

*Includes the complete text of Domarus' original German
4-volume set, and the 4-volume English translation on CD*

The Complete HITLER

*A Digital Desktop Reference
to His Speeches and Proclamations
1932–1945*

Max Domarus



Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, Inc.
Wauconda, Illinois USA

**The Complete Hitler
A Digital Desktop Reference
to His Speeches and Proclamations 1932-1945**

Max Domarus

© 2007 Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, Inc.
All rights reserved.

Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, Inc.
1000 Brown Street
Wauconda, IL 60084 USA
www.bolchazy.com

Produced in the United States of America

2007

by Media Services

ISBN 978-0-86516-658-5

HITLER

Speeches and Proclamations

VOLUME I

HITLER

Speeches and Proclamations

1932-1945

Volume I 1932-1934

Volume II 1935-1938

Volume III 1939-1940

Volume IV 1941-1945

MAX DOMARUS

HITLER

Speeches and Proclamations
1932-1945

THE CHRONICLE
OF A DICTATORSHIP

VOLUME ONE
The Years 1932 to 1934



BOLCHAZY-CARDUCCI PUBLISHERS

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN BY
MARY FRAN GOLBERT

Published by
Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers
1000 Brown Street, Unit 101
Wauconda, IL., 60084
United States of America

Copyright © 1990 by Wolfgang Domarus

Originally published in German:
Hitler. Reden und Proklamationen 1932–1945.
Copyright © 1962, 1963, 1973 by Max Domarus,
1987 by Wolfgang Domarus

English translation copyright © 1990 by Wolfgang Domarus
Licensing by Domarus Verlag
Postfach, D-8700 Würzburg 21, West Germany
All rights reserved

The copyright includes the entirety of Adolf Hitler's words
as translated and cited in this work.
Except for brief quotations in a review, this book,
or any part thereof, must not be reproduced in any form
without written permission from the publisher.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Domarus, Max: Hitler. Speeches and Proclamations 1932–1945.
Volume I: The Years 1932 to 1934.

I. Germany. Politics and government. 1933–1945. Sources.

I. Domarus, Max. II. Title.

ISBN 0-86516-2271 (Volume 1: 1932–1934)

ISBN 0-86516-2298 (Volume 11: 1935–1938)

ISBN 0-86516-2301 (Volume III: 1939–1940)

ISBN 0-86516-231X (Volume IV: 1941–1945)

ISBN 0-86516-228X (Four Volume Set)

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 89–43172

Produced by Verlagsservice Henninger GmbH,
Würzburg, West Germany

Printed and bound in West Germany by
Mainpresse Richter Druck und Verlags-GmbH & Co KG,
Würzburg

VOLUME ONE

Contents

List of Photographs	7
Abbreviations	8
Preface	9

INTRODUCTION

Hitler's Personality	
Manner and Mental State	13
From 'Artist' to 'God-Man'	24
Political Aims	
'Patriotism'	33
Anti-Semitism	37
Domestic Policy	42
Foreign Policy	50
The Methodology of Hitler's Oratory	60
Remarks on the Structure of this Work	72

THE YEAR 1932—THE BID FOR POWER

Major Events in Summary	75
Report and Commentary	
1 The Speech before the Industry Club	78
2 Candidacy for the Office of Reich President	115
3 Landtag Election Campaigns	128
4 Reichstag Elections of July 31	138
5 Reichstag Elections of November 6	162
6 The Final Steps toward Taking Power	175

Introduction

THE YEAR 1933—THE NATIONAL REVOLUTION

Major Events in Summary	205
Report and Commentary	
1 Hitler's Appointment as Reich Chancellor—Statement of Policy	210
2 The Consolidation of Power—Emergency Decrees	230
3 The Enabling Act—Debate between Hitler and Wels	261
4 The Beginning of the <i>Gleichschaltung</i> , of the Boycott against Jews and of the NS Foreign Policy	297
5 Elections in Danzig—The Concordat—First Reich Party Congress in Nuremberg—Withdrawal from the League of Nations	335
6 Commemoration March to the Feldherrnhalle—Beginning of Rearmament	376

THE YEAR 1934—THE DESPOT UNMASKED

Major Events in Summary	407
Report and Commentary	
1 Ten-Year Pact between Germany and Poland	411
2 The 'Reconstruction' of the Reich	431
3 The Röhm Purge	447
4 Hitler's Justification of the Slaughter of June 30	483
5 National Socialist Putsch Attempt in Austria—Hindenburg's Death—Oath of Allegiance to the 'Führer and Reichskanzler'	504
6 Plebiscite on Uniting the Offices of Chancellor and President	520
Notes	551

List of Photographs

- I Correspondence with Hindenburg and Meissner. Hitler dictating a reply to the press chief of the NSDAP (November 1932)
- II General Kurt von Schleicher, at his desk in 1932
- III Gregor Strasser, NSDAP Reichsorganisationsleiter, in 1932
- IV January 22, 1933. Hitler speaking at the memorial ceremony for Horst Wessel
- V February 1, 1933. Hitler making his first radio speech from the Chancellory office
- VI Hitler delivering his first address before the Reichstag on March 23, 1933
- VII Hitler conferring with Röhm and other SA leaders on January 22, 1934 in the Reich Chancellory
- VIII Speech to Autobahn workers on March 21, 1934 in Unterhaching
- IX On the eve of the Röhm Purge. Hitler on June 29, 1934 at the Buddenberg castle
- X Hitler's convoy leaving Bad Wiessee after the arrest of the SA leaders on June 30, 1934
- XI The day after the Purge. Hitler salutes the Reichswehr parading in his honor on July 1, 1934
- XII SS guards posted in the Reichstag. In his speech on July 13, 1934, Hitler feared assassination attempts on the part of incensed party comrades
- XIII Hitler and Mussolini in Venice on June 14, 1934
- XIV Hindenburg and Hitler in Neudeck on July 3, 1934 after the conference on the Röhm Purge
- XV Perceptible dissatisfaction upon learning the outcome of the plebiscite of August 19, 1934

Abbreviations

BA	= Bundesarchiv, Koblenz
BDM	= Bund Deutscher Mädel
BVP	= Bayerische Volkspartei (Bavarian People's Party)
DAF	= Deutsche Arbeitsfront (German Labor Front)
DNB	= Deutsches Nachrichtenbüro (German News Bureau)
DNVP	= Deutschnationale Volkspartei (German National People's Party)
DVP	= Deutsche Volkspartei (German People's Party)
FHQ	= Führerhauptquartier (Führer Headquarters)
Gestapo	= Geheime Staatspolizei (Secret State Police)
HJ	= Hitlerjugend (Hitler Youth)
HQu	= Hauptquartier (Headquarters)
HStA	= Hauptstaatsarchiv, Munich
IMT	= International Military Tribunal, 1945–1949
KdF	= Kraft durch Freude ("Strength through joy")
KPD	= Kommunistische Partei Deutschlands (Communist Party of Germany)
NS	= Nationalsozialistisch (National Socialist)
NSBO	= Nationalsozialistische Betriebszellenorganisation (National Socialist Factory Cell Organization)
NSDAP	= Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei (National Socialist German Workers' Party)
NSFK	= Nationalsozialistisches Fliegerkorps (National Socialist Air Corps)
NSK	= Nationalsozialistische Parteikorrespondenz (National Socialist Party News Agency)
NSKK	= Nationalsozialistisches Kraftfahrkorps (National Socialist Motorized Corps)
OSAF	= Oberster SA Führer (Supreme Commander of the SA)
Pg	= Parteigenosse (Party comrade)
PL	= Politischer Leiter (Political Leader)
PO	= Politische Organisation (Political Organization)
RAD	= Reichsarbeitsdienst (Reich Labor Service)
RGB1	= Reichsgesetzblatt (Reich Law Gazette)
RSHA	= Reichssicherheitshauptamt (Central Office for Reich Security)
RK	= Reichskanzlei (Reich Chancellery)
SA	= Sturmabteilung (Nazi storm troops; brown shirts)
SD	= Sicherheitsdienst (Security Service, the SS intelligence agency)
SPD	= Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands (Social Democratic Party of Germany)
SS	= Schutzstaffel (Nazi elite guard; black shirts)
StA	= Staatsarchiv
TU	= Telegraphenunion (Telegraph Union)
VB	= <i>Völkischer Beobachter</i> (Nationalist Observer)
WTB	= Wolffs Telegraphisches Büro (Wolffs Telegraph Bureau)

PREFACE

This publication of the speeches and proclamations of Adolf Hitler is the final product of records I compiled during the years 1932 to 1945 and supplemented by sources and publications made available after World War II.

Such in-depth study of materials documenting the very recent past—and at such an early date—may first appear unusual for a historian who had, until then, specialized in the nineteenth century. There are, however, certain parallels between the two fields. My own avid interest in English history led me to concentrate my scholarly research on Napoleon I and Wilhelm II. When, in 1932, Adolf Hitler became the most important political figure in Germany, I became interested in his public words for, in terms of foreign policy, they reminded me of these two historical predecessors. There could be no doubt that this man—once in power—would perforce come into marked conflict with the western world, above all with Great Britain. Hence I began to collect all of Hitler's speeches, interviews, proclamations, letters, and other statements available, convinced that they would one day be of documentary value, should this demagogue be allowed to pursue his course.

During my university studies and as a journalist, I had the opportunity to travel widely in Germany from 1932 to 1939 and to gain a close view of many significant aspects of the Third Reich. I personally heard Hitler speak and was able to interview public figures who had direct contact with him. In this way I was able to witness for myself Hitler's astonishing power and influence as an orator. The enthusiasm his speeches prompted was not confined only to easily-aroused mass audiences but also infected—perhaps even more strongly—individuals belonging to Germany's leading circles.

At that time I was aware that Hitler's arguments were most persuasive with the German people and with people in neighboring countries

or those who had some link to the German mentality and culture. Members of the Anglo-Saxon nations were unimpressed by Hitler's oratory, just as were the Soviets and Japanese, although they did make certain concessions to Hitler for diplomatic and tactical reasons. My own observations of the events and the comparisons I drew with historic parallels soon taught me how to accurately and soberly assess both the real and alleged accomplishments of the Third Reich and to anticipate the reactions they would elicit abroad.

I became a particularly attentive and critical listener, studying the various phases and methodology of his oratory and making my own notes of key phrases either during his speeches or shortly thereafter. Thus I was able to immediately spot changes and deletions in texts of the speeches subsequently published.

As a soldier from 1939 to 1945, I no longer had the opportunity to personally attend speeches and visit mass rallies. However, this was less of a handicap than might have been expected, for Hitler's public appearances became increasingly infrequent during World War II, and the few speeches he did deliver were broadcast on the radio. When I had leave, I updated my collection and supplemented it with such military orders, proclamations and directives as were available to me. After 1945, I was able to further complement the documents I had compiled with archive material.

Friends and fellow historians at home and abroad urged me to publish the collection in the form of a day-to-day chronicle, accompanied by a detailed commentary providing the historical background. This would then serve to make the most anomalous and terrifying phenomenon of our century more accessible and comprehensible and—by revealing the sharp contrast between the Führer myth and reality—act as a corrective to an incomplete or false interpretation of the Nazi regime.

Much research on the history of the Third Reich has perhaps viewed its subject in too complicated a fashion. The initiator and driving force behind the fatal events was Adolf Hitler. While he did not necessarily reveal his innermost thoughts, he never made any significant distinction between what he poured forth before mass audiences and what he said in more intimate circles. He readily disclosed most of his views to the public eye, albeit not always at the same time he took action. The advantage in studying his public statements lies in their authenticity, for memoirs and even personal records are inherently prone to error.

The present study is confined to the years 1932 to 1945—but not only for reasons of length. Inarguably, many of Hitler's speeches in the years

preceding 1932 also present interesting and valuable sources of information, but his activities as a minor party leader and failed putschist are of lesser importance for German and European history. He did not become a major factor until he began gaining influence and exercising power, first as leader of the largest party in Germany, then as head of government, head of state, and supreme commander of the German armed forces. This decisive epoch commenced with Hitler's dramatic struggle for control of the government in 1932 and ended with the total collapse of his foreign and military policies in 1945.

I would like to take this opportunity to express my sincere gratitude to all those who, by their inspiration and their assistance, have promoted the publication of this work. First of all, I would like to thank Professors Hugh Trevor-Roper (Baron Dacre of Glanton), Oxford; Alan Bullock, Oxford; Fridolin Solleder, Erlangen-Nuremberg; and Hugo Hantsch, Vienna for their encouragement and support. I would further like to thank the following for their expert assistance: Professor Heinz Lieberich, Munich, Director-General of the Bavarian State Archives; Hofrat Gebhard Rath, Vienna, Director-General of the Austrian State Archives; and Dr. Fritz de Quervain, Bern, head of the Swiss Military Library.

I am especially indebted to the Institut für Zeitgeschichte, Munich, particularly to Secretary-General Helmut Krausnick, Professor Thilo Vogelsang and Dr. Anton Hoch; the Bundesarchiv, Koblenz, particularly to Director Karl G. Bruchmann and former Colonel G.S. D.H. Teske (Bundesarchiv, Militärarchiv, Freiburg im Breisgau); the Staatsarchiv, Nuremberg, the Staatsarchiv, Munich and the Monacensia-Division of the Munich City Library; the Stadtarchiv, Würzburg; the Würzburg University Library; the Stuttgart Military Library; and the Militärgeschichtliches Forschungsamt, Freiburg im Breisgau.

A debt of gratitude is owed to my assistant, Dr. Gerhard G. Drexler, Würzburg, who not only spent years with me working through the voluminous material and reading the proofs, but who also, as a member of the young generation, contributed his valuable assistance in keeping the commentary succinct and to the point. My particular thanks are due to my wife, Gertrud, for her interest and patience throughout.

Notes on the English Edition, Volume I

In 1987, the fourth edition of the hardcover set was published in the Federal Republic of Germany.

The broad international attention and unanimous acclaim the study has received as one of the standard reference works on the history of the Third Reich has necessitated that an English edition be made available, particularly since the majority of the original sources contained therein—speeches, proclamations, public statements, etc.—have not been accessible to date in English. The occasion of the translation was used to do minor revision and updating work on the commentary.

By virtue of this edition, a wider range of historians and all those interested in the phenomenon of the Third Reich are now afforded an opportunity to follow and study the events of the years 1932 to 1945 in Germany on the basis of previously unavailable documentation and to thereby gain a new perspective on this much-researched field.

Above all I thank my son, Wolfgang, and his partners, the publishers in Great Britain and the United States, as well as all those involved in accomplishing this project. I am particularly indebted to the translator, Mary Fran Gilbert, for the courage she has demonstrated in taking on such a demanding task and for her professional and objective approach to the material. Special thanks are also due to the technical editor, Gabriele Kamprad, for her careful and painstaking collation of the translation with the original. Finally I express my thanks to Hanne Henninger, Christiane Wachtel, Uwe Laubender, Andrew Bird, and Susannah Kennedy for their contribution to the project.

I am happy to see the English edition materialize and pleased to have been able to lend my support to its genesis and evolution.

Würzburg, November 1989

Max Domarus

THE YEAR 1932

Major Events in Summary

The year 1932 marked the climax of Hitler's domestic struggle. To a certain extent, the events of these twelve months reflect the entire course of his endeavors to gain control of German government since 1919. Thus the year 1932 as mirrored in this work is an accurately drawn miniature of the fourteen years of struggle for power which preceded it.

There were three alternative paths which could lead Hitler to the power he so coveted. The first possibility was a violent coup, which would, in all probability, necessitate bloodshed and an open confrontation with the armed forces of the Reichswehr and the police—a path which Hitler was hesitant to take now and had attempted to avoid at his putsch in November 1923. Nevertheless, he kept this possibility in mind as a last resort and had made certain preparations for it during this major year of struggle, 1932.¹

The second path was that of legal accession to power by means of a plebiscite, i.e. by achieving an absolute majority or a "right-wing majority" in the Reichstag and the Landtage (State Diets) or else with the election of a National Socialist Reich President. Under normal circumstances, the Weimar Constitution provided for the latter only every seven years.

In both cases—either a right-wing majority in the Reichstag or the election of a National Socialist Reich President—nothing could have prevented the legal constitution of a cabinet chosen by Hitler.

The year 1932, given Hitler's rhetorical prowess, appeared to fulfill all of the prerequisites for this solution: domestic chaos had reached a peak due to the worldwide economic crisis; six million unemployed were demanding work and bread. The *Mittelstand*, the civil servants, and the peasants were less than satisfied with the German Government. The Reich President and the Reich Chancellor had been governing since 1930 with what amounted to dictatorial powers by virtue of Article 48 of the Weimar Constitution and had nevertheless been unable to alleviate the economic oppression.

No less than fifteen election campaigns in 1932 (two presidential elections, two Reichstag elections, nine Landtag elections, and two local

elections) were dominated by Hitler's demagogical talents, which were *sans pareil* at the time. He was nonetheless able to score only partial successes in relatively small Länder. In the more decisive elections, the requisite 50% of the votes cast eluded his grasp despite his tireless efforts and unrivaled oratorical campaigns. The third path to power led, in the current figure of speech, through the "back door." It was essential to exert sufficient influence on both the private and public counsellors of the Reich President in the circles of the aristocracy, the Reichswehr, and the economy to such an extent that they would, in turn, attempt to sway the Reich President to institute a presidential cabinet under Hitler composed of ministers enjoying his personal confidence.

This path, which ultimately took Hitler to his goal, also gave him ample opportunity to make use of his powers of oral persuasion. He who had long been the butt of ridicule as a small-time party leader and failed putschist had become socially acceptable by 1932. The Reich President received him several times. Ministers in and out of office, leaders of industry, former generals, and active officers of the Reichswehr met to confer with him; party leaders from the German Nationalists to the Center made appointments to see him. Some were attempting to consolidate their forces with his; others to pacify him with insignificant ministerial posts. As the "drummer"² of the national uprising, he had served their purpose well; now they wanted to exercise the power he had gained.

But Hitler outplayed them all. Under the very eyes of the Government, he had established a "state within a state" with his National Socialist Party and now declared publicly that he and the NSDAP were the true representatives of Germany, and not the existing Reich Government. His Reichsleiters and Gauleiters conducted themselves as though they were Reich Ministers and District Presidents. Countless party "offices" (Agrarian Policy Office, Army Policy Office, Labor Service Office, etc.) made public statements on the events of the day and interfered with genuine "official" matters. Hitler dispatched his own observer—former General Franz Ritter von Epp—to the Disarmament Conference in Geneva.

In 1932 he issued a proclamation to the German peasants admonishing them to finish harvesting their crops in good time.³

The "Reich Press Chief" of the NSDAP conducted press conferences as though he were the press chief of the Reich Government. Uniformed men of the SS, the *Schutzstaffel*, assumed the task of erecting roadblocks at mass meetings and rallies as though they were the regular police. Tens

and even hundreds of thousands of SA men in uniform made spectacular performances of marching and parading in the former German garrison towns. Their formations⁴ were numbered after the former imperial army troops.

