

**To Thrust and Cut!**



**Voices of the Times from a German Newspaper**

**Edited by  
Gunter d'Alquen**



**1937**

**M. Müller & Sohn K.G., Berlin SW 19, Dresbener Straße 43**

## **Table of Contents**

### **Foreword**

#### **I. A Newspaper Prevails**

**Between Leadership and Followership  
Our Task  
Just Don't Give In!**

#### **II. The Old Guard and the Young State**

**The Führer  
The Unwritten Laws  
Community, or Collective?  
A Party Membership Card, Not a Ration Card  
They Have Always Been Nationalists...  
Blind Zeal Only Does Harm  
National Socialists Without a Membership Card  
Perpetual Class Struggle  
An Idea Versus A System  
Second-Class Citizens?  
Thoughts on the Führer Principle  
The Inflation of Terms  
The Courage of One's Convictions  
No More Empty Phrases!  
No Exceptions!  
Leadership, Not Caste Spirit  
What Do The People Say About This?**

#### **III. Faith and Dogma**

**Faithful Germany  
To Alfred Rosenberg  
Leadership, Dictatorship, and Inquisition  
Form and Content  
The Spiritual Crisis  
A Time Without Faith?  
Offensive?  
A Word On Divorce  
The Illegitimate Child  
The Risk of Faith  
Austria, Awaken!  
Power and Heart**

#### **IV. Common Sense**

**Dangerous Confusions  
Experts – or Characters  
No Unnecessary Harshness!  
These Are The Enemies of the State!  
Women Should Be Women  
They Want to Be Leaders Too  
Doctor—Not Physician  
We Are Not Like That!  
By the Way...**

#### **V. The Economy Is Not Exempt Either**

**The Flag Flies Above the Economy  
Bolsheviks Among Us?  
A Brief Overview of the Economy  
The Best Opportunity**

#### **IV. Soldiers and the Movement**

**The Wehrmacht and National Socialism  
We War Volunteers and National Socialism  
“No One Needs to Have Idealism Anymore”  
The People's Army and the “Reichswehr”  
On Political Soldiering  
The Soil From Which Obedience Grows  
Should I Become an Officer?  
The Soldier as the Bearer of the Idea  
Our Opinion on War**

#### **VII. Cultural Policy**

**Without a Full Beard  
Don't Trumpet – Write Poetry!  
Is There Such a Thing as Communist Culture?  
Homosexuality and Art  
No Educational Philistines!  
Have the Courage to Take a Stand!  
History – Seen Correctly!  
Can Culture Be Created?**

#### **VIII. On a Side Note**

**More Humor!**  
**The Führer Coughs**  
**A Fairy Tale**  
**“Splendid Isolation”**  
**A Conversation with the Procurator Pontius Pilate**  
**More Civil Courage!**  
**We Are Ashamed!**  
**A Jew’s Final Assessment!**

## Forward

For the newspaper man, it is often a wistful feeling to see his share in the conflict of the times, his active participation in the rebuilding of the Reich, sink into the maelstrom of events; many good thoughts, some fruitful suggestions, some works that came from a passionate heart, are forgotten and therefore fade away after a short time.

We soldiers of the press are not poets; our task lies in a different sphere, and yet it is often a creative element in our work, alongside the small but no less necessary debate, that is the key that allows us to enter, with all the goods of daily politics and ideology, into those areas of human life that fundamentally determine the direction of our thoughts and actions. We see our contribution to the leadership of the people in the new era as being to move and awaken the hearts of the community so that they may then follow the path of our idea based on their own understanding.

A sure conclusion from this clear and proven view is the work that has quickly become a household name today: "Das Schwarze Korps" (The Black Corps). Born out of camaraderie and created for camaraderie, it has become another solid building block for the foundations of future development.

We have now once again turned the many pages that, week after week for over two years, sought and found their way in Germany and beyond its borders - friend and foe, attack and defense, blow and stab. Through the written word, a small group of readers became a comradeship whose limits are hardly foreseeable today.

It is not common practice to turn a newspaper into a book, to transform the work of the day into a lasting and thus contemporary historical document, and yet we have decided to take this step because we wanted to give a picture of our work in this summary, a picture of purposeful work on the path to shaping Germany's present and future.

These sections of our work may endure beyond the day because, consciously experienced and longed for beyond us, they must retain their power - a power that is meant to strengthen, inspire, help, and clarify, a power born of our revolution of heart and mind, for consolidation and debate today as well as tomorrow.

And now, as we bring these pages together in book form to the German public, we want to make our contribution to the fulfillment of this era, just as it is the purpose of our work in the daily newspaper; this book cannot and should not be a textbook, but rather a healthy and natural statement from the perspective of our young worldview on questions of life and the problems of political development - it should be a friend to comrades, an enemy of all disease and unnaturalness, and a weapon in the fight for freedom of thought!

**Berlin, May 1937**

**The Editor**

## **I. A Newspaper Prevails**

### **Between Leadership and Followership**

The question of whether the National Socialist press, i.e., the press of the National Socialist German Workers' Party, will have special tasks and thus a special position within the general press in the context of overall German development is almost equivalent to the question of whether today or tomorrow one will consider allowing the party to continue to exist within the German national community or whether it will be dissolved - as I said, the question is similar, but it seems to me that the answer to the latter problem is easier than the former.

Just as party members do not have a special external position vis-à-vis their fellow citizens, but only have greater duties towards them, so too, logically, the special external position of the party press had to come to an end one day, as was expressed in the decree of the Reich Leader for the Press, (one of the oldest National Socialist fighters, mind you). The situation has now developed, and is therefore such today, that after a laborious and systematic purge and reorganization of the entire German press, it is only possible and achievable in the long term to distinguish between the men of the newspaper themselves, i.e., its internal designers, in terms of value, task, significance, and domestic or foreign political weight.

However, since we are only at the beginning of a development that is also dependent on the transformation of the readership, it seems necessary to ask honestly about the needs and requirements of a newspaper – let us just talk about political newspapers here.

The tasks of the political newspaper have fundamentally changed in just a few years; however, this should not obscure the continued political significance of the newspaper as a political tool of the National Socialist state. We do not want to overlook the fact that, based on the past and its grave legacy, an attitude toward the concept of newspapers in general still deeply and profoundly dominates people's feelings—I would say their instincts—which can be briefly described as a now existing concept, commonly referred to as hostility toward the press.

All the newspapers that have succeeded those publications that are solely responsible for this situation, to which we still owe this general aversion in part today, should address this issue and, if they can, try to make amends for a great injustice through decency and willingness - in any case, they must be credited with the will to do so today, for the most part.

We National Socialist journalists, who have been in our position for a long time and who regard our position, then as now, as a front line of the movement, have no need and cannot tolerate being lumped together with all those phenomena that we ourselves helped to overcome through our example and our struggle on the front line.

Is it really necessary to keep emphasizing a distinction that should be more than self-evident? Isn't it superfluous to recall the years when, without resources and without the economic, personnel, and often even professional prerequisites, we fought a battle that demanded not only heart and nerves, but also unheard-of courage and the purest youthful energy? During the years of struggle, we had a small National Socialist press that served the movement, just as the SA and SS men fulfilled their duty on the streets; while sky-high royalties and salaries flowed in Berlin's newspaper district, our camp was dominated both by the bitterest restrictions and the most modest penny-pinching, but also by a courage, diligence, and

successful commitment that is probably unparalleled in the history of the press. The National Socialist press did not seek to earn any external claims or rights to any tranquil pensioner or reserve position, but it did earn a tradition that is honest enough not to be forgotten, a tradition that sharply outlines and defines its position and task in today's Germany and the tasks to come in the Reich of tomorrow.

Like the movement, its press is not an apparatus that serves an end in itself; during the decisive years, the movement allowed and was able to allow only a few capable minds to remain part of its press as just one of its weapons; even these men were almost always actively involved in some formation under the new banner, with their hearts and minds outside the editorial offices, and what even the best training today can rarely achieve—and this must never be forgotten—these years shaped a type of newspaperman who had to be completely new and different, a man who saw his profession first and foremost as a calling, who was a fighter and will always remain so. This National Socialist newspaper man does not deserve the often instinctive mistrust of the often equally nebulous term “press”; this man has overcome the “Schmock” and newspaper writer, the “journalist” of the past, and is therefore worthy of the utmost trust, because he is first and foremost a soldier of the movement, knows the importance of discipline and tactical necessity, became an officer at the front, and knows how to find the only right and necessary words for his team in critical moments, even without regulations.

The task of our time is to educate, reorganize, and train the entire population according to the principles of the National Socialist movement; this is a task in which, by law and principle, the entire German press, far beyond the realm of the party press, has and must have its share - just as the party has its special place in this work, its press likewise occupies its appropriate section.

Now, it is not the case that everything in our development today proceeds according to a pattern of command and strictly prescribed execution - men are put in their place to create and build on their own initiative, based on National Socialist principles. Whoever is the first and best in his performance will also be the first and most suitable to receive new assignments and new powers for further action; just as this fact is valid in our overall political and economic life, it is especially true for the press.

The man who, in difficult and good times, proved himself worthy of great trust, holding high the banner of the idea in small and large disputes, in one of the most visible positions, must know again and again that he still possesses the trust he once had, a trust that alone makes him strong and courageous and, ultimately, passionate and enthusiastic about his special task and duty.

Those who are involved in the unique and stormy, combative work of the newspaper, who know their field of work and master its tools, who believes with all his heart in his calling to be a fighter for the idea, knows best what forces still need to be unleashed, and also knows that we are only at the beginning of a development that can be great and proud if its clear logic is understood and the insights gained from it are correctly utilized.

Those who do not belong to this group, those who are driven solely by personal ambition and petty vanity, and those who even want to believe that they can be the bearers of outdated grumbling and criticism at any price, in a field that was truly acquired with blood and sweat, we throw out, simply because they obscure an image that can only endure and have a future if it is clear and unambiguous.

It can and must therefore be the work of open and honest comradeship, based on trust and wise statesmanlike leadership, in the skillful distribution of the various tasks from the National Socialist party press, to maintain and expand the sharp, agile, and hard instrument that the movement needs, alongside

other forces, as a mediator between leadership and followers, in order to fight for and then stabilize, firmly and more firmly, a state of affairs in Germany and the world that we carry in our hearts as a faithful longing.

## **Our Task**

### **The editorial in the first issue of “Das Schwarze Korps” emphasized:**

As Führer of Germany's National Socialist movement, and thus the Führer of the new state, Adolf Hitler has distributed the great tasks of future construction and design among his followers on a broad scale; each formation fulfills its duty in the place where no one else would be better able to fight than it - any ambition or petty jealousy between groups would therefore be pointless in view of the great task of achieving the best and the most possible in their own field, in view of the goal of being loyal to the Führer and thus indispensable, useful, and supportive to the community.

We have won the great political battle for power; internal power is firmly in our hands. Filled with the ardent will to complete this work, we now stand in the midst of the greater task of winning over the German people entirely, of determining the last man and the last woman to be convinced supporters of our worldview.

The spirit of the fighting days, the spirit of the old SA and SS columns, shall live and remain alive, so that, just as it gloriously defeated the power of the adversary, it may also be great and strong in achieving and shaping victory. We want to prove our belief in National Socialism as the worldview of German blood and, with determined self-discipline, free ourselves inwardly from everything that cannot have anything in common with this belief in our conscience! This would be a difficult, almost impossible task for us if we did not know that the bridge from yesterday to tomorrow rests on our shoulders.

Adolf Hitler's Schutzstaffel [SS] has the iron will to give its all on the path laid out for it by the Führer - in true camaraderie, in loyal spirit, in a connection of each and every one of our units with its duties, we want to fulfill our part of the duty to the whole to the best of our ability; that is why this newspaper, which from now on will find its way to our people, should not be an end in itself, but an aid and a tool to this end. With it, we want to go where our men are, into the storms and into the columns; we want to go into the homes and workplaces of our men; we want to help each individual again and again to clearly recognize the right path; we want to be both a guide and a comrade; we want to bear witness to the outside world of the thoughts and desires of our men; we want to tightly bind thousands together with the bond of comradeship, woven from shared faith and serious duty; we want to show these men that they are nothing alone, and we want to prove to them that everything lies in community.

Here, the men who have earned the right to be heard in the past should speak, but we do not want to exhaust ourselves with old, certainly beautiful memories; rather, we want to clearly point out the tasks of the future and show the way to fulfill them.

As generous as we want to be in the small matters of everyday life, we want to be strict when it comes to the principles of the movement, the principles of honor and cleanliness in our own ranks.

These pages are intended to be a faithful companion to men in their service and leisure time - together with the man, they will go forth to be a pure reflection of the life and struggles of the storms and standards on their way.

Before the conscience of the movement, there is no difference in status or class, or perhaps even a difference in formations; before the eternal German future, there is only one difference, that of responsibility, and there the result of every evaluation always lies solely with the evaluated.

There is no special life without special achievement in our new German community, in which everyone has to bear responsibility; all our strength belongs to our idea, to which we once dedicated our existence, and every group, be it the Sturmabteilung, the Arbeitsfront, the Wehrmacht, or the Schutzstaffel, must do its best in its own field, to the best of its ability.

As strong links, we are united by our National Socialist worldview, which hardens us into a block; we see the meaning of our lives in the one task of shaping Germany internally and externally, so that it can face the future strong and pure.

True commitment to this goal requires special qualities from each individual, which must be proven in times of crisis: iron discipline, unconditional obedience, and loyalty.

These requirements automatically lead to a selection process and bring together a group of men who see the fulfillment of the great German task in voluntary, selfless service to the future.

We are modest enough to know that we are not the glorious conclusion, but only the beginning of true German history; we therefore see the meaning of our lives in building a framework for this beginning of Germany's future.

We, the men of "Das Schwarze Korps", want to feel responsible for this work - we want to recognize the magnitude of this responsibility clearly and purely, so that we know that this task can only be fulfilled through ever-stricter selection, through unheard-of severity toward ourselves, through performance, and through exemplifying our soldierly virtues.

### **Just Don't Give In!**

**"Das Schwarze Korps" entered its third year of work with the following words:**

As always, at the turn of the year 1936/37, we want to make the outer section of the calendar the inner section of our work and take a look around.

If, during this period that is now behind us, we were at the forefront with our newspaper, if we were able to be reliable comrades and loyal fellow fighters to hundreds of thousands of people, then the honest joy we feel about this is part of the strength that will ultimately enable us to overcome all the mountains and obstacles that the coming period will undoubtedly hold in store for us all.

Much has been said about newspapers and the press, and we know that it is not so much the discussion as the result that deserves interest and serious consideration; we do not want to talk much about what we have been able to achieve in our bitter struggle for the purity of the idea and the cleanliness of old, hard-won ideas in our special place. Ultimately, we also want to chalk up the sometimes almost too

frequent attempts to imitate our own new type of newspaper as a success, even if this intellectual authorship sometimes entails a heavy responsibility.

We have succeeded in one thing, and that seems to us to be the most important - we have built a circle of trust and camaraderie around us, and so we have been able to continue on the path that was before us in the early days of this newspaper.

Proof of the correctness of our initial ideas, not just for a limited part of the movement, but beyond it, to speak on behalf of and for the entire movement, was provided by the purely external figure of our circulation; these figures alone should be testimony that what is demanded of us today is not the representation of any particular interests, but rather the frank openness of the old guard, which never speaks for itself, but, no matter where it may stand today, possesses the old supporting melody in the accord of general opinions, despite all its variability, and is not willing to ever give it up.

Just as the formation from which the newspaper grew fulfilled its task of being the guarantor of the internal security of the Reich, we have taken on the same duty in this particular area, both on a large scale and on the equally necessary small scale.

As fundamental as we were in matters of nature and health, we were just as consistent and tough when it came to holding our shield and our sharp sword over the principles of the National Socialist worldview - we have wielded a sharp blade in doing so. We have fought many a battle, both externally and internally, and have extended a protective hand to all those who, with decency and honesty, sought the path that leads to the great community of the new Reich; we were friends and we were enemies, both completely and undividedly. Even if it may be unusual here today, when we look back and see a wide field of accomplished work, we who have always only demanded to honor our promise - to remain in good times and bad, as we have been, the old soldiers of Adolf Hitler.

No matter where we stand today, no matter what uniform we wear, the old heart beats beneath the old brown shirt.

We have all had to learn from the circumstances and irrefutable prerequisites of state, order, and discipline; we have learned, after rapid marches and campaigns, to fill all manifestations and existing institutions of daily life with the fundamental principles of our idea, both tenaciously and in careful work. Frontline officers often had to become strategists who would guarantee victory, even if they did not see strategy as being enough, but also remained behind the front lines, still able to understand and oversee the front; they had to be of one mind and remain servants of the law under which they all fought when they stormed the enemy's first trenches.

We want to be an image of the front and, at the same time, a platform for strategy; we want to carry the blood-red flag with our symbol of the sun high, fluttering and pure, and at the same time be tactical and thoughtful, recognizing every weakness of the enemy, calling for attack and, if we can, setting an example.

We, who were privileged to accompany Adolf Hitler on a long journey, who saw him in sorrow and in jubilation among us, know what love for our people, what faith in their goodness and greatness made him almighty, in spite of all the numbers, calculations, and wise predictions; this love has awakened love, and it has brought a power of the heart to flow throughout the entire German people, which now converges on that one man and thus on his strength and his power - in wondrous certainty, it makes and will make the

ultimate possible. To liberate this power from the people, even from its lowest members, to preserve this trust, both large and small, pure and firm, against all the mists and dark forces that may arise—that is the task that we have attempted here with our modest powers and continue to see as the only direction.

As we now reach out in spirit to each of our many thousands of comrades in Germany and around the world at the turn of the year, we are once again united in our desire:

We all want to fulfill uncompromisingly, in our special place, the duty that the new view of the world and its life commands us to do; only then will the Führer have the strength he needs for everything that lies ahead; only then God will be with us all, because he never abandoned the strong and the pure.

When we look around us at all that Germany has achieved in this duty, let us always remember the greatness of this proud movement in which we all stand firmly united - it goes without saying that we will not become soft and weary.

From our proud heights, we Germans today look forward with smiling eyes to new works!

## II. The Old Guard and the Young State

### The Führer

Flags fly high on Adolf Hitler's birthday - a nation wants to thank its Führer.

Many times on our journey, whether in good times or bad, this day has been a time for reflection and contemplation on everything that the name and concept of Adolf Hitler – the Führer – means to us. We owe our gratitude to the man who exemplified and embodied the idea of a new way of life for making this name the meaning of our lives and struggles.

The name Adolf Hitler, his concept and his myth, was and is for us like a flag; he is an incentive, a driving force, a role model, a constant reminder and conscience. This man became to us what only the concept of a leader of a community of men can mean; a leader because he remained true to himself, because he was always the only one, always straightforward, simple, and unwavering, following his own path with instinctive certainty, a path that was our path. When Adolf Hitler spoke, clearly and distinctly, sentence by sentence, building a new worldview, he shaped our longing, our intuition; a distant, vague desire gave him the strength to perform the act of redemption.

In this way, we were ultimately able to become one with him, and thus that bond and that love could grow, which has nothing to do with Asian subservience or Oriental Byzantinism, and which, in all its dimensions, can only be fully understood by the true fighter of the great National Socialist worldview. We thank Adolf Hitler for the value of our lives, which is called struggle and means struggle as long as it lasts. What are we without him, and what would Germany be without its fighters?

We have traveled a long and arduous path behind the Führer, years made great thanks to him, for he made us hard and strict with ourselves; boys became men so that, despite everything, the flag flies today in pure hands, to be passed on as it was received, from today to tomorrow, to those who come after us.

In hours of bitterness, weakness, and deepest need, when men around us betrayed the idea; in hours of despair that we experienced for the future of our people, for Germany—the purity of this single nameplate, the unchanging strength of this Führer, and our unshakeable faith in him, allowed us to not lose our way even then.

The faith that Adolf Hitler awakened and gave us, the faith in Germany and in our own strength, we gave it back to him, and today an entire people gives it back to this one man unreservedly, from the bottom of their grateful hearts, as a tremendous mandate - a force, a strength, and a proud power that has no equal anywhere else, and will never have an equal again.

We, Adolf Hitler's old soldiers and our young comrades, cannot make a renewed vow of loyalty and obedience in these hours of proud and genuine reflection; both would be too small and too self-evident for us right now to mention them again specifically. If we are allowed to stand before Adolf Hitler at all to give our gratitudes and give thanks, then let us all, each and every one of us for ourselves, vow to remain what we were in hours of jubilation, as well as in days of need and in times of danger:

Ever the faithful ones—we are his guard!

## The Unwritten Laws

A new National Socialist legal framework, permeated by the fundamental requirements of our national and state life, is increasingly taking shape in paragraphs and sentences, in articles and commentaries, to form a solid foundation that will be the basis for the long-term existence of the state.

In addition to the laws of the state and their implementing provisions, there are the fixed regulations of the individual organizations of the movement, basic conditions to which German citizens must submit to when they voluntarily join; conditions that usually set much narrower limits and make a much stricter selection than the paragraphs of the state require of the general public.

Above all these fixed regulations tower the great and harsh unwritten laws of the movement, born and developed from the truth and insights of the struggle, from a time of ultimate readiness and from the authenticity of the best and most loyal comradeship, which was exemplified by the example of our fallen comrades and by the life of the Führer, who became one of the greatest in the fulfillment of these laws - a law that cannot be captured in small sentences or in definitions; it is a law that, unwritten, stands before us, great and yet clearly recognizable, and lives as one of the strongest forces of our existence.

Who among us would dare, in the long run, to live contrary to this example before history, no, before the immediate judgment of the millions of judges of our day, and yet claim to belong to us? The verdict on him may be pronounced slowly, perhaps, and sometimes hesitantly, but it is certain and inevitable that in the end it will be ironclad, just, and incorruptible!

In these times of the heaviest common duties, when the right to work has still not been enforced for all our fellow citizens, may we, for example, celebrate festivals again? The unwritten laws of the movement also answer this question: Yes, you should not forget the joys of festive hours above your duties and everyday life, but when it comes to how we celebrate, the community of our time has already built barriers and walls that separate us from the defeated world of yesterday and its pathogens; these are ramparts that can never be crossed or breached without harmful consequences.

The days of November 9th in Munich pass according to the beliefs of our era, without any model or even a rule - let us remember the dignity and authenticity of these hours. Some may call it style, but we want to call it law - let us live in the truth of the idea that these Munich celebrations are a living expression of, so that we do not violate the pulse of the movement.

The law of this rhythm demands and compels a commitment to action instead of empty words, of which there are often more than enough.

When we speak of Prussianism, socialism, the people, and community, these cannot be empty theoretical concepts; the movement knows only very fixed, universally valid, clear concepts and boundaries within which it demands that we live and act without distinction of person.

When we speak of truth, honor, and the National Socialist worldview, we simultaneously assume the duty of simplicity, of a modest yet joyful existence, a life without pathos and pomp, which is never compatible with things that represented the death of an outwardly glamorous era before us.

When we speak of a soldier's attitude, there is again an unwritten law that outlines this attitude firmly and clearly for everyone; this conscience of the idea beats and watches over all things in our existence, as it were. They know no external penalties and regulations, these great laws; they give the loyal and the brave

the opportunity and the right to weigh and examine in a time when, unlike in the past, daily commitment and daily sacrifice of goods and blood do not prove the value or worthlessness of appearances and words.

There is much to suggest that the young people of the movement, who quietly fulfill their duties and obligations, that the best part of the coming generation feels the great unwritten laws of the National Socialist worldview; it is because they burn deep in their hearts, and they are filled with the free and joyful will to live according to them.

In this way, they will learn to measure time and its individual moments; they will recognize how to love greatness and live by it, and they will learn to avoid mistakes and to stand together in self-discipline and obedience to the idea - if they can do this, then one day they can pass on the torch and become that living law, which we believe is the only source of our people's immortality.

### **Community, or Collective?**

When old National Socialists recall the early years of the struggle, the glorious image of a true community reappears before them - without any coercion, people who were of one mind came together and formed a community the likes of which the world had rarely seen; despite a minimal degree of organizational structure, these people formed an incredible concentrated force.

They accomplished feats that reached an almost mystical greatness as the highest expression of Germanic loyalty, culminating in the sacrifice of hundreds of lives; we recognize that the source of this power of the movement was based precisely on that voluntary union, which nevertheless allowed the individual to exist as a personality, and thus retained his ability to be an independent fighter.

If this community of fighters was the foundation of the movement's strength, then it is important to preserve it for all time, to ensure that, even in a time when the movement would certainly be in a position to exert coercion, there is never and nowhere any danger of the community degenerating into a collective; a coercive organizational registration as a mass, in which the values of the individual personality are naturally destroyed, could never bring about a multiplication of forces.

On the contrary, even a considerable degree of force is necessary just to hold together such a structure, which is fundamentally un-German in its essence; everything that destroys personality in favor of a mass is un-German, and anyone who thinks solely in terms of masses thinks as a Bolshevik, and must inevitably follow the line once laid down by a Marxist who said he would "rather be wrong with the masses" than be right as an individual.

Every collective has as its intellectual foundation the old Marxist fallacy that all people are equal; since this is not the case by nature, but on the contrary, that all people are unequal, with some being capable, others incapable, some honorable, others dishonorable, just as one is tall and another short, one fat and another thin, the intellectual defenders of the collective have always been engaged in a desperate struggle, which is all the more difficult because it requires them to talk obvious facts out of existence.

There is no doubt that, alongside those who, as conscious enemies of National Socialism, advocate the old fallacy of equality, all those whose nature and character make a genuine understanding of the new German worldview difficult or impossible are in danger of unconsciously acting in a collectivist sense.

This type of person is dangerous and comical at the same time when, in defense of the old Marxist theory of equality, they invoke the National Socialist concept of the Volksgemeinschaft (people's community) and suspect even the statement of the fact that there are, for example, wise people in a nation and those who represent the opposite, that this is a commitment to class struggle.

No, this has nothing to do with a division of the people, but is simply a matter of natural facts - our old National Socialist commitment to the "decisive minority" is just as much a political application of these natural facts as the demand "to each his own" is, which National Socialism has always opposed to the Marxist slogan of "the same for all."

There is also a fundamental difference between a community and a collective in terms of leadership - while a community necessarily has a leader who wields power over the souls and hearts of his comrades, the despot of a collective has, at most, power over the bodies of individuals, and his position is based on fear, just as the leader of a community is loved by those who follow him voluntarily.

It is therefore no coincidence that true leaders, in their wisdom and sense of human superiority, regard themselves as servants of their community - Frederick the Great saw himself as the "first servant of the state," Adolf Hitler considers himself "the representative of the nation," and the Führer's deputy reminded political leaders during their swearing-in ceremony of their duty to be servants of the national community. In contrast, we repeatedly observe how those who whip the collective into a frenzy see "domination" as the ideal; out of a deep sense of their own human inadequacy, they fall into the other extreme and treat those under them as despotically as they feign devotion to those above them; they do not know that being a leader requires not only a superior intellect, but even more so that superiority of soul and strength of mind which, according to Fichte, is what wins victories.

If we also consider that the leader of a community will, for the sake of that community, call upon the most capable and decent people to work with him, but that the ruler of a collective naturally cannot need independent collaborators, but only creatures who are his blind tools and who must first and foremost constantly assure him of his value, it becomes completely clear what an enormous danger collectivist thinking could pose to our German people in this time of its rebirth.

Here, too, the National Socialist movement has given the nation a foundation of inestimable value by exemplifying the concept of community, the voluntary following of genuine personalities; in doing so, it has set an example for all time of the true understanding of united forces and has clearly rejected any collectivist thinking - the old soldiers of the movement will never allow the huge crowds at our rallies and organizations to be misunderstood as a commitment to the masses, thereby consciously or unconsciously distorting the National Socialist concept of community into a collective.

### **A Party Membership Card, Not a Ration Card**

The best part of our nation's youth has always been filled with a passionate, ardent desire to shape the future destiny of the nation in a purer and better way than the present. This youth has always strived for communities in which it could take up the fight for this goal - but never before has the fervor and passion of youth been directed toward such a clear, realistic goal as it was through the fighting community of National Socialism: never before has youth been forced to be so hard on itself and on the critical eyes of

its opponents; never before has its passion and belief in the future been channeled into such a hard, clearly defined course as it was during the movement's period of struggle.

Those who swore allegiance to Adolf Hitler's banner left behind everything to which they had previously belonged to with their being and their will; family and career, their own personal future, took a back seat to service to the Führer - thus grew a community of struggle that, in the nature and harshness of its selection of character, cannot be compared to any of the earlier communities of militant German youth.

Those who endured these years of struggle had passed a test that could not have been better; there is no movement, no historical event that, in such a comparatively short time, would have had the power to shape people's characters, to form and select them in this way. The Prussian officer corps and the great intellectual orders of history had to grope and shape themselves through generations before they became a truly consolidated community, while the NSDAP of the struggle period was actually a close-knit community from the very beginning, which only became more solidified by the harshness of the struggle, and in which every new member was integrated and assimilated, regardless of where the individual came from - those who did not fit in were expelled through struggle and internal selection.

In every city, in every local group, there was such a community, solid, tough, and inseparable, in which everyone knew exactly the abilities, human weaknesses, and the nature and degree of the other's probation - in this mutual knowledge lay the whole strength of the community. The difficulty only began when the movement inevitably expanded to the people, when the fighters stepped out of their close-knit fighting community to be deployed in the state and its organizations; here they thus entered a realm in which not only were their neighbors' abilities and weaknesses not thoroughly tested, but also their opponents were no longer as clearly recognizable as before, since they worked under cover and even used National Socialist words and phrases.

In recent years, everything else had taken a back seat to the struggle for the soul of the German people, the struggle for power - day after day, this struggle has worn down all human strength; day after day, the same tireless struggle endured with the enemy, the same commitment as a speaker, propagandist, SA and SS man.

While we were struggling for the political awakening of the German people, others were laying brick upon brick to build a structure of sound expertise, often forgetting their inner, spiritual orientation. When the National Socialist movement seized power, these experts, most of whom had taken an "objectively" liberal or colorless political stance, sat in government offices alongside political opponents who had been trained by years of power; even though they were mostly eager to adapt to the new spirit that had conquered Germany, either outwardly or even inwardly, they had to rebel against the "newcomer" or "non-expert" who had been placed alongside them and who had a superiority over them due to his National Socialist work, if only out of a desire for self-preservation or justification of their entire previous existence.

The old saying, both true and false, that conviction cannot replace performance resurfaced, although it was clear to anyone with insight that only a truly proven conviction can give rise to performance, and that conviction must therefore be a prerequisite for a responsible political mandate; this weighing up of performance and conviction was accompanied by attempts, at least covert but all the more malicious for that, to raise the accusation of party-book bureaucracy.

With the rapid growth of the movement into state tasks, in all areas of life, it was inevitable that National Socialists would also have to be appointed to posts for which their strength and abilities were insufficient. No one opposed this phenomenon with sharper self-criticism than the movement itself, with its principle of the highest responsibility of every office holder - according to National Socialist thinking, ideology or - as the spiteful critic puts it - party membership does not entitle one to a certain ration card; even in the new, difficult task of working alone in isolated positions, exposed to the pitfalls of a secret, often only personal opponent and the dangers of unfamiliar territory, it is necessary to prove oneself again and again, consistently - life and struggle continues to select with the same harshness as before.

For all the severity of this self-criticism, we must not forget another principle that made the movement great and strong in the first place: the close-knit community of fighters.

We do not want to lecture anyone who is sincere and constantly remind them of where they came from and what path they took to finally join the National Socialist movement; no one who comes to us with an honest heart and a clear, open mind should be excluded from the national community, whatever their past may have been - a new people can only be formed if the past is overcome and forgotten. That must be a prerequisite.

But time and again, people who joined the movement late and nevertheless hold positions of responsibility or influence tend to justify the past, to cover it up with a cloak of oblivion for reasons other than the creation of a true national community. There are many examples that confirm how certain connections and relationships from the old, bygone era still play a role here and are also used against former National Socialists - the corps bond is not without significance in this regard. The same sharpness with which we today criticize the failure of any party member is at least also appropriate here, especially where the most important foundation, long-standing proven loyalty, is lacking.

Far more numerous than those cases in which an old National Socialist proves unequal to the new task are those in which it has not yet been possible to place old National Socialists in the positions to which they belong in the interests of permeating our entire life with the worldview of the Führer, their abilities, and their proven character and ideology; they must simply be given a certain amount of time to acquire the necessary technical and administrative experience and to expand their specialist knowledge, which they once had to neglect in the interests of the movement's struggle.

We must preserve that close-knit community of fighters that once made us great, and we must integrate the young people who are now growing up out of the movement into the responsibility in which we see our seeds sprouting, into this great and loyal comradeship of Adolf Hitler's fighters.

### **They Have Always Been Nationalists...**

No National Socialist would claim that the work during the struggle was more important than the work in the Third Reich itself, beyond its particular rhythm - as a result, the fighters from hundreds of rallies and street demonstrations also subjected themselves just as rigorously to the paperwork, conference battles, and representative duties of state administration.

The most capable propagandists of the movement have entered public office to set an example, and the most persistent organizers of the party are now working to build the Reich; this strong transition of the

most active forces of National Socialism into the larger community did not leave the old battle positions unoccupied, but it did reduce their radius of action.

This was partly the intention of a leadership that trusted in the understanding and loyalty of the people, and which by no means considers itself to have been generally mistaken; however, the proverbial stubbornness of the representatives of past times of decline, along with those who, although belonging to new eras, adhere to these representatives in style and outlook, have quickly seen new opportunities - they equate the calming of the political situation with the dismantling of National Socialist activity in all branches of non-official life; they believe that National Socialism has been covered up by an overload of work, and then secretly seek to return the plaster and lime of past glories, which we have knocked down, to their old places by reactionary back roads.

Since National Socialism has become a decisive criterion of our lives once and for all, the restorers of outdated views have tried to pass off their customs and their “comments” as pseudo-National Socialists, and have attempted to co-govern this Third Reich according to their tastes - this has created a silent community composed of the reactionary interested parties of yesterday and ambitious pseudo-National Socialists of today.

If one were to point out to them that their attitude toward National Socialism is peculiar and does not correspond to its original meaning, they would surely invoke the “thankfully progressive clarification of political circumstances” and emphasize that “those old slogans are no longer effective today”, and so on. What we are undoubtedly dealing with here is a particularly dangerous strain of the fairly widespread type of “peace and order fighters” who, in certain associations that today promptly call themselves National Socialist, cultivate traditions that we also revere in their original essence, but which, in their emphatically old-fashioned tradition, are presented as more or less mindlessly worshipped dust from yesterday and the day before yesterday. Those who perform their war dances around these totems are certainly embarrassingly nationalistic—they were even so in the days of their poster and leaflet feuds against us—but never, ever were they touched by even a hint of socialist (what an unpleasant word!) sentiment. They continue to pursue a policy of exclusivity with the attitude of first-class pre-war councilors and the chilly countenance of honorable persons of respect, dazzling with an attitude where knowledge and will were necessary - such gentlemen are busily building a system that bears a worrying resemblance to the caste system of the Wilhelmine era, and often secretly wish to stabilize a well-behaved hierarchy of wigs, which we have just overcome.

Their special characteristics: Lead-heavy boredom in the workplace and overly correct meritocracy, and a zealous emphasis on superior-subordinate relationships, with a condescending treatment of community members who happen to earn slightly less money – in short, they are a serious threat to modern performance principles.

Out with such “nationalists” – we hardly knew them during the war, and so they are not of our flesh and blood! Slow down the reaction, whether it kindly turns off the power to the radio receivers of day laborers listening to the radio on estates east of the Elbe after 10 p.m., whether it pushes itself into the foreground with obtrusive servility at patriotic events, whether it mercilessly lowers the standard of living of others in order to raise their own, whether they conjure up factual conflicts out of personal antipathy, and even whether they roll stones painted with the national colors deceptively in the path of the younger generation with gall and chalk dust!

Let us not forget that there was not only a red, but also a black-white-red politics of interest, both of ultra-liberal origin! Let us also not forget that not all people change overnight, and let us be wary of the many who praise the development of the Reich, who may claim a “clarification of circumstances”, but actually mean the suppression of National Socialism.

### **Blind Zeal Only Does Harm**

No nation was as divided and troubled as the German people; the history of its governmental and political, cultural, economic, social and legal development is, in its basic features, a reflection of this division, and the contradictions and tensions that arose from it - no area was exempt from this.

The year 1932, with its seemingly irreconcilable conflicts and its division of the German people into a multitude of political and economic factions between which understanding was simply impossible, was not solely the result of the barely 14 years since the collapse of November 9th, 1918 - this year of 1932, which claimed human lives almost daily as victims of this division and incitement, was the result of an intellectual development that spanned generations, even a century; when this development came to an end on January 30th, 1933, when the German people turned to forces whose roots lay deeper than just a century of its history, the change did not happen overnight, but from one day to the next.

The transformation that began on that day already had its own history: the history of the National Socialist movement and its fighters. It had been preceded by a spiritual struggle such as had perhaps never before been waged in the great history of our people.

A politicizing association of seven men became, through the seventh member, a spiritual community of struggle that was called upon to fill a nation of 65 million people with a new worldview that drew on the blood ties of this nation; from this number grew the new community, which overcame everything that had previously divided people in terms of class struggle, ideological fronts, parties, and denominations. The struggle for each individual member of the nation, for the soul of each worker and its ultimate conquest, was the great achievement of the National Socialist movement before it came to power - everyone who stood in this struggle knows what sacrifices, what spiritual strength, what willpower were necessary to achieve the goal.

Germany was a country of petty statism, religious wars, a multitude of parties and organizations, specialization, and individualism - to have turned this Germany into a community of a single people in such a short time is Adolf Hitler's historical achievement, upon which all other statesmanship is based, and upon which the Reich of January 30th, 1933 now rests.

However, the other Germany cannot be completely overcome in a few days; an undesirable development that has persisted for generations cannot be completely eliminated at a stroke. The German people of today are still the same in terms of their personal composition as they were in 1932; all the people who make up the new nation, unless they entered politics only with National Socialism, are, in their education, their intellectual development, and their former membership in parties and interest groups, are a part of this overcome era from which they have freed themselves, or yet still have to free themselves - only a generation that is somehow “burdened” by the past, that is truly free inside, that in their parents' homes and at school, at university and in the National Socialist educational communities of the HJ, SA, SS, and

the Labor Service, in the Wehrmacht and in the professional organizations, can completely free themselves from the dross of the past.

A new people grew out of a Germany full of fragmentation and contradictions; the multitude of party programs was overcome by focusing on a single goal, by subordinating oneself to the will of a leader - through this, people from all camps, classes, and parties grew together again as a single people. In the historic Reichstag session in March 1933, in which Adolf Hitler settled his final score with Marxism, the Führer offered his hand to “everyone who is committed to Germany,” regardless of their previous path - not out of weakness, but out of love for the German people “and in order to spare this people all that is perishing in this time of struggle.”

Marxism had organized millions of German people in its parties and trade unions; we had to fight hardest for them. In them we found an opponent who resisted, who fought for a political view, even if it was a false one - it was from these ranks, just as from the front-line soldiers and the growing youth, that Adolf Hitler's best soldiers came.

Once freed from Marxism, they stood with the same loyalty, but often with a much deeper passion, in the National Socialist movement; they had an unshakeable belief in the great synthesis of National Socialism and socialism, which gave us the strength to achieve our final victory. We will never reproach our comrades from the war years for having once been in other camps; their example shows us how loyal the German worker was to the nation in his heart, despite all the disappointments caused by the nationalist rhetoric and selfish goals of the bourgeoisie.

There are people today who claim never to have gone down this wrong path; they may not have been National Socialists, but they “have always been nationalists.” They also never had the slightest thing to do with the plague of Marxism; these are the same people who, in their blind zeal, look down contemptuously on anyone who admits to having once been a Marxist or a union member, and want to hold it against them for all eternity.

These are the same people who do not know that it was the arrogance of a national bourgeoisie, that is, the arrogance of themselves and their ilk, that allowed Marxism to become so powerful.

The poison of Marxism did not eat away at them, but they allowed it to eat so deeply that it became difficult to heal; most of them did not lift a finger or make any sacrifices to eradicate Marxism, because Marxism was not eradicated by the “socialist laws” of the pre-war period, but by the struggle for the soul of the worker, by replacing the false idea with the right one and hammering it home, by preaching it to the people.

They have “always been nationalistic”; inwardly, however, they often feel insecure, and want to somehow prove how “boldly” nationalistic they are; they would like to punish every teacher, every lower-level civil servant who somehow falls under their authority, who was somehow organized as a Marxist until the takeover, yet today has nothing to do with that error, on the basis of differently intended regulations. They do this because they themselves need to prove their impeccable convictions, because they themselves are burdened by their own past - blind zeal only does harm!

The German people have been reborn from that Germany of division and incitement; we can now say that people from the most diverse fronts, classes, and parties have grown together into a new unity, whose foundation was created by the Führer - they have grown together into a single, united people.

## **National Socialists Without a Membership Card**

A hard rhythm of work has gripped our people - it serves a goal of free will, helping, with honest hearts, to rebuild our emerging Reich against the remnants of both a dying era and against the lukewarm, half-hearted, lies and hypocrisy of yesterday.

There stand the men of the fist on the streets of the Führer, destined for a great work that will last for centuries; there stand these young men in the moors and heaths, fighting for land for the people and the nation - from house to house, day in and day out, they create and gather, ensuring that our neighbor, whom fortune has forgotten, will not be forgotten by you and me. Men of intellect and men of labor, who give their all, all inspired by the idea of this time, by the will for true community, and by the belief in the greatness of Germany - they are filled with the duty to serve, as free men, for the freedom of the people.

Tell me, comrade, have you ever, when you saw these men building the highways, who are far from home, mostly toiling and laboring for low wages, have you ever thought of asking that man from the labor service, the comrade from the winter relief organization, and all those from the giant army of silent and loyal workers, have you ever thought of asking them about their party membership; would that thought ever have occurred to you when you saw them at work?

Soldier of the Old Guard, you began your journey for the sake of the idea; you only gave, and you never demanded anything, for then you would not be the one who must go down in the history of the Reich. That was and always will be your goal, that Germany should one day be National Socialist - you know, old fighter, that not everything has been achieved, and cannot be achieved today. You often still stand here and there, as if on an island, against ignorance, against stupidity, and often against exaggeration, in order to defend the purity of your idea; you know that the struggle you began back then still demands your whole heart today.

Some of us have grown gray and tired, and some may have become unfaithful; yet, despite everything, the old guard stands firm, each one a representative of the Führer, and each one aware of this calling—those who are disappointed or lonely have only forgotten how to see.

The party was the growing shock troop on the way to power; it grew large after the victory, and many who did not belong to us came into our house, and were, or still are, disappointed that this house is as simple on the inside as it appears on the outside. This house had to close its doors at one point so that the crowds inside would not hinder the work; some remained outside, whom we did not mourn, but there were also some who stood aside whom we would have gladly exchanged for many who still managed to gain entry.

All those who act and live as if the organization to which they belong to were an end in itself and self-sufficient, we would rather see them far away from us than have them become walking proof against us and our community.

Men of the old guard, can those half-hearted individuals cloud the goal of your work? Can individuals who have become traitors in their hearts embitter you and thus push you away from your workplace? Look around you, and be proud and strong in the knowledge that the seeds sown by the Führer, in the soil he plowed with you, are ripening; look around you, and you must recognize that in all strata and all parts of our people, there are many National Socialists without membership cards, soldiers of labor who today honestly serve the state and the Führer, even outside our organizations, because the idea, because our only movement, seized them and made them fighters.

Comrades, see the many hands that offer themselves in alliance; think of the hour when you joined, think of the last and greatest thing: Germany must become National Socialist!

Do not overlook any of them if they are honest and true today, even if they may have stood somewhere else yesterday; we need every healthy person, every arm and every head is necessary, and no one is expendable. Examine sharply and truthfully, but be comrades, as we are accustomed to in the struggle of many years.

How large the party will be, what its tasks will be in the context of the new structure - these are all questions of expediency, questions that are indispensable on the way to solving the task that we must never forget and that must always dominate us:

The movement must grow and live far beyond all organizational boundaries, so that one day the great longing will be fulfilled, and our idea will live in the hearts of all Germans, because they believe in it and love it.

### **Perpetual Class Struggle**

When, on May 7th, 1919, Clemenceau, the president of the "Peace Conference," greeted the German delegation with words filled with boundless hatred and cutting scorn: "The hour of reckoning has come!", everyone who heard these words and was not caught up in the same fanatical hatred must have felt that this sentence could not be the beginning of a work of peace and international order - on the contrary, these words were the ferment of discord, injustice, and the destruction of every natural order that was to dominate Europe and thus the world from Versailles to the present day; there are still responsible statesmen of great powers who, even today, devote all their actions and thoughts, all their energy and all their diplomatic skill, to maintaining as much as possible of this state of discord, injustice, and destruction of every natural order.

Clemenceau's cutting words tore the world and the nations in two, into victors and eternally ostracized vanquished people; a deeper divide could not have been drawn. It is blasphemy that cannot be surpassed in politics to claim, in the same hour and in the same breath, that one wants to establish a new community of nations.

One cannot establish a state of order, a real community, if one creates unbridgeable fronts, explicitly ostracizes one part, one member of the community, and deliberately excludes it from that community. Against the will of the "victors," Adolf Hitler's power turned the ostracized defeated party back into an equal partner among the nations and, in contrast to those "peacemakers" of Paris and Versailles, truly served the cause of genuine peace. However, the fact that the responsible statesmen of the former "victors" have learned nothing in terms of a real world order in the more than one and a half decades since Versailles is proven by their attitude toward Germany on the question of the colonies.

One would like to replace the contrast between victors and vanquished with at least another, that of the haves and the have-nots, and eliminate this class hatred among nations if at all possible - however, as long as there are classes among nations in this sense, a real world order is not possible.

In the same atmosphere as the Versailles Dictate, a state was born whose actual population represents only slightly less than half of its inhabitants: Czechoslovakia. The state of disruption of the natural order into "victors" and "vanquished," as manifested at Versailles, has been transferred here from the large

community of nations and peoples to a single state; it must have even more catastrophic effects here in this smaller space, where these parts are even more dependent on each other.

It is significant that the same statesmen whose primary concern in international politics is to preserve as much of the Versailles order as possible are pursuing the same policy in this particular case - here, too, their aim is to perpetuate, as far as possible, the division of a state founded in their spirit into two large classes of citizens, into "victors" and "vanquished," into the privileged and the disenfranchised.

Recent events in Soviet Russia have opened the eyes of all who are willing to see that an entire people is being held in terror by a minority imbued with the idea of class struggle; a small group of privileged individuals, who rule with senseless arbitrariness, is opposed by the enormous class of disenfranchised people who are simply at the mercy of this senseless arbitrariness.

Major English newspapers, led by "The Times", have repeatedly ventured comparisons between the conditions in Soviet Russia and other "one-party states", such as Italy and especially Germany; we assume that the authors of such comparisons are not so politically blind that they are really convinced of the truth of their comparison, but that their only concern is to lay the groundwork for a certain policy. However, based on long and bitter experience in world politics and in the political struggle of our own people, we National Socialists venture a different comparison.

We assert that the system of Bolshevick dictatorship and so-called "democracy" are essentially the same - in terms of ideas, Marxism is only the logical continuation of liberalism. Liberalism began the class struggle, the tearing apart of the community, from a bourgeois standpoint. Bolshevism, however, represents nothing other than the highest and most brutal completion of this class struggle from the proletarian ideology.

In the name of "democracy" and "humanity," Europe has been torn apart into "victors" and vanquished, into haves and have-nots; in the name of 'democracy' and "humanity," a majority of parliamentary seats, often formed by a coalition of diverse forces, rules over a parliamentary minority. This type of "democracy" has found its most blatant realization in Czechoslovakia, where a narrow majority of the "privileged" abuses the power of the state against the large ethnic group of the disenfranchised.

It is significant that it is precisely those countries that claim to have achieved and defend "democracy" in its "purest" form have the most sympathy for the state of Bolshevick terror; conversely, Bolshevism is now seeking to cover up its brutal oppression of the large masses of the Russian people with the flimsy cloak of a "democratic" constitution.

Those who want community must not first tear apart the natural order between and within peoples by means of barriers and classes - those who truly want this unity must eliminate the opposites and classes. Not the proletarian dictatorship of a minority, not the parliamentary rule of a majority of "representatives of the people," but the integration of every single person into the community - that is the prerequisite for a state of truly stable order within a people and between states.

In no country on earth, be it parliamentary democracies, proletarian dictatorships, or so-called authoritarian states of various kinds, has this goal been even remotely as close to being realized as in National Socialist Germany.

In 1933, the German people experienced a revolution of the greatest magnitude - the old classes and parties were eliminated, and a political minority, which could rely on the will of the overwhelming majority, became the bearer of the political will that governs the state.

But despite this revolution, despite the political restructuring by a minority selected in battle, there was never even the slightest hint of a confrontation between the “victors” and the “vanquished,” the rulers and the ruled, the privileged and the disenfranchised.

It goes without saying that the old fighters, who had proven themselves in years of struggle for political power, took over decisive leadership positions, but this never resulted in a greater degree of rights, only a greater degree of duties and a greater demand for performance.

Certainly, there were many who applied for membership in the NSDAP after the seizure of power, or who now occasionally apply for the relaxation of the membership ban and associated the old idea of the party state with the party membership book, now hoping to gain entitlement to some kind of sinecure; inevitably, however, this proved to be a fundamental error all too soon, and certainly very sobering for those concerned.

In this sense, there is no classification in the NSDAP between old fighters and newcomers, nor among the German people between party members and non-party members - quite apart from the fact that the term “old fighter” is very relative, the “Septemberling” of 1930 is already an ‘old’ National Socialist today compared to the “March fallen” of 1933, and the latter will soon be so, but only in the same relative sense, compared to the “class of 1937.”

The real old fighter does not refer to his long-standing party membership, but only to the greater achievements he has made for the movement and the nation, and that he will continue to make for all the time to come.

When, on January 30th, 1937, the Führer admitted leading men of the state into the NSDAP and awarded them the Golden Party Badge as the highest honor of the movement, this meant that every member of the people who performs a supreme service for the people and the state can become a bearer of the highest honor of the NSDAP.

The German people know no classes or privileged classes; every member of the nation is an equal member of the great community, for which he can prove his special value at any point through special achievements.

There are no sole guardians of the sacred flame of National Socialism who stand guard from some kind of constructed high vantage point, like a new kind of inquisition, as the émigré press would have foreigners who do not know Germany believe.

The German people are increasingly growing together into a large community that is becoming ever more deeply imbued with the National Socialist idea - may the other nations, in their own way and according to their own nature, also eliminate the divisions between the privileged and the disenfranchised and become a true community.

May the idea of class struggle between “victors” and “vanquished” be finally eliminated from international politics - both would be nothing less than progress on the path of peace that Adolf Hitler has already advanced among his people and, to his credit, in the world as well.

### **An Idea Versus A System**

Since Germany's rise to power under the swastika, the term “revolution” has taken on a whole new meaning.

All the revolutions of recent times, whether they be the French Revolution of 1789, the Paris July Revolution of 1830, the uprisings of 1848, the days of terror of the Paris Commune from March to May 1871, the Russian March and October Revolutions of 1917, and the German November Revolt, but also all the revolutions of earlier centuries, show the same distorted face throughout - they all follow the same law, which is not called creation but destruction; they all present themselves as exclusively social revolutionary phenomena, driven solely by purely social and economic tendencies that have sprung from a doctrine that is detached from reality and therefore hostile to life.

