



ADOLF HITLER:

From Common Bigotry to Scientific Racism to Genocide

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4411933

Included is a chapters from Vol. 1 of **The Eugenics Anthology** book series: **“From a ‘Race of Masters’ to a ‘Master Race’: 1948 to 1848.”** This chapter is separated out because it covers a specific issue about Adolf Hitler’s evolution from common bigot to genocidal maniac. It is a transformation that is apparent in the timeline of Hitler’s speeches. To the knowledge of this author, no one else has taken note of the discernable change in rhetoric in Hitler’s speeches. Adolf Hitler went from common bigot equipped with the musings of a pedestrian crank, to surfacing from his stint in jail as a genocidal maniac equipped with the scientific racism of Ivy League biologists.

This is a discernible and all-important change in Hitler’s type of racialism. A survey of Hitler’s pre-Landsberg speeches and his post-Landsberg speeches demonstrate this shift in Hitler’s rhetoric. Of note is that Adolf Hitler changed his racial rhetoric from defining the Jewish population as the cunning oppressors to characterizing them as the feeble vermin. These are two diametrically opposed characterizations that cannot be reconciled. While both views are that of a racist, they are polar opposites in the type of racism they are derived from and represent. Common bigotry pollutes the mind of the single bigot. Scientific racism is a well-honed tool for the politically entrenched and powerful. The later being much more dangerous than the other.

This divergence and evolution can only be explained with Hitler’s introduction to medical and scientific knowledge. J.F. Lehmann, Hitler’s publisher, brought him books on the International eugenics movement as he was writing “Mein Kampf” while imprisoned in Landsberg. The result of this “education” was the transformation of the man that was nothing more than a pedestrian crank spewing worn-out and commonplace grievances against the Jewish population. The Hitler that emerged from Landsberg was equipped with the much more dangerous “racialist” repertoire of Ivy League biologists and Oxford economists.

- **A.E. Samaan**, Jan/02/2021

Sec. 5 - FROM OPPRESSED TO OPPRESSOR:

The Beer Hall Putsch, Hitler's attempt at violent revolution was inspired by Benito Mussolini's successful March on Rome. As this book has earlier opined, Hitler's experience at trial and later stay in jail were critical and important learning experiences for the evolving dictator. This transformation from failed thug to informed political figure was critical to the evolution of National Socialism, as historians have also noted that thereafter Hitler insisted in gaining, amassing, and achieving power only through legal means, or at least means that gave the appearance of legality. This is no small turn of events, and it must be noted that this *modus operandi* only became more pervasive after Hitler had consolidated political power.

While in Landsberg, Hitler read a lot of books. Hitler would describe his spell in prison as “free education at the state’s expense.” Of critical importance is the book hand-delivered by J.F. Lehmann, Hitler’s publisher, financier, and sympathizer. “*Grundriss der Menschlichen Erblchkeitslehre und Rassenhygiene*,” or in English the “Principles of Human Heredity and Racial Hygiene” was written by Eugen Fischer, Fritz Lenz, and Erwin Baur. It comprehensively detailed the “science” of eugenics. The book was first published by J.f. Lehmann in 1923, and it is quite literally the “scientific” blueprint for Hitler’s racial policies. The book has come to be known by historians as the “Baur-Fischer-Lenz” book or as “Human Heredity,” the title given to the English edition. The “Human Heredity” edition was translated in 1931 by Eden & Cedar Paul.

Hitler is also quoted by historians as stating that he had “studied with great interest the laws of several American states concerning prevention of reproduction by people whose progeny would, in all probability, be of no value or be injurious to the racial stock.”¹ The “Baur-Fischer-Lenz” book was the primary source of that study. While some historians of the eugenics movement make a direct reference to the “Baur-Fischer-Lenz” book as influencing Hitler's views of eugenics, the actual contents of the book have not been adequately documented by American historians. The book is replete with references to the anti-miscegenation laws of the United States and the eugenic laws of Britain:

For the sake of completeness we must glance at the Negroes outside Africa,

¹ Pg. 37 – “The Nazi Connection: Eugenics, American Racism, and German National Socialism”, Stefan Kuhl, Oxford Univ. Press, 2002.

and above all in the United States. In the American Union we find a peculiar intermediate type which has been produced by the indiscriminate crossing of all sorts of Negroid stocks, so that individual characters are chaotically intermingled without the formation of a genuinely new race. The American Negroes have, however, retained the typical Negroid characters, the mental ones not excepted. Where they have been left pretty much to themselves (as, for instance, in Jamaica), isolated groups have relapsed into states of primitive culture (fetish, voodoo, etc.), and have become what are sometimes termed "Bush Negroes." (Pg. 206, Description of Races of Man chapter, "Human Heredity," English version: Eden & Ceder Paul, 1931)

"Human Heredity" juxtaposes Charles B. Davenport's studies of black-white intermixing with Eugen Fischer's study of the Hottentots interracial children from German colonies, or the "Rehobother Bastards" as labeled by Fischer:

F.L. Hoffmann reports that in his experience the individuals who in the southern States of the American Union enter into mixed marriages or illegal relationships between white and coloured, are far below the average of the two races. (Pg. 691, Chap.: Racial Psychology, "Human Heredity," citing "Race Traits and Tendencies of the American Negro, New York, 1896; Negro-White Intermixture and Intermarriage, in Eugenics in Race and State, Baltimore, 1923)

The book references Francis Galton's work at least 11 times and Galton's book "Hereditary Genius" five times. The authors give Francis Galton credit for being the father, not just of "eugenics" but its German iteration, "racial hygiene"; a pretty big crown to be awarded by the intellectual leaders of Hitler's infamous Nuremberg Laws, as well as proof that Hitler's top scientists recognized that their "racial hygiene" policies originated from Anglo "eugenics," precisely the distinction the Allied prosecution at Nuremberg evaded:

Galton was the founder of racial hygiene. In the domain of genetics, indeed, he had clearer notions than had his cousin Darwin, and he can be placed beside Mendel as a pioneer in the modern study of heredity. (Pgs. 575-576, Chap.: The Inheritance of Talents, "Human Heredity," English version: Eden & Ceder Paul, 1931)

The book references Charles B. Davenport on 18 separate instances, more than Darwin and Galton themselves. The Cold Spring Harbor Eugenic Records Office is referenced 8 times. Harry H. Laughlin's work is referenced at least 3 times,

namely his 1922 book “Eugenic Sterilization in the United States,” where Laughlin's “Model Eugenical Sterilization Law” was first published. It specifically refers to Davenport’s work in biometrics of all US Army men enrolled in World War II which was published in 1921. ² In fact, the book relies substantially on the pedigree studies of families specifically ones produced by Charles B. Davenport and Harry H. Laughlin. One of the works cited for inherited feeble-mindedness comes from Davenport’s Eugenic Record Office publication of 1912 titled “Hill Folk,” which included mention of the infamous “Kallikak” and “Jukes” dysgenic family studies. Of specific importance to a study of the Holocaust and the infamous “twin studies” conducted by Dr. Mengele at Auschwitz is the fact that much of the book’s inquiry into twins came from Davenport’s “Influence of the Male in the Production of Human Twins,” which had previously been published in “American Naturalist,” Vol. XXXIV in 1920. The Morbific Heredity Factors chapter of “Human Heredity” address twins and especially those with birth defects.

The admiration Adolf Hitler had for Henry Ford has also been widely documented by historians and here again, the “Baur-Fischer-Lenz” book serves as a likely source where this admiration was bolstered as rational and scientific. Henry Ford and “The International Jew” is quoted by the “Baur-Fischer-Lenz” book on 3 separate occasions, insultingly enough as an authority on the psychology of Jews:

The theaters are for the most part in the hands of Jews; in the United States exclusively so, according to Henry Ford. The same is true of the movies. A large proportion of daily newspapers and other periodicals are issued by Jews, edited by Jews, and provided with articles by Jewish journalists. The legal profession would almost seem to have been created especially for Jews. (Pg. 668)

CONTINUES . . .

Where the Jews form only a small minority, the economic position is as a rule an extremely good one. Their influence and their power will be found to be much greater than is proportional to their numbers. Salaman shows this as regards England, and Ford as regards the United States. (Pg. 670, “Human Heredity,” chapter: Racial Psychology, English version: Eden & Ceder Paul, 1931)

² Pg. 198 - “Human Heredity,” Eugen Fischer, Fritz Lenz, Erwin Baur, English version: Eden & Ceder Paul, 1931.

Of note is that Nietzsche is quoted and referenced on 9 separate instances, largely as an example of the genius mentality, but also as a philosophical reference.

“The cultivation of suffering, of great suffering – do you know that this and nothing but this has hitherto led to all the advancement of mankind?”- Thus writes Nietzsche. (Pg. 618, “Human Heredity,” chapter: Talent and Psychopathy, English version: Eden & Ceder Paul, 1931)

Why is the “Baur-Fischer-Lenz” book important in the timeline leading up to The Holocaust? With the “Baur-Fischer-Lenz” book J.F. Lehmann succeeded in transforming Adolf Hitler from the racism of a typical uneducated foot soldier, who felt victimized and “stabbed-in-the-back” by powerful Jewish forces, to a Hitler which now saw himself as part of the elite, justified by science in his racism and desire for a racially pure society. J.F. Lehmann made Adolf Hitler a eugenicist and a scientific racist by delivering the “Baur-Fischer-Lenz” book on the precise moment when Hitler was reconciling all his views into “Mein Kampf.” J.F. Lehmann provided Hitler a book about eugenic legalisms precisely at the juncture when Hitler was rethinking his revolutionary strategy from a violent to a legal one. Ernst Hanfstaengl, the Harvard educated Foreign Secretary noticed a change in Hitler’s anti-Semitism at this critical juncture, although he attributed it to influence by Hitler’s cellmates at Landsberg:

He seemed to have come out of Landsberg with all his worst prejudices reinforced. I am sure that this is the point at which his latent radical tendencies started to crystallize, although there were still years to go before he became the unteachable, unreasonable and unapproachable fanatic whom the world knows from his days of power. The year he spent in Landsberg, instead of giving him time to sit back and take a broader view of political problems, had only given those imprisoned with him an opportunity to narrow his mind within their own confined limits. His anti-Semitism had acquired even more specific racial undertones. Between them, they had filled his mind with fury about the French use of Senegalese troops in the Ruhr during the occupation, and I am not at all sure that this was not the starting-point of the racial purity laws which the Nazis finally evolved. They would pick these ideas up and embroider on them and, to bolster their arguments, even quote such respected sources as Bernard Shaw, who was not averse to advocating the necessity of breeding human beings according to the standards we have developed in the domestic animal world. (Pgs. 120-121, “Hitler: The Memoir of the Nazi Insider Who Turned Against the Fuhrer”, 1957, Republished by Arcade Pub., 2011)

If Hanfstaengl is right, then Hitler gleaned the idea of “breeding human beings” as a result of his prison education. This is no small revelation. It is a critical observation to make if one is to understand when and where Hitler made the all-important conversion from street-level bigotry to genocidal despot. In turn, it is important to ask where Baur, Fischer, or Lenz obtained such detailed information about American and British eugenic policies? Paul Lombardo provides the answer:

In late 1920, Erwin Baur wrote to the ERO for information on US sterilization practices that he could distribute to “his committee of eugenic advisors for the German government. Davenport referred the inquiry to Harry Laughlin, a recognized expert on sterilization who had just completed an article on national eugenics in Germany that would appear in the London-based *Eugenics Review*. There Laughlin praised the “Teutonic stock” and its instincts for self-preservation memorialized in a new constitution. He believed the time was “ripe for the development of a [German] national eugenical policy” and told Davenport that he would be “especially interested in the success that Dr. Baur’s committee has in developing eugenical interest in Germany.” Laughlin’s correspondents eventually included a virtual who’s who of German eugenics. In addition to Baur, Ploetz, and Rüdin, he knew Fritz Lenz, a coauthor of the influential eugenics text. Lenz wrote to Laughlin in 1928, asking permission to reprint a Laughlin paper on sterilization in a German eugenics journal. Eugen Fischer was the third coauthor of that volume, and he developed a particularly collegial relationship with Laughlin. More than once, Fischer and Laughlin had each other’s articles translated for publication in both Germany and the United States. (Pg. 200, “Three Generations No Imbeciles: Eugenics, the Supreme Court, and *Buck v. Bell*”, Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008)

Hitler was fed the knowledge that had been the longstanding project of people like Davenport, Laughlin, Galton, Pearson, and Darwin, and the result was a fundamental shift in Hitler's revolution. The revolutionary that entered the jail cell was best known for leveraging the “stabbed-in-the-back” myth, which painted a picture of a German people allegedly victimized by “International Jewry.” The Hitler that emerged was a prophet of Aryan superiority. Ponder upon the drastic differences in these two conceptions. These are two drastically different and diametrical opposite views of the German people; superiority and victim status cannot be reconciled.

Historians must take note of this fundamental change, which can only be

attributed to Hitler's "indoctrination" into the eugenics creed. Aside from Hansfaengl's observation, one can verify this shift in Hitler's mindset by tracking it in his speeches. Hitler relied heavily on speeches in order to attain power, so the changing themes in these speeches are the best way to chart a shift in his thinking. According to Norman H. Baynes', the editor of 1942 book, "The Speeches of Adolf Hitler," Hitler's first speech was on April 12, 1922. In these early speeches, Hitler adopted themes of "interest slavery," and the "November criminals," which was a direct reference to the "stabbed-in-the-back" myth that alluded that German Jews of a Bolshevik political taint betrayed the German soldiers in World War I:

"Christian capitalism" is already as good as destroyed, the international Jewish Stock Exchange capital gains in proportion as the other loses ground. It is only the international Stock Exchange and loan-capital, the so-called "supra-state (*überstaatliche*) capital," which has profited from the collapse of our economic life, "the capital which receives its character from the single supra-state nation which is itself national to the core, which fancies itself to be above all other nations, which places itself above other nations and which already rules over them. (Pg. 7, "Speeches of Adolf Hitler: April 1922-August 1939", Oxford Univ. Press along with the Royal Institute of International Affairs in England, 1942)

On September 18, 1922, Hitler carried on with the theme of "The Stock Exchange Revolution of 1918," illustrating that local economics was of secondary concern to the greater conflict he saw at play at a world stage; the Jewish influence of democratic egalitarianism and equality. Note again the emphasis on "international":

Internationalization to-day means only Judaization. We in Germany have come to this: that a sixty-million people sees its destiny to lie at the will of a few dozen Jewish bankers. This was possible only because our civilization had first been Judaized. The undermining of the German conception of personality by catchwords had begun long before. Ideas such as 'Democracy', 'Majority', 'Conscience of the World', 'World-solidarity', 'World-peace', 'Internationality of Art', &c. disintegrate our race-consciousness, breed cowardice, and so to-day we are bound to say that the simple Turk is no more man than we are. — No salvation is possible until the bearer of disunion, the Jew, has been rendered powerless to harm. (Pg. 42, "Speeches of Adolf Hitler: April 1922-August 1939", Oxford Univ. Press along with the Royal Institute of International Affairs in England, 1942)