When Hitler later acceded to power, he did not hesitate to appoint his party friends to the same positions in State which they had held within the Party, with the exception of the SA, as would become dramatically evident in 1934.

When attending negotiations in Berlin in 1932, Hitler resided at the Kaiserhof Hotel across the street from the Chancellory. He intended that those in power there see that he was really standing “ante portas” and hear the cries of the many thousands from the Wilhelmsplatz demanding Hitler’s *Machtergreifung*.

Asked by a journalist whether one might indeed witness a march on Berlin á la Mussolini, Hitler replied: “Why should I march on Berlin? I’m already there!”⁵

In reality, Hitler was not as certain of victory as he pretended to be. He knew very well that, were he not successful in exploiting the extraordinary circumstances of the year 1932 (i.e. the economic and political crises and the presidential and parliamentary elections), his accession to power would become a thing of the distant future. By the end of 1932, the worst of the world economic crisis had passed, the unemployment rates had already begun to decline, and there were endeavors in Lausanne and Geneva to close the chapter on the Treaty of Versailles and the reparations.

To some of Hitler’s voters, the struggle for power had already taken too long: they would no longer cast their ballots for him. Party leaders here and there began to lose heart and became restless. Hitler declared at that time: “If the Party ever falls apart, I will take a gun and end it all in a minute.”⁶

But Hitler mastered these crises. His talent for oratory and his persistence won out. In the end he was able to persuade not only his vacillating party comrades but also those in power at the time—above all Papen and Hindenburg—that he alone was able to lead Germany onwards to an age of new greatness.

The triumph Hitler achieved over his domestic opponents in 1932 continued to affect him throughout his lifetime. He believed himself capable of attaining his foreign-policy goals by using the same methods and expected that the outcome of this second struggle would not deviate “by a hair’s breadth” from the first.⁷

Report and Commentary

1

It was Hitler's habit to begin the new year with a proclamation to his National Socialist supporters, a practice he upheld until 1945. Originally, the proclamation was coupled with a New Year's command to the fighting formations of the SA and SS, the HJ, etc.; from 1935 on, this was replaced by the order of the day to the soldiers of the Wehrmacht. Hitler's New Year's proclamations adhered more or less to a standard pattern: enumeration of the enormous successes of the preceding year and the pronouncement of even greater victories for the year to come. The ominous figures naturally played an important role, whereby their accuracy was of lesser importance.

In the New Year's proclamation for 1932, which follows verbatim,⁸ Hitler maintained without hesitation that his following had swelled to 15 million. In point of fact, however, the most successful election of the year 1932, the Reichstag election of July 31, had brought him no more than 13.7 million ballots.

*New Year's Proclamation to the Party.*⁹

National Socialists!

The twelfth year of our Movement's struggle has come to an end. Thanks to the colossal loyalty of all our fellow fighters, thanks to their sense of duty and sacrifice, the victory march of the National Socialist German Workers' Party can continue this year as well. We all know one thing: in 1931 our Movement became the largest party in Germany. Tremendous external victories are visible evidence to all of this fact.

When six and a half million German adults elected 107 of our trusted deputies to the German Reichstag on September 14, 1930, for the first time the whole world saw rent apart the web of lies with which the internal growth of our Movement has been outwardly veiled for years. Even the lies and slander were forced to halt their workings: a victory had been wrought which lies could not erase. Admittedly, only a few short weeks later, those professional political

January 1, 1932

perverters of the truth had regained their footing and recovered from the initial shock to the extent that their brazen old game of lies could begin anew. They made an attempt to persuade themselves and the world that only a “temporary illness” of the German Volk could be the cause of our success. The Party—according to them—had reached its climax and would now plunge into abrupt decline.

Party Comrades! You have witnessed how Fate and the facts have once again proven our official political prophets to be liars. The year 1931 has pinned victory upon victory to our National Socialist flags. In spite of the flood of lies, misrepresentations, and slander which I had predicted, the masses of our adherents have grown enormously in this year’s elections. Germany is in the process of becoming National Socialist at a rapid pace. The elections in Bremen, Hamburg, Oldenburg, Anhalt-Dessau, Mecklenburg, Hesse, and Württemberg have brought about a continuous increase in the greatness and significance of our Movement. However, these external victories, no matter how exhilarating they are, would be worthless were they not ultimately accompanied by a comparable internal growth within the Party.

Party Comrades! You should gauge the magnitude of our Movement’s growth by the following: on September 14, 1930, our Party had 293,000 members. Today, on January 1, 1932, membership has already exceeded the 800,000 mark.

By January 1, 1931, approximately 100,000 men had joined our SA and SS organizations. Today, on January 1, 1932, there are far more than 300,000. The number of our adherents already exceeds 15 million!

This is a victory march unparalleled in the history of our Volk.

This numerical growth corresponds to the unique internal expansion of our organization.

Today Bolshevism and its Marxist-Centrist-Democratic helpers are faced with a gigantic front of awakening Germany!

Were it not for the pact which the Center and the middle classes have entered into with Marxism as a result of their inner relatedness of character, there would be no red, anti-Christian Germany today.

Therefore they are the accursed accomplices of Bolshevism.

Just as a figure like Bismarck once rightfully described liberalism as the pacesetter of Social Democracy, Democracy and the Center are today the pacesetters of Bolshevism and thus the parties who are mainly to blame for our misfortune. One merely external demonstration of the greatness of our National Socialist Organization is the establishment of the “Braunes Haus” as central Reich Office. In February of last year, the move was made from the offices in 50 Schellingstrasse to the newly acquired building in the Brienner Strasse. Despite extensions and modifications, today this building is already much too small. A new building is on the rise, another is in the planning stages, and yet another structure neighboring the Braunes Haus has been occupied since December. Not until 1931 was it possible to enlarge Organization Department II.

This has led not only to the increased conquest of the worker in the city, but also to the winning of the peasant.

The National Socialist German Workers' Party is a party not only of city dwellers; today it is also already the largest German peasants' party.

Its policy of balancing and reconciling the individual ranks of life, of unifying all Germans for the great political lifework of our Volk, impresses its mark more strongly upon its own composition with each passing month.

The inner stability of our Movement and the absolute rightness of the thoughts as well as the foundations of its organization revealed themselves perhaps most clearly when called upon to overcome all of our adversaries' attempts, by way of internal disturbances, to fragment the party of German resurrection they so abhor.

The rejoicing with which our enemies welcomed every apparent indication of inner rebellion in our Movement was just as great as their bitter disappointment: the Party has come out of every test stronger than before. The year 1931 is the most convincing evidence of all!

National Socialists! Today you see this evolution clearly behind you. May you set your sights from there on the future. The time is approaching when the world will face a decision which comes about only once in millenniums.

The bourgeois parties view what happens in the world through their own eyes. Small and shortsighted as they are, they suppose the manifestations of the environment to be powers similar to their own. Even now, they have not yet recognized in Bolshevism the destruction of all human cultures but perceive it to be a perhaps still "interesting experiment of a new desire on the part of the State." They are totally unaware that today a thousand-year-old culture is being shaken to its very foundations; they have no conception of the fact that, if Bolshevism ultimately triumphs, it will not merely mean that a few miserable bourgeois governments will go to the devil, but that irreplaceable historic traditions will come to an end as well. Yes, and that furthermore a turning point in the development of humanity will inevitably be the end result in the worst meaning of the word. Bolshevism's triumph means not only the end of today's peoples, their states, their cultures, and their economies; it also means the end of their religions! This world shock will result not in freedom, but in barbarous tyranny on the one hand and a materialistic brutalization of man on the other!

As so often before in the history of peoples, Germany's fate this time will again be of decisive importance for the fate of all. If the flags of the red stultification and brutalization of humanity (*Menschheitsverdummung und Menschheitsvertierung*) should ever be hoisted over Germany, the rest of the world will share the same lot.

For seventy years, disreputable bourgeois parties in Germany have exhausted the power of the national idea and, to a large degree, left our Volk at the mercy of Marxism. For seventy years the parties of democracy and, in their wake, the strictly Christian Center Party, have helped to corrupt our Volk by practicing sodomy with the forerunners of Bolshevism.

Today they are clinging with a reprehensible thirst for power to a regime which would no longer belong to them if their own significance alone were any measure.

Were the National Socialist Movement to cease existing today as a counterbalance to Marxism, Germany would be Bolshevist tomorrow.

January 1, 1932

But what is Fate's will? If there was any deeper meaning underlying the events of last year, then it can only be that it is Fate's own will that a clear line is drawn.

We can see how the verse from the Bible which recognizes both the hot and the cold but damns the lukewarm to being spewn forth is coming to fruition in our Volk. The middle will be smashed and shattered. The compromises will come to an end. Today international Bolshevism is faced with the German nation under National Socialism. The Almighty Himself is creating, out of His own merciful will, the prerequisite for the salvation of our Volk; in allowing the lukewarm middle to be destroyed, He intends to give us the triumph.

National Socialists! We now enter upon the new year in the conviction that it will be the most difficult year of the struggle of our Movement.

A glance behind us shows countless sacrifices. As long as we comprised a small party, we were entitled to perceive in our own sacrifices the magnitude of the obligation for our actions. Now that Providence has granted us such great successes, the extent of our duties to Germany lies in the magnitude of the sacrifices which our Volk has taken on in the course of its historical evolution. We are fighting not for the victory of one party, but rather for the preservation of our Volk.

In view of the magnitude of these sacrifices and this task, we cannot expect that the way which lies ahead will be easy!

Men of the National Socialist Movement! SA and SS Comrades! I repeat the demands I made last year:

Men of my National Socialist Movement! I am not demanding that you do anything illegal, I am not requiring anything which would bring your conscience in conflict with the law, but I do demand that you follow me loyally on the path which the law permits and which my conscience and my insight require, and that you join your fate with my fate.

It will be a purgatory of slander, lies, misrepresentations, terror, and suppression through which our Movement must pass!

Our opponent fears retaliation for the inordinate number of crimes he has perpetrated upon our Volk. Hence no trick or deed is beyond him in his determination to prevent the victory of our Movement.

National Socialists! Expect it from the very beginning, and nothing will surprise you. Then you will overcome everything.

The path from seven men to fifteen million was more difficult than the path from fifteen million to the German nation will be.

As we once had the audacity to believe in our gigantic goal and its realization, let us today have the courage, like a knight without fear and without reproach, to withstand hell, death and the devil and choose the way to victory and freedom. National Socialists! Each of you shall be proud to be attacked by our adversaries in 1932!

He who is not attacked by the Marxist falsifiers and the Centrist liars and their press is useless to Germany and worth nothing to our Volk!

Struggle through to the realization that our enemies today are left with only one means of fighting: lying; and gauge from this the necessity of a community welded together for better or worse.

January 1, 1932

Comrades! Let us march into this new year as fighters with the goal of leaving it as victors.

Long live our glorious National Socialist Combat Movement!

Long live our eternally beloved German Volk!

Deutschland erwache!

Munich, January 1, 1932

Adolf Hitler

New Year's Command¹⁰ to the SA, SS, HJ, and the NSKK

The year 1931 strengthened and consolidated the Movement's units combined under the command of the Supreme SA Leadership both internally and in terms of numbers.

The army of Brownshirts has multiplied many times over.

The Movement has had to bear a high number of casualties. Forty-six were killed for the honor and freedom of the Volk; 4,804 were wounded. We wish to commemorate them foremost in loyalty and gratitude.

The victims were not killed in vain. The blood of the fighters shall give the sprout new energy.

Comrades, I thank you at the threshold of the new year for everything you have accomplished in the past year full of renunciation and sacrifices.

I wish to express my unqualified recognition of all the leaders and men of the SA, SS, HJ, and NSKK.

Proud of the accomplishments of 1931, you may enter the new year with cheerful confidence.

You are the hope of the German Volk.

Be worthy of your mission!

Der Oberste SA Führer: Adolf Hitler

Pursuant to the Weimar Constitution, the Reich President, who was to be elected directly by the people, had a term of seven years. The Field Marshal of World War I, Paul von Hindenburg, had been elected in 1925 as a candidate of the right-wing parties. In 1932, he was nearly 85 years old, which meant that under normal circumstances he would not have been considered for a further term. In any case, the right-wing parties which had chosen him as their leader in 1925 did not approve of his manner of governing, for he was more or less loyal to the Constitution. However, the Social Democrats and—even more so—the Center suddenly clung to him in 1932. Reich Chancellor Heinrich Brüning (Center) was using Article 48 to govern in an authoritarian fashion as Hindenburg's presidential chancellor and could hardly have remained in office given a different President. But the Social Democrats feared that new elections could result in even more ballots for the National Socialists or even in the election of a National Socialist Reich President.

One possible solution to this problem was a parliamentary maneuver: all of the parties, with the exception of the Communists, would pass

January 1, 1932

a resolution in the Reichstag by a two-thirds majority which would extend President Hindenburg's term in office for national reasons.

For this purpose Hitler was sent a polite invitation to attend negotiations in Berlin in early January 1932. The Reich Government believed that Hitler would be so naive as to consent to the extension of Hindenburg's term and forfeit this magnificent opportunity to launch a tremendous speechmaking campaign. Although Hitler was certain from the onset that none other than he could be considered as candidate for the NSDAP, he nevertheless accepted the invitation and proceeded to Berlin. The Party's press agency circulated the following account on January 8, 1932:¹¹

On Tuesday, January 5, Adolf Hitler was requested by telegraph to travel to Berlin for talks with Reich Minister of the Interior Groener. The leader of the National Socialists conferred with Reich Chancellor Brüning and Reich Minister of the Interior Groener on the evening of Wednesday, January 6 and yesterday afternoon, January 7, on the subject of the Reich President election.

Adolf Hitler reserved comment to the Reich Chancellor in order to first inform the parties of the national opposition of his opinion.¹²

Hitler subsequently failed to enlighten Brüning and Groener, who told the press that the talks had been held "on friendly terms."¹³ He first travelled to Lemgo to speak there on January 8 at the Lippian municipal election. It was, he declared to the *Völkischer Beobachter*, "the most monumental election rally the land of Arminius had ever seen."¹⁴

On January 9, Hitler was back in Berlin, where he once again conferred with Brüning and Reich Minister Treviranus for one hour. A further conference with Privy Councillor Alfred Hugenberg¹⁵ followed in the afternoon. The discussions with the national opposition (German Nationalists and Stahlhelm), which had formed what was called the "Harzburg Front"¹⁶ with Hitler as early as October 1931, were continued on January 11 in the Kaiserhof Hotel and concluded with a rejection of an extended term "due to doubts as to its constitutionality," in spite of State Secretary Meissner's previous personal visit to Hitler.¹⁷

On January 12, Hitler addressed the following letter to Reich Chancellor Brüning:¹⁸

Berlin, January 12, 1932

Dear Herr Reichskanzler!

On January 6, 1932, Reich Minister of the Interior General Groener informed me that there were plans to extend the presidency of Field Marshal von Hindenburg by parliamentary measures or to reelect the Reich President by a

January 12, 1932

two-thirds majority. Reich Minister of the Interior Groener requested my Party's view on this contemplated action.

I have the privilege of informing you, Herr Reichskanzler, that the National Socialist German Workers' Party, with all respect for the person of the Reich President, is not in a position to support this proposal. On behalf of the National Socialist Movement, I thus refuse our consent. I will inform you, dear Herr Reichskanzler, of the constitutional, foreign policy, domestic, and moral reasons which have prompted us to take this view in a detailed statement to be dispatched without delay.

With my assurance of respectful esteem, I remain, Herr Reichskanzler, faithfully yours,

Adolf Hitler

The "detailed statement" of reasons promised by Hitler was given to Brüning on January 16, 1932 by Göring. The lengthy letter¹⁹ was written in the style of a painstakingly exact constitutionalist who simply saw no way of departing from the letter of the law and approving of an extension to the President's term by resolution of parliament. Brüning made the mistake of answering this empty, albeit long-winded document. Now Hitler was in his element: he branded Brüning as a national opportunist who had not voted for Hindenburg in 1925 but now intended to exploit him as a shield for his own political machinations.

Hitler's open letter to Brüning of January 25, 1932 (in reply to the latter's letter of January 23, 1932) read as follows:²⁰

In respect to your remarks, Herr Reichskanzler, concerning the political reasons which force me as Führer of the National Socialist Movement to reject your attempt, with all due respect to the person of the Field Marshal von Hindenburg, I may note as follows:

You perceive in the arguments which we have to show for our rejection of your proposal a lack of objectivity and a motivation due solely to party politics, while conversely claiming for yourself the exclusive right of being motivated by vaterländisch (patriotic) and other similar standpoints. Herr Reichskanzler, may I then take the liberty of posing the following question:

Seven years ago, at a time when the Center was fighting Hindenburg's election to Reich President with every means available and the Field Marshal's rival candidate was truthfully anything but an "historic figure," did you or did you not cast your ballot for Herr Marx, motivated by the same *vaterländisch* or party political reasons? Or did, in your opinion, the interests of the *Vaterland* speak against Hindenburg at that time and only now speak for him?

Herr Reichskanzler, you are of the purely personal opinion that today your parliamentary attempt is a necessary act in terms of national politics, and I am of the conviction that the most important thing to be done in these terms is the elimination of the present system.

In your letter you write that you must, as a "tax to truth," disagree with my "theories" by pointing out the facts.

Herr Reichskanzler, I have reread your letter perhaps a dozen times now but have searched in vain for these "facts"; apparently they have been omitted. You say that, from a "patriotic point of view," you find it quite striking that I attribute the main cause of distress in Germany to the political conditions resulting from our parties. Herr Reichskanzler! Fürst Bismarck, who indisputably represented a patriotic standpoint as well and for this very reason was so dreadfully showered with hate and reproach by the Center, had the exact same opinions, particularly in respect to the parties—the same ones which constitute your basic support, Herr Reichskanzler—in viewing party politics as the main causes of distress in Germany.

Then you write—also with little regard to the "facts"—that, in what is "almost the general opinion," one of the "external factors" for our misery is the Treaty of Versailles which, with its political and economic-financial injustice and unreasonableness, has given rise to distress in both Germany and the world.

Quite right, Herr Reichskanzler! But a Treaty of Versailles would never have come about had not the Center, the Social Democrats and the Democrats, the parties who support you, undermined, destroyed and betrayed the old Reich—if not in fact prepared, carried out, or at least accepted and covered up for the revolution. I, for one, Herr Reichskanzler, have never regarded the Treaty of Versailles as a possible foundation for the life of our Volk or the success of the economy, but the parties supporting you have, by signing this Treaty, at least pretended that its performance was within the realm of the possible. In order to "preclude any confusion in history," I may note that I, and not you, was the first person in Germany to take a stand against this Treaty in countless mass rallies. However, the merciless handling of this Treaty which, in your view, destroyed every attempt at rebuilding Germany in the first five years, would have been completely impossible had not certain "German" parties given their consent to each act of blackmail, ignominy and disgrace.