In all these revolutions, a cold system rebels against warm-blooded life; their proponents are never the earthbound classes, but urban mobs and that intellectual decadence that has already decayed with all genuine life.

The mob and a rootless intelligentsia: these are the groups that rally around the banner of destruction with their tainted blood. It is not only the state, the existing social order, but life itself that is the object of these degenerates' hatred; this also explains the orgies of bloody frenzy with which these revolts defiled themselves, for it was precisely in the most senseless bloodshed that their true meaning lay: the sacrifice of life to thinking determined by doctrines.

Only against this grim backdrop can one comprehend the full magnitude of the German Revolution. It differs from every other upheaval in world history, not only in the unprecedented discipline of its external course, but even more profoundly in its internal form, which arose not from a lifeless scheme of thought, but from a living idea. This is not an idea limited to social and economic goals; it does not seek only social revolution, but the creation of a new world from the ground up, the upheaval and rebuilding of an entire world. It is not for nothing that the German uprising has chosen the ancient Nordic symbol of light as its emblem, because life itself marches under its banners - what is rushing forth here is blood from the depths of the earth, which wants to shatter all schemes and systems in order to finally create the appropriate forms of its soul in the state, law, science, art, and all areas of economic life.

No wonder that this upheaval of blood and earth drew the best blood to its storm banners - like a red wave over the land, these flags surged forth.

They are a symbol to us, but not a system; they surge and flow, like everything that lives, and never again must it happen in this people that a lived life solidifies into a system.

As rebels of the German earth, we want every single doctrine to be sacrificed to life.

Those who want to see the German uprising progress according to the laws of logic have not understood it; an uprising from within can only be accomplished according to the laws of life's development - life, as the end of all doctrinal attempts teaches, cannot be forcibly structured, ordered, and changed, and blood always takes revenge, even when it is shed in torrents.

From this great sanctification of organic laws, the movement once fought its battle legally; it purified itself of the doctrinaires of the barricade and remained controlled by legal means until the inner development of German life had matured toward the historical turning point. If bloody persecution once tore the cry for bloody retribution from oppressed hearts, forgiveness and atonement have now been achieved through it. Such strength of soul is unique to the victor, who ultimately sees a necessary fate in dungeon cells and the hero's grave - if fire and hammer blows are not endured, how could a good sword ever be forged?

The same sanctification of the great laws of life is now expressed in the moderate and cautious manner with which the victorious uprising approaches the construction of an envisioned image. While in the revolutions of past times the overthrow itself was often the fulfillment, here it only creates space for

construction, and while there everything was smashed to pieces in order to construct a new system from the drawing board, here one notices the German effort to spare, to examine, and to wait until the fruits have truly ripened; fulfillment, like any harvest, does not present itself all at once, but must be gathered into the barns little by little.

Nothing is rushed, nothing is contrived; it testifies to the Führer's profound wisdom that he only tackles a problem when it is ripe for a solution.

Only a fool would point to the fact that banks and department stores have not been completely nationalized, that this or that remnant of the old world still exists, and that many questions have certainly not yet been resolved - who would want to cut the grain in spring, who would want to harvest in summer what belongs to autumn? Doctrinaires want to do everything at once, they eat everything unripe—and that is what kills them.

National Socialism, however, will not be realized through the schematic execution of a program, but rather through which a flowing life carries us from one fulfillment to another. The ultimate goals may still lie at the edge of our field of vision, in any case beyond all attainable possibilities - only future developments will bring them closer.

Only in the field of domestic politics had developments progressed so far that the German uprising, recognizing its hour, fought the great historic battle that broke through the barrier; here alone it could and must it deliver those hard blows that were like scythe cuts to overripe grain; here, only traces remained. Who would deny that it was a job well done, that the shadows of the past disappeared, and that a lofty goal was radically achieved? The harvest was total, and like this first one, let it be noted, so will every one to come in the future.

What can be done today and tomorrow cannot be achieved in a glorious rush; doctrinal measures and interventions will not do the trick, however desirable they may seem to some at the moment. Today, there can be only one goal: freedom on the outside, and work, reconstruction, and bread on the inside. What is important at this moment is not the academic dispute over currencies and economic systems, but the sacred subject of life, for whose sixty-seven million people bread must be produced and secured.

Outside, the grain is now standing tall again, but the time has not yet come to cut it. The farmer is now sharpening his scythes for the harvest; he is in no hurry, he takes his time, he waits. When the hour comes, the grain must fall, but until then there is still plenty of time. Once again he will plow and reap and sow; winter will come, then spring again. It is like the calm lapping of waves, rising and ebbing, again and again.

Blessed are the people who know the power of the earth! Blessed is the man who knows how to act at the right time, and also how to be modest at the right time - blessed is he who honors the eternal law of life.

### **Second-Class Citizens?**

The conditions in Germany during the Wilhelmine era, the collapse in 1918, the deep divisions within our people in the postwar years—all of this was only possible because the German people were essentially apolitical in the second half of the 19th century.

According to the view of the ruling class at the time, politics was a matter that simply did not concern the “ordinary man of the people” – a term conceived as broadly and comprehensively as possible. The entire education system was geared toward keeping the German people apolitical, turning them into so-called “good citizens and members of civil society.” Anyone who did not agree with this “ideal,” who saw in it the seeds of decay and disintegration, who dared to have their own opinion, was labeled a “public enemy” and “social democrat” from the outset, even if they had nothing to do with Marxism; this attitude on the part of the state inevitably drove many decent Germans into the arms of Marxism.

A catastrophe as enormous as the World War and the collapse of the mighty Reich was bound to bring about the politicization of the German people; however, the tremendous political agitation of the years after the war - the clash of political passions, which was all the more intense as all the previous basic concepts of life were increasingly shaken, and the myriad of opinions, programs, and views, should by no means be seen as the first sign of the awakening of political will among the German people; on the contrary, these events were nothing more than the final shocking proof that a fundamentally apolitical people had fallen into complete confusion.

The real politicization of the German will to live found expression in the young, slowly forming National Socialist movement, not in the confusion of Germany's democratic parties - here, the political experience that the front-line soldier brought home from the battlefields and trenches of the Great War took shape. Here, the front-line generation and youth found themselves in a truly political fighting formation. Those men who, with unheard-of tenacity and strength of conviction, followed the unknown soldier of the Great War, Adolf Hitler, from the first difficult years onwards, created a great work: the unified political will of an entire nation.

It goes without saying that the false attitude of Wilhelmine Germany, which drove all Germans who struggled for a healthy socialism into the arms of Marxism, now prevented many decent Germans from finding their way to National Socialism after the World War.

We old National Socialists know from the years of struggle that valuable forces and a truly healthy will could often be found among the Marxist-infested working class of that time; precisely because we knew this, we fought so passionately for these people. The target of our struggle was not the bourgeoisie, but the German worker, and it was precisely because he was so difficult to win over that, once he was completely won over, he became so valuable as a comrade-in-arms in our ranks.

The year 1933 brought us Germans the tremendous experience of a truly socialist community of Germans for the first time - just as the first day of national labor brought with it a tremendous commitment to socialism and the workers, just as the first major socialist measures of the Third Reich were being implemented, it was only possible to join the National Socialist movement internally, but no longer externally by joining the party.

National Socialists have never judged a person solely on whether or not they possess a membership card of the NSDAP; one's attitude and commitment to Adolf Hitler can be expressed at any time and in any situation in life, and it is precisely this commitment in the daily struggle of life that is much more genuine and important than simply possessing a membership card.

The year 1932 brought a huge influx of people from previously bourgeois circles into the National Socialist movement; the then Reich Chancellor von Papen, for example, lifted the ban on civil servants belonging to the NSDAP. Those that came running, genuine and fake, had no template for this; there was no longer any personal risk involved in being a National Socialist, unless you fought in the SA and SS

against the red murderer on the streets. But the majority of these newcomers were wary of that, and when the “great crisis” of the “setback” came during Schleicher's time, some thoughtfully left the ranks they had just joined with such enthusiasm.

There was a certain type of person who tried to infiltrate the ranks after the takeover: the revolutionary profiteer. They were there at every moment, and they came forward whenever there was a position to be filled - they had only joined the party in 1932/33, and were eager to capitalize on their party membership. Only one thing bothered them though: when armbands and sleeve stripes were introduced, when the Golden Badge of Honor of the NSDAP was created. Why make such a distinction? It only creates divisions within the movement. But this discontent was soon overcome; they patted the old fighter on the shoulder in a fatherly manner and kept their annoyance at the existence of such people hidden, only making sure that none of these suspects were brought into their working group, for they were uncomfortable with them there.

The word “gleichschalten” (to bring into line) was the appropriate slogan for these types; those who had discovered their National Socialism in March 1933 were already in a position in April to fill large enterprises, government agencies, etc., with their newly acquired spirit - in return for appropriate payment, of course. One can imagine the results of this, and unfortunately had to experience them often. But in the end, they exposed themselves, because a late membership card is no substitute for conviction. There is also a second thing these gentlemen understand - just as the old National Socialist is secretly an abomination to them, they take public offense at anyone who is not a party member; they want to label anyone who does not have a membership card as a second-class citizen, a despicable individual, especially if the poor soul was perhaps even a Marxist at some point.

They do not even bother to find out whether the victim of their displeasure is an unknown helper of air raid protection, the labor front, or the NSV, who work quietly and modestly, but far better than the profiteers, doing his duty as a National Socialist even without a membership card.

Such class distinctions, which these gentlemen would like to see, have no place in National Socialist Germany; judgment is not based on external affiliations, but on whether the individual proves himself to be a National Socialist in his daily actions and work.

### **Thoughts on the Führer Principle**

The greater the tasks that a period of time sets for the people, the more clearly the circle of those who only appear to be fulfilling these tasks stands out; where the highest values are most urgently appealed to, there will always be individual attempts by inferior people to surround themselves with the appearance and attitude of what is truly valuable, in the shadow and at the expense of the chosen elite.

Let us imagine a well-behaved but essentially insignificant contemporary whose burning desire is, unfortunately, to be able to give orders. He does not have the patience to be called upon to perform a task that places a greater responsibility on his shoulders; he could probably wait a long time, but his burning and consuming ambition would be pretty much alone among his abilities, and that is precisely why he cannot be called upon. Let's assume that this contemporary, little Moritz, with his power complex, becomes a big Moritz; as luck would have it, his first lesson is how to skillfully feign abilities he does not have - someone who does not know him well may very well fall for him.

Our friend becomes a superior somewhere in an office or in a formation; he knows that the importance of his personality is now recognized (at least outwardly for a certain period of time). Comrades from the past who have not risen in rank, so this contemporary imagines, are now necessarily less valuable than he is. In powerful speeches, all his contemporaries are first convinced of the authority of the great Moritz; in the offices he has taken over, the telephone lines are rerouted, a listening device is installed in the boss's room to deepen trust, the departments are reorganized, and a little newsletter circles about that outlines his enormous powers.

Unfortunately, it soon becomes apparent at work that leadership is not so easy after all; however, the newly minted superior does not want to show that he does not yet know much and needs advice. He sees his authority wavering and does not want to reveal his minor weaknesses, which everyone has, or his lack of thorough experience; his inner insecurity must now be compensated for by even greater outward confidence. The distance between him and his former comrades is growing noticeably - which of his followers is his favorite?

The "subordinate" he likes best is the one who gladly, often, and loudly confirms that he, the "superior," is a particularly capable person; in his stupidity, he certainly does not notice that such a "subordinate" speaks about him in exactly the opposite way behind his back. But if one of the "subordinates" dares to raise factual objections here and there, to criticize this or that, or perhaps even to make a counterproposal on some issue, then this is an unmistakable sign to the "boss" that he has a dangerous opponent who certainly only wants his job; the critic is then suppressed, and, in paranoia, he believes that his employees work secretly against him, all out of the belief, which has become a matter of course, that his own value is undisputed and that the abilities of others are nothing in comparison.

But this person is always standing on the edge of the abyss - woe betide him when the moment comes when he needs not only the professional correctness of his employees, but also their joyful cooperation, their absolute and determined commitment to their leader! This test can come any day, through a coincidence, a mistake, a task that absolutely must be solved - woe betide the inferior leader if he does not have the trust of his men; his downfall is then certain, and fate takes its course with ironclad internal consistency.

Another type, different from the wild-eyed ambitious Moritzs of the world, the pocket-sized tyrants, are the embarrassing bureaucrats. They often cannot be denied their expertise; what separates them from leadership, however, is the fact that they are in no way willing to take on any responsibility. They patiently accept everything and carry out orders and competencies to the letter; they see only the apparatus, the organization, the cells of order. They abhor the actions of a Yorck in the wars of liberation; they would not have supported Hitler, but Kahr.

In both cases, these are distortions of leadership; the first sees only the individual, he sees leadership exclusively as a hierarchy of persons. The century of democracies and parliamentarianism had successfully contested this absolute rule of people over people, and rightly so, also against a leadership structure that saw only personal supremacy in its rights.

The original idea of leadership had lost its inner purpose; the ambitious and selfish princes of the small states no longer had the right to rule, as they no longer saw themselves as servants of the state, but rather saw the state as a means of personal power - when this pseudo-leadership became the rule and the system, the hour of leadership, and thus of an orderly organization of the people themselves, had struck.

Today, we are seeing that pseudo-leadership is running itself into the ground with internal consistency, while genuine leadership is growing and forming more and more naturally through education and selection. We certainly do not want to wait until the next millennium to realize that the formation of a new leadership class has never been a matter of a few years in history; everything depends on our people's journey through this history, not on the small-time show-offs and undisciplined critics. These archetypes are basically useless and do no harm, for our strength lies in action, in creation, and in the future alone! The faithful fighters in the service of this single task are still shaping history!

### **The Inflation of Terms**

*“On Saturday afternoon, there was a rush on tangible assets; all shops were overcrowded, and in some places the sales assistants could hardly cope with the rush of customers. The department stores announced that they would not raise their prices despite the devaluation... This was obviously a demonstration by right-wing circles against the government's devaluation measures; the police had no reason to intervene...”*

This did not happen in Germany, but in Paris - we Germans know that, on the day similar events take place here, the whole terrible process of inflation could repeat itself with cruel consistency. Within a few days, profiteers and black marketeers would once again seize control of all essential goods, and all the welfare measures of the state, even the most cruel corporal punishment, would not be able to stop the decline of the people and the state, its inevitable corruption, and ultimately the destruction of a laborious reconstruction effort.

This cannot, must not, and will not happen. We know that the security of our currency is also a foundation for the future of our people; not only the twilight years of all those who are now working, but above all the health and existence of our children depend on our currency remaining stable. The terrible misery of currency collapse, which has cost the lives of thousands upon thousands of Germans, and which has plunged tens of thousands into the most undignified hardship and miserable poverty, must not and will not be repeated!

This is guaranteed by the unequivocal and clear proclamations of the leading men of the National Socialist state.

The will of the Führer and the energy of his colleagues have thus protected us from this danger. But there is another kind of inflation that is no less serious and no less dangerous than the devaluation of money and the destruction of economic security, which, like the latter, can undermine the state and ultimately threaten the entire people and their existence: the inflation of words and concepts, of ideas, and even of worldviews.

Every day, we all see how a certain type of contemporary pushes themselves into the public eye to emphasize as loudly as possible that, as the only true National Socialists, they cannot under any circumstances stand by and watch how anti-social and un-National Socialist this or that harmless petty bourgeois behaves; these are people whose faces we are seeing for the first time, and who during the years of struggle, either hid away or even stood in those well-known “friendly camps” that at the time put obstacles in the way of the new state wherever possible.

These contemporaries are now opening their mouths to shout out, with the loudest voices and with a tone of conviction, the words that were our party's battle cry during the struggle, but which are now in danger of becoming worn out, devaluing not only their true meaning and ideological content, but also dragging them through shameless abuse, shouted by those unworthy of even uttering these cries - these phrase-mongers do not even stop at the most sacred concepts.

No German word is abused as much today as the adjective that describes our party—and the same is true of all the expressions that are dear to us, which the Führer and his helpers created during the struggle as a mark of positive civic sentiment. “Gewaltig” (mighty), “National Socialist” and “German nature” – no, soon no one will be satisfied with anything less. It is a great inflation, a mass surge, a dilution.

Watering down is when someone has a very good wine, but then adds ten times the amount of water; he may have a large quantity, a huge quantity, which can hardly fit in the barrels, but the stuff doesn't taste good. It tastes so... yes, it tastes a bit thin, doesn't it? In any case, it no longer tastes like wine!

Jesus Christ was certainly pious, but his prayers were short; later, the prayers were lengthened, piety became more and more complicated, heretics were burned, and, in the end, even the best religion no longer smelled fresh - there had simply become too much religion, and the people had had enough. This multi-faceted religion, since it was trumped, had to serve all kinds of purposes; in particular, it had to serve as a cover under which private interests could be most conveniently promoted - it was warm and protected under this cover.

Today we have the young worldview of National Socialism, and thus also face the same dangers that every worldview encounters: the truly pious brought it into the world, its followers spread it far and wide, but since they are not always believers alone, but also children of this world, time and again and still, they use the faith for different means...

There is the staid old fox of a factory manager, not a bad man at all, just a human being, not a believer, and he constantly seeks his own advantage; he also thinks (and probably believes) that his own advantage is to the advantage of everyone else as well. Dutifully and loyally, he goes about his little business dealings, he “saves” a little now and then, but when a heavy drop falls on his nose from above because of it, then he has, then he is, well...

*“Well, I did that purely in the interests of the welfare of the followers entrusted to me,”* he says. *“The German economy,”* he says. *“Germany should move forward,”* he says. *“Heil Hitler,”* he says.

We have always made it our mission to denounce such dangerous abuses; one need only recall the nonsense that has been perpetrated over the last three years with words like “Nordic” and “Aryan,” from “Nordic” wallpaper patterns to “Aryan” grandmother's chairs. How the term ‘worldview’ has been dragged through the mud, by declaring that everything and anything was “incompatible with it.”

But that's not all! This highly damaging and, for the state, unacceptable devaluation of words goes hand in hand with a slow destruction of concepts; even the most sincere, trusting, and loyal party member cannot bear it in the long run when unworthy individuals, through a horrendous combination of economic opportunism and business acumen of the worst kind, degrade the very words that are sacred to him to mere empty rhetoric.

It has already reached the point where, wherever it may be, people prick up their ears suspiciously when words such as “the National Socialist faith” or “Nordic character” are uttered somewhere; one senses something foul when “the ideology of blood and soil” is spoken of in an overly bombastic manner, and one is dismayed to hear valuable ideas being regurgitated by the unqualified, their teeth bared in an enclosure. One basically fears the empty rhetoric—what a dangerous and grotesque reversal of reality!

It started with individual words, individual terms, and continues with entire, ready-made stolen complexes of ideas - true rat kings of the most alien provenance! Unfortunately, this applies—and let me say this emphatically—first and foremost to certain newspaper people who are doing truly monstrous things in this area, and who are doing everything they can to make the work of us National Socialist newspapermen difficult and hard.

People who have mostly never seriously grappled with the reality of National Socialism, who are incapable of thinking in terms of our worldview, take refuge in the world of the most hollow and meaningless phrases because they think they can hide their ignorance behind them - that is really the only possible explanation.

But what is even worse is that it is not only those followers from the former “nationalist,” i.e., German nationalist or conservative camps who are ruining the movement's vocabulary, so to speak, but there are also a large number of other contemporaries who imagine that it is quite sufficient to diligently use the established vocabulary of the movement from the struggle period; these people believe that they can acquire the entire range of ideas of National Socialism by eagerly and diligently memorizing its fundamental writings, thus relieving themselves of any further intellectual activity for the rest of their lives - these second-handers refuse to see that National Socialism is, so to speak, a living entity that must grow if it is to endure.

The entire realm of today's National Socialist ideology - that is, our views of the people and the state, but also the idea itself and its form - must be reborn every day.

Everyone—no matter how small their active contribution to this eternal renewal may be—must be aware that they too must help creatively in their own small sphere, that they live for themselves and their existence in this idea, and that new life sprouts in place of concepts that are devalued simply by the passage of time - the new Reich must not become frozen in dead phrases and lifeless formalism, but eternally renewed with the springtime of each young generation.

### **The Courage of One's Convictions**

When, in 1914, the German people faced the most difficult test in their history to date, a statement was made on August 4th in the White Hall of the City Palace in Berlin that, in view of the mounting dangers, was intended to bridge the mistakes of decades at a stroke:

*“I no longer recognize any parties - I only recognize Germans!”*

With this sentence, the man who was to be the leader of his people perhaps unconsciously wanted to start anew on everything that had been neglected for half a century; barely four years later, it had already become clear that this attempt had come too late, and that damage that had already eaten away at a people from within could not be repaired with the passive will of a single hour. “I know no fatherland called Germany” was the answer given to those men who either failed to recognize the decisions of their time or, when they did recognize them, were unable to translate them into the necessities of the day.

The great upheaval of 1914 to 1918 had cast its shadow long before - the rise of the German Reich since its re-establishment in 1871 had decisively changed the political balance of power in Europe. For this reason alone, the responsible leaders of the nation had to be prepared for the possibility that the German people would one day be forced to defend their new positions; it would therefore have been their duty to consider all the means and measures that could have made Germany strong and invincible for this test.

November 1918 is proof that they failed in this task.

The self-sacrificing enthusiasm of the first year of the war in 1914 was not enough to give the nation the emotional and spiritual reserves it would have needed for the long duration of its most severe trial; the millions of German people who had to defend the Reich for hundreds of kilometers of front lines and in the roaring workshops of the country were ultimately unable to withstand the onslaught of the destructive forces that had been preparing for this, their great hour, for decades.

Too many of those who were required to make the ultimate sacrifice every day were susceptible to the destructive question: "Why? Why for this Germany?" They could not answer that question, and the call of duty that had carried them forward at first gradually waned under a burden that was not as senseless as it may have sounded to the other part of the homeland.

What did the German industrial worker from the man-eating cities of Germany care about Germany? What did this concept mean to those people who, throughout their lives, had experienced a fate of semi-bondage in daily hard labor somewhere in the East? What did they know about the Reich, its power, and its prestige in the world? What were the beauties of the great German homeland for them, what were the treasures of a thousand-year-old culture? All this was unknown and inaccessible to them. For them, Germany was their workplace, which had long since become the battleground for workers fighting for greater rights; for them, the Reich was the power that opposed their unions, who ignored what sometimes forced them to cry out in protest. Only the army had become a concept that most of them could have loved, even if they too had not already been largely caught up in the blindness of the decades before the Great War.

In retrospect, then, November 1918 was inevitable - not because the military onslaught was too powerful, not because hunger was rampant in the country and the most necessary materials were lacking, nor because the agents of disintegration were able to spread the seeds of contagion unhindered, but primarily because the entire population lacked that all-conquering certainty that alone can defy fate.

Germany was no longer a community in which one person was bound to another by the same, indestructible belief in the Reich and its mission; for a people that had increasingly slipped into seeing itself as nothing more than a collection of different classes and parties over the course of decades, it had become too late to face a historic decision with decrees and official appeals. For this people, the only option left was to accept their fate and take it upon themselves in the hope of rebuilding according to new plans, toward a new goal.

It was in this spirit that National Socialism came into being, and it was in this spirit that it committed itself to the entire long and relentless history of its people. Herein lies its greatest strength and the deepest reason for the steadfastness of the men who lead it today; they felt most directly the collapse of the German people as fighters in the Great War on all fronts. In the great battles of the World War, the realization was hammered into them for all time that a people will only pass its most difficult tests if it is ready for them at every moment, both externally and internally; they have learned that an army, often called the best in the world, is capable of achieving great things, but that it must nevertheless succumb if

the people are not prepared to stand behind it under the same law - the minutes of the most difficult hours of their lives stretched endlessly, making them one with these truths of German destiny.

National Socialism, which sees itself as the fulfillment of centuries-old aspirations of the German people, is not prepared to renounce these insights for even a moment; all its work is directed toward creating, through daily toil in every area of the nation's life, the conditions for the great and indestructible community that shall one day be called Germany. The awareness that the coming years will be a time of momentous decisions is an incentive to multiply our efforts and to be more vigilant and uncompromising than ever - this is the greatest task that the Führer has set for his old guard and the entire National Socialist people.

The new Four-Year Plan for the creation of Germany's economic independence is a project of gigantic proportions; the further tasks of the state and the movement, which were accounted for in comprehensive speeches in Nuremberg, are no less ambitious in their goals than this plan, yet none of them can be compared to the Führer's command to create and maintain a united community of the German people that is capable of withstanding all storms - everything else will have to be subordinated to this task, for it alone creates the basis for the achievement of all other goals.

In the coming years, the German people will continue to be called upon to make great sacrifices. The economic situation in Germany, about which the Führer has spoken so emphatically on several occasions in Nuremberg, still does not allow us to guarantee the millions of productive workers the standard of living that National Socialism has set as its goal; instead of appealing figures for wage increases and reductions in working hours, as in other countries, the appeal for tireless work and the fulfillment of duty will continue in the coming years.

The German people will respond to this call with the same spirit of sacrifice and courage with which they have fulfilled their great tasks since 1933; they will draw strength from the conviction that they are now led by men who are aware of all their worries and hardships and who will therefore devote all their energy to eliminating them. They will also continue to have confidence that not a single sacrifice will be demanded of them that is not necessary for their future, in order to escape from that state of dependence which, despite all that has been achieved, still makes every step in Germany so difficult and slow. Creative Germany must also know and feel that the community not only demands sacrifices, but also makes the greatest sacrifices to ensure that even the last person feels that he will never be abandoned if he has fulfilled his duty; the socialism of the NSDAP must not be a mere cover for anyone. Just as the NSDAP was not anti-Bolshevik in order to be a protective weapon for the bourgeoisie, it will not preserve conditions today that stand in the way of its step into the future.

We are convinced that the great program that the Führer has outlined in the new Four-Year Plan will again be an opportunity for many in the coming years to hide their lack of understanding for the demands of the community behind him. We already know today that the phrase "interference in the economy", and thus "sabotage of the Führer's reconstruction project", will once again be circulated about among those who still do not understand or do not want to understand; they will again fail to understand why new demands are being made of them when everything is already "so beautiful and so perfect." We will know how to interpret their laudatory statements as the exclamations of those who would only have to fear further steps toward the great goal. National Socialism will not fail to appeal to them again and again to understand the great decisions of our time and to act accordingly; it will make it clear to them that nothing would be possible without the community of the people, and that no individual can be more than their

representative; it will also not shy away, if all efforts to gain understanding and support should prove fruitless, from drawing the necessary conclusions and overcoming resistance that is small in comparison to the great goal that must and will be achieved.

The question of our time is too great to be met with half-measures - only the courage to take the ultimate consequences in all areas of our people's life will guarantee that there will never again be a time of which later generations would have to be ashamed. The National Socialist movement and the people have a duty to accept this great law with complete discipline and tireless work, and to enforce it in his own position and ability; only then will we all be able to justify the all-conquering trust in the German people that has carried the Führer to this day, and that enabled him to lead 67 million people back to their best selves.

### **No More Empty Phrases!**

Worldviews that cause fundamental upheavals among peoples are always simple, clear, and without any embellishment; those who realize them are modest in their actions, reserved, and aware that they are nothing more than tools and fighters for the idea. Their most important task is to preserve the purity of their ideas and to keep them free of any embellishments pushed by those who rush breathlessly to join them in order to be able to say, "We also did our part in realizing the idea."

It is high time to point out the futility of these efforts, for in the current economic climate, they threaten to become more papal than the Pope; they forcibly seize the simple forms of expression of the movement and reduce them to slogans that they constantly babble instead of allowing them to quietly sink into their hearts.

This is how "Gebrauchslirik" (functional poetry) has come into being, against which official bodies are now forced to take action in an unmistakable manner.

From the very first day of its publication, "Das Schwarze Korps" has made it its main task to campaign against the excesses of exuberance and Byzantine banality; we have resisted the excess of enthusiasm that resorted to the strangest means to make itself noticed by the general public.

It was not National Socialism that produced this type of person; unfortunately, they have always existed. It is the "philistine" who "held out" at the regulars' table during the war and stroked his beer-soaked beard with martial gestures as he remembered the heroes lying in the mud holes of Flanders; it was he who could express his patriotism only in paper banners with Bismarckian slogans, who had to see the national colors fluttering on his ashtray and have felt slippers under his bed, on which a thoughtful woman's hand had embroidered "God is with us!"

In critical moments, we never found him in the foreground, but only in so-called quiet times; only then he always pushed himself energetically into the foreground and shouted it out so that everyone could hear that he had always been there and belonged to the steadfast.

Every action he performs he spends "in the spirit of the Führer"; the sales of a mass-produced article increase under the motto that "public benefit comes before self-interest," and in the allotment gardens he sinks the seeds of radishes into the earth with the solemn remark that without the power that comes from "blood and soil," it simply cannot be done.

A violent confection has taken over the local traditional costumes and is flooding Kurfürstendamm with playful peasant jackets and Black Forest aprons; heraldists are springing up everywhere, selling the coats

of arms of the Maier and all the E and Y fraternities, eight marks apiece, hand-colored and on Japanese paper. Nothing is safe from them; neither genealogical research nor the idea of a national community. Whereas in the past it was impossible to emphasize enough that one's father had been a high-ranking official, today it is fashionable to point out that one comes from a gnarled peasant family, and to take this circumstance into account by having energetic artisans furnish one's home in the style of a farmhouse parlor.

Nothing is sacred to them; they make long speeches and try to convince others with bombastic references of the noble tasks that the state has entrusted to them, of all people. Their business correspondence degenerates into "leadership letters" in which they try to push down prices by quoting from Hitler's "Mein Kampf." German studies of the ancient past are used to celebrate wild orgies, and the noble names from our treasure trove of legends are transformed in their hands into labels and banderoles for health breads and blood-purifying teas. With licorice and other expectorant chest candies, they want to open up new paths to "strength through joy" for us, and fingers busily clatter away on typewriters to forge club verses so that we "awaken" instead of themselves, who, by God, need it more than we.

And then there is their "willingness to make sacrifices"! They are involved in everything where something is offered "for the benefit" of others and where they can also be seen; that is the beauty of "sacrifice" when it is reported in the newspaper the next day for everyone to see.

It is not for nothing that a decision has just been made to ban the use of chants at party events; this is not directed against chanting per se, but against the amateurism that had taken hold of it. Even if this "dull functional poetry" may have sprung from sincere motives here and there, we must defend ourselves against the kitsch that is rampant here, just as decisively as we defend ourselves against the postcard hype, for example, in which swastika suns rise behind church towers or SS men mischievously bow down to their sweethearts, reciting a polite, naturally politically apt little saying.

We want nothing to do with the patriotism of the imperial era, where pithy drinking toasts and demurely smiling maidens of honor under Chinese lanterns were the most powerful expression of the devotion of those present. We do not need to assure our Führer of our loyalty by burning his image into coffee cups and dangling a swastika from our beer mugs - it would be sad for us if we could find no other expression for our convictions.

A National Socialist is neither someone who shoves it in everyone's face in advertising brochures, nor someone who pins the party badge to his lapel for very special purposes, such as when visiting a ministry or a government administrative office; National Socialism is demonstrated through attitude, through strictly avoiding its intrusive emphasis - an attitude cannot be displayed solely by hanging a flag from the skylight; attitude is something you have!

Particularly, we are most embarrassed by the fact that a certain section of the press has developed an exaggerated Byzantine style that has had a downright devastating effect.

Time and again, reports on party events describe crowds of people whispering to each other in the crowd: "The Führer is coming!"; the reporter goes overboard with a jumble of randomly assembled catchphrases, trampling on the statements of the "pioneers of our idea," even though entire pages in the same issue have been rented out to strange advertisers.

The true expression of National Socialism is simplicity in speech and action - just as the struggle to enforce our worldview was simple and straightforward, so too should the bearer of the idea be. It was not with reckless gestures that our soldiers withstood four years of a world of enemies, but through the most devoted commitment of their own persons; if they mustered the strength for their legendary courage, it

was not because moustache bandages bearing the slogan “It is achieved!” were sold in the rear, or matchboxes decorated with the war flag.

We must reject this nonsense, which threatens to spread here again today, with all severity, however much it may hurt “affirmative” minds. Being German does not mean having to capitalize on unwritten laws.

Starved shirts were never an expression of “strength through joy,” as traditional advertising executives would have us believe, nor a return to down-to-earth self-reflection.

There are things that are sacred to us, and that we profane when we call them “sacred.”

Away with all this nonsense in our Germany; down with the Pharisee masks worn by clean-shaven faces, who, God knows, always know how to fold themselves into contemporary wrinkles.

We must keep our ideas pure and preserve them for the young generation that will take our place when we are no longer here; it is our duty not to leave them in the form of hackneyed phrases that have become threadbare and worn out through overuse. Let us not forget that it was a popular method among the Jews to devalue dangerous truths by repeating them over and over again in the most varied ways until they finally became ambiguous doggerels.

Being a National Socialist is so easy that it is almost impossible for many people to not become one - it takes heart, openness, and courage to profess one's beliefs.

World history was made through personal commitment, not through dull phraseology; all those who believe they can make a living from slogans should take note of this.

### **No Exceptions!**

For soldiers who are called to arms by their Führer, there is no higher duty than loyalty to their Führer and comradeship among themselves - a comrade-in-arms must adopt an attitude toward his comrades that is determined by the fact that they are called to service by the same leader as he is.

Comradeship toward fellow soldiers and fellow workers is a duty that arises directly from the duty of loyalty to the Führer.

What applies to comrades in arms applies to the same extent to comrades at work; a comrade at work is not only a brother in the mines and pits, in the fields and in the office, but also one who has been called by the Führer to a teaching position or has been retained in it.

It seems that this insight, which is self-evident for a National Socialist state, has not yet risen to those heights where the lecterns stand, from which knowledge and wisdom should actually be propagated “downwards.” Among comrades in gray coats, farmers' smocks, or coal miners' pants, it has never been customary to disparage the performance of a workmate working alongside them, to suspect them behind their backs, or to attack their honor—at least as long as this workmate is retained in his position by the common leader. As long as this is the case, every workmate represents the Führer himself; his honor is the Führer's honor, and camaraderie towards him is loyalty and camaraderie towards the common leader.

Anyone who wanted to act against these principles would soon exclude themselves from any decent working community, because antisocial behavior exists not only from top to bottom and from bottom to top, but above all to the right and left; the true value of a soldier is sometimes more evident in his behavior toward his comrades than in his behavior toward his superiors.

Anyone who cannot understand this must accept the fact that they are considered unsuitable for a leading position in the National Socialist Reich; to be entrusted with the task of teaching and character building in this Reich, for example, is not a cause for increased arrogance, but should be a cause for increased application of National Socialist principles.

This duty, however, does not consist in the use of grandiose phrases and constant references to National Socialism, but first and foremost in the preservation of National Socialist principles of comradeship; all this applies to an even greater extent to teachers, who are called upon to draw on research into Germany's past to awaken German sentiment and shape Germany's future.

There are a number of scholars in the lecture halls of German universities who, due to their advanced age, are no longer able to comprehend what is at stake today for our people and its future; there are also others who, despite their advanced age, have understood this and act accordingly. The former cannot complain; at worst, they are treated with the respect accorded to natural monuments that are no longer entirely contemporary – provided that their activities do not have a detrimental effect on the people and the Reich. It is worse when, on the basis of some special professional achievements, a younger man attains a professorship or an office for which he lacks not only the “professional” maturity but also the personal maturity - worst of all is when such a person abuses the authority still associated with his office to suggest personal malice, dark resentment, and other less transparent feelings to decent fellow citizens through pamphlets and underhanded attacks, in order to defame scholars who are not to his liking but who are deserving and, like him, appointed by the state.

It is most intolerable when such people presume to use their uncomradely weapons in the name of National Socialism and sometimes even in the name of the Führer, especially when, as is often the case, they themselves belong to the late harvest of 1933.

Despite all their rhetoric, these people still have no idea what National Socialism is: namely, loyalty to one's followers and comrades. They talk about the Führer state, but in actuality they mean themselves; in reality, they still live in the ideas of a dusty “republic of scholars” in which all the degenerate phenomena of other republics have gradually found their way.

We remember all too well that not-so-distant time when entire faculties indignantly protested “in the name of science” against the appointment of a deserving “outsider,” which, of course, none of those brave warriors wants to be reminded of today; when they finally did bow to the facts, it was under the banner of that bittersweet “collegiality” that is a caricature of true camaraderie, as it exists among men who have to face the hardships and dangers of life more closely.

The history of science is a chain of errors in which “outsiders” who have discovered new and important things for our national history within their own research have repeatedly been reviled and belittled by the holders of official chairs; when their research results were later tacitly acknowledged and just as tacitly evaluated, almost none of the former detractors were willing to restore the honor of those they had previously disparaged. Just how fragile such judgments are can be seen from the fact that sometimes even holders of official chairs have labeled each other as laymen and “fantasts,” so that the poor non-expert, even with the best will in the world, could not know which of the two was actually and truly justified in hurling anathema at the other.

No wonder that broad circles, whose sole and exclusive concern was to increase their knowledge of the people, became disillusioned with science itself.

Scholars who are called upon today to increase the knowledge and character of future intellectual leaders from an academic chair have only one task: to devote themselves to this task with all their strength, and to refrain from any envious glances to the side.

If, moreover, their field of research is one in which insights for shaping our future are gained from the roots of the German character, then this task is doubly serious and doubly binding; even more than other researchers, they must have the feeling that they are on a front line that is one of the most important German front lines today, and on which the battle for our spiritual and cultural independence and future is being fought.

However, they should not presume to be the only front-line fighters in this sector; they must always remember that, alongside them, others are also called to this military service by the same government. Those on this front who, instead of doing their duty with all their might, constantly fire into their own ranks, who constantly attacks his comrades fighting alongside him with insidious pamphlets and suspicions, and seeks to defame them by abusing his official position, should not be surprised if he is regarded and treated as a soldier or worker would be regarded and treated in this situation - such a man is unfit to play a leading scientific and educational role in the National Socialist Reich. Nevertheless, we still consider him wise enough to understand what is meant, so as not to ignore a well-intentioned warning.

### **Leadership, Not Caste Spirit**

Just as the concept of race forms our ideological foundation, so too does the idea of the unity of state and party form the political foundation of the new Reich.

It must be borne in mind that the term and title of "party" originated during the struggle to unite all those who were willing to help build a better future against those who were the most bitter enemies of the new world of ideas; one must therefore bear in mind that the functions of the organization that is now called upon to lead the state are, due to this historical fact, greater and broader than the old concept of "party," since it now has responsibility for the welfare and woes of the entire nation, beyond the circle of former times.

Opponents of our worldview have repeatedly accused National Socialism of appointing a minority, namely the party, to lead the state - the transformation of the entire state in the new spirit, along with the permeation and fruitful reorganization of the state apparatus with new ideas, was only possible because a following that was firmly united in the hands of the Führer, inspired by a common will and thoroughly disciplined, took over the leadership, allowing them to shape the spiritual and ideological guidance of the people; nothing proved more clearly that National Socialism was on the right path in taking this historical necessity into account than the overwhelming unanimity of the entire people, who stood united behind the Führer and thus also behind his party in the vote.

However, nothing would be more misguided than to try to derive personal privileges for individual party members from this historical development - membership in the NSDAP entails duties, not undeserved rights. According to the will of the Führer, the party is the bearer of the German concept of the state and the political will of the nation, and is therefore inextricably linked to the state. A Reichsleiter and Reich Minister, a man who unites both party and state within himself, has characterized the significance of this fact, which is so extraordinarily important in world history, with the following words:

*"The NSDAP is the Führer's order of the nation, and according to the Führer's will, its members should be a selection of the most capable, determined, and courageous members of the people.*

*The next generation of leaders of the NSDAP does not mean the establishment of a new privileged caste, but rather the assumption of enormous responsibility and increased duties toward the Führer, the people, and the state; it would therefore be a complete misjudgment of the Führer's intentions if party members, insisting on their external position in the party, wanted to claim privileges over other members of the people to which they have no internal entitlement.*

*External authority can only be maintained in the long term if it corresponds to an internal value and is internally convincing - the best proof of this is the person of the Führer himself."*

This clearly and unambiguously outlines not only the current situation, but above all the development for the future - due to the membership freeze imposed immediately after the seizure of power, the party comprises as its valuable and actual foundation those who, during the actual period of struggle, subordinated themselves unconditionally to the Führer out of the most sacred conviction and fought with him for a new Germany—that is, those whose loyalty to their convictions and willingness to follow were tested and proven often enough during those hard years.

Furthermore, every year a large number of young people who have successfully completed the preliminary stages of ideological training have joined these old fighters, and therefore appear suitable to serve the new state as capable helpers in its construction; because entry into the multi-level party organization is open to every young German, this new generation of the leadership class will be natural leaders.

These young people are not appointed or selected on the basis of any inherited class advantages or other social considerations—rather, they grow into the organization on the basis of their proven and tested innate leadership qualities.

Through the nature of the organization, the new state ensures that it always has only truly useful leadership qualities available for the next generation, and in this way, over a longer period of time, the party becomes a consolidation of all the truly creative and leadership forces of the nation.

This phenomenon, which is a blessing of fate to witness, can hardly be overlooked today in its enormous significance for world history; it not only eliminates forever and ever all differences of status and, in particular, the class antagonisms of the past, but also creates that tremendous internal unity of the nation which, based on the idea of unified leadership, already today makes the entire body of the people the instrument of a single will.

Just as loyalty, which is our honor, subordinates us all to the person and work of the Führer, and thus to the good of the whole, so too will the spiritual and ideological unity that the next generation of leaders is to bring about in all areas of life one day help the German people achieve that great unity which is the sublime goal of National Socialism - peace.

### **What Do The People Say About This?**

There are certain terms that were abused in the former political system, and ultimately these terms, along with the fundamentally sound ideas and forces behind them, were inevitably devalued; it will one day be a

grateful and politically significant task for future research to show how Jewish subversive activities have falsified, inflated, and destroyed such healthy ideas with sophisticated methods.

The word “freedom” has always had a particularly high value for the Germanic people, yet it was precisely in the name of “freedom” that measures were carried out that systematically destroyed what was healthy, that annihilated what was vital, and enslaved what was conceived - think of what was proclaimed and believed in the name of “freedom” that had nothing to do with the original meaning of this German word!

“Freedom” became “libertinism” because this foreign word was more suitable for concealing the change in meaning that was systematically pursued - the freedom of the individual was falsified into bondage to oneself, in order to deliver the people, thanks to the detachment from all healthy bonds and roots, to unhealthy instincts that were consciously awakened and strengthened in them, thus bringing them firmly into the hands of a foreign leadership. The freedom of science was falsified into the irresponsibility of the intellect; there was no perfidy that could not be elevated to a thesis in the name of science - these examples of devaluation could be multiplied at will, especially with regard to the word freedom.

It is to the credit of Friedrich Nietzsche, a solitary thinker who rebelled against his entire era, that he reemphasized the true meaning and value of freedom by raising the question of the purpose, the goal, of every preacher of freedom, thereby exposing the falsifiers of values.

A people knows nothing higher than growing together into an indestructible, fateful community in which the whole is everything, yet at the same time the individual, as a member and as a part of this whole, receives a new, higher value, a greater responsibility, and at the same time greater security - the individual is inconceivable without the community from which he grows, from which he draws his strength, through which his values find their direction and purpose, and through which he can truly form his personality. But personality over time became individuality; once again, a distortion of meaning was disguised.

Community was replaced by solidarity of all against all, the solidarity of transforming interests, castes, and classes; it was only the National Socialist movement that restored the true meaning of the words “community” and “solidarity” by exemplifying a genuine, committed community in its fighting units, thereby reawakening the people's sense of genuine community - the solidarity of the National Socialist fighters became the solidarity of an entire people against hardship and decay.

Every healthy person also has healthy instincts; the teaching of certain religious circles that everything human, everything that exists, is sinful by nature, is not only a heresy of decay but also a degradation of God's creation, falsely claimed to be in the name of God. From one's blood, one's race, one has a certain attitude toward life and its values, such as honor, freedom, community; from this blood-determined thinking of man, there is certainly a so-called healthy national sentiment that ultimately prevails over all the falsifications and all the work of subversion that has been carried out.

For example, when the Swiss Protestant theology professor Emil Brunner, in his strange theological ethics, expresses the opinion that there are “only sinful people,” and therefore “only sinful marriage” exists, that every marriage is “at the same time adultery,” or compares the state as a “structure of human sin of the greatest style” to “quite exemplary criminals,” then healthy popular sentiment will recognize these trains of thought for what they are - the misguided ideas of an intellectual who can only find understanding among similarly unfortunate, misguided intellectuals.

Things are not always quite so simple - “common sense” has been abused in much the same way as all such concepts. “In the name of the people,” once the basic concepts of all moral and cultural life, has been falsified, inflated, and destroyed, with the political system of parliamentarianism being established on this sentiment, even though the people basically had nothing to do with it; the people instinctively rebelled against this type of “government,” and yet repeatedly fell for the ever-new methods of enticement and camouflage maneuvers that were used. This psychologically skillful work of destruction also succeeded through intensive propaganda—to name one of the most blatant examples—in attacking the moral strength of the people; for example, the scourge of abortion was able to penetrate ever deeper into the population through such propaganda. “Healthy public sentiment” and “public opinion” were the terms used to describe the erosion of the people's true feelings - a major transformation process was and still is needed to restore clear, healthy conditions in this area.

Just as it was a minority that exemplified the true community in the National Socialist fighting units, thereby eliminating the solidarity of interest groups and classes and realigning the people, so it was also a minority, in fact a single man, Adolf Hitler, in whom the blood-bound sentiment of the German people broke through again in its purest form, despite all distortions.

Part of the greatness of his success as a speaker is that he knows how to grab even the simplest people emotionally and present the most difficult things in such a way that anyone of good will must understand them; there are only a few who, like him, have mastered this gift and possess such an ability to grasp things in their entirety. Many who openly profess National Socialism and are enthusiastic supporters of the Führer have instinctively grasped the National Socialist worldview, but they do not have the ability to recognize the whole, and thus the core of things, in every single question; this can be attributed to the fact that the education in a different spirit, as taught in school and at home, simply cannot be shaken off - it is therefore nonsense to always think of the judgment of the “broad masses” in relation to healthy popular sentiment today. A healthy popular sentiment understood in this way, with the emphasis always on being “healthy”, is changeable and can be influenced; how else would it have been possible for the Jewish element in Germany to have had such a strong, pervasive influence before the seizure of power? If, therefore, the sentiment of the people is invoked today at every appropriate and inappropriate opportunity, in many cases it is likely to be a phrase of embarrassment, because the formerly clear meaning of the term has slowly been robbed of its inner truth and value through overuse.

What we have to put in its place—well, that is very simple: the will of National Socialism for the future, or, as the Führer puts it, the belief in the Thousand-Year Reich. This goal will not be achieved by appealing to the “healthy sentiment of the people” in certain cases, perhaps in order to avoid making a clear decision. In the National Socialist state, the healthy sentiment of the people can, of course, only be National Socialist, and what is National Socialism—which, to the chagrin of some dutiful contemporaries, must be said—can only ever be decided by those men who have been at the forefront of National Socialism's intellectual struggle for power - they do not need to look left and right or glance upwards to find out what people there might think about this or that issue; their yardstick is the healthy instinct that once led them to the movement and which still determines their actions today.

The number of these men, who stand unshakable as a rock in the midst of intellectual upheaval, is not large; they are an elite group called to leadership by virtue of their faith and the realization that National Socialism truly represents a turning point, even when measured by the yardstick of history - it knows no today, but only yesterday and tomorrow.

### **III. Faith and Dogma**

#### **Faithful Germany**

**Munich, November 9th**

“Oh, this faithless age” - we have often heard this sigh from seemingly deeply concerned hearts, from the side of the road we have marched along for years and years. Insofar as those voices created obstacles for us, we rendered them harmless; otherwise, we left them to their sighs and did not concern ourselves with them. We went our own way, and we countered theoretical arguments, no matter how well-polished and cleverly formulated they were, with clear action - with this, we built the new Reich.

Today, however, on this holiday, when deepest longing took shape in its most dignified form; today, in this quiet hour, when thousands have experienced the commemoration of our idea under the wide, open sky; when all of Germany, with these witnesses on the Royal Square, has witnessed the consecration of our own worldview, let us listen to that reproachful interjection, so that we may know the answer all the more clearly.

Whether in history or legend, great miracles have always been the work of believing hearts, for faith can truly move mountains; so it was, and so it will always remain.

But what mountain did that unknown man with a burning heart face when he first decided to set out on his path; what flame must have burned within him to melt the ice of all those embittered, indignant, and weary hearts; what faith must have been in him when he took his men with him on that march into that November day, whose victorious collapse we commemorate today?

Men fell under the flag, martyrs who rose up and sanctified the cloth and the sign; when the battle cry sounded again, the mountains may have risen even higher, but the faith was also stronger, for the primordial power of those martyrs joined the living, their image growing and watching over all weakness and fatigue - next to the Führer stood the first immortals of the idea, a tangible, comprehensible symbol of the incomprehensible greatness of our goal.

Today, after what is historically only a short time, we stand in the midst of this German miracle, for which history or legend cannot give us any parallel - is there anyone who could be so blind as not to see it in all its greatness?

We who stood with the Führer today on the Royal Square, who followed him through those difficult years in a country where we once seemed to be strangers, and which now belongs entirely to us, we sensed the dead of the flag among ourselves; we know that they remained with us, that they only entered another plane, but they never left. All these feelings and emotions, which Adolf Hitler had awakened and brought to life in us because he always appealed to the good in our people and evoked this good from the deepest depths - all of our beliefs - he has given form to it all with this celebration of German resurrection for future generations, meant for all those who could not follow our path yet now carry in their memory this image for which these celebrations are intended to be a lasting symbol.

No, your sighs, if they come from an honest heart, are groundless, for never has this people been more faithful than today; it is a faith that cannot be squeezed into tight clothes and houses, that does not freeze into self-evident commandments, but demands action and loyalty, and is as mighty and beautiful as the life of this country and its people.

We believe in eternal life, and the Eternal Watch in Munich is a symbol of this faith; when we stand before this watch, we know its commandment, which demands of us service and work without ceasing - when we visit our martyrs, the thought of them is a commandment for our existence.

Just as we are inextricably linked to our people through our blood and our ancestors, just as our own clan and all life within it belongs to the people, so too is its immortality our continued existence, beyond all boundaries of individual existence.

This certainty is a commitment, for it does not make life easier; it only gives us laws and a direction for our actions and creations, which we then, at the end of our earthly days, pass on pure and faithful to those who come after us.

From a day with its celebrations such as this, we draw new strength for this conviction again and again in contemplation; whatever we may call it, gratitude, duty, commandment, or law—our faith is free and does not tolerate narrow-mindedness or rigidity—we return to our workplace with pride, and yet with modesty.

No, this people has never been more faithful than it is today, and this is where its strength comes from - the Lord God is still just to the strong who remained true to themselves, because they remained faithful to their blood and their people.

### **To Alfred Rosenberg**

When you gave me your newly published “The Myth of the 20th Century” years ago with a kind word of inner solidarity, I took the book, drove to my house by the lake, and devoured this encyclopedia of a National Socialist worldview - through your work, I learned that National Socialism was not only a political mission, but also a call and demand for a spiritual and mental transformation of the German people. I can still see the skeptical smile on your face when I predicted that the book would sell hundreds of thousands of copies; your doubts seemed to be justified, for I had never experienced such a literary boomerang as with my presentation on this work of confession - I received critiques from all sides. But times have changed - alongside Adolf Hitler's legislative “Mein Kampf,” your systematization of the ideological struggles of our time was particularly well-suited to providing insight into the mindset and spiritual foundation of the movement; it must be emphasized again and again to a wider public that this is not a matter of party dogma, but rather the confession of a personality.

