

# Hitler and the Third Reich

*By Anthony M. Ludovici*

**T**HE present temper of the German people, unlike that of their kinsmen before the Great War or under the Republic, is also unlike anything that Europe has witnessed probably since the Middle Ages.

The visitor to their country who fails to grasp this fact, like the stay-at-home Englishman whose Press does not enable him to appreciate it, misses the most fundamental feature in the whole of Nazi Germany.

For something akin to a new religious zeal has spread throughout the land, making the people deeply wistful, but strangely light-hearted and confident in their earnestness. It is as if they had been not only raised from the dust, but also shown a star or ball of fire which will lead them to the fulfilment of their destiny.

It was to be expected that a great proud nation, broken and humiliated, would respond with turbulent gratitude to anyone who helped her to recover her self-esteem and face the world once more without shame. But those who are inclined to see only thankful exultation over rescued vanity in the present mood of the German people would sadly misunderstand and therefore underrate what has happened. For in Germany today there is none of the truculence of a greedily recovered self-confidence, none of the self-complacency of a people basking in a light which their sense of superiority claims. On the contrary, everything is reserved, serene, almost reticent, as if beneath the inexpressible joy that everyone feels, there stirred the constantly sobering reflection that the defeat, the humiliation and the shame of yesterday was a judgment, a penance for the mistakes of the older generation.

The Fuehrer never loses an opportunity of reminding them of this. But it is a thought that must form spontaneously in most of their minds, because their behaviour, even towards strangers and foreigners, bears the stamp

of it. They appear to have reached a level of self-respect from which they look down with anxious dread upon any impulse, word, or action which might bear an a-social or negative interpretation. Petty deeds of mutual strife, hostility or exploitation, are naturally scorned as *infra-dignitatem*. Again and again the visitor is impressed by the scrupulous honesty, consideration, patience, and willingness of menials, public servants and the rank and file of Government employees. I could mention scores of instances of this. The tone of the country seems to be set by the general consciousness that a great common good is being served, and that those who depart too conspicuously from the example of impersonal effort set by the Fuehrer may wreck his prodigious scheme. Thus a mood prevails which makes certain things—mean, ill-natured thoughts and actions—appear unworthy of a great nation stirred and united by a lofty purpose.

“Not individual gain, but the common good!” This can be read on almost every hoarding. And it is no empty phrase. It genuinely inspires the mass of the people, and makes for a wholesome reluctance to indulge in ill-informed criticism and fault-finding, while the gigantic work of reconstruction is in progress. Indeed, the Fuehrer himself is the very last to claim infallibility in his function, and with a wisdom surely exceptional in history repeatedly takes the people into his confidence to remind them that, if he is to act with courage and a cheerful readiness to shoulder responsibilities, they must allow him occasionally to make mistakes.

The last great movement of anything like the same importance as National Socialism was the Reformation. With his teaching, the fire he put into it, and the music and song he used so skilfully to carry it into the hearts of the people, Luther swept the country. But he divided Germany and left it divided. Even the united Empire created by Bismarck, although it integrated a

congeries of petty States whose rulers had often been dominated by mutual jealousies, left Germany in the grip of parties whose rivalries proved even more dangerous and disintegrating.

The Nazi movement, however, has united the country as no country has been united since the Renaissance. It has not merely destroyed the barriers between the States, it has obliterated the demarcations of factions. There are no parties today in Germany. Nor should there be in any so-called "nation."

If the people naturally look up to their leader more as a Saviour than a statesman, more as a Heaven-sent prophet than a politician, if at the loudspeakers fixed to almost every pillar and post in the land, they hang on his words and his voice and are ready to accept and do his bidding, and if to us in strife-ridden England they appear to be standardised, "conditioned," on a scale no free Briton would tolerate, let us in this country remember two important aspects of this state of affairs :

The first is that over here we cannot pretend to be able to fathom the depths of the humiliation they suffered after the Great War and therefore cannot appreciate the extent of their devotion to their rescuer.

The second is that we, too, in this country are standardised and "conditioned" on a vast and alarming scale. But whereas in Germany the standardising and conditioning powers are responsible and ready to answer for the effects they produce, over here these powers are wholly irresponsible and, as things are, could not by any conceivable means be made to answer for what their untrammelled use of publicity enables them to effect in the moulding of so-called "public-opinion".

Herr von Ribbentrop assured me that if to-morrow the Fuehrer were to ask the German people to do without sheets on their beds, they would cheerfully accede to his request and, to a family, give up this form of comfort.

There seems to me not the slightest doubt that this is true. But before we call such a request tyranny, and

the hearty response to it slavery, let us be quite sure that we understand the amount of mutual confidence, affection and respect it implies.

When I was asked by a prominent member of the Government, a man who, in his day, had ruled over one of the smaller nominally autonomous States of the old Empire, to sum up in a line how the Germany of the Third Reich impressed me, I replied that I could think of nothing like it in recent history and could compare it only to what I imagined western Europe must have been when our great Gothic cathedrals were being built.

Nor is there anything factitious or perfunctory in the enthusiasm with which the people acclaim and welcome the enigmatical figure who has contrived to strike this deep religious note in their hearts. I witnessed two public appearances of the Fuehrer. I saw him drive into a vast stadium at half-past eight in the morning to address 80,000 children of the *Hitler Youth Movement*, and a few thousand adults ; and, an hour or two later, I saw him arrive at the *Lustgarten* in the centre of Berlin to address a vast assembly of working men and specially invited guests of both sexes.

On both occasions something more than ordinary enthusiasm was displayed and no visitor required to understand the language in order to feel the magic of the moment.

Long before the actual appearance of the smart black touring car bearing the Leader, the ringing cheers of the populace could be heard in the distance drawing gradually nearer and nearer, until, when the car entered the arena, the whole gathering of thousands took up the cry and, standing with right arms raised, shook the May morning with their greetings.

“*Sieg!*” (Victory) he cried.

“*Heil Hitler!*” the throng roared in return.

“*Sieg!*” he cried again.

“*Heil Hitler!*” came the response once more.

"*Sieg!*" he cried for the third and last time.

"*Heil Hitler!*" was thundered back by 100,000 voices.

No sense of humour!—No! But we should be thankful that there are still occasions, even in modern England, when a sense of humour would be thought out of place. We still see no humour in the death of a beloved relative or in a broken heart, or a lost love. And is it not possible for the degree of passion behind the love for a relative or a betrothed to be equalled by the love for a figure which stands for the salvation of a people's native land, their pride and their hopes?

I certainly saw no sign of a sense of humour in the reception given to the Fuehrer on these two occasions. But I witnessed instead something bordering on the magic, something which although beyond reason, was anything but madness.

I saw bent old men and women who must have known Bismarck, the Kaiser William I, and the glorious early seventies of last century, and I saw crowds of educated and uneducated middle-aged people, young men and women and adolescents, thousands of whom could never have seen the days of the Empire. But one and all displayed the same passionate affection of children in the presence of the Fuehrer, and to watch them was to learn what miracles can still be wrought with the ultra-civilised and often effete populations of modern Europe if only they are given a lofty purpose.

This is surely the secret of the perpetual hold religions have on men, and it explains Adolf Hitler's magic influence. To exhort men to commercial and industrial prosperity is not enough. To stimulate them to make good in individual enterprise, in profit-making, in self-help, ultimately leaves the best elements of the nation cold—not merely cold, but fractious, restless, mutually negative and given to petty criticism and fault-finding. In fact it creates the populace which is typical of modern democratic politics, and makes possible every kind of

large-scale fraud, from a general election to the vast advertisement hoardings of a city like London.

The religious appeal, however, by giving men a higher, impersonal purpose, sets humanity at one stroke above the market-place, above considerations of merely individual gain, with all that these mean in internecine and suicidal struggle. And to have given his nation such a purpose, to have persuaded them that such a purpose can be worth while, is the secret of the Fuehrer's magic. To my mind this constitutes his chief importance to the German nation.

It is perhaps a pure coincidence that this man who, according to his own admission, moves and acts in State affairs with the somnambulistic certainty (*nachtwanderische Sicherheit*) of a sleep-walker—that is to say, whose most important decisions spring from the mysterious strata of the Unconscious—should have chosen for the badge of his Party and his Movement the ancient mystic sign known as the *Gammadion*, *Fylfot*, or *Swastika*. But when we bear in mind that this very badge was once the symbol of a mysterious cult, and has for countless ages stood as the sign of a particularly instinctive and deep-seated form of worship, the choice of the symbol seems particularly apt. For the fact that Germany is to-day stirred by a purpose super-personal and therefore intensely religious, is beyond question.