Hence I am disregarding neither "the external circumstances" nor the "state of affairs" which they have created; rather, I am holding those parties responsible who, through their doings, either created these circumstances or at least encouraged them. Just as Bismarck was once forced to overcome the old liberal party in order to weld Germany together, so must your parties, Herr Reichskanzler, be annihilated in order to save Germany.

Herr Reichskanzler! You talk about "well-informed men in all countries" and attempt to play them off against us. Do you intend perhaps to cite the opinions of these "experts," who talked the German Volk first into taking the Dawes Plan and then the Young Plan by prophesying that we and the rest of the world would benefit as a result of these "treaties"? Herr Reichskanzler, we, and not your experts, have accurately prophesied the developments. I am willing at any time to confront the "opinions" of your "experts" with our warnings at that time before the entire German Volk. Seldom have opinions of government experts been proven wrong by the facts in such a dreadful fashion. Today's catastrophe, Herr Reichskanzler, is one we have been predicting for years, and

for this reason we were decried by you and your parties as “dreamers posing a threat to state security.”

Herr Reichskanzler! If you say that a different Reich Government would have to continue on the paths you have taken, I grant you, seen from your vantage point, the necessity of such an attitude: just as a military commander, regardless of how many defeats he has suffered, is still convinced that another would not have done any better. But history has shown that there is indeed a difference, in a situation which is desperate as it is, whether someone like the Herzog von Braunschweig is commanding the army or someone like Gneisenau. In conclusion, you admonish us to consider that successes in foreign policy are only attainable by means of the unanimity with which the nation supports its negotiators.

Herr Reichskanzler! Certainly there was a time when it was the obligation of every decent human being to support those who preserved the interests of Germany which were defended on the battlefield at that time. But in that most terrible age, the very parties upon which you depend today did not follow this doctrine in the least!

Today the main thing is to finally snatch the soul of the nation for the most “patriotic of interests” from these saboteurs of the German power of resistance. You cannot expect us, Herr Reichskanzler, to cover up for the Young Plan, the implementation of which your parties celebrated as a decisive step forward, while we recognized it as madness from the very start. And you cannot expect today that a genuinely responsible German give his unqualified approval to measures which, as the sum of human and historical experience has shown, can only bring further disaster upon a people. I do not doubt for a second, Herr Reichskanzler, that if Frederick the Great, Freiherr vom Stein or Bismarck had been damned to observe the politics of the last thirteen years as normal citizens, they would not be members of your Centrist-Democratic-Marxist club; they would be in the national opposition.

Your actions, Herr Reichskanzler, are dictated by conscience; ours by insight. Perhaps your conscience gives you the energy to continue on your desperate way, but we are inspired by the will to elevate reason and courage to reign over our German life in place of the servile policy of illusionism and the international slogan-slinging doubletalk of the past thirteen years.

I further take the liberty of expressing my astonishment that you, Herr Reichskanzler, choose not to see the difference between purely informatory talks, which you had with me and concerning which I have consequently refrained from comment, and the suggestion—upon which the Party as such should pass a resolution—to go along with a parliamentary action at a time when National Socialists throughout Germany are being brutally deprived of their civil rights: you have only to think of how National Socialist civil servants are treated in Prussia, think of the official acts of suppression, the suspicions, and persecution of all sorts being exercised against National Socialism; think of the many hundreds of honest fighters of my Movement who have been killed; remember, too, that the Reich with its ban on National Socialists gaining employment even as simple dock workers promotes the campaign of persecution against National Socialism!

January 25, 1932

The fact that you, Herr Reichskanzler, do not wish or are unable to comprehend my astonishment at being enlisted to take part in a parliamentary act of this kind in view of these circumstances is nothing but an indication of how fundamentally your thinking differs from mine.

Herr Reichskanzler! You regard it as your given right to believe that no one else could have done better than you have. But then do not deprive us of the right to be convinced that no government could have done worse than yours.

Munich, January 25, 1932

Braunes Haus

Adolf Hitler

Hitler's speeches in January 1932 were predominantly concerned with Germany's general economic and political situation but did not yet contain any indication of his decision to campaign for the office of Reich President. First he had to lay the groundwork.

On January 14, he composed a written dedication²¹ to the newly-founded NS Party press agency. On January 16, he submitted a declaration to the Lower Court of Berlin-Moabit in the libel suit filed against him by former SA leader Captain Stennes for defamation as a police spy.²² Hitler was acquitted. On January 17, he delivered a speech to National Socialist students at the Berlin tennis courts,²³ and on January 23, addressed 7,000 party comrades in Munich (Zirkus Krone).²⁴

Hitler pulled off a major coup on January 27. Introduced by the industrial magnate Fritz Thyssen, he spoke before the Industry Club in Düsseldorf. As at nearly all major speeches in 1932, he was attired in a dark-blue, double-breasted suit with a black tie.

Most of the captains of industry gathered at Düsseldorf witnessed Hitler's oratory for the first time, and most of them were unquestionably opposed to him at the commencement of his two-and-a-half-hour address. They mistrusted the NSDAP—its very name hinted of Socialism—and expected at best a crude rendering of party propaganda.

Although Hitler essentially expounded the same themes he treated in his mass rallies, the skeptical leaders of industry soon fell prey to his oratorical skill.

Here Hitler again utilized his standard method of tiring his audience. For one and a half hours he held forth on lengthy "philosophical" explanations of the alleged causes of the world crisis, on the values of the individual and the Volk, on the principles of struggle and achievement, on the *Herrensinn* (concept of domination) in economics and politics, etc. When he had reached the conclusion that all of his listeners, including those who were antagonistic, were thoroughly confused and hence incapable of any intellectual resistance, he proceeded to the more

tangible passages and confronted his now highly receptive audience with the imminent threat of Communism. At this point he began juggling with figures and percentages. He claimed point-blank that fifty percent of the German population had Bolshevist leanings; the question was how to create a strong and healthy Germany under these circumstances.

Soon he began to cite nationalistic slogans to his awakening audience. The World War, he claimed, had been lost due to the spiritual aberration of Marxism. Only the *Machtstaat* (totalitarian state) could combat the disease in the economy. It was essential for Germany to maintain an army of eight million reservists. A single supreme command should govern the state, just as in the army or, even better, in a company! He himself had been a mere nameless German soldier "with a very small zinc number on his breast"; today he and his Party comprised the German Volk's only remaining assets. And even if he were only the drummer of national Germany, this in itself would be a great statesmanlike deed.

The means for Germany's recovery were "the restoration of a healthy, national, powerful body politic, intolerant and relentless against those who do not acknowledge the vital interests of the nation and otherwise open to friendship and peace with anyone who wants friendship and peace."

These closing words brought Hitler tumultuous, long drawn-out applause. But this was not all: he was granted access to German industry's *Nibelungenschatz*, a secret fund for combatting Bolshevism. This meant that the Party's strained financial situation was restored to good order for the approaching presidential election. As Goebbels noted,²⁵ it was improving "from day to day."

Hitler addressed the Industry Club in Düsseldorf verbatim as follows:²⁶

If today the National Socialist Movement is regarded in many circles in Germany as being opposed to the business world, I believe the reason for this lies in the fact that we formerly adopted a position in respect to the events which determined the development of today's situation differing from that of the other organizations which play a significant role in public life. Today our views still differ in many points from those of our opponents.

It is our conviction that the misery is due not only and not primarily to general world events, for this would more or less exclude, from the very onset, the possibility that an individual people might better its situation. Were it true that the German misery is necessarily due solely to a so-called world crisis²⁷—a world crisis on the course of which we as Volk naturally can exercise no influence or only an insignificant amount of influence—then Germany's future could only be described as hopeless. How should a state of affairs change for

which no one bears the blame? In my opinion, the view that the world crisis alone is to blame leads, in the long run, to a dangerous pessimism. It is only natural that the more the factors giving rise to a certain state of affairs are removed from an individual's sphere of influence, the more that individual will despair of ever being able to change this state of affairs. The gradual result will perforce be a certain lethargy, an indifference, and ultimately, perhaps despair.

For I believe it is of primary importance to break with the view that our fate is determined by the world. It is not true that the final cause of our misery lies in a world crisis, in a world catastrophe; what is true is that we have slipped into a general crisis because certain mistakes were made here from the very beginning. I cannot say: "The general view is that the Peace Treaty of Versailles is the cause of our misfortune." What is the Peace Treaty of Versailles other than the work of man? It is not something which has been burdened or imposed upon us by Providence. It is the work of man for which, quite naturally, once again men will have to be held responsible, with their merits and with their faults. If this were not so, how would man ever be able to do away with this work at all? It is my opinion that there is nothing which has been caused by the will of man which cannot in turn be changed by another man's will.

Both the Peace Treaty of Versailles as well as all of the consequences of this Treaty are the result of a policy which was perhaps regarded as being correct, at least in the enemy nations, some fifteen, fourteen or thirteen years ago; seen from our vantage point, it can only be seen as fatal, even though it was still supported by millions of Germans a mere ten years or less ago and only today stands revealed in its utter impossibility. Hence, I must conclude that there is some implicit blame for these events in Germany as well if I want to believe at all that the German Volk can still exercise some influence toward changing these conditions.

It is, in my opinion, also false to claim that today's life in Germany is determined solely by considerations of foreign policy; that the primacy of foreign policy today controls the whole of our domestic life. It is naturally possible for a people to reach a point where factors of foreign policy exclusively influence and determine its domestic life. But let no one say that this circumstance is either natural or was intended from the onset. Rather, the important thing is for a people to lay the necessary groundwork to alter this state of affairs.

If anyone tells me that foreign politics are the foremost determining factor in the life of a people, then I must first ask: What do you mean by "politics"? There are a number of definitions: Frederick the Great said: "Politics is the art of serving one's State with every means." Bismarck stated: "Politics is the art of the possible"—based upon the concept that everything within the realm of possibility should be done to serve the State and, in the subsequent transition to the concept of nationalities, the nation. Yet another considers that this service to the people can be effected by peaceful as well as military means, for Clausewitz said: "War is the continuation of politics, albeit with different means." Conversely, Clemenceau believed that peace today is nothing other than the continuation of the battle and the pursuit of the battle aim, although, once again, with different means. In short: politics is and can be nothing other than the realization of the vital interests of a people and the practical waging of

its life-battle with all means available. Thus it is quite clear that this life-battle has its initial starting point in the people itself, and that at the same time the people is the object, the value in and of itself, which is to be preserved. All of the functions of this body politic should ultimately fulfill only one purpose: securing the preservation of this body in the future. Therefore I can neither say that foreign policy is of primary significance, nor that economic policy has priority. Naturally a people will require an economy in order to live. But this economy is also only one of the functions the body politic requires for its existence. Primarily, however, the most essential thing is the starting point itself, namely the people in and of itself.

One should not say that foreign politics are of prime importance in determining the path of a people; rather, one must say that, first of all, it is the people, with its own intrinsic value, with its organization and training in this value, which marks out its own path within the world around it. I should not say that foreign policy is capable of changing the value of the people to any significant extent; rather, I must say: each people must wage the battle to safeguard its own interests and can only wage a battle which corresponds to its innermost nature, its value, its capabilities, the quality of its organization, etc. Naturally, foreign policies will in turn exercise their retrospective influence. We ourselves have experienced it: what a difference there is in the reactions of the individual peoples to foreign policies! The reaction is determined by the inner state of mind, by the inner value, by the inner disposition, by the capabilities of each individual people. Thus I can ascertain that, even if the basic value of a nation is constant, shifts in the inner organization of the life of this nation can suffice to give rise to a change in its attitude to the external world.

Therefore it would be wrong to claim that foreign policy shapes a people; rather, the peoples control their relations to the rest of the world respective to the forces inherent in them and respective to their education in the utilization of these forces. We can be quite certain that, had a different Germany stood in the place of today's Germany, the attitude to the rest of the world would also have been appreciably different. However, presumably the influences of the rest of the world would also have manifested themselves in other ways. Denial of this would mean that Germany's destiny could no longer be changed, no matter which regime is governing in Germany. The roots underlying such a belief and the explanation for it are obvious: assertions that the destiny of a people is determined solely by foreign countries have always been the excuses of bad governments. Weak and bad governments throughout the ages have made use of this argument in order to excuse their own failures or those of their predecessors; the failures of their entire tradition-bound, predetermined course; and in order to claim from the very beginning: no one else in my position could have done otherwise. For what could anyone do with his people against conditions which are firmly established and rooted in the rest of the world, with a people which is then naturally regarded as a fixed value as well?

My view in this respect is another: I believe that three factors essentially influence the political life of a people.

First of all, the inner value of a people, which is passed down from one generation to the next as inheritance and genotype—a value which only suffers

any change when the carrier of this inheritance, the people itself, changes in terms of its genetic composition. It is a certain fact that individual character traits, individual virtues and individual vices always recur in peoples as long as their inner nature, their genetic composition, does not undergo any essential change. I can see the virtues and vices of our German Volk in the Roman authors just as clearly as I perceive them today. This inner value, which determines the life of the people, can be destroyed by nothing save a genetic change in its very substance. An illogical organization of life or an unreasonable education may interfere with this value temporarily. But in this case, merely its outward effects are obstructed, while the basic value in and of itself continues to exist as it has before. This is the great source of all hope for the recovery of a people. Here lies the justification for believing that a people which, in the course of thousands of years, has exhibited countless examples of the highest inner value cannot suddenly have lost this inborn, genetically transmitted value from one day to the next; rather, that this people will one day again bring this value into play. Were this not the case, the belief of millions of people in a better future—the mystic hope for a new Germany—would be incomprehensible. It would be incomprehensible how this German Volk, depleted from eighteen to thirteen and a half million people at the end of the Thirty Years' War, could regain the hope of rising again by means of industriousness and efficiency, how hundreds of thousands and finally millions belonging to this utterly crushed Volk could once again be seized by the yearning for a new form of government. It would be inconceivable, were there not a certain unconscious conviction in all of these individuals, that a value was present in and of itself which manifested itself time and time again throughout the millenniums, perhaps repressed and hindered in its effectiveness at times by bad leadership, bad education, bad organization within the State—but which in the end always struggled its way through—presenting to the world over and over again the wonderful spectacle of our Volk rising anew.

I said that this value can be corrupted. In particular, however, there are still two other inwardly related phenomena which we can observe again and again in periods of national decline.

One of these is the substitution, in democracy, of a levelling, numerical concept for the value of the individual. The other is the negation of the value of the people, the denial that there is diversity in the natural abilities, achievements, etc. of the individual peoples. In fact, each of these two phenomena is mutually dependent upon the other or at least exerts an influence on the other's development. Internationalism and democracy are inseparable concepts. It is only logical that democracy, which negates the special value of the individual within the people and puts in its place a general value, a numerical value, must proceed in this same way in respect to the life of the peoples, and there it degenerates to internationalism. It is maintained, in a general sense, that peoples have no innate values; rather, at most, there may be manifestations of temporary differences as a result of education; but there is no essential difference in value between Negroes, Arians, Mongolians, and Redskins. This view, which constitutes the basis of our entire international body of thought today, is so far-reaching in its consequences that ultimately a Negro will be able

to preside at the sessions of the League of Nations; it leads perforce in turn to the further consequence that, within a single people, in the same way, any differences between the value of individual members of this people will be particularly disputed. In this way, of course, any existing special ability, any existing basic value of a people can, for all practical purposes, be made ineffective. For, with this view, the greatness of a people is not the sum of all its achievements, but rather ultimately a sum of its outstanding achievements. Let no one say that the image which is conveyed as the first impression of the culture of mankind is the impression of its overall achievement. This entire structure of culture, down to its foundations and in each of its building blocks, is nothing other than the result of creative talent, the achievement of intelligence, and the industriousness of individuals. The greatest results are the great crowning achievement of individual geniuses endowed by God; the average results are the achievement of men of average ability; and the total result is undoubtedly a product of the application of human working power towards the exploitation of the creations of geniuses and talented men. But this naturally means that, when the capable minds of a nation—who are always in the minority—are given a value equal with all the others, this must result in subjugating the genius to the majority, in subjecting the ability and the value of the individual to the majority, a process which is mistakenly called the rule of the people. This is not the rule of the people, but in fact the rule of stupidity, of mediocrity, of half-measures, of cowardice, of weakness, and of inadequacy. The rule of the people is rather when a people allows itself to be governed and led in all areas of life by its most capable individuals who are born for the task, than to allow all areas of life to be administered by a majority which, by its very nature, is alien to these areas.

In this way, however, democracy will, in practice, result in cancelling out the real values of a people. This is one of the reasons why peoples with a great past slowly forfeit their former status from the very point onwards when they submit to unlimited democratic rule by the masses; for the existing and potentially outstanding achievements of the individual in all areas of life are then practically ruled ineffective, thanks to being subjected to rape by numbers. But this means that such a people will gradually lose not only its cultural and not only its economical significance, but also its significance as a whole. In a relatively short time, it will no longer represent to the rest of the world the value it once did. And this will necessarily be accompanied by a shift in its ability to safeguard its interests in respect to the rest of the world. It is not inconsequential whether a people embarks on a period such as, for instance, 1807 to 1813 under the leadership of the most capable individuals who are granted extraordinary authority, or whether, in a similar period, such as 1918 to 1921, it marches under the leadership of parliamentary mass madness. In the one case, one observes that the inner rebuilding of the life of the nation has led to the highest achievements which, though certainly founded in the value of the people, are only then capable of being manifested; while in the other case even the value which already exists no longer manifests itself. Yes, things can proceed to the point when an unquestionably industrious people, in whose lifetime apparently very few changes have taken place—particularly in respect to the efforts of individu-

als—loses so much in terms of its overall achievement that this achievement is no longer of any significance to the rest of the world.

But there is yet another factor involved: namely, the view that, having already denied the value of the individual and the particular value of a people, life on this planet must not necessarily be maintained through conflict—an opinion which, perhaps, might be of no import had it only become implanted in individual minds, but which has appalling consequences because it is slowly poisoning an entire people. It is not as though these types of general changes in the *Weltanschauung* are confined to the surface or involve purely intellectual processes. No, in the long run they affect the very roots, influencing all of the expressions of a people's life.

