts in Nuremberg, noting that this
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aided immeasurably in the growth of National Socialism there.19

Interestingly, Hitler noted in his table conversations that Streicher might have shown too much tolerance toward the Jews. Referring to Streicher's pseudo-philosophic approach to the racial question, Hitler claimed that Streicher "idealized" the Jew. He added: "The Jew is baser, fiercer, more diabolical than Streicher depicted him."20 Even though Hitler's anti-Semitism was more biologically oriented, he was far less inclined than Streicher to blame the Jews for all of Germany's problems. Unlike Streicher, Hitler considered anti-Semitism as only one facet of his political ideology, which included other programs, such as the need for more living space, and the need for a moral regeneration of Germany.

The chief medium of Streicher's anti-Semitic campaign was his newspaper, Der Stürmer. Some historians consider this weekly the most rabid, sensational, and depraving anti-Semitic newspaper ever published over a long period of years.21 Beginning in 1923, the Stürmer appeared almost without interruption until early 1945. With few exceptions, each Stürmer issue devoted over 90 percent of its literary content to the Jewish question. Most front-page articles dealt with some sensational, or hateful charge or story about Jews. Many of these feature stories were repeated countless times. The literary style was crude and simple, bordering on gutter language.

19 Hitler, Secret Conversations, pp. 168; 393.
20 Ibid., p. 168.
21 SBN, Mueller, Geschichte der Juden, p. 170; Bondy, Racketeers of Hatred, p. 16.
Perhaps as evidence of the prevalent mentality and prejudice in Franconia during the Weimar period, this newspaper subsisted almost solely on local support. Circulation during the later years of that period reached as high as 25,000. During the mid-1930's, however, the Stürmer was distributed throughout Germany and attained a peak circulation of nearly one-half million. Thanks to a special order by Hitler, Streicher was able to bring his Stürmer to the attention of almost everyone in Germany by having glass-enclosed poster boards erected in every section of cities and towns, as well as in farming villages. By governmental decree, some women were designated to clean the glass and post new Stürmer issues in these poster boards each week. While the Stürmer became well-known throughout Germany, the Nazi Government, perhaps out of embarrassment, refused to allow its exportation.

Despite Streicher's attempt to "force feed" the Stürmer on the masses in this manner, the newspaper probably had little effect on adults who were not already convinced anti-Semites. According to statements of Germans interviewed later on this question, the consensus of opinion was that most people dismissed it with only a passing glance. As for the overall effectiveness of the Stürmer, most people interviewed were emphatic in their opinions that the newspaper was of little real propagandistic

22BAK, Streicher Nachlasse, folder 342, which is also the source for the following.

23Interview with Fritz Nadler, Nuremberg journalist and author, March 1971.

24Dutch, Hitler's Twelve Apostles, p. 179.

25Personal interviews with citizens in Nuremberg and Munich, July, 1920; March 1971, which is also the source for the following.
importance. Rationale for this opinion centered on the fact that the *Stürmer* was so extreme in its views and so base in its allegations and cartoons, that only those who were already confirmed racists, or who were overly naive, could take the newspaper seriously. However, the judges at the Nuremberg trials for major war criminals did not share this opinion.

Louis Bondy, a British historian, discusses at length a point that is mentioned only infrequently by other authors, and may merit some consideration. Bondy alleges that the *Stürmer*, because of its abundance of cartoons and its simple style of phraseology, was read widely by children, and was a definite factor in mentally conditioning these young people, who turned into a generation of anti-Semites in the later years of the Hitler regime. Bondy also mentions that Streicher's subsidiary publications, such as the children's book, *Der Gifthilz*, were effective in this regard. One problem with Bondy's thesis, however, is that allegations of this nature are impossible to prove with figures. However, it is not unlikely that a certain number of German youth were swayed by Streicher's propagandistic style and his constant harping on the subject. However, the percentage of the total population of German children affected by Streicher's publications before the Nazi takeover was most likely small because until 1933 the *Stürmer*'s circulation was limited and the children's books were not published until the mid-1930's. During the Nazi period, however, it is more likely that Streicher's publications reached a large number of children.

26 Bondy, *Racketeers of Hatred*, p. 42 ff., which is also the source for the following.
While Streicher's publication business made him a rich man, he allegedly added to his wealth in illicit dealings through the "Aryanization" program initiated throughout Germany after promulgation of the Nuremberg Laws in 1935. This included the appropriation of Jewish property ostensibly for the benefit of the Nazi Government. However, many party leaders used this program to enrich themselves.

By this time, Streicher had incurred the enmity of most of the highest ranking Nazis, especially Hermann Göring, who found in the Nuremberg "Aryanization" program a means to destroy Streicher politically. Göring brought charges of embezzlement against Streicher to Hitler, who reluctantly agreed that a commission be formed to conduct an investigation and hearing in order to determine whether or not Streicher was guilty. In late 1938, he was tried before a panel of his Nazi peers and found guilty of illegally profiting by forcing Jews to sell valuable property to him at a fraction of the actual value. Although Göring and others were also heavily involved in such practices, Streicher was judged by the panel to be "unfit to rule." Hitler did not strip him of his Gauleiter title, but ordered him to be banished from Nuremberg indefinitely. After this, Streicher moved to his nearby farm, Pleikershof, where he continued publication of his Stürmer until the final months of World War II.

Prior to the Göring Commission hearings, the major investigation into Streicher's activities was conducted by the Nuremberg Police President,

27) IFZ, Göring Commission Reports, doc. nr. 1757 PS, which is also the source for the following.

28) Ibid.

Dr. Benno Martin, who, in 1970 was still living in Munich. Martin recalled that the formal charge brought against Streicher was not the actual reason for the investigation or the verdict. According to Martin, Streicher had insulted Göring personally and this triggered the petition to Hitler. Göring had no trouble gaining the support of other ranking Nazis who hated Streicher because of his suspected sexual advances to their wives or because of his general immoral personal behavior. In addition, many of these officials had long been embarrassed and repelled by Streicher's paranoid anti-Semitic fanaticism. Martin claimed that these were the principal reasons that Streicher was "railroaded out of town." Hitler, however, continued to side with Streicher to the extent that he consistently refused all demands by ranking Nazis to prohibit the continued publication of the Stürmer.

It is ironic that anti-Semitism, the principal vehicle of Streicher's political and financial success, was the major cause of his disgrace and eventual downfall. Long before the end of World War II, Streicher had become the object of almost universal scorn and hatred because of his fanatic and unreasonable campaign against the Jewish people. As mentioned above, this was one of the reasons for his political banishment even under the Hitler Government. His extreme racism earned him the unsavory subtitle, "Number One Nazi Jew-Baiter." He will undoubtedly be known forever in history as one of the most disreputable Germans of the twentieth century. During the Nuremberg trials of major war criminals, he was considered so repulsive that he was shunned by other Nazis who formally re-
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quested of their jailers that they not be required to eat at the same table with Julius Streicher.\textsuperscript{31}

In the end, the most damning evidence that brought about his conviction and execution was read by the prosecutor from issues of his own newspaper, \textit{Der Stürmer}.\textsuperscript{32}

\textsuperscript{31}Kelley, \textit{22 Cells in Nuremberg}, p. 149.

\textsuperscript{32}IMT, Vol. 12, pp. 359-366.
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