Where there is light, shadows are formed, and so the works of dark men in the shadows soon haunted the beacon of your work! Your long, patient, indulgent silence was interpreted as weakness, and brochures appeared with increasing frequency, rubbing themselves against you in order to ignite.

In the middle of May, you now give these gentlemen your answer, "An die Dunkelmänner unserer Zeit" (To the Dark Men of Our Time); I can only recommend to all the good people who are so fond of discussing without being clouded by expertise, who throw their weight into the so-called balance without having conscientiously worked their way through the conscientiousness of your myth, to at least read these 104 pages of German prose now - since this writing is not yet on the prohibited index, Catholics can also read it!

Having studied the polemical writings of Luther and his contemporaries, one is initially surprised by the restrained calm and intellectual discipline of your response; the tenor of your sentences is seemingly without any agitation - one feels reassured that this is a man concerned with the matter of his good

conscience. All the passion of your conviction has shifted to the persuasiveness of the theses you put forward at the time of the attack, and of which you need not relinquish an inch today.

The “ecclesia militans” had launched a small, fresh and cheerful guerrilla war against you; it was calculated that you could be killed scientifically. This hypocritical procedure had been tried and tested frequently over several centuries, for Rome was very familiar with German thoroughness. If it could be proven—even if only through a fallacy or a sleight of hand—that an author was not to be taken seriously scientifically, the turmoil of his soul, and with it the only essential question of the justification of his struggles of conscience, were immediately swept under the rug.

The Church was not concerned with the moral necessity and inner purity of spiritual elevation, but with the appearance of righteousness; it had two thousand years of experience to show that the slumber of the world was and remained the best business for consolidating its power.

In such cases, it therefore countered the restless awakening or even awakened spiritual bliss of a layman with the routine of a Jesuit mind, which, trained in such legal tricks, deftly demonstrated the scientifically weak foundation of its opponent on the basis of the infallibility of the Church; the writings of this defeated man were placed on the Index, and the well-protected flock looked down on the stray sheep with frowns, without the faintest idea of what it was actually about, with the arrogance that befits a true Christian.

These circles of obscurantists and even more obscure backers had two tried and tested schemes up their sleeves:

Firstly, they tried to drive a wedge between the Führer and you - they said, for example, that the Chancellor was a devout Christian and that, in order to prove his Christianity, he had to slaughter this neo-pagan Rosenberg (attention, dear fleeting reader, here's the trick! Rosenberg is already dismissed as a heathen!!), just as Abraham was once commanded to slaughter his son. But Rosenberg did not fall victim to them, for the Führer has a principle from his days of struggle: a man who is most fiercely attacked by his political opponents or former opponents must have something of a “domini canes”<sup>1</sup> about him, as a faithful servant to his master.

Secondly, as I already mentioned, they appealed to the educational instinct of the good German; with anonymous force, they declared Rosenberg a pseudo-scientist. In doing so, they unfortunately betrayed a gross ignorance of the situation, which had been fundamentally changed by National Socialism - it was overlooked that Germany had become very aware of the taboo of the absolute, stamped arrogance of the pharisaical scribes. Common sense can no longer be underestimated or devalued in the Third Reich; on the contrary, this Reich is in the process of helping common sense, the unspoiled nature and character of the nation, to have its say and make its mark, to the jubilation of the entire rejuvenated people, who are breathing a sigh of relief. Discussions that could previously have had deadly consequences—I recall the unmistakable victory avenues of the Roman Church in the form of pyres—have lost their meaning in the 20th century.

We see that the anonymous stylists have all overstepped the mark, as they have become either too personal or too factual; they either believed they could destroy your person, or they believed that their feigned objectivity was infallible, simply because it was a priori godlike. Unfortunately, they forgot that this godlikeness had lost its historical splendor under their earthly hands, because these advocates too often confused the sacred with their personal advantage in the course of history. These people condemn

---

<sup>1</sup> A Latin phrase meaning “hound of the lord”.

you, Alfred Rosenberg, a pagan, because they were arrogant; had they been humble, as befitted their profession, they would have accused themselves of pagan transgressions. It would have been fatal for you, Alfred Rosenberg, in practical terms, if these pious brothers had proved themselves to be pure Christians and had said: yes, this man's conscientiousness, however crude, however painful, however excessive, is basically right. We are secularized, and we want to acknowledge this man's accusations as a sign of the times, and we want to refute them; we want to return to our idea with all our soul. For the sake of this glorious, supernatural idea, every soul is right for us, every occasion is not a reason for abusive and dialectical departure, but a beloved reason for noble, courageous reflection and homecoming!

If the Church had been concerned not with power, both in political and economic supremacy, but with the inviolability of divine omnipotence, it would have refuted you, Alfred Rosenberg, in this way. It might even have been wise enough to say: This myth is worth a mass to us!

Nothing of the sort!

Invisible mice are allowed to gnaw at individual roots, but nowhere does a man's axe flash against the trunk of your organic work; this explains why your answer exudes an almost painful cheerfulness - no aggression towards believers, but a commitment to the desperate, the abandoned, and the disappointed—that is the tone of this writing.

The Church presents itself as the sole institution of the Holy Spirit that can bring salvation - you, Alfred Rosenberg, claim freedom of spirit for yourself, your work, and your worldview. You do not attack, but only intervene.

You want to help the millions whom the Church has lost; it is not you, Alfred Rosenberg, who is to blame for the ecclesiastical flotsam of our time, but the past of the Church, which cared more about its political position and power than about the spiritual welfare of those entrusted to it - so much for principles.

It is impossible to respond to your book in detail; it is so powerful and so compelling in its internal logic that one would have to copy it in its entirety if one did not want to be guilty of misrepresentation. We, the cultural-political servants of National Socialism, can only thank you, for your clear answer has clarified the situation - whoever is not for us is against the cause!

And to those who are against the cause, we offer this good advice: do not move foreign currency, not even on paper, not even in bookkeeping! Strict laws are in place - we will ensure that these laws are obeyed!

### **Leadership, Dictatorship, and Inquisition**

It goes without saying that the principle of leader and followers, which National Socialism is now beginning to implement into its state policy, was initially met with astonishment by the old powers; realizing that this situation could no longer be changed, they began to attempt to distract and obscure it. Initially, they attempted to bring what they had done in the past and still wanted to do today into theoretical agreement with the principles of National Socialist policy; this was done above all by certain circles of economic liberalism.

It was characteristic of the past era of parliamentary democracy that the politics of a state were exposed to the most unpredictable coincidences and grandiose brawls were allowed to take place in the midst of the most serious political situations, but the economy, the brutal standpoint of absolute domination over work and people, was always maintained - purely material property was regarded as the foundation of

domination over human life, and the principle of political freedom, which had degenerated into unrestraint, was converted by economic liberalism into the dictatorship of economic and financial power. Outwardly, the liberal economic dictator demanded freedom of action as far as the limits of prison walls; inwardly, whether from individuals or corporations, collective submission was demanded of the workforce.

Pointing out that Germany had now acquired a strong and unified political leadership, many economic liberals who had not yet undergone an inner transformation tried to explain that they had in fact already implemented the Führer principle in the economic sphere, and that if one disregarded the understandable fighting spirit of recent years, nothing now stood in the way of equating the Führer principle with the “long-established” master-of-the-house position in economics.

National Socialism must, of course, take a clear stand against these attempts, which are still evident here and there; the political leader will and must make his decisions independently of his own economic advantage, and therefore without any self-interest, but in the case of the owner of a company, it is humanly understandable, but politically unacceptable, that he should make thousands of jobs and employees subservient to his economic interests by threatening to rob them of their livelihoods. The founding of the German Labor Front was a declared break with the economic egoism of the individual in favor of his subordination to a new work ethic - the principle of leader and followers has replaced economic tyranny and formless masses. If some may not yet have become accustomed to this state of affairs, the coming times will force recognition of this internal and external transformation.

Basically, this is meant to express that the economic dictator had nothing to do with the principle of leadership, but rather with its opposite, for the principle of the masses includes the tyrant and the principle of leadership includes followers who have been liberated from the inside-out. Economic liberalism can neither theoretically nor practically refer to its past or revive it internally; its representatives can and should only try as individuals to fit into the tasks imposed by the political necessities of the whole nation.

The other type who today strives to claim the idea of leadership for himself is the inquisitor, even if in the modern 19th and 20th centuries he does not appear to be endowed with absolute power as he had in the past. However, like the economic liberalist in the economic sphere, he has by no means abandoned his claims to dictatorship in the spiritual and ideological sphere, and he is currently working diligently to equate the terminology of National Socialism with the customs and traditions of the ecclesiastical hierarchy.

It is emphasized that the National Socialist state demands authority, and that the principle of authority has long been realized in the Roman Church; National Socialism represents the Führer's point of view, while Catholicism has had the Führer's claim in effect for centuries through the establishment of the papacy; National Socialism demands unconditional allegiance and obedience, as does the Roman Church, and is therefore invincible - here, too, there are enormous differences.

Certainly, taken schematically, the rule of a leader is realized in the Roman Church, but in human life it generally manifests itself in the authority of a military commander, just as much as in the authority of a captain or the leader of a research expedition. However, the substance of a leader is different from the exterior - it relates entirely to the intellectual and spiritual freedom of a person, and the external organization is secondary, while a political leadership state demands political and military subordination - National Socialism is a strictly structured leadership community, from top to bottom, but it is not a

spiritual inquisition, worked out down to the last articles of faith of a dogmatic legislation for all areas of spiritual and intellectual life.

What National Socialism demands is a basic attitude of character, a certain recognition of the hierarchy of values familiar to the German character; otherwise, it is tolerant in matters of religious belief and free research. Here, the Roman doctrine of obedience differs fundamentally from the Germanic concept of freedom - the former demands a dogmatic constriction of the inner world and a domination of the world outwardly, while the latter has tight external bond in the political community and inner spiritual infinity. Here, too, leadership from within differs from leadership from without, and therefore National Socialist leadership cannot be equated with organizational forms and figures of past times, whether they originate from the liberal or medieval era.

The National Socialist concept of leadership stems rather from other, namely Germanic characteristics, which were instinctively realized earlier by the duke and his followers, which later appeared in knighthood, which were strictly formulated in the Prussian discipline of Frederick the Great, and which were relived from within in the uprising for German freedom.

The National Socialist concept of leadership stems from the idea of freedom as expressed in very similar terms by the great German mystic Ekkehart, the great revolutionary Luther, and the thinkers and poets Kant and Goethe - National Socialism will unite the entire nation as followers in this sense, which is in fact the realization of the oldest and most recent dreams.

Only when the German people, through the National Socialist movement, truly grasp this one decisive fact in their hearts will the foundation, its solid, inner foundation, be laid for the permanence of this Reich, which is linked to the demand to adhere to the necessary breeding of character types and the necessary self-discipline of character values; it demands selection unwaveringly so that the great task can also find great people, and thus its great fulfillment.

### **Form and Content**

One of the most important questions of our time is that of religious behavior - in recent years, an extraordinarily large number of German compatriots, driven by a need to find a clear path in accordance with the National Socialist worldview, have spontaneously addressed this difficult problem, and have arrived at a wide variety of conclusions.

It is not our task to decide in any way for or against any of the proposed regulations; however, we consider it our duty to clarify, without taking sides, what this whole complex of issues is all about - as always, our goal in such a consideration is not negation.

Religious experiences can and must never seek its content and source of strength solely in the struggle against another belief system, for such a basic attitude would be contrary to our sense of morality in the spirit of the party program. Therefore, when considering the whole problem, we must always assume that, as National Socialists, we are not interested in the substance of one doctrine or another, but only in the question of whether and to what extent it corresponds to the principle of our political worldview that religion is a private matter.

The new state has clearly defined its position on the religious question in two fundamental points - first, Point 24 of our party program guarantees: "...the freedom of all religious beliefs in the state, insofar as

they do not endanger its existence or violate the moral sensibilities of the Germanic race.” - thus, our innate, natural, and racially determined sensibilities are expressly made the ultimate standard for religious decisions.

The National Socialist state itself has also clearly expressed how this is to be understood in the so-called “Freedom of Conscience Decree”:

*“Faith is a matter for each individual alone, for which he is responsible only to his own conscience.”*

- it follows from this that the National Socialist state is to refrain from any interference in truly religious matters, as long as their representatives do not enter the realm of politics.

The true meaning of this behavior is the recognition that only in this way can every Catholic or Protestant Christian, or followers of other religious beliefs, live their faith within the party and within Germany, as long as they stand up for it out of conviction and their own knowledge.

However, this does not mean that this high degree of freedom should be maliciously interpreted negatively by those with different worldviews; the Reichsführer of the SS expressed this with convincing clarity when he said in a speech outlining the tasks of the Schutzstaffel:

*“...we object to this because, as a community, we do not commit ourselves to this or that denomination or to any dogma, nor do we demand this of any of our men; we want to avoid the process of being denounced as atheists through the misuse of the word ‘heathen’.”*

We want religious feeling and religious renewal, and that means that we have nothing to do with that materialistic view of history which rejects all religiosity on principle because, from the narrowness of its attachment to this world, it denies the existence of the metaphysical altogether. According to the Reichsführer of the SS, we consider those who believe in nothing to be “arrogant, megalomaniacal, and stupid” - accordingly, this statement cannot refer to those who, as apostates from some denomination, are somehow left hanging in the air. The confessional churches are not entirely wrong in stating that no religious revival or renewal can be expected from these circles, for negation alone is not a suitable foundation for new ideas; rather, a truly new religious experience can only ever come from a positive creative will that attempts to create a new content of faith.

But this can naturally only be the work of an individual—a person who must have the makings of a reformer or prophet within them, without it being necessary for them to behave as such.

We also do not see why those German people who, for ideological reasons, want nothing to do with Christianity, primarily because they reject the parts of Christian morality that seem alien to them being prescribed as moral law, should not organize themselves in some way in the form of a public-law community; this would be desirable in itself because it is probably the only way to achieve the equality that is often urgently needed for the individuals concerned and their families.

For these reasons, we too believe that, in the long run, it cannot be tolerated that those of our compatriots who adhere with loyalty and conviction to the moral law inherent in our race that their young children should be deprived of any so-called solemn admission into the human community, whether that be through marriages, communal events or funerals of any solemn form; however, we also know that, if it is

not to become a laughing stock, a new form must develop slowly and organically from the genuine and ancient customs that still exist today, and therefore cannot be suddenly “created” by any organization. Above all, however, we are of the opinion that these external customs, which alone justify and necessitate an organization, must never be the reason for an “organization in religious worldviews”; it is precisely the typical sign of truly Germanic religious behavior that it does not tolerate any paternalism or collectivist summarization in this area.

For the Germanic peoples, religion was and remains a private matter; the Germanic patriarchs were their own priests and did not tolerate a priesthood.

What we need is not a vague enthusiasm for some secretive and sectarian pseudo-religiosity, but an open and honest commitment to the religious and, above all, moral views of our ancestors.

It was one of the most fateful errors of these small associations that wanted to renew the religion of our race that they tried to pick up where the violent Christianization of the time had interrupted its living development - it is impossible to erase a millennium of human and ethnic development and treat it as if it never existed.

Wotan and Thor are dead, and those enthusiasts who, a good dozen years ago, slaughtered an equally old white horse on an ancient sacrificial stone were sad fools who needlessly compromised a good cause.

Neither these pre-Christian religious customs nor the ideas underlying them are readily applicable to us; if an attempt is to be made to express our race-appropriate moral consciousness in external religious forms, we must try to refer to the sacred book of our ancestors, the “Edda”, in the same way that Christianity today refers to the books of the Old Testament.

One can certainly allow the poetically beautiful and, in particular, the ideological passages to have a direct effect on oneself and, if one wishes, compile a kind of moral code from them; however, one should not try to overshoot the mark.

Religion is a matter of the spirit, and can therefore only be based on the spiritual; our task is merely to ensure that a German person who has rejected all Oriental teachings and strives to gain the moral heritage of our race through his own knowledge is not hindered in this endeavor.

### **The Spiritual Crisis**

Now that the opponents of National Socialism have themselves realized that open or covert resistance at the political level is futile, they have sought suitable cover and are tentatively reappearing on the scene to try to continue their struggle against the regime in a disguised form. This camouflage can take many different forms: sometimes it is purely religious, sometimes it has a “scientific” flavor. However, we must not be deceived - the fact is that it is still the same circles that, as before, intend to disrupt the development of National Socialism.

\*\*\*

*"In his new work, 'German Socialism,' Werner Sombart has attempted to provide an overview of the current situation, along with investigating the causes of the crisis in which our fatherland, along with the entire cultural world, finds itself; he rightly seeks the ultimate causes of the tremendous turmoil that is*

*shaking and threatening all our lives behind both political and economic events, which lies in the sphere of worldview.“*

With these words, which leave nothing to be desired in terms of clarity, the "Deutsche Bergwerkszeitung" in Düsseldorf begins their editorial. We are accustomed to all kinds of vicious attacks against our worldview, but rarely has anyone stated so bluntly and clearly that we are not only to blame for the current failure of Christianity but also, on closer inspection, for what he believes will soon be the demise of the entire world.

The author, who calls himself Spitama, considers with every line he writes how far he can go with his hateful accumulation of cleverly disguised insults against National Socialism without falling foul of the law; he forgets that we weigh not words but spirit, and that we are not stupid enough to mistake such a "scientific discussion" for what it is, namely a political pamphlet.

As far as practical action is concerned, this would suffice for both Mr. Spitama and the "Deutsche Bergwerkszeitung", which devotes its first two pages, in a large format, eight columns long, to this insolent mockery of the National Socialist worldview. But the intellectual realm that has been touched upon cannot be remedied by any coercive measures; our primary concern is to make it clear to those German compatriots addressed by the "Deutsche Bergwerkszeitung" that the "intellectual crisis of the present" is quite different from how Mr. Spitama sees it, and that, in particular, what he wants to regard as the "cause of the disease" is the only remedy and the only way forward for a German future.

We did not actually know that we were living in a "tremendous confusion" that "shakes and threatens the existence of us all"; we actually had the impression that even our fellow citizens who are still distant from us (if there are any such people among the readers of the "Deutsche Bergwerkszeitung") agree with us in the view that National Socialism has put an end to this "enormous confusion" and replaced it with an order that is as beneficial as it is fruitful. However, it seems that the developments of recent years have apparently passed Mr. Spitama and his source without leaving a trace, for both still imagine the German people to be in that hellish pit of destruction, which the actual purpose of the aforementioned essay is to portray as the inevitable consequence of a departure from Christianity.

In his article, entitled "Die Krankheitsursache" (The Cause of the Disease), Mr. Spitama proves, with far-reaching and factually correct arguments, that Marxism had set itself the goal of de-Christianizing Western thought; he uses numerous quotations to prove that the abandonment of Christianity, or rather of the Christian churches, was in fact a natural accompaniment of the materialistic worldview, especially in the second half of the last century.

There would be little to object to these statements, insofar as they relate to the history of religion and the philosophy of history, if the purpose of the entire essay were not to attribute similar tendencies in this area to National Socialism of all things. Mr. Spitama culminates his wisdom in his concluding words:

*"...that salvation and redemption for Germany can only be hoped for through a return to the one who is the way, the truth, and the life (That is, Christ!) Only in this way can the West escape its predicted downfall."*

There we have it! National Socialism, which is of course accused of hostility toward the church, is also responsible for the downfall of the West, for de-Christianization “is the disease from which we suffer and which would destroy us if we did not succeed in eliminating it.”

To prove this, all the stops of church welfare are pulled out; the harmless and by no means very current Professor Sombart is credited with a somewhat gloomy sentence, which Mr. Spitama describes as “spirited”:

*"What we have experienced can only be interpreted as the work of the devil; the ways in which Satan has led people down his path can be clearly traced: he has destroyed the belief in an afterlife in ever-widening circles, thereby throwing people with full force into the lostness of this world."*

It wouldn't take much for Mr. Spitama to blame us, possibly classified as lesser devils, for the fact that his now flimsy “belief in the afterlife” no longer appeals to the majority of our people; it is indeed, as the author of the article describes it, as the most terrible of terrors that modern people no longer allow themselves to be bullied by threats of hellish punishment, and the temptations of otherworldly rewards no longer console them to the adversities of this world. There was no need to throw a spanner in the works by citing Heinrich Heine of all people as the authority for such views—as if this Jewish, but precisely because of that very clever mind had not correctly foreseen developments when he said that one should confidently leave heaven to the angels and the sparrows.

Certainly, our religiosity, that is, our belief in our people and its future, has both feet firmly on the ground - let no one come to us with the objection that such ideas “seek a substitute for the deposed God in ‘conscience’ and his categorical imperative.”

We refuse to allow our most sacred conviction to be labeled a pseudo-religion, as if our faith were inferior to that of denominational circles, for we believe in eternity just as much as church Christians do. And if we believe that the forces that gave our people the moral impulse to turn away from a deadly path are just as “religious” as those multi-layered ideas which, almost buried by medieval dogmas, constitute the true core of today's church doctrine, this is because we are able to see and experience the eternal in this world—a quality that Christianity, wherever it has been and is alive, has cherished and nurtured.

*"Faith in God and an afterlife is in truth the root of morality, from which it draws its universally binding force; autonomous morality, which seeks to eliminate God as lawgiver and judge, is a study room creation that is not weather-resistant and cannot withstand the stormy gusts of serious temptation. Moral autonomy, this product of modern subjectivism, amounts to the self-deification of man."*

– There it is, the insidious stab in the back!

For us, any morality that is decreed from above and imposed on the people below is just as reprehensible as the hypocritical behavior that, for example, often exploits the most natural human failings for political control of the mentally immature by means of the seal of confession.

The abstruse doctrine of original sin, which makes redemption necessary in the first place—the Fall, indeed the very concept of sin as understood by the Church, with reward and punishment in the hereafter—is unbearable to the people of our race because it is incompatible with the worldview of our blood.

Above all denominational disputes—and debates about religious issues in Germany today can hardly be anything more than that—stands the irrefutable fact that what matters most for the future of our people is that religion, as a servant of the state, creates new spiritual forms that are capable of helping to realize the heroic ideal of life of our race - then—and only then—might it be possible to truly discover the root of Christianity, which today is unfortunately still predominantly southern in character, in our people; as is well known, in the thousand years since forced Christianization, this was something that been impossible to achieve.

It is therefore outrageous when Spittama speaks of the Catholic-dogmatic form of Christianity as the “faith of our fathers,” as if it had not taken centuries of hard struggle to impose this religion of “love” on our fathers with sword and torture.

Moreover, we also know today how strongly the religious sentiment of Germanic culture has permeated “German” Christianity; the social morality that the Church would so much like to regard as its own creation was based far more on the ethical characteristics of our race than on the pulpit teachings of the medieval centuries.

Finally, we must not forget that the last thousand years have meant an alienation from the original source of our being and our nature in every respect; we do not want to skip over them, or even erase them from our consciousness, but we do not want to forget that, as the origin of our being and knowledge, these thousand years are only “as a day and a night watch before God—before the eternity we experience in this world.”

Compared to the millennia of our people and the tens of thousands of years of our race, the arrogant errors of a heretical doctrine alien to our people do not count for much - this should be said to those who, with evil intentions and adorned with borrowed plumes, imagine that they can denigrate our religious feelings with impunity.

### **A Time Without Faith?**

*“... Few saints come as close to us as the holy mother, and few have as much to say to the mothers of our time, with their focus on a purely worldly culture, their lack of morals and faith, and the increased dangers for young people; that is why we gladly reach for this book, which speaks to us in a special way in our current situation...”*

This is the conclusion of a book review in the magazine of the Catholic Women's and Mothers' Association, Messengers of the Prayer Apostolate "Frau und Mutter" (Woman and Mother).

There is nothing surprising about this quote, because what is said here can be found, with varying degrees of emphasis, in almost all church newspapers; they express deep regret when speaking of the present, and prophesy, in mystical terms, the downfall of the German people into immorality and depravity.

Today, we want to ignore the fact that this method of ideological pessimism is nothing more than open agitation against the National Socialist state, and examine objectively the real facts that would justify a denominational publication in making such accusations.

In order to avoid superficiality, let us examine each claim individually:

We believe we have understood the magazine “Frau und Mutter” correctly: it takes the view that immorality is greater today than in recent years, and with it the dangers for young people, which are allegedly constantly on the rise.

At first glance, this assertion may seem absurd - has the state not done a thorough job of cleaning up the morally corrupting influences that have posed a serious danger to our youth in the postwar years through the press, cinema, theater, and the big city with its garish, shameless advertising? Everything that was once aimed solely at demoralizing and corrupting the people has now disappeared from public life in Germany, yet week after week, the so-called Christian press warns of conditions that threaten morals and continue to endanger young people even in the new Reich; one searches in vain in police reports for evidence to support this cry of alarm.

The only major scandals whose revelation has brought to light a picture of incredible moral degeneration were the Franciscan trials in Koblenz<sup>2</sup>; surely the eternal moralizing of the clerical press can refer only to these incidents in their own religious orders.

Are these moralistic remarks not directed against National Socialism after all? We welcome such self-criticism, which is all the more necessary because the autonomy of monastic life prevents the state from taking the measures that are necessary in the interests of German youth, the reputation of the nation, and, not least, the Catholic Church.

What remains of the accusations in the aforementioned quote is the “mere worldly culture” and the alleged lack of faith that we are accused of.

Both terms are a contemptuous disparagement of the honor of countless Germans who cannot reconcile their conscience with belonging to one of the existing religious communities today, and have therefore drawn a line of separation - when we speak up for them this time, it is not to commit ourselves to one direction or another, but to contribute to clarifying the intellectual situation, which must be in the interest of the German people.

It is easy to claim that someone is faithless, especially when one is so intolerant and believes that one has a monopoly on the faith that leads to salvation; however, let us also consider the possibilities of real circumstances that could justify such an accusation!

One of the first acts of National Socialism after January 30th, 1933, was to dissolve the godless associations, and with them those parties and associations that fundamentally viewed religion as “opium for the people.” In addition, Nazi Germany had appointed representatives to declare that no denominational distinctions would be made in the new state and that everyone could attain salvation in their own way, provided that their religious beliefs were compatible with the fundamental views of our people.

The Church, which for years had been engaged in hopeless struggles against the godless movement and representatives of the Internationale, was thus freed at a stroke from an opponent against whom it was unable to offer any serious resistance; when interested parties today claim the opposite and describe Christianity itself as “the only bulwark against Bolshevism,” the example of Spain should make it unnecessary to seriously consider refuting this presumption.

After the National Socialists came to power, the churches in Germany no longer needed to defend themselves against an external enemy, and they were once again given the opportunity to devote themselves in peace and quiet to their own tasks, which for some of them naturally consisted of bringing

---

<sup>2</sup> In reference to multiple trials that took place between 1935 and 1937 that accused Franciscan monks, priests and nuns of immorality, homosexuality, pedophilia, and other sexual perversions against the youth.

back to the church those followers who had fallen away as a result of the godless propaganda of the Weimar era; in this endeavor, both religious communities, Catholic and Protestant, have suffered an obvious failure, so it can be assumed that the churches have become emptier rather than fuller. National Socialism, on the other hand, succeeded in integrating these people into the national community, thereby giving their lives new meaning.

However, we believe it is wrong to draw conclusions from this fact about a faithless era, as certain church circles do; here, too, one should first look for the log in one's own eye before crying out about the supposed splinter in one's brother's eye as they invoke Sodom and Gomorrah.

It is true that some Germans have turned their backs on their religious community in the last three years - why? Certainly not because the state considered it desirable, as some of the foreign press claims, but in many cases because National Socialists, loyal to their Führer and their people, no longer wanted to be insulted from the pulpit for this reason.

Those who turned their backs on the church for these reasons are not unbelievers, for they took this step out of a sense of responsibility to justice, out of an inner distress into which they were driven not by the state or National Socialism, but by the irresponsible agitators in the pulpit; they alone are to blame if faithful Protestants and Catholics have lost faith in their former beliefs or their earthly expression.

However, this group of people is likely to be far outnumbered by those who once belonged to the church organizationally (because of their parents' denomination) but who never had an inner relationship with it - here, too, it is ultimately absurd to want to blame the state for the failure of church authorities. National Socialism proclaimed freedom of religion, but the structure of its worldview compelled it to reject any role in promoting the church; if one now objects that this "worldly culture" preached by National Socialism was to blame for the way that things have developed, this assertion leaves us cold, for we can see no cause for reproach in it.

However, we must object to the life-affirming attitude of National Socialism being equated with a lack of morals and faith, as was previously propagated by Marxism and other atheist associations in Germany; in our opinion, failing to recognize these differences is a mistake that could one day come back to haunt all those circles that still imagine they can deliberately overlook and cover them up, because an old rule teaches us that it is better to overestimate than to underestimate the strengths of others.

Anyone who travels through Germany today, with their eyes fully open, will find a people who are once again happily going about their daily work and whose faith in the future is unshakeable; this is most evident on the nation's most important holidays, when the whole of Germany, represented by its best and brightest, gathers in Nuremberg year after year to give an account of the work it has accomplished.

One would like to give everyone who talks about a time of faithlessness today the sight of, for example, a Hitler Youth or labor service rally, so that they would finally recognize the profound transformation that has taken place within our borders, including in the spiritual realm. All these people who gather annually in Nuremberg have not united on the basis of a program or rational consideration alone; their hearts alone have made the decision, and the impressive achievements of the last three years of this nation of 67 million people would not have been possible if that minority had not had faith in the one man who is today the Führer and chancellor of the German people; to describe the men and women of the movement,

who were prepared to give everything if required, as faithless, is an irony that may well go down in German history as a “treppenwitz”<sup>3</sup>.

Our opponents are right when they claim that it is a different kind of faith that has gained ground in National Socialism; with this acknowledged, who can claim to possess the only true faith? This is a dispute over the emperor's beard<sup>4</sup> which we will not participate in, because we take the view that one person can be a devout Christian and act in accordance with their faith in such a way that they are a valuable member of their community, while another person may be a follower of Buddhism and achieve the same goal.

What is decisive for us is not faith per se, but the effect it has, and that can vary greatly among different people and races - ultimately, however, only those worldviews that were able to shape a people and inspire them to achieve their highest potential will stand the test of history. The Christian Church was once such a positive source of strength, and to that it was able to leave its mark on the earthly world; there is no compelling reason to deny this future to another, younger idea.

The development of our domestic politics is described as a miracle, especially by foreigners who knew Germany in the past and have the opportunity to see the situation today; is it not a miracle even for those who know the secret of this success? We, too, without being effusive, may call it a miracle, and we openly acknowledge the conditions that made its existence possible in the first place.

The success of the appeal that National Socialism has made to the German people lays in the awareness of the strength and goodness that lays dormant within them; at a time when, every Sunday in hundreds of churches, the misery and incompetence of everything that bears the face of man was hammered into the minds of churchgoers, a previously unknown figure arose among the people who had no outward power to command, who preached the opposite of what the masters of the pulpit tried to impress upon the faithful, namely, that it was not presumptuous to attempt to “restore order to a world that had fallen out of joint.” National Socialism never agitated with human weakness and the fear of punishment in another world that is beyond our observation - perhaps this is precisely where the unique rise of the movement lies—in the “culture of this world.”

But it is dangerous to work with new word formations that are often nothing more than slogans, and therefore “this worldly culture” needs an explanation:

Certain circles often and readily accuse contemporaries who do not belong to the two Christian communities of usually knowing better what they do not want than what they do want; to a certain extent this may be true, insofar as it is difficult to find a uniformly rigid formula for new ideas in the sense of Christian dogma. We doubt that this is a fundamental shortcoming, because in our opinion, Germans are guided here not so much by the intellect as by the soul, by their instinct; it should not be so difficult to express in a few sentences the religious desires of millions of good Germans who no longer have any inner connection to the church.

What separates them from the others is precisely this “worldly culture” - the belief that we are not placed in this world by God to weep over it as a vale of tears, to be ultimately redeemed; that divine providence has placed us on this earth not for the sake of a painful trial, the outcome of which will later result in reward or punishment, but with the intention to do our best here, and thus to realize in practice the divine power that also lives within us; this idea is not materialistic in the sense that it denies the hereafter, for we

---

<sup>3</sup> German equivalent of a historical contradiction or irony; in personal terms it's the equivalent of coming up with a comeback after a conversation is over.

<sup>4</sup> German idiom meaning to argue over pointless or frivolous things.

too feel connected in infinity beyond the years of the past and future through the succession of generations, which corresponds to the movements of the sea like ebb and flow.

One could write books the size of a ballot box against the "new faith" that is alive in the German people, mathematically proving the "mortal sin" of "this worldly culture"; they would not stop the course of natural development, but perhaps accelerate it through the excessiveness and intolerance of their attacks. In this sense, the church magazines and devotional journals that feel compelled to scrutinize today's immoral and faithless society should consider whether their work is not futile, if not harmful to the achievement of their own goals.

We would have no objection if, instead of hateful sermons, insidious taunts, and hidden attacks, there were an open, honest debate between these various forces on an intellectual basis; this could only be of general benefit to our people. However, the attacks by church circles against National Socialism, which are the order of the day, only give the impression that loudness and overzealousness are meant to compensate for a lack of certainty.

### **Offensive?**

There was a time when the contrast between body and soul formed the cornerstone of thinking; however, in its battle against the energetic and life-affirming Nordic ruling class of all European states at that time, Christian medieval dogma used the Oriental concept of original sin and declared all natural bodily urges, even the entire healthy sensory life, to be hostile to God - the entire world of this life was contrasted with a world of the soul, detached from it, so to speak, by using the hope of the hereafter as the driving force behind the supposed ennoblement of man.

Within this whole system of dogma, which is alien to our nature and essence, the rule of the strong, life-loving Germanic peoples over the world was to be hollowed out from within and ultimately brought down; the most dangerous argument in the chain of all these sophistries was the doctrine that the life of the soul had an unconditional prerogative in all areas, which would have been synonymous with the rule of the clergy in political matters as well.

On the whole, the Nordic spirit has triumphed over this medieval, gloomy world of belief in sin; we know that, as the ancient Greeks and Romans, who still felt Nordic, already recognized that a healthy soul can only dwell in a healthy body, and that true humanity only exists when soul and body, inner and outer life, form a perfect unity. We believe that the lofty demand once made by Nietzsche, "A time will come when the spirit will be as at home in the senses as the senses are in the spirit," will soon be fulfilled; therefore, we want nothing to do with the defamation of physicality that still haunts the minds of some "do-gooders."

In Zarathustra's words, "Have I commanded you to kill your senses? I say to you: refine your senses!", we also recognize its application to us - we must recognize that the contempt for the 'flesh' was nothing more than a political weapon of the "sub-races," who took revenge for the fact that their own pitiful physicality caused them to fall short everywhere in the world compared to the physically fit Nordic master class. We are proud to have returned to the healthy sensibilities of our ancestors, and therefore the new state devotes its special care to the racial physical health of the growing generation.

Nordic Greece had already established the eternally valid guidelines for the physical well-being of our race - since the Renaissance, when the Nordic attitude to life triumphed over monastic obscurantism, the

figures of classical sculpture have begun their triumphal march across the world as the most perfect expressions of the human sense of beauty; no one, not even the popes, who artfully promoted the revival of classical antiquity, thought to morally object to this irrefutable canon of the ideal of beauty, apart from a few fig leaves that the dying Middle Ages quickly attached to their original branches.

The triumph of great German painting in the late Renaissance, especially that of Dürer, Holbein, and Cranach, gave art the inner and outer freedom of physical representation necessary to produce perfect works, for the human body will always be the highest conceivable object of artistic creation - just as nature created man, he should not be afflicted with the shortcomings of the individual, but rejoice in the highest perfection of all forms and formations of the body, he should preach a joy of life close to this world to the viewers of works of art, and glorify the victory of healthy sensibility over that monastic asceticism that is hostile to existence.

Baroque and Classicism, and above all the masterpieces of the last century, have uniformly developed this sense of beauty among all civilized peoples, so that even a generation ago it was no longer considered offensive to choose completely naked figures as motifs for works of art. None of our greatest painters and sculptors are exceptions to this - neither Schwind nor Feuerbach or Menzel or Klinger or Rauch or Begas shied away from depicting the human body in unclothed nudity – and that would be perfectly fine if it weren't for the representatives of that extensively described medieval theory of sin, who regard any glorification of beauty as a crime, trying once again to skillfully apply their antediluvian<sup>5</sup> poisonous injections.

As always, they are quick to claim that displaying the naked human body is fundamentally pagan and encourages fornication; how they intend to justify the latter assertion remains a mystery to us, of course, because they always limit themselves to saying that physicality is synonymous with sinfulness.

A typical example of this kind is the letter from Pastor Stephan Vollert in Greiz to the editors of the “Völkischer Beobachter”:

*“What can one say about the special edition of the ‘Völkischer Beobachter’ with its depiction of ‘German art’ in the form of a naked woman; does German art not have other, more noble subjects than this? I was ashamed when I got my hands on the paper, and immediately cut out two offensive pictures from the ‘Beobachter’ and tore them up. One must remember that the paper falls into the hands of simple folk and children - does the ‘Völkischer Beobachter’ want to introduce nudity to them?”*

There are three things we need to examine closely in this cultural document - first, here is the sufficiently marked medieval attitude on display that a naked body, especially a female body, is not something noble, but something offensive and vulgar; such an attitude, developed logically from a Christian perspective, no longer has much to do with Christianity as it is generally preached today, because Christianity has long since recognized the mortification of the senses and the resulting declaration of the inferiority of the physical as nonsense.

Hardly any Protestant pastor—for Vollert is one—would wish to see the unhealthy scholastic ways of thinking of the Inquisition era resurrected. With this skewed attitude toward art, Mr. Vollert is likely to stand completely alone, for the overwhelming majority of the German people consider art to be the highest expression of cultural life and thus of the nation's will to eternity; is it so difficult to understand that art, as the most perfect object of its creative will, necessarily chooses the naked body, or, to remain in Christian terminology, the most perfect work of the Creator?

---

<sup>5</sup> Meaning “before the flood”, which means that the beliefs of these priests and monks are incomprehensibly old.

This brings us to the second argument - Pastor Vollert was ashamed and, to ease his conscience, staged a kind of private “auto-da-fé”<sup>6</sup>. Certainly, this heresy trial took place in his quiet hermitage, and the only victims of this highly embarrassing inquisition were two innocent pieces of paper; above all though, what is this, in essence, other than a small-scale witch burning, with exactly the same moralistic arrogance that the Pope's mass-murdering emissaries in Germany liked to engage in centuries ago?

We also have a third criticism of Pastor Vollert - his attack on public opinion takes the form of the strange assertion that art should not be allowed to fall into the hands of “simple folk” and children. What must be going on inside the mind of a person who sees something morally dangerous in a picture of ideal nudity, quite apart from the fact that the aforementioned restriction shows that Vollert clearly sees art as the privilege of a certain class?

Certainly, there will be some controversial elements in these representations, especially in modern art, despite the purge – does that mean we need to fear that schoolchildren will be corrupted when we take them to museums? Here, too, the saying “to the pure, all things are pure” applies – that, in a sense, refutes Vollert's accusations.

At the end of his letter, Pastor Vollert launches another fanfare of attack; he accuses the “Völkischer Beobachter” of promoting nudism, which shows that the letter writer has failed to recognize the deep inner connection between art and a worldview that affirms the body. Since we have expressly defended the right of art to depict the naked body, we must, for better or worse, also comment on the very delicate intellectual relationships that connect so-called “nudity culture” with art.

We have explained above that every life-affirming and energetic era must affirm the body as the healthy vehicle of all human experience; like no other since the time of the Greeks and Romans, our century has restored the physicality that had been stunted by the Middle Ages to its rightful place, and so it was no wonder that, in the course of this movement, isolated enthusiasts have overshot the mark.

Towards the end of the 1890s, a large number of communities, mostly organized as associations, sprang up, which, usually in strict seclusion, exaggerated the general demand of the time for physical culture by turning the tables and declaring nudity to be the only possible form of physical exercise; these peculiar prophets went so far as to declare, with the most solemn pathos of conviction, that this was the only way to successfully combat real immorality, for once one had become accustomed to the noble purity of “naked culture,” one would despise and avoid the bodily malfunctions caused by civilization.

The enthusiastic followers of this movement ultimately became so “dogmatic” that they believed swimming in swimsuits or bathing trunks to be an immoral act, because covering certain parts of the body was seen as defaming them as immoral; a view that was entirely logical and consistent, but whose consequences inevitably led to an intolerable exaggeration of the whole problem, with all these nude bathing clubs claiming to be patented world reformers, and, in the Weimar era, which provided fertile ground for all kinds of extreme special interests, the politically very left-wing associations of “sun worshippers” and similar organizations flourished merrily - it would be not only unfair but also wrong to hold the nationalist movement, which has always advocated a healthy view of these matters, responsible for what has happened in these circles.

Because of the mischief that the Marxists have wrought in this area, we must not throw the baby out with the bathwater and overlook what we consider to be the healthy core expressed in the views of the völkisch movement, which National Socialism fully recognizes. It is not for nothing that Caesar reports that the young men and women of the Germanic tribes bathed naked together in rivers; this custom is still

---

<sup>6</sup> A ritualized act of public penance, common in Spain during the Spanish Inquisition.

common in Scandinavia today, and no one finds anything offensive or even immoral about it - there must be a special reason, which is part of the peculiarity of our race, for this strong emphasis on physicality. Incidentally, in order to enjoy our healthy bodies, we do not need to engage in any "secret societies," as is still practiced in some cases today, because the whole matter is a private affair and everyone should ensure that they do not come into conflict with the laws of the state, because, as is well known, nude bathing is rightly prohibited wherever it can cause "public outrage," that is, offend those who think differently.

That is why we do not want a nudist culture like those organized groups that rave about sun and health, as they are often just sensationalist, decadent little gnomes who have turned what is essentially a good thing into a romantic gimmick; in contrast, we simply call for a strong and joyful affirmation of body awareness, because we need this to build a strong and conscious gender that is proud of its race's joy in worldliness; only then will future generations also meet the high standards in their outward appearance that were a matter of course for any civic evaluation in the time of the Greeks.

We are not prudish - just as a beautiful work of art can never offend our sense of modesty, so too the sight of a naked female body, especially if it is truly beautiful, will not upset our emotional balance. We instinctively sympathize with the Athenian judges who acquitted the beautiful Phryne, who was accused of allowing herself to be worshipped as Venus, when the defense attorney, who was also one of her worshippers, tore off her robe to present her impeccable, radiant beauty as an argument; we, too, believe that true beauty is something divine, and therefore always demands reverence and respect in all areas of life.

It may be that there are people who, when they see a naked body, must fundamentally rein in their dirty imaginations; we are not among them, nor do we try to lecture them, for they are corrupt at the core of their souls—any attempts to convince them would be like throwing pearls before swine.

### **A Word On Divorce**

Divorce has always been one of the most controversial issues in all legal codes - until now, ideological differences within parliaments have repeatedly stood in the way of a uniform solution; only where a state or movement is guided by a clear ideology have internally justified solutions been found.

The Catholic Church, for example, takes the position that marriage is indissoluble, on the grounds that it is ordained by God; it is not our intention to comment on this view in the context of these remarks, but incidentally, we will make our opinion clear enough. However, we would like to emphasize one thing here, namely that the position of the Catholic Church on this point has not always been uniform and consistent; rather, it is only in recent times that the development of ecclesiastical marriage law has moved toward this position.

Liberalism, on the other hand, sees marriage as the exact opposite, as the example of Soviet Russia teaches us; it treats marriage as a private contract that can be terminated at any time, with this termination only needing to be declared by one of the spouses. We must also reject this interpretation because it is based on a complete misunderstanding and disregard for the value of the family.

The National Socialist worldview, which is based on the principle of racial biology, has elevated the family to the primordial cell of the people:

*“Marriage can therefore no longer be an end in itself, but must serve the greater goal of the propagation and preservation of the species and race - that alone is its meaning and its task!”*

Our position must be derived from these words from Adolf Hitler in “Mein Kampf”; the Führer has thus expressed for the first time that marriage is not simply a state of being, but a representation of a task. The Family Law Committee of the Academy for German Law also adopts this position when it now provides a legal definition of marriage for the reform of divorce law - it proposes the following wording:

*“Marriage is the community of life recognized by the national community, based on mutual fidelity, love, and respect, between two persons of the same race, of the same hereditary health, and of different sexes, for the purpose of preserving and promoting the common good through harmonious cooperation and for the purpose of producing children of the same race and hereditary health, in order to raise them to be capable members of the national community.”*

It is clear that the National Socialist state, despite the importance it attaches to marriage, must also advocate the legalization of divorce, for it has already legally prohibited marriages that carry the seeds of decay (hereditary diseases, etc.); in doing so, it has blocked the path that those affected would probably have taken sooner or later to divorce.

Despite all these precautionary measures, however, there will always be marriages in which the conditions for a harmonious life together are permanently disrupted. This fact is related to the inadequacy of human cognitive powers - as long as we are unable to see into a person's innermost being, and as long as we are also unable to predict the future, nothing will change in this regard.

Since the National Socialist state attaches such great importance to marriage, it must—especially in view of the danger that a breakdown poses to the family and, beyond that, to the entire community—naturally continue to allow for the possibility of divorce; in doing so, it cannot, of course, simply adopt the wording of the Civil Code, but must redraft this law on the basis of its worldview.

Above all, honesty and an open and clear attitude will have to be emphasized once again.

It is a fact that in all divorce cases, absolute grounds for divorce are the quickest way to achieve desired outcome. Among these, adultery is the most common ground for divorce; we have statistics from 1933 which show that in one third of all divorced marriages, the divorce was granted on these grounds, and it is therefore reasonable to assume that some spouses were particularly keen to use this pretext in order to separate more quickly. Of course, this assumption cannot be proven, but there are enough known cases where adultery was directly fabricated and used as a pretext in order to achieve the desired result more quickly.

It would certainly be desirable if, before entering into marriage, the preconditions of a human and healthy nature were considered and examined as carefully as the Schutzstaffel demands of its men and their wives, but we cannot ignore the facts that otherwise exist: there are simply cases of misalliances in which spouses who are completely estranged from each other are simply forced to look for grounds for divorce in order to escape a bond that has become unbearable for them, and thus completely worthless for the national community. Although in our case internal processes are decisive for divorce, an external and materially verifiable reason must be found; according to the law currently in force, the breakdown of the marriage must also be culpable.

There is no need to explain further that such an approach is incompatible with the National Socialist attitude; for this reason, the Family Law Committee of the Academy for German Law has dealt with this point in particular detail in the reform of divorce law, and in doing so, it also examined the proposal for so-called “divorce by mutual consent”; this refers to divorce based on an agreement between both spouses.

This raises the question of whether a marriage should be dissolved solely on the basis that, although no external reason for the breakdown can be identified, both spouses are completely estranged emotionally and mentally and now both insist on divorcing - from a National Socialist point of view, such a regulation would still be preferable to the dishonest circumvention of the law by pretending adultery or by constructing another reason.

The Family Law Committee has two main objections to “divorce by mutual consent” - first, it points out the danger that decisions made hastily in the heat of the moment can destroy a marriage that is otherwise perfectly viable, and second, it believes that respect for marriage could be seriously undermined by the grounds for divorce based on mutual consent.

We have now had the opportunity to ask a man of practice, a well-known Berlin divorce judge, for his opinion on this point - he explained to us that he is very much in favor of divorce only upon mutual request; the objection that the decision is premature could be countered by suspending the judgment for a certain period of time—about six months—in order to determine whether the two spouses have acted rashly or whether the marriage is still viable. Last but not least, the judge pointed out that if both parties jointly file for divorce, there is undoubtedly a breakdown of the marriage and there is no need to look for reasons; if both spouses jointly file for divorce, it can be assumed that the marriage has become untenable. Of course, in such cases, the work of a divorce judge could never be limited to simply accepting the applications of the two spouses and, on that basis, granting the divorce, albeit with a waiting period; on the contrary, it should be his task to ascertain the unsustainability of the marriage by introducing himself to the situation (possibly with the assistance of medical advice). It should be clear to everyone that a marriage law drafted along these lines places far greater responsibility on the judge and makes much higher demands on him of an intellectual and emotional nature than is the case under current legislation. We do not consider the objection that such a regulation could undermine respect for marriage to be sufficiently valid, especially when the German mentality is taken into account in contrast to that of other peoples.

In the postwar years, such fears were probably justified - today, however, marriage is generally entered into under completely different circumstances; a man who adheres to the National Socialist worldview will certainly not enter into marriage more quickly if he knows that divorce legislation makes dissolution possible again. When a National Socialist marries today, he is fully aware of his responsibility; we also do not hesitate to assert that this will apply to every German citizen in twenty or thirty years.

The reference to reckless and superficial elements (which will always exist in a national community) does not seem valid to us, because, first of all, laws are not made solely for a numerically insignificant minority, and secondly, experience shows that these circles would prefer a “free union” that does not impose the inevitable obligations of a marital community on them.

Adolf Hitler once said that the struggle that began in 1933 is far from over - National Socialism is a doctrine of education of the people and also of education of oneself, of adaptation, of consideration, and of mutual assistance, which, passed on from generation to generation, will shape the community of the future in an ever more vibrant way.

We firmly believe that the more the National Socialist idea takes root in the hearts and minds of our people, the more the number of divorces will decline of its own accord; that is precisely why we need not fear any undermining of respect for marriage.

However, there will certainly always be cases of divorce that cannot be remedied by any educational measures: cases of inner alienation, which, as I said, cannot be foreseen and do not raise any questions of guilt; that is precisely why a way should be found to dissolve such a failed marriage cleanly and without ugly pretexts, especially since, until now, the economically weak have usually been at a disadvantage compared to the financially strong without the help of a costly specialist.

Ultimately, the state itself cannot have any interest in maintaining such a marriage - on the contrary, it should encourage the dissolution of such a bad marriage, which in most cases is childless, in order to give both spouses the opportunity to enter into a harmonious relationship with another partner that serves the interests of the state; since our case is only a bad marriage, the conditions for a happy remarriage are certainly in place.

However, the question becomes difficult when children are involved. The judge we interviewed repeatedly emphasized the unfavorable effect that divorce has on the development of children; the dangers of a one-sided upbringing for the emotional growth of children are extremely great in the event of a separation. Incidentally, the judge recounted many cases from his practice in which it was precisely the children who repeatedly acted as a link in the marriage; through them, the parents were much more inclined to ultimately come to an understanding. In many cases, as the judge emphasized, it all depends on personal and varying circumstances.

Of course, we must not overlook the downside and forget those unfortunate children who grew up in a parental home where the side effects of a broken marriage were part of their everyday experience from an early age; we can imagine that in some cases, for this reason, divorce would be advisable in the interests of the children. It is not possible to establish a standard here, but only to emphasize again and again that the demands that the state must place on divorce judges in terms of human qualities cannot be high enough, both in terms of character and knowledge.

We do not want to advocate easier divorce here, because we have seen enough examples in the Soviet Union of the conditions that can arise from it; on the contrary, precisely in view of the increased importance of marriage in the National Socialist state, we are even in favor of making it more difficult to separate, provided that it is sought for purely selfish reasons in order to shirk the fulfillment of assumed obligations. However, if the conditions for marriage in the National Socialist sense are not met, we want to be open and honest enough to find a way to make dissolution possible.

### **The Illegitimate Child**

Certain circles still tend to view illegitimate children as a “transgression” - it should be clear that we cannot subscribe to such a view. Above all, it is clerical circles that cannot get enough of trumpeting their moral judgments about “fallen” people with the tone of the most sacred conviction; this is, of course, related to these people's unworldly teachings about the afterlife, which fundamentally view the body as something sinful. Experience shows, however, that the customs and traditions in Catholic regions in particular contradict such narrow-minded views, as can be proven at any time.