Whether the conspicuous diminution in crime all over the country is to be ascribed to this religious mood, I cannot pretend to judge. If, however, I throw my mind back, as I like to do, to the days in western Europe when our great cathedrals were springing up in almost every large town, I imagine that they, too, must have been times of a low incidence of crime. For it is impossible to believe that all that anonymous, impersonal work, which must in millions of cases have offered no hope of being completed before those engaged upon it died, could have been performed in any mood which promoted the negativism of crime.

When, therefore, we learn from Liebermann von Sonnenberg, the head of the Criminal Investigation Department of the German Government, that since 1932, crime in Germany has declined 50 per cent., and in some districts actually as much as 60 per cent., and that in all Prussian towns of over 50,000 inhabitants, murders have declined 32 per cent., robberies by violence 63 per cent. and burglaries 52 per cent., it ought not to surprise us.

To suppose that, in such a mood and with such impersonal strivings, the German nation can now entertain purely predatory and venal aims would be wholly to misunderstand the feat Adolf Hitler has performed, and the metamorphosis his magic has effected.

He has effected this transformation on a foundation of repentance, on the constant reminder that Germany's defeat and humiliation were a judgment and a penalty. Those who have been chastened by his appeal, and they represent over 90 per cent. of the German nation, cannot, therefore, be insincere in their desire for a relationship of peace and friendship with their neighbours and particularly with England.

This is not to say, however, that peace and friendship do not impose certain duties of mutual consideration on the parties concerned. But it struck me that it is only to that feeling of duty, and not to ideals of force and violence, that modern Germans now look with hope for the redress of their wrongs and the relief of their domestic difficulties.

Thus the greatest of the Fuehrer's reforms and most creative of his innovations, as I hope to show, have aimed at construction and development at home. And if, in this work, Hitler and his advisers have in the last three years performed miracles, about which we in this country hear little, and appear to care less, it is to the rigorous press-censorship now prevailing over here that we must ascribe both our ignorance and indifference.

# Hitler and the Third Reich—II

*By Anthony Ludovici*

IT is difficult to give an adequate impression of the enormous assistance afforded to the Fuehrer's various schemes of construction by the spirit he has contrived to stimulate in the German people.

In a country uninspired by his personal leadership many of his reforms, particularly those deriving from his biological revaluation and his wise attitude towards women, manual labour and agriculture, would undoubtedly have provoked the liveliest opposition. And if so many of his fundamental innovations have passed smoothly into the everyday life of the people to transform their sentiment and outlook, he has to thank the religious mood with which he first infected his nation.

Nowhere, however, has the change of point of view and life-habits been more conspicuously displayed than in the movement which led to the so-called "Labour" Camps, of which there are now 1,300 for men alone all over Germany.

Designed, on the cultural side, to reduce class cleavage, to whittle down the marked difference of esteem in which manual and mental work are held throughout Western civilization, and to promote health and manliness in all classes, these Labour Camps are, economically, one of the greatest assets of the new régime. For by providing the means of concentrating unpaid labour at all those points in the land where it is most needed, either in order to develop or reclaim existing wastes, or to help newly settled urbanites to make good as farmers, market-gardeners, fruit-growers, etc., it has given an impetus to agricultural development which, without it, would have been quite unrealisable.

It is not generally appreciated in England that the problems in the sphere of agriculture alone which the Fuehrer had to face, and which had actually been studied by him and his advisers before his Party came into power, were manifold and complicated.

The Treaty of Versailles deprived Germany of 9.5 per cent of her people and over 13 per cent of her area. Thus the ratio of population to territory was in any case less favourable than it had been before the war. Over and above this, however, the land lost on her eastern and western frontiers was of a very high grade, and therefore made the total decrease of her agricultural area more than it seemed, *i.e.* nearer 30 per cent than 13 per cent in actual value.

In addition, about one million of her nationals returned to the Reich from ceded territories, and, owing to the increasing use and perfection of labour-saving machinery, ever larger numbers of industrial workers were being turned out of work every year. So that, failing a wise and drastic policy calculated to improve the state of agriculture and provide fresh employment for the workless (numbering 6,000,000 before 1933), it seemed as if disaster must soon overtake the country.

Two things were clear—thousands of recently urbanized families must at all costs be restored to the land, and the arable areas of the Reich must be increased.

A "Back-to-the-land" movement was therefore immediately inaugurated on a grand scale, while under the slogan that Germany, if she chose, could conquer a whole new province for herself within her own borders, another movement was started to improve the quality and yield of existing agricultural areas, to reclaim millions of acres of existing marsh, heath, and moor-land in various parts of the country, and shoals and flats along the North Sea coast, to regulate the course of small rivers, to plant and grub, and to transform waste woodland into profitable forests.

In connexion with the first movement an administration, known as the *Reichsstelle für die Auswahl deutscher Bauernsiedler*, was soon set up for selecting desirable people for settlement in rural districts as farmers, farm-labourers and peasants, which, working on the lines of the new biological revaluation, granted permits, land and

sometimes credits, only to the best people from the standpoint of descent, health and capacity.

Thus favour is invariably shown to :—

(a) Men who in their family line and blood have long had some close relationship to the soil and been lately separated from it—for instance, farmers who have been recently uprooted or lost their farms through no fault of their own.

(b) Men who have large families. (Only men over 25 and married are considered.)

(c) Men who served in the late war, or who are known to have served in the S.A. (Hitler's *Sturmableitung*) or the S.S. (the biological cream of the S.A.).

(d) Men who have served in the *Reichswehr* (the post-war German army).

(e) Finally, rural labourers whom adverse conditions have driven from the soil.

I have not the statistics for 1935 at hand ; but in 1934, the Office for Selecting German Settlers on the Land received 15,948 applications of which 11,094 were accepted and provided for ; and since the inauguration of the movement (not reckoning 1935) 67,000 new farmsteads have been established, covering about 1,827,800 acres. Altogether, up to the end of 1934, about 2,964,000 acres had been secured for settlement purposes.

The Government reckons that it takes about five years for these newly settled farmers and peasants to make good, and during their first years of endeavour, every kind of assistance is given them provided they display the right spirit and energy.

Now in the work of reclaiming the soil for the reception of these new agricultural workers, and in the task of helping them to make good, the Reich Labour Service finds its principal functions; and, apart from the cultural advantages the camps secure for the whole male population, as described above, it is in these principal functions that they constitute one of the greatest assets of the new régime.

Briefly stated, the conditions of the service are these :—

Every young German must enter the Labour Service between the end of his seventeenth and the end of his twenty-fifth year; he is enrolled only after a thorough physical examination, and has to serve for six months, after which his year's military service begins.

Life in the camps is divided between manual labour with spade and hoe, in which all must take part, strenuous drilling exercises, and periods of leisure given to reading and the study of contemporary events and problems. The day starts at 5 a.m. in the summer and 6 a.m. in the winter, and ends at 10 p.m.—the time after supper (7 p.m.) and short intervals during the day being devoted to rest and leisurely pursuits.

Each camp consists of 152 men, and there are at present about 1,300 camps for men in Germany. Thus, year in year out, the country can command the work of 200,000 young men whose labour is to all intents and purposes unpaid. Actually they do receive about 3*d.* a day in pocket money.

A similar organisation exists for German girls. But, so far, the service has not been made compulsory. Nevertheless, such is the impersonal spirit prevailing in Germany to-day, that on the present voluntary basis, these Reich Labour Service girls have come forward in sufficient numbers from all classes of society to form 500 camps, which, like those of the men, provide unpaid labour devoted to assisting the newly settled peasants and farmers all over the land.

As to what these men's Labour Camps have done, let it suffice to say that, out of an area of 15,437 square miles (about half the size of Portugal) of swamp land, half has already been reclaimed for agricultural purposes; hundreds of thousands of acres of waste land and waste woodland, of no use to the peasants, have already been transformed into profitable forests; and drainage and irrigation, now being carried out, is expected to double the value of more than 46,312 square miles of existing agricultural land of poor quality.

It is, in fact, reckoned that the net annual proceeds derived from the work done by the Labour Service organisation have already exceeded 10 per cent. of the cost of the organisation. But the full value of what they are now creating in the form of new agricultural areas, new farmsteads and a new peasant population, will, of course, not be realized for perhaps a generation or two.