From very early on, Hitler makes plain that he was neither a man of the “Left,” which he identifies as beholden to either “International” Communism or “International” capital nor was he a man of the “Right,” which he claimed was exploitative of the working class. He held equal condemnation for them, and blamed them both for helping the Jews oppress people like himself:

There were Jews who in politics took the side of the Right: they were there to see to it that people did not have their eyes opened their eyes. . . . This was their only object for joining the Right; for the most part they acted as “leaders of the proletariat” for the working classes. ---- The guilt of the Jews lies in the fact that they have “agitated” the masses into this November madness. When we look at the parties we see on the Left lying and deceit on the part of the leaders, blind faith on the part of the led and all alike in the service of a single aim: to destroy this State, to rob this people of its freedom, to enslave its labour-strength. On the Right we see that the masses in part recognize the true position, but among the leaders there is limitless incapacity. There are but two alternatives: either “remain quiet and become slaves,” or Resistance. And if you decide for resistance who will lead you? “the Left? First: it does not wish to do so; and secondly, it cannot do so. For your leaders of the Left are still the same as those who scourged you into this misery . . . The same Jew who, whether as majority Socialist or Independent, led you then leads you still: whether as Independent or as Communist, whatever he calls himself, he is still the same.” (Pgs. 8-9, “Speeches of Adolf Hitler: April 1922-August 1939”, Oxford Univ. Press along with the Royal Institute of International Affairs in England, 1942)

Hitler makes it clear through his public speaking that he identifies the Jew with Bolshevism or “International” Communism:

While now in Soviet Russia the millions are ruined and are dying, Chicherin – and with him a staff of over 200 Soviet Jews – travels by express train through Europe, visits the cabarets, watches naked dancers perform for his pleasure, lives in the finest hotels, and does himself better than the millions whom once you thought you must fight as ‘Bourgeois’. The 400 Soviet Commissars of Jewish nationality – they do not suffer, the thousands upon thousands of Sub-Commissars – they do not suffer. No! all the treasures which the ‘Proletarian’ in his madness took from the ‘Bourgeoisie’ in order to fight so-called capitalism – they have all gone into their hands. --- But the bread is in the hands of the State Central Organization and this is in the hands of the Jews: so everything, everything that the common man thought that he was winning for himself, flows back again to his seducers. (Pgs. 9-10, “Speeches of Adolf Hitler: April 1922-August 1939”, Oxford Univ.

Press along with the Royal Institute of International Affairs in England, 1942)

Hitler opined that the interests of the “International” Jewish community were to maintain an ongoing and never-ending Communist Revolution, in order to keep reaping the profits he describes above. Hitler characterizes the Soviet “Revolution” with the “land of milk and honey,” which is the promise-land according to Old Testament scripture:

And now, my dear fellow-country men, do you believe that these men, who with us are going the same way, will end the Revolution? They do not wish the end of the Revolution, for they do not need it. For them the Revolution is milk and honey. (Pgs. 9-10, “Speeches of Adolf Hitler: April 1922-August 1939”, Oxford Univ. Press along with the Royal Institute of International Affairs in England, 1942)

From very early on in these first speeches, Hitler makes it clear that the “Right” was confused and held back by clinging to what Hitler regarded as outdated and outmoded conservative and traditional political models:

And there is another fundamental error: they have never got it clear in their own minds that there is a difference on how a great a difference there is between the conception of ‘National’ and the word ‘dynastic’ or ‘monarchistic.’ They do not understand that to-day it is more than ever necessary in our thought as Nationalists to avoid anything which might perhaps cause the individual to think that the National Idea was identical with petty everyday political views. (Pg. 12, “Speeches of Adolf Hitler: April 1922-August 1939”, Oxford Univ. Press along with the Royal Institute of International Affairs in England, 1942)

Hitler also detested the tendency of the conservative “Right” to depend on “Jewish democracy” to rule. Hitler announced his hatred of “democracy” in his speech by immediately instituting the “Leadership Principle” and abandoning any sort of parliamentary system of committees and majority voting within the Party:

And the Right has further completely forgotten that Democracy is fundamentally not German: it is Jewish. It has completely forgotten that this Jewish democracy with its majority decisions has always been without exception only a means towards the destruction of any existing Aryan leadership. (Pg. 13, “Speeches of Adolf Hitler: April 1922-August 1939”, Oxford Univ. Press along with the Royal Institute of International Affairs in England, 1942)

It is also in these early speeches that Hitler qualified the collectivist and socialist aspect of his movement. In his speech delivered on April 27, 1923, on “The Paradise of the Jew or the State of the German People,” Hitler drummed up the hardline Socialist theme of attacking private property. Clearly, this was a message intended to warn the “Right” as to the economic intentions of the National Socialists to confiscate private property:

And land (*Grund und Boden*), we must insist, cannot be made an object for speculation. Private property can be only that which a man has gained for himself, has won through his work. A natural product is not private property, that is national property. Land is thus no object for bargaining. – Further, there must be a reform in our law. Our present law regards only the rights of the individual. It does not regard the protection of the race, the protection of the community of the people. It permits the befouling of the nation’s honour and of the greatness of the nation. A law which is so far removed from the conception of the community of the people is in need of reform. (Pg. 65, “Speeches of Adolf Hitler: April 1922-August 1939”, Oxford Univ. Press along with the Royal Institute of International Affairs in England, 1942)

The early speeches also help to clarify other core concepts of Hitlerism. Hitler’s claim that he is both against “capitalism” and “communism” has been a real source of confusion for historians, for it’s a seeming contradiction if understood in the polarized politics of today. First, this is a simplistic understanding that is mostly the product of the polarized Cold War two-party system in the United States, which sees left vs. right as “capitalism” vs. “communism.” It forgets that “National Socialism” as created by Edward Bellamy, and then followed by British Fabians and American Progressives was meant as a “third way.” Hitler understood “nation” to be one and the same with “race,” and that any cooperation or socialist coordination was most natural when it occurred amongst people of a shared ethnic background, as opposed to the economic class distinctions of the Marxists. Hitler’s position is explained in these early speeches:

Every truly national idea is in the last resort social, i.e. he who is prepared so completely to adopt the cause of his people that he really knows no higher ideal than the prosperity of this – his own – people, he who has so taken to hear the meaning of our great song ‘Deutschland, Deutschland über alles’, that nothing in this world stands for him higher than this Germany, people and land, land and people, **he is a Socialist!** (emphasis mine, Pg. 35)

And again:

And one can see constantly how wonderfully the Stock Exchange Jew and the leader of the workers, how the Stock Exchange Jew organ and the journal of the workers, co-operate. They both pursue one common policy and a single aim. Moses Kohn on the one side encourages his association to refuse the workers' demands, while his brother Isaac in the factory incites the masses and shouts, 'Look at them! They only want to oppress you! Shake off your fetters . . . ' His brother takes care that the fetters are well and truly forged. (Pg. 29, "Speeches of Adolf Hitler: April 1922-August 1939", Oxford Univ. Press along with the Royal Institute of International Affairs in England, 1942)

To further underscore the socialist aspect of "National Socialism," Hitler delivered a speech on May Day Festival, May 1st, 1923, in which he promised that May Day, a socialist holiday, would be a yearly festival in the Third Reich:

So on the 1st of May can be only a glorification of the national creative will over against the conception international disintegration, of the liberation of the nation's spirit and of its economic outlook from the infection of internationalism. – Our will is to be National Socialists – not National in the current sense of the word—not National by halves. We are National Socialist fanatics, not dancers on the tight-rope of moderation! (Pg. 68, "Speeches of Adolf Hitler: April 1922-August 1939", Oxford Univ. Press along with the Royal Institute of International Affairs in England, 1942)

For Hitler, the State was the "essential character of the people." Economics was secondary, as long as the State was the "fusing together" of those who "have still a German heart and a love for their people in the fight against the common hereditary foe of the Aryans." ³ None of this meant that Hitler's "third way" was in any way, shape or form the party of the independents or the party of the middle compromise. The "socialism" that Hitler describes was radicalized by its racialism. He clearly intended to usurp the "socialist" forms and radicalize them along "nationalistic" boundaries that were drawn upon ethnicity. Hitler proposes the alternative to the Soviet Bolshevism and the ineptitude and corruption of the conservatives precisely by proposing a socialism radicalized by a racial nationalism, prophesizing that it would be "a sorry day for them when this Socialist idea is

³ Pg. 12 - "Speeches of Adolf Hitler: April 1922-August 1939", Oxford Univ. Press along with the Royal Institute of International Affairs in England, 1942.

grasped by a Movement which unites it with the highest Nationalist pride, with Nationalist defiance.”⁴

In fact, that first speech of April 12th, 1922 in which Adolf Hitler gives his most coherent explanation of what precisely was the concept of National Socialism:

1. ‘National’ and ‘social’ are two identical conceptions. It was only the Jew who succeeded, thought falsifying the social idea and turning it into Marxism, not only in divorcing the social idea from the national, but in actually representing them as utterly contradictory. That aim he has in fact achieved. --- We said to ourselves that to be ‘national’ means above everything to act with boundless and all-embracing love for the people and, if necessary, even to die for it. And similarly to be ‘social’ means so to build up the State and the community of the people that every individual acts in the interest of the community of the people and must be to such an extent convinced of the goodness, of the honourable straightforwardness of this community of the people as to be ready to die for it. (Pg. 14)

2. And then we said to ourselves: there are no such things as classes: they cannot be. Class means caste and caste means race. If there are castes in India, well and good; there it is possible, for there there were formerly Aryans and dark aborigines. So it was in Egypt and in Rome. But with us in Germany where everyone who is a German at all has the same blood, has the same eyes and speaks the same language, here there can be no class, here there can be only a single people and beyond that nothing else... (Pgs. 15-16)