Even farmers are generally not thrilled when their unmarried daughters announce the arrival of a new mouth to feed, which is understandable given that they'd be considered a surprise in the family; however, in rural areas, people tend to come to terms with this fact much more quickly and naturally than in the city, for example, out of a healthy idea of common sense; in the various valleys of Tyrol, this even goes so far that girls who do not have children out of wedlock find it difficult to find a husband, because childlessness is instinctively assumed to be a sign of female infertility.

Things are far more complicated in the city - we do not want to go into the various individual cases here in which inferior mothers—often addicted to alcohol—prostitutes, nymphomaniacs, etc., are used by men and whose offspring in institutions for the mentally retarded bear witness to the necessity of purposeful eugenics; despite this, the danger to the general welfare of the people must be considered far greater from the offspring of such legitimate unions, as no one would think of placing the sad results of such marriages on the same level as genetically healthy but illegitimate children.

From this point of view, the inevitable conclusion is that children born of a legally valid marriage cannot automatically be placed above illegitimate children in terms of hereditary biology.

It is not only the illegitimate child who is looked down upon by some social classes, but, above all, it is the illegitimate mother who is frowned upon by the narrow-minded average person; now, however, everyone can see for themselves that it is precisely those women who make a profession out of extramarital sex, and there are others who are in the same situation and who almost never conceive because they have the necessary experience and technique to prevent it; these types of women, in all their variations, therefore have no more right to be held in higher esteem because they do not have children than a young woman who, perhaps in the genuine passion of first love and devotion and in ignorance of these "various means," gives birth to a child.

Nowhere is the problem of illegitimate children more striking than in the big city, where hundreds of thousands of people live crowded together in a small space.

Here, the question of children born out of wedlock is primarily a social issue - as recent history teaches us, no political system has been able to solve this social problem, and so it will also be the task of National Socialism, without devaluing marriage, to give illegitimate children the position in the national community that they deserve.

None of the social reforms to date have been able to unite the "classes" into a community; on the contrary, the communists and democrats before 1933 thrived on creating ever greater divisions between the different social classes, with the term "declassed," which also included illegitimate children, originating during this period.

In our national community, this untenable situation cannot be allowed to continue, for above all else the future survival of the people, which, despite the rising birth rate, is still not so guaranteed; we cannot afford to do without the offspring of illegitimate children.

This is not to advocate extramarital intercourse and its consequences of course, but it is certain that raising the social status of illegitimate children is a huge step toward curbing the various violations of the abortion law, which have cost the German people a considerable loss of births and numerous gynecological diseases.

An objection often raised against illegitimate children is that they play a significant role in police statistics; in most, if not almost all, cases, this is likely to be related to the fact that many illegitimate mothers are employed and, for financial reasons, are unable to devote the necessary care to raising their

children. The mother is part of the child - neither the woman's parents, nor the man's parents, nor even the biological father can replace the mother. Even if the child is taken in by the grandparents with all due care, in ninety out of a hundred cases they will be spoiled and pampered, and they will ultimately always see their own mother as a woman who does not give in to it for educational reasons and is therefore "strict"; the same objection can of course be made with good reason in the absence of the father in the child's upbringing.

This brings us to the most sensitive, but also the most realistic aspect of the problem: how can we ensure that illegitimate children receive a careful upbringing? This is primarily a question of financial support; it is not only a matter of course, but also the moral duty of the father to provide for his child if he does not marry the child's mother.

Today, no measures can be taken that are strong enough to protect the mother of an illegitimate child in every respect by law and to secure her financially; however one looks at the matter, we have no moral right to deny respect to the illegitimate child and the mother and assign them a secondary role in the community.

The primary goal of our efforts must be to make marriage possible in such cases by providing financial support; a second possibility for raising an illegitimate child to become a full member of the community is through adoption, though this will only be an option in cases where the mother is willing to place her child in good hands because she herself realizes that it is impossible for her to raise them on her own.

### **The Risk of Faith**

It is not always an ill will and an unwillingness to understand that make it impossible for many foreigners to do justice to the new Germany - the more our people reflect on their own character and consciously return to the sources of their ethnic strength, the more difficult it becomes for outsiders to truly understand all the new developments that are becoming more prevalent every day within the borders of the German Reich.

In most cases, it is false assumptions that are used to approach National Socialism from the outset; some see it merely as an economic program, while others envision a "general renewal" without the concept of an emerging worldview, exposing their own lack of clarity. When one speaks of National Socialism in terms of a worldview, one often encounters a smile that is half pitying, half superior - it seems to say, "Why so presumptuous?" Therein precisely lies the difficulty:

One could talk to this person for hours and try with all one's might to convince them, but success would rarely be significant, because what is at stake here is difficult to put into words - it is not hair-splitting, not a dispute about dogma, but the cardinal question of faith that is at stake, where ultimately the heart and not the mind is the deciding factor.

Proving it is also a delicate matter, because we are not dealing here with the solution to a mathematical problem, but with processes that are anchored in the mystery of life itself; that is why we cannot agree with the well-meaning French professor who wrote about the development of the German birth rate after 1933:

*"A few clever measures were enough to bring it up; they prove that the legislature is capable of much more in this regard than I would have thought possible."*

This statement is both correct and incorrect - it characterizes the situation insofar as "clever measures" created the necessary economic conditions for many people to marry, and thus for the birth rate to rise. Would that alone have guaranteed success?

We doubt it - even if the improved social situation finally enabled some people to start a family, this would only have been a temporary boost, which bears no relation to the fact that the slow recovery in Germany's demographic development is continuing.

Some will come and say that propaganda is to blame! Propaganda? Propaganda is undoubtedly a necessity, especially when the existence of the people is at stake, but isn't it attaching too much importance to it to believe that it and economic measures alone are the reason why thousands more children have been born in Germany in the last three years than usual?

"Germania" saves us the trouble of pursuing these lines of thought further - in a Sunday supplement, it writes:

*"Today, and for many years now, there has been frequent talk of the 'risk of faith'; I myself can hardly think of a more beautiful example of this faith than the procreation of children, as this is the deepest proof of religious confidence in the earthly realm."*

We agree wholeheartedly, and thus we inevitably come to a conclusion that we already hinted at in a previous issue of "Schwarze Korps" in the essay "Eine glaubenslose Zeit?" (A Time Without Faith?).

If, then, the visible success of faith, which in this case is expressed in the birth rate, is so great, how strongly must faith have taken root once again in the German people, even when economic factors are taken into account?

The question remains as to the nature of this faith that begets life - in this regard, however, we cannot agree with "Germania", which naturally claims that it is of a religious-Christian character. Where are the signs—we deliberately speak of evidence—that allow such a conclusion to be drawn?

We recently demonstrated on the basis of impeccable statistical material that the claim, made by Catholic circles in particular, that the Christian religion is an asset in population policy is not only no longer true but, applied to today's circumstances, is a direct fallacy because of the non-Catholic provinces of East Prussia, Oldenburg, Pomerania, and Mecklenburg.

Even if the sober figures were missing, however, "Germania"'s insight is simply incomprehensible, for the paper surely does not want to claim that the appeal of the Catholic idea in Germany after January 30th, 1933, has increased in the same sense as the population policy figures have skyrocketed; after all, that would be the necessary prerequisite for the validity of the assertion that the "risk of faith" manifested in the procreation of children is of a religious-Christian nature (Christian and Catholic are equated in this case because Protestantism hardly plays a role in this context, which hardly needs to be discussed).

Anyone who feels compelled to distrust the official German surveys should refer to the example of the "Christian State" (Vienna), where they will find the picture we have painted – albeit in a far more bleak form. Just recently, the Viennese "Reichspost" addressed the problem of the declining birth rate in Austria and its devastating consequences in an editorial entitled "Der Volksraub" (The Robbery of the People). The paper writes, for example, about Vienna:

*"In 1910/11, there were still 70.9 births per 1,000 women aged 16 to 49, but by 1933/34 this figure had fallen to only 19.9; whereas at that time there were an average of 15 births per 10 marriages, today this figure has fallen to 7. The number of births fell from 15,136 in 1931 to 10,620 in the short period up to 1935; the devastation that is taking place here becomes even clearer when one considers the fact that in 1910/11 there were still 21.9 births per 1,000 inhabitants on average, that this figure had already fallen to 16.4 in 1922/23, and that in 1933/34 it was only 6.4 - the birth surplus of 4.5 per 1,000 inhabitants that was still recorded in 1910/11 has now turned into a birth deficit of over 6 per thousand."*

It then goes on to say:

*"Yes, it is high time; if the current situation were to continue and natural population growth were not to decline at the current rate, assuming today's fertility rate and maintaining the current housing density per apartment, in six decades the area between the Danube Canal and the beltway would meet the needs of the Viennese; the Second District and Districts Ten to Twenty-One would already be superfluous construction projects created for the needs of an extinct generation."*

This is the situation in Austria, a decidedly Catholic country that is not unjustifiably referred to as the second Papal States; we search in vain here for signs of that theory of the "risk of faith" that seeks its focus in the Christian world of ideas; even taking into account the economic hardship, the complete groundlessness of this thesis put forward by "Germania" is clearly evident.

If, on the other hand, we look for reasons for the improvement in demographic conditions in Germany, we cannot ignore the general causes of the rise of the Reich and thus inevitably come back to National Socialism, which, as the sole supporter of the political order, deserves credit for having saved our people from the imminent dangers of collapse at its final hour.

Furthermore, what "Germania" describes as a "risk of faith" and cites as the deepest reason for the rise in the birth rate is also entirely true; the objection of certain religious circles, which claim that National Socialism is hostile to religion, or rather irreligious, thus refutes itself. We, too, see in the conception of children a fine example of the risk of faith, as "Germania" does; the fact that this "risk of faith" is no longer a rarity in Germany today, but belongs to the essence of the people, is solely due to National Socialism, which has restored confidence to the individual.

There is no need to be narrow-minded here and think only of the material side, whose successes cannot be doubted even by Christian circles; more important for us is the realization of the idea, as it is also visible in the population statistics. More than the economic conditions, these statistics say something about faith in Germany, about that faith which is directed toward eternity, not toward the hereafter, which finds its fulfillment in the everlasting succession of generations.

### **Austria, Awaken!**

The Catholic central organ, "Germania", has indirectly claimed that the rise in the birth rate in Germany was the positive effect of Christian teaching; we disagreed and explained that, on closer inspection, this thesis is completely unfounded, because practice unfortunately shows the opposite.

In our opinion, one can certainly speak of having children as a "risk of faith", but in a different sense than "Germania" did; when we cited the rapid decline in births in Austria as a negative example, this was the

most compelling evidence against “Germania”'s view. Now, there may well be some very cautious and skeptical people who feel they must mistrust us - to them we say (and you can inquire about this at the Ballhausplatz) that the January 21st, 1937, issue of the “Linzer Tagespost” was confiscated because it published an essay under the headline “Warning from a Country Doctor” that fully confirms our statements.

After discussing the decline in births, the one-child system, etc., and concluding that Austria, in its current state of development, is a nation dying according to mathematical laws, the author then writes:

*"Can we stand idly by and watch our nation die; do we not have a duty to ward off the death of our own people, even if it means making a final and fanatical effort? There is no doubt that we have this duty; I am of the opinion that legal measures will not change the problem of declining birth rates and childlessness. A people that does not want to give birth cannot be forced to do so; the effective measures announced by the legislature to protect nascent life will increase caution, tariffs, and perhaps also unscrupulousness in the treatment of unwillingness to give birth - I do not expect anything more from them, i.e., an increase in population.*

*The doctor, who has grown gray while working in the country, has his ear to the heart of the people; he hears more than the others, and so he also knows the main cause of the epidemic of declining birth rates. But it is not easy to say aloud - one can already hear the accusations: pessimism, illegal propaganda, etc. If the duty to leave no stone unturned in order to avert the death of the nation did not weigh heavily on every clear-sighted person, one would sensibly keep quiet.*

*Anyone who has seen a generation grow up in a small town knows that the old mothers still have their children with them, even if they are already in their thirties - the boy has learned a trade, is skilled and hard-working, and if times were not so terrible, he could be a master craftsman, have a slender mistress and a bunch of children around him. The old mother could be supported, could...could! Instead, however, the strong lad has to live off his old mother because he can't find work, and she has to cut back on her meager pension soup.*

*This turns the lad into a brooder, a dreamer, and finally a politician, and when he hears that things are looking up in the new Austria, he doesn't believe it; even if irrefutable evidence of his fatherland's economic rise and political prestige is there in black and white before him, he doesn't believe it. The people have lost faith in their own future - a lost faith is usually irretrievable. In this regard, it doesn't matter who you talk to, whether it's a craftsman, a farmer, or an unemployed person: 'It's getting dumber and dumber' is the final word of wisdom you hear everywhere. Are people in this state of mind supposed to have children?*

*'Those who are here now have no work and no place to live - what will become of those who are yet to be born?' The answer then comes: 'It is easy to bring children into the world, but it's irresponsible when you see that they can't find a place to live' - this or something similar is what you hear when no clergyman or policeman is listening; it is mainly the women who say this, even though they are the ones who are primarily concerned with the question of childbirth.*

*The deepest cause of the childlessness of our time is the loss of faith in the future of our fatherland - it is unwise to refuse to acknowledge this.*

*Is it possible to eliminate the cause of the disease and thus create the conditions for curing the disease of declining birth rates? I say yes.*

*The faith in the future of our fatherland will be restored to the extent that confidence in the correctness of the path to the future gains ground; the blessing of children will show, without many words or gestures of agreement, whether the German people in Austria have gained the confidence that they are being led into a future in which they believe, and can even see, that their children will one day have a good life.*

*Children come with this belief because it has always been easier to conceive children than to prevent them; human beings are such that they only place their full trust in things in which they have a spiritual interest. People want to be co-creators when it comes to building a future for their children - a house built by others will not make them happy, will not interest them, and above all, they will not give it their soul; it will be alien and indifferent to them. But who would deny that the fatherland is the home of our children in the future?*

*In this context, the idea of positively satisfying Austria has fateful significance for the political problem of the declining birth rate. I reject the accusation that this is far-fetched: only if we succeed in convincing the internal opposition within the state, which no reasonable person will deny exists, that the path we have chosen for Austria's future is the right one, will the cooperation of this opposition become internal and joyful; only on this basis of joint work toward a lofty goal can that general confidence in the correctness of the path grow, which alone guarantees belief in a better future - the outward sign of this belief, however, is the blessing of children of the German people in Austria.*

*I said that the internal opposition within the state must be convinced; the word 'convince' is the most essential part of that sentence. But one can only convince with the priestly component of understanding and healing medicine, and never with plastic logic.*

*As a person of the times, one should also refrain from mentioning the other cause of the decline in births in Austria; if one does so, one is easily labeled an antichrist and a Bolshevik - but it must be done! Christian doctrine prohibits any birth control under the threat of severe punishment in the afterlife - now, all external signs indicate that Christianity and Catholicism in Austria have experienced a tremendous upswing since the defeat of Marxism; the leadership of the state is exclusively in Catholic hands, the Christian character of the state is emphatically emphasized, and Catholic associations are experiencing an unprecedented heyday. Considering all this, one would assume that the death of the unborn and the prevention of pregnancy, as contrary to the commandments of the Church, would be disappearing - but official reports tell a different story. How can this apparent contradiction be explained? The old country doctor knows all too well:*

*Religion has lost its inner meaning, at least as far as the broad masses of the people are concerned; the practice of religion has become an outward formality and a habit.*

*People go to church because they have always done so, because it has been the custom since time immemorial, and because they would stand out if they did not; people go to the sacraments because the pastor, with whom they want to be on good terms, repeatedly urges them to do so, and likes to see them do so; only a few go to church and to the confessional according to the dictates of their hearts in their need for a closeness to God.*

*Christianity now has much more power over the outer man, but it no longer has any influence on the inner man. The Church's eternal condemnation of birth control falls on deaf ears: 'It's easy for the pastor to talk, he should try it himself' is the recurring refrain when the faithful warning is given about birth control.*

*One sees men in positions of trust in the state and the Church emphasizing their Catholicism almost pathologically, who have a practical wife at home who is just made for bearing children. But the*

*children? - one spoiled and pampered child, but only one. One cannot help thinking that this Catholic woman, when she receives the Savior in the sacrament in the morning, cheats on him in bed in the evening, and that her husband's Christianity is nothing but rhetoric, calculation, or hypocrisy, because otherwise his living room would have been filled with the noise of children.*

*The second major cause of the disease of our time, the decline in births, is thus clear to us: the teachings of Christ no longer have power over the inner man. Will there be a therapeutic measure, a treatment option, for this very powerful cause of disease? I confess with resignation that I do not believe so. If the Church, at a time when it has the state with all its means of power as an unconditional ally, does not succeed in winning over the inner man so that he subordinates his sexual nature to it, then it will never be able to do so again, and the religious idea will no longer be able to raise the birth rate among our people.*

*No, I believe there is only one means left to curb the appalling epidemic of declining birth rates in Austria—the national, the ethnic idea: the Germans in Austria must not die the death of childlessness, because otherwise their beautiful homeland, with its snow-capped mountains and lakes, its vineyards and deep forests, its countless monuments, its thoroughly German character, would become an empty space into which the Czechs and Slovenes, the Hungarians and Italians would then have to pour in according to the laws of physics.*

*They must not have our homeland - it must remain German forever! I wish this idea had a herald with a burning heart and powerful language: our children must once again fill the streets with noise so that the country remains German into the distant future, whatever it may bring!"*

This essay by an Austrian country doctor speaks for itself; to add anything to it would be to weaken its effect. This effect, which we see as something absolutely positive, can be prevented by prohibiting any enlightenment.

But does that really achieve what was intended - do we seriously believe that by remaining silent, by refusing to see, and by desperately burying our heads in the sand, we can eliminate facts that are, after all, a sad reality? The precisely calculable number of stillbirths in Austria continues to rise; certain circles still refuse to take notice of it, but there is no getting around this crucial issue. The sooner we recognize its significance for the future, the better - we can only hope that this will happen soon.

Austria, awaken - awaken before it's too late!

### **Power and Heart**

The trinity of body, mind, and soul is united in living harmony within a healthy person; however, these three entities, which are completely equal in our view, can also be evaluated differently, which has repeatedly happened throughout history to the detriment of us human beings.

A well-known example of this is the medieval ecclesiastical viewpoint, which sought to do justice only to the so-called soul, thus luring people away from this world into otherworldly spheres where the needs of the body are no longer understood; we also know of tendencies that saw only the spirit, the "Golden Ratio", which thus reduced everything to pure mechanics, or soulless causality. These one-sided and false attitudes are pathological because they fly in the face of healthy reality - a view that does not keep pace with reality and ultimately does not correspond with it is both alien and hostile to life.

Here, it is also fair to mention an overemphasis on the “spiritual” side with regards to the national principle - if liberalism previously emphasized only the material, then it is ultimately a mistake in the same direction to see only the ideological and what one imagines about it as a reaction against liberalism; in this case, the ethnic reality, the concept of race, and our anchor point in this world become an insubstantial illusion, replaced by a metaphysical or scholastic analysis of the people, enthusiastic speculations, and a mystical distortion of ethnic reality.

We see this “ethnic” mysticism at work here and there; its representatives are pedantic and intolerant like medieval Dominicans, with their ideas revolving around “Weistum,”<sup>7</sup> runic gymnastics, and mysterious tortuous magicks; they gather in sects and believe that by fighting other priests they themselves have an alibi. These people hate clear formulations - for them, science and economics are purely liberalistic fields and inventions of the devil.

Nationalism is committed to an ethnic reality, and it emphasizes the primacy of the worldview without neglecting the other entities of our existence.

The division of human totality and the isolation of the physical, mental, and spiritual realms has also found expression in the state; not only has the individual gone astray, and not only has the ethnic substance been violated, but the form of government and the systems of rule have also repeatedly failed to achieve genuine harmony - thus it came about that art was taken to heart while the necessities of power politics were neglected, and that power that did exist there was without those spiritual and emotional values that belong to true humanity.

This is especially true for Germany; it is here that power and spirit, power and soul, have hardly found each other - thus, it is here that art went its own way and power went another. The reason for the decline of both areas ultimately lies in this enmity or alienation - art cannot flourish permanently without state power, and a state must become rigid and reactionary if its spirit and soul does not guarantee its inner life. We have outgrown the ideal of a merely powerful state apparatus, because today the entire people stand behind the state, and with them the spirit and soul of the nation; that is why German spirituality no longer develops without a positive relationship to power, and that is why it no longer runs the risk of falling into the hands of the Jews, as it did in the past - the state no longer sees the spirit as something fundamentally hostile, undesirable, and impermissible, as it did in the past, but as an expression of the nation's life.

Our task is to create the synthesis of power and spirit that has long since been created elsewhere. In many cases, art found a home only among the small but powerful elite, while the great masses often passed it by; that is why it is necessary to bring power and spirit into step with each other. Added to this are those spiritual substances of which the German people have an abundance - thus, the deepest problem is not only the harmony of power and the spirit, but the eternal synthesis of power and the heart.

To connect these entities with one another, and to keep them in an everlasting union, is one of the highest tasks facing the people today; in this way, power will never become rigid or a facade, but always in harmony with the German people; meanwhile, the German soul will increasingly come to self-reflection and be freed from all foreign temptations and enthusiasms, because it will have reality as its starting point - only then will the body, the mind and the soul regard the highest reality that exists on this earth as its goal: a happy people and its continued existence.

---

<sup>7</sup> A term used for rules that were created in rural communities through local customs.

#### **IV. Common Sense**

##### **Dangerous Confusions**

There are people who, whenever they don't understand a conversation or a written text, are quick to use the buzzword "intellectual"; if you then ask what is meant by "intellectual," you usually get the most contradictory and bizarre answers.

Sometimes this term, intended as an insult, is understood to mean that exaggerated sphere of sophistry that belonged to a bygone era, whose essential element of thought was a juggling, fraying analysis; other times, the term is used to disparage all higher intellectual functions in general in order to draw a line between manual laborers and intellectual workers, which would be highly inappropriate today; the latter interpretation of the word "intellectual" also clearly originates from Marxist vocabulary and was coined at the time to brand the antithesis of that notorious "proletarian thinking."

Dr. Goebbels once explained, with desirable clarity, that although he did not consider himself an "intellectual," he did claim to be intelligent.

What then is the reality of this definition, since both words come from the same root but are clearly evaluated differently in today's usage? As is always the case with once-established terms that have been debased to buzzwords through overly frequent and cheap use, their meaning subsequently fluctuates - intelligence, that most noble virtue of the mind, thus apparently has two different effects according to today's perception, one constructive and one destructive.

Nothing is more understandable than the fact that, in a time that has broken with the past and is now beginning to build a new world, any force that runs counter to this creative will is decisively rejected - hence the clear commitment of the present to all constructive forces of the mind and the equally clear rejection of all destructive ones! But here there is also a catch - not everyone is able to decide for themselves which intellectual activities of an analytical nature are productive, and therefore useful, and which are negative and therefore harmful; this is particularly true in the difficult field of criticism, which is by no means always inhibiting or even harmful, as some worriers would have us believe.

Any human work that aims to have an effect in the present is subject to the judgment of those affected by it; only if it finds the voluntary approval of those it is intended to serve will it be able to endure. The judgment of history, which alone has the power to decide the value of human achievements, is already being formed in the present - the opinion of contemporaries determines whether what is intended remains an imposed utopia or becomes truly alive.

Given the importance of each individual's critical assessment of the events of their time, it is of fundamental importance that the intellectual basis of this critical recognition rests on sound premises; only when the individual—for it is always and only the individual who is capable of critical assessment—starts from a sound basic attitude will the decisive force, intelligence, have a constructive and creative effect.

That useless, pathological exposure of physical and mental processes that characterized the spirituality of the postwar period must therefore be rejected by us for the simple reason that it did not originate from a healthy, natural and nature-loving type of person, but by the kind of overexcited city dwellers who were prematurely worn out by highly developed civilization, and who judged all phenomena in the world solely on the basis of their sensational contents - for example, post-war journalism, with its greed for ever new stimuli, had created an atmosphere whose poverty of intellectual content was simply unsurpassable, and which therefore favored exaggerations, especially in the spiritual realm, as a surrogate for real content. Certainly, there may still be people today who, due to their upbringing and habituation, remain stuck in this pseudo-intellectual sphere, and whose intelligence therefore operates exclusively in the negative—in

the understanding rejection of all those spiritual phenomena that are now beginning to grow naturally and simply on a healthy basis. But it is not these remnants of a bygone era that we mean, but a much more dangerous breed of contemporaries! Those who believe that primitiveness means health and poverty means simplicity are a much greater danger to our cultural and political life. Let us not misunderstand the prerequisites of the intellectual life of our century, which, of course, in all its manifestations presupposes a long, centuries-old development, also in terms of consciousness - just as education and knowledge are necessary in order to correctly recognize the inner laws of today's events, only intelligent people will be able to take an independent position on the events that surround them.

In times of social upheaval, such as the French Revolution, these upheavals have always produced a veritable inflation of concepts - cheap slogans reign supreme here, and faster than one might think, they become hollow phrases devoid of any independently perceived content; this applies not only to politics, where it is a phenomenon known to every historian as inevitable, but also to all other areas of the mind that are affected by the collective impact of the present, whatever form it may take.

The only force that can effectively prevent this decline of intellectual values into powerlessness and stupidity is the alert intelligence and common sense of those classes which, according to their healthy instincts and sound judgment, are destined to provide intellectual leadership for the nation - nothing is more necessary than an alert and trained intellect to prevent the values we have fought to establish from being devalued by ignorance and folly.

### **Experts – or Characters**

The inner, uncreative formlessness of the Wilhelmine era inevitably led to a collapse that—like that formlessness—was spread to all areas of national life. The World War was merely an external framework for this inner, moral, and spiritual collapse, accelerating the dissolution of all forms of order - it was not the end, however, but rather the beginning of a new era.

The faithless, isolated, half-hearted, ossified and spiritually depleted forces of the German nation saw its sunset as its own turning point; despite all later corrections, they abandoned their flag, capitulated to the underworld, surrendered, and were prepared to burn what they had previously worshipped in sackcloth and ashes for their own personal well-being.

Many who were once “paladins for throne and altar,” who were supposedly willing to fall “fighting on the steps of the throne” for supposed ideals, sat down at a table with traitors and high treasoners who had previously denounced them; meanwhile, the “anti-national left”, led by Jews, betrayed the future of the nation, while the “national right” denied the past and created the political, social, intellectual and ‘moral’ conditions for the spread of “political entrepreneurship.”

It is necessary to remember this time of great betrayal, not because we want to “reopen a wound that has just healed” – as those who were not entirely innocent in the existence of this wound now so nicely put it – but because it is a historical process that has played a decisive role at all times.

Whenever a death-defying minority of convinced fanatics had created a new political order through their selfless personal commitment, it was surprisingly those who had previously avoided, despised, and exploited those in the trenches who were at the forefront of this revolution - they came in busy

complacency and made themselves “available for the great task”; they took the hand of reconciliation offered by the heroic, magnanimous minority fighting only for the cause, only to almost crush it in their “oath of allegiance” - their “loyalty” was determined by their personal interest.

Just as they had tried to make policy “in the spirit of our Führer” in recent years, gesticulating wildly in offices, on the streets, and in public squares, so they had also tried in the age of the French Revolution to water down, stifle, or at least de-popularize figures like Cromwell, along with all the great men of history and their revolutionary aspirations.

The National Socialist German Workers' Party has never had any reason to fear for its ultimate success - at those times when it was embroiled in serious internal conflicts, when profound crises threatened to shake its foundations, it held high its banner and carried it victoriously into the enemy camp; it did not lose its will, its pride, its unshakeable stance, its tenacious resilience, and its heroic spirit, even when those who had hitherto been prominent external figures in the struggle went astray and withdrew.

The National Socialist German Workers' Party, that is, strictly speaking, each of its members, has the historical right to the state, having proven the resounding power of its worldview through action at a time when the all-too-many stood by with incredulous smiles, when some of these unbelievers threw pebbles and stones at its flag.

With somnambulistic certainty, and accompanied by the fanatical dedication of its followers, imbued and convinced to the very core of the necessity and inner righteousness of its struggle, it walked a lonely but nonetheless proud path.

Now her political revolution has reached a major milestone - there is still much to be done in terms of establishing new values in terms of attitude and character, and in terms of organization and propaganda within the new national community, we by no means mean to overlook this; however, those among the all too many who quietly anticipated an “inner collapse,” some kind of “factional rebellion,” or even a “crisis of state,” will have to put away these secret wishes of a liberal worldview after the announcement of universal conscription and the internal stabilization of the state in recent years.

It is obvious that the new Reich has been anchored by those forces that brought the party from the anonymity of an unhistorical minority to the forefront of European politics; it is only natural and, as the expression of internal stability, the decisions of the Führer, who map the path of the party and the state, has found the most lively response among those who, at the time, found their way to Hitler and thus to the creation of a new statehood from a primitive background and against the backdrop of an overshadowed intellectualism. The old guard remains the eternally young hope of the party - this not only can be, but must be so.

The “intellectual interpreters” of National Socialism, the many “experts,” the masses of “ready-to-use specialists” are somehow necessary yesterday as well as today; however, they are not and can never be decisive, not only because the “experts” were also there yesterday and, in their ignorance or thoughtlessness, surrendered their power to the enemy of the state, or because they would also be there again if National Socialism could perhaps one day be supplanted by another force, but because the inner strength of these experts, because their character, soul, moral and thus truly creative significance — insofar as one can speak of such a thing at all — is far from having any positive value for the future in itself, and therefore does not represent a secure guarantee for the nation.

Thus, without any personal intervention, the struggle for the final shaping of things remains to those parts of the old guard who, in the course of this struggle, will prove that they belong to the elite, that they are truly the elite! The question of the elite will therefore be answered not by the “intellectual,” but by one’s

character - one day, the question will not be whether someone “was there,” but whether, since it was still a confession of the heart, he was there and how he was there.

If the “Third Reich” is to grow from a concept into a political reality, it will be necessary to measure by standards that too many people are often too quick to assume we have long since forgotten in the hustle and bustle of everyday life.

While contemporaries who have remained liberal at heart are “debunking” the new Reich that we have created, and while so-called “historians” are examining the intellectual foundations of National Socialism and making comparative observations about the value and worthlessness of our methods of struggle, an elite group, most of whom are still nameless today, is increasingly asserting itself in all areas and in all organizations of our political life; it goes without saying that the personal abilities and technical skills of the individual play an important role here, for National Socialism has always propagated the principle of merit; the principle of merit prevents the party membership book from becoming a blank check for bunglers and slackers.

Just as the party saved the Reich while others were still talking, so, when all-too-many believe that they have settled into this new Reich, they will one day be replaced by this select group, a generation of old and young fighters who carry the pure image of the National Socialist worldview in their passionate hearts, and who, as the followers of the Führer, will be needed as the shock troops of coming conflicts.

### **No Unnecessary Harshness!**

Today, it is no longer necessary to prove that no other government in the world is as deeply rooted in the people as our National Socialist government. The great referendums of recent years have proven with unbeatable clarity that Adolf Hitler's policies are the policies of the German people; every foreign visitor to the Olympic Games in Berlin has been able to see that enthusiasm in Germany is not generated by any kind of propaganda, but that the enthusiasm for the Führer and his most loyal followers comes from the hearts of millions, and that there is no statesman in the world who is loved by his people to such an extent. Those who refuse to believe this – and there are still quite a few of them in the world – simply do not want to see it, out of hatred, envy, and other such “noble” motives.

Today, it is no longer necessary to list the successes of the National Socialist government individually and thus prove how much everything has improved compared to the past; the situation that prevailed in Germany until January 1933 has been so thoroughly overcome by all Germans today that it takes a great deal of imagination to reconstruct that time in its entirety; despite this, the opponents of National Socialist Germany elsewhere in the world relieve us of the effort of mustering such imagination by showing us once again, in their own way, what we ourselves have gone through.

We National Socialists are not complacent enough to be unaware of the enormous amount of work that still lies ahead of us, and we are not complacent enough to see everything that exists in Germany today in the most rosy light. We are grateful to our opponents in the world for demonstrating to us how much we have already achieved - we can see for ourselves what still needs to be done.

It is no longer necessary to explain to individual Germans how National Socialist reconstruction has affected them, for they feel it every day in their own sphere of influence, in the small world in which they live; what is more, they feel that they are part of a nation that has found itself again, that has regained its strength, and both wants to move forward and is moving forward; this awareness, which fills everyone

again and again and spurs them on to new achievements, despite all the dross and shadows that still remain, is the German miracle that the world is talking about today, which has also found expression in the unexpected results of the Olympic Games.

It is no longer necessary to collect trivialities - what is necessary, however, is never to forget what has given us National Socialists success from the very first day of our struggle. We have never been content with what we already had; we were never complacent, but always focused on the future; we did not want to solely conquer the minds, but also the hearts and souls of our fellow citizens. The state we are building should be anchored in the heart of every last citizen, just as the will to victory was anchored in the heart of every last fighter in the movement - not only anchored today or tomorrow, but anchored for all time. Every day that we forget this goal is a step backward, not forward.

It is no longer necessary to prove that the National Socialist state is a state of the people; what is necessary, however, is to secure the state and National Socialism in the hearts of the people and of each individual member of the people every day anew, for in our meetings, we not only crushed the enemy's terror when it mattered, but we also tried—and this was our primary goal—in each of our meetings to win over the Marxist worker and the selfish citizen to what fulfilled us.

When it comes down to it, the National Socialist state is a state of harshness - today, the enemy of the state is more than that, because he is also an enemy of the people; the state and the people can no longer be separated. When it was necessary to secure the state after the seizure of power, when communism tried to play its game here and there, the Malicious Acts Act was created, which, with its Sections 1 and 2, made it possible to take harsh action; no state can do without harshness if it does not want to become a plaything of opposing forces.

However, the state is not merely secured by bayonets or defensive laws, as the emigrants and other agitators would like to portray it as if these were the sole sources of power in National Socialist Germany. When the Führer travels through Berlin, through Munich, through the Bavarian mountains or through any other German district, it becomes clear once again where the real source of our power lies: in the heart of the people.

There are complainers of course; there always have been and always will be; there are people who, when the problem of unemployment is solved, ask why the wage issue is not also resolved, for example. But not everyone who complains is an enemy of the state - grumpy temperaments should, as far as possible, be taken with some humor rather than completely seriously.

There have always been regulars' tables that thrived on rumors and whispers of some strange news; it would be too much of an honor for this type of person to see the state endangered by their very existence. Political jokes have always been made; often they are the same jokes that were told in the past, with different names and different circumstances, but always with the same punchline. If they are good, they are merely an expression of the popularity of the person they are told about, even if they gloss over some character trait; if they are bad, they only speak against the person telling them.

The people have an instinct for real humor, but not everyone who reveals such a lack of taste that they spread a bad political joke can be counted among serious political criminals, though Sections 1 and 2 of the Malicious Acts Act, if interpreted broadly, can be applied to almost every joke, every complaint, and every rumor.

Harsh measures should only be used when they are really necessary, such as things that can't be dealt with humorously; rumors that can be dispelled by appropriate public information should not be turned into major state actions by prosecuting their propagators—the actual originators are usually not found anyway.

For example, who hadn't heard the rumor that Elly Beinhorn, the famous German aviator, had been shot? This spreads from the émigré press, which someone has read on a trip abroad, to the Reich; the first person to hear it may still tell it as a typical example of how lies are spread abroad, but by the tenth person, it has already become something completely different.

One should compile precise statistics on how many accusations are made on the basis of denunciation and personal vendettas - someone at the card table tells a politically incorrect joke, just to show off his knowledge, and everyone takes note of it without objection; afterwards, an argument arises about who has to pay for the round or for some other personal reason, and now the other person is targeted for a form of petty revenge - and just like that, the “public enemy” is ready. When questioned by the police before charges are brought, the party concerned naturally wants to answer in such a way that it does not appear as if he had understood what the joke meant; now the report states – in the case of a construction worker, for example – that the one who told the joke “was a member of a Marxist trade union until 1933 and is considered not entirely loyal.” (Which construction worker, might we ask, was not a member of a free trade union until 1933?) The joke was really not entirely appropriate, and fate has taken its course. All those involved—the police, the courts, the offices of the movement, and, last but not least, those affected by the joke or rumor—should work together to ensure that the full force of the law is not applied in such cases; harsh prosecution does more harm than good, because severe punishment only hardens the sinner, influences his entire circle of relatives and acquaintances, and ultimately turns him into a real enemy of the state, whereas up to that point it had only been a stupid remark. A small lesson in the form of a fine has a much greater educational effect; however, when it comes to widespread nonsense and the person concerned is only one of many propagators of this general rumor, the best means of combating it is not punishment, but general education about the contrary facts.

This is where the crux of the problem lies - we must never forget that National Socialism must be anchored in every member of the nation, and no one should be left out; no member of the national community should ever be blamed for having been a member of a free trade union before 1933, and therefore fundamentally considered an enemy of the state solely on the basis of an unfortunate remark. Such lapses can never endanger the National Socialist state, but they can alienate a member of the national community from the community through unnecessary harshness.

### **These Are The Enemies of the State!**

A considerable amount of time has passed since the reformulation of the famous and formerly highly controversial Section 175 in June 1935, which was necessary prior to the introduction of a new penal code because the old version of the section did not provide any means of enforcing the legal interpretation of the National Socialist state; it may therefore be time to take a look at the praxis that followed closely on the heels of the legislator's theory. When we do this, we are entering an area where bourgeois morality grows into the little “touch-me-nots”<sup>8</sup>, and there may be some who bristle at the prospect of a public discussion of such issues; however, the facts that the new state had to reckon with when it began its work in this area proves how little this problem can be solved by burying one's head in the sand, and how much it concerns every single member of the community.

---

<sup>8</sup> Referring to the mimosa flower, which folds up its petals to defend itself when touched.

When, after the seizure of power, an inventory was made of those associations and clubs that represented the “idea” of the “third sex” with great “intellectual” and “scientific” verbiage, it turned out that these organizations comprised two million men; if we subtract children and the elderly from the total number of male citizens of the Reich, two million represents ten percent of men of working age who are in full possession of their mental and physical faculties.

Faced with this terrible realization, which it would be harmful to gloss over or conceal, the state had only two options: either to resign itself to the situation, or to wage a ruthless battle on this front; as it goes without saying, it chose the latter - to choose anything else would mean surrender.

Had the fight against this national epidemic, which came upon us as a terrible legacy of the liberal era in its boundless spread, not already been a clear consequence of racial thinking, the state would have been faced with an unconditional decision based on its own sad experience - what looked like a tragic misfortune and a severe test of endurance a year and a half after the seizure of power may one day appear to the historians of future generations as a stroke of luck: the young state was forced, by a cruel fate that seemed to turn against itself, to learn about the epidemic in its most dangerous form, and perhaps it may serve as an example of how to stand against such a plague.

At a time when the whole world was still inclined to regard homosexuality as a “medical” problem and to treat it with corresponding caution, it revealed itself to be a political problem capable of bringing about the collapse of a weak state; the value of this insight can hardly be overestimated.

It gave the men in charge the necessary strength of inner conviction that was needed if they now wanted to tackle the supposedly medical problem with the weapons of politics - in this sense, as in every National Socialist sense, politics is not the craft of politicians, but every action taken for the good of the people. Initially, the struggle was removed from the scientific sphere; it was not “who” one was fighting that was decisive, but “what” one was fighting for. The “who” was meaningless, but the “what” was clear to everyone: it was about the recovery of the German people and about preserving and strengthening the German national spirit.

Experience had taught us that those afflicted by this disease were morally corrupted, and that they usually became weak, unreliable, and deceitful - on the one hand they were servile, on the other hand domineering, and in the long run they were incapable of performing any positive functions in the community; even if it cannot be assumed that the two million mentioned at the beginning were, without exception, no longer eligible for the preservation of national strength, the epidemic undoubtedly deprived the natural reproductive process of numerous, indeed hundreds of thousands of people in the prime of life. A nation faced with the task of increasing its annual birth rate by 1.5 million cannot afford to do without a large proportion of its fathers simply because they have fallen victim to decades of unchecked tactics aimed at wearing down the German people - this outlined the task that needed to be tackled in terms of national policy.

The task was tackled initially without regard for the pros and cons of the scholars who racked their brains over the “nature” of the epidemic; it is well known that the “findings” of the “eminent” authorities in this field, whether they were called Krafft-Ebing, Schrenk-Notzing, or Magnus Hirschfeld, were always based on the assumption that homosexuality is an inherited or at least congenital anomaly, and the various theories merely contradicted each other in their assumptions about the causes of this anomaly. This gave rise to the “moral” attitude that Hirschfeld, speaking on his own behalf, formulated as follows:

homosexuality is as innate as, say, a wolf's mouth or a harelip; just as one should not punish or fight a person because of their harelip, one should not persecute a homosexual or restrict their personal freedom. One thing should be said in response to this: the men who took on the task assigned to them in the Third Reich would have carried it out ruthlessly – and this must be stated despite all humanitarian outcries – even if Hirschfeld & Co. had been right. But their work did give them a surprising insight: the number of “abnormally disposed” people play no role at all in the totality of the cases treated; out of a hundred homosexuals, not even two belonged to the type that proper science has dealt with exclusively up to now! This gives a different perspective to the theory of pity for poor, sick people “who can't help it.” Opponents may now object that such “police findings” have little scientific basis; in response, the delinquent would have an interest in presenting himself as capable of reform, but we know that his statement is worthless. To this it must be said: if one were to rely solely on the statements of the delinquents, the figure would be much higher than two percent, because the entire ideology of homosexuals is based on “not being able to help themselves,” and the more cunning among them like to steer toward Section 51. The political task at hand is not limited to punishing those who have committed a criminal act; it also includes educational efforts and, ultimately, a review of success, of which the person concerned is usually unaware; in this context, a clear distinction must be made between the anomalous and the follower, the seduced.

This method is also a scientific method; in fact, it is the only scientific method, since it does not base its findings on specially selected and suitable specimens whose characteristics cannot be generalized, but on the masses of those who are randomly washed up on the shores of police intervention. If one takes a close look at these people as they arrive, they turn out to be creatures who mostly lack any attitude, any expression of their own will, any hint of character formation - a superficial observation might lead one to assume that they are incurably ill. If one then requires them to perform systematic work—which is a first for most of them— if you isolate them from “normal” people under strict supervision, prevent them from playing the complacent role of being sick to others, and force them to always see their own impossibility reflected in their fellow human beings, then the transformation occurs with astonishing punctuality - the “sick” person now suddenly becomes healthy, and the “anomalous” person proves to be perfectly normal; they are merely going through a phase of development that they missed out on in their youth. All that remains are the two percent who are truly anomalous, who, just as they were the source of disease out in the world, now become the focal points of disgust that separate the chaff from the wheat that is still usable. Unfortunately, such healing methods cannot be applied to the whole wide field of practice; the state cannot set up sanatoriums for two million “sick” people. The battlefield is still in the process of being established, but experience now confirms, even in individual cases, how right it was to use political power where criminalistics had to fail. Only a certain two percent are sick; they appear no more poor and pitiful than the born criminal. Their dangerousness exceeds all imagination - forty thousand anomalies, who could very well be removed from the national community, are capable of poisoning two million if given their freedom. One might object that these two million are undoubtedly inclined to allow themselves to be poisoned due to their own weakness of character; certainly, a people cannot consist entirely of iron-willed characters. This is all the more reason then to support the weaker ones, just as the achievements of hygiene are not used for the benefit of those who are as strong as bears and can cope with any bacillus, but for the benefit of those who are susceptible.

Above all, however, we know that every human being unconsciously goes through a period in their development in which they are susceptible to poison to a certain degree; sexual desire awakens at an age when the opposite sex cannot yet appear as a conscious ideal, and unfortunately, experience teaches us that the carriers of the disease approach young people of this age, unfortunately not openly, but behind the mask of the “well-meaning friend” who chooses every conceivable detour to conceal his true goal - only by abusing the trust of young people can the large number of those who have stumbled be explained at all. The philistine who wrings his hands in horror at these terrible facts is not allowed to wash his hands of them in innocence; for decades, the “intellectual leadership” of the German people has tolerated public propaganda by homosexuals, if not regarded it as a special achievement of democratic freedom. A homosexual teacher can corrupt an entire school, a youth leader (of blessed memory) can corrupt a generation entrusted to him, and a youth-friendly “uncle” can corrupt the youth of an entire town - these people are state criminals and must be treated as such. They are state criminals because, as soon as they hold a position of authority and are superiors of dependent subordinates, they surround themselves with their own kind, not only out of “inclination”, but also for reasons of expediency. They form a state within a state, a secret organization that runs counter to the interests of the people, and is therefore hostile to the state - thus, the circle becomes complete.

It is not “poor, sick people” who need to be “treated” - it is enemies of the state who need to be eradicated!

### **Women Should Be Women**

National Socialism has clearly emphasized that the man is the provider who secures the family, while the functions of women in our state lie in a completely different area - and their function is not one bit less important than those of men.

Our worldview is based on racial and biological principles, and thus essentially on the concept of the family; we need not emphasize once again that marriage is no longer an end in itself, no longer just a state of being, but that it represents a task for us - this should sufficiently define the “world of women.”

It is a fact that, from the very beginning, National Socialism was perhaps best understood by our women, and that it was perhaps they who loved it most fervently; it is therefore clear that the phrase “the German woman as mother” was correctly understood and interpreted by those who had been involved in the movement from the outset.

Today, however, this concept is being degraded to a slogan and thus robbed of its innermost meaning - by “German woman as mother,” we do not mean to express a limitation to a single task, but rather we want the term “mother” to be understood as encompassing the entire immeasurable breadth of women's tasks.

For this reason, it would perhaps be more correct to speak of the “German woman as woman.”

Dr. Goebbels once used a wonderful image when he said:

*“The people only have a secure future when children's diapers flutter on the line right next to the national flag.”*

He was not only talking about mothers in general, but also expressing what is important to us here:

We do not want women who only give birth to children; we want women who live in their world, whose existence is evident in every corner of the house, whose actions and deeds as women leave their mark on the entire household - fluttering diapers not only tell us about their children, but they also allow us to recognize the full extent of women's work and influence. In addition to the mother, they show us the housewife, the homemaker, and the pride and love of man's eternal companion.

This is where the woman's great responsibility lies - once she is completely in her own world, and once she has clearly recognized her position in relation to the man and limited herself to the feminine side of her nature, then the desire to become a mother will inevitably awaken in her; to only be a woman is the prerequisite for the most sacred and highest destiny.

Once German women have taken this position, all remaining "controversial issues" will resolve themselves: these women will no longer have the ambition to make a special political appearance; they will no longer entrust their children to the nanny day after day in order to find time to rush from meeting to meeting and from political tea parties to board meetings; she, too, will understand her political role correctly, but she will know how to limit it to her own particular field.

There are enough things in the household that require and presuppose an understanding of economic and social policy - to name just a few examples, women can and must repeatedly decide for themselves how to balance their household budget in the most advantageous way; they must decide what to buy most urgently from the funds at their disposal, how to replace foreign goods with domestic products, and what dishes to serve their families in each season - if women fulfill their political function in this context alone, they have recognized their task and probably already have enough to do to cope with it. In addition, they will live primarily for their families and their husbands - in doing so, they will very quickly regain the respect they deserve.

When foreigners talk about German women today, they almost always imagine a particular type that they have formed in their misunderstanding of National Socialist ideology. We ourselves have contributed significantly to this stereotyping: shortly after 1933, no coffeehouse owner suddenly believed he could operate without a huge sign saying "German women do not smoke" on the front of his business; other slogans such as "German women do not need powder" etc. were added, while others advocated uniform clothing, walked the city streets in nailed shoes, and propagated Spartan simplicity.

But any desperately sought-after and unnatural attitude is rejected with determination by the true woman. We must finally stop talking about a "well-groomed woman" as something extraordinary; for us, it goes without saying that women take care of themselves, and how they do so is another question, but in any case, we are happy to refrain from prying into the secrets of their routines. Whether they powder themselves or not is by no means a matter of state policy; if they do, they will be careful to use it as an aid and only as such, serving merely to enhance their natural beauty.

A woman herself will probably understand best how to take care of herself so that she looks nice, and a real woman despises nothing more than blatant "window dressing." With smoking, things are exactly the same; a sensible woman will certainly realize that nothing can harm her health more than habitual chain smoking, but this does not mean, of course, that it is "inappropriate" for a woman to light up a cigarette once in a while.

In all these things, the evil lies solely in exaggeration, and its expression has become a catchphrase - therefore, let us return to the original meaning of the slogans. Let us no longer talk only about the "mother," but first and foremost about the "woman" - only the true woman is the prerequisite for motherhood!

## **They Want to Be Leaders Too**

If someone happens to be at the front, that does not necessarily make him a leader; after all, a lot of Germans were at the front. But ever since the German Reich has been under the leadership of one man, and the term “Der Führer” has been coined, crowds of people immediately come running, as always, and appoint leaders everywhere.

They all wear the emperor's beard, as they once did, and when a new emperor with a different beard style comes along, customers crowd into the barber shop - me too, me too, everyone, everyone!

Yet it is so easy to understand - the Führer is the one who really leads, the one without whom the others would not know how to find their way and without whom they could perish; he is the leader who takes us up into the high mountains and across glaciers, who knows how to ward off the wind, the fog, the snowstorm, and guides us safely.

But now there is nothing more beautiful—and nothing more kitschy and dishonest—than this terrible “and also” - nothing distorts the truth more than half-truths. When a plant manager is called a “plant manager,” that is exactly the limit of what can be tolerated, because he calls himself a “plant manager” and he actually manages the plant; now, however, there are such failed military leaders and heroes who would like to be greater than Mother Nature made them - they would also like to be leaders.

They would like to have eagles flying in front of them, to ride in spirit on the neighing stallion and try in front of the mirror to see how they look when they try to look pithy, and, when possible, they speak even more pithily. They think it makes an impression - it does make an impression, but not a good one.

But who tells them that? The mirror lies to them, and the poor souls who are in their power through salary payments and company regulations remain silent out of caution; the light of glory continues to shine unhindered, and the great masked ball continues.

However, they are splendid fellows - here is a man named Schulze, Wilhelm Schulze; he isn't a Schulze like you or me though, but a Kernschulze, “Führer Schulze.” He leads an association, which could just as well be led by any old Meyer<sup>9</sup>, and when he signs letters, he signs them with the tagline “Association Leader.” Let anyone dare to complain to him and he's already blitzing; he'll give the crooked fellow a piece of his mind about the “Führer principle” and ‘subordination’ and “German loyalty,” and without any effort he'll find the right words and spew them out like gargled water: “Take measures”, “strict implementation”, an “unconditional willingness to make sacrifices” - everything, everything, everything he has ever heard that sounds similar, everything that is right and good in the right place for the right occasion - here he is wasting it on the smaller things.

His opinion is: “Children, no bowling club can allow such hesitation with the contributions, because if we don't pay on time, the landlord will terminate our contract” - but he can't make it sound that small and simple, he makes it bigger; conscientiously, he appeals to every member's sense of honor as a German man, and foams at the mouth as he does so.

---

<sup>9</sup> Common German surname, used famously by Hermann Göring in 1939 when saying, “If planes drop bombs on Germany, you can call me Meyer.”

With all this, we are putting our finger on a wound in order to first identify the wound, to feel it and then perhaps heal it; that is better than tolerating such nasty wounds, allowing them to grow, fester, and develop into incurable ulcers.