I visited several of these men's camps in the Haveländische Luch and questioned men whom I saw at work. As I had been led to expect, there were among them representatives of every class of the community, and they all appeared to be enjoying their labours and flourishing under the discipline of the camps. They were young enough to relish the hard work and the rough life as an adventure, and they all looked healthy enough to thrive under Spartan conditions.

Their camp officers who, without exception, attracted attention by their unusually fine physique and manly bearing, are men specially picked from the standpoint of psycho-physical standards. They do not separate from their men at meals or during the hours of leisure, as Army and Navy officers do, but have to live every moment of their waking hours with them, setting them an example of good manners, correct speech, and a cultured outlook.

In the women's camps the girls are subjected to much the same camp discipline, but their work is, of course, different. They may, if called upon, help the newly settled farmers and peasants in light work in the fields, but their principal function is to give the rural families help in the home as unpaid domestic servants, dairy-maids, nursemaids, etc. In this way, the newly settled farmers who are trying to make good, are substantially assisted at no cost to themselves, and are often able to have the more skilled work of their wives in the fields, while the voluntary Reich-Service workers look after the home and the children, and do the cooking, mending and washing.

Valuable by-products of both the girls' and the men's

Labour Camps are, of course, the excellent discipline that all these young people have to undergo at a period in their lives when discipline is most salutary, the breaking down of class barriers by the mixing of the various social strata in the camps, and the benefit to all concerned derived from the closer acquaintance made by the children of middle and upper-class families with manual labour, its hardships, its advantages, and its immense importance in the economy of the nation.

“ Work ennobles ! ” (*Arbeit adelt !*)—that is the device of this branch of the National Service. And, thanks to the right spirit and the right values, and in spite of a world that has too long worshipped only money and the successful stockbroker and financier, it somehow comes true ! It can already be seen in the faces and manners of the people, and it is evidenced in every relationship of high and humble in the life of modern Germany.

Meanwhile, promoting and consolidating the “ Back-to-the-land ” and “ Reich-Labour-Service ” movements, laws have been passed which make it difficult, particularly for young rural women, to swell the throng of country folk who annually try to migrate to the large towns ; and a very important series of laws—not based on abstract principles or theory, but rooted in peasant custom—which came into force in September, 1933, and are known as the *Reichserbhofrecht* (the Law relating to the Inheritance of Landed Property) now provide for the hard-working and capable peasant a security in his holding, which no usurious or other kinds of creditors can defeat (Paragraphs 37-39 of above law). The test appears to be not whether the creditor has a lien on the land, but (a) whether the present debtor has defaulted through any fault of his own, and (b) whether the peasant debtor is a capable, knowledgeable and diligent farmer and has shown that he can keep his land in a proper state. The general idea inspiring the whole measure is that land cannot and should not be treated as moveable property, to be bought and sold in the open market.

It is impossible in the space at my disposal to describe in detail what this law has done to secure the peasant landowner in his holding, to regulate the inheritance of land so as to keep it in the hands of worthy families, and generally to enhance the prestige of conscientious and painstaking husbandry ; but anyone who wishes to study the law in detail can do so in the excellent handbook on the subject by Otto Baumecker (*Handbuch des Gesamten Reichserbhofrechts*) the third edition of which was published in Cologne in 1935.

## In Memoriam : G.K.C

**G**OD rest the great Defendat, who fought the  
poor man's fight ;

Whose weapon was his laughter, the kind  
laughter of a knight !

Who fed the fire of fancy with fuel of common things,  
And heard the mighty beating of the archangelic wings.

The primal marks of England, he saw them disappear,  
And called upon all Englishmen—but could not make  
them hear !

He bade them toil as freemen and not as social slaves,  
Guarding their human dignity to consecrate their graves.

He bade them return again to psalter and to plough;  
To drink their beer, to sing their songs, to pray their  
prayers.....and now

He sees from native altars the heaven-borne incense rise,  
And quaffs (we trust) good English ale in inns of Paradise!

K. C. B.

# Hitler and the Third Reich III.

By Anthony Ludovici

*(Mr. Ludovici this month concludes his estimate of contemporary Germany with a survey of the cultural and biological background.)*

**G**REAT as are the reforms discussed in my last article, and wonderful as is the tribute their success pays to the inspiration of the Fuehrer, they are, however, as nothing compared with his innovations in a far more difficult and pitfall-strewn field—the field of human biology.

Three influences—urbanisation, industrialism and the negative Socratic values which began to prevail with the spread of Protestantism, and happened to be favourable to the two former—have now, for almost two centuries, been inclining the people of Europe, and all countries like Europe, to set their faces ever more and more steadfastly against a biological attitude towards man. And this has resulted in the tendency of modern civilisation not only to neglect and despise the body but also to exalt as praiseworthy all those practices which favour the multiplication of biologically inferior human beings.

To deal with urbanisation first, it must be clear even to those who are unfamiliar with the contempt in which boroughs and their inhabitants were held by the rural populations of the Middle Ages, that the city and town do not and cannot breed the healthiest, sturdiest and most active members of the community and cannot, therefore, cultivate a very fastidious taste in standards of human desirability. The kind of occupation open to the town-dweller—quite apart from the air he breathes and the food he tends to live on—neither selects nor is calculated to maintain the soundest types. Moreover, by withdrawing the human being from a close touch with the realities of Nature's work and laws, from the everyday and obvious lessons to be learnt by watching cultivated plants and animals grow, and observing

the conditions essential to their prosperity, town life must in time foster a fantastic or unrealistic attitude to life and its problems, which of itself constitutes mental or intellectual unsoundness.

Over and above this, however, in towns and cities, the very roots of human life tend to wither. In the country there is always some way in which the child only just past toddlerdom can help in the general impersonal work of Nature, even if it is only to scare the sparrows from the ripening corn. Thus children are always welcome and quickly become a further asset to the house in which they are born. But in towns the child tends to become more and more a luxury, an undesired by-product of the sexual adaptation of its parents. The result is that an unnatural relationship begins to grow up between married couples, and women as a whole incline to neglect and despise maternal occupations. In fact, society reaches a condition known as Feminism, on the one hand, in which, as even the Feminist, Havelock Ellis, admits, "Motherhood is without dignity,"—indeed how could it have dignity when children are unwanted?—and on the other a condition known as Pornocracy, in which the taste of the harlot, and the outlook of the harlot, necessarily tend to prevail.

Industrialisation, even under the most humane and solicitous factory laws and regulations, confirms and intensifies most of the worst influences of urbanisation. It cannot help so doing, because, in addition to offering the urban crowds unhealthy occupations, it has not reached that stage of enlightenment when it would necessarily regard it as a duty to protect the character and minds of the so-called proletariat from the besotting and degrading influence of mere machine-minding, or of performing year in year out unskilled, repetitive and often merely fragmentary tasks. Besides, the factory can be adequately served by types which would not have the stamina or endurance for heavy farm work, and this again exercises with the town a preferential selection in favour of unsoundness.

On its occupational side, therefore, it undermines the garnered qualities of a national constitution and character. It lives on the spiritual and physical capital of the people, without making a single contribution of value to either from one generation to another. Thus it creates among a mass of physically deteriorated, uprooted and traditionless individuals, already removed from the instructive realities of life by their urban habits, a standardized type of mind and character, which is steadily becoming more and more helpless, passive, colourless and servile. It means that a race is being reared which in character, body and mind is hardly civilised.

Turning now to the third influence—that of Socratic values—which has made the two former influences possible, it is difficult for the modern man of Western Europe to appreciate the extent to which he has become saturated, “conditioned,” and disciplined both in body and mind by the values which tend to underrate and neglect body standards. If we have ceased to look with horror on a man or woman who, although under thirty, has false teeth, if we have ceased to demand an apology from people with foul breath, and if we imagine that human rubbish and human foulness can give us good laws, good poetry, good science and good art, it is wholly and exclusively due to Socrates and his influence.

His chief claim to notoriety is that, thanks to his own wretchedly poor physical endowments in the midst of a population of beauty-venerators, he found himself forced in self-defence to discover a dialectical method of excusing every kind of physical disreputability, degeneracy and putrescence.

He argued after the manner of the fox who had lost his tail, that the beauty of the body is but a slight affair, and that man's greatest achievement is to set a higher value on the beauty of the soul, and he declared to Glaucon, “If there be any merely bodily defect in another, we will be patient of it and love the same.”