I may cite an example: you, Gentlemen, are of the opinion that the construction of the German economy must be based upon the concept of private property. Then again, you can only maintain the idea of private property if it appears to be somehow founded in logic. This concept must draw its ethical justification from the insight that it is a necessity dictated by nature. It cannot, for instance, be motivated solely by the claim: "It has been this way until now, and therefore it must continue this way." For—in periods of great upheavals in the State, of movements of peoples, and of transitions in thought—institutions, systems, etc. cannot only remain unaffected because they have existed previously in the same form. It is characteristic of all truly great revolutionary epochs in the history of mankind that they pass over, with unparalleled ease, forms which have become sacred only with time or which only apparently become sacred with time. Thus it is necessary to justify these types of traditional forms which are to be preserved in such a manner that they can be regarded as absolutely necessary, and as logical and right. In that case, I must say one thing: private property is only morally and ethically justifiable if I assume that men's achievements are different. Only then can I say that, because men's achievements are different, the results of those achievements are also different. But if the results of men's achievements are different, then it is expedient to leave the administration of these achievements to men to an appropriate degree. It would be illogical to assign the administration of the fruits of an achievement connected to one individual to the next best, less capable individual or the whole, for these latter individuals have already proven, by the simple fact that they themselves have not performed the achievement, that they cannot be capable of administering the resulting product. Therefore one must admit that, from an economic point of view, men are not equally valuable, not equally significant in every area from the onset. Having admitted this, it would be madness to claim that, while there are doubtless differences in value in the economic sector, there are none in the political sector! It is nonsense to base economic life on the concept of achievement, of personal value and thus practically on the authority of the individual, while denying this authority of the individual in the political sphere and substituting in its place the law of the greater number—democracy. This will inevitably slowly cause a gulf between the economic view and the political view which one will attempt to bridge by assimilating the former to the latter—an attempt which has indeed been made, for this gulf has not remained pure, empty theory. The concept of the equality

of values has meanwhile been raised to a system not only in the political but also in the economic sector. And not only as an abstract theory: no, this economic system thrives in gigantic organizations—yes, today it has already seized the huge territory of an entire State.

I am, however, incapable of regarding two basic ideas as being the possible foundation for the life of a people for any length of time. If it is correct to assume that human achievements are different, then it must also be correct that the value of man in respect to the creation of certain achievements is different. But then it is absurd to attempt to apply this only in respect to a certain sphere, in the sphere of economy and its leadership, but not in the sphere of leadership in the life-struggle as a whole, namely in the sphere of politics. Rather it is only logical that, if I acknowledge the unequivocal recognition of particular achievements in the sphere of economy as the prerequisite for any higher culture, then politically I must similarly grant priority to the particular achievement and thus to the authority of the individual. If, on the other hand, it is asserted—by none other than the economic sphere—that no particular abilities are required in the political sector, but that absolute uniformity reigns here in respect to achievement, then one day this same theory will be transferred from politics to the economy. Political democracy, however, is analogous to Communism in the economic sector. Today we find ourselves in an age in which these two basic principles are in conflict with each other on every border and have already penetrated the economy.

One example: the practical activity of life is rooted in the significance of the individual. This is gradually becoming threatened by the rule of numbers in the economic sector. There is, however, one organization in the State—the Army—which cannot be democratized in any way whatsoever without surrendering its very essence. One proof that a *Weltanschauung* is weak is when it is inapplicable to all areas of life as a whole. In other words: the Army can only exist if the absolutely anti-democratic principle of unconditional authority from above and absolute responsibility from below are maintained, while in contrast, democracy means, for all practical purposes, complete dependency from above and authority from below. However, the result is that in a State in which the whole of political life—beginning with the community and ending with the Reichstag—is built upon the concept of democracy, the Army must gradually become an alien body, and an alien body which is bound to be perceived as an alien body. To democracy, it is an alien idea, an alien *Weltanschauung* which inspires this body. An internal struggle between the advocates of democracy and the advocates of authority is the inevitable consequence, a struggle we are now experiencing in Germany.

One cannot expect that this struggle will suddenly come to a standstill. No, the opposite is the case: this struggle will continue until the nation ultimately becomes immersed in either internationalism or democracy and thus falls prey to a complete dissolution; or else creates a new and logical form for its inner life. It follows that education in pacifism must of necessity affect even the most insignificant of individual lives. The concept of pacifism is logical if I proceed on the basis of a general equality between peoples and human beings. For what other sense could there be in struggling? The concept of pacifism, translated

into practical reality and in all sectors, must slowly lead to the destruction of the drive for competition, of the ambition to bring forth particular achievements of all types. I cannot say: in politics we will become pacifists, will rid ourselves of the notion that it is necessary to protect life by means of conflict—but in economics we wish to remain keen competitors. If I eliminate the idea of struggle as such, it is of no significance that it still exists in isolated areas. In the end, political decisions will determine individual achievements. You can build up the best economy for fifty years on the basis of the principle of authority, on the basis of the principle of achievement; you can construct factories for fifty years; you can amass wealth for fifty years—and in three years of inadequate political decisions you can destroy all the results of these fifty years. (*Chorus of assent*). This is only natural, because political decisions spring from a different root than constructive economic decisions.

In summary, I see two principles starkly opposed: the principle of democracy which, wherever its practical results are evident, is the principle of destruction. And the principle of the authority of the individual, which I would like to call the principle of achievement, because everything which mankind has achieved until now and all human cultures are only conceivable given the rule of this principle.

The value of a people in and of itself, the type of inner organization through which this value is to be made effective, and the type of education are the starting points for the political action of a people and thus the foundations for the results of this action.

Do not go so far as to believe that a people which has deprived itself of its values to the extent the German Volk has would have fared better in former centuries, whether there was a world crisis or not. When a people chooses the path which we have chosen—practically for the past thirty or thirty-five years, but officially for the past thirteen—then it can end nowhere else but where Germany is today. The fact that evidence of the crisis has spread throughout almost the entire world is understandable when one considers that the development of the world has today progressed to an extent, and mutual relations have been reinforced in a manner, which seemed scarcely possible fifty, eighty or one hundred years ago. But it would nevertheless be wrong to believe that this process is only conceivable now, in the year 1932. No, the history of the world has witnessed similar things more than once before. Whenever particular relations between peoples have led to situations being created accordingly, the disease of these peoples has necessarily spread and influenced the overall situation.

It is, of course, easy to say: we prefer to wait until the general situation has changed. That is impossible. The situation which you see before you today is surely not the consequence of some revelation of God's will, but the result of human weaknesses, human errors, human fallacies. It is only natural that, first of all, these causes must be transformed and thus mankind committed to an internal transformation, before one can count on a change in the situation.

This follows from a single look at the situation of the world today: we have a number of nations which have created for themselves an outlook on life based upon their inborn superior value, which bears no relation to the *Lebensraum*

they inhabit in densely populated areas. We have the so-called white race, which has, in the course of some thousand years since the collapse of ancient civilization, established for itself a privileged position in the world. But I am incapable of comprehending the economically privileged supremacy (*Herrenstellung*) of the white race over the rest of the world if I do not view it in the closest of connections to a political concept of supremacy which has been peculiar to the white race as a natural phenomenon for many centuries and which it has upheld as such to the outer world. You can choose any single area, take for example India: England did not acquire India in a lawful and legitimate manner, but rather without regard to the natives' wishes, views, or declarations of rights; and she maintained this rule, if necessary, with the most brutal ruthlessness. Just as Cortés or Pizarro demanded for themselves Central America and the northern states of South America not on the basis of any legal claim, but from the absolute, inborn feeling of superiority (*Herrengefühl*) of the white race. The settlement of the North American continent was similarly a consequence not of any higher claim in a democratic or international sense, but rather of a consciousness of what is right which had its sole roots in the conviction of the superiority and thus the right of the white race. If I imagine things without this frame of mind which, in the course of the last three or four centuries of the white race, has conquered the world, then the fate of this race would in fact be no other than that, for instance, of the Chinese: an immensely congested mass of people in an extraordinarily restricted territory—overpopulation with all its inevitable consequences. If Fate allowed the white race to take a different path, it was because this white race was of the conviction that it had a right to organize the rest of the world. Regardless of what external disguise this right assumed in a given case—in reality, it was the exercise of an extraordinarily brutal right to dominate (*Herrenrecht*). From this political view there evolved the basis for the economic takeover of the rest of the world.

A famous Englishman once wrote that the characteristic feature of English policy was this miraculous marriage of economic acquisitions with political consolidation of power, and conversely the political expansion of power with immediate economic appropriation: an interaction which becomes inconceivable the moment one of the two factors is lacking. I know, however, that the view is held that one can also conquer the world economically. But this is one of the greatest and most terrible fallacies there are. Let the English confine their struggle for India to economic means; let England relinquish in full the attitude with which it once acquired India, an attitude which helped to preserve India for England throughout the many rebellions and the long and bloody battles in the middle of the last century—and you will see what happens: the English factories will not hold India, they will come to a standstill because the spirit of old England, the spirit which once laid the necessary groundwork for these factories, has been lost!

Today we are confronted with a world situation which is only comprehensible to the white race if one recognizes as indispensable the marriage between the concept of domination in political will and the concept of domination (*Herrensinn*) in economic activity, a miraculous consensus which left its mark on the whole of the past century and in the consequences of which the white

peoples have, in part, undergone a remarkable development: instead of expanding in a territorial sense, instead of exporting human beings, they have exported goods, have built up a worldwide economic system which manifests itself most characteristically in the fact that—given that there are different standards of living on this earth—Europe, and most recently, America as well, have gigantic central world factories in Europe, and the rest of the world has huge markets and sources of raw materials.

The white race, however, is capable of maintaining its position, practically speaking, only as long as discrepancies between the standards of living throughout the world remain. If today you were to give our so-called export markets the same standard of living we have, you would witness that the privileged position of the white race, which is manifested not only in the political power of the nation, but also in the economic situation of the individual, can no longer be maintained.

The various nations have now—in accordance with their innate natural abilities—safeguarded this privileged position in various ways, perhaps England most ingeniously, for she has consistently tapped new markets and immediately anchored them in a political sense, so that it is quite conceivable that Great Britain—assuming its mental outlook remains unchanged—might develop an economic life more or less independent of the rest of the world. Other peoples have not attained this goal because they have exhausted their mental powers in internal *weltanschaulich*—formerly religious—battles. During the great period when the world was partitioned they were developing their capacities internally, and later they attempted to participate in this world economy; but they have never created their own markets and gained complete control of these markets.

When Germany, for example, began to establish colonies, the inner conception, this entirely cool, sober, English concept of colonization, had already been replaced in part by more or less romantic ideas: the transmission of German culture to the world, the spread of German civilization—things which the English viewed as far-removed during the colonial period. Thus our practical results failed to meet our expectations, aside from the fact that the objects of our endeavors were, in part, no longer capable of fulfilling our lofty and romantic hopes, particularly since the white race has slowly increased to such numerical proportions that the preservation of these gigantic population figures appears guaranteed only if the economic world market potential is secured. Thus, in reality, one part of the world is absolutely dependent upon maintaining a situation which we Germans as democrats and members of the international League of Nations have long since rejected in an intellectual sense. The result is obvious: competition forced the European peoples to an ever-increasing improvement in production, and the increasing improvement in production led to a steady economizing in the labor force. As long as the tapping of new international markets kept pace, the men who had been dispensed with in agriculture and later in the trades could be transferred to the new lines of production without further ado, so that we now perceive the characteristic features of the last century in that primarily men were being eliminated in agriculture and entering the trades; later, in the trades themselves, more and

more people fell victim to rationalization in the methods of production and then, in turn, found new opportunities to earn a livelihood in an expansion of the branches of production. But this process was conceivable only as long as there was a constant increase in available sales potential, a potential which had to be as large as the increase in production.

The situation in the world today can be summed up as follows: Germany, England, France, and also—for non-imperative reasons—the American Union and a whole series of smaller States are industrial nations dependent upon the export business. After the end of the War, all of these peoples were confronted with a world market practically empty of commodities. Then the industrial and manufacturing methods, having become particularly ingenious during the War in a scientific and theoretical sense, pounced on this great void and began to restructure the factories, invest their capital and, as the inevitable consequence of the invested capital, to increase production to the utmost. This process was able to work for two, three, four, five years. It could have continued to function if new markets had been created which corresponded to the rapid increase and improvement in production and its methods—a matter of primary importance, for the rationalization of the economy leads, from the beginning of the rationalization of basic economy, to a reduction in the human work force, a reduction which is only useful if the workers who have been dispensed with can easily be transferred in turn to other branches of industry. But we see that since the World War there has been no substantial increase in the number of markets; quite the opposite, they have shrunk in number because the number of exporting nations has slowly been increasing; for a host of former sales markets have themselves become industrialized. We see, however, a new major exporter—the American Union, which today has perhaps not manifested itself all-powerfully in all sectors, but certainly in individual areas—can count on advantages in production which we in Europe do not and cannot possibly possess.

The last and most serious phenomenon we observe is the fact that, parallel to the gradual growth of confusion in white European thinking, a *Weltanschauung* has seized hold of a part of Europe and a large part of Asia which threatens to actually tear this continent out of the framework of international economic relations—a phenomenon which German statesmen even today pass over with an astonishing lack of regard. For instance when I hear a speech which stresses: “It is necessary that the German Volk stand together!”, then I am forced to ask: does one really believe that this standing together today is nothing but a question of good political will? Do they fail to see that a gulf has already grown in our midst, a gulf which is not the mere figment of some people’s imaginations, but rather whose spiritual exponent today forms the basis for one of the largest world powers? That Bolshevism is not only a mob ranting about in a few streets in Germany, but a world view which is on the point of subjecting to its rule the entire continent of Asia and which today, in the form of a State, stretches almost from our eastern border to Vladivostok?

Here the matter is presented as though these were only the purely intellectual problems of isolated visionaries or ill-disposed individuals. No, a *Weltanschauung* has conquered a State and, starting from there, will slowly

shatter the whole world and bring about its collapse. Bolshevism will, if its advance is not halted, expose the world to a transformation as complete as the one Christianity once effected. In 300 years people will no longer say: this is a new idea in production. In 300 years people might already know that it is almost a new religion, though based upon other principles! In 300 years, if this movement continues to develop, people will see in Lenin not only a revolutionary of the year 1917, but the founder of a new world doctrine, worshipped perhaps like Buddha. It is not true that this gigantic phenomenon could simply, let us say, be thought away in today's world. It is reality, and must of necessity destroy and overthrow one of the basic requirements for our continued existence as the white race. We observe the stages of this process: first of all, a decline in the level of culture and, with it, of receptivity; a decline in the level of humanity as a whole and thus the breaking off of all relations to other nations; then the construction of an independent system of production with the aid of the crutches of capitalist economy. As the final stage, an independent system of production to the complete exclusion of the other countries, which, as a matter of course, will one day be faced along their borders with the most serious economic competitor.

I know very well that gentlemen in the Reich Ministry of Defense and gentlemen in German industry will counter: we do not believe that the Soviets will ever be able to build up an industry genuinely capable of competition. Gentlemen, they would never be able to build it solely from Russian, from Bolshevik natural resources. But this industry will be built from the resources of the white peoples themselves. It is absurd to say: it is not possible to build an industry in Russia using the forces of other peoples—it was once possible to equip an industry in Bohemia with the help of Germans. And one more thing: the Russia of old was already in possession of a certain amount of industry.

If people go on to argue that the methods of production will never by any means be able to keep pace with us, then do not forget that the standard of living will more than compensate for any advantages we have due to our methods of production. (*Hear, hear!*)

We shall, in any event, witness the following development: Bolshevism will—if today's way of thinking in Europe and America remains as it is—slowly spread throughout Asia. Whether it takes thirty or fifty years is of no consequence at all, considering it is a question of *Weltanschauungen*. Christianity did not begin to assert itself throughout the whole of southern Europe until 300 years after Christ, and 700 years later it had taken hold of northern Europe as well. *Weltanschauungen* of this fundamental nature can manifest their unrestricted capacity for conquest even five hundred years later if they are not broken in the beginning by the natural instinct of self-preservation of other peoples. But even if this process continues for only thirty, forty or fifty years and our frame of mind remains unchanged, then, Gentlemen, one will not be able to say: what does that have to do with our economy?!

Gentlemen, the development is obvious. The crisis is very serious. It forces us to economize in every sector. The most natural reduction is always made in human labor. The industries will of necessity rationalize more and more; that means increasing their productivity and reducing the numbers of their work

forces. But when these people can no longer be given places in newly tapped professional fields, in newly tapped industries, this means that, in time, three people's accounts must be opened: the first is agriculture. Once people were economized from this basic account for the second account. This second account was the trades, and later industrial production. Now, in turn, one is eliminating men from this second account and pushing them into the third account: unemployment. In doing so, one is putting on a disgraceful show of glossing over reality. It can be best put by saying that those without a means of existence are simply regarded as "non-existent," and thus superfluous. The characteristic feature of our European nations is that gradually a certain percentage of the population is proven superfluous in terms of statistics. Now, it is quite clear that the requisite maintenance of this third account is a burden thrust upon the other two. This increases the tax pressure, which in turn requires a further rationalization of the methods of production, further economization, a further increase in the third account.

In addition, there is the battle for world markets being waged today by all European nations with the consequence that this battle naturally affects prices, which again leads to a new wave of economizing. The final result, which can hardly be foreseen today will, in any case, be decisive for the future or the downfall of the white race and, above all, of the peoples who are greatly hampered in establishing inner economic autarky due to their territorial limitations. The further consequence will be that, for instance, England will reorganize her domestic market and erect customs barriers for its protection, high ones today and even higher ones tomorrow, and all other peoples who are in any way capable of doing so will take the same steps.

In this sense, all those who claim that Germany's hopeless position is particularly indicative of our distress today are right. At the same time, however, they are wrong in seeking the distress only in external causes, for this position is of course not only the result of external developments, but of our inner, I would almost say, aberration, our inner disintegration, our inner decay.

Let no one say that we National Socialists do not understand the necessity of dealing with momentary damage. But one thing is certain: every type of distress has some root or another. Thus it does not suffice—regardless, Gentlemen, of what emergency decrees the Government issues today—when I doctored around on the periphery of this distress and attempt from time to time to cut away the cancerous tumor; rather, I must penetrate to the agent, the origins. In this connection it is of relatively little significance whether this generative cause is discovered or eliminated today or tomorrow; the essential thing is that, without its elimination, no cure is possible. It is wrong to reject a program covering twenty or thirty years today on the grounds that we cannot wait that long—a tuberculosis patient does not care if the treatment his physician has recommended to cure his illness lasts three or more years. The essential thing is that no purely external remedy, even if it is quickly applied and momentarily alleviates his pain, is capable of eliminating the disease as such. We can observe this in an absolutely classical form in the consequences of our emergency decrees. Again and again the—admittedly honest—attempt is made to somehow improve and combat an impossible situation. You see that every attempt,

in its final consequence, leads exactly to the opposite: to an increase in the very phenomena one is trying to eliminate. In this connection I am willing to leave out what is, in my opinion, the greatest problem at this moment, a problem which I would like to describe not only as a purely economic one, but also a *völkisch* problem in the truest sense of the word: that of unemployment.

What one sees are only six or seven million people who are not engaged in the process of production; and one regrets, from a purely economic standpoint, the loss in production which this causes.

But, Gentlemen, one fails to see the mental, moral, and spiritual effects of this fact. Do they really believe that such a percentage of the national work force can lie idle for even ten, twenty, or thirty years without this idleness exercising any mental effect, without it leading inevitably to a spiritual change? And do they believe that this will have no significance for the future?

Gentlemen, we know from our own experience that Germany lost the War due to a mental aberration whose consequences are today evident practically everywhere. Do you believe that, once seven or eight million people are barred from taking part in the national process of production for ten or twenty years, these masses can perceive of Bolshevism as anything but the logical *weltanschaulich* complement to their actual, practical economic situation? Do you really think that one can choose to disregard the purely mental side of this catastrophe without it one day becoming reality, an evil curse following the evil deed?