We know who the Führer is; we know who actually leads, continues to lead, and, as the chosen one, finds the right path and leads us there. But we also know who is merely parading their vanity and wannabe status at the masked ball, and we see with concern that this type of leader is becoming a danger to the Führer's ideology - a sergeant, even if he leads a squad, is far from being a commander; a man who has a penny in his vest pocket has money, there's no denying that, but he is far from being a man who has money. --- (These three dashes are intended to invite you, dear reader, to reflect.)

### **Doctor—Not Physician**

The Müller family is discussing the career choice of their son Hans, who is in his final year of high school. They go through the various professions and their “prospects” one by one - finally, Mr. Müller sums up the situation according to his own opinion: Business – no future; technical studies – takes too long; law – overcrowded. The best option? – the boy should become a physician.

A good practice always puts food on the table - period. Does Hans, the high school senior, feel the calling to become a physician, a helper of humanity? No one has even thought about that; a profession has been “chosen” in the same way that one chooses a stock that appears solid and likely to yield a good return, and this materialistic approach to choosing a profession is impossible, doubly impossible if the choice falls on the profession of doctor - although there is no profession that does not require an inner calling, an unqualified businessman, technician, or artist can usually not cause as much harm as an unqualified physician, because the latter harms all those who come to him seeking help.

He may have absorbed all the academic wisdom of the universities and have a large practice, but nevertheless, he will differ from a real physician as much as a copyist differs from an artist, or a priest from a pastor - he will not restore vitality to people, but will only prescribe them bitter medicine.

The materialistic era has unconsciously invented a very apt term for such practitioners of the medical craft: doctors! A doctor is someone who knows how to handle medicine, just as a cobbler handles shoes and a carpenter handles tables; even this comparison is flawed, because the cobbler usually makes new shoes and the carpenter can create new tables, thus creating the greatest possible perfection in his field. The doctor, on the other hand, only springs into action when there is nothing new to create, but only to repair; the physician's calling is to guide and creatively shape human health, while the doctor only patches something up when it is already sufficiently damaged.

One could object to this distinction by saying that normal people only go to the doctor when it is high time, and that even if the doctor wanted to, he would have no opportunity to guide healthy people in this way; even the dedicated doctor would therefore inevitably become a “physician.”

The objection is correct if one presents the currently prevailing system of “prescribing” and “processing patients” as an immutable fact. But it is not this system that has bred physicians; rather, physicians have developed this system because it is most convenient for them.

In our fathers' day, people did not go to the physician around the corner, as they would go to the grocer or the plumber, but they “had” a physician, a specific physician, a family physician; he accompanied entire generations as they grew up, sometimes helped to deliver the child, and even performed the same loving

service for the child's child. He was a friend of the family and knew all its members, not only in their sickness but also in their health; consequently, for him, illness was not an isolated phenomenon to be treated according to a standard formula, but he was able to take into account the nature of his patient, his physical and mental condition, allowing him to give long-term advice and draw conclusions from his long experience.

We do not want to speak up for an outdated patriarchal institution here and fall into the trap of dragging the family physician out of the mothballs of the "good old days"; the institution had its disadvantages, otherwise it would not have been displaced - it was based on financial foundations that are no longer viable today, and above all, it was a privilege of the wealthy middle class, and the resurrection of privileges is not in our interest. Workers could not afford to "keep" a family doctor for an annual flat fee, and they still cannot today - this means that the reintroduction of this institution is out of the question. But we still do not want to discard the moral concept of the family physician, and the new ethics of the medical profession can very well be built around this focal point - the good old family physician had a soul, and it is this soul that we would like to encounter again in a modern guise, after everything has been done in recent decades to dehumanize medical professionals.

The opposite of soullessness is soulfulness, but that is a buzzword that has already been abused too much; the real physician does not need soulfulness at all, because he comes from an inner calling to help us, and we do not want others in whom the soul would first have to be cultivated; it is merely enough to free the medical profession from the shackles of mechanization that turned it into medicine, and then it will follow the right path.

The dedicated physician will always see himself first and foremost as a health care provider, not as a plague doctor who repairs damage that has already occurred; he will not be content to cure a disease as best he can, because he knows that not being sick is far from being healthy; he will want to guide those in his care so that they are not just "just healthy," but, building on the foundation of health, reach the peak of their performance - that is also the point where the physician's work shall begin, for which the apt expression "health guide" was coined.

The National Socialist community is not merely a welfare institution whose purpose is limited to negative preservation and prevention; in the field of public health, it also strives for upward development beyond all protective measures, which can safely be described as an improvement in quality - only those who have this ultimate goal of medical practice in mind and act accordingly are physicians in our sense of the word, and have risen above the status of the doctor.

Like the old family physician, this health care provider becomes a friend in the best sense of the word, albeit in a new sense - while in the past it was only important to provide blanket care for a family, hereditary biology research has now given the concept of family a new meaning, especially for physicians; the individual as a link in a chain cannot be cared for responsibly unless at least the immediate family is also cared for, and the physician can draw conclusions from the family as a whole.

The demand for a "family physician" does not arise solely from the consideration that a better overview makes the physician's work easier; rather, it is intended to give him the opportunity to fulfill his crucial duty as a caregiver and advisor. He is also jointly responsible for the future of the family; he can and must intervene in an advisory capacity when serious questions of career choice and training, and even more so of choice of spouse, have to be decided.

The work being done in this area by SS physicians within the framework of the SS proves that this is by no means a utopian ideal; a significant portion of the younger generation has already recognized how beneficial it is when the medical profession is imbued with a new professional ethic.

No one will fail to recognize that such a reshaping of the relationship between caregiver and patient also has its material aspects and preconditions; the last word has not yet been spoken on the mechanization of this “business,” which, as a sophisticated but soulless system, must place an equal burden on physicians and patients. But here, too, the principle applies that the will and experience of those involved must precede the creation of any new “system” - there are physicians who are covered by health insurance who are genuine caregivers to their patients, and there are doctors in private practice who treat their clients according to some kind of formula.

What must disappear is mass production; even when a caregiver who operates like a gatling gun, who perhaps sees 50 to 60 patients a day, one cannot expect that every visitor will get what they are entitled to. We demand thoroughness in the interest of public health, but thoroughness takes time, and time is money, even at the physician’s office - this statement is by no means meant to be disparaging, but it simply needs to be made in order to point out where the difficulties lie—especially with some panel physicians.

We do not want to fall into the layman's mistake of pitting the various “schools” of medical science against each other, but we do believe one thing - namely, that a true healthcare provider cannot commit to a single approach, “school,” or “direction”; it is not the academic wisdom of a “school” that governs his actions, but the responsibility that compels him to do the best he can for his patients. The health of our people is not a battlefield on which the advocates of theories can compete with evidence and counter-evidence; the doctor who insists on “his” school, even though he cannot deny the successes of others, will not find the trust he needs.

In an era of unrestrained specialization, the “country physician” was looked down upon as an outdated phenomenon because he was not allowed to ride on the high horse of a “school”, but was forced to rely solely on the treasure trove of his own experience - today, it is not the worst doctors who stand in honest admiration of the achievements of some of their rural colleagues. The country physician had to find his way in all kinds of situations, often under primitive conditions - he was not allowed to arrogantly block the source of centuries-old experience preserved by the farming community, but had to be a true universal genius of the medical arts, a conventional physician, a homeopath, a naturopath and a surgeon; that is why those who mastered only one of these fields ridiculed him. Despite difficulties and resistance, the leaders of our medical profession have paved the way for a new German medicine that combines the valuable and beneficial insights of all schools; now that the work is complete, we can see that thousands of unknown country physicians have quietly and undauntedly followed the same path, because they had no other choice under the increased pressure of greater responsibility - the victory of science on a large scale is the most beautiful justification of what they, each in their own small way, have done.

The country physician, who drives miles from farm to farm in his car or other small vehicle, who must himself be half a farmer, who, in the rarest of cases, can organize the material side of his existence according to systems and tariffs, for whom the words duty and responsibility are ever-present because he is the only helper in a hundred miles — he may be a product of his field of work and only conceivable within it, but he still acts as a symbol of the medical profession as we imagine it - he must always be a physician, and he must never be a doctor.

## **We Are Not Like That!**

Without lamenting our sinfulness: none of us are angels. And thankfully, the world is not a model place - each of us has our own quirks, weaknesses, and pet peeves. How interesting and moving the world is because of this! And how deeply regrettable are those sourpusses who face these facts without humor; they do not understand how to enjoy the cheerful side of life, which a healthy sense of humor can convey so delightfully, and for which life is just as worthwhile as it is necessary to fight for every day through serious work.

Humorless people are a punishment from God, and they come in many different types and forms - there are those who think of themselves as little demigods and feel superior to themselves, their weaknesses, their fellow human beings, and everything else; for other sad figures who don't understand fun, life is a vale of tears, a solemn procession, a necessary evil; in gloomy self-mockery, they pity their own inadequacy, or they tyrannize those around them as chatterboxes, know-it-alls, oversensitive curmudgeons, and as perpetually irritable people.

Their existence oscillates between grumpiness, complaining, and schadenfreude; they confuse servile flattery with sincere service, and that is why they hate risk, struggle, and consistency. When they say dignity, they mean arrogance; they complain instead of pitching in and helping; they would like to beat down anyone who dares to make light of their important person with a sledgehammer.

They are dried up inside: humorless and heartless. Inner and outer generosity is foreign to them, and because they themselves are torn, unbalanced, and weak, they cannot be genuinely human and kind.

Poisonous, corrosive satire is sometimes their playground; most of the time, however, nothing but chatter comes out when they try to be funny despite their tension.

People who are strong and balanced inside love humor and wit as the forces and weapons of life - they master both in giving and taking; open in their attitudes, upright in their conduct, they grow through healthy self-criticism; they know that true self-confidence requires inner modesty; humor and wit flourish among them, and with it friendship, camaraderie, and a sense of belonging. For good wit and good humor connect and build people up. They do not insult, are not tactless, and are not maliciously mean; they want to give joy, bring laughter, cheer others up, encourage them, and stimulate them to think.

In them, criticism also has a creative and constructive value - if friends speak their minds to each other—and a joke is often more effective than many words—then a friendship that suffers as a result of it is not even worth a penny.

Jokes that come from the community and serve the community have always had a special significance; drawn from shared experiences, they outline a situation whose often tragic harshness and hardship would have been much harder to bear without humor. In the trenches of the World War, primal wit gave rise to the “frontline German” - it is much more than gallows humor.

Often a confrontation with the ultimate values of life, this humor did not have a destructive effect on inner and outer discipline; it was the liveliest expression of the masculine fighting spirit and the overcoming of many hardships, pitfalls, weaknesses, and follies. It helped to kill what is called the inner pig a thousand times over - the men who joked about their company commander's big and small weaknesses, for example, loved him and would have walked through fire for him; even old Blücher<sup>10</sup>, about whom the

---

<sup>10</sup> Gebhard von Blücher, commander of the Prussian Army of Silesia who fought against Napoleon during the Battles of Leipzig and Waterloo.

juiciest and crudest jokes were told around the campfire, is said to have once said: "As long as my boys joke about me, the spirit is good..."

Dignity and humor are not opposites, because nothing is worse than humorless dignity - it is too easy to go from the sublime to the ridiculous! And bureaucrats often seem so funny precisely because they want to be dignified and then, lacking humor, come across as arrogant and dry.

Political humor is also a question of attitude and disposition - when it flourishes, it is always a healthy sign of the intellectual vitality of the people and their inner involvement in political events; here, too, however, there are chatterboxes, know-it-alls, and people who are dissatisfied with themselves and the world; here, too, there is self-parody and self-adulation. Political jokes in particular require inner discipline and, inextricably linked to this, national discipline; this is all the more true because, like all jokes, they tend toward contrasts and exaggerations. Nevertheless, it is a mistake to believe that there is no room for humor and jokes in politics.

Politics shapes life and is so closely connected to life that it extends into all areas of life; it must take people's strengths into account just as much as their weaknesses. Just as healthy people need self-criticism in order to grow, only a community that dares to engage in self-criticism and can endure it demonstrates inner strength and courage - this can also be achieved through humor.

Haters are usually without humor and wit; those in positions of responsibility who, for the sake of the cause to which they feel connected and which they want to serve, who choose to serve not out of vain self-satisfaction, dress their admonitions in the form of a joke and show more character than moralists who stubbornly remain silent or secretly grumble about every human and organizational weakness. This is where the assessment of political humor comes in: even today, there is a rich variety of political jokes and anecdotes. Certain topics are particularly popular, discussed in a variety of ways, and are subject to the law that the greatest effect lies in making a mountain out of a molehill.

People like to make jokes about those things that they love, and they are allowed to do so because they know that, despite all human mockery, they will never forget their strengths, their greatness, and their sincerity - if someone thinks it is funny to insult or slander them, then they know what they are doing. Incidentally, we often love people because of their little weaknesses; jokes are often a stronger bond between leaders and followers than obsequious and undignified flattery; it is always a sign of strength, generosity, and good-natured humor when you can laugh along with jokes about yourself. Of course, you may get bored when the topic never changes; you forgive those who mean well with a smile, you show contempt for those who complain out of envy and resentment, and you say to those who want to be malicious: "Yes, if only you were all wolves in sheep's clothing, but most of you are just sheep!"

But we also have serious things to say - there are "political jokes" that we are not willing to view with humor, but not because we are humorless! Stories of atrocity are no longer jokes; they have a deliberately destructive tendency and are directed against what we want to keep and become pure and strong: our ideas and our convictions. They construct small and larger weaknesses out of malice and underhanded meanness; they turn the mistakes and errors that we ourselves want to overcome into a deliberately biased judgment of the movement; out of a desire for schadenfreude and an opportunity to complain, they search everywhere for topics that allow them to do what they consider to be a joke, but which in reality is a method of poisoning trust and satirizing decent attitudes.

These "jokers" are just as cowardly when it comes to decent criticism as they are when it comes to responsible cooperation - they cross the boundaries of tact and inner decency; they just want to get rid of

their complexes. As much as we demand self-criticism from the man who fights with us for the idea and who has proven where he stands, in order to give him the right to healthy, constructive criticism of us as well, we are just as unwilling to overlook those hidden and anonymous opponents who believe that their “witty” fantasies are “jokes” in more or less well-disguised, malicious slovenliness.

As tempting as it may be for some to invent jokes solely for the sake of effect and contrast, our idea is not a playground for imaginative jokers.

Only those who work with us with an honest heart, an open mind, and the best of intentions should and can share in our laughter and our joy; only they are allowed to make a good joke about our little weaknesses, which we ourselves see and want to overcome. We know that being able to laugh has often given us courage in difficult times - we don't want to lose that ability.

### **By the Way...**

Have you ever met a baker? A locksmith, a civil servant, or anyone else just as what they are by their title? I have never seen anyone like that; it would be too strange, and if such a creature existed, I would probably spend hours looking at them, first with pleasure, then with amazement, then by shaking my head, and finally, with horror.

There are no bakers, locksmiths or civil servants; there are only people, and these people, while remaining human beings, are also bakers, locksmiths and civil servants; they are also husbands, air raid wardens, allotment gardeners, walkers, and other things besides, but they are never just bakers, locksmiths, etc - it would not be possible to see them so plainly.

“Yes,” says the reader, “of course, that's obvious; but why do you explain this at such lengths as if it were something special?”

My friend, it is something special, it is – time and again – Columbus' egg<sup>11</sup>. Let us now carefully take this egg in our hands; we will put it on the table afterwards so that it stands, you will see, but so far you know nothing and only see that this egg is very smooth, very round, very delicate; you cannot put it down without it immediately falling over.

Approach a baker, or a locksmith, or a teacher; complain about them if necessary, or do whatever else is permissible - but woe betide you if you touch their title! They'll immediately go off screaming to their professional associations and say that you have damaged their professional reputation, their professional image—

They are very small, miserable scoundrels, very ordinary, petty curmudgeons, and if you say you think that they're quite the scoundrel, everyone will agree with you - but woe betide you if you not only mention their name, but also their profession! Immediately they will spray you with talks about their professional honor, and immediately their professional organizations will come running and protect them. “The baker Meyer is a bastard!”

---

<sup>11</sup> “Columbus' egg refers to an apocryphal story about Christopher Columbus, who, after being told that finding a new trade route is seemingly impossible, challenges his critics to make an egg stand on its tip; when the critics give up, Columbus taps the egg on a table to flatten its tip before making it stand upright - the story is used to demonstrate how a seemingly impossible or otherwise difficult situation can be solved through simple means; for a similar story, think of the legend of the Gordian Knot.

Maybe he cheated you, and you're right. But the bakers won't tolerate that; they take the view that a baker cannot be a bastard simply because he is a baker, and bakers must not be associated with anything even remotely bastardly - the pretzel now waves in the billowing banner as they demand justice!

This gross nonsense hits us, the writers and printers, very hard; it is bad enough that in a short story, a film, or a novel, there are people who bear a name, and suddenly someone from real life appears, who also has that name, and writes angrily to the poet Friedrich Schiller, forbidding him to say aloud on stage: "Franz is the name of the scoundrel!" He is also called Franz, and he is also a Moor - he is offended. What if a character in a novel is a chimney sweep who steals a box of cigars and slaps the housewife on the cheek with his soot-covered hand? Then the representatives of the chimney sweeps and the regulars' table<sup>12</sup> and everyone else rises up and protests the very idea that a chimney sweep could have such a black soul. That must be damaging to the entire profession - a good chimney sweep would never do such a thing.

Here the shell of Columbus' egg cracks - namely, a good chimney sweep would never do such a thing, and only a bad chimney sweep would. Once again the egg cracks and is now almost standing upright - it was not the bad chimney sweep who sinned, but the bad person; this guy would have acted exactly the same way if he were a baker, a locksmith, or a clerk; he did not sin as a professional, but as a human being - he did not use bad flour and cheat his customers as a baker, but as a fraudster; the fact that he cheated in this particular way has little to do with baking. As a locksmith, he would probably have cheated by doing a botched job.

All professional associations should take a leaf out of this editorial, and they are all the more inclined to do so because it is the only way to protect themselves from overzealous members who completely misunderstand the necessary and difficult tasks of their professional association; they should protect their members when their professional honor is attacked, but they should declare themselves incompetent when members are attacked on purely human grounds - if a baker bakes poorly, that is a matter for the bakery, but if a baker has bad character traits, that is a matter of character that is none of the bakery's business. In this way, every organization avoids the constant accusation of harboring great scoundrels. Great scoundrels are everywhere; there are also great hypocrites everywhere - the greatest hypocrites are found where there are false concepts.

Of course, professional organizations now may say, "Why do you mention the profession if it's only a matter of human affairs?"

But that, my dear friends, my dear friends, is necessary because it is part of the picture of life, because we are all interested in knowing: How old is the person who has been so strongly gripped by passion; what did he earn, how did he live, what kind of person was he, on closer inspection? Every picture needs a little color.

It makes you happy, doesn't it, when the brave lifesaver also happens to be a baker's apprentice? Then you know that the simple little man threw himself quickly, loyally, and boldly from the bridge into the water; then you know that the unemployed man held the thief down, even at risk to himself; then it becomes a valuable addition to the report, which otherwise, out of sheer fear for professional honor, it would simply say: "A man saved another man in Köslin in the evening hours!"

Because if it were written who, whom, and on which street it happened, then a profession would be discredited, wouldn't it, and so would the city and the street along with it, wouldn't it? We would see a picture of life, sure, but how many interests, honors, and other calcareous rocks would have been kicked

---

<sup>12</sup> Referring to an informal group of people who regularly meet up in beer halls or other places.

by doing so? And that, supposedly, must not happen; in the opinion of some people, there needs to be no other mentions at all; it is enough if there is professional honor that is so great that it covers the entire horizon, especially the horizon of those who have none; those are precisely the ones who can make themselves and their profession formally hated through exaggerated professional pomposity in the wrong place.

Too much piety is a nuisance for the people, and too much misunderstood and misconceived professional pride can also make people stupid - all this needs to be said formally and politely, by the way...

## **V. The Economy Is Not Exempt Either**

### **The Flag Flies Above the Economy**

They dragged themselves along the endless road to the front, and the hurricanes of fire roared into them. They clung to the earth, and it seemed as if they were no longer there - but when the attack came, they arose, and now they threw the barrage of bullets into the enemy's bodies and the hand grenades into their teeth. What were they fighting for? They did not calculate in terms of accounts, but fought, fought for a flag that was not yet visibly planted.

In the secure homeland, others were very much present; they also knew exactly what the troops should fight for and what they should not fight for. They subordinated the momentum of the front to their small daily goals - they were the realpolitikers, and they managed to consider their actions more important than the uprising against death, superior forces, and the past at the front; they considered themselves clever when they asked what the struggle at the front would do for their party's economy and their own valuable, professional advancement.

In the November collapse, everything that had been considered authoritative in Germany until then disappeared; these "Novemberlings" considered themselves the new authority. But as much as they pushed themselves to the forefront, they were not Germany - their state was not the Reich, because it consisted of warring groups with economic interests. The economists in particular felt very real and thought highly of their realpolitik, but it was built on sand: when they were done with their loud-mouthed speculation, the economy was no longer there - it was broken.

The real Germany seemed to have disappeared, just as the front-line soldiers seemed to have disappeared into the earth under heavy fire - but it was there, just as the front-line soldier was there, waiting for its hour, just as the soldier waited for the hour of deliverance and when the enemy waves would come after the shelling had ceased. The real Germany rose up and marched through the streets in brown and black columns, speaking through the mouth of their Führer; the others did not see this real Germany and perceived it only as a disturbance in their realpolitik - only to be shocked when their realpolitik collapsed, and on January 30th, 1933, there was a Reich again.

Germany and the Reich are the embers in the hearts of those who are pure and stand firm; Germany is only with those who stand firm despite the distance to victory. They are Germany, whose faith is so strong that it can determine the fate of a thousand years; Germany and the Reich are so superhumanly great that they can only be the prize of a superhuman struggle.

Germany is with those who hold the flag.

The flag is a symbol of faith, of struggle and steadfastness - the flag flies into the future, and so we look to the future and measure all actions by whether or not the power of faith is alive in them.

We carry within us the image of the Reich of honor, freedom, and the community of all Germans.

It will come because we believe in it, because the faith of the fanatical individual is the promise of the race to which he belongs; everyone believes in what the spirit of his race is about to accomplish.

The Führer has planted the invisible flag of the World War, for in the World War, they only knew that they were fighting for Germany and the Reich, unaware of what was coming; the goal, however, has now become visible, and that is a tremendous gain - now that the goal is known, the columns marching toward it can form.

As long as the fighting on the front lines of the World War was only for the dream of Germany, there could be no organized columns for this Germany.

Now we march, today in the Reich, as yesterday and tomorrow we marched throughout the country in closed columns - today we have a flag before us. The dreamlike belief of the World War has become a belief in a firm, concrete goal - in the World War, this belief was linked to dreams, but now it is married to

a determined will. In the World War, one could only die with dignity; now that there is a goal, one can also live with dignity. There is only one life worthy of the dead: a life that is nothing but a struggle for the goal and for the Führer's thousand-year Reich.

Those who are devoted to this future also have the spirit of a race that is addicted to the future; those who believe in the future are not intimidated by the hardships of the day. Although the front did not return home victorious, the German people nevertheless professed their allegiance to the front when they professed their allegiance to National Socialism - once the front remained alive despite the efforts of November 1918, it can no longer be stifled.

Who are the opponents of us today?

They were strong during the World War; everyone who did not understand the new spirit of the front was an opponent, and that was almost everyone who did not serve on the front; the November revolt was the uprising of the 19th century against the dawning 20th century, just as the entire World War was the struggle of the 19th century against the 20th.

The material triumphed over the myth because the 19th century was clearly and distinctly formulated in the material, while the myth had not yet found a formulation - now that it has been formulated, its columns are marching.

In the World War, the 19th century was still on the offensive against the 20th, but now it has been forced onto the defensive - we, who were committed to the myth of the 20th century, have become more secure, stronger, and more steadfast; those who are stuck in the 19th century have lost their old security and can no longer find their way. All this is quite clear.

During the years of the November Republic, capitalism felt secure and went on the offensive; now it no longer attacks, but is instead helpless, conforming, and hidden; it may hope to bring National Socialism into line, but National Socialism will nevertheless make the economy National Socialist.

They have managed to camouflage themselves very skillfully; they were able to do this by promising to help overcome the difficulties of the moment, by saying that the prerequisite for National Socialism to exist is that the economy gets back on track; they attempted to make National Socialism dependent on the economy - in their opinion, the best way to get the economy back on track is the way that is most convenient for them and deviates as little as possible from the capitalist method.

We, on the other hand, say that National Socialism is also a prerequisite for the new prosperity of the economy - objective difficulties can only be overcome by objective measures, but these measures can only be successful if they are supported by National Socialist will and belief.

The economy is not a complex entity to which National Socialism must conform.

National Socialism is the people on the move, and our flag flies above the economy as well.

A bank account may be all well and good, but it has meaning when it is used for the flag.

We do not ask what the economy will do with our faith and will in practical terms, for we know that the economy can only flourish in the shadow of the flag; the people of the National Socialist awakening want "their" economy, an economy which serves them, because the faith of the people is too great to be transferred to bank accounts.

Anyone who thinks today that the front line is not there is not where the front line is; anyone who hesitates today because the National Socialist will has not yet been completely implemented everywhere is simply too weak to be the bearer of the eternal will - the front line always rises from the earth where the decision is being fought for.

In the World War, the front line lay before Germany, spatially and spiritually - now it runs through Germany. What would we do if we could not fight and struggle!  
Our struggle is as infinite as our faith - at the very moment when new tasks arise, the old ones will be completed, for the 19th century only has room to the extent that the 20th century has not yet concretely formed its tasks.

### **Bolsheviks Among Us?**

After seizing state power in Russia, world Bolshevism, backed by the homeland of the Bolshevik Revolution, began to unleash its systematic propaganda campaign in all countries of the world; this propaganda ruthlessly disregarded the principle of non-interference by one state in the internal affairs of another, and it did not even attempt to conceal this interference, which took the form of propaganda-incited strikes, unrest, and acts of sabotage.

The country that had to endure the strongest onslaught of Bolshevik propaganda, and on which the entire efforts of the Third Internationale were concentrated, was Germany; it was believed that the best conditions for the further spread of Bolshevism had been found here, firstly because Germany, located in the heart of Europe, seemed particularly suitable for this plan, and secondly because the economic exploitation of our people through the Versailles Peace Treaty and its related economic agreements had created a general mood that made it easier for the Bolshevik poison to take hold.

It was precisely at this moment that the unforgivable mistakes of pre-war Germany in the social sphere had to have the strongest impact.

It is solely thanks to the National Socialist movement and the work of Adolf Hitler that this danger, which threatened the whole of Europe, was averted; the German people are the only ones on earth who have the inner strength to put an end to the ever-growing Bolshevik campaign.

This success of Adolf Hitler's policy is the greatest practical contribution that has been made to date to the preservation of peace in the world; moreover, not only to the preservation of peace, but to the preservation of Western culture as a whole - this achievement was only possible because the creative people within the nation were given a completely different status than before, which made manual workers realize that they were just as valuable a part of the entire people as any other class of the nation.

The international congresses of the Third Internationale have shown that the masterminds behind Bolshevik propaganda have clearly recognized the defeat their destructive work has suffered at the hands of National Socialism, and National Socialist Germany became the focus of both the Comintern and the Youth Internationale congresses. All interest was concentrated on Germany; every speech that dealt with National Socialism and Adolf Hitler was nothing more than an attempt to deceive the supporters of Bolshevism about the defeat that communism had suffered in Germany. On the other hand, however, it was announced that the struggle for the heart of Europe would not be abandoned.

The Bolsheviks' campaign plan attempts to tactically exploit every conceivable starting point for developing their activities, and in doing so, it targets all those whose sense of community is not yet strong enough to be immune to such infiltration - a worldview based on the destruction of all healthy forces of a people must naturally also appeal to the basest instincts in human beings.

It is precisely the fact that the German people are trying to eliminate everything foreign within themselves that has intensified Bolshevism's hatred of National Socialist Germany. The speeches and suggestions of

the Moscow officials dealing with the German question see only one way to regain a foothold for propaganda in Germany: the contamination of those enterprises in which the community has not yet become strong enough in the sense of the National Socialist idea.

The tactic is as follows: first, one builds on a tribe of subhumans who, due to their character, which is rooted in their blood, can be nothing other than followers of these destructive Bolshevik ideas; in doing so, attempts are made to smuggle these propagandists of Moscow's ideas into National Socialist workplace cells and other organizations as far as possible in order to camouflage them and protect them from detection.

The best of these people are then supposed to go on to form so-called groups of five. No group knows about the others; only the leaders discuss the tactics of the operation with each other. The first task of these leaders is to exploit every opportunity, no matter how minor, to sow discontent among the workforce - basically, the plant manager is portrayed as the workers' fiercest opponent and greatest enemy, who must be fought with all means necessary, even to the point of destruction.

It goes without saying that Moscow relies mainly on anti-social plant managers who provide the greatest cause for such propaganda; they even go so far as to recommend that the representatives leave plants where the plant manager forms an inner unity with the workforce in order to have an easier time working in other plants that have not yet been infected by the National Socialist spirit.

Moscow's best ally is therefore the unsocial and unfriendly factory manager. This is also where the propaganda directed by the Comintern across the border comes in; this is clear from the leaflets that were smuggled across various borders after the Comintern Congress.

The German people have now grown together into such a unity that there is no danger of this propaganda campaign being particularly successful; however, the fact that Bolshevism believes it can still find starting points for its subversive work in individual companies obliges us to be constantly vigilant and to bring about change wherever such starting points still exist.

National Socialism will never rest on its laurels - it will try to implement its socialist ideas in every last cell of the people, in every last factory.

It is not those business leaders who, through their behavior harmful to the people have become Moscow's henchmen, who have made it possible for life to flourish again in businesses today and have allowed millions of compatriots to find work again, but National Socialism.

The struggle that our people still have to wage is not an easy one. Manual laborers in particular have the greatest understanding of this situation; they know full well that the wage problem cannot be tackled as long as the German people have to fight for economic freedom. However, the National Socialist movement will ensure that factory managers also adopt an attitude that is in keeping with this struggle for the nation's survival.

No Bolshevism has ever been born; Bolshevism has always been made, and they are made solely through the antisocial behavior of bourgeois elements.

There are companies in Germany that are still forced to work reduced hours due to the overall economic situation, where workers' wages are at the subsistence level because of this fact, and where, nevertheless, a healthy National Socialist spirit prevails because the company manager is a role model for his followers in his attitude.

The company roll call is not only there so that the working man can develop new forms of community life from within himself, but also so that the company manager can repeatedly make it clear to his followers

how the company, in its overall economic development, fits into the economic life amid the nation's struggle for internal and external freedom.

There are still plenty of opportunities for improvement in every enterprise, regardless of its economic situation, through which the manager can prove his socialist commitment; this applies not only to industrial enterprises, but equally to farming and agricultural businesses: there are still large estates today that do not provide electricity in workers' homes, and there are still managers today who, through their behavior in the workplace, make their workers feel like second-class citizens and who, through their entire conduct, prevent the formation of a genuine community.

We do not eliminate these things by concealing them, but by waging a fierce struggle against them.

The German Labor Front has already brought about change in most businesses; however, we will not rest until every last business is imbued with the National Socialist spirit - we have no right to speak of a national community unless all enemies of the people have been eliminated.

It must be made clear to a certain class of our contemporaries that their behavior is no longer possible in the third year of National Socialist leadership.

The whole world knows today that the National Socialist revolution has decided the defeat of Bolshevism in the world; anyone who today cannot live in true comradeship with every honestly working German is a destroyer of this great work; any plant manager who is not truly the best worker in the entire plant may not bear this honorary title, and should not be trusted with supervising German workers.

The struggle for the German people did not end on January 30th, 1933, but must continue with the same intensity as before the seizure of power, day after day, year after year, generation after generation.

Socialism is not a one-time action, but a perpetual completion and perpetual struggle for the inner recognition of each individual member of the people for their own socialist attitude; anyone who slackens in this struggle in any way is indirectly an ally of the Bolshevik work of subversion. Our whole life must be guided by one thing only: that in everything we do, we bear responsibility toward the whole.

We must never slacken in this struggle; our demands on ourselves and on others must become ever harder and ever clearer, so that those destroyers who meet in Moscow are deprived of even the last basis for an attack on the unity of the nation - in this spirit, the work that the Führer has created will be passed on from generation to generation, thus achieving an eternally National Socialist Germany.

### **A Brief Overview of the Economy**

That's quite a rush - from the car to the plane, to the sleeper car to the ship in Frankfurt am Main, to Berlin, to London, to Amsterdam, Paris, and Italy; then, once you arrive, the phones are ringing, the telegrams are clattering, the entourage of secretaries appears with their briefcases, along with the typists for English, French, and German dictations (they are also pretty and familiar with the private correspondence of the master of economics).

Then the time is divided up - 10 a.m. reception by General Director Pomuchelskopp<sup>13</sup>, 11 a.m. consultation with the Labrador department, 11:15 a.m. discussion with the works council, 11:20 a.m. a visit to Ms. Silvia Paganello (a prominent film star), 1 p.m. lunch at the club, and 1:40 p.m. getting ready for the flight to London, with a quick visit home on the way.

---

<sup>13</sup> A reference to a character from Fritz Reuter's popular rural German novels.

My God in heaven, who can stand this? The swarm of admirers and sycophants marvel at the wealth of knowledge possessed by this great and indispensable man, who is actually already at the age limit, but is still fresh and crisp and rightly enjoys his small, oh so rare weekend pleasures.

Yes, one wants to become such a man one day, for the benefit of the German economy! There is no time for politics; that is the grand form of street and mass polemics - oh, how bad it stinks there.

One cultivates only the finely perfumed, stiletto-sharp diplomacy of salons and conference rooms; now and then, someone falls by the wayside if he goes too far, but on the whole, yesterday as today, the master of the economy is international and detached - a demigod in higher spheres, a god among demigods.

\*\*\*

“Mother, why isn't Father saying good night to me today?”

“Shh, my boy, you must be good, Father still has to work - tomorrow the director is coming back from his trip, and Father has to make big presentations for him; they have to be exactly right, and woe betide him if something is not in order; poor Father will be in trouble, and then he will be very sad.”

“Yes, Mom, tell Dad that I love him and I'm looking forward to Sunday - that's when he'll play with me-”

“-and one more thing, dear Käthe, go to your parents alone; I want to go back to work quickly, and maybe then I'll still be able to get the new process up and running; I was given a hard time today, and the director mentioned in passing that there are other capable colleagues waiting for the plant manager position. It has to work, I won't give up, my honor is at stake.”

“I don't understand you, Arthur - the director is always so affable, shouting ‘Heil Hitler’ from afar and being the first to join in on every company outing. Does the man have two faces?”

Yesterday and today, the eternal drudge, loyal, good, and modest, yet still a servant of the relentless leader and master of the economy.

\*\*\*

“-yes, gentlemen, you have no idea how difficult it is to find the right young talent, even today; we would so much like to promote gentlemen from your circles, from the circles of the party- don't be angry with me now - hand on heart, who can you recommend me who is on a par with Mr. von Ochsenradel? (Mr. von Ochsenradel is the son-in-law of Director Rumpfbeuge; he is a lively dancer who had an affair with Ria Bemmi, third grandmother, caution.) My colleague Daumendruck is in charge of all training, and he is supported by Professor Seidenaffe, who, God knows, has a great understanding of human nature (he will also be my successor until my son is grown up).

Anyone who wants to climb the ladder in our company can only get ahead through exceptional performance, diligence, and perseverance. Character alone is not enough - on the international stage, where we have to fight alone, other skills are still required that are not so easy to find.”

Yesterday as today, there is room for adventurers; now and then one is observed, now and then a huge fool, but he is cleverly protected, and then he enters the golden family book. Every now and then, the layman marvels at the total lack of insight into human nature on the part of the master of economics, but

things muddle along - what would Germany be without these masters, enthroned in front of their mouse holes like the lords of the world?

\*\*\*

Do you hear the drums, do you see the youth? Farmers and soldiers work shoulder to shoulder, and from their ranks spring forth the leaders of the future, who know their positions of command, who are trained by the movement to be officers of the economy, and who take a firm hand and remain loyal to their comrades. Their highest praise is the happiness of others, who remain simple and do not forget their families on the ladder of happiness - tomorrow, tomorrow the nightmare will be over!

### **The Best Opportunity**

The Führer's first four-year program was aimed at eliminating unemployment; the solution to this crucial issue was so urgent that it was necessary to accept the continued existence of numerous outdated phenomena in economic life for the time being.

The second four-year plan now serves to increase the German's national wealth through increased domestic production, which means nothing less than eliminating the poverty among the German people; however, this goal can only be achieved to the extent that industry and the economy are aligned with the principles of the movement.

It must be said that even today, the economy does not always enjoy a good reputation in relation to the National Socialist worldview - time and again, it must be noted that in many places, the old evil spirit still prevails; more than elsewhere, grand words are used to conceal true intentions; considerations are made, responsibilities are examined, commissions are set up, and in reality, this results in a great deal of valuable, serious work being wasted.

A huge array of statistics is used to gloss over a particular pricing policy, which often serves only to further strengthen the financial supremacy of individual circles; when a new development arises, some insignificant sub-problem is sure to be picked up, and every minor innovation is going to be presented as a technical sensation; in the end, as much as possible will be left unchanged, and outdated facilities will continue to secure the easiest possible profits.

The old motto then applies: risks are socialized while profits are privatized!

However, these circles always have a concerned phrase at the ready when it comes to putting as many obstacles as possible in the way of real new developments - by trying to silence and eliminate unpleasant critics through personal attacks.

These were the methods used in the past by certain capital groups and their allied large corporations, which have always been linked to the interests of other powers through a thousand underground connections; the result was a numerically verifiable, ever-increasing damage to exports as Germany fell further and further behind due to artificially created technical and price difficulties; this was made all the easier for the interested circles by the fact that, at the same time, the corporations' incessant and advancing monopolization successes eliminated all competition, and thus all free competition, in performance.

Sophisticated market regulations, which strictly prohibited the sale of unsaleable remaining stocks at lower prices, even if they were overpriced, did the rest; on the other hand, the corporations themselves often dumped remaining stocks abroad with the help of their superior foreign organizations in such a way that the sale of regular goods, and thus normal exports, were virtually prevented.

The German people now want a slow but sure general clean-up in this complicated and vital area; that is why the groups in question have been desperately trying to put on a harmless, respectable mask since the takeover. However, despite all their meager concessions, one should not try to pretend that a wolf that has been so voracious up to now has already turned into a harmless little lamb in such a short time; German workers, in particular, have an extremely keen sense of this, and they would certainly have a few complaints to make in some individual cases.

Now that we are entering the second four-year program, we should not believe that we can get away with all the old excuses, nor should we come up with new experiments in the field of bureaucracy - we know the results that will come of them.

No one should talk anymore about having to wait because they cannot do anything without state subsidies - we want to finally see the private initiative that has been so often emphasized and desired! Industry must learn to understand that it is about more than just securing profit margins - we want to see an honest will that truly strives for a goal and then achieves it. We want to finally stop encountering those types who are always looking for shortcuts to avoid responsibility, who want easy profits, but no necessary risks.

We want to get to know National Socialist industrialists and economists who are true strategists in their field, and who do not shy away from even the greatest difficulties, who should then also have the right to go beyond individual boundaries of responsibility and authority!

In the long run, profits on individual items will have to be reduced across the board; instead, care must be taken to ensure that, through our own diligence, we catch up with the technical advances made by other countries in some areas, thereby eliminating our technical and economic dependence - in this way, we will also succeed in regaining lost sales areas, increasing production volumes, and thus achieving greater profits.

Healthy exports always mean safeguarding the interests of the domestic market; German engineers and clean calculation methods can certainly achieve this goal if the necessary conditions in the economy and industry are ensured.

The Führer has set the goal, and how this goal is achieved is a matter for the economy, which has the support and advice of practical men from whom it need not fear any bureaucratic obstacles. We will take stock after four years - those who are unwilling today may then watch our achievements before them. We will have to examine whether the necessary initiative has been taken everywhere, whether sufficient facilities and resources have been created for the new processes, or whether any necessary requirements have not been met due to negligence or even business considerations; we will have to check whether the economy has provided the necessary funds for new developments in non-corporate enterprises, or whether the old double standards of bygone times have remained alive.

The German people have no obligation to ensure the well-being of companies that are not fulfilling their obligations to Germany today; National Socialism will therefore, in any case and against all possible resistance, find a way to achieve its goals here as well. The business community would have only itself to blame if the new labor battle had to be waged under "martial law," so to speak, in order to compel those circles that are unable to muster honesty and decency voluntarily and to prevent any possible sabotage or passive resistance.

Ultimately, therefore, it is not an economic question that must be decided here, but a question of character and will - thus, the old principles of past systems can no longer apply: in a newly oriented economy, National Socialist principles will have to serve as a model.

Let us hope that this appeal to the willingness to make sacrifices and the energy of industry and business will suffice to create all the many and necessary conditions for the economic freedom that Germany must achieve—and, because the Führer commanded it, will achieve!

The economy has often been outraged by politicians' mistrust of its internal structure and its representatives, and now it has the best opportunity to prove them wrong! After many experiments and long speeches, it is time to understand the storm clouds of the times and take action - for Germany expects it!

#### **IV. Soldiers and the Movement**

##### **The Wehrmacht and National Socialism**

The National Socialist movement is currently facing a great test - after fourteen years of testing in the political arena, the great test in the ideological arena is now beginning; the future of Germany and the future of the movement will depend on the outcome of this struggle.

The party stands or falls with its ideology, for if it had replaced 30 parties with a single party; that would have been a victory for Germany, but it would not have been a guarantee that, after the death of the current generation, the ideological supporters of the last 30 parties would not reappear after 20 years - if we cannot shape this political and ideological stance so strongly that it overcomes the ideologies of other groups, then the National Socialist movement is still far from victorious.

The battle of dogmas is over for us today, but the great struggle for values has consciously continued; after all, the political parties we have overcome were also the bearers of certain values and certain worldviews:

The Center Party was the bearer of a certain medieval worldview and never made any secret of it - the highest value of the Center Party was religion,  
the highest value of liberalism was profit,  
the highest value of Marxism was class,  
And the highest value of National Socialism is national honor!

Today, this value is being fought for in its implementation, not only in the military sphere, but also in the sphere of legal philosophy and in the sphere of a new economic ethic, along with other spheres of knowledge. We have an example of how this battle of values is being fought in practical life in the Winter Relief Fund - charity bazaars and festivals were also held in the past, and signatures were also collected in the past to alleviate the plight of starving compatriots, but the character from which this campaign was born today differs in terms of values, will, and motivation: according to our thinking today, we no longer donate out of mercy, but out of duty.

Today, we give not out of condescension, but out of an awareness of the equality of those who receive a gift; today, we give not out of pity, but out of a sense of honor; we give not out of mercy, but out of justice - we do not want to humiliate the recipients, but to uplift them inwardly.

This is the inner revolution of values in which we find ourselves today, and in which we will have to decide which side we intend to fight on.

In the midst of this struggle, the values of those whom the soldier serves also come to the fore.

The idea of soldiering has become more popular today than ever before in German history, and that is no coincidence; like all other concepts, the idea and concept of the soldier has fluctuated greatly over the decades and centuries. I believe that around 1648, the soldier's status was the most despised in Germany; around 1813, everyone flocked to the Prussian flag; in 1870 and 1871, the German and Prussian soldier was the symbol of Germany's resurgence, the founding of a great German Reich, and in 1914, this became even more true than ever before, because at that time all of Germany believed that Moltke had prevailed over Bleichröder<sup>14</sup> - in reality, it turned out in 1918 that Rathenau had triumphed over Hindenburg.

Contempt would then set in for these German soldiers again, as it had last been seen during the Thirty Years' War; what was written about German soldiers in Berlin in "Die Weltbühne"<sup>15</sup> and other

---

<sup>14</sup> Gerson von Bleichröder, a German-Jewish banker and a close confidant of Bismarck.

<sup>15</sup> A German left-leaning magazine that was banned by the NSDAP shortly after it came to power.

publications during those fourteen years is the most shameless thing that could ever have been written about Germany's past and German honor.

The National Socialist movement has also opposed this denigration since its first day, and its soldierly principle of unconditional leadership and discipline, which is so self-evident to the soldiers of our Wehrmacht today, was also a self-evident prerequisite and practical action of Adolf Hitler's movement.

It has always been said that these principles only apply to immediate war and immediate combat, where this discipline and leadership are necessary - in doing so, a cowardly generation has forgotten that a nation is always at war as long as it exists.

This truthful insight gives rise to what we today call the "political soldier"; even the ties between this political soldier and the soldiers of the Wehrmacht should not be rejected, for the ties and concept of the political soldier are something that directly connects the Wehrmacht with the German people today, while also preventing the Wehrmacht from ever becoming a caste again.

If one looks back over the history of society, say, over the last 30 years, one may be able to determine from novels and stories, along from one's own life, that around the year 1910 or 1913/14, the German soldier, the German officer in particular, was increasingly pushed into a caste-like consciousness; he was the representative of heroic values, he remained a special representative of these values on his own, and other ideals and values formed around him. The German soldier's living space became increasingly restricted; he had to defend himself against this somehow, and therefore adopted caste forms in his society, which then separated him more and more from the rest of the nation. That was not his fault, but the fault of political leadership and the entire ideological attitude of the past decades - but that was how it was. Today, we can say, both to the satisfaction of the German soldier and to the delight of the political movement, that these barriers have fallen, and that a sense of commonality has spread from one side to the other.

I ask that we not make too much of the difference between military personnel and civilians, for I believe I can say one thing: there are very few people in Germany today who feel like civilians. None of us feels like a private individual; every National Socialist, regardless of which group he fights in, feels like a servant of a particular community, be it the community of political leaders, the community of the SA or SS, the community of German youth, or the community of the German Labor Service. The German nation is finally on the verge of finding its own way of life, a way of life that differs fundamentally from what is known as British liberalism, which believes it can operate solely on its own island - it is a way of life that may still be uncomfortable for some today, but which is clearly and noticeably emerging for everyone. It is the style of a marching column, and no matter where and for what purpose, this marching column may be deployed.

I believe that this alone is a great achievement - we all owe it to the Führer that he has placed politics on a natural, aristocratic foundation in accordance with the eternal laws of life, that he has reintroduced the German Wehrmacht to the people, and that the German people are now more committed to its defense than perhaps ever before in their history.

It is this great brotherhood of the Wehrmacht and the people that both the soldier and all of us can serve, and the great battle of values is largely being fought in the arena where soldiers, as long as there are German soldiers, must stand.

That is the value of honor, pride, and courage; it creates conditions other than those of fear and punishment, here or in the hereafter, that can be achieved in human beings; we are engaged in this tough battle of values today, and we will continue to serve it in the coming decades.

Once unity between worldview, politics, and the state has become a reality, I believe that no single power in the world will be able to prevent the rebirth of Germany!

### **We War Volunteers and National Socialism**

There was an increasing number of cases in which eloquent speakers and writers ventured forth to recount, in resounding phrases, their merits and sufferings in the struggle for Germany; quite apart from the fact that we are willing to draw a line under the past and warmly welcome into our ranks anyone who is seriously willing to work for the ideas of our Führer, the truly enthusiastic always show a meaningful modesty in all their forward-looking efforts, as far as their own person is concerned.

Without a considerable amount of selflessness, none of the National Socialist pioneers before 1933 would have been able to fulfill their tasks, and the party would never have achieved victory if the selflessness of the individual had not been one's first duty at all times - it was not just a matter of conviction, but of a willingness to put one's self entirely at the service of the movement and to renounce everything that makes life pleasant and enjoyable that makes one a collaborator in the renewal of the nation.

When, many years after the war, which for them were also the years of turning away from all memories of the war, people suddenly feel called upon to represent the "interests" of the war volunteers of 1914, their actions desperately resemble the behavior of the 110 percenters.

We, the actual war volunteers, strictly reject such behavior.

We did our duty in the war without making a fuss about it, and we are doing it again today; it is precisely our pride that allows us to disappear into the masses as unknown soldiers.

Even back then, it was the aspiration of each and every one of us to be treated as equals with the active soldiers, reservists, and Landwehr soldiers - today, we have just as little right to receive special treatment, for that would be a caricature of the essence of National Socialism. But just as those who spent the war behind the lines are the ones who talk most about their experiences at the front, so too are those who joined the movement just before the gates closed—or failed to do so—the most eager to prove their importance with many words, for obvious reasons.

Even today, people often have a false image of the war volunteers of 1914; enough books have been published about them, and some good chapters can be found in them. But Remarque's "All Quiet on the Western Front," which was one of the first and has been read by millions, has had a devastating effect in many ways - it is not the descriptions of battle, whose value or lack thereof is not at issue here, but rather the entire intellectual attitude that does not apply to us "child soldiers" of the first months of the World War.

Just as the warrior of 1916 was different from that of 1918, so too were the young men that went into the field in October 1914 after six to eight weeks of training different from those that followed later; their mood, fighting spirit, self-confidence, and expression were incomparable to the attitude of the replacements at the beginning of 1915. For us, one thing was certain: Germany is invincible!

When we stood in the barracks courtyard for the first time in our drill uniforms, there were indeed no longer any differences in origin or education; a wonderful feeling of solidarity inspired the recruit company, which will remain unforgettable to us until the day we die.

And then came the march - the bells rang, the flags waved, everyone on the side of the road cheered with tears in their eyes. With every word of regret that we were leaving so young, our pride grew - yes, we felt loved as the budding flowers of the nation, and it was so easy—even to face death.

Death?!—A word and nothing more; a concept without imagination. We dreamed of victory and honor; the idea that something could happen to us was dismissed with a smile in the carefree, happy manner of youth. On the way to the station, we heard the cheers of welcome surrounding us: “The first war volunteers!”—we were even less able to come to our senses then.

We only awoke to reality in the trenches, in the field, in battle - but even this was not a real awakening. The impression of dying, of being tortured, of suffering, was so overwhelming, the inner turmoil so paralyzing, that everyone acted almost mechanically when orders reached them.

For days, the dull pressure of suppressed fear weighs down on everything we do and think; then, slowly, very slowly, we get used to the face of war and involuntarily conform. Letters tell of a strange planet that was once inhabited, but to which there is no longer any way to return and whose language does not describe our state of existence - something within us is buried, lost forever.

That was our first experience, and that was how our youth died - in a few weeks, these children became men, for whose acquaintance with death remained a simple fact throughout their years of service at the front.

Not many of those who stood outside in blood and horror for four summers and winters are still alive today; those that testify to me that after the upheaval of the spirit in the first days of battle, there was no further development except that of a hardening into ever more iron-willed men of duty.

What strengthened and shaped us was our belief in victory; the certainty that these enormous sacrifices could not be in vain kept us going with self-evident strength, simplifying our way of life into a healthy naturalness that made life bearable even in the worst situations.

Gradually, however, we began to waver in this belief - that was when the end came upon us.

Only those moments on the front lines can be compared to the inner experience that was our return.

We all became spiritually homeless, and that period of adventurous wandering from formation to formation began, this frivolous oscillation between catching up on vocational training and participating in revolutionary events - aimless, embittered, restless, and without hope, we staggered.

Certainly, great achievements were made in those years by communities that truly did not seek success, yet all these groups lacked the grand goal that could have given direction to their struggle; when the black-red government consolidated its power and the prospects for renewal became increasingly slim, even these last ones crept aside and sought compensation for their lost faith in their people, in work and family. Every year, bitter experience confirmed their belief that they had been betrayed for their great sacrifice, and despite all attempts to create a viable basis for themselves in new foundations and alliances, it must be said today that the majority of front-line soldiers resigned themselves to their fate until Adolf Hitler began to assert himself!