“Merely bodily defect!”—These three words epitomise the whole savour and trend of Socratic teaching.

Thus radiant and flawless health is everywhere rare among human beings, and wherever Western civilisation has spread the minority of the sound are taxed out of existence and sacrificed in order to preserve, succour and pay honour to the unsound.

Now to set one's face against this deeply implanted bias, to invite modern men, and particularly modern women, in the teeth of their morbid sentimentality, to change their attitude and to honour and look up to the sound, to protect the sound from extermination by the unsound, and to resist their being sacrificed for the latter—in fact, to assume towards humanity the very attitude which to a farmer contemplating his animals and his crops is a commonplace of good husbandry, is to-day one of the most difficult and precarious of undertakings, particularly for the head of a State.

In the lives of the people, Socratic values, by inculcating a contempt for bodily considerations, lead to all kinds of perverted tastes and unwise matings—marriage with cripples, with the hereditarily blind, with the hereditarily deaf and dumb, the diseased and malformed. Three popular works, such as Lytton's *Pilgrims of the Rhine*, George Eliot's *Mill on the Floss* and Charlotte Yonge's *Pillars of the House*, in which diseased or crippled persons are solemnly held up as marriageable or as objects to be specially honoured (and there are hundreds of lesser English novels which do the same), could hardly have been written or read unless a culture had lost its sanity in mating.

Now the fact that Adolf Hitler, as soon as he seized the reins of Government at the beginning of 1933, did not hesitate to grapple with Socrates and, at least in Germany, to discredit him, is surely one of his most remarkable achievements.

True, his assault on urbanisation and industrialism would have been imperfect and abortive had he failed

to attack the values based on Socratic teaching which enable both to flourish. But, apart from the measures he has framed to restore a healthy agricultural life to Germany and arrest the flight to the cities, his daring attack on the traditional "glory" of fifth century Athens should alone have sufficed ultimately to sweep unhealthy tastes and prejudices from his country.

For to-day the sound in health and mind are the honoured of the German nation and, as the guarantors of a desirable posterity, are granted many privileges. Although to us over here this cannot help seeming slightly odd, it is, of course, the most elementary wisdom.

Among the principal measures framed to secure a healthier generation. I would refer to the Law of July 14, 1933, to Prevent the Transmission of Hereditary Diseases. By means of this law it became possible through sterilisation to prevent men and women suffering from certain hereditary diseases, specified in the law, from having progeny. Such diseases are congenital feeble-mindedness, certain mental diseases such as schizophrenia and manic depression, hereditary epilepsy, blindness, deaf-mutism and severe malformations.

All cases are tried before a Eugenics Court, consisting of one judge assisted by two doctors, and their decisions are reached only after a thorough and conscientious inquiry into each case. In the report for the year 1934, published on July 3, 1935, we find that in all 84,525 petitions were filed in the 205 Eugenics Courts, *i.e.*, about one case per 771 of the population. There were 42,903 males and 41,662 females.\* Of this number, 64,499, or about 75 per cent. were heard before the Courts, and sterilisation was ordered in 98.8 of the cases, *i.e.*, 56,244 persons. In 3,692 cases (6.2 per cent.) the petitions were rejected, while in 4,563 the petition was either withdrawn or else referred to a superior

\* The total according to these figures should be 84,565 and not 84,525. But the fault lies with the original German report and not with the present extract from it.

Eugenics Court, of which twenty-six participated in the ultimate decisions.

Of 8,219 appeals taken against a court order for sterilisation, only 377 were allowed. In 438 cases, appeals were made against the rejection of sterilisation petitions ordered by the Eugenics Court of first instance. And of these, 299 heard before the end of 1934 ended in the granting of the petition in 179 cases, and the reversal of the decision of the first Court.

In regard to pregnant women, it has been decided that, if a valid Court has ruled that sterilisation should take place, the pregnancy may be interrupted provided that this is done before the sixth month of pregnancy.

The importance of these measures will be appreciated, as Dr. Burgdörfer points out, when it is remembered that according to the last census there were 2,000,000 sufferers from incurable disease, crippledom and insanity in the country. The cost of maintaining them was 1,000,000,000 Reichsmarks, or about £76,000,000 a year—a burden which is not only useless but also actively pernicious, seeing that under it the sound cannot have the number of desirable healthy children they might otherwise give the country. To continue suffering such a burden and allowing it to increase, as it inevitably would if it were not dealt with, amounts to sacrificing the sound for the unsound. And this only a nation that has forgotten the laws of good husbandry through generations of urbanisation could ever tolerate.

A further measure, known as the Law to Protect the Hereditary Health of the German People (October 18, 1935) provides for the refusal of marriage certificates to all applicants who fail to reach certain standards of health. Thus a marriage certificate must be refused, (1) to all parties suffering from an infectious disease which may affect the other partner or the children of the marriage; (2) to all parties suffering from a mental disorder which would make it contrary to public policy

for them to marry, and (3) to all parties affected with a hereditary disease within the scope of the law of July 14, 1933, described above.

If both of the parties to the proposed marriage are foreigners, or if the prospective husband is a foreigner, the law does not apply. But if a foreign woman wishes to marry a German citizen, she must subject herself to a medical examination and obtain her *Ehetauglichkeitszeugnis*—her certificate of fitness for marriage.

The law makes it compulsory for these certificates to be obtained from the local bureau of health, and all people contemplating marriage have to undergo a medical examination before they can obtain their certificates.

But these purely negative measures do not satisfy the present rulers of Germany, and, side by side with them, they have instituted positive measures, not merely for encouraging marriage and large families, but also and above all, for giving such encouragement only to desirable and sound couples. Thus, the unhealthy and pornocratic tendency of town life is stigmatized, and honour is given where it is due, *i.e.*, to those who are a guarantee of a desirable coming generation, and who, as married couples, are fit to lead normal lives as parents.

The first measure dealing with this policy, formed part (para. x) of the law for the Reduction of Unemployment of June 1, 1933. It provided that all young couples who desired to marry and who had not the means to do so, could obtain from the Government a loan to the extent of 1,000 marks in order to help them to set up a home. But other measures have since confirmed and amplified these provisions, as, for instance, those of July 1933, August 1933, and March 1934.

The conditions under which the loan is granted are, however, severe. The parties to the marriage contract are required to be of German blood, hereditarily sound, and free from any disease, infectious or otherwise, which would make their marriage incompatible with the best public interest.

From August 1933 to March 1935, 400,738 such loans were made, of an average of 600 marks apiece, and the statistics show not only a sudden increase in marriages throughout the Reich, but also—and this was one of the objects of the measure—a corresponding decline in unemployment, owing to the number of posts vacated by the girls concerned. The number of marriages encouraged under this law were far more numerous in the urban than in the rural districts, and rose to the level of 12.6 per thousand in towns of more than 100,000 inhabitants.

The loans carry no interest, but are repayable at the rate of 1 per cent. per month. Thus a loan of 600 marks is repaid by 100 monthly instalments of 6 marks. If, however, children are born of the marriage, a quarter of of the loan is remitted for each child, and the repayments are suspended for a year. Of the 400,738 marriages which took place under these conditions, 182,355 children were born by the end of March 1935, and a large proportion of the recovery of the German birthrate may justly be ascribed to these measures.

But these are not the only measures adopted by the Government to promote soundness and good health in the nation. From the Health Record books of the Hitler Jugend—the corps of young Germans constituting the Youth Movement in Germany—to the biological selection of the S.A. (*Sturm-Abteilung*) known as the S.S. all of whose members strike the onlooker by the splendour of their health, build and looks, no detail is lost sight of which can transvalue the Socratic values still latent in the people, and make them honour, seek and favour the sound in mind and body.

The S.S. men may be encountered in every walk of life, and before the stranger, familiar with the spectacle of widespread degeneration at home, has learnt to read the signs or symbols proclaiming their order, his attention is usually drawn to them by their exceptionally fine condition and bearing. Our chauffeur on one occasion

happened to be a man of this type, whose biological rank was obviously high, and as I was then unaware of the significance of the various badges worn in present-day Germany, I commented to my host on the healthy manly appearance of his servant.

“He belongs to the S.S., the biological cream of the S.A.,” replied my host. And he proceeded to inform me that not only did the young man belong to highest biological class, but that his wife, too, when he took one, would require to be the same. In fact, no marriage certificate would be granted either to him or his fiancée unless she could satisfy the relevant authorities that she came up to his standard.