3. And in the third place it was clear to us that this particular view is based on an impulse which springs from our race and from our blood. We said to ourselves that race differs from race and, further, that each race in accordance with its fundamental demands shows externally certain specific tendencies, and these tendencies can perhaps be most clearly traced in their relation to the conception of work. The Aryan regards work as the foundation for the maintenance of the community of the people among its members, the Jew regards work as the means to the exploitation of other peoples. (Pgs. 16-17)

4. And fourthly we were further persuaded that economic prosperity is inseparable from political freedom and that therefore that house of lies, ‘Internationalism’, must immediately collapse. (Pgs. 17-18, “Speeches of Adolf Hitler: April 1922-August 1939”, Oxford Univ. Press along with the Royal Institute of International Affairs in England, 1942)

⁴ Pg. 11 – Ibid.

Hitler closes by identifying the “International Jew” as the “November criminals” or, in other words, the ones responsible for “stabbing” the German soldier in the back:

And finally we were also the first to point the people on any large scale to a danger which insinuated itself into our midst – a danger which millions failed to realize and which will none the less lead us all into ruin – the Jewish danger. (Pg. 19, “Speeches of Adolf Hitler: April 1922-August 1939”, Oxford Univ. Press along with the Royal Institute of International Affairs in England, 1942)

Taken as a whole, Hitler’s first speech presents a well-formed conception of what “National Socialism” would become, and as this is how Göring and Brandt defined the Party when interrogated in the Nuremberg Trials. It was also the description of the movement by those that survived it to recount it in retrospect, as Albert Speer did when he wrote his memoirs. This is also the conception of the movement that Joseph Goebbels describes in his diary, and the description of the movement which American OSS intelligence reports depict.

The evidence found in the memoirs of his close associates also points to Hitler's indoctrination into the eugenics. Hitler had been jailed before. There was an unproductive four-week imprisonment two years earlier in 1922 between Hitler’s first and second speech. Hitler dedicated himself to the researching and the writing of “Mein Kampf” during his second jail sentence, while at Landsberg prison. The 1924 imprisonment at Landsberg, which produced “Mein Kampf,” must be compared to the unproductive 1922 imprisonment, as the absence of policy developments are important toward an understanding of exactly when and where these policies were adopted. Analyzing the contents of these early speeches is crucial in answering the question of when Hitler became genocidal. Case in point, Hitler emerged from that first four-week imprisonment to give a speech on July 28, 1922, with any policy of genocide or mass murder conspicuously absent:

Everywhere—in Russia, in Italy, in France, and in England – he saw a vast battle in progress between the ideals of the nationalist and those of the supra-State International. “It is a battle which began nearly 120 years ago, at the moment when the Jew was granted citizen rights in the European States. The political emancipation of the Jews was the beginning of an attack of delirium. For thereby there were given full citizen rights and equality to a people which was much more clearly and definitely a race apart than all

others, that has always formed and will form a State within the State. (Pg. 21, "Speeches of Adolf Hitler: April 1922-August 1939", Oxford Univ. Press along with the Royal Institute of International Affairs in England, 1942)

Hitler tied his imagined debacle of civilization with the emigration from rural to urban, where the Jewish influence was felt in "moneyfication" of the nation:

Especially in England crowds of farm labourers, sons of farmers, or even ruined farmers themselves streamed into the towns and there formed a new fourth estate (Stand). But here one fact is of more importance than we are accustomed to admit: this England, like France, had relatively few Jews. And the consequence of that was that the great masses, concentrated in towns, did not come into immediate contact with this alien nation. (Pgs. 22-23)

Hitler continued this early speech with his disdain for "self-government" and "democracy":

As everyone knows, this system is given some such name as 'Self-Government of a People'. Besides this we always find two great catchwords, 'Freedom' and 'Democracy', used, I might say, as signboards. 'Freedom': under that term is understood, at least among those in authority who in fact carry on the Government, the possibility of an unchecked plundering of the masses of the people to which no resistance can be offered. The masses themselves naturally believe that under the term 'freedom' they possess the right to a quite peculiar freedom of motion – freedom to move the tongue and to say what they choose, freedom to move about the streets. A bitter deception! – And the same is true of democracy. (Pg. 24, "Speeches of Adolf Hitler: April 1922-August 1939", Oxford Univ. Press along with the Royal Institute of International Affairs in England, 1942)

Hitler spares no effort to advance the concepts popularized by Henry Ford through the "Protocols of Zion" and the "International Jew." The themes are plagiaristic and unoriginal. Pregnant as they were with the most acidic Jew-hating rhetoric, it is important to note that these speeches only identified why and how Jews had come to be regarded by Hitler as the enduring enemies of his beloved "Aryans." They pretend to prophesize a great collision between "Internationalism" in the form of "Jewish capitalism," "Bolshevik Communism," and his "National Socialism." However, these speeches lean towards a defensive stance, if not to overtly demonize the "International Jew" as the alleged aggressor, and the Aryan,

not as “master,” but as a victim:

On one point there should be no doubt: we will not let the Jews slit our gullets and not defend ourselves. To-day in Berlin they may already be arranging their festival-dinners with the Jewish hangmen of Soviet-Russia – they will never do that here. (Pg. 39, “Speeches of Adolf Hitler: April 1922-August 1939”, Oxford Univ. Press along with the Royal Institute of International Affairs in England, 1942)

The Versailles war reparations that the Allies placed on the Germans were based upon “war guilt,” or in other words, who was responsible for instigating World War I. Hitler gave his opinion on whom had instigated and profited from the war on April 17, 1923:

“Who,” he asked “were the real rulers of Germany in 1914 to whom war guilt might be attributed: not the Kaiser, not the Pan-Germans, but Messrs. Ballin, Bleichröder, Mendelssohn, &c., a whole brood of Hebrews who formed the unofficial Government. And in 1914 the real ruler of the Reich was Her Bethmann-Hollweg, “a descendant of a Jewish family of Frankfurt—the genuine article, and in his every act the Yiddish philosopher all over. (Pgs. 54-54, “Speeches of Adolf Hitler: April 1922-August 1939”, Oxford Univ. Press along with the Royal Institute of International Affairs in England, 1942)

On April 20th, 1923, Hitler spoke on “Politics and Race: why are we Anti-Semites?” paralleling what Americans of this era propagandized as the “Yellow Peril” of Chinese immigration, and belittling those concerns against the German’s “Jewish Peril”:

The German people was once clear thinking and simple: why has it lost these characteristics? Any inner renewal is possible only if one realizes that this is a question of race: America forbids the yellow peoples to settle there, but this is a lesser peril than that which stretches out its hand over the entire world—the Jewish peril. Many hold that the Jews are not a race, but is there a second people anywhere in the wide world which is so determined to maintain its race? (Pg. 59, “Speeches of Adolf Hitler: April 1922-August 1939”, Oxford Univ. Press along with the Royal Institute of International Affairs in England, 1942)

More to the point, about the closest Hitler ever came to eugenic or genocidal concepts in the early speeches was in calling for the cultural exclusion of the Jews, but does so explicitly claiming that the influential Jews would no longer drown out

the German voices if they were segregated:

Clear away the Jews! Our own people has genius enough—we need no Hebrews. If we were to put in their place intelligences drawn from the great body of our people, then we should have recovered the bridge which leads to the community of the people. – Finally we need a reform in the sphere of art, literature, and the theater. The Government must see to it that its people is not poisoned. There is a higher right which is based on the recognition of that which harms a people, and that which harms a people must be done away with. (Pg. 66, “Speeches of Adolf Hitler: April 1922-August 1939”, Royal Institute of International Affairs in England, 1942)

We have a backward view of history, analyzing it by coloring that the latest developments give historical events. This is our viewpoint: a white-supremacist Hitler who regarded Jews as lower than humans, and barely as formidable as a pestilent species. When one reads the speeches given between 1920 and 1924 one is struck by the recurring theme of German victimhood and Jewish aggression and cunning, which is the diametric opposite of the white-supremacist views Hitler would later propagandize. This is an all-important distinction to understand if one is to comprehend the roots of the genocidal acts that would follow. Conspicuous enough is the absence of a policy of annihilation of the Jews or any elements Hitler and his henchmen would later identify as undesirable to their “National Socialist” community. Historians quibble as to when Hitler’s racism appeared during his lifespan, and as opined earlier, this is the wrong question to ask. There have always been and always be “racists.” The more important question is when Adolf Hitler turned petty racism into a plan of annihilation and genocide. The identification of the “International Jew” as the enemy was clearly present in his first speech, but there is no mention or allusion as to how to address the advances of this alleged enemy. This is why the more appropriate question is when Hitler’s policies became murderous, and when his “Ideal State” became the mechanism and engine of the destruction of entire portions of both Aryans and Jews.

If we are to adequately answer this poignant question, it is crucial to note that the most important shift in strategy is the immeasurably important shift from characterizing the Aryans as the oppressed and defeated nation of humble laborers by a cunning and formidable onslaught of the “International Jew,” to that of Germans as a superior race whose biological and cultural superiority could only be diminished by inclusion of the allegedly inferior, pestilent, downtrodden and

disease-ridden Jew. This is a shift that can only be attributed to the white-supremacy inherent in the eugenic creed and the “science” and law documented in the “Baur-Fischer-Lenz” book that was delivered to Hitler while imprisoned at Landsberg in 1924. This shift from the defeated and vanquished German to an arrogant white-supremacy is an all-important one, as it is the “scientific” justification for the Nuremberg laws that were implemented in 1933 and 1935. This was the justification for the T4 Euthanasia program that annihilated half-a-million “Aryans” and whose technology and personnel were later transferred to the extermination camps to carry out the Final Solution. It was these laws that deemed marriage with allegedly inferior biological stock or degenerated races as an imminent danger to the German gene pool. More to the point, none of these laws could have implemented with force or authority if they would have attempted to prevent marriage or procreation among cultures deemed equal, or worse, the marriage between the victorious Jew and the oppressed and humble German laborer, as Hitler characterized the conflict before studying eugenics. The “International Jew” had to be subordinated and demoted for those laws to make any sense at all.