Hesitant and with little confidence at first, they began to familiarize themselves with the party's program; a voice inside them then rejoiced: Yes, that is what we dreamed of back then, when we marched out singing to protect our homeland - but then nagging doubts would return.

Someone then brought us to a meeting, and we witnessed storms of enthusiasm; we heard the captivating flow of a speech carried by fervent fanaticism and were captivated. We were quickly caught up in the whirlwind of events; the intense activity swept us along and soon made us cogs in the mighty machine that was driving us forward into a better future.

This is how we came to Adolf Hitler, the front-line soldier and war volunteer, who succeeded in doing what most of us did not believe was possible: making his front-line experience the focal point of his political struggle for liberation. Today we stand behind him, filled with the deepest gratitude that he restored our faith in ourselves - our gratitude for this shall consist in our efforts to fulfill the tasks assigned to us today with faithful and simple dedication.

We war volunteers and we front-line soldiers have always hated one thing: empty rhetoric. We must reject its attempts to spread again today, with reference to deeds that truly had nothing to do with it.

### **“No One Needs to Have Idealism Anymore”**

It is a hard and narrow path, ironclad and straight in its relentless consistency, from the “royal ensign” of the great Frederick to the well-armed youth of the new Reich.

It is a line that runs without fluctuation through the ages, despite detours and errors, from that ensign who, marching in goose step toward the church tower of Leuthen, led his grenadiers to battle and victory, to the young and old who have conquered chaos under the banner of faith.

Even in death, it is necessary to lead the way and guide those who are to come to complete and build upon what the sacrifice was the beginning and the prerequisite for - only a great faith, which only people with young hearts can carry and live, can carry us beyond death to victory.

This faith, which never allowed itself to be chained to dogma, has its symbol in the flag that flutters and waves through the centuries of Prussian-Germany's becoming and growth.

Every battle was fought for the flag, never for personal existence and property, but ultimately for the preservation of German life and living space; it was always the flag bearers who had to give their lives first, and always, we can say with equal pride, a new young German who took up the banner when the ensign fell; this young man carried it on closer to the goal, for that was the greatest honor - to protect the flag, and with it, the idea.

The ensign of Leuthen marched not only with the banner, but also in front of and for his men. Victory belonged to the commander and his followers - in the end, it could only, and therefore had to, belong to the force that united them in a single community.

This soldiering knows no pomp and splendor, for he carried the black-and-white flag, with all its traditions from that authentic world and outlook on life of the German Teutonic Knights, where poverty, faith, and sacrifice of life for the common good were the foundations; this worldview rose again in the wars of liberation.

This black-and-white banner of “either-or,” “all or nothing,” “victory or defeat,” was once again carried in the same authentic worldview by the stormtroopers of Langemarck against the enemy - even then, it was about the idea, not money; what was held in common was blood, uniform, and the great idea!

“Deutschland über alles” roared through the ranks, over every nameless flag bearer of the idea of a new Germany; this German youth remained true to itself, no matter how often poverty and sacrifice were demanded of them.

The war volunteer from Langemarck became the lieutenant of 1918, who carried the will to resist within him until the last second of the battle.

This lieutenant was more like the ensign of Leuthen than any pre-war lieutenant; he had never had an "allowance," never worn a parade uniform, never danced at court, and knew nothing of dinners and gala receptions; he was hungry and wretched, lice-ridden and filthy, gray from head to toe, like his men. Under his stahlhelm was a steel will; his medal of honor was the trench dirt, at best the Iron Cross. His future - "Death for the Fatherland!", for he possessed as little fear and money as the hungry and ragged SA and SS men when they cleared the streets for freedom.

Those of these standard-bearers of faith in Germany who remained fought in the Baltic States, the Ruhr, and Upper Silesia, completing their studies as working students, put up posters, and stood up for Germany, not for personal possessions and glory, in the hall battles and street fights - always poor and always ready to sacrifice.

A number of these officers from the World War joined the Reichswehr, which had been curtailed by Versailles and internal enemies; they, who today lead battalions and regiments, will not forget the time of struggle, hardship, and poverty, nor can they ever forget the experience that the poorest members of the nation have often been the most loyal.

The Wehrmacht of the Third Reich does not exhibit the courtly plutocratic characteristics of the army of Wilhelm II, with its differences and distinctions of property and privilege of name that are no longer comprehensible to us today; nor is it a professional army, of whom Reichswehr Minister Gröner once said is tasked with protecting the interests of the League of Nations.

The regiments of the first, second—what am I saying—tenth class must be a thing of the past, as must the preferential treatment of noble regiments that Wilhelm II cultivated.

Forty years ago, many an old Prussian officer and nobleman watched with concern as money often became essential for enlistment in the officer corps; I remember from that time how, at an officers' meeting of a poor, very feudal cavalry regiment, the count commander had to say, fortunately and very decisively, that "he would reject any cadet whose father declared himself willing to give his son any allowance he wanted."

In the Wilhelmine army, individual rich garrison towns with their luxurious social life were a downright corrupting force for the regiments stationed there - but the World War destroyed the monarchy and put an end to the old state of affairs.

The traditions of Leuthen and Langemarck must remain, but the plutocratic stratification and classification of the time can and will, of course, no longer exist in a people's army.

We know that in the foreseeable future, all officers in the people's army of the future will, in accordance with the will of the Führer, have gone through the school of combat organizations of the new Reich; it is an army that can be expected to continue in a straight line, from the Teutonic Knights to the nameless leaders and sub-leaders of the World War, as well as the unknown fighters clad in brown shirts.

The flag with the swastika flutters above the cadets of today's Wehrmacht, and the spirit of Walter Flex and Horst Wessel hovers over the marching columns - no materialism must cloud their high idealism.

"The flag is more than death!" - money and fear have never been with those who devote their lives as flag bearers to a sacred cause. Anyone who wants to be a flag bearer in the Third Reich must only possess the greatest thing of all: "Faith in Germany!"

## **The People's Army and the “Reichswehr”**

We live in turbulent times - almost every hour, new world events announce themselves with tremendous force, and what used to take years to develop and unfold now takes only days, even hours: it rises, it gathers momentum, it explodes.

Day after day, we are forced to take a stand on all the powerful events that are happening around us and within us, yet we must wrest a little time from our existence now and then to look back, lest we too easily lose our sense of proportion; we do this in order to properly appreciate current events and, inspired by the course of events, to gain new momentum.

When the day of Versailles came, we were given the Reichswehr, and with it began an era of its own kind in the defense of our fatherland; indeed, not to say of a peculiar kind. One can aptly describe that era with the expression: The Reichswehr “Sphinx”; this does not refer to the practical work of its sculpture, but rather to the external image of the internal attitude, the fundamental political mindset of this new type of organization. Thankfully, conditions today are ripe enough to be able to talk about this; one can only learn from the past, never from the present alone, or even from the future.

The basic political attitude of that era was to be determined and was determined both by the state leadership and the political Reichswehr leadership dependent on it: the Reichswehr Ministry; the pacifist, internationally oriented, Jewish-influenced government of the time naturally sought, from day one, to influence the spirit and attitude of the troops through the Reichswehr Ministry.

How did the troops—both leadership and soldiers—react to such efforts? What, people asked themselves a thousand times, would the troops do if they were asked to choose between Germany or the Third Internationale; what did the officers think, what did the men think? Did orders remain orders for the Reichswehr in any case?

Then came serious internal political conflicts. The Reichswehr stood ready to fire - against whom? It was a question that burned ever more fiercely and found no answer.

Unfortunately, men like Groener and Schleicher did not sit in the relevant ministerial chairs for nothing, and so the image of the Reichswehr as a “sphinx” grew ever stronger in the hearts and minds of an awakening Germany, the image of an eerie creature that seemed inscrutable; the more the Reichswehr withdrew into itself, the more it distanced itself, showing only a lowered gaze to everything and everyone, the more sphinx-like its impression became.

Could this state of affairs ever lead to a connection with the people?

\*\*\*

If one pauses for a moment to consider such thoughts and becomes almost incredulous about one's own experiences and observations in relation to what has been described, think about how much heavier the statements now coming from the mouth of the first marshal of the new Reich weigh!

His words have made everything clear - there is no longer any magical shroud, and everything sphinx-like and inscrutable has come to a complete end: the sphinx is dead, and never again shall it rise!

What even the ignorant among our ranks once refused to understand, because those few ultimately failed to grasp the greatness of our idea, has now become reality!

The term “Reichswehr” has now become a tangible reality; today, there is an army living among us that belongs to us, to which we are so attached to in our hearts that the past seems further away than just a few years; yes, it is far, but it is not useless to think of those years, of all the days when we looked with concern to the other side and listened to every movement. The other side—a term that has passed and faded so quickly that only the power of the movement can explain the historical result today; where any thorns or thistles remained, they were superficialities, rough edges that were bound to remain, and that will be smoothed and rounded off in the great test of our time.

We can be proud that nothing needed to be destroyed or dissolved; we are proud of soldiers who, in the most difficult times, quietly and bravely fulfilled their duty in solitude for us; we are proud of the power of the National Socialist worldview, how it pushed away and erased even seemingly rigid barriers, and that it was able to give the German people back their old army by fighting for a new and young Wehrmacht.

And this new Wehrmacht, which we love and which belongs to us all, was created on the ground on which everything must stand today: the soldiers of the army created a core in a historic work that remained clean and pure throughout the darkest times; the soldiers of the National Socialist movement have won the Reich in which this core could bear fruit.

Let neither of them forget the work of the other, and let no one forget that it is only together that they represent the greatness of these days, our proud German Wehrmacht, whose most beautiful possession is not cannons and tanks, but the trust and love of our people.

To be an officer and soldier of the people—that is the program, the wish, and the command that the marshal expressed to his comrades in his words, which we all heard with joy.

“The Marshal, yes, but the officers, the Wehrmacht...?” Only someone who is far removed from the pulse of our life could ask such a question; even if this realization does not please our “friends” abroad, we are not concerned - those who truly know Germany's Wehrmacht will laugh at such questions, but to those who do not know it, let it be said, and the few years of National Socialist German history have already proven it, that those who do not make the Marshal's words their own, those for whom they have not allowed it to become their own possession and sacred conviction, are excluded from our life, no matter where or how high they may stand; they would not be understood, they would be useless, and if they did not leave of their own accord, circumstances would force them to do so with all the brutality of inevitable law - we are therefore unconcerned!

We know only too well, and the images around us are always eloquent proof, that a people cannot be ruled or led with the bayonets of a so-called apolitical army.

The German Wehrmacht did not need to be “politicized” according to earlier concepts; it is German and therefore National Socialist. Our movement lives above and within it, thus guaranteeing its great future - Germany's Wehrmacht has therefore become a people's army in the best sense of the word.

When the striking power of a people's army means, which today and tomorrow will increasingly correspond to the realization of our worldview, the unity of political and military leadership, of convinced knowledge and combative example, we can then calmly leave our people to fate with firm conviction!

\*\*\*

*“These words of trust between the two cornerstones of the state—the party and the Wehrmacht—the commitment to the meaning and essence of true comradeship, which binds the general and the soldier, is held together by a single role model: Adolf Hitler.”*

- Field Marshal von Blomberg's speech was programmatic, and has set the direction for future work in the Wehrmacht.

If someone were to come along now and ask what position the German Wehrmacht takes on the European question, the questioner would probably be considered stupid.

Whatever other questions may be asked: obedience, education, the duties of an officer, the separation of tasks between party and state, nothing will remain unanswered; the Field Marshal has spoken about everything, and has thus clearly and unambiguously set the course of action; in doing so, he has also firmly established the basic intellectual direction of our future development. Certainly, the Wehrmacht is still in the process of being built and reorganized, but every day it is growing closer to the goals that the speech has set out - thus it is commanded.

With well-considered and wise words, the Field Marshal also addressed the soldier's ideological attitude toward National Socialism - he came to the conclusion that a good soldier must also be a good National Socialist.

We thank him for these words - extending this statement, as a goal for the future, so to speak, we can also say: every National Socialist is also a good soldier!

This is certainly a goal that will be achieved in the spirit of Adolf Hitler's demand: to educate the entire population, and especially the youth, in National Socialism.

Once we have reached that point, and the next generation will prove it to us, the last difficulties will have been overcome; there will then be astonishment that there was once a problem called “military leadership” and “superiors,” or that terms such as “obedience” or “loyalty” once stirred up negative emotions - from the National Socialist point of view, from this sincere attitude that will one day be entirely characteristic of our people, any problems of the above kind will be impossible. Everyone will then be nothing but a National Socialist, and the best of them will be leaders among both the people and the Wehrmacht.

It is thus a joyful feeling, after these proud and sincere words, and especially in memory of the once sphinx-like and mystical nature of the Reichswehr, that one can contrast this concept with the image of an eagle as a symbol of today's and tomorrow's German Wehrmacht. An eagle that flies calmly, with clear eyes and sharp talons, following its path: it is no longer a mystery to anyone, it belongs to everyone, and it lives with us under one flag, one Führer and a united, strong Reich!

### **On Political Soldiering**

*“If the sacrifice of life is necessary, take it upon yourselves - do not impose it on others.”*

- **John Ruskin (1865)**

Liberalism bases its worldview on “unrestrained freedom and cold reason”; these ideas, which are alien to us, have poisoned the minds and hearts of the entire Western world since the French Revolution of 1789, and it continues to do so today.

Knowledge, i.e., reason, has become the guiding principle of all life and the judge of all events, yet more than 50 years ago, Nietzsche, a member of the master race (“who looked into the abyss, but with the eyes of an eagle”), coined the phrase:

*“It is better to know nothing than to know much halfway; it is better to be a fool on your own than to be thought a wise man by others.”*

The idolization of the eternally rational, practical, and worldly has spread further and further. Knowledge became equated with education, and all professions and classes in Germany were gripped by this overvaluation of knowledge; the idea of viewing life solely from the standpoint of an eternally practical reason, of thinking only of utility, took hold most strongly among those “mathematical people,” the heartless calculators and strategists - certainly, knowledge is power, and calculation and strategy are of utmost importance in many professions; these values rose to enormous proportions in the age of technology and scientific research. But it was with that that the world of the mind, the heart, character, and personality declined - Professor Virchow, a famous physician who was politically committed to liberal ideas, once declared:

*“I have dissected hundreds of people, but never found a trace of spirit in them.”*

That is why liberalism took hold most readily in trade and banking, industry and technology, and then, gradually, it contaminated all professions. This alien view of life has led to the degeneration of the professions - the patriarchal factory owner became a factory director dependent on anonymous shareholders; the “royal merchant” became a dealer and profiteer; the helpful physician became a “doctor”, who saw the sick person only as a “scientific case” and a source of income; the defender of justice became a cunning lawyer, whose greatest achievement was to find loopholes in the law through which his client could slip with impunity; the farmer became an agriculturalist; the government official no longer governed but “administered”; the officer and leader became a mere commander. Everywhere, the patriarchal relationship between superiors and inferiors began to disappear, and with it, an abyss opened up that would have swallowed the German people whole if one person had not possessed “the eyes of an eagle”, who the courage to recognize this abyss and save Germany from a bottomless pit.

Anyone who is given such a position of power can be a “superior”, but superiority and leadership are based on different foundations:

The “superior” has “subordinates” who “obey” him because he has the legal means of power to enforce obedience; the “leader” has “followers” who “follow” him because he “leads the way,” because he is the “leader”; the distance between him and his followers results from the fact that he acts, thinks, and sees so far ahead that none of his followers are “above him,” i.e., superior to him; superiors who lack personal strength and character all too often believe that they must punch down, that they must not allow their subordinates to have their own opinions, creative energy, or independent action, and that they must create distance just to show their subordinates the cold brutality of the power of superiority that has been given to them.

Anyone who is deemed worthy of being a “superior” or “leader,” regardless of whether they are in charge of a few or many, must make themselves a leader and transform their subordinates into followers.

In addition to his “knowledge,” if he is a true German, there is the great and unrelenting question of “conscience” that must never leave him, namely:

Would your followers raise you up as their leader, as the best they can find, or do you owe your office and dignity only to the word of authority that placed you before your men as their “superior”?

Those who can modestly and self-critically affirm the former have then risen from “superior” to “leader”; it is they then have the hearts of their men, for they must have their hearts, not their brains, which only obey because obeying is “reasonable” and “expedient.”

There will be people who claim that Prussian-German soldiery has always had only outstanding leaders; they will rightly point to the enormous losses of officers in the World War, such as the 49 Prussian and Bavarian generals who fell during that time.

Nevertheless, it is fair to say that, in many places, a gap between leaders and followers opened up as a result of liberalist worldviews; the liberal factory director with his telephone and the clattering typewriters of his staff, who thinks only of profitable prices and not of his workers, bears a great resemblance to those commanders who believed that a battle, and thus a war, could be won simply from the telephone center of a dugout - the overestimation of knowledge led to an overestimation of strategy, along with an underestimation of personality and the value of tactical successes.

We must move away from these misguided paths and toward true leadership on the part of all those in positions of responsibility (and not only in a military sense) - Rome did not tremble before the mercenaries of Carthage, but before Hannibal; it was not the Roman legions that defeated Vercingetorix, but Caesar; Prussia was not held for seven years by Prussian soldiers against the great powers of Europe, but by their great king; it was Blücher and his energy that defeated Napoleon, and yet he confused the words “me” and “myself” in official writings; Emperor Wilhelm I could hardly be prevented from personally leading his Guard Cavalry Division against the enemy in the August battles of 1870, yet he had an army behind him that had been his “followers” for decades.

Victory or defeat, every war and every battle is decided by the spirit of the fighters, especially their leader, and this spirit must be developed before the battle - we won the wars of liberation with the spirit of Scharnhorst, Stein, Körner, Fichte, and Ernst Moritz Arndt; we won the campaigns of 1864, 1866, and 1870 with the spirit of Prince Friedrich Karl of Prussia, Generals von Manteuffel and von Manstein. Hardly any of the hundred officers of the old army studied the spirit of that time before 1870, the spirit of victory, this lieutenant spirit; this spirit was often considered outdated in Wilhelm II's army, and yet it was the spirit of those who took Douaumont against higher orders.

Prince Friedrich Karl of Prussia wrote in 1860:

*“Prussian officers cannot tolerate the constraints of rules and regulations; we give free rein to the ingenuity of the individual...”*

This leadership spirit must remain - Adolf Hitler, who created the new Reich, was only able to do so because he placed himself “at the front” of his men as their Führer; he was only able to win the revolution because he instilled his heart and his will to win in a number of men to such an extent that they followed him through thick and thin!

Political soldiering, with its concept of leadership, must permeate all circles of the German people in order to weld the German people together into a great following, and thus into one people - the strength of our movement lies not in the cold knowledge of our brains, but in our faith and loyalty to the Führer, to whom our hearts belong.

### **The Soil From Which Obedience Grows**

The defining characteristic of the armies of Prussia-Germany, from the armies of Frederick the Great to our young Wehrmacht, is obedience - and yet, what a change in the internal structure; even if obedience remains obedience, the way in which it was demanded and performed then and now has become completely different.

Someone once said that without obedience, even the best-equipped army is just an armed mob - this is a fundamental insight that cannot be disputed. Even today, the two components of obedience, namely the person giving the order and the person carrying out the order, must still intersect at the right angle if obedience is to be fruitful.

The leader and the follower, both figures of the 20th century, are towers of knowledge, culture, political thought and action, and conscious civic pride compared to leaders and followers of, say, the 18th century; despite this, the same unconditional obedience is and must be demanded of today's young people as it was then, whether they become political soldiers or bearers of arms, despite their thousand times more conscious lifestyle, higher education, greater rights and freedoms, and their more enlightened and alert sense of the necessities of the nation.

What, then, is the basis on which every decent soldier of his lot can stand in order to render obedience based on voluntary submission?

Let's be frank, Adolf Hitler's Reich has not exactly made the position of those in command any easier, if we begin with those who demand obedience and who are the cultivators of the soil on which obedience is to grow.

This assertion needs to be proven: well then, there has hardly ever been a time that has placed such demands on leadership qualities and achievements as our age - whereas in the past, leaders mostly came from privileged classes, today the principle of achievement alone is decisive, and has replaced privileges of birth, education, or money; every young person who joins the party, the labor service, or the Wehrmacht with the will to become a leader is put through their paces a thousand times over, and must prove, day after day, that they are working toward one goal alone, putting everything personal aside: Germany.

In addition, their personal lives must be beyond reproach, and they must be nationalists and socialists in the best sense of the word; it is particularly important for young Germans who want to devote their lives to the new Wehrmacht to know this.

The new Reich further demands that those who want to lead and command have to learn how to think politically, even if they cannot and should not be politically active externally, as officers are; this is precisely a point that is unavoidable in today's state if one wants to be a leader, because otherwise one's work for the state is dead and lifeless; it has cost the nation heavy sacrifices that economic thinking was once given priority over political thinking.

These are the general and guiding principles by which today's state measures the work of those who want to lead and command.

Those who can and are willing to work according to these principles stand on soil from which obedience can grow, especially in the new Wehrmacht - here, thank God, many things have changed compared to the past.

For example, there is the relationship between officer and soldier - far more than in the past, the boundaries between officers and soldiers have been blurred, and there is no longer any forced separation. This is beneficial! The concept of duty and care for subordinates has almost reached the stage of self-sacrifice, and the objective—first obedience, and then the command—must not be shifted one iota. Furthermore, the attitude that culminated in referring to soldiers with the emphatically derogatory term “die Kerls” (the lads) has, thank God, been completely eradicated during the harsh years of war - even today, it is demanded that officers find a way to the hearts of their men, and that is right, good, German and National Socialist.

Anyone called upon to lead and command in the political and armed forces who makes all this the guiding principle of his actions will be delighted and amazed at how obedience grows, as it were, out of his followers, whether they be called a storm troop or a company; his soldiers will respect, admire, and strive to emulate his real and ideal achievements—they will obey him.

We are well on our way - the words that a recruit recently wrote home from his company commander's welcome speech may illustrate this. He wrote that the captain had said:

*"You are now going through the tough school of recruits; at times it will seem to you that your superiors are hard on you, and that the obedience demanded of you is oppressive. But you should know that your superiors are working hard to become your comrades, so that at the end of your service we can part as true friends - through our achievements, the example we set for you with our lives, and the way we fulfill our duties, we will prepare the soil on which your voluntary obedience will grow."*

### **Should I Become an Officer?**

For a large number of young people, a period of serious reflection often begins here because the long years of going to school are coming to an end. Fate imperiously demands an answer to the important question: What do you want to become? For many, it has been clear for some time which path they want to take in order to find a fulfilling career; this is partly on their own initiative and partly guided by friends, parents, or teachers; we should also not forget those among them who, from an early age, have nurtured the idea of becoming a soldier or officer, and have consistently focused their inner selves on this goal. However, there are also many young people who—without anyone being able to blame them directly—approach the question of career choice with the same childlike thoughtlessness with which they have approached their entire lives in a youthful and playful manner. But these are not even the worst cases - in addition, there are always a number of unstable characters who, due to their disposition and temperament, have never seriously considered the question of career choice - it is precisely the playful and unstable who will have welcomed a newspaper notice that read: Who wants to become an officer?

Surely a good number of them will have seen this sentence as a bridge that enabled them to move from indecision to solid ground; they will now have tried everything to put their late decision about a career into practice; however, it will soon become apparent that for some, this decision was a mistake, because there are widespread misconceptions about its implications.

Living as an officer today is by no means easier than it was during the long years of peace between 1870 and 1914; indeed, it is no exaggeration to say that it has become more difficult. It is also all too easy to overlook the fact that the still somewhat carefree lieutenant period, with its not yet too great responsibility, will come to an end, and that the passion, especially the sudden passion of young men who are undecided about their career choice, must extend beyond the lieutenant period; the attainment of the handsome high cap of an officer is by no means a stopping point or a goal, and the opportunity to wear it is far from being everything.

This achievement, which in principle is not even that difficult and which is often possible even for those who are not born to be officers, does not mean anything; those who ultimately decide to become officers because they suddenly like the trappings associated with the profession will soon find themselves in bitter internal and external conflicts.

But more on that later - first, let us say a few words about the mental attitude and physical requirements demanded today of young people who decide to enter the career of an officer:

It is well known that during the time of Frederick the Great, and especially after him, indeed until the outbreak of the World War, the typical mental attitude of an officer was often questioned; even if the officers of Old Fritz may have been rough fellows, and even if the officers under his successors may have indulged in games and dancing, and even if they have not exactly distinguished themselves through intellectual alertness, that is not the decisive factor; even if the intellectual attitude of the pre-war officer corps was not particularly striking in individual cases, this also means nothing - what does matter, and what shows the intellectual attitude of a class, is its achievements, especially its outstanding achievements; in view of the Prussian-German officer corps, there is no need to argue about this.

Where outstanding achievements of this kind are and were possible, an idealistic, clean intellectual attitude of the most solid kind is a prerequisite; of course, the will and desire of the individual members of this class is also expressed in some way in the special achievements of the class, but as much as the special achievements of the past repeatedly oblige and drive their descendants, it is nevertheless necessary that there always be a moment that enables real achievements that can stand up to those of the past: namely, the spirit that, to put it in a nutshell, is to lead by example and is the first to die!

Every young person who becomes an officer today is put to the test, hour after hour, and demands are made of him that repeatedly test the values of his moral, character, and spiritual attitude; he must already represent something if he wants to withstand these ongoing demands and tests, some of which also arise from the obligations of the past. They must be and remain aware that they belong to a class that is expected to do more and will be scrutinized more than other classes; they must ultimately realize that they will have to prove their ability to maintain a particular inner attitude and state of mind, even in the most difficult circumstances - in short, he must be a completely upright, honest, sincere, idealistic, and determined person, who never forgets, day or night, that even as a young person, he is and must be a leader and superior; in addition, he must be able to pull himself together in any situation, subordinate himself, be able to adapt even against his own will, and be able to revere the power of command as dogma to a certain extent, yet also be able to put his heart and soul into the task at hand.

It should also be borne in mind that the profession of an officer, as wonderful as it is, takes place within a relatively narrow framework throughout one's life, a circumstance that ultimately also requires a special inner attitude - an attitude that those young people probably do not possess. It should also be borne in mind that achievements are valued, but that they in no way entitle the person to preferential treatment or special recognition - yes, such special achievements are definitely required, without any mention of special rewards.

The officer, whatever his position—lieutenant or general—ultimately has no life of his own; he serves the cause tirelessly and without respite, and any consideration for himself, his family, his wishes, inclinations, and private interests must take a back seat to what his profession requires and demands of him.

These are all things that only strong characters can withstand in the long run, which is certainly not those who, tempted by the attractive trappings that come with military life, have chosen it “for lack of a better idea.”

Added to this are the purely physical demands, which are by no means easy to take; every young person who wants to become an officer must tell themselves that their youthful years of excess energy will pass, but that the other years are by no means easier, especially when it comes to physical demands - how often have people failed because they believed themselves capable of more than they could or wanted to achieve?

Young people who want to become officers must be what can be described in one short, apt word: they must be real men, men of substance! And beyond passion, they must have the honest, firm will to do everything they possibly can, and they must put all their talents and abilities completely at the service of the cause, without any restrictions, from the day they enter service until the end of their term of service - those who cannot do this should not even consider becoming officers; everyone should think twice, or even more than that, before making this truly momentous decision and saying: I am ready!

Playful and unstable individuals may well be capable of achieving great things in other ways, in professions that do not require this complete and uninterrupted commitment of the whole person, but they are certainly not suited to being officers - therefore, let me warn you once again: anyone who has not already been preparing for years to choose such an enormously responsible profession—including responsibility for oneself—should not be tempted to suddenly feel like a soldier and believe that they have the calling to be an officer.

### **The Soldier as the Bearer of the Idea**

Can the soldier be the bearer of an ideological concept? The answer must be clear and unequivocal: they have to be, no, they must be! To this end, it is first and foremost necessary to clarify the term “a bearer of ideas.”

First, of course, we must understand the National Socialist ideology of our Führer, who is also the supreme commander of every German soldier - it is the ideology of a renewed people in a new state! Young Germans who fulfill their military service already have a good grounding in political science as part of their general education; in the coming years, this will be even more the case when the far-sighted educational policy of our new state begins to bear fruit.

The German soldier should not only be a “bearer” of the idea, but also, as everywhere in his present and future life, a disseminator and fighter in the best sense of the word!

It is precisely as soldiers that some come into close contact with their fellow citizens from all walks of life for the first time in their lives, from which genuine camaraderie will later develop, not only in times of peace, but also in times of war; it is this simple, natural camaraderie that should also be cultivated in all other areas of our current state and party life, and from which genuine friendships between men often develop that last a lifetime.

It is precisely in these circles of comrades that former Hitler Youth, SA and SS men have the best opportunity to prove that the intellectual training they have undergone also proves its worth in practice; not all comrades are so firmly anchored in National Socialist ideas in their younger years, which opens up a rich field of activity that is available to every activist. Today's soldiers are supported by exemplary reading rooms and libraries, which are managed by suitable comrades and constantly kept up to date with new publications; in many units, National Socialist newspapers and writings are also kept within the barracks comradeships, enabling every soldier to follow the practical development of the idea even during his service.

At the same time, however, it is also necessary for young soldiers to learn to distinguish between "duty" and "off duty"! He should not become a fanatical talker who ultimately only bores his comrades because he wants to lecture them, but should carefully consider what, to whom, and where he engages in political discussions; otherwise, due to his incomplete training, he will achieve the opposite of what he originally intended with the best of intentions.

Even though political discussions today no longer cause as much disruption as they did in the past years of struggle, it is still necessary, in the interests of the iron discipline that is now required, that such debates do not lead to endless discussions and are conducted only by those who are really capable of doing so; temperaments must be restrained, strict self-criticism must be practiced frequently, any showboating or spouting of empty phrases is to be considered unworthy of a National Socialist. On the other hand, the young National Socialist has no reason to shy away from the limelight if circumstances require him to speak up - on the contrary, he should always protect the idea that has become second nature to him; he should take advantage of the opportunities given to him by his superiors in the form of general lessons and actively participate in the discussions that are already often used with great success today.

Through the reactivation of veteran officers with rich war experience, many old National Socialist fighters have also rejoined our Führer's new Wehrmacht as officers, and it is precisely these people, matured by their manifold struggles and experiences in life, who are the most suitable leaders of such ideological lessons, in which all the questions that are on the recruits' minds are answered and positive opinions are gladly received and steered in the right direction.

To some older people, who may not have had the good fortune to be carried away by our Führer's youthful ideas, these "innovations" may seem completely incomprehensible, even harmful, because they still draw comparisons with the former times of the old party and authoritarian state, in which our fatherland had not yet been blessed with unified leadership! However, true to the words of our Führer, every German citizen should take a lively interest in the overall life of the nation and, in particular, in the development of his state - the days of the old authoritarian state are now finally over!

Many people still remember the saying from earlier times that "thinking" in the military was, on the one hand, "a matter of luck" and, on the other hand, "forbidden"; this was often mentioned only jokingly, but unfortunately there were also many examples in which "independent thinking" was indeed highly "undesirable" because it presented problems that were at least "uncomfortable" for people who were perhaps not quite so mentally agile! There is even said to have been a note in some personnel files saying

“U.S.” - “uncomfortable subordinate,” just so that a possible successor would have a slightly “more comfortable” time with this “uncomfortable” person!

Such a thing may have existed in the past, but in Adolf Hitler's state today, there is no place for such “comfort-seeking people”; already during the first medical examination, which every recruit undergoes before enlisting, army psychologists attempt to determine his “aptitudes”! Today, efforts are made from the outset to place everyone in the right position, in the correct recognition that this can significantly increase performance!

It is not through one-sided drill, but through enjoyment of the task at hand that the young German recruit is to achieve the highest possible level of skill, and it is our Führer's idea of the necessity of our people's military readiness that enables him to do so; every superior, even the lowest, must constantly fight for his leadership qualities on the basis of his example, which in turn is only possible if he constantly allows the Führer's ideas to influence him!

The closer the development of our young Wehrmacht comes to completion, the more deeply the bond of genuine National Socialist community spirit will entwine itself around the leader and his followers in our Wehrmacht, all for the blessing of a life-affirming German future!

### **Our Opinion on War**

One thing is missing for the world to achieve eternal peace: harmony in the hearts of individuals. However, achieving this is a utopian ideal or the domain of a god - it will never be attainable. Thus, hearts will remain restless forever, and this restlessness will be transferred to the lives of nations; their desires, resulting in a thousand different ways, will remain manifold, and thoughts will clash fiercely: there will continue to be wars.

Soldiers will therefore always be necessary, and this question—one of many questions related to “war” and “soldiers”—is a vital one.

Close to war and soldiers is also death, as three concepts in a framework that can hardly be broken; everything related to death has, for the living, today as always, the aftertaste of an apocalyptic gift, bringing with it a feeling of horror, wild pain, and deep sadness.

As soldiers are living beings; we therefore ask: Does the soldier love war? The question almost sounds paradoxical - just as war and death belong together, war and soldiers are also inextricably linked in their emotional, positive bond.

The soldier is not trained for games and dancing, nor for art and science; the goal of his existence—whether he is a professional soldier or only temporarily enlisted—is war and his craft.

In this, he is not even trained schematically, but rather it is a fervent effort to direct his feelings, actions, and thoughts toward war, which—beyond human ability and action—is fate, in which we must prevail or perish.

Those who are free and unspoiled readily embrace the beauty of soldiering and live joyfully in it, namely in the camaraderie, masculinity, close connection to nature, ideals, and toughness that characterize soldiering, especially in war.

Thus, even in war, the soldier's lot would be a lot drawn in the lottery of bliss - but we know that death stands alongside war, and soldiers are living beings.

What does war bring to the soldier? It brings him many things, namely everything that has been said about camaraderie and toughness, in an unprecedented increase; to experience this has always been a gain for all truly masculine natures. It also brings him an unprecedented, great feeling for the beauty of existence, especially when he has come into contact with death; it gives him the opportunity to face danger, eye to eye, in order to show and prove who is stronger, the enemy or himself. When he has triumphed, through his willpower and energy, and the danger has been overcome, it brings him a feeling of happiness beyond comparison - all old soldiers will confirm this.

This in turn is because soldiers are living beings; that feeling of happiness ultimately springs from the uplifting feeling of being given life again.

Certainly, there are also cheap ideas, notions, and customs that can inspire people and soldiers to wage war: that is the somewhat robber baron-like existence in war. It is the opportunity to give free rein to animal and semi-animal instincts, its somewhat carefree existence and the opportunity to play with danger; in short, it is everything that is so aptly described by the ugly term "a fresh and cheerful war."

But the reality is quite different - take an old soldier, a really old soldier who was there on the Chemin des Dames or on the Loretto Heights or at Kemmel, and he will tell you what war is; he will also tell you that there is no more unfortunate word in the world than the word "a fresh and cheerful war."

Finally, when he has described to you what war is, you will be quite astonished when he says that even today, without a moment's hesitation, he would do his duty in war. If you then asked him, "Do you love war, soldier?", he would nevertheless answer, "No, I do not love war."

Two decades have passed since the last war, and it is undeniable that there is a widespread desire to continue raising the cultural level of the world during these two decades - the more cultured the world becomes, the less inclination there is to wage war. This is by no means decadent, for ultimately the virtues that distinguish warriors and soldiers can also be awakened, developed, and needed in times when there is no war.

Struggle in the world will be eternal, but it does not always have to be struggles that drive people against each other; there is enough to be overcome that requires outstanding people in unprecedented numbers.

The desire to avoid war can probably be explained by the fact that, as culture continues to advance, people are slowly and gradually moving closer to harmony, without ever being able to achieve it completely within a humanly measurable time frame.

No, soldiers do not love war; they cannot love it, but they will do their duty in it, that is beyond doubt - who would want to escape the fate that brings war upon them and their nation?

But today, all of us, Germans, French, English, Italians, and whoever else took part in the World War, are still too much under the spell of those harrowing years to be able to descend into frivolity, a position that has so often caused immeasurable damage, especially when it comes to war.

Soldiers love life; soldiers love life perhaps even more than all those who have never seen war or suffered from it - how, then, could they risk everything that life has offered them and everything that life can still give them in order to fall in love with war?

We Germans, in particular, have thankfully struggled to arrive at our own point of view, a point of view that was almost considered dishonorable before the war: to not to praise war as the most beautiful thing in the world. We will never wage war for the sake of war, and never again will we focus our inner and outer energies solely on preparing the ground for the death, despair, and hardship that accompanies every war. That is why soldiers do not love war; they will not instill a love of war in young people who have grown up after them and have not yet seen war. They have often promised this to themselves and to others; this is

also what those ten thousand soldiers recently promised themselves, English, French, and German soldiers who swore at Douaumont at night to work for peace.

Nevertheless, one thing is certain: if fate calls, because the existence of the nation is threatened, then everyone will be there and do their duty in the war that is their destiny.

The soldier will preserve peace, and he will say: Peace above all else! Nevertheless, he recognizes the validity of that old saying: “Si vis pacem, para bellum,”<sup>16</sup> despite everything.

For the rest, let us hope and wish and work for harmony to grow in the hearts of individuals throughout the world, so that the world may finally achieve true peace.

We ask again: does the soldier love war? We can say, all of us who are soldiers of the nation, one and all, the reply - no!

---

<sup>16</sup> Latin for “If you want peace, prepare for war.”

## VII. Cultural Policy

### Without a Full Beard

Nothing is more beautiful and advantageous than a long, flowing beard - in winter, it keeps you warm, you don't need to wear expensive ties, and, if you're attacked, all you need to do is say in a deep voice from under your beard that you are outraged. An indignant full beard immediately cloaks, for itself and around itself, everything that is cowardly, comfortable, stupid, and possessive—in other words, the whole man. A man with a full beard who declares himself indignant must be protected; his opponent is always wicked - these are principles that are as instinctive to the human masses as the feeding and danger instincts are to a herd of deer.

But we do not want to attack the man with the full beard at this point. (for we would only come off worse) - no, we are just talking among ourselves, and we are not paying any attention to him. If he listens anyway and expresses his outrage from the next table, however—yes, children, the tyranny of men with full beards is a real plague.

You see, my friends, a man with a full beard will readily claim the right to be outraged, but how outraged is he when someone is outraged about him; should we speak quietly because of him, or not say anything at all? Thank God he's not our father.

We're sitting here at our own table, and we raise the question—just for the sake of having a nice conversation—of “To what extent should we revere classical works of art?” What is that? A “classical work of art”?

My God, a classical work of art is just that: a classical work of art. None of us here are educated; we know little about solemn art history; many of us don't even know what art history is, and the only thing that is completely certain is that we are alive, that we are sitting here together, discussing this topic, and that things like art and classical art simply exist, exist with us and supposedly even for us.

\*\*\*

Classical art can be recognized by the fact that it is “revered”; try ranting about a work of art in the presence of a full beard, and if he rants along with you, it's not a classic work of art; however, if he lashes out at you with his flowing beard and calls you a “good-for-nothing” (“Good-for-nothings like you should be slapped around the ears!”), ha, then it's a classic work of art!

You must have reverence for the classical work of art; you can allow yourself the greatest insolence in front of the non-classical work of art - this brings us closer to the heart of the matter.

The poetic classical work of art can be found printed in school textbooks, and the painted classical work of art can be found hanging in museums; the condition for both is that around a hundred years must have passed - only then, as I said, you must have reverence. We are not talking about classical works of art in the field of music here; I do not engage in such entertainment, because I know nothing about music.

We have thus gained a certain foundation under our feet; may God help us never to stray too far from each other. Our words must remain understandable to all; there are no scholars among us. I have deliberately omitted reverence, for one can have reverence afterwards, when one has understood the matter, but one cannot have it beforehand, when one does not yet know what is to be played afterwards - one can pray with reverence, but one cannot think with reverence. And precisely because there is so much endless,

false talk about art – “Before we enter the hallowed halls of art” – precisely for that reason it was necessary to wash away all this slime, and for that reason alone I suggested: “Let's drink a beer!” I think we have a very good, valid reason to drink.

\*\*\*

And now, after we have drunk, let us ask once again: “In what way should we have reverence?”

We don't have to have any reverence at all; it has always been a paralyzing poison of the nerves that we should be forced and compelled to have reverence; this results in nothing but idolatry, dull shyness, numb feet, and great hypocrisy - one can easily line up a hundred men for a field march and even for church, but one cannot line up anyone for the enjoyment of art.

Only through willing understanding, even through voluntarily chosen effort, can one cultivate oneself to enjoy art; this effort is worthwhile, because in art we are given the world a second time; in art we watch life without having to participate in it - in art we have, so to speak, the wonderful Italy without the damn flies that are there in droves. “Poetry”, in quotation marks and with reverence, means something like “Italy without flies,” that is, beauty that is not true, although a lie cannot be proven.

To write poetry means to “condense,” to compress, to boil down, to extract - a drop of rose oil from ten pounds of rose petals. In a novel, poem, or drama, the poet always gives only the essentials and leaves out the non-essentials; he condenses three years of waiting into two lines, and he gives the five minutes of reunion in slow motion over twenty pages. Hot days, sore feet, ringing in the ears, toothache, and boredom, missed trains, and futile attempts—he leaves all that out. The hero and heroine always do their best; we don't see the rest; we are only there when something important happens; the unimportant is left out. Rarely does anyone in a poet's work stamp their feet and curse the low temperature of the water; that is why the sensitive souls sigh when reading novels and say, “That's how my husband should be!”

In exactly the same way, the painter depicts only what he considers to be important for the area in his eyes and according to his intentions - he emphasizes what he wants and leaves out what is insignificant; he puts his soul into the landscape, especially his own soul.

When three painters paint the same landscape, the result is three different landscapes - one sees the sadness, the other the sunshine, and the third falls in love with the little details and shows them to us. They all have an eye for it, and through them we learn to see and feel; here we already see the first small glimpse of the value and usefulness of art. Through art, we learn to see and feel new things, our emotional range becomes richer, the area of boredom within us becomes smaller, and, in short, we get more out of life from now on - art enriches us inwardly.

The work of poets enriches us the most, because here we get to know people and destinies, conditions and landscapes, foreign peoples, social and political circumstances, and the more a person has read (with understanding), the richer, greater, wider, and deeper the world has become for them; even if they have nothing else, they can think for themselves over barley coffee and hard bread, and are not dependent on playing cards or going to the pub.

I think that with all this we have already wandered through a very nice piece of art; the result is positive, and it is all the more positive, that is, useful and genuine, because we began with an explicit rejection of any premature reverence; we have arrived at a point where voluntary reverence can very well arise, for reverence is nothing more than recognition of an achievement that has flowed from high human qualities.

## **Don't Trumpet – Write Poetry!**

You show me, with great joy, that you have found a leading German publisher for your poems; rest assured that I am sincerely happy for your success, even though my objections to your work remain unchanged; it even seems to me that you have misunderstood me on the essential points. I now feel obliged to write to you again, as I believe that our disagreements concerning the fundamental questions of German poetry are worth discussing publicly rather than privately - we must do everything we can to approach our work today without any misunderstandings.

First, a statement of fact that we have both made: poetry is being read again. Four years ago, the literary jargon would have been that “poetry is in demand again”; we all know that the cultural pontiffs of the recent past have tried, at some expense in ink and paper, to make it clear to the German people that poetry is an art form that is no longer in keeping with the times - a dying art form.

We know from our practical experience that, apart from Weinert, Tucholsky, Kästner, Mühsam, and Toller, virtually no poetry was “officially” published and promoted through newspaper reviews; we know, however, that this poetry represented nothing other than the deliberate Jewish-Bolshevik liquidation of lyric poetry, a deliberate “reduction to absurdity” of poetry in general.

Now that the National Socialist revolution of 1933 has finally freed the German people from the Jewish cultural corset, and now that our blood can once again flow freely and unhindered into the deliberately stifled limbs of German cultural life, German lyric poetry is awakening to new life. Twice now, lyrical works have been awarded the State Prize of the German People: the poems of W.E. Möllers and Gerhard Schumann. We read print runs in poetry collections that a few years ago would have been considered the stuff of fairy tales; the tremendous impulse of life that Germany has received through the actions of the Führer is driving poetry to new and beautiful achievements.

But here we come to the point where our opinions diverge - if we may paraphrase an essential point of the National Socialist revolution, then we can say that the German people have been led, or are to be led, to a fundamental understanding of their political calling. However, political vocation is not an end in itself or a fulfillment; it derives its meaning solely from the shaping of the German people with the sole aim of fulfilling our highest duty in the best possible way: to secure and preserve the people into which we were born into by blood and destiny; the human concept of eternity indicates the greatness and breadth of that goal.

What those that are part of an actual and spiritual emigration cannot comprehend, either intentionally or through stupidity, is the concept of freedom of the creative German given by this goal; the “aere perennius” has been redeemed<sup>17</sup> from the narrow and changeable relationship of the artist's ego, because the measure of eternity is given by the people as a whole - thank God, the concept of personality today no longer coincides with the former concept of individuality.

Today, no commentators or commentaries are needed to understand an artist's legacy, no mediators are needed who have to familiarize themselves with the particularities of this individual in order to give the astonished people a retort-like measure of understanding - no, in the vastness of the national concept of

---

<sup>17</sup> Latin for “more lasting than bronze”; for the “aere perennius” to be redeemed means that German poetry has been made immortal through the action of the National Socialist revolution.

freedom, there are no longer any “misunderstood artists” who were only misunderstood in the past because they were incomprehensible.

It is therefore the task of creative Germans to fill the great space of national freedom with their works; this is the greatest task that can be set for our creators. The perfectly formed eternal values of a people, conscious of its ethnic mission, are cultural values par excellence; they are cultural values which then also – but very far removed from the ramblings of intellectual internationalists – represent timeless human values.

The political necessities arise from this fundamental national attitude - they are thus also exponents of the German cultural task.

And now I repeat my question to you, and perhaps the question will astonish you even more now than it did the other day:

“Why don't you write love poems?”

Reading through your poems, I got the impression that you have a preconceived opinion of “poetry and poets in our time”; I believe that not only you, but also a whole number of young poets, are laboring under a misunderstanding.

Today, we demand a new attitude from the German people; we would even go so far as to say that anyone who wants to understand Germany's work and path into the future must literally march along this path. Why should young artists march with the Hitler Youth, perform their labor service, and fulfill their honorary duty in the Wehrmacht; why should they find their way into our formations? Fundamentally, not to become lyrical or otherwise artistic propagandists of these influences! That would be a very, very superficial misunderstanding of the education of German character; we can generously leave all the other “poets of direction” to others, as we got to know them well enough in Germany until 1933. We do not represent any direction - we are a people, and we want to shape a people whose 1000-year tragedy was that it was always divided.

I have already said that presenting individuality as personality was a liberalist pastime; to rise from the melting pot of the people, which contains all the forces of life, of personality, i.e., as the leader of this people, is the enormous educational task of National Socialism, which it must carry out: it is not that you willingly march in formation, not that you willingly worked in the labor service, not that you willingly wear a soldier's uniform, that is an achievement for you and thus an experience that must be shaped - no, it is that you have understood the meaning of service, that you have buried your own self-interest and individual stubbornness, that you no longer perpetuate your “being,” but have learned to transform it into “being there” for the people - that is why you, as poets and artists, belong in the marching front of the young German people!

The artist's creative process stands at the end of this all-encompassing educational work; now that you have experienced your existence as a German, you can begin to help shape this Germany in your work. I know you are now indignantly pointing out the works of Anacker, Schirach, Schumann, Möller, Nierentz, Brockmeier, and others; however in doing so, you are making a mistake. These men actively participated in the struggle for Germany in leading positions; they wrote a large part of their works while they were fighting and literally helping to shape the path to freedom with their fists. In their works, these men shaped the struggle for Germany, just as they are helping to shape Germany today; when they wrote their verses, they were the first to write in a time of great uncertainty, but out of a faith that could not be broken. They did not write to establish a canon of National Socialist poetry; most of them would probably have been very surprised if someone had wanted to classify them as literature.

Horst Wessel did not sit down and write the “new German national anthem”! Nor did they know anything about forming “schools” and representing movements.

But when one picks up the works of some others today, one cannot shake the feeling that they conceived the idea of a new German poetry purely in literary terms, as if they had now learned how “one must write today”; one is also struck by the observation that many, especially young people, have in mind a form of poetry that is not a creation, but an echo of the times; they are carried along by a great wave of emotional experiences that they have received in our time - I would almost call them “lyrical impressionists of political impulses.” They experience the times, but they do not shape them.

I fear that some of them are taking the easy way out, feeling that they would otherwise not be relevant; that is why I undoubtedly have the feeling that our poetic youth is moving single-mindedly through time, but is not shaping the whole beyond today.

I ask you: “Why don't you write love poems?” quite deliberately, because I am not criticizing your work for the sake of criticism, but am myself trying to find the way forward with you.

If you have become a National Socialist, then it is very insignificant if, as an artist, you now make this transformative experience the tenor of your entire work; I know that this inner and outer revolutionary transformation, this new realization, but above all this unique liberation of the artist in the National Socialist worldview, shakes and moves you, grips you in a completely different way than perhaps someone who does not feel so responsible before eternity, who has limited his sphere of activity to the reality of everyday life.

But your path to National Socialism is basically just as natural as that of any other German citizen; it is the path of duty, not the path of special glory - for you as a poet, this means creating your work from a new perspective, not promoting your new perspective in your work.

If you now use your skills and your capacity for experience to be a poet and creator from your attitude, then you will realize that you can write and compose everything that concerns the life of the people; you will then realize that there are no “National Socialist themes”, but only one National Socialist attitude to all things, one National Socialist “worldview”, and no other.

Why don't you write love poems as a National Socialist? You are familiar with the rich treasure trove of German love poetry, so you know that this is folk poetry in the truest sense of the word and always will be.

However, the relationship between men and women has gained infinitely through the upheaval of the National Socialist worldview compared to earlier times; it is no longer the individualistic feeling of love, no longer the exclusive polarity of man and woman, no longer the erotic game or the regulation of sexual urges, the motif of recently departed “poets,” that dominate our thinking, but a new knowledge of the infinity of life and a new commitment to eternal lawfulness.

When you, as a National Socialist, stand before a woman, a mother, or a girl today, you see in their eyes the future of everything that will become and grow great in our people.

Are these things not worthy of the poet?

Can you not guide many searching souls with them?

Do you not thus shape Germany, eternal, immortal Germany, in your work and in the thousand hearts of those who find themselves in your work?

Come with me then - let us write poetry, and not blow trumpets!

## Is There Such a Thing as Communist Culture?

In view of the horrific and unconditional destruction of all traditional cultural values, as it is currently taking place again in Spain, for example, before the eyes of the whole world, to ask about the possibility of a communist culture seems like something out of a madhouse, or at least like the question of someone who has been living on the moon for almost 20 years. However, if one is familiar with the theoretical and practical attempts to create a Bolshevik "culture," which are propagated both in fundamental ideological literature and in communist reality, the question is nevertheless justified.

Not only will every communist feature writer calmly declare, in accordance with his own convictions, that he is an absolutely more valuable writer than the representatives of the entire modern bourgeois culture, Schiller, Goethe, and Hamsun combined, every communist poet, even with the proverbial modesty of a Johannes Becher<sup>18</sup>, will also answer "yes", seriously and with a clear conscience, when asked whether he considers his poems more valuable than Goethe's most beautiful poems - but more important than these private opinions of megalomaniacal literary snobs are the manifestos of communist spokesmen and ideologues; above all, it is the view, always seductive to Germans and instilled in them for decades, that communism is an expression of the unconscious, and thus of creativity.