No sense of humour?—Lucky Germany!

# Hitler and Nietzsche

*By Anthony Ludovici*

**M**UCH has been written and more has been said about the Nietzschean influence behind the new régime in Germany. And, while some have condemned National-Socialism off-hand on that score alone others (among them some Nietzscheans) have condemned it for being a travesty of Nietzsche, i.e. for having misinterpreted and misapplied the Master's teaching.

But no matter how the dispute on these points may ultimately be decided, it seems fairly obvious that there must be a strong Nietzschean influence in National Socialism, if only because of the powerful breath of pre-Socratic Hellenism which has prevailed in Germany ever since the N.S.D.A.P. seized the reins of government.

For the sake of those readers who are not quite clear regarding this association of Nietzscheism with pre-Socratic values, perhaps it would be as well to point out that, according to Nietzsche, the history of mankind falls, as it were, into two halves—the period preceding Socrates, during which the public estimate of a man was always based upon his biological worth, and the period following Socrates, during which the public estimate of a man always tended to neglect or ignore his biological worth. How Socrates changed the point of view in order to make things tolerable for himself (a degenerate specimen) I have already explained in these pages. Thus Nietzsche claimed that the Socratic way of looking at men which ignored their biological worth, or regarded it as negligible, was a way which favoured degenerates, just as it had favoured the great degenerate who first instituted it; and the German philosopher advocated a return to the pre-Socratic values which, by being concentrated on biological worth, would combat and eliminate degeneracy.

Now, if only in this return to the biological angle of vision in viewing mankind, modern Germany is essentially Nietzschean, and when we come to appreciate the other elements in National Socialism which owe their inspiration to Nietzsche, and bear in mind not only Adolf Hitler's

sincere and earnest admiration of Nietzsche's philosophy and his great friendship with Frau Förster-Nietzsche, Nietzsche's sister, but also Alfred Rosenberg's strong sympathy with the Nietzschean outlook—Rosenberg being the head of the department in charge of political training for the National Socialist Party—we are left in no doubt whatsoever regarding the profound influence the creator of the peripatetic sage, Zarathustra, is now exerting over his native country. Perhaps it may not be uninteresting to inquire what, besides the wave of pre-Socratic values, may definitely be ascribed to Nietzsche's leadership in the Third Reich.

During the recent Parteitag in Nuremberg, the first most characteristic feature was the Fuehrer's own attitude towards Culture as outlined in his speech of 9th September at the Opera House. He made it quite clear that he would not and could not regard Art as an international affair, as our own Oxford æsthetes and dilettantes have always done, and declared that "all this chatter of internationalism in Art is as idiotic as it is dangerous." He argued that since Art is the expression of a people's life and the bloom on the tree of their values, and that "no man can bear any intimate relation to any cultural achievement which does not have its roots in his own origins and soil," it is as ridiculous to expect a national Art-product to have international validity or to make the same appeal everywhere, as to suppose that a German or an English national can feel the same emotions when reading another nation's history as when reading his own.

Thus he concluded that culture is invariably the product of discipline and authority within a particular national unit. It invariably springs from the work of the legislator who first established the values of a people. "It is the civilized product of political leadership." And he made it clear that "just as a Christian Age could have only a Christian Art, so a National-Socialist Age could have only a National-Socialist Art."

All this is perfectly consistent with Nietzscheism. But before showing the connexion, it is important to refer to certain misconceptions that may arise, and have indeed arisen, in respect of the last quoted statement of the Fuehrer.

To this end I need only recall the communication made by the Berlin Correspondent of the *Morning Post* to his journal on 8th October.

Referring only to the statement in question, the writer of the article said: "Which, one wonders, of the susceptible, but non-German-speaking English guests of honour who have since written to the Press to assert that Nazi Germany is saving Christian civilization from Bolshevism, realize that this striking antithesis was uttered and applauded in their hearing? Rarely, if ever, has Herr Hitler given the world such a succinct clue to his pretensions—that the political movement of his formation is destined to inaugurate a new era in Europe, to inherit the moral authority and inspiration exercised by Christianity to a lesser or greater degree in European affairs for a thousand years."

The implication is, of course, that the set of values promulgated by National-Socialism are, on the Fuehrer's own showing, in conflict with Christianity.

Now I happened to be one of the English guests of honour present when that statement was made, and I understood and applauded it. But so far was I from drawing the conclusions which the *Morning Post's* Berlin correspondent drew that, when I read his interpretation, it was with feelings of complete astonishment.

Nor do I believe that his interpretation could be upheld even on purely historical grounds. For instance, if he will turn up the article "Architecture" in the second volume of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (11th Edition) he will find chapters under various headings which are just as susceptible to his interpretation of the Fuehrer's words as the Fuehrer's own statement was. He will find a whole chapter under the heading "Early Christian Architecture", and later a chapter under the heading "Renaissance Architecture". Would he infer from this that the writer intended solemnly to maintain that there had been a complete breach between the two periods in question on the matter of Christianity's moral authority and inspiration? And if he would not, why does he infer it in discussing the Fuehrer's statement which, by-the-bye, he wrenches quite gratuitously from its context?

All I inferred from the Fuehrer's words was that just as Christianity had, as an international faith, untinged by local sentiment and character, produced a certain kind of Art which ultimately became differentiated as the Church split up and became influenced by national segregations of humanity, so National-Socialism (one of these more recent segregations) would necessarily and in time produce an Art having its own peculiar character. There was not a word in the Fuehrer's speech to indicate, however, that an antithesis was meant or that this peculiar national character manifesting itself in National-Socialist Art would necessarily be in conflict with true Christianity. And as far as I can see the influence drawn by the *Morning Post's* Berlin Correspondent was as entirely gratuitous as was his quotation of this one line out of the context of the Fuehrer's address.

The Fuehrer was simply making it quite clear to his listeners that any Art which is nondescript to the point of being independent of the soul of the people among which it finds its being—any Art, that is to say, which in the true sense may be termed "international"—is of minor importance unless, of course, a homogeneity of types and values prevails over all national units. And why must this be so?—Because such Art cannot help being chaotic, labyrinthine and characterless, owing to its being rooted in a clash and chaos of values.

"No people could live," said Nietzsche,\* "that did not in the first place value. If it would maintain itself, however, it must not value as its neighbour doth. . . . Values did man stamp upon things only that he might preserve himself."

To have the same Art as everybody else, therefore, would be to value as everybody else values, and this to a people means self-extermination; hence the basic stupidity of the idea of an international Art in present-day conditions, in which homogeneity of type and values is still remote.

"What does all art do?" Nietzsche asks. "Does it not praise? Does it not glorify? Does it not select? Does it not bring into prominence? In each of these cases it strengthens or weakens certain valuations."

\* The quotations from Nietzsche's works in this article are all taken from the Authorized English Translation, edited by Dr. Oscar Levy.

But the Fuehrer did not imply or lead his audience to suppose that out of National-Socialism a new Art, peculiar to it, would be evolved, as it were, over-night. He suggested nothing so ridiculous. He spoke, on the contrary, of the "enormous importance of prolonged moulding" (*die ungeheure Bedeutung dieser langsamen Formung*). He made it plain that his own and his colleagues' efforts were concentrated on restoring to the German people those great traditions of their nation, those tried and time-honoured customs, those characteristic institutions and values, out of which an Art of the future, a National-Socialist Art, would necessarily grow, as did a Judæo-Græco-Christian Art out of a Europe made well-nigh homogeneous in spirit by the Hellenistic, Jewish and other values spread by the early Church.

"The essential thing in heaven and earth," said Nietzsche, "is apparently that there should be long obedience in the same direction; then there comes about and has always come about in the long run something which has made life worth living—for instance, virtue, art, music, dancing, reason, spirituality, etc. . . . Even the beauty of a race or family, the pleasantness and kindness of their whole demeanour, is acquired by effort; like genius it is the final result of the accumulated labour of generations."

Again in his insistence on beauty in this same address, the Fuehrer revealed the Nietzschean influence in his outlook. "We of the National-Socialist Party love health," he declared. "The best of our nation's stock, in body and soul, gives us our standard, and all we demand from our art is the glorification of this standard. The first precept of our ideal of beauty will always be health."