If the German distress could be alleviated by means of emergency decrees, then all of the major legislators in the past centuries would have been bunglers; for they attempted, under similar circumstances, to regenerate the body politic in order that, with the aid of this newly created source of strength, they might implement new and healing resolutions. What the current German Government wants is of no significance at all, just as it is of no significance what the German economy wants or desires. The important thing is to realize that we are presently once more in a situation which has already previously arisen in the world a number of times: a number of times in the past, the volume of certain types of production grew to exceed the parameters of demand. Today we are experiencing the same thing to the greatest possible degree: if all automobile factories existing in the world now were employed one hundred percent and working one hundred percent, then one could replace the entire stock of motor vehicles within four and a half or five years. If all locomotive factories were employed one hundred percent, one could easily renew all of the locomotive parts in the world within eight years. If all of the rail factories and rolling mills of the world were employed one hundred percent, one could, perhaps in ten or fifteen years, lay the entire network of tracks in the world today once more. This applies to almost all industries. One has achieved such an increase in productive capacity that the present market potential no longer bears any relation to capacity. But when Bolshevism as an ideology tears the continent of Asia out of the human economic community, the prerequisites for the employment of these gigantically developed industries will no longer exist to nearly the same extent. Then we will find ourselves industrially in approximately the same stage in which the world has found itself several times before in other areas. It

has happened several times before, for instance, that the tonnage of sea-going vessels was much larger than the amount of goods requiring carriage. Several times before certain economic groups have thus been subjected to severe crises. When you read history and study the ways which have been chosen to rectify this situation, then you will in short always find one thing: the amount of goods was not adjusted to fit the tonnage, the tonnage was adjusted to fit the amount of goods—in fact not by voluntary economic resolutions on the parts of the shipowners, but rather by decisions of power politics. When a politician or an economist objects and says to me: that may have once been the case between Rome and Carthage, or between England and Holland or between England and France, but today it is business that decides; all I can answer is: that is not the spirit which once opened up the world to the white race, which also opened to us Germans the way into world economy. It was not the German economy which conquered the world, followed by the evolution of Germany's power; but in our case, too, it was the power-state which created the basic conditions for ensuing prosperity in the economy. (*Hear, hear!*) In my view, it is putting the cart before the horse to believe today that Germany's position of power can be recovered using business methods alone instead of realizing that a position of power constitutes the prerequisite for an improvement in the economic situation as well. That does not mean that the attempt should not be made today or tomorrow to combat the disease which has seized our economy, notwithstanding the fact that it is not possible to hit the focus of the disease with the first blow. But it does mean that each such external solution ignores the root of the problem, the fact that there is only one basic solution.

It rests upon the realization that the collapse of an economy always has as its forerunner the collapse of the State and not vice versa; that a prosperous economy cannot subsist if it is not backed by the protection of a prosperous, powerful State; that there would have been no Carthaginian economy without a Carthaginian fleet and no Carthaginian trade without the Carthaginian army; and that, in our modern age—when things get rough and the interests of peoples clash—it is natural that an economy cannot exist unless the all-powerful, determined political will of the nation is standing behind it.

Here I would like to enter a protest against those who simply dismiss these facts by claiming: the Peace Treaty of Versailles is, "in what is almost the general opinion," the cause of our misfortune. No, this is certainly not "almost the general opinion," but solely the opinion of those who share the blame for its having been concluded. (*Applause*)

The Peace Treaty of Versailles is itself nothing but the logical consequence of our slowly increasing inner, mental confusion and aberration. We happen to find ourselves in an age in which the world is approaching extraordinarily difficult mental conflicts which will thoroughly shake it up. I cannot avoid these conflicts by simply shrugging my shoulders in regret and—without clearly realizing their causes—saying: "What we need is unity!" These conflicts are not phenomena born merely of the ill will of a few individuals; rather, they are phenomena ultimately having their deepest roots in the facts of race.

If Bolshevism is spreading in Russia today, then ultimately this Bolshevism is just as logical for Russia as Czarism was before it. It is a brutal regime ruling

over a people which, were it not led by a brutal government, could in no way be maintained as a State. But if this world outlook should spread to us as well, we must not forget that our Volk, too, is composed racially of the most diverse elements, that we thus of necessity must perceive in the slogan "Proletarians of all countries, unite!" much more than a mere political battle cry. In reality, it is the expression of the will of men who, in their natures, indeed do possess a certain kinship with respective peoples of a low level of culture. Our Volk and our State were also once built up only through the exercise of the absolute *Herrenrecht* and *Herrensinn* accruing to the so-called Nordic people, the Arian race elements which we still possess in our Volk today. Therefore whether or not we can find our way back to new political strength is only a question of regenerating the German body politic in accordance with the laws of an iron logic.

The claim that inner *weltanschaulich* unity is of no significance can only be made by a man who is a specialist in one area or another and therefore no longer has an eye for the real living forces which shape the nation—a statesman who never gets out of his office and busies himself in his bureaucratic ivory tower, in thousands of hours of negotiations and meetings, with the latest effects of the crisis, without discovering the major causes and with them the major decisions required for their removal. It is quite clear that, by issuing a decree, I can easily take a position today on any of the various aspects of public life. But take a look at what effect this position can have on the practical side of life! There is no organization existing in the world today which does not have as its foundation a certain unanimity of purpose. One cannot conceive of an organization which does not view certain basic questions which arise repeatedly as requiring an absolutely unanimous recognition, affirmation or solution. This applies even to the smallest organization there is—the family. No matter how competent a man or a woman may be, if certain, necessary, basic questions are not affirmed equally by both in their common union, then their competence will not be able to prevent their union from becoming a source of perpetual strife and their external life from ultimately failing due to this inner discord. Man can only develop the force of his activities in one direction, and the main question for the people as a whole is the direction in which this force is to be guided. Should it direct itself outwards, or should it turn inwards? It must turn inward at that point when the attitude toward a certain problem is not completely unanimous; otherwise the individual will already have become the enemy of his neighbor, who effectively constitutes his environment. It is not a matter of indifference whether or not an association has and recognizes a set of basic principles. No, the decisive factor in judging any human organization is the strength of the inner relation, a strength which is based upon the recognition of certain guiding general principles.

In the life of peoples, external strength is determined by the strength of the internal organization, but the strength of the internal organization in turn depends upon the stability of common views on certain basic matters. What good is it if a government issues a decree to save the economy when that nation, as a living thing, itself has two completely different attitudes towards the economy? One part says: "The prerequisite of the economy is private property," while the other claims: "Private property is theft." Fifty percent believe in one

principle, fifty percent in the other. You may object by saying that these views are pure theory—no, this theory is of necessity the basis for practice. Was this view mere theory when, in November 1918, the Revolution broke out as a consequence and shattered Germany? Was that a completely insignificant theory which, above all, was of no interest to the economy? No, Gentlemen! I believe that such views must, if they are not clarified, inevitably tear apart the body politic, for they are not simply confined to theory. The Government talks about the “*vaterländisch* way of thinking,” but what does “*vaterländisch* way of thinking” mean? Ask the German nation! One part supports it, while the other declares: “Vaterland is an inane bourgeois tradition and nothing more.” The Government says: “The State must be saved.” The State? Fifty percent regard the State as a necessity, but the sole desire of the other fifty percent is to crush the State. They are conscious of their role as a vanguard not only of an alien national attitude and an alien national concept, but also of an alien national will. I cannot say that this is only based on theory. It is not mere theory when fifty percent of a people at the most are willing to fight, if necessary, for the symbolic colors, while fifty percent have hoisted a different flag representing a State which is not their own but lies outside the borders of their own State.

“The Government will seek to improve the morals of the German Volk.” Which morals, Gentlemen? Even morals must have some basis. What appears to you to be moral appears immoral to others, and what seems immoral to you is for others a new morality. The State says, for instance: “Thieves must be punished.” But countless members of the nation counter: “One must punish the owners, for ownership itself comprises theft.” The thief is glorified more than anything else. One half of the nation says: “Traitors must be punished,” but the other half holds: “Treason is a duty.” One half says: “The nation must be defended with courage,” and the other half regards courage as idiotic. One half says: “The basis of our morality is religious life,” and the other half sneers: “The concept of a God does not exist in reality. Religions are merely the opium of the people.”

Do not ever think that once a people has been seized by these conflicts of Weltanschauung one can simply circumvent them by means of emergency decrees, that one can delude oneself into believing that there is no need to take a stand on them because they involve things which concern neither the economy, nor administrative life, nor cultural life! Gentlemen, these conflicts affect the power and the strength of the nation as a whole! How can a people actually constitute a factor of any significance abroad when, in the final analysis, fifty percent are Bolshevik-oriented and fifty percent nationalistic or anti-Bolshevik-oriented? It is conceivable that Germany can be turned into a Bolshevik State—it will be a catastrophe—but it is conceivable. It is also conceivable that Germany can be turned into a national State. But it is inconceivable that a strong and healthy Germany can be created if fifty percent²⁸ of its members are Bolshevik-oriented and fifty percent are nationalist-oriented! (*Hear, hear!*) We cannot get around solving this problem! (*Animated applause*)

If today’s Government declares: “But we are industrious, we are working, this last emergency decree cost us so and so many hundreds of hours of sessions” (*amusement*), then I do not doubt what they say. That does not,

however, mean that the nation will become even the slightest bit stronger or more stable; the process of inner decay will continue unceasingly on its inevitable course. But the consequence to which this path will finally lead is something you then again can see only if you take a very large mental leap: once, as the first prerequisite for the organization of our Volk on a large scale, Germany had a *weltanschaulich* foundation in our religion, Christianity²⁹ When this *weltanschaulich* foundation was shaken, we see how the strength of the nation turned away from external things and toward the internal conflicts, for the nature of man forces him, as a matter of inner necessity, to seek a new common foundation at that point at which the common *weltanschaulich* foundation is lost or attacked. These are then the great ages of civil wars, religious wars, etc.—conflicts and confusions in which either a new *weltanschaulich* platform can be found and thereupon a nation erected anew, a nation which can turn its strength outwards, or in which a people becomes split and falls into ruin. In Germany, this process ran its course in an absolutely classical form. The religious conflicts meant a withdrawal of the entire German strength inwards, an internal absorbing and exhausting of strength and thus automatically a gradual increase in an attitude of no-longer-reacting to major world events in foreign countries, while these meet with a completely passive people, because at the same time this people has inner tensions which urgently require a solution.

It is incorrect to say: world politics and the world situation alone determined Germany's fate in the sixteenth century. No, our internal situation at that time played a helping role in shaping the image of the world which later caused us so much suffering: the partitioning of the world without Germany.

In a second, really magnificent example from history, this process is repeated: in order to replace the lacking religious unity—for both religions are finally frozen fast, neither is now capable of overcoming the other—a new platform is found: the new concept of the State, first of legitimist character and later slowly passing to an age of the national principle and colored by it. It is on this new platform that Germany once more unites; and, piece by piece, with this unification process, a Reich which had fallen into decline as a result of the old confusions automatically and once more lastingly increases its strength in the external world. This increase in strength led to those days in August 1914 which we had the proud good fortune of experiencing firsthand. A nation which apparently had no internal differences and thus was able to channel its entire strength outwards! And in scarcely four and a half years, we see the process reverting. The inner differences become visible, they slowly begin to grow, and gradually the external strength is crippled. The inner conflict once more takes on urgency; in the end comes the collapse of November 1918. In reality, this means nothing other than that the German nation was once more investing its entire strength in inner conflicts—externally, it was relapsing into complete lethargy and powerlessness.

But it would be quite mistaken to believe that this process was confined only to those days in November 1918. The *weltanschaulich* disintegration set in at the very time when Bismarck was powerfully uniting Germany. Citizens and proletarians began to take the place of men from Prussia, Bavaria,

Württemberg, Saxony, Baden, etc. In place of a many-faceted disintegration, which is overcome politically, the classes begin to split, leading ultimately to the same result. For the remarkable feature of the former disintegration of the State was that Bavarians would, under certain circumstances, tend to cooperate more readily with non-Germans than with Prussians. That means that relations with the outside were regarded as more feasible than relations with one's own German Volksgenossen. Exactly the same result is coming about now by means of the class division. Once again a mass of millions has ceremoniously declared that it is more willing to take up relations to men and organizations who think similarly and have a similar outlook but are members of a foreign people, than to enter into relations with men of its own Volk who are of the same blood but think differently. This is the only explanation for the fact that today you can see the red flag with the sickle and hammer—the flag of an alien sovereign power—waving over Germany; the fact that there are millions of people to whom one cannot say: “You, too, are Germans—you, too, must defend Germany!” If these men were willing to do this as in 1914, they would be compelled to renounce their Weltanschauung; for it is thoroughly absurd to believe that Marxism would have been converted to the national cause in 1914. No! The German worker, with an intuitive realization, turned away from Marxism in 1914 and, contrary to his leaders,³⁰ found his way to the nation. (*Lively applause*) Marxism itself, as concept and idea, knows no German nation, knows no national State, but knows only the Internationale!

I can thus state one fact today: no matter what the legislature does—particularly by means of decrees and most of all by means of emergency decrees—if Germany is unable to master this inner division of outlook and Weltanschauung, then no amount of legislative measures will be able to prevent the ruin of the German nation. (*Hear, hear.!*) Indeed, do not believe, Gentlemen, that in ages in which peoples have fallen into ruin as demonstrated by history, the governments were not governing! At the same time Rome was slowly disintegrating, the governments were certainly active. Yes, I would almost like to say that the rapidity with which a legislative machine functions seems to me to be almost proof of the disintegration of a *Volkskörper* (body politic). (*Hear, hear!*) One merely attempts to veil the existing inner division and the degree of disintegration from the outside world by means of the legislative rotary machine. Today the situation is no different. And do not believe that any government would ever have admitted that its work was not conducive toward saving the nation. Each of them naturally protested against the view that its activities were not absolutely necessary; each was convinced that no one else could have done it better than itself. You will never, in the history of the world, find a general who, no matter how high the number of battles on his debit account, was not convinced that no one could have done better than he. (*Amused laughter*) But the essential fact will always remain that, in the end, it is not immaterial in the least whether the Herzog von Braunschweig or Gneisenau is commanding the army; whether a system confines its attempts to save the nation to emergency decrees or whether a new mental outlook inspires a Volk inwardly and leads it back to life, back to being a vital, living factor, and away from being the dead object of legislative machinery.

(*Animated applause*) It is not immaterial whether, in the future, you simply attempt to bring the most obvious manifestations of the crisis under control in Germany by means of a legislation more or less trimmed with a border of constitutionality, or whether you lead the nation itself back to internal strength.

And when this system³¹ objects and says to me that there is no time left for that now—it is true, *meine Herren*, that far too much time has been wasted on unproductive work, far too much time has already been lost. One could have initiated the regeneration process in 1919, and in the past eleven years Germany would have undergone a different external development. For it was only possible to impose the Peace Treaty upon us in the form chosen because at the time it was being drawn up, Germany had totally ceased being a factor of any weight whatsoever. (*Hear, hear!*) And the results of this Peace Treaty took on those forms we know and have experienced only because, in all these years, no Germany with any kind of definite and perceptible will of its own existed. Thus we are not the victims of the treaties, but rather the treaties are the consequences of our own mistakes; and I must, if I wish to improve the situation at all, first change the value of the nation again. Above all, I must recognize one thing: it is not the primacy of foreign politics which can determine our actions at home, but rather the character of our actions at home that determines the character of our successes in foreign policy, yes, and even our very objectives. (*Hear, hear!*)

I may cite two examples of this from history: firstly, Bismarck's idea of a conflict between Prussia and the House of Habsburg, the construction of a new Empire by ousting Austria, an idea which never would have become reality had not—before the attempt was made to put it into action—the instrument been created with which the political objectives could have practically been turned into reality. It was not the political situation which forced Prussia to decide to reorganize its Army; rather, the reorganization of the Prussian Army which Bismarck far-sightedly carried through against the resistance of parliamentary madness first made the political situation possible which came to an end in Königgrätz and established in Versailles the Empire which, because it gradually came to be founded on other principles, was later once more destroyed and partitioned in the very same chamber at Versailles.

And vice versa: if today a German government attempts, along the lines of Bismarck's ideas, to take the path of that age and, perhaps as forerunner of a German policy of unification, attempts to establish a new *Zollverein*, a customs union, then formulating this aim is not the important thing, but rather the important thing is what preparations one undertakes in order to make the implementation of this aim possible. I cannot formulate an aim which, supported by the press campaign of one's own papers, is understood throughout the world to be a political aim of utmost importance unless I secure for myself the political means which are absolutely essential for the implementation of this type of plan.

And the political means—today I can no longer view them as limited—can lie only in the reorganization of an army. Ultimately, it is completely irrelevant whether Germany has an army 100,000 or 200,000 or 300,000 strong; the main thing is whether Germany has eight million reservists whom it can transfer to

January 27, 1932

the army without heading toward the same *weltanschaulich* catastrophe as that of 1918.³² (*Hear, hear!*)

The essential thing is the formation of a political will of the entire nation; this is the starting point for political action. If this formation of will is guaranteed in the sense of a willingness to commit oneself to some national objective or other, then a government that is supported by this formation of will can also choose those paths which one day may lead to success. However, if this formation of will does not take place, every power in the world will test the chances of such an undertaking on the strength of the means at its disposal to back it. And one will surely be aware of the fact that a government which rouses itself to exhibit such a great national show externally but is, internally, dependent upon the shifting forces of Marxist-Democratic-Centrist party views, will never be capable of really fighting to carry through this plan to the very last. (*Hear, hear!*) Let no one say: this is simply a case in which all are standing together as one man. This standing together of all as one man can only then be attained when all share one single opinion. The phrase "March divided, fight united" exists only in terms of the army because in an army with a single supreme command, the order to march divided is followed in exactly the same way as the order to fight united, because both stem from one and the same root of command. But I cannot simply allow armies to run around side by side as complete strangers and then expect, upon some signal which a high-and-mighty government deigns to give them, that they will suddenly harmonize wonderfully and initiate a joint maneuver. (*Hear, hear!*)

That is impossible! And it is simply impossible for the further reason that, ultimately, the catastrophe lies not so much in the existence of different points of view, but rather foremost in the fact of the State's licensing these differences.