The white-supremacy gleaned from American jurisprudence and Ivy League “science” was also a necessary precondition for enlisting an entire nation to commit the crimes of The Holocaust. Historians must note that this was not the brutish bigotry of the Southern states, but rather the intellectual elite of the United States. In fact, Alfred Ploetz said so explicitly in a famously bitter debate between Ploetz and Max Weber. Ploetz illustrated just what he absorbed from race relations in the United States during the afternoon of October 21, 1910, at the first meeting in Frankfurt of the German Sociological Society. The contentious debate was over the paper presented by Ploetz on “The Concepts of Race and Society.” Ploetz had spent more than four years in the United States, and it was the “scholars” and the elite “Yankees,” which according to Ploetz, prevented blacks from entering American universities and mixing with the white race.⁵ Ploetz understood this to mean that this was the opinion of educated men and that therefore their reasons must have been justified by logic and facts.

Ploetz was correct in one respect. It actually was the heads of Harvard, Yale, Stanford, Johns Hopkins, and Cal. State which were the leaders of any eugenic

⁵ Pgs. 311-312 – “Max Weber, Dr. Alfred Ploetz, and W.E.B. DuBois: Max Weber on Race and Society II”, *Sociological Analysis*, Vol. 34, No. 4, Winter 1973, Pgs. 308-312.

segregation in the United States, and it was this elite crowd that would actively correspond and collaborate with the heads of German eugenics such as Ploetz and Rüdin. It was the icons of American Progressivism which made them their partners. It was the prestigious Rockefellers and Carnegies who were eager to fund a movement that enjoyed the reputation as a serious “science” peddling on Charles Darwin’s reputation.

Clearly, a Jewish “dictatorship” is very different from the portrayal of Jews as the inferior, rodent-like, poor of the slums and ghettos, as the eugenic propaganda films of the Third Reich would later portray. Historians must take note at the absence of any eugenic or genocidal policies in Hitler’s diatribe when he took the stand for his trial in 1923, and contrast it to their sudden emergence after his stint in jail. There is a shift in thinking that can only be attributed to the influence of the eugenicists, and an honest historical perspective would reveal that Hitler was true to the policies that had already been developed and matured by Alfred Ploetz, Leonard Darwin, Harry H. Laughlin, and Charles B. Davenport. Science wasn’t perverted, as is popular to claim. Any honest reading of the works of the eugenicists proves that Hitler was faithful to the goals and desires that the scientific elite had been clamoring for decades prior.

Upon these revelations, we can state with some conviction that historians have awarded way too much importance to the Wannsee Conference of 1942 as the turning point into the “Final Solution” and The Holocaust. We like our historical events grand and punctuated, and the anti-climatic occurrence of a publisher delivering something as seemingly innocuous as a book to an inmate at a jail may seem unimportant against a conference of the middle ranks of the Third Reich held in a luxurious estate. Yet, the facts evidence that the Final Solution was the product of that seemingly innocuous transfer of knowledge from publisher to imprisoned author. Historians must reconsider the importance of Wannsee against the absorption of the “Baur-Fischer-Lenz” policies into “Mein Kampf” and National Socialist policy. They have given way too much importance to Adolf Eichmann, and way too little to Fritz Lenz, Ernst Rüdin, Eugen Fischer, Erwin Baur, Alfred Ploetz, and Wilhelm Schallmayer. Compared to these intellectual leaders, Adolf Eichmann is nothing but a pencil pusher and an administrator. Important as he may have been to the day to day logistics, the entire program, the Final Solution had been digested, formalized, matured, and enshrined into German law by the time Eichmann and the Wannsee Conference came to pass. Realistically

speaking, Adolf Eichmann was a minion to the eugenic masters in Ploetz, Rüdin, Lenz, Verschuer, Fischer, and Baur. In fact, Eichmann's contribution pales in comparison to that of foreigners such as Harry H. Laughlin, Charles B. Davenport, Julian Huxley, and Leonard Darwin. Ironically, the best way to characterize Eichmann's contribution is to recognize that all he actually did was to "follow orders."

ORIGINS OF THE EXCERPT:

This paper is derived from the research conducted for the first two volumes of **The Eugenics Anthology**. It extends the contents of the books, as I felt it went outside of their scope. – **A.E. Samaan**

From a 'Race of Masters' to a 'Master Race': 1948 to 1848:

Distributed through **Library Without Walls, LLC**

ISBN-13: 978-0-9964163-9-9 (Amazon KDP Format)

ISBN-13: 978-1-954249-00-4 (Ingram Spark Format)

ISBN (Kindle): 978-0-9964163-7-5

ISBN (EPUB): 978-0-9964163-4-4

Library of Congress: 2020920428

VOL. #1

The Eugenics Anthology

From a 'Race of Masters' to a 'Master Race': 1948 to 1848