Those who know of the recent scientific justification of this standpoint, who remember Herbert Spencer's words: "The aspects which displease us are the outward correlates of inward imperfections," and who are aware of the fact that research-workers like Dr. Kretschmer, Dr. George Draper and Dr. E. S. Talbot all associate morbidity, abnormality or degeneracy with ugliness, will appreciate the prescience of Nietzsche when they learn that as long ago as 1888 he was writing:

“From the physiological standpoint, everything ugly weakens and depresses man. It reminds him of decay, danger, impotence. . . . Ugliness is understood to signify a hint and a symptom of degeneration; that which reminds us however remotely of degeneracy, impels us to the judgment ‘ugly.’ . . . A certain hatred expresses itself here. What is it that man hates?—Without a doubt it is the *decline of his type*. In this respect his hatred springs from the deepest instincts of the race: there is, however, caution, profundity and far-reaching vision in this hatred—it is the most profound hatred that exists. On its account alone Art is profound.”

These sentiments are redolent of a period when man still clung to the point of view—now at last in the process of being confirmed by science—that body and mind are one and cannot be separated, that they are both merely different aspects of the same thing.

The emphasis the Fuehrer laid on this prerequisite—beauty, the way he linked it up with the demands he makes of a national Art, and his idea that the best of his nation’s stock should be the standard glorified by the national Art—all these elements in his memorable address, down to the very notion of a national Art as the glorifier of a type, reveal him and his associates not merely as a new and potent force for the sanitation of European humanity (a force which is now inspiring even our own people), but also certainly as followers of Nietzsche, or, to put it moderately, as influenced by the poet-philosopher’s teaching.

Maybe that he would never have presumed, even with Nietzsche behind him, to come forward with such a doctrine at this hour, had he not known that science itself—much more acceptable than Nietzsche to the modern man—was rapidly advancing to the defence of the same position. And the fact that he has found loyal support in scientific quarters in Germany rather confirms this supposition.

Turning now to the legislation of the National-Socialist rulers during the last three years, and all the emphasis it lays on the desirability of sound stock, of preventing inferior or tainted stocks from multiplying, and of eliminating from the ranks of parents all persons who are in any

way hereditarily diseased, we find further confirmation of the Nietzschean influence, and, as I pointed out above, light upon definite proof that the pre-Socratic bias of Nietzsche is at last making itself felt in Germany. Indeed, certain passages from Nietzsche might even now serve as the outline of the National-Socialist programme.

Take for instance, the following :

“ There are cases when to have a child would be a crime—for example, for chronic invalids and extreme neurasthenics. These people should be converted to chastity and for this purpose the music of Parsifal might at all events be tried.”

Compare this with the Fuehrer's reiterated claim that if in the past voluntary chastity has been constantly demanded of a section of the population for the sake of religion alone, why is it not justifiable to expect and demand voluntary chastity for reasons of devotion to the home-land, of all those whose reproductive efforts would merely extend degeneracy ?

“ Society as the trustee of Life,” says Nietzsche, “ is responsible to Life for every botched existence that comes into this world, and as it has to atone for such lives, it ought to make it impossible for them to see the light of day : it should in many cases actually prevent the act of procreation, and may, without any regard for rank, descent, or intellect, hold in readiness the most rigorous forms of compulsion and restriction, and under certain circumstances, have recourse to castration. The Mosaic law, ‘ Thou shalt do no murder,’ is a piece of ingenuous puerility compared with the earnestness of this forbidding of life to decadents, ‘ Thou shalt not beget.’ For Life itself recognizes no solidarity or equality of rights between the healthy and unhealthy parts of an organism. The latter must at all cost be eliminated, lest the whole fall to pieces. Compassion for decadents, equal rights for the physiologically botched—this would be the very pinnacle of immorality ; it would be setting up Nature's most formidable opponent as morality itself ! ”

It is hardly possible to read the above without appreciating the extent to which its light is reflected in the eugenic

legislation and general atmosphere of modern Germany. The details of much of this legislation has already been dealt with in this journal. But the fact that in the Third Reich the husbandman's concept of pity (i.e. as an emotion felt when the sound and valuable plant is in danger of being sacrificed for the unsound or worthless plant) is beginning to take the place of the urbanite's sentimental and unreasoning pity which is felt only for morbid or abnormal existences and is prepared to succour the latter at no matter what cost to the sound—surely that is the plainest proof that Nietzsche's inspiration is at work.

“A medical certificate as a condition of any marriage,” said Nietzsche, “endorsed by the parochial authorities, in which a series of questions addressed to the parties and the medical officers must be answered (family histories).” And he made this demand for the marriages of the future.

This has already been realized legislatively, as we have seen, in modern Germany.

Turning now to political forms and the licence permitted in criticizing them, Nietzsche's anti-democratic bias is, of course, well known, as is also the Fuehrer's. According to the latter, and I think rightly, democracy is the precursor of anarchy and communism; because as the suffrage is extended to the ranks of the ignorant, the purely subjective, and the foolish, who cannot see beyond the limits of their own self-interest, the democratic form of government necessarily leads to a chaotic clash of self-interested groups or sections, who are prepared to see their country perish before they will yield one iota of what they conceive to be their immediate advantage.

According to Nietzsche, democracy must be wrong because it means that the few successful throws of Nature's dice must be swamped by the mediocre, the inferior and the congenitally undesirable.

“I am opposed to parliamentary government and the power of the press,” he said, “because they are the means whereby cattle become masters.”

But to-day it is even worse than that. The advocates of democracy claim that it is no respecter of persons; but the real trouble is that it is no *disrespecter* of persons. This

means that parliamentary government is not only a means whereby cattle become masters, but also whereby *sick* and *degenerate* cattle become masters, and everybody, however ill-informed, is led to think that he has a right to discuss any problem.

Throughout the Parteitag the Fuehrer repeatedly emphasized the value to Germany of having rid herself of her democracy, her talking institutions, her overweening loose-lipped chatterboxes, and the voice of degeneracy and impudence at her council table. And here again, like Napoleon, Bismarck, and other eminent political thinkers, he showed his appreciation of silence as a healing force in the life of a wounded, disordered nation. Referring to the sacred years of inarticulate babyhood during which, as we now know, we acquire most of what ultimately determines our character as men, de Quincey spoke of "that mighty silence which infancy is thus privileged by nature and by position to enjoy." Nietzsche, too, was well aware of the value of silence and enjoins on those who would recover wisdom the duty of emulating the Pythagoreans.

But in a democracy the noise of chatter never ceases, the tongue of the nation never rests, and the impudence of degenerate nonentities is pampered and defended. When, therefore, the Fuehrer repeatedly assures Germany of the benefits of her silence, if only as a therapeutic measure, and points to the advantage which, as the silent nation, she now enjoys over all the vociferous and chattering nations of Western democracy, he once more reveals, if not the Nietzschean influence, at least a deep sympathy with the ideas of the latter-day German sage.

# Hitler and Nietzsche

*By Anthony M. Ludovici*

## II

**T**HE feature which chiefly marks the pronounced social change in National Socialist Germany is the new attitude towards manual labour and the working man, and the latter's new consciousness of his importance and dignity, in both of which matters the National Socialists have displayed considerable skill and psychological insight. The notion of making the spade, not the symbol of a class but of a service—a service to which every German, "Duke's son, Cook's son, son of a belted Earl", is supposed to belong for a certain length of time—was an excellent one. As the Führer said on the 10th September last, every German can now "look back and think with emotion of that period in his life when, irrespective of his class, origin or standing, he, with others of his countrymen, performed the same work, wore the same uniform, and bore the same weapon of work, calling them all his own."

This elevation of common physical labour above the plane of a mere bread-winning fatigue; this promotion of the sweat of men's brows to the rank of blood spilt in national defence, raised at one stroke the dignity and reward of labour above the price it could command. In fact, it divorced the whole question of wages from the kind and extent of the work done. For, as the Führer stated in his proclamation at the recent Parteitag: "It is not the wage or its amount that now counts."

All this is reminiscent of Nietzsche who, in the 'eighties of last century, wrote: "Workmen should learn to regard their duties as soldiers do. They receive emoluments, incomes, but they get no wages! There is no relationship between work done and money received; the individual should, according to his kind, be so placed as to perform the highest that is compatible with his powers."