If today they wish to hurl the worst accusation at me as a National Socialist, then they say: "You want to bring about a decision in Germany by violence, and we must oppose that. You want to one day destroy your political opponents in Germany! We, on the other hand, stand for the precepts of the Constitution and must thus guarantee all parties their right to exist." To that I have only one reply: translated into reality, this means: "You have a company. You must lead this company against the enemy. Within the company there is complete liberty to form a coalition." (*Amused laughter*) Fifty percent of the company have formed a coalition based upon love and defense of the Vaterland, the other fifty percent based upon a pacifist Weltanschauung; they reject war as a matter of principle, demand the inviolability of freedom of conscience, declare it to be the highest and only virtue we have today. (*Amused laughter*) But if it does come to a fight, they want to stand together. (*More amused laughter*) But should one man—insisting on freedom of conscience—desert to the enemy, then the absurd situation would arise where you would have to place him under arrest and punish him as a deserter, while completely forgetting that you actually have no right to punish him. A State which allows the view to circulate—with license from the State—that treason to the Vaterland is a duty; which tolerates that large organizations calmly state: it will be our task to put a simple stop to any military action in the event of war—what right does that State have to punish a traitor to the Vaterland? Of course it is only incidental that such a State itself carries the

madness of this view ad absurdum, for the man who would otherwise have been branded a criminal now will become a martyr for one half of the nation. Why? Because this same State, which, on the one hand, declares the theory of treason to one's country an ethical and moral theory and protects it, has the audacity, on the other, to imprison a person who attempts to transpose this view from the sphere of theory into practice.

Gentlemen! All this is impossible, completely impossible, if one at all believes that a people, in order to survive, must direct its strength outwards. But take a look at the situation today: seven or eight million employed in agriculture; seven or eight million employed in industry; six or seven million unemployed! Consider that, in all human probability, nothing at all will change in this respect, and you will be forced to admit that Germany as a whole cannot survive in the long run—unless, that is, we find our way back to a truly extraordinary, newly-shaped political strength working from within but having the capacity of making us effective once more vis-à-vis the outside world.

For it does not matter at all which of the problems of our *völkisch* life we wish to attempt to solve: if we wish to maintain our export trade, then here as well the political will of the nation as a whole will one day have to take a serious stand to prevent us from being thrust aside by the interests of other peoples. If we wish to build up a new domestic market or if we wish to solve the problem of our *Lebensraum*: whatever the case, we will always need the collective political strength of the nation. Yes, even if we want to be valued merely as allies—beforehand we must make Germany a political power factor. But that will never be achieved by bringing a proposal before the Reichstag that negotiations be initiated for procuring a few heavy batteries, eight or ten tanks, twelve aircraft, or, as far as I'm concerned, even a few squadrons—that is entirely irrelevant! Throughout the history of peoples, technical weapons have undergone continual changes. But what had to remain unchanging was the formation of will. It is the constant factor and the prerequisite for everything else. Should it fail, no number of weapons can help. On the contrary: if you were to summon the German Volk to a levée en masse and place weapons at its disposal for this purpose—tomorrow the result would be civil war, not a fight against the external world. Practical foreign politics can no longer be implemented with today's body politic. Or do you believe that Bismarck would have been able to fulfill his historic mission with today's Germany, that the German Empire would have emerged from this state of mind?

In stating this, I am still a long way from confronting today's system with the claim that one should, for instance, remain silent and inactive in the face of individual incidents; rather, my claim is that an ultimate solution is only possible when the internal disintegration in terms of classes is overcome once more in the future. When I say this, I am not being a pure theoretician. When I returned to the homeland in 1918, I was faced with a situation which I, just as all the others, could have accepted as a given fact. It is my firm conviction that a large part of the German nation was of the unequivocal opinion in those November and December days of 1918, and even in 1919, that were Germany to continue on its path in terms of domestic policy, it would be heading rapidly towards its downfall in terms of foreign policy. In other words, the same opinion I held.

January 27, 1932

There was only one difference. At that time I said to myself: it is not enough to merely recognize that we are ruined; rather, it is also necessary to comprehend why! And even that is not enough; rather, it is necessary to declare war on this destructive development and to create the instrument necessary to do so. (*Bravo!*)

One thing was clear to me: the world of the parties up to that time had shattered Germany, and Germany was broken by this. It is absurd to believe that the factors whose existence is inseparably bound up in history with Germany's disintegration can now suddenly be factors in its recovery. Each organization becomes not only the personification of a certain spirit; in the end, it even symbolizes a certain tradition. If then, for example, associations or parties have almost made it a tradition of retreating in the face of Marxism for sixty years, I do not believe that, after the most horrible defeat, they will suddenly break with a tradition which has become second nature to them and transform their retreat into an attack; what I do believe is that the retreat will continue. Yes, one day these associations will go the way of all organizations which suffer repeated defeats: they will enter pacts with the opponent and attempt to attain by peaceful methods what could not be won by fighting.

Granted, given a cool and considered view, I did have to say to myself in 1918: certainly it is a terribly difficult course to present myself to the nation and form a new organization for myself. Actually, it would naturally be much easier to enter one of the existing formations and attempt to overcome the inner gulf dividing the nation from there. But is this at all possible in the existing organizations? Does not each organization ultimately have in it the spirit and the people who find satisfaction in its program and its struggle? If an organization has, in the course of sixty years, continually retreated before Marxism and finally one day simply capitulated like a coward, is it not then necessarily filled with a spirit and with people who neither understand nor are prepared to take the other path? Is it not so that the opposite is true, that in such an age of confusion the future will simply consist of once again sieving through the body politic which has fallen into disorder; that a new political leadership will crystallize from within the Volk which knows how to take the mass of the nation in its fist and thereby avoids the mistakes which led to downfall in the past? Of course I had to say to myself that the struggle would be a terrible one! For I was not so fortunate as to possess a prominent name; instead, I was nothing but a German soldier, nameless, with a very small zinc number on my breast. But I came to one realization: if, beginning with the smallest cell, a new body politic did not form in the nation which could overcome the existing "ferments of decomposition,"³³ then the nation as a whole would never itself be able to experience an uprising. We have practically already experienced it once. It took more than 150³⁴ years until Prussia, the germ cell of a new Empire, arose out of the old disintegrated Empire to fulfill its historic mission. And believe me: the question of the inner regeneration of a Volk is no different in the least. Each idea must recruit its own people. Each idea must step out before the nation, must win over the fighters it needs from its midst and must tread alone the difficult path with all its necessary consequences, in order to one day achieve the strength to change the course of destiny.

Developments have proven that this reasoning was right in the end. For even if there are many in Germany today who believe that we National Socialists are incapable of constructive work—they are deceiving themselves! If we did not exist, Germany today would no longer have a bourgeoisie. (*Hear, hear!*) The question, “Bolshevism or no Bolshevism” would long have been decided! Take the weight of our gigantic organization—this greatest organization by far in the new Germany—off the scales of national events and you will see that, without us, Bolshevism would already tip the scales now—a fact best evidenced by the attitude which Bolshevism has toward us. It is a great honor to me when Herr Trotsky calls upon German Communism today to cooperate with the Social Democrats at any price because National Socialism is to be regarded as the only real danger to Bolshevism. And it is an even greater honor for me because in twelve years, starting with nothing at all and in opposition to the overall public opinion at the time, in opposition to the press, in opposition to capital, in opposition to the economy, in opposition to the administration, in opposition to the State: in short, in opposition to everything, we built up our Movement, a Movement which can no longer be eliminated today, which exists, on which one must have an opinion whether one wants to or not. (*Cheers of approval*) And I believe that this opinion actually must be quite clear to anyone who still believes in a German future. You see before you an organization which does not only preach the theory of the realizations I characterized as being essential at the beginning of my speech, but which puts them into practice; an organization filled with the utmost national sentiment, based on the idea of the absolute authority of leadership in every field, on all levels—the only party which has, in itself, totally overcome not only the international idea but the democratic idea as well; which, through its organization, acknowledges only responsibility, command and obedience and which thus for the first time integrates into the political life of Germany a phenomenon of millions united in upholding the principle of achievement. An organization which fills its followers with an unrestrained aggressive spirit (*Kampfsinn*); for the first time, an organization which, when a political opponent declares: “We take your behavior to be a provocation,” is not satisfied to suddenly withdraw, but brutally enforces its own will and hurls back at him: “We are fighting today! We will fight tomorrow! And if you regard our meeting today as a provocation, then we’ll hold another one next week—and will continue until you have learned that it is not a provocation when the German Germany professes its will! And if you say, “You may not go out on the streets”—we will go out on the streets in spite of it! And if you say, “Then we will beat you”—no matter how many sacrifices you force us to make, this young Germany will always march again, it will one day completely win back the German streets, the German individual. And when people reproach us for our intolerance, we are proud of it—yes, we have even made the inexorable decision to exterminate Marxism in Germany down to its very last root. We made this decision not because we are pugnacious—I, for one, could imagine a life made up of nicer things than being chased through Germany, being persecuted by countless decrees, standing constantly with one foot in prison, and having no right I can call my own in the State. I could imagine a better fate than that of fighting a battle which, at least

in the beginning, was regarded by everyone as a mad chimera. And lastly, I believe that I also have the capability of taking on some sort of post in the Social Democratic Party, and one thing is certain: had I placed my capabilities at its service, today I would presumably even be fit to govern. But for me it was a greater decision to choose a path along which nothing guided me but my own faith and an indestructible confidence in the natural powers of our Volk—which are certainly still present—and its significance, which will one day of necessity once more manifest itself, given the right leadership.

Now a twelve-year struggle lies behind us. We did not wage this battle in purely theoretical terms or put it into practice only in our own party; rather, we are also willing to wage it on a large scale at any time. If I reflect back to the time when I founded this association together with six other unknown men, when I spoke before 11, 20, 30, or 50 people, when, in the space of one year, I had won 64 people over to the Movement, when our small circle expanded steadily—then I must confess that that which has come about today, when a stream of millions of German Volksgenossen flows into our Movement, represents something unique, standing alone in German history. For seventy years the bourgeois parties have had time to work. Where is the organization which could compare itself to ours? Where is the organization which could point out, as ours can, that if necessary, it can bring 400,000 men out on the streets, men who carry within them a sense of blind obedience, who follow every order—as long as it is not against the law? Where is the organization which has achieved in seventy years what we have achieved in barely twelve—with means which were so improvised that one would almost have to be ashamed to confess to the opponents how pitiful the birth and growth of this great Movement once was.

Today we are at the turning-point in German destiny. If the present development continues, Germany will one day of necessity result in Bolshevist chaos; however, if this development is brought to an end, our Volk must be sent to a school of iron discipline and gradually cured from the preconceptions of both camps. A hard lesson, but one which we cannot avoid!

If one believes that the concepts of “bourgeois” and “proletarian” can be conserved, then one is either conserving German impotence and thus our downfall, or one is ushering in the victory of Bolshevism. If one is not willing to abandon these concepts, then it is my conviction that a recovery of the German nation is no longer possible. The chalk line which the Weltanschauungen have drawn for peoples throughout the history of the world has more than once been the death line. Either the attempt to reshape a body politic hard as iron from this conglomerate of parties, associations, organizations, world outlooks, arrogance of rank, and class madness is successful, or else Germany will perish once and for all for lack of this inner consolidation. Even if another twenty emergency decrees were sent to hail down on our Volk, they would be unable to alter the main course leading to our ruin! If one day the way which leads upwards is to be found again, then first of all the German Volk must be bent back into shape. That is a process no one can escape! It does no good to say: “The proletarians are the only ones to blame for that!” No, believe me, our entire German Volk, every single class, has more than its share of the blame

for our collapse; some because they willed it and intentionally tried to bring it about; the others because they looked on and were too weak to prevent it! In history, failure weighs just as heavily as the intention or the deed itself. Today no one can escape the obligation to bring about the regeneration of the German *Volkskörper* by means of his own personal contribution and integration.

When I speak to you today, then it is not with the aim of moving you to cast your ballots or inducing you to do this or that for the party on my account. No, I am presenting an outlook to you here, and I am convinced that the victory of this outlook constitutes the only possible starting point for a German recovery; at the same time it is also the very last asset which the German Volk possesses. I have heard it often said by our opponents: "You, too, will be unable to master today's crisis." Assuming, Gentlemen, that that were the case. Then what would that mean? It would mean that we were approaching an appalling age and would have nothing with which to counter it but a purely materialistic attitude on all sides. The crisis, however, would be experienced a thousand times more strongly as a purely materialistic matter, without some ideal having been restored to the Volk. (*Animated applause*)

People so often say to me: "You are only the drummer of national Germany!" And what if I were only the drummer?! Today it would be a greater statesmanlike deed to drum a new faith into this German Volk than to slowly squander away the one they have now. (*Cheers of approval*) You take a fortress and subject it to the harshest of privations: as long as its garrison can envision salvation, believes in it, hopes for it—it can bear reduced rations. Completely remove from the hearts of these people their last faith in the possibility of salvation, in a better future, and you will witness how these people suddenly come to view reduced rations as the most important thing in their lives. The more they are made conscious of the fact that they are mere objects of trade, mere prisoners of world politics, the more they will turn exclusively to material interests, like any prisoner. Conversely, the more you lead a people back to the sphere of ideal faith, the more it will come to regard material distress as a less exclusively determinant factor. The most tremendous proof of this has been our own German Volk. Surely we never want to forget that it waged religious wars for 150 years with an enormous sense of devotion, that hundreds of thousands of people once left their own plot of land and all their worldly goods for the sake of an ideal and a conviction! We never want to forget that for 150 years there arose not a single ounce of material interest! And then you will comprehend how tremendous the power of an idea, of an ideal, can be! And only in this light can one understand that today hundreds of thousands of young people in our Movement are willing to risk their lives to combat the opponent. I know very well, Gentlemen, that when National Socialists march through the streets, and the evening is suddenly pierced by commotion and racket, then citizens draw open their curtains, look out and say: "My night's rest has been disturbed again and I can't sleep. Why do the Nazis always have to agitate and run around at night?" Gentlemen, if everyone would think that way, then one would have one's peace at night, but citizens would no longer be able to go out on the streets today. If everyone would think that way, if these young people had no ideal to motivate them and propel them forwards, then of course they would gladly

manage without these nocturnal battles. But let us not forget that it is a sacrifice when today many hundreds of thousands of SA and SS men of the National Socialist Movement climb onto trucks every day, protect meetings, put on marches, sacrifice night after night and return only at daybreak—and then either back to the workshop and factory or out to collect their pittance as unemployed; when they buy their uniforms, their shirts, their badges, and even pay their own transportation from what little they have—believe me, that is already a sign of the power of an ideal, a great ideal! And if today the entire German nation had the same faith in its calling which these hundreds of thousands have, if the entire nation possessed this idealism—Germany would stand differently in the eyes of the world today! (*Animated applause*) For our situation in the world results, in its devastating effects for us, only from the fact that we ourselves underrate German strength. (*Hear, hear!*) Only when we have revised this disastrous assessment can Germany make use of the political possibilities of once more—if we look far into the future—placing German life on a natural and sound foundation: either new *Lebensraum* and the expansion of a large domestic market or the protection of German economy against the outside by deploying accumulated German strength. The labor resources of our Volk, the capabilities are there, no one can deny our industriousness. But first the political foundations must be laid anew: without them, industriousness, capability, diligence, and thrift would ultimately be of no avail. For an oppressed nation is not capable of allocating the profits accruing from its thrift to its own welfare; rather, it is forced to sacrifice them on the altar of blackmail and tribute.

Thus, in contrast to our official³⁵ Government, I regard the vehicle for German recovery not as being the primacy of German foreign policy, but rather as being the primacy of the restoration of a healthy, national and powerful German body politic. It was in order to accomplish this task that I founded the National Socialist Movement thirteen years ago and have led it for the past twelve years; and I hope that it will also accomplish this task in days to come, that it will leave behind it the best reward for its struggle: a German body politic completely regenerated from within, intolerant against anyone who sins against the nation and its interests, intolerant against anyone who will not acknowledge its vital interests or opposes them, intolerant and relentless against anyone who endeavors to destroy and subvert this *Volkskörper*—and otherwise open to friendship and peace with anyone who wants friendship and peace! (*Tumultuous, long, drawn-out applause*)



IX On the eve of the Röhm Purge

Hitler on June 29, 1934 touring the labor camps in the Buddenberg castle near Lünen (Westphalia).

Photo: Domarus archives

The Year 1932

Notes

1. In September 1932, SA and SS formations in Mecklenburg conducted joint maneuvers with the National Socialist police force there. Cf. illustrated reports in VB, No. 264, September 20, 1932. See also below, September 15, 1932, note 240.
2. Hitler frequently called himself the drummer of the national movement, as for instance in his closing statement before the Munich People's Court on March 27, 1924: "it was not modesty which moved me to be a 'drummer' then; that is the highest calling; the rest is nothing." Quotation in Dr. Ernst Boepple, *Adolf Hitlers Reden* (Munich, 1933), p. 118. Hitler also cited his mission as "drummer" in his speech to the Industry Club in Düsseldorf on January 27, 1932; see below, January 27, 1932.
3. See below, February 16, 1932.
4. Called *Standarten*.
5. See below, interview of August 16, 1932.
6. Cf. Joseph Goebbels, *Vom Kaiserhof zur Reichskanzlei* (Berlin, 1934), p. 220.
7. See below, November 8, 1940.
8. The New Year's proclamations of the following years are excerpted to the extent that they contain anything new.
9. Published in VB, No. 1/2, January 1/2, 1932.
10. Ibid.
11. Published in VB, No. 9, January 9, 1932. Dr. h.c. Wilhelm Groener, born 1867 in Ludwigsburg, died 1939 in Berlin; last General Quartermaster in 1918; Reich Minister of Transportation in 1920; Reichswehr Minister in 1928; Reich Minister of the Interior in 1931 (appointed). Dr. Heinrich Brüning, born 1885 in Munster i.W., died 1970 in Norwich, Vt., U.S.A.: Reich Chancellor from 1930 to 1932.
12. In this press release, Hitler withheld the fact that he had also met in Berlin with General Kurt von Schleicher (born 1882 in Brandenburg a. d. H., murdered June 30, 1934 in Berlin). Schleicher had been chief of the ministerial office of the Reich Ministry of Defense since March 1, 1929. Hitler had become acquainted with this influential general through former Captain Ernst Röhm (born 1887 in Munich, murdered July 1, 1934 in Munich). Röhm used these same connections to gain Hitler's access to Reich President von Hindenburg for initial—as it turned out, unproductive—talks on October 10, 1931. During the negotiations in 1932, Hitler relied heavily upon Röhm. Röhm and former Captain Hermann Göring (born 1893 in Rosenheim, committed suicide in Nuremberg in 1946; fighter pilot in World War I and decorated with the pour-le-merité medal) comprised the two assets which he used alternately at the negotiations in Berlin. Schleicher was pursuing his own political goals by cooperating with the NSDAP and believed he could use Hitler and his party for his own designs. He paid for this error with his life.