In a critical examination, we must first be clear that so-called "communist culture" is not a matter for the Sovietized Russian people, that it is not bound to any geographical area or a particular people, but is demanded and supported by a certain type of humanity, independent of place and people.

We in Germany have had a communist "culture" for almost 20 years, just as at least 75 percent of the "art" currently officially recognized in France is communist (Gide, Maurois-Hertzogen, Jules Romain, J. Duhamel, H. Barbusse, to name but a few representatives of this Jewish literature in the French language). Incidentally, it is a shameful fact that certain authors, who are engaged in the wildest agitation against the new Germany, still occasionally appear in German translations and enjoy hospitality in Germany.

We must also free ourselves from the mistaken idea that communism sees the destruction of traditional cultural values as the sole goal of its "cultural revolution"; on the contrary, as its programmatic slogan suggests, communist ideology strives for a revolution, i.e., for a change that always implies the creation of something new in place of the old that has been destroyed. Indeed, one is astonished to read in Lenin's works (Volume 17) the thoroughly bourgeois and conservative-sounding demand:

*"Proletarian culture must be a lawful, further development of the store of knowledge that humanity has developed under the yoke of the capitalists, the landlords (!)..."*

As the intellectual leader of revolutionary Soviet Russia, he mocks and scorns those mindless and brainless literary radicals who want to create a "new proletarian culture" out of nothing. With this then, let us try, along with Lenin, to disregard all those "people of bourgeois-intellectual origin" who "see the newly created educational institutions of the workers and peasants as a playground for their personal whims in the field of culture," in order to offer "all kinds of supernatural and crazy things under the guise of purely proletarian art and culture"; let us really stick to the pure Leninist cultural program and the officially recognized cultural practice in Soviet Russia in order to answer our question about the possibility of a communist culture.

---

<sup>18</sup> Becher was a German politician and writer who was a member of the KPD.

The goal has already been mentioned several times: proletarian culture. We claim that this goal itself is wrong and that any attempt to pursue it is therefore bound to fail.

Is there such a thing as proletarian culture? We Germans, through long and sad experiences, are in a position to answer this question with a resounding “no”; we need not even think of the worst excesses in this regard, Jewish decadent art, or even actual communist art. Even the work of an artist of international renown, Gerhart Hauptmann, who still has a seat and a vote in the Academy of Poets, can provide us with information about this in part of his oeuvre.

But—and this is essential to our consideration—it is precisely for this reason that a large part of his work has failed as art, to such an extent that even today, during his lifetime, the performance of a number of his plays is completely ineffective, as they no longer have anything to say to the German people. How is this possible? Because all art and all culture are expressions of community.

A community is not a social class or a caste, but a people in its entirety; art is not the one-sided depiction of proletarian destinies, but of those experiences in which the people as a whole participate, regardless of social class, wealth, religion, or education - to name just a few of the many shared experiences of our people, apart from truly mythical and primal experiences such as love, religion, etc., we need only refer to the experience of war, unemployment, and the decline and rise of the German people. There is therefore no such thing as proletarian art in the sense of an artistic form that expresses the experiences of a particular class and belongs solely to that class.

If we compare the positive products with this objective, a few examples suffice to demonstrate the inadequacy of such a project: the question of how the “cultural revolution” should be reflected in the theater gave rise to the so-called “Moscow Association for Proletarian Theater”; it set out to imbue the new, post-revolutionary stage with a spirit that would make the legacy of the old Russian theater culture serve the “sharpening of class consciousness.”

The association includes not only the major Moscow stages—the Theater of the Revolution; MGSPS, the Proletkult trade union theater—but also all the amateur and workers' theaters scattered throughout Russia, representatives of a theatrical art that emerged directly from the factories and daily politics, and which we in Germany also came to know as the “theater of the blue shirts” during the Weimar era; this also includes the peasant theaters.

This is the broad basis on which the association is founded, and the one-sided class-struggle tendencies of this association, which thus negate the prerequisite for a work of art from the outset, are already clearly expressed in its emergence in the confrontation with the high, pre-revolutionary Russian theater culture. Names like Tarioff are no longer on the agenda at all; his theater is considered that of the new bourgeoisie, the “Nep”. In contrast, the debate with Stanislavsky's stage could not be conducted with a few slogans; it was precisely in this controversy that the supporters of the association were forced to reveal their intentions.

Stanislavsky's supporters pointed out to the Marxists that they explained human beings as the product of circumstances and environment - wasn't Stanislavsky's realism based on the most accurate reproduction of the environment? The Marxists replied: The milieu you are talking about is that of Taine's individualistic social theory; Marx, however, asserts that the individual is determined by class position, which in turn is determined by their position in the production process. As a result, Stanislavsky's theater knows no class psychology, but only that of the individual - no class struggle, but only class reconciliation!

Here, then, the association is forced to reveal what matters to it: not a cultural revolution, but the realization of the political revolution, the cultural-political propagation of the goals of the Communist Party - wherever art is dragged down into the depths of party politics, it relinquishes its claim to artistic value.

The result of these class-struggle tendencies presented on stage is inevitably a one-sided black-and-white portrayal of the characters, which is even more evident in Russian propaganda films; it is an illustration of the Marxist doctrine of sinister capitalism, which, whatever it does, can only do evil, and of the good, revolutionary proletariat, which, whatever it does, can only do good.

The stock characters of communist theater and film are the villainous capitalist, the kulak, and the lovable proletarian; most Russian plays and screenplays are structured according to this one-sided view, which, until recently, still believed in angels and devils. They try—but undoubtedly without meaning to—to transfer this old theological worldview into a new theological worldview, just as the altar corners of Russian farmhouses were simply converted into Lenin corners by hanging “Saint Lenin” instead of the Holy Mother of Kazan.

This is not only the Tolstoyan sentimentality inherent in the degenerate Russian people, who are sinking into Asian passivity, about the simple, good brother Muschik<sup>19</sup>, the God-fearing bastion of early Christianity, or that salon Bolshevism, whose eternal romantic primitivism once filled all the Jews of Berlin with bright delight - even more than that, it is about the deliberate Marxist reduction of art to a state of naked political didacticism.

As much as we are convinced that there is an eternal struggle between good and evil, light and darkness, in human beings and in world affairs as a whole, that knowledge of this fruitful polarity is the linchpin of the Nordic worldview; its dramatic effect is based solely on this tension. Meanwhile, there is something completely foreign in this fantastical depiction of human beings by the Marxist that is alien to natural creation, who on the one hand represents the flawless and angelic, and on the other hand the abominable and ugly - in short, the devilish principle.

This juxtaposition of light and dark, angel and devil, does not exist in the sense of two hostile elements that do not seek to complement each other but seek to destroy each other; the reconciliation of opposites in an exalted unity, depicted on stage, is a re-creation of the natural events in creation, and therefore art. The black-and-white portrayal, on the other hand, invented for party political purposes, namely the fight between two classes, has no model in the order of creation; it is constructed by human brains and is therefore a “contrivance.”

Culture is only possible where there is community; there is much truth in the words of a noble, Nordic spirit, the Norman Frenchman Suarès, that “culture is a place of love.” But not every community produces culture; there is also a community in a prison, yet this forced community of locked-up convicts is naturally not a bearer of culture.

The basic unit of all cultures is the family; not the economic community of one or more breadwinners, but the deep community between father, mother, and children - it is a spiritual community that culture needs. The highest law of any community that wants to be a bearer of culture is this: the individual must lose himself in the community with his soul in order to fulfill his own task completely.

---

<sup>19</sup> The Russian word for “peasant”, or, more informally, meaning “real man”.

How can a people produce a cultural achievement when it is nothing more than a forced community under foreign leadership, whose forms of community have been systematically destroyed, and whose people have been just as systematically uprooted and proletarianized?

Here, a third point simultaneously imposes itself - the word "culture" itself holds fast to the awareness that its essence is closely connected with the cultivation and preparation of the maternal soil. Culture is not something abstract, floating in the air, but something that has grown organically; it is the fruit of the mother soil of the national substance.

But how can a people be culturally creative when it proudly calls itself the people of the proletariat, i.e., the uprooted? There has never been a culture of the uprooted in the history of mankind; on the contrary, there have always been times of human and ethnic decay when these uprooted people pursued the phantom of an abstract, supranational "art" that denied all racial ties.

It is therefore no wonder that there is not a single product of the communist mindset that deserves to be called a work of art, and that, moreover, there is no longer any real Russian culture today, unless it finds a refuge in emigration; quite simply, it is because the substance of the Russian soul has been destroyed to its very core, for culture, in the narrower and proper sense, is nothing other than the emergence and elevation of what is inherent in the seed - culture is the embodiment of the noblest hereditary traits of a person, a people, a race, which is emerging from a supreme and autocratic elevation of nature.

Can one still seriously expect a people that is being systematically denigrated, namely through the violent extermination of its leaders as the bearers of the best racial values and thus of culture, to crystallize racial values into cultural achievements? No, a people with the inheritance of diseased blood has played out its role as a cultured people; a people without culture is a people without a soul, without divinity - a soulless body is nothing more than dead matter.

When communism appeared, the world was mystified by the claim that it was a religion, and thus a moral and cultural power - just as we National Socialists are the first to proclaim once again to a dying Europe the message of a divine origin of the world and the connection between man and nature, and just as we believe unshakably that all art arises from a longing for God, it is also certain that mankind has never been taught a doctrine that represents such a satanic rebellion against the divine as communism; only religiously misguided enthusiasts could portray Dostoevsky as the herald of a new religion, namely those who see the fulfillment of the divine mission in the general, impossible brotherhood of the world.

Just as Tolstoy could not bring himself to put his doctrine of "evangelizing the masses" into practice by distributing his vast estates among the poor, so communism has no right to call itself a religion.

This is based on a fatal error in the understanding of religion - National Socialism may well find the focus of religious experience in the irrational, in feeling in general, but irrationalism and feeling are something quite different from the cult of the unconscious and the subconscious, of intoxication and an obsession with impulse - the former is part of God, while the latter is of Satan and subhumanity.

This elemental, powerful emotion discharges itself only as raw material of the soul, as an hideous scream; it simultaneously attempts to create a beautiful form appropriate to the material, but the organism of the racially inferior can only discharge itself as an animalistic sound, as a broken word, as the abrupt gesture of a madman.

Thus concludes the Leninist thesis of the cultural revolution, after it has inevitably ended in all those signs of decay that have been issued under various programmatic slogans in recent decades, such as Dadaism,

Expressionism, or Surrealism - these “directions” are well known to all of us, and they are too unpleasant to be subjected to analysis once again.

### **Homosexuality and Art**

There is no need to prove that homosexuality has played a significant role in German art over the past decade - for those who are unaware of this, it should be noted that there were theaters, for example, where well over 50 percent of the male performers took advantage of this “right to originality”, not to mention the women; unfortunately, these were not isolated cases.

Since National Socialists do not regard the phenomena of life as problems with their own laws, but only as problems in their organic connections to the community, every former “problem” has become an object of political decision-making. Since National Socialism has returned the concept of politics to its original meaning, i.e., that politics is not a limited construct of purpose alongside which there are others of equal or even higher value, but instead it is imperative, indeed necessary, that all areas of life has its values lie solely in their political fulfillment, any other value system must logically lead to the liberal concept of freedom, i.e., the recognition of anarchistic antisociality.

Our cultural policy is clearly and simply based on these fundamental insights, which unambiguously defines the position of art; when today's mob of émigré scribblers rage about the “political rape of art” in Germany, this sentiment proves even to the most hard of hearing how significant the National Socialist reorientation must be.

There is no need to greet the police commissioner in art with songs of doom, for history teaches us that he has always been only an episodic figure of secondary importance; however, the complete destruction of an artistic principle of international significance will always produce an audible echo. We certainly do not listen to the hysteria of the literary barricade fighters of Kurfürstendamm<sup>20</sup>, but in this case we can read with satisfaction from their echo the correctness of our path.

The basic principles of National Socialist cultural policy are unproblematically simple, and they are of the same timeless simplicity as all the demands of National Socialism: they have raised degraded art back to the level of eternal creativity and pointed the artist toward the divine order of that lawfulness which alone fulfills the meaning of life, namely its preservation and its undisturbed continuation into the future.

Seen in this light, art today is being led back to the purest source from which it has drawn its strongest impetus at all times and among all peoples - the natural and therefore divine polarity of creative procreation.

If National Socialism were to claim that it had discovered this fundamental law, it would be denying the eternal creations of past generations - no, it has precisely drawn this indestructible law from them. What it can rightly claim is that it consciously discovered this law as an artistic obligation—one might almost say programmatically—par excellence; it can claim that it has found in this law the meaning, the sole and unalterable meaning, of all artistic creation today, and has established it as the sole scale of values.

Thus, through National Socialism, the eternal concept of freedom in art has been found. Our concept of art has broken the last shackles of art's lack of freedom; it has overcome the concept of individuality, and it will be left to future generations to judge what this process means for artistic creation as a whole.

---

<sup>20</sup> A boulevard in Berlin known for its high society and excesses of wealth.

Art that grows out of the primordial law of creativity without slowing down this impulse through the fragmentation of individual values and forms and without isolating it in the realm of true artistic fulfillment, in the realm of the national community, this divine order par excellence, through the transience of an individual will that represents both contemporary taste and individualism, unconditionally and flawlessly perfects the species-bound personality in the creation of the purest eternal values; the artist's ego now enters into the meaning of the divine order, which has placed this fundamental experience at the beginning of all communal fulfillment, into the "we" of the duty of life that transcends the individual, through the meaningful (not unique and transitory) experience of the procreative polarity of the masculine and feminine.

Art has thus been redeemed from pure instinctual impulses; it has redeemed itself from a completely fruitless erotic problem, and it has redeemed itself from all ideologies of self-gratification and self-redemption - it is inextricably anchored in the experience of love, which is not an end in itself, but serves the divine order with its life-giving and life-sustaining powers.

In such art, man is not violated, neither by a life-denying ideology nor by any antisocial drives; in this art, man is liberated because he experiences the fulfillment of his life in its divine greatness and uniqueness, which is far removed from any loneliness.

Only that which is meaningful speaks the language of eternity; that which is meaningless is the problem of all antisocial and destructive forces - the Führer outlined the basis of art in a single word when he said that health is the soil from which true and great art can grow.

Health—that is the only guarantee for the life of the people; health—that is the epitome of National Socialist racial hygiene and racial policy; health—that alone is the foundation of the population policy of the new Reich; health—to protect the people from unexpected, senseless bloodshed—that is the deeper meaning of German defense policy; health—which provides the German people with the foundations of life—is the sole purpose of the economy and industry in the National Socialist Reich, and not selfish ends; health—this is the binding legacy that every young generation will inherit from their parents as the greatest national treasure for all time.

German art is an immovable part of this program for life, and German culture grows solely from this program for life; it only has meaning if it is a reflection of a time whose goal has broken through all the temporal limitations of earlier political tendencies; it only has justification if it has grasped and shaped the greatness of this goal in its creations, if it has thus served in its ethos a world order that lasts from eternity to eternity. To testify to future generations on the will of the present to achieve their future—that is the meaning of art and the meaning of cultural creation in the new Reich, and in this fulfillment, it has become a world-historical rejection of individualism, liberalism, and internationalism - an eternal rejection of all ideologies hostile to life.

The superficial reader of these lines, who was enticed to read on by the headline, may have followed along with a certain disappointment, since so far there has been only talk of art and not yet of homosexuality, which the essay promised to discuss.

But the fact is that we take very little pleasure in criticism for criticism's sake, yet we claim the right to criticize above many others because we see in our criticism the final elimination of all those things that stand in the way of our will and our development; we can say what art and culture mean to us, and we turn against all destructive forces, indeed, because we take the view that knowledge of what is right is the best way to kill what is wrong.

The reader who now stops reading and says, "I can spare myself the rest of this essay because it is now obvious to me that there can be nothing sick or abnormal in the realm of this art," is our best friend - nevertheless, let us now say this about the subject:

Just as the question of homosexuality today can be understood not only in criminal terms, but above all in political terms, so too is the question of homosexuality and art a clearly political problem for us; it has two sides with the same end result.

In our historical view of the development of art in the 19th and 20th centuries, we can confidently include the advance of homosexuals in the field of art and artistic creation in the chapter on the Jewish question, for with the Jewish seizure of power in the field of German culture comes propaganda for homosexuals. Within the framework of this campaign, homosexuals are a highly desirable instrument, as insofar as they are truly predisposed, they represent the antisocial element itself, just like the Jews in German culture. Homosexuals can never be creators or bearers of art that comes from the fundamental laws of creativity; those who are different lack the creative experience of a purely biological nature. They are homunculi and thus excluded from the eternal laws of life; it is therefore no coincidence that the principle of "art for art's sake" and its entire aesthetic attitude was the domain of homosexuals; it is also no coincidence that the degenerate logically ended up with the worldview of the Jewish-led destruction of life, Bolshevism, for which many of today's emigrants are living testimony - we see that a homosexual-led art movement must lead to a strict rejection of the natural community of life.

However, these observations are purely political in their effect, because they identify effects that are hostile to the community based on the given conditions. Unfortunately, for our healthy attitude toward life, there is no gradation in the concept of hostility to the state; anyone who intends to be active in this area must accept this fact without regret - the divine order of life in self-sustaining nature proceeds with the same consistency, and we do not see any reason to interfere with the Creator's laws.

Precisely when we see the fulfillment of art in the heightened representation of reality, as well as in the creation of ideals that have transcended time, we must protest most vehemently against the intrusion of artistic products by people who are incapable of fitting into the framework of natural laws into the living space of the people as accounts or models to follow; they will cause the same process of degeneration as the products of the Jewish artists and Bolsheviks, whose works have been the given elements of decomposition, both formally and thematically.

The other side of the problem is typically individualistic - based fundamentally on the autonomy of the individual, it leads to the unconditional recognition of otherness in the field of homosexuality.

One can readily speak here of a crime of intellectual individualism, which, with its fundamental views on homosexuality, has done the best possible service to its proponents; it is not far from the right to uninhibited individuality to the right to "otherness." From this point of view, it is not difficult to understand the fixation on the concept of the "artistic person," who must now represent the sum of individualistic specialization; the "collective person," the masses, who are "type casted" into their natural laws, are contrasted with the artist, who, for heaven's sake, must be different in order to be an artist at all. Many German artists will still be familiar with the cynical saying of former art authorities, which stage artists often encountered: "Are you Jewish, homosexual, or Viennese (which was understood to mean a special variety of Jewish artist) - if not, what are you doing in German theater?"

This was the complete confirmation of what we have claimed from an ideological point of view: being different in terms of race and sexual orientation became the basis of artistry; the sharp smell of an animal

from another forest was enough to attract the curiosity of the masses to the bestiary of Jewish-Bolshevik art production.

Otherness was linked to the concept of artistry in order to ultimately abolish it; the primitive fairground instincts that finance the hunchbacked dwarf and the giantess had thus been completely unleashed in the realm of art, with the end result, of course, that these attractions had to outdo each other in order to maintain sales, because this art stood outside any sense of national identity.

The anti-social, i.e., the asocial, became the prototype! The Bolshevization of concepts took place via the "third sex."

Parallel to this immediate effect, however, a second, no less dangerous inversion is taking place in direct connection with it - within the framework of this "cultural-political" direction, the existence of women could no longer be completely denied. If we consider how alien the homosexual man is to women, whose nature he does not understand, the emergence of a type of woman and its characteristics immediately becomes clear to us; not only did the "lesbian" correspond to homosexual tastes, but also all those women who are fundamentally unsuited to fulfilling a truly feminine life. It is probably not necessary to outline this category in more detail, especially since we have regained such a clear and unambiguous understanding of women through National Socialism - without any narrow-mindedness or prudishness, we must fundamentally dismiss the masculinization of women, as it was experimented with in previous years, under this heading, for the concept of camaraderie between men and women only becomes clear in its purity when the ultimate devotion to love, duty, and sacrifice arises in the child between these people; that is why we consider it tragic when the life partnership between man and woman is denied this highest experience, when they cannot or do not want to meet on the natural basis of life.

The right to life in the community of destiny of our people uncompromisingly demands the eradication of all elements that disrupt this community - that is the policy of the healthy.

Today, this fundamental law leaves no area untouched - not even art!

### **No Educational Philistines!**

Standing at attention in front of an overflowing bookcase may in many cases be an expression of reverence for this accumulation of intellectual work, but in many cases it is also an expression of a sudden "complex" phenomenon arising from a supposed feeling of inferiority; the printed word becomes a magical incantation, and the book becomes a mystery sealed with seven seals of the truth of faith of all four Gospels. Certainly, we must acknowledge the book as a guide in and through life, but only if we do not forget nature, the active and creative life around us, by combing through the book.

Art enriches our lives if we do not detach it from life, but rather allow it to express how to absorb life more deeply and impressively through it; gradually, nowadays, word now spreads that art for art's sake is a Jewish invention based on purely material considerations.

Teaching art, i.e., interpreting it, explaining it, making it understandable from its biological and racial laws, and bringing it to the people is only possible if one is also aware of art's ties to life.

In order to bring art to the people, it is necessary to create a receptive audience; however, recognizing the existence of this receptiveness is not enough to measure the duration of the applause with a stopwatch and

then walk away with a swollen chest and self-satisfaction about the “cultural mission being accomplished.”

Through education, we have already reached the point where the name of Goethe or any other classic, be it in words or music, the theater or lecture program, is enough to elicit a loud and strong applause as the ultimate sign of wisdom, regardless of whether one understood what one has heard or not; if you ask a fellow citizen for their impression, though, you will very often only get the answer: “It was very nice!” Here we would like to ask the event organizers to listen to a word of advice. Your good faith, honest intentions, and willingness to work should not be underestimated; however, while stringing together well-known names may create a pleasant evening, it does not constitute a cultural achievement. Not mere speculation—and including Goethe, Schiller, or Wagner in the program is in many cases speculation, whether conscious or unconscious—but only hard work can bear fruit in the accomplishment of cultural tasks.

The Marxist class struggle term “workers' art” cannot be eliminated by replacing it with classics; here, one binding norm is simply replaced by another, and in many cases it remains the same if, for example, today's artists are used instead of the classics chosen here.

For the common man, who does not need to concern himself with specialist knowledge as a result of his profession, it is completely irrelevant whether the rhythm of a verse is derived from Silesian art drama or French classicism, whether a painter's brushstroke is related to Cezanne's or whether a musician's composition has been influenced by that of an earlier master; discussing these questions belongs to the realm of specialist scholars, and to pass them off as art education is educational fanaticism.

Education in art is, first of all, the expansion of one's own cultural experience, i.e., not an education of the mind, but an education of the heart; furthermore, education in art is a guidance and introduction to works of art, but this can only happen if the work of art is viewed as a whole, i.e., if its erudition is not misused for analysis, but rather used to bring the beauty of a work and its significance in general cultural life closer to the senses, and thus ultimately to understanding.

However, this cannot be achieved either by a random method or by quantitative demonstration; we want neither a general leveling of taste—we gladly leave such demands to the Bolsheviks—nor a meager and flimsy smattering of knowledge, where, in the end, “no one wants to be a cobbler, but everyone wants to be a poet,” as Goethe once put it - to create culture with art in this way is to put the cart before the horse.

Art education is public education in the noblest sense, because it awakens the most valuable thing in human beings: the affirmation of life; it is not by cramming educational material into the minds of the people that one improves their social and sociological position, but by calling upon their spiritual power; it becomes clear, then, that art for its own sake is a destroyer of these spiritual powers, because it negates the bonds to the wholeness of life, the expression of which is culture, and thus also political life as a commitment to this wholeness.

Just as one cannot explain the uniqueness of the whole fruit with an apple seed, one cannot interpret or even elevate the culture of a people with artistic activity - both are the gray theory of an education-obsessed philistinism or the collective cunning of irresponsible profiteers.

Two thousand years of German culture are too good to be squandered or hawked as valuable objects on the private exchanges of busy art auctioneers; we must make it clear to those contemporaries who can no longer stop talking about cultural issues what culture means both in the German living space and in the National Socialist state.

## **Have the Courage to Take a Stand!**

Nothing is as embarrassing in the long run and as repugnant to us as the senseless and indiscriminate use of buzzwords; they are among the things we cannot do without, but which nevertheless annoy us, and that is because, instead of helping us to overcome the banal, they themselves become banal through their overly frequent and imprecise use, which strips them of their essence.

The full extent of the damage caused by this empty chatter is evident in one of the most common, ambiguous, and most abused buzzwords of the last decade: the term “tendency”; we encounter it in all theater circles and literary reviews, where it stares at us with a thousand faces, deterring and enticing, praising and condemning, affirming and denying.

The downright sleight-of-hand use of this expression, which has gradually become established, gives the word a double meaning, into which one can conjure up anything and from which one can make anything disappear; it is, as it were, the zero in our artistic mathematics with which, as is well known, everything can be proven, even that idea that two times two is five. Prove everything and condemn everything - one only needs the word “tendency” to drag any artist to the scaffold.

What does “tendency” actually mean? We will by no means attempt to answer this question with a meaningless definition - “tendency” was originally a completely harmless foreign word, “beyond good and evil,” which was used merely to designate the direction of the will toward some purpose. But while the corresponding words “intention” or “intentionality” retained their original meaning, this foreign word took on something of another color that was splashed onto its colorlessness canvas, just as vessels take on a taste from the liquid with which they are most often filled.

There was already talk of biased representations and biased reports before people began to agonize over the value and worthlessness of bias in the artistic sphere, with the earliest bias report in our history dating back to Tacitus; a veritable deluge of biased reports also broke over the German people with the World War, and probably at no other time have Jewish writers made the composition of biased representations their literary task as they have in the present.

Things are much more difficult and complicated in the field of art; even if we take only a cursory look at artistic development, we find that there has never really been any art that was completely free of bias. Certainly, there have been fanatics at times who demanded an exact and literal truth from works of art, who saw their first and last purpose in dry reporting and thus placed works of art on par with court proceedings and historical reports; I need only recall the era of naturalism, the painstakingly accurate descriptions of the environment by Zola, Hauptmann, Zille, and Kollwitz.

However, the view that art has a tendency to reproduce the facts of life with the greatest fidelity and neutrality has never taken root in the large circles of art lovers; recent times have only proven sufficiently that our people demand something else from artists than to hold up a mirror to the lowlands of their everyday existence and the demands of human instincts.

Apart from the fact that value-free impartiality has always had an inability to have an inner tendency toward the whole, a lack of spiritual worldview due to cowardice to make a positive decision, the people, beyond all the theoretical squabbles of the art dictators, have retained the very natural view that all art is consciously altered nature, inventions based on creative imagination, combination, and free processing of natural impressions, with the claim to simulate a second reality for us; however, since such inventions

have existed, assertions have been made about the purpose of these combinations that would have long since killed art if it had not lived beyond all these theories from the impression it makes on people. It is not, therefore, the existence of the tendency itself, which — as we shall see — is quite necessary to the essence of art, without which no creation can claim to be a work of art, but rather the nature of the purpose, indeed the degradation of something that is indispensable in itself to the prelude of human passions, that has made the word “tendency” so vexing to us in recent decades; it is the abuse that unscrupulous minds have made of the elasticity of this originally highly unambiguous term that has devalued it.

In truth, there is no communication between people that is not attached to some tendency; its immediate purpose is to convey the idea of something perceived from one person to another. Indeed, a moved person and a person of discernment will not even be satisfied with a straightforward factual report, but will unconsciously convey it in such a way that the listener's perception of what has happened is accompanied by a judgment of the facts. This effort is even more evident in elevated language - what purpose, for example, should a preacher ascend the pulpit? If we are not mistaken, it is not only to speak, but to improve humanity; if one wanted to dismiss this kind of proclamation with the contemptuous criticism of “tendency,” one would have to throw all the sermons of our famous pulpit speakers, which we are accustomed to appreciate as oratorical works of art in literary history, onto the pyre as worthless scribblings.

In reality, however, the listener demands nothing else from a sermon, especially from the best ones, than that it calls him to reflection and contemplation; only at the moment when the preacher misuses the pulpit for purposes unrelated to the sermon does the sermon lose its moral and artistic value; only at that moment, when the listener notices this intention, does he become disgruntled and turns away. Here we immediately touch upon what I would call the most criminal way in which this tendency has ever been applied - first of all, it is necessary to clarify the question of whether the political tendency of art as such is unartistic and reprehensible. Starting with the attempts at national revival by the German humanists, namely “Germania,” the lonely nightingale Wimpfeling, through the poems of “Sturm und Drang,” especially “The Robbers,” “Fiesko,” and “Götz,” clearly displays this tendency and occasionally even makes it particularly conscious in a prologue (“In Tyrannos!”); the Romantics, who, despite their pride in “pure,” abstract art, nevertheless placed it at the service of national rebirth, even at the occasional sacrifice of their theories: the art poet par excellence Friedrich Halm, who, despite everything, wrote “The Fencer of Ravenna,” a work that flows directly into the currents of the day; Grillparzer, who is tendentious precisely in his most mature works (“Ottokar,” “Bruderzwist”), and Anzengruber, who cannot be understood without the Tacitean trait in his work, right up to the political drama of recent times, namely its most outstanding representative, Kolbenheyer (“Gregor und Heinrich”) - political tendency wherever one looks, has tendency even in the principles of non-tendency; who would even have the audacity to dismiss these dramatic achievements, unique in art history, as tendentious works! There is no need for justification; however, a comparison with tendentious poetry in the negative sense may reveal the essence of political tendentious drama, in order to show those who feel called upon to do so what is important and to warn our people against false prophets.

Ideological struggles are always most effectively played out in dramas, on the stage; drama is the greatest form, the greatest tension of the human condition. On stage, ideological opposites become tangible, visible, vividly portrayed, more convincing and more immediately inspiring to imitate than any other art form could ever achieve, and no one has recognized this as clearly as those who have always used the

stage to play out ideological tensions and political party squabbles with the clear aim of world domination: the representatives of Jewish-civilizational drama, Paul Kornfeld, Yvan Goll, Wedekind, Sternheim, Toller, and above all Georg Kaiser.

Let us delve a little further into poetic development, to the Jesuit drama of the Baroque, the representatives of “Young Germany,” who set out to destroy national identity, naturalistic drama, the systematic preparation for the collapse of human society - Strindberg's tragedies of accusation against the family, for example, which in his view concentrates the mystery of satanic malice within the four walls, and all those “poets” with the inheritance of sick blood who made the underworld and prostitutes suitable for literature; when we linger over certain political works of recent times, we see that this kind of political poetry and political tendency is always supported either by Judaism itself or by Jewish scribes, in conjunction with artistic incompetence.

However, developments have also confirmed that genuine political poetry has also survived the centuries, even though it was at times mocked and ridiculed and its creators were punished with imprisonment or expulsion from the country; the former, thank God, has disappeared in the course of development or is in the process of disappearing, even though it was often aided by both the spirit of the times and the respective rulers in whose service it stood.

Why did Jesuit drama decline? Firstly, because art was misused for exclusively educational and didactic purposes, as a means of promoting the proper use of the Latin language and, furthermore, as an exemplary illustration of a moral dogma - above all, it declined because it was not political in the sense of liberating national, ethnic, and thus the best moral instincts, but rather it was a systematic, intellectually pursued conquest of a political power grab: the regaining of the Church's position as a world power, which had been shaken by the Reformation; it had no redemptive, liberating tendency, but saw its ultimate goal precisely in the gagging of minds and the breaking of the national independence of peoples.

Why did the drama of “Young Germany” come to an end? Likewise, because these Jewish scribblers did not seek to arouse noble, national passions for the purpose of ethnic rebirth, but rather to whip up the basest instincts of man with the aim of bringing about anarchic conditions.

Why did the drama of Expressionism remain stuck in sketches and drafts; why, despite its program, did it never achieve the elevation of the human to the extreme, the highest, and the tragic? Because its authors were not reformers, not do-gooders, but representatives of a worn-out and sick humanity, whose “poetic” intention was not the elevation of the soul, but a systematic attempt to empty the soul, humanity, and the whole world.

Why is the political work of so many contemporary poets already beginning to fall prey to the contempt of the people? Precisely because of this same inner untruthfulness and artistic incompetence - the people recognize that these works are, at best, merely contrived to illustrate some opinion elevated to a doctrine, and they react to them quite naturally with the expression “Mache”<sup>21</sup>, which conveys the idea of intentionality, of bias; they call out to the artist: “If you cannot dive with your feelings and views into those depths from which your wisdom springs, then stay away from us.”

The people have an unerringly sure sense of the authenticity and depth of feeling with which what they see is imbued; if they notice that the writer, in order to please, regulates the warm spotlight with cold calculation, that instead of feeling the essence of a time, he is content to process a fashionable judgment about the time in an exemplary manner, then this tendency, this intentionality, is rejected with contempt. There are certain products of sycophancy towards those in power, from which the people instinctively

---

<sup>21</sup> German expression, used in this context, as a sign of disgust.

turn away; there are certain political fashion statements that they already consign to the dustbin of history. Their authors are not sincere nor truthful; they have a tendency that does not flow from their hearts, and they seek to mislead the viewer - in one case, we are dealing with an unartistic or artistically impotent tendency, and in the other with an untrue, speculative, sycophantic tendency; both are unbearable, but what is worse, they are dangerous to our people. Why? Because these writers continually feel compelled to prove their "connection to the people" and "down-to-earthness" in their productions, which not only highly disreputable because of their "earthy smell," but also serve to flatten the innermost experience of our nationhood with their false closeness to nature and their stale socialism, instead of coming to the aid of our people's unredeemed longings and relieving them.

What is the prerequisite for bringing about this release? In a nutshell: true and genuine poetry with a purpose! Poetry that does not come from the intellect and seeks to illustrate some didactic, moral proposition by means of artificial constructions, or pursues political goals that may benefit an individual or a particular group of people at the expense of an entire people - in any case, a selfish and therefore inartistic tendency. Give us poetry that comes from the innermost experience, that is written with the poet's heart and soul, and that therefore has an effect from its own content and compels the viewer to devote themselves to the work; I am specifically referring to poetry that is natural, selfless (all great art is selfless, the ultimate fulfillment of the artist, the unreserved devotion of his inner wealth), magnificent, and truly liberating! This tendency is never directed toward the practical fulfillment of the specific needs of life, but rather has an effect as a whole, in and of itself, on life as a whole.

The deepest meaning of this tendency is that it comes from a deep, inner experience of the poet, that this passionate experience strives straightforwardly outward like a natural, unconscious urge, that it is transferred to the minds of the recipients without any deliberate intention, and that it awakens the same experience in them and urges them to practical action in life; in this way, the impulses of will become fruitful without instruction, without a ready-made view, without "tendency," but through the force of experience alone.

This was the original meaning of the moral tendency of antiquity, which was the self-evident view that all artistic activity had the purpose of beneficially influencing the formation of human character, bringing about the purification of the emotions, and the refinement of dispositions - in short, the cleansing of the passions. The reformist impulse was also the tendency of the poetry of Goethe and Schiller; that was even the goal of that art form which is said to be devoid of any purpose, classical music - who would deny that creations such as Beethoven's "Eroica" and "Ninth Symphony" are imbued with feelings of exaltation and liberation, in which a great desire for redemption is unleashed? The moral elevation of humanity is also the intention of poetry that is political in the narrower sense: purification through the power of its ethnic character, from which national rebirth then grows organically of its own accord; this includes, as we have already said, that proof that the poet himself is first shaken to his core by the experience he depicts, and that he has also been granted the divine gift of "saying what he suffers."

This artist is the genius we are waiting for, who is filled with inner fervor and the irrepressible will to improve his people, to purify them, to lead them to their very essence, by virtue of faith and by virtue of love for the political idea; he is not empowered in the sense of conquering positions of power himself or on behalf of an organization or a superior, but in the truly dynamic sense, i.e., by revolutionizing human nature through unleashing its best racial instincts.

## **History – Seen Correctly!**

A nation that does not learn from its history is doomed to perish, for history is nothing more than the sum of knowledge and experience that the great unity of a nation has gathered over a long life. If any present generation were to disregard the rich treasure of knowledge, acquired with such effort and often hard-won, it would be acting no differently than a foolish old man who throws away the experiences of his own long life, bought at great expense, and acts again and again like a clueless youth.

### **I.**

Historical consciousness is therefore nothing more than the living memory of the people as a whole; only those who see it as a link in the eternal chain of time will be able to see and experience the present in its full scope and with all its prerequisites. Drawn up by the inevitable passage of time, today will become irretrievably yesterday and tomorrow, and for the same reason that everything we create today in the light of day will belong to the past tomorrow, we must also recognize the past as part of ourselves.

The long-lived unity of the people does not reckon with human generations; on this evergreen tree, new leaves sprout eternally from the same ancient roots that once nourished the young sapling.

Thus, the past is nothing more than a faithful mirror that shows us other possibilities for living in accordance with our innate nature: realities of life that may have taken shape under different circumstances, but those prerequisites and forces are also effective within us.

In other words, those who disregard the history of their people sin against the future, for they contribute to stupidity and laziness that is preventing the people from exploiting the rich treasure of their historical experiences in such a way as to find the best possible path to the future.

If, then, historical consciousness is the most vital part of the intellectual life of the nation, it must never, under any circumstances, become dead scholarship; nothing has harmed the people as a whole as much as the criminal delusion of materialism, which alienates fields of knowledge from the consciousness of the people through exaggerated specialization - just as our art must always be close to the people, so too is it the most noble task of science to abandon its hermit-like isolation and make itself and its work accessible once again to all educated people.

The dead knowledge of the liberalist century is of no use to either the people or the state, and we have no desire to continue to tolerate the arrogance of a few paid civil servants who, invoking the supposed autonomy of science, demand the right to continue doing things that are of no interest to the people, and therefore of no use to them.

### **II.**

“Threefold is the step of time!” - anyone who wants to understand the present—who wants to try to assess the true causes of the intellectual and, in particular, the political forces at work in their society and environment—is immediately confronted with one of the most difficult questions of fate that exists; mindful of Goethe's words that the present “flees like an arrow,” they must immediately decide which events that have just happened still have a lasting effect at the moment of observation, and which others, even if they belong to the recent past, are already marked by the breath of death simply because of the fact that they are of the past.

The present, forever caught between the two poles of past and future, is for this reason always the enemy of the eternal, and since in this world only that which possesses a solid measure of eternity is lasting, the present, with all its problems and struggles, with all its efforts and achievements, is insignificant unless it is consciously seen as a bridge to the future.

For this reason alone, the past is never simply dead and gone for us, but, in terms of our own goals, the path we have traveled with our own blood to ourselves, to the present, and to our own future and that of our people; such a fundamental attitude toward the past must lead to a revolutionary reordering of all previous historical evaluations, and it goes without saying that the pale universalism of the liberal century must be replaced by a conscious and significant overemphasis on those historical events in which we see the foundations of our present ethnic and racial existence - in no other field of knowledge and understanding does our worldview divide minds more decisively than here, where it is a matter of constructing a new worldview.

We are aware that everything the new Reich has created so far and still has to create will only last if the growing youth fills the forms we have created with new and unique life - the inevitable law of time makes what was right yesterday, and even what is right today, obsolete tomorrow.

We are clear that the youth of our people will not measure us or our work by our standards; we also have little inclination to fall into the delusion of all those bearded old men who, when they talk about the good old days, embarrassingly reveal their lack of adaptability and creativity—but above all their inability to recognize themselves.

### III.

The liberal age saw history as a relatively dry field of knowledge, the study of which was left to the experts; the result was an unprecedented desolation of this entire intellectual domain, for wherever they were left to their own devices, scholars have always taken pride in cultivating this field, which is removed from the concerns of the masses and the interests of so-called broader strata, in such a way that it soon became impossible for the people as a whole to participate in this work.

The reason for this approach, which is still familiar to older scholars today, was the dangerous principle of the materialistic worldview that man, with all his deeds and aspirations, is always only the result of his material environment and that, accordingly, historiography, wherever it deals with past life, must make a painstaking effort to eliminate everything that is contemporary and alive - in this way, historiography became a museum curiosity that dealt only with things that were absolutely dead, and therefore itself was surrounded by the smell of the morgue.

The consequence of this basic attitude was the peculiar scholarly delusion that it was already an intellectual achievement to tackle past times and their documents with the dangerously fraying tools of source criticism; these useful but insignificant henchmen of science forgot that creative science only begins where their auxiliary work ends, for what matters is the shaping of past life, not its registration and archival labeling, however necessary that may be.

The vast majority of today's scholars have not yet abandoned this outdated viewpoint of yesteryear, and do not yet realize that the detailed work of individual disciplines, as seen by the people, must remain insignificant patchwork unless it is immediately and simultaneously accompanied by a creative synthesis of the material covered in a form that is accessible to the entire population; this criticism applies in particular to the field of German prehistory, where, despite all the efforts of the new state, no handbook has been produced since the outstanding achievement of Gustaf Kossinna that is even remotely suitable

for popular use, which would make the enormous results of this particular branch of science accessible to the educated public as a whole.

#### IV.

Scholars do not falsify history, apart from a few who, for political reasons, mostly as henchmen of supranational powers, lend themselves to this; however, there is a category of contemporaries who, for sometimes quite honorable reasons, violate historical facts simply because their ignorance made the real historical picture inaccessible to them; this type of scientific parasite is far more dangerous than solitary scholarship, and there is nothing that the new, popular science must distance itself from more decisively than those laymen who believe they must replace their ignorance with fantasies.

History is a field of knowledge that requires the most precise training and the strictest scientific discipline; it is unacceptable to ignore the basic requirements of scholarly work, which, as the basis of all knowledge, necessitate the most accurate evaluation of sources. It shows little receptivity and even less independent thinking when someone, for example, misuses Alfred Rosenberg's "Mythos" to presume to paint the formidable personality of Charlemagne solely as a devil, black on black – as if this mighty Germanic king, blood of our best blood, had not, on the other hand, saved the threatened tribes of Germany by uniting them (against their will!).

It is equally foolish to condemn the Italian policy of the greatest German kings of the Middle Ages with cheap slogans, painting them as merely unpatriotic and alien to the country, as if these rulers had not, precisely because they wore the Roman imperial crown as German kings and were therefore called to be rulers of Western Christianity, sought confirmation of the true power and greatness of the German people in the threatened German southern land of Italy.

In other words, specialized knowledge of individual minor events is by no means sufficient for a true view of history; it takes a great deal more than mere specialization to see events correctly and, above all, to recognize the great connections in their fateful interdependence. This is especially true of those borderline areas of science that have unfortunately become a popular playground for so-called amateur researchers today - as much as science can rejoice that unbiased minds are finally participating in its work again—that through the cooperation of all compatriots, scholarship is finally coming into lively contact with the needs of the present again—it must be wary of the cheap prejudices that cling to every obsession, even the best ones; it would be falsifying history if, for whatever reason, the image of the past were distorted by fixed ideas.

#### V.

It is not knowledge – not learning – that matters, for both are the self-evident prerequisites of any scientific activity - we demand from all those who wish to contribute to the image of our people's history that decisive change in thinking and feeling that is the prerequisite for the new state: a decisive turning away from material things as such, and the enthusiastic devotion of the whole person to the idea, wherever it has been and is effective in the past and present.

We are not interested in what is dead; we want creative achievements on the part of historians—achievements that have something to say to us, because history is nothing more than the sum of knowledge and experience that the great unity of the people has gathered in a long life.

## Can Culture Be Created?

Culture and civilization are two different things - culture is the sum of all the intellectual and spiritual needs of a nation, while civilization is the sum of those institutions that allow people to satisfy their physical and material needs. The two are not mutually dependent; our Germanic ancestors placed high intellectual demands on moral law and on the faith of the individual, and in doing so managed with a minimum of civilization. On the other hand, there are modern states that are leaders in the construction of skyscrapers, bathtubs, and tractors, but have to borrow their cultural assets from others.

Civilization can be created - if you teach a Negro how to use soap, how to drive a car, put pants on him, and let him earn the money necessary to purchase a portable gramophone, he will gradually become civilized and eventually live impeccably in an eight-room apartment with running water and a built-in home bar. But you cannot teach him culture; if that were possible, the centuries of effort by missionaries would have had to produce visible results - these are doubtful and, at best, civilizing in nature. Where spiritual and emotional needs in our sense do not exist, they cannot be conjured up.

Culture can never follow in the wake of civilization; however, civilization can be a servant of culture: if a person can read more books with the help of an electric light than he could without light, if he can take the train to an opera performance when he would otherwise have to stay at home, it is civilization that allows him to satisfy his spiritual needs - in this way, civilization can promote culture, by not creating the need, but enabling him to satisfy the need. It can also do something else by awakening the need that lies dormant within him: suppose a person was born in the jungle and had never heard music, and the civilizational achievement of radio broadcasting conveyed it to him one day, then a need would be awakened in him whose existence he had previously been unaware of. Here, however, the limits of every possibility become clear to everyone: if the person in the jungle has no need to hear music, then even the radio will not be able to conjure up this need in him and will be of little use to him; at best, he will take it apart, perhaps to satisfy a different intellectual need, namely to understand physical relationships.

It follows that culture can be promoted with the help of civilization by using civilizational achievements to awaken intellectual needs and enable their satisfaction, but culture cannot be "made" by preparing it in the kitchen of civilization and distributing it to each individual with a large ladle; it could be that one or the other rejects the dish because it is not to their liking.

Culture is an indivisible whole - if one takes a cross-section of the intellectual needs of an entire nation—insofar as it has any—one can probably draw up a table of the individual needs that make up the overall culture of the people! One could say: the moral and religious requirements are this large, the need for musical enjoyment and for the experience of literary, dramatic, and artistic works occupies this and every space, the scientific thirst for knowledge is this large - however, one cannot simply transfer the results of these statistics to the individual.

One cannot create a type of normal German whose cultural needs must consist of 20 percent faith, 15 percent enjoyment of music, 10 percent literary interest, and so on; otherwise, our great minds who themselves created lasting cultural values would appear to be very imperfect outsiders - Richard Wagner did not even invent a gasoline lighter, and to our knowledge, Gottlieb Daimler did not write a music drama. Exceptions only prove the rule - Goethe did discover the intermaxillary bone, but measured against his other achievements, this accomplishment was little more than a fluke.

A nation certainly does not consist only of great geniuses, but it does consist of many small ones and even smaller ones. Every person has a special talent for very specific things, that is, a special need for something that can be awakened and encouraged in them. This happens first by using civilization to create institutions that enable individuals to satisfy their particular needs: churches, concert halls, technical colleges, libraries, theaters, opera houses, and cinemas are built; books, musical instruments, radios, and films are produced, and cultural figures such as teachers, musicians, poets, and actors are promoted - with the help of civilization, we build up the multifaceted apparatus known as cultural infrastructure and leave it up to the individual to decide how and where he wants to satisfy his intellectual needs.

This works to a certain point, at which the social problem hinders the intellectual freedom of the individual - the larger and more complicated the "cultural armament" is, the less beautiful words can save us from the realization that it costs money to indulge our needs.

Culture is not a commodity that can be bought, because you either have it or you don't, but the satisfaction of intellectual and spiritual needs cannot be achieved for free - that is when the social problem becomes a cultural problem.

The philistine distinguishes between cultured and uncultured people, counting himself among the cultured because he has the classics on his convertible sofa and his daughter takes piano lessons; this distinction is false, because the unskilled worker can (not: must) have much greater intellectual needs than the senior postal secretary; however, the difference lies in the fact that the senior postal secretary is materially able to satisfy his demands in this direction (if he has them), while the unskilled worker generally cannot.

Marxism based its theory of culture on this deficiency - true to its doctrine of the equality of all human beings, it also subjected culture to its economic views and regarded it as a large cake that could be divided into any number of equal pieces. In accordance with its theory of milieu, it regarded all people as equally receptive to culture; it should be enough to "bring" culture to them, just as Marxism wanted to bring material goods and civilization to people.

Unfortunately, Marx misunderstood the nature of culture; he did not see it as an inherent spiritual need conditioned by race and heredity, but as a commodity, a luxury item that could be purchased at reduced prices through consumer cooperatives, like liquor and cigarettes.

In truth, it is not a matter of "involving" people in culture and bringing it to them, but of enabling them to satisfy their spiritual needs; one should certainly remove the obstacles that stand in the way of this satisfaction, but otherwise each individual must achieve this satisfaction for themselves. Civilization should be organized in such a way that the culture of the individual is not restricted, but culture itself cannot be handed to them on a silver platter - each person must come to terms with it on their own, just as they must come to terms with the questions of faith and conscience that move them.

Churches can be built with or without confessionals, but faith cannot be created by forcing people into churches. The churches have solved the social problem perfectly by allowing even the poorest free admission - but they cannot claim that they have thereby solved the problem of faith.

The will to overcome social hardship was one of the essential forces that created the new Germany and continues to drive it today, and the same will will give rise to the efforts that tear down barriers that stand in the way of satisfying our spiritual needs - when the rubble of the class state and the Jewish-Marxist afterculture had been cleared away, it was a profound and joyful experience for every German who believed in his people to recognize how great were the idealistic desires that were pressing for satisfaction; the streams of people who turned to cultural institutions and took possession of them proved

at the same time that culture cannot be made, but that it is a living longing of the soul of the people that only needs to be satisfied.

But a stream must be guided, that is certain: it is not enough just to make way for it. And Germans, with their innate talent for organization, are eager to guide; at times, it almost seems as if there are too many guides.

*“There is hardly a structure or organization that is not exceptionally interested in cultural matters,”* wrote the president of the Reich Theater Chamber, Minister Dr. Rainer Schlösser, in the magazine *“Wille und Macht”* (Will and Power) - *“Yes, one can speak of a boom in cultural policy, which has turned a large number of unsuitable people into cultural apostles, in addition to those who are suitable for this field.”*

This does indeed pose a certain danger, not for our culture, but for the individual, who may sometimes be led to a source from which he did not want to drink from.

Since the cultural needs of each individual are different, the needs of a community cannot be satisfied according to a single formula; it is not possible to “introduce” an organization to culture in lockstep, because that would be – except for the lockstep – merely the realization of a Marxist pipe dream.

*“You either have a passion for art,”* says Schlösser, *“or you don't; those who don't should not be forced to go to the theater, for example.”*

That's right, because a man who feels no need for dramatic art may have a need for music, or he may be inclined toward the visual arts, or he may quench the thirst of his soul in the great outdoors and through physical training, which may well have the same origin.

Certainly, one should educate people to become harmonious characters according to the principle “a healthy mind in a healthy body,” but first, this is a question of education that must be resolved in the younger generation, and second, this ideal harmony does not imply a minimum level of intellectual needs, in the sense that an inwardly balanced person must at least be enthusiastic about Mr. Schulze's dramas and Mr. Müller's symphonies; this would bring us back to the figure of the culturally minded normal person, who cannot possibly exist.

That is why it seems inappropriate to create a “popular culture” in the same way that one builds a popular radio or a Volkswagen, in other words, a culture that is easily affordable for everyone - it is a mistake to believe that everyone can reach a certain “level of culture” and that everyone can be satisfied at this level; such a “level” smacks dangerously of class distinction. It is not clear why workers—to take one example—should only listen to “Undine” and “Wildschütz” at the opera, while people with higher incomes flock to “Der Ring”; if one counters that workers do not want to hear “Der Ring” at all, that may be true as long as one thinks in terms of the masses. But, mass culture is not the goal of cultural policy, but only a foundation on which it can build; in the field of cultural policy, social action will always consist of opening the doors to which individuals knock, not merely enabling them to knock.

Certainly, it is difficult to break away from the mold within the framework of organizations and deal with the individual; certainly, it also takes courage to be unpopular if the responsible director of a cultural institution is to please not only the “broad masses” but also the few who have been chosen by inner calling.