But for such an aim to have been realized, a fundamental change had to come over the country. Work had to be transvalued. The ideas associated with the meanest work required to be linked up and drawn aloft on to the plane of national duty, love of country, and heroism and

self-sacrifice on the field of battle. And if this transvaluation has been so successfully accomplished that no worker in Germany now doubts that "work ennobles," it is chiefly to Adolf Hitler and his inspiration that the change is due. Amid the chaos of modern capitalistic exploitation, with its impersonal, almost abstract masters, standing aloof and not knowing or seeing the worker, it was no easy task to create a bond between the labourer and his work which had some of the feeling that bound the worker of former times to his employer. Nor was it simple, in a cynical humorous age like the present, to build up a reverence for the shouldered symbol of the new order, which is a common navvy's spade. But both these feats have been accomplished in modern Germany. Nietzsche's ideal of the workman as a soldier drawing emoluments which bear no relation to the value and honour of his service has been fulfilled, and his implement, the spade, is now the most respected symbol in the nation.

This does not claim to be more than a rapid sketch of the common ground between Nietzscheism and National Socialism\* ; but even as a tenuous outline it would be incomplete if I were to omit all mention of the attitude of the Führer and National-Socialism to Women.

This has been much debated in England, and some time before I paid my first visit to the new Germany I opened two public discussions in London on this very subject. At both these meetings I found the same errors and misunderstandings rife, which, according to my experience, cling like burrs to the Woman Problem in modern England—the idea that a man cannot more convincingly demonstrate his friendliness to women than by moving every power on earth to give them occupations and pastimes which a former generation associated only with men, and the idea that a man cannot more frankly avow his hostility to the female sex than by doing everything possible to secure for women an early marriage, children and domestic duties.

On both occasions I stood on a platform before an audience composed preponderatingly of young women and

\* See the article by the same author in the January issue of *The English Review*.

girls, and was told by my feminist opponent in the debate that I was only advocating a life of domesticity and motherhood for women because I was either jealous of women's competition or else standing as the spokesman of other jealous men.

In such an atmosphere, and amid such errors it is not surprising that Hitler's attitude is distorted and disfigured over here. And when, on 11th September, Hitler told an audience of over 20,000 German women and female visitors from abroad that "Foreigners say women are oppressed in Germany, trodden underfoot, enslaved and given no freedom and no equality of rights," he was entirely justified. "But," he continued, "we reply, what some regard as a yoke, others regard as a blessing; what some conceive as heavenly, others stigmatize as the very product of hell . . . an infinite field of labour lies open to women. Because for us woman has at all times been the most faithful workmate and life-mate of man. They tell us: 'You wish to drive women out of the professions!' No! I aspire only to giving her as many opportunities as possible to marry and to have children, because in that capacity she performs the highest service for her nation. Even if to-day we should find a woman lawyer doing most valuable work, and next door to her a mother with five, six, or seven children, who are all healthy and well brought up; then I say that, from the standpoint of the eternal worth of our people, she who has borne and brought up those children, and has thus assured our nation life in the future, has done much more, and much more valuable work."

And then he made the following profoundly wise statement: "A sound National Government must regard it as their duty to afford every man and woman the opportunity of winning the choice of their hearts, or at least facilitate their so doing. We are striving to effect this end through legislative means, above all by rearing up sound stocks. But, in addition to this purely legislative machinery, we have bestowed a further gift on women, in that we are training the male youth of the country, the menfolk of the future, for the German woman, for the German maiden."

This concentration upon an ideal of woman as wife,

mother and domestic mate, and this conviction that only thus can woman secure happiness and health, is in harmony not only with Nietzsche's views, but also with the latest findings of science. But while Nietzsche relied only on his extraordinarily sound judgment when he threw in his stake on the side of anti-Feminism (which should on no account be confused with misogyny), the National-Socialist leader has now, in supporting a similar standpoint, the whole of enlightened modern science behind him.

We now know that the penalty paid by women for renouncing normal functioning, i.e., motherhood and all that it involves, or even for curtailing its duration, as in family limitation, is very severe indeed; and when we reckon up the contribution of the Feminist eras in history to the culture and work of the world, and the vast amount of it that is merely either the duplication of mediocre men's work, or else an inferior emulation of it, we may well ask ourselves whether the pain and suffering women endure through the sterility or partial sterility, imposed by modern Feminist conditions, is justified by their contribution to the non-domestic life of the community, and therefore whether their virtual sacrifice is worth while.

The Führer thinks it is not. He thinks that on balance Feminism means a loss to the nation that tolerates it. Nietzsche thought the same.

"Would any link be missing in the whole chain of science or art," Nietzsche asks, "if woman, if woman's work, were excluded from it? Woman now writes, she now paints, she is losing her instincts. And to what purpose, if one may ask such a question?"

Again he says: "To be mistaken in the fundamental problem of 'man and woman,' to deny here the profoundest antagonism and the necessity for an eternally hostile tension, to dream here perhaps of equal rights, equal training, equal claims and obligations: that is a *typical* sign of shallow-mindedness; and a thinker who has proved himself shallow at this dangerous spot—shallow in instinct!—may generally be regarded as suspicious, nay more, as betrayed, as exposed! . . . Certainly, there are enough idiotic friends and corrupters of women amongst the learned

asses of the masculine sex, who advise woman to de-feminize herself in this manner, and to imitate all the stupidities from which 'man' in Europe, European 'manliness' suffers—who would like to lower women to 'general culture,' indeed even to newspaper reading and meddling in politics!"

What did Nietzsche understand by tenderness, chivalry? towards women? Precisely what the Führer understands, i.e., providing her with the means whereby she may function normally as a mother and a wife. All else he condemned as cruelty to women, no matter how ingeniously it decked itself out in pro-feminine frills and furbelows. And modern science is showing him to have been a thousand times right.

All real friends of woman—and this cannot be stated too often or too emphatically—have always assumed this position. And if the actual enemies of women have yet to be unmasked in England and recognized as the body of Feminists, male and female, who for over a hundred years, with ever-increasing noise and self-righteous bluster, have been advocating Birth Control, masculine careers for girls, female emancipation, and interests outside the home even for married women, it is merely because this country is still stubbornly disinclined to bend her head from the clouds and adopt a biological attitude towards humanity.

Hitler believes, as Nietzsche did, that the women of a country are what their menfolk make them. They do what their menfolk expect of them, and become the apes of their men's ideal. If, then, the women of a country strain after interests outside the home and are happy only when they are disporting themselves as men, it is to their menfolk that they ultimately owe their inspiration. This can be proved of any country in which Feminism has flourished.

"It is men who corrupt women," declared Nietzsche, "and everything that women lack should be atoned for and improved in men—for man creates for himself the ideal of woman, and woman moulds herself to this ideal. . . . We must educate men better."

Fifty—thirty years ago this was still impossible. The error of Feminism could not then have been shown

conclusively to be biologically unsound. To-day, however, science itself has given the anti-Feminist his best arguments.

If any doubt still remained concerning the fundamental similarity between Nietzscheism and much that is now advocated and put into practice by the National Socialists of Germany and their gifted leader—and I do not claim to have called attention to all the common ground between them—it would be necessary only to call attention to the rumblings of discontent which have been discernible in the two leading Churches of the Third Reich.

It is impossible here to deal with the phenomenon as a whole, but let it suffice to glance at one or two facts connected with the Evangelical section of the nation, and comment on their significance. To this end it will be necessary first to consider a certain prominent figure in German governing circles who, there can be little doubt, has played a prominent part in shaping National Socialist policy.

This man, Alfred Rosenberg by name, a native of the Baltic provinces and brought up on the Russian border amid the ferment of revolutionary ideas and movements, was from his earliest manhood in a position to acquire first-hand knowledge of both Bolshevism and Communism. When he came to Germany at the end of the War, his aim was to preserve his native land from Communistic infection, and soon after the November revolt of 1918 he was introduced to Hitler through Dietrich Eckart, and became the Editor of the *Völkischer Beobachter*. From the very start he helped to build up the National Socialist German Labour Party, and in 1923 marched with Hitler, Ludendorff, Goering and Roehm to the Feldherrnhalle. He did not forsake the Führer in his hour of need and, after the latter's return from the Fort of Landsberg, provided him with a new speaking-tube to the German people in the form of the *National Socialist Gazette*.

Now, in April, 1933, Alfred Rosenberg was appointed Foreign Secretary, and very soon afterwards, in February, 1934, was made head of the department in charge of the Education and Training of the Party Leaders. Meanwhile, however, i.e., in 1930, he had already published an important book, *Der Mythos des 20ten Jahrhunderts*, in which he had

outlined at least his own attitude to religion, politics and culture ; and this book which, by-the-bye, is on the *index librorum vetitorum*, became identified to a great extent with the ideology of National Socialism.