13. WTB report, January 8, 1932.
14. Report in VB, No. 10/11, January 10/11, 1932.
15. Dr. Alfred Hugenberg, born 1865 in Hanover; Privy Finance Councillor; owner of nationally-oriented newspaper and film companies (UFA); Chairman of the German National People's Party; Reich Minister of Economy, Food and Agriculture in 1933 (resigned June 27, 1933); died 1951 in Kükenbruch near Rinteln.
16. The "national opposition" (National Socialists, German Nationalists, Stahlhelm and Reichslandbund) had consolidated for joint action in Bad Harzburg and formed an action committee, the Harzburg Front, on October 11, 1931.
17. Cf. the account in VB, Nos. 12–14, January 12–14, 1932 and Otto Meissner, *Staatssekretär unter Ebert-Hindenburg-Hitler* (Hamburg, 1950), p. 216; see also Heinrich Brüning, "Ein Brief," in *Deutsche Rundschau*, 70 (1947), No. 7, pp. 2 ff.; Theodor Eschenburg, "Die Rolle der Persönlichkeit in der Krise der Weimarer Republik. Hindenburg, Brüning, Groener, Schleicher," in *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte*, 9 (1961), pp. 1 ff.; Erich Matthias, "Hindenburg zwischen den Fronten," in *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte*, 8 (1960), pp. 75 ff.; Thilo Vogelsang, "Neue Dokumente zur Geschichte der Reichswehr 1930–1933," in *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte*, 2 (1954), pp. 420 ff.; and Karl Dietrich Bracher, *Die Auflösung der Weimarer Republik* (Stuttgart-Düsseldorf, 1955).
18. Published in VB, No. 14, January 14, 1932.
19. Published verbatim in VB, No. 19, January 19, 1932; see also *Hitlers Auseinandersetzung mit Brüning* (Eher pamphlet, 1932).
20. Published in VB, No. 29, January 29, 1932.
21. Published verbatim in VB, No. 16, January 16, 1932.
22. Excerpt in VB, No. 19, January 19, 1932.
23. Excerpt in VB, No. 20, January 20, 1932.
24. Excerpt in VB, No. 26, January 26, 1932.
25. Goebbels, *Kaiserhof*, p. 42 (journal entry of February 8, 1932).
26. Excerpt in VB, No. 110, April 19, 1932. The full wording was published by the Eher Verlag in a pamphlet entitled *Vortrag Adolf Hitlers vor westdeutschen Wirtschaftlern im Industrie-Klub zu Düsseldorf* (Adolf Hitler's presentation before German businessmen in the Industry Club, Düsseldorf) (Munich, April 1932). The text published above was taken completely from the Eher pamphlet, including the applause cited.
27. Refers to the world economic crisis of 1931/32.
28. The percentage of Communist voters in Germany, even in the—in this sense, remarkable—Reichstag election of November 6, 1932, never exceeded the figure of 17.06 percent.
29. Hitler's interest in Christianity confined itself to religion's function in supporting the State.
30. The leadership of the Social Democratic Party was no less enthusiastic about war in 1914 than its adherents. However, Hitler chose to ignore this fact.

31. Referring to the Reich Government, i.e. the Reich Parties, at that time called the "system."
32. Hitler staunchly refused, as did the right-wing parties as a whole, to recognize the military reasons behind the defeat.
33. One of Hitler's favorite slogans, taken from Theodor Mommsen.
34. The old Holy Roman Empire collapsed in 1806. Between 1806 and 1871, sixty-five years elapsed, not one hundred and fifty.
35. In Hitler's opinion, the inofficial government at that time was none other than himself and the NSDAP.
36. The announcement of what was called the "Hindenburg Committee" (formed by the First Mayor of Berlin, Heinrich Sahn) was made on February 1, 1932.
37. Cf. Goebbels, *Kaiserhof*, p. 36.
38. VB, No. 31, January 31, 1932.
39. Published verbatim in VB, No. 43, February 12, 1932.
40. Report, *ibid*.
41. For discussions of Hitler's Austrian citizenship and, respectively, attempts to expel him in 1924/1925, see Franz Jetzinger, *Hitlers Jugend. Phantasie, Lügen und die Wahrheit* (Vienna, 1957) and D.C. Watt, "Die bayerischen Bemühungen um Ausweisung Hitlers 1924," in *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte*, 6 (1958), pp. 270–280.
42. Dr. Wilhelm Frick (born 1877 in Alsenz in der Rheinpfalz, hanged 1946 in Nuremberg) participated in the preparations for Hitler's putsch on November 8, 1923 although he was a civil servant at the Munich Police Headquarters at the time. From January 23, 1930 to April 1, 1931, he was Minister of the Interior and Popular Culture in Thuringia. The cabinet there collapsed in 1931 due to disputes between the NSDAP and the Christian National Peasant and Rural Peoples's Party (Christlich-Nationale Bauern und Landvolkpartei).
43. The minutes of the meeting are filed at the Geheimes Staatsarchiv in Munich (Ministerial File 1943, A.V. No. 427) and quoted by Rudolf Morsey, "Hitler als braunschweigischer Regierungsrat," in *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte*, 8 (1960), p. 421. This article also contains documentation on the attempt to gain citizenship in Thuringia in 1930 and on the related incidents in Brunswick and Berlin in 1932. See also Hitler's testimony before the parliamentary investigating committee of the Thuringian Landtag (VB, No. 77, March 17, 1932).
44. Reichs- und Staatsangehörigkeitgesetz (Law Concerning Citizenship in the Reich and State) of July 22, 1913, § 14. RGBl. 1913, I, p. 586.
45. Since the Brunswick Landtag elections of September 14, 1930, a right-wing government had been in office there with the National Socialist Dietrich Klagges as Minister of the Interior and Popular Culture and the German Nationalist Dr. Werner Küchenthal as Chairman of the Ministry of State.—In the course of 1932, the governments of the following Länder also became National Socialist when Landtag elections took place: Mecklenburg-Strelitz, Anhalt, Oldenburg, Mecklenburg-Schwerin, and—for the second time—Thuringia.

Das Jahr 1933

Übersicht über den Verlauf

Was Hitler im Jahre 1932 konstant verweigert worden war, das gewährte man ihm endlich am 30. Januar 1933: er wurde Reichskanzler und Chef eines Präsidialkabinetts¹⁾. Anders als seine beiden Vorgänger Papen und Schleicher wußte er sich durch das Bestehen auf Reichstagsneuwahlen eine parlamentarische Mehrheit zu sichern. Denn das Vertrauen des Reichspräsidenten allein war, wie die vergangenen Monate gezeigt hatten, für eine Regierung keine verlässliche Basis. Hitler war aber, wie er im Oktober 1932 mehrfach angekündigt hatte²⁾, entschlossen, den deutschen Regierungszug, in den er nun als Lokomotivführer eingestiegen war, unter keinen Umständen wieder zu verlassen.

Dazu wollte er „die Macht schnell und in einem Zuge“ erobern³⁾. Nach den Grundsätzen der Weimarer Verfassung war Hitler zum verantwortlichen Leiter der deutschen Politik berufen worden. Jetzt aber sollte eben diese Verfassung möglichst schnell insoweit außer Kraft gesetzt werden, als sie ihm zum Gebrauch der Macht hinderlich war oder anderen Persönlichkeiten und Gruppen Handhabe bieten konnte, irgendwelche Machtansprüche auszuüben oder geltendzumachen.

„Streng verfassungsmäßig werden wir die Verfassung ändern“, hatte Hitler zwar noch im Jahre 1932 erklärt⁴⁾ und seine Gegner vor jedem Staatsstreich und Verfassungsbruch gewarnt. Gar so streng hielt er sich jedoch nun in der Praxis nicht an die Verfassungsvorschriften. Warum sollte er auch? Seine Vorgänger hatten ihm vorgeführt, wie sehr man die Verfassung mit Hilfe des Artikels 48 strapazieren konnte.

So war bereits die Verordnung des Reichspräsidenten zur Herstellung geordneter Regierungsverhältnisse in Preußen vom 6. Februar⁵⁾ ein eklatanter Verfassungsbruch und noch dazu ein offener Verstoß gegen das Urteil des Staatsgerichtshofs vom 25. Oktober 1932. Wohlweislich ließ Hitler diese Verordnung, durch die die Auflösung des Preußischen Landtags erzwungen wurde, durch Papen gegenzeichnen, einer der wenigen Fälle, in denen sich Hitler in seinen Reichskanzlerfunktionen von ihm vertreten ließ.

Der nächste Schritt war die Verordnung zum Schutz von Volk und Staat vom 28. Februar⁶⁾. Durch sie wurden nicht nur alle Artikel der Weimarer Verfassung, die bei einer Gefährdung der öffentlichen Sicherheit und Ordnung aufgehoben werden konnten (z. B. Unverletzlichkeit der Person, der Wohnung, des Briefgeheimnisses usw.) außer Kraft gesetzt, sondern es wurde auch der Reichsregierung (in der Praxis dem Reichsinnenminister) das nur dem Reichspräsidenten zustehende Recht übertragen, Reichskommissare in den Ländern einzusetzen und die Befugnisse der obersten Landesbehörden zu übernehmen. Von dieser Möglichkeit machte Hitler nach dem 5. März in allen nicht nationalsozialistisch regierten Ländern entsprechenden Gebrauch.

¹⁾ Vgl. hierzu S. 185 ff.

²⁾ Vgl. S. 140.

³⁾ Rede v. 12. 7. 1933, vgl. S. 289.

⁴⁾ Rede v. 7. 9. 1932, vgl. S. 134.

⁵⁾ RGBl. 1933 I S. 43.

⁶⁾ RGBl. 1933 I S. 83.

Am 12. März 1933 folgte der nächste Verfassungsbruch. Artikel 3 der Reichsverfassung bestimmte, daß die Reichsfarben schwarz-rot-gold sind. Demgegenüber ordneten Hindenburg und Hitler durch Erlaß des Reichspräsidenten vom 12. März ⁷⁾ an, daß die schwarz-weiß-rote Fahne und die Hakenkreuzflagge gemeinsam „bis zur endgültigen Regelung der Reichsfarben“ zu hissen seien.

Das vom Reichstag mit verfassungsändernder Mehrheit beschlossene Gesetz zur Behebung der Not von Volk und Reich vom 24. März (Ermächtigungsgesetz) ⁸⁾ bestimmte, daß künftig die Reichsregierung die Gesetze erlassen konnte und der Reichskanzler, nicht der Reichspräsident, sie ausfertigte und verkündete. Auch jede Verfassungsänderung konnte durch die Reichsregierung künftig verfügt werden, soweit nicht die Einrichtung des Reichstags oder des Reichsrats als solche betroffen würde. Die Rechte des Reichspräsidenten sollten zwar angeblich unberührt bleiben, aber schon die Ausfertigung der Gesetze durch den Reichskanzler war eine wesentliche Einschränkung seiner Rechte. Außerdem war die verfassungsmäßige Reichspräsidentennachfolge in diesem Ermächtigungsgesetz nicht garantiert ⁹⁾.

Zwei neue Gesetze der Reichsregierung entmachteten die Länder: Das vorläufige Gesetz zur Gleichschaltung der Länder mit dem Reich vom 31. März ¹⁰⁾ wies den Landesregierungen das Gesetzgebungsrecht der Landtage zu und bildete diese analog den Reichstagswahlergebnissen vom 5. März um. Das zweite Gesetz zur Gleichschaltung der Länder mit dem Reich vom 7. April ¹¹⁾ führte in allen Ländern Reichsstatthalter ein, die die Landesregierungen zu ernennen hatten. Im größten Land, in Preußen, übernahm Hitler selbst die Funktion des Reichsstatthalters. Damit war auch das Länderorgan, der Reichsrat, dessen Einrichtung angeblich vom Ermächtigungsgesetz nicht berührt werden sollte, ausgeschaltet.

Nun ging es weiter an die Beseitigung der Gewerkschaften, der politischen Parteien und Verbände. Nachdem die Büros der Gewerkschaften bereits am 2. Mai geschlossen worden waren, ordnete Hitler am 10. Mai die Errichtung der Deutschen Arbeitsfront (DAF.) als neue nationalsozialistische Organisation der Schaffenden an und machte Dr. Robert Ley zu deren verantwortlichem Leiter.

Die Kommunistische Partei war bei den Wahlen vom 5. März noch vertreten gewesen. Den gewählten Abgeordneten wurde jedoch die Übernahme ihrer Mandate nicht gestattet. Durch Gesetz vom 26. Mai wurde das Vermögen der KPD. eingezogen. Ein offizielles Verbot wurde nicht ausgesprochen, dagegen ein Verbot der Sozialdemokratischen Partei am 22. Juni erlassen. Das Vermögen der SPD. und des Reichsbanners war bereits am 10. Mai beschlagnahmt worden.

Am 21. Juni wurden die deutschnationalen Kampfringe (Kampfverbände) verboten. Der Stahlhelm wurde z. T. der SA. eingegliedert, z. T. Hitler unterstellt.

Am 27. Juni löste sich die Deutschnationale Volkspartei (Kampffront Schwarz-Weiß-Rot) selbst auf. Hugenberg trat als Reichsminister zurück.

Die Selbstaufösungen der übrigen Parteien erfolgten am 28. Juni: Deutsche Staatspartei (Deutsche Demokratische Partei), 30. Juni: Christlich-Sozialer Volksdienst und Deutsch-Hannoversche Partei, 1. Juli: Volksrechtspartei, 4. Juli: Deutsche Volkspartei und Bayerische Volkspartei, 5. Juli: Zentrumspartei.

7) RGBl. 1933 I S. 103.

8) RGBl. 1933 I S. 141.

9) Vgl. hierzu S. 229.

10) RGBl. 1933 I S. 153.

11) RGBl. 1933 I S. 173.

Am 14. Juli erließ Hitler ein Gesetz, daß in Deutschland als einzige politische Partei die Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei bestehe und jeder Versuch, eine neue Partei zu bilden, mit Zuchthaus bis zu 3 Jahren bestraft werde¹²⁾.

Hitler konnte wohl behaupten, daß man somit „die politische Macht schnell und in einem Zuge“ habe erobern können. Die Entwicklung zeigte jedoch, daß er mit dem damals erreichten Stand keineswegs zufrieden war und unaufhörlich an der Vergrößerung seiner Machtfülle weiterarbeitete.

Auf wirtschaftlichem Gebiet waren seine Methoden dagegen weit laxer. Er ließ den Wirtschaftlern und auch den Fachministern ziemlich freie Hand, verbat sich aber grundsätzlich jede Währungsmanipulation. Die aufgestaute deutsche Arbeitskraft kam durch Hitlers Wirtschaftsprogramm, Häuserreparaturen, Straßenbau, Ankurbelung der Betriebe durch Staatsaufträge, Förderung der Motorisierung usw. recht schnell wieder in Funktion, und da die Weltwirtschaftskrise ebenfalls abklang, so dauerte es nicht lange, bis die Wirtschaftsmisere, die mehrere Jahre hindurch Deutschland erschüttert hatte, verschwunden war. Die Mehrzahl der Deutschen, die jahrelang unter drückender Not gelitten hatten, waren mit Hitlers Regierung daher recht zufrieden und kümmerten sich wenig um dessen politische Maßnahmen zur Ausschaltung andersdenkender Parteien und zur Unterdrückung politischer Gegner.

Das Ausland freilich betrachtete die Entwicklung in Deutschland mit Sorge. Die ausländische Presse kritisierte offen die Entwicklung Deutschlands zum Einparteiensystem bzw. zur Hitler-Diktatur.

Hitler, darüber erbost, ordnete für den 1. April einen Boykott der jüdischen Geschäfte in Deutschland an. Er betrachtete eine solche Maßnahme als geeignetes Druckmittel auf das Ausland, und der Erfolg schien ihm recht zu geben¹³⁾.

Der Abschluß des Konkordates mit dem Heiligen Stuhl, unterzeichnet am 8. Juli, half Hitler nicht nur, das Zentrum zur Selbstauflösung zu veranlassen, sondern stärkte auch seine eigene außenpolitische Position¹⁴⁾.

Andererseits wollte er es keineswegs zu einer außenpolitischen Konsolidierung der Verhältnisse kommen lassen. Das innenpolitische Chaos hatte ihn zur Macht gebracht. Das außenpolitische Chaos würde ihm, so hoffte er, die Verwirklichung seiner außenpolitischen Ziele ermöglichen. Wenn die Welt bzw. der Völkerbund Deutschlands Wünsche nach Gleichberechtigung, nach Revision des Versailler Vertrages usw. akzeptierte, dann hatte er nicht mehr die Möglichkeit, mit der Miene der gekränkten Unschuld Forderung auf Forderung zu erheben und sie in seinem Sinn und mit seinen Methoden durchzusetzen.

Hitler war daher eifrig bemüht, die Verwirklichung der von den Großmächten am 11. Dezember 1932 beschlossenen deutschen Gleichberechtigung zu hintertreiben. Was er schon am 17. Mai bei seiner außenpolitischen Reichstagsrede angekündigt hatte¹⁵⁾, machte er am 14. Oktober wahr und erklärte Deutschlands Austritt aus dem Völkerbund und aus der Abrüstungskonferenz¹⁶⁾. Aber wie gewöhnlich, schlug er zwei Fliegen mit einer Klappe. Der am 5. März gewählte Reichstag, in dem noch immer die Abgeordneten der Deutschnationalen, des Zentrums usw., wenn auch als Hospitanten der NSDAP, vertreten waren, mißfiel

¹²⁾ RGBl. 1933 I S. 479.

¹³⁾ Vgl. S. 247 ff.

¹⁴⁾ Vgl. S. 287 f.

¹⁵⁾ Vgl. S. 278.

¹⁶⁾ Vgl. S. 305 ff.

1. Januar 1933

ihm schon lange. Jetzt ließ er diesen Reichstag auflösen, angeblich, damit das Volk zum Austritt aus dem Völkerbund Stellung nehmen könne. Dies wäre mit einem Volksentscheid genau so und noch besser möglich gewesen.

Hitler aber wollte einen rein nationalsozialistischen Reichstag, und auch dieser Wunsch ging durch die Neuwahl vom 12. November in Erfüllung. Das Jahr 1933 brachte somit für Hitler Erfolge auf der ganzen Linie.

Er brauchte als Regierungschef nicht wie Mussolini jahrelang um die Anerkennung der absoluten Vorherrschaft seiner Partei oder um einen Ausgleich mit dem Vatikan¹⁷⁾ zu kämpfen. Innerhalb weniger Monate gelang es ihm, sich in den Besitz aller entscheidenden Positionen zu setzen, ausgenommen derjenigen des Staatsoberhauptes und des Oberbefehlshabers der Wehrmacht.

Dafür hatte er freilich fast fünf Mal so lange und gegen viel größere Widerstände kämpfen müssen, bis man ihn, wie Mussolini, zum Regierungschef ernannte.

*

Wiedergabe und Kommentar

Neujahrsaufruf

*an die Nationalsozialisten, Nationalsozialistinnen, Parteigenossen*¹⁸⁾

Nach dem üblichen Rück- und Ausblick betonte Hitler, daß er auf keinen Fall von seinen bisherigen Forderungen für eine Regierungsbildung abgehen werde.