A “full house” is simply not the only possible measure of a cultural achievement, and if you have given a dozen poor devils the experience of a lifetime with “Faust” or “Götterdämmerung,” you have done more for culture than with three sold-out variety shows.

It is not important that one engages in culture at all, but rather that one keeps one's eye on the goal; this goal can only be to create free access to all of the nation's cultural assets. Everyone should be able to satisfy their intellectual and spiritual needs, but mind you – remember their needs. Cultural assets should be stripped of their character as purchasable goods, but their value should not be diminished as a result; the purchase price paid by the individual should still remain reasonable—not in terms of dollars and cents, but in terms of their efforts to prove themselves worthy of culture. It is in the nature of high culture that it must be earned; needs that can be easily satisfied are usually superficial in nature.

These remarks are directed only at those,

*“...who, on a moment's impulse, decides to engage in cultural policy after having previously excelled in a department that is certainly useful but has nothing to do with music.” (Schlösser).*

We do not believe that their well-meaning zeal could cause any serious harm, but much can be achieved by protecting them from disappointment and from the fallacy that follows disappointment, namely, that the people are not grateful for the efforts of cultural policymakers.

## VIII. On a Side Note

### More Humor!

Woe to the people who lack humor!

Woe to the person who cannot laugh wholeheartedly until their eyes glisten; woe to the person who fears humor, who filters it suspiciously through a brain that mistrusts everything and cannot react spontaneously with their diaphragm out of a sense of inner security and superiority - woe, three times woe, for in doing so, they only prove that they are weak and half-hearted, or even a Pharisee.

We receive many letters, hundreds of them, expressing joy at the way we tackle the various problems of everyday life, issues that are not really problems at all or can only be described as such with quotation marks; our collection, which grows richer every day, shows us the stirring understanding among our people not to analyze the little grains of sand that occasionally appear in the huge machinery of our state under a microscope, the kind of people who hear a quiet crunch and look under the wheels with a worried frown - no, we prefer to blow it away with a smile and not to treat it as though its a boulder, lest the poor speck of dust imagine it could stop the flywheel.

A good friend once advised us not to use a sledgehammer to crack a nut; we only “work” with heavy artillery in the rarest of cases, and only when the object in question requires it. To the sparrow, however, our booming laughter may seem like a barrage of fire, and some sparrows have puffed themselves up mightily, only until they realized that we didn't think they were royal eagles after all - we will continue to shoot at sparrows, not with cannons, but with slingshots, simply because we don't want them to smear the facade of our building – more for aesthetic reasons than out of concern that the foundations of National Socialism are shaking as a result.

No one can demand that we stand to attention with deadly serious expressions on our faces over so many trifles; however, we want to drink the fiery wine of our convictions from pure glasses, and do not see why clumsy fingerprints on the crystal should be overlooked - who would smash the cup into pieces when a quick wipe with a cloth is enough to keep it as clean as we want it to be?

For us in particular, humor has been one of the most important weapons in the struggle for power. It should remain a weapon - with resounding laughter, we have mocked an entire system, scrutinized every single representative of the November clique with grim humor, and stripped them of the clown nose they called their “dignity.” The artist Mjölnir skewered them with his sharp pencil and, with his caricatures, wrestled down a malicious and dangerous police system embodied in the form of “Isi Weiß,” who actually wanted to be called Bernhard; this was only met with Homeric laughter when healthy humor called him “Isi” - all of us who know Mjölnir appreciate and honor him for his humor as a serious artist, who put this weapon of humor at the service of the struggle.

The harder the struggle became, the more confident our laughter grew; the smiling faces of our comrades-in-arms were a sign to the Führer, in the most difficult of times, that his followers stood unbroken, imbued with an unbridled belief in victory - doubters never laugh.

Of all days, are we now supposed to walk around with gloomy faces, today, when we are in power and National Socialism has built up its positions to be impregnable, because the people joyfully profess their faith and love for it?

National Socialism is not a medieval intrusion; it has instead become the essence of German youth; this youth, which looks joyfully to the future with its unbridled and overflowing energy, is the new Reich. From this self-confident and proud confidence grows a joyful, cheerful optimism, an eternal and inexhaustible source of contemplative, grim humor.

Tomorrow we will calmly “stir up dust” and thereby cause displeasure to one or the other; what we are doing is nothing more than frequently throwing open the windows of this or that stuffy room, where the dust of asthmatic philistinism lies on the shelves. It is not our dust that then settles on the lungs of those affected - who is offended when you point out a spot on their nose? Only philistines and Pharisees who believe that the clock of German development has stopped because they stubbornly run around with a board in front of their heads and do not want to see.

The clock is ticking and the hands are moving inexorably forward; there's nothing we can do about that, and that's why we must have a little more understanding for humor - please, don't ponder everything rigidly and seriously when laughter gives you air and liberation. A little more humor in everyday life - or you'll get annoyed and grow old and gray, and one day you will become a burden to yourselves.

But we...

### **The Führer Coughs**

For the first time, his slight clearing of the throat was heard at Rue de la Boetie Number Five, in the 8th arrondissement of Paris. The man at the ink-stained desk pricked up his ears; behind a pair of glasses that tried to hide a pair of bulging eyes with their sparkle, an oily gaze lit up, lingering pensively on the slightly moth-eaten green fabric covering the door... His hand, reminiscent of a washed-out deerskin glove, ran through his ice-gray hair, which crackled like cat fur when a thunderstorm approached: this is Georg Bernhard, editor-in-chief of the “Pariser Tageszeitung.”<sup>22</sup>

No one but him had heard the clearing of his throat; not even the Führer's most trusted associates in Wilhelmstraße did - not one. Only he, who differed from the emigrants with tinny food stamps jingling in their pockets only by his clean collar, which, incidentally, had to be paid for by those comrades who loitered on the benches in the Tuileries, who tried to pass the time by reading Bernhard's editorials that costed half a franc on the corner.

Georg Bernhard has become somewhat uncertain over the last three years - his predictions for the future have proven to be serious misjudgments, and every fortune teller in the back alleys of Montparnasse would have had to close up shop by now if they hadn't been able to read more in coffee grounds than Bernhard could in the political firmament.

The headlines announcing the fall of the Führer in his newspaper have long since lost their modest appeal, and the emigrant newspaper is now barely keeping its head above water by arranging group trips to Palestine and Switzerland; even the life and accident insurance policies offered to subscribers as a bonus are not really taking off. Understandable - what emigrant wants to be told, in black and white, that he must expect to die and be buried on or under French soil?

---

<sup>22</sup> The “Pariser Tageszeitung” was the largest German exile newspaper in Paris, printing from 1936 to 1940.

And since there is no prospect of even the faintest silver lining on the hopeless horizon, announcing even the slightest, tiny shake-up of Adolf Hitler's position of power, he wished the Führer “the Kränk”<sup>23</sup> in accordance with Old Testament custom.

The first report appeared in bold print in his newspaper that the Führer was “ill” - oh, they were evil diseases that Bernhard published, and they grew worse and worse, since the printing company, aware of their life-threatening nature, did not charge extra for the typesetting costs.

That was in March, and when the Führer spoke to the whole world shortly afterwards in a powerful two-hour speech, with a voice and lung capacity that in itself was a great physical achievement, the press fell silent again, so silent that you could have heard a pin drop, along with Georg Bernhard's penny. At the end of July, the Führer “fell ill” again; it was the silly season<sup>24</sup>, so Bernhard took up the topic again with his rolling pin - thin as puff pastry, he stretched it out lengthwise and widthwise; he reported on coded telegrams sent via embassies and consulates urgently requesting the best doctors in the world, which no one could decipher except the editor-in-chief of the “Pariser Tageblatt” and which, therefore, appeared only in that newspaper and nowhere else.

Shortly thereafter, the party convention took place, and the Führer spoke with the same powerful voice day after day, for a whole week, and the best speakers from both hemispheres listened to the airwaves and quietly envied him for his “stamina.”

One day, Georg Bernhard finally had solid “proof” in his hands - the Führer went to Obersalzberg over New Year's, without first asking his office on Rue de la Boetie whether this might cause some consternation behind the door with the moth-eaten felt covering!

Of course, the “Pariser Tageblatt” reported that all the radiotelegraphists in the Reich were pulling strings to win over the greatest specialist who had ever set his somewhat flat feet on the ground of this shameful vale of tears: Professor Neumann.

According to Bernhard's version—and we have not heard any others—Neumann had brusquely rejected the request, which was unheard of for a Jew, leaving the Führer with no choice but to deliver his speech in Lippe “unhealed.”

Now the news came thick and fast, so much that it almost seemed as if it were coming from the Tartar country with almost imperceptible changes - Georg Bernhard now began his quotes from Schwarzschild's “Neues Tagebuch” and the “Neue Weltbühne”, both of which have lost their aura of objectivity over the last three years; he published a report in his newspaper, which was supposed to have appeared in the “Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung,” that the Führer was “seriously ill” and would no longer be able to speak - we, who missed it, must assume that the D.A.Z. prints certain messages intended for the “Pariser Tageblatt” between the lines with lemon juice, and Bernhard irons the German newspapers every morning with a hot iron to make the writing visible.

But Aunt Voß's<sup>25</sup> former gigolo is not letting up, as he continues to swear by the Führer's suffering; he swears with the fervor of his ancestors, who raise their swearing fingers to the health of their parents and children without fearing that a harsh fate will take them at their word. To give his claims a serious air, he even dispassionately reports that the Führer has a “thread” in his voice.

---

<sup>23</sup> To wish someone ill.

<sup>24</sup> A period in the summer months known for frivolous news stories.

<sup>25</sup> Reference to the nickname given to the “Vossische Zeitung”, a nationally famous newspaper known for its middle-class liberal audience.

Despite rigorous research, we were unable to find out what a “thread” is; not even when we listened intently to the Führer's speech on January 30th. He spoke as usual: firmly, harshly, with a resonant voice. But - in the speech, which lasted almost an hour, he cleared his throat slightly twice—twice, mind you! We have heard members of parliament in various European parliaments who had coughing fits every five minutes and whose voices whimpered like newborn babies or screeched like circular saws; we have seen them reach for glasses of water after every sentence, into which they dipped their beaks so vigorously that one could not help but think of thirsty chickens. Today, the airwaves are brimming with speeches by political leaders in a wide variety of languages, interrupted by snorts and puffs, which is of no consequence, because it is politicians who have the floor, not first lovers who have to deliver Antony's speech from the Forum according to Shakespeare - what is acceptable for world-famous actors, without anyone finding fault with it, to clear their throats slightly before a major performance, is conscientiously noted with worried frowns when the Führer does so—through three amplifier tubes, so to speak—especially by people who cannot utter two sentences without having to swallow. The Führer has coughed... Thousands of people do the same and hold their teary eyes to their handkerchiefs without anyone finding fault with it; he will clear his throat even more often during his speeches, despite the “threads” put into his mouth by such puny fellows as those who eke out a shivering existence in the Rue de la Boétie - until this thread itself runs out. The world waits in vain for the Führer to sing a high C three times on the radio to “reassure” them.

### **A Fairy Tale**

“There was once a king in Thule...” - no, that won't do! Firstly, it's not Thule, secondly, it's not a king, and thirdly, Goethe has already dealt with this case. Our fairy tale must begin differently:

Once upon a time, there was a powerful ruler; after an unfortunate war in which his subjects had shown exceptional heroism, he had retired to a foreign land and thus lost his reign - he left the country and cannot return.

Perhaps he had thoroughly lost the joy he had often found in ruling, or perhaps he lacked the strength to stand by his people in their hour of need - suffice it to say that, since he was not granted the privilege of dying at the head of his troops, he remained alive, building himself a house in a foreign land, as he grew older and older.

For a time, he probably dreamed that his people would call him back, but they did not, for they had other concerns. Their need was great and their suffering was immeasurable; they were led astray by a bunch of ambitious and greedy adventurers, robbed of their natural borders and powers by the victorious powers, and deprived of their honor by unscrupulous seducers.

Meanwhile, the ruler grew old in a foreign land, and his followers, who still remained among the people, did the same: they did not grow any younger either. Once a year, they gathered to celebrate the old man's birthday in a foreign land; they sang the old anthem and gave a thunderous cheer to their sovereign, who was abroad and rightly wanted to finally rest in peace!

These gatherings were always very solemn, and when a message was sent to the old man in his new home beyond the borders, their caps were nodded with enthusiasm, and many a tear rolled shyly into spacious beards. They thundered and sang, they looked transfigured and blew their noses emotionally into dainty handkerchiefs – while the people fared worse and worse.

They also knew nothing of the heroic efforts that those loyal to the Kaiser – they called themselves “The Upright” – had made to control his misfortune, for everything was done in secret - fearing their own lion-like courage, the “upright” had locked the doors from the inside during their birthday celebrations, and the party, which had, so to speak, leased its loyalty to the ancestral ruling house, wrote the same on its banner, but occasionally ignored it.

Then, one day, the man who had vowed to restore the people's honor and rebuild what had become rotten and decayed took the reins of government. However, the “upright” merely remained what they were, only their beards have grown longer, the voices of the old women more tremulous, and the emotions of the old men more tearful. A hollow rattling echoes through their brains - can you hear them singing?

They are still alive today only because they have not yet died - that is the only reason!

### **“Splendid Isolation”**

“Man, I'm fed up,” Gordon once said to his neighbor, passing him the mead horn for a drink. “They don't even wipe their mouths, let alone the rim of the vessel, and then you're not supposed to get sore corners on your mouth,” the other growled back. “It's honestly embarrassing to be a Saxon.” “There's only one thing to do: just isolate ourselves from them.” And they took their spears, put on their boots, and marched toward the Rhine. “This river must once again become the border between these people and us, who have always advocated for the reform of customs; up there, I know of an island where we can retreat, and then we'll be rid of them all, these uncivilized Germans.” “Sitting under oak trees and bellowing into the air, as if you couldn't do that in a cozy log cabin.” “You're right Gordon - we'll start a club, the spears will be left in the cloakroom, and in front of the fireplace there will be a table where you can comfortably put your feet up.” Discussing the club's statutes in more detail, they drifted down with the waves, built a proper dugout canoe, and crossed over. Once they arrived on the island, they fell into each other's arms: “Finally, the two best Saxons, alone among ourselves!” “Don't say Saxons anymore; compared to them, we are pure angels.” “Well, Anglo-Saxons then.” “Magnificent! Splendid! And we want to remain completely isolated!” “OK! To ‘splendid isolation’!” “Yes!” “Bye, bye!” That's pretty much how it could have been.

\*\*\*

Over the centuries, they remained relatively faithful to the principle of “splendid isolation”; eventually, however, they could no longer justify it to their conscience.

When they left their island, there was great joy among the colored peoples of the world; they gathered on the shores, admiring the large ships, which sometimes in return shot into dense clusters because a few cannons had accidentally gone off; despite this, neither the Indians nor the Negroes nor the Arabs took this seriously, and as a sign that they also understood fun, they unanimously announced in the Anglo-Saxon referendums that it was their heart's desire to remain under their protectorate - the French were also asked whether they wanted to cede India and Canada to Britain, and if they deny this today, it is further proof of Gallic fickleness.

When the Anglo-Saxons owned 28% of the earth and pretty much everything that protruded from the water in the world's oceans—with the exception of icebergs—they undertook the difficult task of finally establishing balance in the world and bringing it to the status quo; a club was founded on Lake Geneva, whose members promised each other that all the strife of the last 2000 years would be buried forever, and that, in the future, anyone who demanded colonies out of pure extravagance in order to squander their hard-earned money in them would be counted among the greedy wolves - after all, colonies are a losing business, and those who do not have any cannot judge, and therefore cannot have a say.

Colonies! People always imagine lavish celebrations at the courts of native kings, beguiled by Scheherazades<sup>26</sup> who shower guests with precious gifts from their hosts and offer themselves for pleasure and dance - but what is it really like? A tremendous heat and nothing but a desolate landscape, where not even a few meager rapunzel flowers bloom.

You drill and drill and drill, because everyone is deluded into thinking that there must be something there; you drill two hundred meters deep, three hundred... four hundred... and what comes out: emeralds, diamonds - gold? Ha ha! Stinking, dirty crude oil, which at best can ruin your nice suit!

Incorrigible idealists want to get rich on precious woods; they dream of whole forests of Caucasian walnut, Canadian birch, or at least hickory, where you can scratch around on the trunks and sticky stuff runs out; nothing but rubber trees remain, whose wood wouldn't even be good enough for the most modest Scotsman to build a sideboard, and that's saying a lot.

As for a little bit of cotton... that's only grown to give the natives something to do; most of it is burned again or plowed back into the fields, and if the Germans need some, they can have it, along with rubber and oil and all the junk they claim they can't live without.

This greed in the world! It recently claimed the best and most steadfast member of the Geneva Club, who swore by its statutes, the Negus Haile Selassie; certainly, a powerful friend could have closed the Suez Canal for him, but that's easy to say. Imagine you have a movie theater and you're sitting at the box office; everyone who wants to see the “Ethiopian Games” has to pay, of course, and in cash. Would you close the counter when 300,000 Italians are crowding outside to get into the very last show?

And the friends of the Negus were not idle - the largest cruisers were fired up for him, rocking through the Mediterranean, guzzling coal; sharp, sharper, yes, the sharpest protests were lodged. They waited, waited, and then he went into exile - no shame in that, for there are others in Europe who do the same, namely nothing; it always takes three to play skat<sup>27</sup>.

---

<sup>26</sup> The narrator of the Arabic story collection “One Thousand and One Nights”.

<sup>27</sup> German card game.

Make no mistake; the British lion is watching, even if one or two of his teeth may have become loose. An uprising in Iraq? London is following developments with keen interest. A change of government in Tehran? The British chargé d'affaires inquires with proper restraint whether this is perhaps a dig at England. Reassured, he goes home - it's not a dig after all.

In Madrid, the British representative sits calmly, and he somehow does not see the burning churches and the persecution of nuns - the Anglican High Church is not burning, the nuns are not Londoners, no violation of the concordat has been established so far, and one should respect the national character of the Spanish people, and thus also their customs - if it is not the Spanish but the Russians, one should certainly not interfere, and if the non-intervention commission has not yet established whether it is the Russians, then they must be Spaniards after all...

There's a very high-pitched buzzing sound - is that gunfire, just missing the air column above extraterritorial soil? A proper diplomat visits Franco and asks whether a hidden challenge to England was intended, whereupon he calmly retreats into his "splendid isolation" and, shaking his head, notes in his favorite newspaper that a hairline crack is running through the German people, splitting them into two halves that are facing each other in a culture war - in Ireland, the Christians did attack each other with barking machine guns, and there were always deaths in these theological disputes, but as I said, the hairline crack is not in Ireland, and "my home is my castle".

Only the Germans isolate themselves, says the most handsome English minister; they talk of the Bolshevik threat, yet Mr. Litvinov is so well dressed - evil people don't wear tailcoats.

The Germans want to communicate with the French, but that is not possible - where does that leave the diplomacy of "splendid isolation," and where does that leave a world without tensions and notes? England wants to fraternize with the whole world, but England, of course, remains isolated; that ensures balance and means it wants nothing to do with anyone - "splendid isolation" indeed.

### **A Conversation with the Procurator Pontius Pilate**

You come across rather badly in the Book of Books, Procurator; even today, people resent you for condemning to death on the cross the man who was identified to you as a certain Yeshua of Nazareth.

You are portrayed to posterity as a cold cynic who, with his statement "What is truth?", placed himself beyond all moral teachings, but take it easy: someone like you, a student of Stoicism, cannot claim to be understood by the religious ecstasies of that turbulent spiritual awakening.

Yes, if you had known that the spirit of this man, carefully adapted to antiquity by a skilled cosmopolitan named Paul, would one day conquer the world, you would probably have been more cautious and treated Mr. Caiaphas, the president of the Sanhedrin, more harshly.

Your philosophy came from the firmly established spiritual home of cool thinking; you saw with the serene knowledge of experience that strange man before you, from whose wealth of visions a new world of the unearthly arose; you were also, moreover, the representative of Rome, whose yoke was borne partly with open rebellion and partly with diplomatic courtesy - in any case, you were THE enemy.

What contemporary historiography already denied you in terms of justice, the zealots of later centuries were exacerbated to the point of calling you "Antichrist"; people were looking for someone to blame, and

among others, they found you, who had given the order to send the man from Nazareth, who surely could not have been remarkable to you, to Golgotha.

That is why your good reputation as a Roman administrator was shattered, and why your decision, which you made at your own discretion, is branded as a sacrilege in world history, for you were nothing less than that - without knowing it, you stood on the threshold of a new age and, moreover, had the misfortune of being condemned to all the torments of hell only after your death; it was Paul, a Roman citizen of Jewish faith who knew neither you nor the Nazarene, who proclaimed the doctrine that the one you had put to death on the cross had freed the faithful from their sins.

To add to your guilt, legend tells of your wife, who, like Cassandra of old, was filled with evil dreams and became fearful shortly before the verdict. Is it permissible to doubt this? Women with dark dreams are too effective poetically to be probable. (Or have you ever believed the rumor that Calpurnia pestered her Gaius Julius Caesar not to go to that fateful Senate meeting because she allegedly had a prophetic dream?)

It just occurs to me that I am conversing with you, Procurator, in a tone that is not generally customary for people who belong to history - the longer ago it is that "historical figures" walked the earth, the more pathetic the debate usually becomes, and all the more inhuman and blurred is the image.

But should it not be permissible to imagine that the shouting of the Jews, who were yelling at you under the leadership of Rabbi Caiaphas, was humanly repulsive and got on your nerves?

You knew this Caiaphas from countless small and large negotiations and knew very well that he was not an easy opponent to deal with; this priest had greater responsibilities than just being the most pious among the pious, because he was a politician who had the increasingly difficult task of keeping these strange Jews together as a people; Caiaphas was the head of a spiritual central administration based in Jerusalem, and he had no other means of power at his disposal than the law as it was derived from the Torah and the Talmud.

This law was the wall, once erected by Ezra, behind which Israel had withdrawn for its protection, and everything that called itself Jewish had to be forced under this law. It was this Talmud and Torah that formed the constitution of the Jewish people; it was mysterious and incomprehensible to any stranger, yet it represented a tremendous power. The rigid representative of this power, the high priest Caiaphas, had a hand in the case of Jesus of Nazareth - you knew where you stood!

The Nazarene was said to have blasphemed against God - well, that was none of their business; after all, it was more of a matter for that constantly agitated temple clique in Jerusalem, which had, so to speak, taken over the Yahweh religion. Jerusalem and those Jews!

Rome had come to terms with every people on earth, and had shown exemplary tolerance, especially in matters of faith; whether Isis or Astarte, Ammon or Baal, under the eagles of ancient Rome, everyone could believe what they wanted.

Different peoples, different gods - the constant was taxes and recruitment. Only with the Jews did religious issues seem to be of decisive political importance, and there was constant quarreling about it; the debates were conducted with a pathos that was bound to get on the nerves of any decent European.

These Jews were not only a strange and troublesome people - it was also their behavior! When arguments and words were no longer enough, they tore at their clothes, threw dirt on their heads, and even the hungry threw meat or bread into the sand as soon as it was offered by a non-Jew, as it was therefore "unclean"; their backwardness was coupled with boundless arrogance, which led to a chain of unpleasant incidents.

And now this man from Nazareth - he was also among those who did not suit the narrow-minded priests; he had probably violated some bookish rule of the complicated laws, had probably encroached a little too closely on the coffers with his teachings, and now it was essential that he be removed. It was a purely Jewish matter that did not interest the procurator of Rome at all; the Jews were otherwise so jealous of their sovereignty in matters of faith that they should be the ones to kindly pass judgment on this man.

That's how it was, wasn't it, Procurator?

You were not a murderer per se; you had no opinion on this preacher whatsoever and declared yourself incompetent.

But the lords around Caiaphas were already waiting for this: they themselves were unfortunately not in a position to punish the denier of God and "new pagan" with death, as they were busy preparing for the Passover. But that was also irrelevant, because this man had also claimed to be the King of the Jews; that must surely have been considered high treason, and therefore, as a political crime, belong before the judgment seat of Lord Pilate.

You immediately saw through this ploy and looked at the man who was supposedly dangerous to Rome: this dreamer wanted to wrest a province from the aged tiger Tiberius? He didn't look like it; every child in Jerusalem knew that in serious cases, the two legions in Judea were not to be trifled with, yet this man was supposed to be a warlike adventurer?

You asked him, "Are you the King of the Jews?" He spoke of a kingdom that was not of this world; Rome was not threatened by him, and found no fault in him.

But these Jews were once again as persistent as blowflies, unbearable with their shouting; the old fox Caiaphas had already stirred up the whole mob, and they all shouted in unison: Release Barabbas! So they wanted to make a trade, exchanging the professional highwayman for the man under the crown of thorns. Of course, that was out of the question, because Rome was particularly interested in the case of Barabbas, and they politely declined this deal; but, to top off their insolence, this gang immediately threatened to contact their superiors in Syria.

That was the last straw! Complaints, counter-arguments, documents, and finally the petrified, suspicious Tiberius on Capri found out about it, and there was a full-blown scandal - here you had to put your personal interests aside and decide as a politician.

You have learned that posterity has no heart for battles fought quietly and modestly before the forum of conscience; your decision, which you must have felt with all the distance you felt from the man standing before you, was later suspected of being the lowest, yet, from your point of view at that moment, you were right: if the hermit on Capri was once again in a bad mood, you would have to reckon with your dismissal; you would have gotten out of this miserable cesspool, but Rome's position of power would have suffered a severe blow.

This Nazarene was innocent, that was certain, and the whole affair seemed like a brazen call for judicial murder - but for you, it was not Jesus who was at stake here, but Rome. And when you realized this, you handed the man over.

The rabble now roared with delight, yet you had a basin brought to you and washed your hands in front of the whole crowd - in Jerusalem, in the religious stronghold of Israel and on its stock exchange—both of which were located close to each other and whose boundaries were fluid—people should have known how a gentleman felt about such a dirty business.

As a Roman, you did your duty; you could not have known that at that very moment you were ushering in a new era.

You sacrificed an unknown man for the greatness of Rome, a man who wanted love among people; you lived in a state where more than a third of the population were slaves, you were a civil servant in a country that you had every right to consider barbaric, and, as a Roman statesman, you had no reason to value this man's life more highly or consider it more important than that of any other stranger.

The procurator Pontius Pilate was, in the higher sense, innocent of the death of Jesus of Nazareth, just as innocent as the founder of Christianity who said, "Love your neighbor as yourself," and in whose name hundreds of thousands of people were later sacrificed.

What a tragedy! You had a stranger crucified, and yet you had something in common with him: the opposition of Caiaphas!

### **More Civil Courage!**

First, a caveat that is not really a caveat at all: moral courage and what is commonly understood as opposition are not one and the same - the philistine who whispers a joke—unfortunately, usually a silly one—into his neighbor's ear with a wink is not displaying moral courage; the newsagent in the Kurfürstendamm who hands his goods to receptive-looking customers with a very small snide comment because he still can't forget that someone spoiled his nice business with certain Swiss chatterboxes – he, too, is not a hero; yes, not even the loudmouth who publicly spouts his political opinions is fit to be a martyr, because the National Socialist state is so generous that it smiles and says, "Let him be..." and moves on to the order of the day.

Civil courage is something other than shooting your mouth off at any price - civil courage is nothing more than knowing your rights and asserting them, and its prerequisite is that you know your rights before you try to assert them.

There are a whole lot of well-meaning people who are quick to take up the battle axe whenever something seems "wrong" to them. They do not belong to the dangerous guild of self-serving informers; no, they mean well. But when they come marching in as soon as they "hear something" or when something "seems as if..." The authorities and party offices know all about this.

A lot of effort is wasted trying to teach these guardians of order that the state and the party are on the ball all by themselves and, from their lofty vantage point, sometimes have a broader horizon than the individual who thinks he alone has heard something ringing, and that only he thinks something is rotten in the state of Denmark. Such a well-meaning guardian of the Capitol can all too easily turn into a troublemaker and then claim rights that are not his at all - the state and the party must claim the right to protect themselves.

The situation is different when it comes to one's own rights or – which goes hand in hand with this – one's own duties. Representing and defending them is everyone's business if they do not want to be considered a coward - this is the area where civil courage is called for.

If a case arises where someone has been wrongfully stepped on, where, because things have to be done, a splinter has been dropped that should have remained in the wood by right, then the know-it-alls and the overly cautious, the great diplomats of everyday life, step in and say: shhh! Keep quiet! Don't say a word!

Be glad that it didn't turn out worse! And they cover the injured party with their good advice to such an extent that he must be a true Hercules if he wants to stand up, take a deep breath, roll up his sleeves, and stand up for his rights.

That is the strange thing about moral courage: it is more likely to be used against the state or some other public authority than against good friends and advisors who peddle the slogan of “caution is the better part of valor”; these contemporaries breed within themselves and their peers the inner coward who, when he gets a slap on the left cheek, would prefer to quickly offer the other cheek. They must be very confident and convinced of their own courage when they give the person concerned their “good advice”: he may not achieve anything by going straight, but if he puts on his tailcoat and goes to the So-and-so Club, he can get to know Mr. X, who in turn has a good standing with Y... and so on.

Such moral pessimism and spinelessness, which may not be meant maliciously at first, then spreads like an epidemic, and one day it becomes a foregone conclusion for thousands that “you can't get justice” unless you have connections, that you should keep your mouth shut in front of people, and instead you should try to beg for fair weather behind their backs; in opposition, the person who goes his own way knocks energetically on the right door and calls out, “Oh ho, gentlemen, I have been wronged, and I wish this to be rectified as soon as possible,” is considered an exception and a hero.

This is the much-admired man with moral courage - he is a hero because the heroic aura of the forbidden and dangerous surrounds his path.

It doesn't take much thought to imagine that the National Socialist state would prefer it if everyone, somewhere and sometime, followed the straight path of the morally courageous; how much manpower is required to direct petitions and submissions, which are washed up at the most impossible places via the detour of alleged connections, to where they can actually be processed and decided upon! Can we blame a clerk for handling such a request, which already bears twenty notes from incompetent authorities, with extreme caution, because he thinks that the overly cautious writer of the request might have something to hide?

Anyone who has read Rosenberg should know what the National Socialist worldview understands by the freedom of the Germanic people - it is not the unrestrained freedom of speech of liberalism, but the inner inviolability of the Germanic people who have fulfilled their duty to the community and the right derived from this to defend their honor against anyone.

Well, a state that adopts this worldview would be on shaky ground if it denied the individual the right to his honor; a state that makes the position of honor the foundation of its foreign policy would perish from internal dishonesty if it did not also make the right of the whole the right of the individual.

We could not speak of liberating the nation from liberal chains and compulsive ideas if we had not replaced the democratic pseudo-freedom of the individual—the ability to do and let do as one pleases—with a deeper right to the honor of the individual; this means, however, that the National Socialist state takes so-called civil courage for granted, as something that, like the entire mindset of human beings, cannot be “regulated” or even “permitted” by laws and regulations.

You can't make an omelet without breaking eggs; a government, organizations that think and act for millions, cannot take every “special case” into account in advance; the lower, executive bodies might sometimes be able to do so, but aren't they human beings like the rest of us, who can make mistakes and fail?

The state is not a nursery; it must expect that when someone is carelessly hurt, a loud “Ouch!” will be heard.

It cannot run after individuals and ask: Excuse me, dear fellow citizen, have you perhaps been hurt on some occasion? It must rely on the sense of honor of the individual; that is why anyone who prevents this good control mechanism and peddles the stupid slogan “Shut up, it's pointless anyway!” is our enemy. We are of the opinion that a completely “oiled” existence is not compatible with the German people's sense of honor; emphasizing the point of honor, understanding as a duty not only what is currently prescribed, but also what one's own honor dictates, can always lead to friction and overlap.

A sense of honor is always something demanding, not something that is tacitly accepted; if these demands never had to overcome resistance, we would be in a sad state, because then these demands, the individual's claim to honor, would be too low - only the community of these demands, which he feels and must feel again and again, gives the state the strength to assert its own claims to honor.

That is why—we repeat—civil courage is by no means forbidden in the new Germany; rather, it must be assumed to be a natural trait of every citizen of the Reich.

### **We Are Ashamed**

In front of an enthusiastic crowd of Jewish women, New York Mayor LaGuardia made a terrible threat: he wanted to open a chamber of horrors at the Paris World's Fair, in which Germany's lack of culture would be depicted in words and pictures. Unfortunately, this did not happen because, as LaGuardia explains:

*“There is neither a painter nor a writer who possesses the means of expression to artistically portray the Nazi regime.”*

Unfortunately, LaGuardia is right - with wire, old corks, and tin foil, you can glue together paintings for your chamber of horrors, but you cannot use it to portray a country; at least we are stung by the fact that LaGuardia has called us culturally barren.

In a quiet hour of introspection, we admit that we are indeed somewhat backward; America is far ahead of us with its freedom, democratic principles, and open path, where even the most capable can fall by the wayside if they lose the sympathy of the Jews and their comrades.

America! Since it was discovered by Karl May, this country has become the longing of our youth - healthy, unspoiled, and with an almost medieval chivalry towards women. In New York dance halls, you can't just waltz around like we do and then thank your partner with a curtsy to get out of your obligations; in New York, you have to press a tin token into the dancer's hand, which you can buy at the box office for 10 cents, because the girls dance on a piecework basis, usually called “taxi girls” for the sake of simplicity. Of course, they take great pleasure in having to let every youngster grope them, which they are contractually obliged to do - that's why the taxi girls smile sweetly, and that's why the common motto there is “keep smiling”.

Keep smiling! Smile at everything you encounter, even gangsters; they're hearty boys with a sawed-off machine gun under their arms and a picture of the Madonna over their hearts, and in their exuberance, they shoot around in the open street, and it can happen that they accidentally seriously injure a bank

messenger; of course, no one wants to be responsible for that, and that's why the police intervene, which is perceived and treated as an infringement of personal freedom.

The freedom granted to Americans goes so far that people who think highly of themselves hire private police; the relationship between security and the better people goes so far that every child has their own policeman, who watches over them with the suspicion of a concerned mother hen to make sure the little ones are not stolen off the streets.

The free American cannot be denied their active, inventive spirit - the rubber truncheon, under which the German people sigh according to LaGuardia's remarks, is an American invention; it was born out of the necessity to educate the American worker when and where he may strike and how he can best use his freedom - in America, everyone can do what they want, and if they don't, they get a beating and a gas grenade in the face.

What a democratic country has, of course, declared war on capitalism, and the capitalists, of course, are fighting back; they are usually very pious and have their own prayer wheel that is always turning, which ensures their prosperous growth - this, of course, is the assembly line. The workers have to conform to it, and every move is calculated with a stopwatch; anyone who has eaten too much fat is fired from the company, because even digestion has to conform to the assembly line.

There are still godless people who rebel against the sacred assembly line; they are not handed over to the police, since freedom of religion also prevails in America, but instead some missionaries are called in - they're called the Pinkertons (detectives). A barbed wire fence is quickly erected around the factory and charged with electricity; this is their ring, and in it the workers measure their strength against the Pinkertons. Although outnumbered, the Pinkertons always win; they know all the tricks and techniques of judo and jiu-jitsu, the elegant art of self-defense, while in between, they beat people with rubber truncheons and shoot if necessary, whereupon the workers return to the assembly line and the Pinkertons go to the cashier to pick up their check.

The entrepreneurs should not be seen as slave drivers; they are only scrambling to make money so that they can build a church and found a charity in their twilight years; almost all of them are supporting members of the League for Human Rights.

New Yorkers are a cheerful bunch, and they are far removed from any racial fanaticism; in the big variety shows on Broadway, they trample their heels off their boots with enthusiasm when a black woman appears, dressed in nothing but a banana peel.

Those who don't have the money to buy a ticket can find entertainment on the next street - there, a black man is often lynched, perhaps even the brother of the black dance star, not because he is black, oh no, but because he does not have white skin.

Almost every year, the entire American national wealth is distributed; those who are really on the ball can become very rich, and that's why people line up at the banks in the evening to get to the counters in time. It usually goes very quickly, as there are some clever people who get to the cash registers from behind - of course, by that time, they pocket everything so that there is nothing left to distribute.

It's almost always the same people - they're called Morgan, Vanderbilt, Kuhn, Loew & Co. and Warburg. There is still no agreement on what to call this day; the big bankers call it Golden Sunday, while the savers call it Black Friday.

While art is gagged in Germany, it enjoys unimagined freedoms in New York - nude dances, nude revues, private cinemas, and marathon dances, songs, runs, and meals; however, in order not to corrupt the youth, Shakespeare's "The Merchant of Venice" is banned in numerous schools because, unfortunately, his

Shylock incites racial hatred. Those who don't feel like washing dishes become composers; they don't need to play an instrument or even know how to read music.

Old castles are extremely popular; they are bought in Europe, torn down, the stones numbered, and reassembled on the other side. Of course, there is no commitment to the early Gothic style - the first floor is usually an English country house, the second Renaissance, plus two Turkish turrets with Bavarian onion domes; the windows come from Salzburg monasteries and are in the lovely Knödelbarock style. Scottish family seats with real ghosts are highly prized - at midnight, the invited guests fall silent and wait with their lorgnettes drawn for the ancestress.

Since we started creating family trees and ancestry charts in Germany, the better-off New Yorkers are no longer satisfied with their own; anyone who was a real beer driver and had made something of himself has a genealogist prove that his ancestors arrived on the Mayflower, the ship that brought the first four hundred Europeans to the land of unlimited opportunities. Descending from the Mayflower is considered particularly distinguished; each grandmother therefore costs a hundred dollars and is, of course, available in any quantity.

As befits true democrats, whose hands are still scarred from packing corned beef cans, they want princes as husbands for their daughters; a genuine Caucasian can be had for as little as \$100,000, but if that's too much, you can buy a prince who has been discarded by a movie star in Hollywood - he's considerably cheaper. Even a Habsburg who traded in family jewelry was once available; a stolen necklace was among the items. These blue blood donors need to bring nothing to the marriage but the airs and graces that the parents-in-law so sadly lack - before they are introduced to high society as family members, their prices are carefully removed and all outstanding bills are paid; if business is good, the daughter usually gets a duke after just one year of wearing princess dresses.

This is a culture that, unfortunately, turns up its nose at us for good reason; this is the land of democratic freedom, whose national heroes fled abroad under false names and which has a Laguardia who guarantees every immigrant Jew personal safety, but unfortunately could not promise the same to a Lindbergh.

Today, Laguardia believes he is the American the world listens to, by which he means the Jews. He will be even cheaper; you will be able to see him for 50 cents, just like his predecessor, Mr. Walker, who ended up in vaudeville. Perhaps he will try his hand at the Paris World's Fair in the chamber of horrors intended for us as a standardized model of the average American - all of Europe will grin at his face: keep smiling!

But we barbarians will weep bitterly over our cultural disgrace in the face of the fact that we will probably never reach those heights; all that remains is our silent confession: great, sky-high America, we are ashamed!

### **A Jew's Final Assessment!**

Some may have wondered why, with Adolf Hitler's seizure of power and the mass exodus of Jews abroad, no voice beyond the borders rose up in dramatic protest - neither that of Peter Panter, nor that of Ignaz Wrobel, Kaspar Hauser, or Theobald Tiger<sup>28</sup>.

---

<sup>28</sup> This essay is about the German-Jewish satirist and writer Kurt Tucholsky; these names were pseudonyms that he used while writing articles.

Like the ghostly carnival masks that their owner loved to wear when he stepped into the limelight of the “Weltbühne” to hurl all his cynicism and scorn in the face of a degenerate and degenerate audience, these names became moldy in the intellectual baggage of the agitator who had fled Germany, who preached treason as the highest virtue, who called the two million heroes who had fallen on the battlefields “murderers and barbarians,” and who mocked their grieving mothers and wives with caustic sarcasm; the sparkling and glittering tinsel of these four masks has become blind, the rustling silk of dazzling rhetoric has become tattered, and the probe of corrosive wit, which was a scourge whipping up the deepest mud, has become rusty.

Kurt Tucholsky has been silent for the last three years, but he was the only one among his comrades who had the courage to admit that they had been crushed, and that their threatening gestures from their safe asylum across the border only made them look unspeakably ridiculous.

Restless, he moved from one country to another and in quiet hours reflected on his, “their”, fate.

Compared to this whining and impotently raging men of emigration, the Schwarzschilds, Bernhards, and whatever else they may be called, he is actually the only one among them who remained consistent; he had the courage to face the situation squarely, and drew the ultimate conclusion from its hopelessness: he fled this world, in which he had gambled away his life, before his time.<sup>29</sup>

However, before he threw his life away because it no longer made sense to him, he sat down and wrote his last confession in a letter to the emigrant Arnold Zweig.

It is not Peter Panter, Theobald Tiger, Kaspar Hauser, Ignaz Wrobel, or any other dazzling mask that speaks here - Kurt Tucholsky has found his way home to his fathers, in whose spirit he lived, loved, and above all, hated.

\*\*\*

**Zurich, December 15th, 1935**

**Dear Arnold Zweig!**

*“Thank you very much for your letter of November 13th; I thank you for all your kind words—and if you would be so kind as to send me “Bilanz der Judenheit”, in addition to “Verdun,” I would be very grateful. You, dear Zweig, are one of those rare writers who have taken criticism as it was meant to be, namely in a spirit of friendship; that is why I would like to write something to you that has little to do with your work and much to do with your views—it is not addressed to you at all, but know that I am speaking to you.*

*I “left Judaism” around 1911, and I know that this is not possible.*

*You know that this was not motivated by opportunism—a Jew could live tolerably well in the German Empire, but a non-believer could not. So why did I do it? I did it because, ever since my earliest youth, I had an indelible aversion to the anointed rabbi... Wendriner<sup>30</sup> was not yet born at that time - well, he was, but he did not yet have a name. So out with it.*

*I only encountered anti-Semitism in the newspapers, but never in real life; with the instinct that distinguishes young men, many people did not consider me a Jew, which I note not with flattery, but with amusement. In three and a half years of military service, nothing. Most recently, I was a police*

---

<sup>29</sup> Tucholsky committed suicide via sleeping pills while he was in exile in Sweden.

<sup>30</sup> A reference to one of Tucholsky’s characters.

*commissioner—not even a hint of an idea. I drank with the fellows in the casino, which gave me a good knowledge of the milieu for later – yet nothing was noticeable. From this, I know I am not speaking out of resentment, nor am I one of the well-known Jewish anti-Semites.*

*I will not allow myself to comment on Palestine – I am not familiar with the circumstances there. Two things strike me however: this is not a Jewish state, but an English colony in which the Jews—as under Pontius Pilate—play a role that I don't like, and probably many Jews down there don't like either. Secondly, the German Jews who had money were only allowed to leave if, instead of their money, they took with them an agreement to flood Palestine with German goods.*

*But that is a matter for the Zionists, and since I am not involved, I do not feel I have much right to criticize. However, I can tell you this:*

*What are you? A member of a defeated but not vanquished army? No, Arnold Zweig, that is not true. Judaism has been defeated...and it is also not true that it has been fighting for thousands of years - in fact it is not even fighting at all. The emancipation of the Jews was not the work of Jews; this liberation was given to the Jews by the French Revolution, that is, by non-Jews—they did not fight for it. That has now taken its revenge...*

*I never liked this vague and lazy explanation that people gave me: the ghetto Jews in the sixteenth century couldn't do anything else, they were oppressed, they were allowed to do nothing but haggle. No, dear friends, the ghetto is not a consequence—the ghetto is fate. A master race would be broken—but these people 'must live.'*

*But let's leave the medieval Jews aside—let's take today's Jews, those in Germany. The great moment found a small race - how? It is incomprehensible that in March 1933 the moment had come to move out in reverse proportion—that is, not one in ten as today, but one should have stayed and nine should have left, or at least should have had to leave. Was there even one rabbi who was the leader of his people? Even one man? None. Nuremberg was home to such a rich and influential Jewish community – yet that's where Mr. Julius Streicher grew up...*

*If you had told the average Jew in 1933 that he would leave Germany under the conditions that 1935 and beyond would offer him, he would have laughed at you: 'I can't leave!', (and now like a gambler), 'I'm at a loss: what do you mean—my business...' And now they are sneaking out, gloomy, beaten up, broke, and robbed of their money... Heroism was the better deal here. Why didn't we choose this path? This may sound as if it is directed against the person to whom I am addressing this letter – but it only has a very indirect connection to you. I cannot agree with you when you praise the Jewish woman because she has qualities that I see in others as well ('She knows how to be beautiful at garden parties' — Minchen Müller can do that too), but I know that you never gave an inch; I am complaining to you, I am not barking at you...*

*We have suffered a defeat; we have been beaten as no party that had all the trump cards in its hand has been beaten in a long time. What is to be done now? Now is the time for self-reflection, with iron energy; now, at the ridiculous risk of this exploitation, self-criticism must be carried out that makes sulfur eye soap water seem mild.*

*What is happening instead? Instead, we are reading adulation that I don't like – praise for the Jews and praise for the Socialists and Communists – 'they sit there and hold each other in high esteem,' as they say in Swedish... Instead of self-criticism and self-reflection, I see something like 'We are the better Germany' and such nonsense - a country is not only what it does—it is also what it tolerates, what it puts up with.*

*It is eerie to know what the people of Paris are doing—how they play with something that no longer exists. How they still squint—how they feel like Germans—but damn it, the Germans don't want you! They don't realize it.*

*That's Germany. The uniform fits them—only the collar is too high for them. A little uncomfortable—a little annoying—so much pathos and so little butter—but otherwise? As Alfred Polgar says: 'The downfall begins when you hear: You have to give people credit for one thing.' And they let them have this and that and then everything... My life is too precious to me to stand under an apple tree and ask it to produce pears - that's not me anymore. I have nothing more to do with this country, whose language I speak as little as possible. May it die – may Russia conquer it – I'm done with it...*

*You have to start all over again – 'Ford, c'est Descartes descendu dans la rue'<sup>31</sup> is one of Dandieu's sayings. (Unfortunately, he died far too young at the age of 36.)*

*You have to start over, not listen to this... Stalin...*

*– and the saying 'That's not Germany at all.'*

*We won't live to see it; it's part of what most emigrants overlook, a youthful energy that we no longer have. New ones will come after us - but it can't go on like this. The game is over.*

*Nihilism? Dear Zweig, I have learned a lot in the last five years – and if it weren't for my poor health, I would have expressed this publicly. I have learned that it is better to say that there is nothing here than to pretend to myself and others that there is. (Which you have never done.) The theater of despair that still exists in... Thomas Mann, a man who, as a Nobel Prize winner, does not dare to speak out and continues to sell his 'harmless' books in Germany—the despair that continues to make the same mistakes that ruined us: namely, not taking our allies too seriously—I cannot participate in this theater. Here is what repels me so much about German emigration:*

*Everything goes on as if nothing had happened. On and on, on and on – they write the same books, they make the same speeches, they make the same gestures. But that didn't work when we still had the opportunity and a little power – how can it work from outside! Look at Lenin in exile: steel and extreme purity of thought. And these people? German culture. The conscience of the world... Good night."*

\*\*\*

Tucholsky's letter is the confession of a man who has recognized the futility of the actions of his fellow countrymen, who even in their darkest hour refuse to accept that their game is over - it is an indictment of all forces that unite with Judaism to bring Germany down, disgusted by the hypocrisy of his blood, which tries to assert itself with slander, lies, and spinelessness, too cowardly to fight openly.

"I 'left Judaism' in 1911, and I know that this is not possible" - the most witty and probably most intelligent of "them," Kurt Tucholsky, has come to this realization, which we have always advocated throughout the years of struggle, for which we have been persecuted, hounded, slandered, and defamed. Yet some church circles have supported the Jews in their struggle in word and writing, not only in the

---

<sup>31</sup> "Ford is Descartes brought down to the level of the street", or, the degeneration of reason to that of a machine intelligence, fit only for the assembly line.

past, but also today—we need only think of the Jacobi case in Berlin<sup>32</sup>—turning the burning racial question into a confessional matter that can only be solved by baptismal water!

He, the Jew, who “from his earliest youth had an indelible aversion to the anointed rabbi...”, who was horrified by his own reflection as if it were a basilisk, who perished when he saw his image in a calm pool of water... Kurt Tucholsky had recognized the absurdity and deceitful hypocrisy in the attitude of that racial mush that sought to rule over a population of 65 million, cowardly, treacherous, on stealthy feet, not grabbing its opponent by the throat from the front, but groping for individual nerves in order to paralyze the entire organism in its individual parts.

Kurt Tucholsky was not one of the “well-known anti-Semites” who deny and fight their race because they are too cowardly to profess it; with a comedian's gesture and the kind of melodramatic pathos that used to be seen in poorly lit barns by traveling theater troupes, emigrated Jews “confess” to their blood, but the few spectators are already leaving their seats, finding the artificially exaggerated monologues boring; this continues until the last one has left, and the mimes stand alone on the wobbly boards, enthusiastic about their own words, and finally the flickering stable lantern goes out and everything is shrouded in darkness. Tragedy? No, deserved fate!

There is no ghetto - “ghetto is fate.” The ghetto is the environment of people who are too cowardly to fight for their existence; the ghettos of Prague and Warsaw, of Vienna, Eisenstadt, and Carpathian Ruthenia are not only infested with vermin and latent sources of disease, but the people who live in them first created the ghetto around themselves in the first place: “A master race would be broken... but these people ‘must live’.”

Tucholsky fled the ghetto, wandering restlessly from one country to another in order to free himself from his fate, which every Jew carries with him in the form of a subconscious memory of the ghetto, whether he may be ennobled at imperial courts and “honored” with crosses of merit, or “drinking with the fellows in the casino” - all those who were not bothered by the ghetto air, in which only Jews can live because it is their very own element, perished; the ‘empire’ has fallen, and even the “fellows in the casino” will have become sick and powerless...

“They sit there and hold each other in high esteem...” - on the terraces of coffee houses in Paris, Amsterdam, Prague, and Vienna, on the sun roofs of Swiss hotels and in homeless shelters, in the day rooms of the Salvation Army; they cannot bear to be nobodies, and since others deny them respect, they “hold each other in high esteem” in their émigré press, from one writer to another: Georg Bernhard in his “Tageblatt”, to Leopold Schwarzschild, and the latter again in his “Tagebuch,” with both together bound by Claus Mann, as the praised writer finds warm words of appreciation for both in his “Sammlung.” There is only one thing they do not want to hear and do not admit to themselves, although they all feel and know it: they are not “the better Germany,” “German culture,” and “German civilization.” “...Damn it, the Germans don't want you!” - Kurt Tucholsky, of all people, the living spirit of the dead Jew, shouts it in their ears.

Germany? “May it die – may it conquer Russia – I'm done with it.”

Hatred speaks from Tucholsky's words, the hatred of a spurned lover who lay in wait for his beloved every day with the pistol of his corrosive intellect and, finally, perishes, overcome by the golem in his

---

<sup>32</sup> Referring to Carl Gustav Jacobi, a German-Jewish mathematician whose involvement with the 1848 Revolution led to him having his royal salary being seized, though this was later reverted.

chest, which gave him the strength to quadruple himself in order to appear as Peter Panter, Kaspar Hauser, Theobald Tiger, and Ignaz Wrobel.

He was one of the strongest among them—and yet he took his own life. Tucholsky's final mockery is directed at those who always thought of him with pride as a savior residing abroad, waiting only for the right moment to... They will talk excitedly and confusedly and try to agree on a “nervous breakdown” and that he, “in a fit of depression”...

No - Kurt Tucholsky knew what he was writing until the very last moment; he had not only had the sad courage to commit high treason and slander, but also, once – when he saw no way out – to tell the truth. It is a bitter, but true truth for them:

*“And that? ...German culture. The conscience of the world... Good night.”*