It is an extraordinary work, largely inspired by both Lagarde and Nietzsche, and it has sold in hundreds of thousands of copies. In time it was actually ordered by Kuft, the Minister of Education, to be placed in the libraries of all the higher schools in Germany.

It is not possible here to give any adequate summary of its contents. My own view, however, is that, properly understood, it is to a very large extent no more than a reasoned advocacy of Lagarde's proposed pedagogic reforms and of Nietzsche's leading eugenic and pre-Socratic values. It contains a good deal besides, but for the present purpose this description will suffice.

Needless to say, it provoked a storm of indignation, and the literature that has accumulated about it is already so extensive as to be wholly unwieldy. Dr. Walter Künneth, who made an elaborate reply to it on behalf of the Evangelical Church in 1935, was forestalled by numerous lesser attempts, among which I may mention those of the Rev. Heinrich Huffmeier (1934), J. Witte (1934), Helmuth Schreiner (1933) and many others.

The Party officially declined all responsibility for the personal religious views expressed in the *Mythus*, although it happened to be the work of one of their own members, and a very prominent one to boot. Seeing, however, that Rosenberg is now the head of the Education and Training Centre for the Party, the Evangelical Church refuses to accept the professed independence of his opinions and constantly returns to the charge, claiming that the principles of Christianity are assailed not merely by his treatise but also by much that he says in public and much that is said and done by his friends in the Government.

For instance, on 23rd August of this year, the Bruderrat of the Bekenntnis-Synode of the German Evangelical Church, and the Provisional Controlling Board of the German Evangelical Church, issued to their congregations a striking manifesto, in which they declared that Germany

now stands at the parting of the ways and that, "upon her decision now hangs the question whether the Christian Faith is any longer to continue to have the rights of citizenship in Germany." It went on to say that "the Gospel of Christ is to-day being assailed throughout the land with a vehemence and pertinacity never experienced before," and that "powerful forces in the State and in the National Socialist Party are concentrating on opposing the Gospel of Jesus Christ and all those who uphold it."

"Every Sunday in the year," the manifesto proceeds, "prayers are offered up both for the Führer and the Fatherland. Three years ago millions of evangelical Germans greeted the new beginning in the life of our people with the utmost enthusiasm. And they did so all the more gladly seeing that in its first proclamation of 1st February, 1933, the Government of the Reich declared that it would undertake steadfastly to protect Christianity as the basis of the nation's moral life."

"Nevertheless," say the writers of the manifesto, "Departments of State in Germany are turning against the Gospel of Jesus Christ . . . we have remained silent too long." And they go on to remind their readers how, in April, 1935, a memorial was forwarded by the German Evangelical Church to the Führer himself, deploring the fact that things had gone so far in Germany "that the honour of German citizens is now being trodden in the dust, because they are Christians" . . . and that "because of their faith in Jesus Christ they are scoffed and jeered at in every possible way—in the Press, on the Stage, in the lecture hall and at public meetings."

A further memorial on the same subject was forwarded to the Führer by the same Board this year, and all its claims were supported by evidence at every point. The members of the Bruderrat, moreover, declare that they took every precaution to maintain absolute secrecy about it, even concealing it from the various departments of their section of the Church, and it was in spite of this that reports of the document appeared in the foreign Press.

It is not possible in the space at my disposal to give the reader any idea of the nature of this Evangelical indictment

of the National Socialist régime ; but I may be given an opportunity of dealing with it on another occasion.

My present argument is, however, best served not by quoting the actual details of the Evangelical protest, but merely by emphasizing the fact that such a protest has been made ; because, to my mind, the indignation displayed by certain sections of the Evangelical community denotes the recognition by them of the important part Nietzsche's thought plays in the National Socialist Party.

Nevertheless, the fact that the Führer himself is a Catholic, that his Party undertook in 1933 to protect the Christian Faith in Germany, and that a considerable section of the Evangelical congregations still appear to be contented with the régime, should warn us against regarding the Nietzscheism of modern Germany as wholly consistent and thoroughgoing. It is much more prone to be eclectic and fragmentary, concentrating rather on Nietzsche's positive biological ideals in regard to man than on the negative and purely destructive aspects of his teaching. We should, in sooth, be nearer the mark if we concluded, in so far as Evangelical Christianity is concerned, that the crimes of the National Socialists consist not so much in their literal application of Nietzsche's teaching, as a whole, as in their wholehearted acceptance of his pre-Socratic values. The difference is an important one, and, as I see it, probably fundamental. For I venture to suggest that it is to a large extent paralleled by the difference between primitive and developed Christianity (in Newman's sense).

As I have pointed out above, Socrates effected a complete breach with the past. It was inevitably to prove most difficult to go back to pre-Socratic values after him. The biological attitude towards man was to a great extent moribund thenceforward. But Aristotle made a very serious and determined effort to revive it by combating the extreme consequences of Socratic dualism. Indeed, some say that this was the very spring of his life-work. Now, Aristotle was essentially the thinker of the developed Church and of the scholastic system, just as Socrates and St. Paul were the thinkers of primitive Christianity. Hence, possibly, as I see it, the many features of mediaeval life

which conflict with the Socratic values. Protestantism, however, was decidedly a swing back to Socrates. To Luther, Aristotle was "insolently opposed to divine grace, and consequently to God." Had he not been of flesh and blood, Luther declared, he would have thought him the Devil. In May, 1517, Luther wrote to his friend Lange: "Aristotle is tottering, and is on the point of collapsing for ever," and he declared that Aristotle's ethics rested on a purely human foundation, and was consequently to be rejected. In 1521, before a large congregation at Erfurt, he spoke of Aristotle as "the enemy of God," and until his death always regarded him as his "greatest adversary."

This attitude coloured the whole of Protestant thought which was to a great extent a return to primitive Christianity and Socrates. Thus Nietzscheism, which in one of its aspects is an attempt to restore pre-Socratic values, is sympathetic to Aristotle and, as any reader of Nietzsche knows, contains many attacks on Socrates and the Socratics. In addition, however, Protestantism was essentially a return to the Bible, and thence to the teachings and atmosphere of early Israelitish history. The Patriarchs Abraham and Jacob became, under Protestantism, the real heroes of the schoolchild. And here it is that Lagarde comes in with his strong antipathy to this very element in modern education. But, just as Lagarde did not cease to be intensely religious while maintaining this attitude on pedagogics, so, we must remember, there is nothing essentially anti-Christian in upholding Aristotle. If Catholicism to-day seems in many respects to sponsor a Reformed, Liberal and Socratic teaching, this is not because such a teaching is traditional in the Church, but because, in its conflicts with Reformed Christianity, it has inevitably been influenced by its opponent's tenets, just as English Conservatism has through the decades of Party politics become infected with Liberalism.

We are, therefore, entitled to infer that although protests from the Evangelical Church in Germany, and even from the Holy Catholic Church there, confirm the suspicion that the influence on National Socialism of both Lagarde and Nietzsche is far-reaching and profound, it does not

necessarily follow that the National Socialists are on that account alone anti-Christian. On the same principle one might try to argue that they must be in favour of an aristocratic form of government, and opposed to Socialism, or that they must be anti-Wagnerians and admirers only of Latin music and literature.

I suggest that all the protests of Evangelicalism and Catholicism mean is merely that in National Socialism we are confronted by another Reformed Christianity—a Christianity deliberately being purged of much of the acquired Socraticism which is unessential to it, and is hostile to a biological attitude towards humanity—and an educational programme liberated, or on the way to becoming liberated, from the pronounced influence of a foreign people's early history, an influence which, as none can deny, tends to stamp on the minds of the young in Protestant countries the values and images of a gallery of heroes who, marvellous and edifying though they may be, are too often allowed to overshadow both in the memory and folklore of a Christian people all knowledge of their native worthies.

Hence, I submit, the frequent coupling of the names of Lagarde and Nietzsche by those leading members of the National Socialist Party who are responsible for the outlook and sentiments of modern Germany, and hence, too, the consistency of Nietzschean and Lagardian influence in National Socialism with an attitude still friendly to Christianity although, perhaps, it would be extravagant to hope that the Evangelical Church of Germany should be able to see the matter precisely in this light.