„Wenn jemals, dann bin ich gerade heute auf das äußerste entschlossen, das Recht der Erstgeburt unserer Bewegung nicht für das Linsengericht der Beteiligung an einer Regierung ohne Macht zu verkaufen. Der Einwand der Klugen, doch von innen heraus und hintenherum und allmählich sich dann durchzusetzen, ist kein anderer als derjenige, der im Jahre 1917 und 1918 riet, uns mit unversöhnlichen Gegnern zu verständigen und dann in einem Völkerbund uns friedlich mit ihnen auseinanderzusetzen. Das deutsche Volk hat sich diesem Rat dank seiner inneren Verräter ergeben. Die unglückseligen Ratgeber des Kaisers glaubten, sich ihm nicht widersetzen zu sollen. Ich aber werde, solange mir der Allmächtige Leben und Gesundheit läßt, bis zum letzten Atemzuge mich gegen jeden solchen Versuch wehren und weiß, daß ich in dieser Entschlossenheit hinter mir die Millionen Fanatiker und Kämpfer unserer Bewegung besitze, die nicht gehofft, gestritten und gelitten haben dafür, daß die stolzeste und größte Erhebung des deutschen Volkes ihre Mission für ein paar Ministerstühle verkauft!

Denn wenn unsere Gegner uns einladen, in solcher Art an einer Regierung teilzunehmen, dann tun sie es nicht in der Meinung, uns damit langsam und allmählich die Macht zu geben, sondern in der Überzeugung, sie uns damit für immer zu entwinden!

Groß sind die Aufgaben unserer Bewegung für das kommende Jahr. Die größte Aufgabe aber wird die sein, unseren Kämpfern, Mitgliedern und Anhängern in größter Klarheit vor Augen zu führen, daß diese Partei kein Selbstzweck ist, sondern nur ein Mittel zum Zweck. Sie sollen erkennen, daß die Organisation in ihrer ganzen Größe und Schönheit nur dann einen Sinn und damit eine Lebensberechtigung besitzt, wenn sie die ewig unduldsame und kampfbereite Verkünderin und Verfechterin der nationalsozialistischen Idee einer kommenden deutschen Volksgemeinschaft ist!

Alles, was diese Bewegung ihr eigen nennt, alles, was sie an Organisationen besitzt, ob in der SA. oder SS., in der politischen Führung, der Zusammenfassung unserer

¹⁷⁾ Mussolini wurde am 28. 10. 1922 Ministerpräsident, 1925 Diktator. 1929 konnte er die Lateran-Verträge mit dem Hl. Stuhl abschließen

¹⁸⁾ Wortlaut im VB. Nr. 1 v. 1. 1. 1933.

1. Januar 1933

Bauern und unserer Jugend, alles das kann nur den einen Sinn haben, für dieses neue Deutschland zu kämpfen, in dem es endlich keine Bürger und keine Proletarier mehr geben soll, sondern nur noch deutsche Volksgenossen.

Dies ist die größte Aufgabe, die unserem Volk seit mehr denn tausend Jahren gestellt wurde.

Die Bewegung, die sie löst, gräbt ihren Namen für ewig ein in das unsterbliche Buch der Geschichte unserer Nation.

So wollen wir, Parteigenossen und Parteigenossinnen, SA.- und SS.-Männer, nationalsozialistische Bauern und nationalsozialistische Jugend, angesichts der roten Flut, der Gefahren im Osten und Frankreichs ewigem Drohen, inmitten von Not und Elend, Jammer und Verzweiflung unser Banner fester denn je in die Faust nehmen und mit ihm hineinmarschieren in das kommende Jahr.

Wir wollen bereit sein, zu opfern und zu kämpfen und lieber selbst zu vergehen, als vergehen zu lassen die Bewegung, die Deutschlands letzte Kraft, letzte Hoffnung und letzte Zukunft ist.

Wir grüßen die nationalsozialistische Bewegung, ihre toten Märtyrer und lebenden Kämpfer!

Es lebe Deutschland, das Volk und das Reich!

München, den 31. Dezember 1932.

Adolf Hitler.“

In dieser Neujahrsbotschaft nannte Hitler die Bauern in einem Atemzug mit SA. und SS. Und in der Tat, die Bauern waren zur damaligen Zeit sein größter Aktivposten, stellten sie doch das Hauptkontingent seiner Wähler.

Am 3. Januar unterstrich Hitler auf einer *agrarpolitischen Tagung der NSDAP. in München* in einer längeren *Ansprache*¹⁹⁾ die besondere Bedeutung des Bauerntums für die nationalsozialistische Bewegung. Ziemlich unverblümt verkündete er, daß die These von „Blut und Boden“ sich nicht nur auf die Innen-, sondern auch auf die Außenpolitik beziehe. Gemeint war die Erwerbung von neuem Grund und Boden, wie sie bereits in *Mein Kampf* proklamiert worden war. Am 3. Januar erklärte Hitler u. a.:

„Die Verwirklichung des vom Nationalsozialismus wieder erweckten fundamentalen volkspolitischen Gedankens, der in der These von ‚Blut und Boden‘ seinen Ausdruck findet, wird die tiefgehendste revolutionäre Umgestaltung bedeuten, die jemals stattgefunden hat.

Unsere durch dieses Wort gekennzeichnete grundsätzliche Forderung der Stärkung der rassistischen Grundlagen unseres Volkes, die zugleich die Sicherung unseres völkischen Daseins überhaupt einschließt, bestimmt auch die gesamte innen- und außenpolitische Zielsetzung des Nationalsozialismus.

Nach erfolgter innenpolitischer Säuberung und Regeneration unseres Volkes wird es auch dem Ausland sehr bald zum Bewußtsein kommen, daß ihm ein anderes Volk gegenübersteht als bisher.

Und damit werden dann die Voraussetzungen geschaffen sein, den eigenen Grund und Boden völlig in Ordnung zu bringen und das Leben der Nation aus Eigenem auf lange Zeit hinaus sicherzustellen. Die weltwirtschaftliche und politische Entwicklung, die automatisch immer mehr zu einer Verschließung der Weltmärkte für unseren Export führt, macht eine große, grundsätzliche Umstellung absolut notwendig. Wenn die heute Regierenden auch ihre Augen davor verschließen, so ist diese chronische Ursache unserer großen wirtschaftlichen Not und entsetzlichen Arbeitslosigkeit doch unbestreitbar vorhanden. Entweder wir beseitigen diese Ursache und führen die dann notwendige Umstellung mit Tatkraft und Energie beizeiten selbst durch oder das Schicksal wird sie erzwingen und unser Volk zerbrechen! Wenn wir innen- und außenpolitisch den fundamentalen Grundsatz von Blut und Boden zur Verwirklichung bringen, dann werden wir

¹⁹⁾ Auszug im VB. Nr. 4 v. 4. 1. 1933.

3. Januar 1933

in Zukunft als Volk zum ersten Male nicht mehr von den Ereignissen geworfen werden, sondern wir selbst werden dann die Verhältnisse meistern.

Wie der Bauer, der jedes Jahr säen und an seine Ernte glauben muß, ohne zu wissen, ob sie nicht Wind und Wetter zerstört und seine Arbeit ohne Lohn bleibt, so müssen wir auch politisch den Mut haben, das zu tun, was notwendig getan werden muß — ganz gleich, ob im Augenblick der Erfolg schon sichtbar ist oder nicht. Gerade der deutsche Bauer wird in Zukunft noch mehr unseren nationalsozialistischen Kampf verstehen als bisher. Wenn aber der deutsche Bauer, die Grundlage und der Lebensquell unseres Volkes, gerettet ist, dann wird auch die ganze Nation wieder mit Vertrauen in die Zukunft sehen können.“

Am 4. Januar fanden in Deutschland zwei politische Unterredungen statt, die eine in Berlin, die andere in Köln.

In Berlin unterhielt sich der alte Reichspräsident mit Gregor Strasser, der ihm vom Reichskanzler von Schleicher vorgestellt worden war. Es scheint, daß Hindenburg von Strasser persönlich einen ganz guten Eindruck hatte.

Aber was sollte er mit diesem abtrünnigen Reichstagsabgeordneten anfangen, hinter dem nach seinem Bruch mit Hitler niemand mehr stand?

Die Unterredung verlief, ebenso wie eine zweite am 11. Januar, ergebnislos. Hindenburg und Schleicher konnten sich nicht entschließen, Strasser zum Vizekanzler zu ernennen.

In Köln trafen sich am 4. Januar Hitler und Papen im Hause des Bankiers Kurt Freiherr von Schröder ^{19a)}.

Hitler hatte diese Zusammenkunft vor den meisten seiner Unterführer verborgen gehalten und nur seinen Sekretär Rudolf Heß, den Reichsführer SS. Heinrich Himmler und seinen Wirtschaftsberater Wilhelm Keppler mitgenommen ^{19b)}. Letzterer, der übrigens auch bei dem Anschluß Österreichs im Jahre 1938 eine besondere Rolle spielte, hatte die Unterredung vermittelt.

Es wäre verfehlt anzunehmen, daß bei den Kölner Unterhaltungen, an denen nur Hitler, Papen und Schröder teilnahmen, etwa finanzielle Angelegenheiten zur Sprache gekommen wären. Hitler verachtete das Geld und hielt es für unter seiner Würde, über finanzielle Nöte zu sprechen. Er hatte genügend Anhänger, die derartige Bittgänge für ihn erledigten. Sehr viele wohlhabende Leute in Deutschland aber öffneten, wenn sie Hitler reden hörten, von selbst und unaufgefordert ihre Börsen, um für die hohen nationalen Ziele, die er predigte, zu spenden.

Die drei Gesprächspartner in Köln konferierten über andere Dinge, nämlich wann und unter welchen Modalitäten man Hindenburg veranlassen könne, Hitler zum Reichskanzler zu ernennen. Baron von Schröder hatte in diese Richtung hin schon im November einen sehr beachteten Vorstoß unternommen und an Hindenburg eine Denkschrift führender deutscher Wirtschaftler gelangen lassen, in der eindeutig die Kanzlerschaft Hitlers gefordert wurde ²⁰⁾.

Papen, der von August bis November 1932 zu spüren bekommen hatte, was eine Gegnerschaft Hitlers bedeutete, war von seinem hohen Roß heruntergestie-

^{19a)} Kurt Freiherr von Schröder, geb. 1889 in Hamburg.

^{19b)} Wilhelm Keppler, geb. 1882 in Heidelberg, 1938 Staatssekretär.

²⁰⁾ Die Denkschrift wurde unterzeichnet von Schröder, Dr. Schacht, Fritz Thyssen und einer beträchtlichen Anzahl namhafter Industrieller und Wirtschaftler. Der Wortlaut der Denkschrift ist wiedergegeben bei Meißner-Wilde a. a. O. S. 153. Kommentar S. 288/289. Die Namen der Unterzeichner und anderer Sympathisierender in Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft Berlin 1956 S. 366 ff.

4. Januar 1933

gen und nunmehr bereit, die Führerschaft Hitlers anzuerkennen. Seine Erfahrungen mit Schleicher mochten diese Sinneswandlung beschleunigt haben. Trotzdem ist es durchaus möglich, daß die Gesprächspartner kein Wort über Schleicher selbst verloren.

Das gemeinsame *Kommuniqué*, das Hitler und Papen am 5. Januar nach Bekanntwerden ihrer Kölner Unterredung veröffentlichten, hatte folgenden Wortlaut: ²¹⁾

„Gegenüber unrichtigen Kombinationen, die in der Presse über das Zusammentreffen Adolf Hitlers und des früheren Reichskanzlers von Papen vielfach verbreitet werden, stellen die Unterzeichneten fest, daß die Besprechung sich ausschließlich mit den Fragen der Möglichkeit einer großen nationalen politischen Einheitsfront befaßt hat und daß insbesondere die beiderseitigen Auffassungen über das zur Zeit amtierende Reichskabinett im Rahmen dieser allgemeinen Aussprache überhaupt nicht berührt worden sind.“

Was Hitler bei dieser Konferenz zum Gesprächsstoff beitrug, erfahren wir am besten aus der *Rede*, die er noch am gleichen Abend, dem 4. Januar, in *Detmold* anläßlich der Eröffnung des lippeschen Landtagswahlkampfes hielt. Denn Hitler machte keinen großen Unterschied zwischen dem, was er in politischen Verhandlungen, und dem, was er in öffentlichen Kundgebungen zum Ausdruck brachte.

Er erklärte in *Detmold* folgendes: ²²⁾

„Was die nationalsozialistische Bewegung ins Leben gerufen hat, ist die Sehnsucht nach einer wahren Gemeinschaft des deutschen Volkes, die jahrhundertlang die Besten unserer Nation bewegt hat. Diese Bewegung gibt uns etwas, was man nicht in Worte fassen, sondern nur empfinden kann, und von dem wir wissen, daß es zu tun notwendig ist.

Uns hat das Schicksal die große Aufgabe gestellt, die Zerrissenheit des deutschen Volkes, die Wurzel seines Elends, zu beseitigen. Mit einfachen Notverordnungen von oben herunter auf dem Wege der Gesetzgebung kann man diese Not nicht beheben. Entscheidend ist nicht, daß man sich heute in der Wilhelmstraße einbildet, die Nationalsozialisten zu regieren, sondern entscheidend ist, wer den deutschen Menschen erobert hat.

Wenn ich heute vor der Alternative stände, Reichskanzler zu werden, aber dadurch nicht mehr Arbeiter zu erobern als bisher, oder umgekehrt nicht zu regieren, aber im Laufe der nächsten Monate Millionen neuer arbeitender Menschen der Nation zuzuführen, dann würde ich sagen: ‚Behaltet die Regierung, ich greife nach dem Volke! Die Türe zur Wilhelmstraße werde ich mir dann über kurz oder lang mit diesem Volke schon aufsperrnen!‘

Wenn wir um den deutschen Menschen ringen, dann tun wir es letzten Endes nicht, weil wir ihn als Wähler brauchen, sondern weil wir ihn umerziehen und zu der großen schicksalhaften Aufgabe bewegen wollen, als Volk sich zu einigen und damit die Nation zu befreien.

Diese eine große Mission kann die Bewegung aber nur dann erfüllen, wenn sie unendlichsam ausrottet, was unser Volk zerreißt. Und wenn die Bürger heute unsere Bewegung lästern und fragen: ‚Warum greifen Sie nicht nur die Marxisten, sondern auch die Bürgerlichen an‘, dann gebe ich ihnen zur Antwort: Weil es keine Marxisten gäbe und niemals gegeben hätte, wenn nicht vorher bürgerliche Parteien dagewesen wären.

Die bürgerlichen Parteien würden froh sein, wenn sie nur einen Bruchteil des Glaubens, des Idealismus und des Opfersinns besäßen, der in unserer Bewegung ist. Wo wäre das Bürgertum heute, wenn nicht diese braune Armee, dieser braune Wall, diese braune Mauer sein würde!

²¹⁾ Wortlaut im VB. Nr. 7/8 v. 7./8. 1. 1933.

²²⁾ Auszug im VB. Nr. 7/8 v. 7./8. 1. 1933.

4. Januar 1933

Meine Gegner haben ein Menschenalter Zeit gehabt. Sie sollten mich doch wenigstens nicht kritisieren. Ich habe 13 Jahre gearbeitet, 13 Jahre nur im Kampf oder im Gefängnis für Deutschland zugebracht und die Volksgemeinschaft dieser Bewegung geschaffen. Was haben denn meine Kritiker, die diese Aufgaben ja auch hätten lösen können, in dieser Zeit zustandegebracht?

Was gut ist an den Gedanken unserer heute herrschenden Gegner, haben sie von uns gestohlen, und was nicht von uns ist, ist unter aller Kritik.

Die Regierung Schleicher wird die Regierung Papen fortsetzen und wird genau dort enden, wo die Regierung Papen endete.

Ich habe es abgelehnt, Minister ohne Portefeuille zu werden, nicht weil ich die Verantwortung scheue, sondern weil der Weg nicht zum Ziele führt. Im übrigen wäre es schon einfacher gewesen, sich alle vier Wochen vor das Mikrophon zu stellen und etwas herunterzulesen, an dem ein ganzes Ministerium gearbeitet hat.

Und wenn man mir sagt, ich hätte doch in die Regierung gehen sollen, um von hinten herum die Macht zu gewinnen, dann kann ich nur sagen, daß ich dieses Spielen hinter den Kulissen nicht gelernt habe und auch nicht lernen will!

Niemals lasse ich mich und die Bewegung mit Halbheiten abspesen, und wenn sie sagen: dann lösen wir wieder auf. Tut es! Uns macht es nichts aus! Wir müssen ohnehin um den deutschen Menschen kämpfen.

Auch die Drohung mit der Wahlmüdigkeit kann uns nicht schrecken. Es ist letzten Endes gleichgültig, wieviele Prozent des deutschen Volkes Geschichte machen. Wesentlich ist nur, daß die Letzten, die in Deutschland Geschichte machen, wir sind!

Im übrigen, wenn sie von Rückgang reden, sie sollen sich nicht täuschen: Die Welle kommt wieder! Die Bewegung wird ihre Idee immer und immer wieder an die Menschen herantragen, solange, bis sie uns verfallen sind.

Wir werden nicht müde und gehen unseren Weg unentwegt bis zum Ende. Schließlich werden wir mit unserem Glauben, unserem Opfer und unserer Willenskraft doch siegen.

Und so wird uns auch diese Wahl wieder eine Stufe weiterbringen auf dem Wege, der uns emporführt zur deutschen Freiheit!"

Was Hitler da vom „Spiel hinter den Kulissen“, das er nicht gelernt habe und auch nicht lernen wolle, erklärte, mutete freilich etwas eigenartig an angesichts der gerade stattgefundenen Geheimkonferenz mit Papen. Aber das Hauptgewicht seiner Detmolder Rede und sicherlich auch seiner Kölner Erklärungen lag auf dem Satz: „Die [nationalsozialistische] Welle kommt wieder!“

Im November und Dezember 1932 war ohne Zweifel ein Rückgang der nationalsozialistischen Stimmenflut feststellbar gewesen, und Hitlers Gegner, einschließlich Schleicher, frohlockten bereits in der Annahme, es gehe nun unaufhaltsam mit der NSDAP. bergab.

Hitlers Besprechungen in Köln konnten allein keine Änderung in der politischen Situation herbeiführen. Dazu mußte schon noch ein augenscheinlicher Beweis von seiner ungebrochenen Popularität und von einem neuen Vormarsch der NSDAP. erbracht werden.

Hitler war entschlossen, den Lipper Wahlentscheid am 15. Januar zu einem solchen Kriterium zu machen, das, ähnlich wie die Landtagswahl in Oldenburg am 29. Mai 1932, den letzten Anstoß zum Sturz des Kanzlers geben würde.

Unermüdet, wie immer bei solchen Wahlrede-Kampagnen, sprach Hitler in den folgenden 10 Tagen in allen möglichen Ortschaften des kleinen Lippe-Detmolder Landes, so am 5. Januar in *Leopoldshöhe* und *Örlinghausen*, wo er u. a. folgendes ausführte: ²³⁾

²³⁾ Auszug in VB. Nr. 7/8 v. 7./8. 1. 1933.



I Briefwechsel mit Hindenburg und Meißner

Hitler diktiert im Hotel Kaiserhof in Berlin dem Reichspressechef der NSDAP.,
Dr. Otto Dietrich, eine Erwiderung (November 1932).

Aufnahme: Archiv Domarus