

January 30, 1942 in Berlin

Foreign Broadcast Monitoring Service, Federal Communications Commission. [Garbled sections indicated by "..."]

MY GERMAN FELLOW COUNTRYMEN AND WOMEN, MY COMRADES.

At present everybody speaks before the forum which seems to them the most fitting. Some speak before a parliament whose existence, composition and origin (are well known).

I believe that I should return again today whence I came, namely to the people. Because you are all representatives of this nation with the one difference that you are not getting any salaries, and often it is more difficult for you to come to such demonstrations, more difficult than for the so-called qualified representatives of those democracies.

Before we enter the tenth year of the National Socialist German State, it is appropriate that we should look into our past, and once again occupy ourselves with the principles of our existence, of our life, and of our victory.

Quite often we hear today the remark that this war is really the second world war. It means that this struggle is identified with the first, which most of us lived through as soldiers. This is not only correct ... that also this struggle which in reality encompasses almost the whole world, it is even more correct when we consider that it is a question of the same aims; that the same powers which brought about the first world war are responsible for the present one, and that these powers and states have the same aims which they had at that time ...; they had the same intentions which are the true cause and purpose of this struggle.

They are not only the same causes, but, above all, they are the same individuals. And I can proudly say that the only exceptions are the very nations which today are embodied as allies by the German Reich, by Italy, by Japan, and so on. For certainly no one can deny that Churchill even in 1914 was one of the most rabid (literally: mean) war-mongers of his time; that Roosevelt was then the disciple of President Wilson; that the capitalistic countries then also had thrown the weight of their alliance into the scales on the side of war. Just as no one can deny the reverse, that we were entirely innocent in (starting) that war. We were all only very ordinary soldiers, just as you are now, my dear wounded men sitting here before me. Unknown and nameless men, whom duty had simply called, nothing else, and who in response had fulfilled their duty as faithfully as they were able.

The same motive forces which were to blame for the first world war are now responsible for the second (static). Germany then was a monarchy; in other words not a National-Socialist dictatorship. The Germany of that period was democratic, that is, not a national-socialistic state, and the Germany of that period was parliamentary, that is, not what Germany is today, to say nothing of all other differences. There had to be reasons therefore, which led to the attack of these powers then as today, and which had nothing to do with the respective forms of government, although both sides pretend that it is just this which called them into the field of battle.

We Germans cannot possibly imagine that if a country near us suddenly decides on a certain form of government, we must declare war on this country just because that particular form of government doesn't suit us. We can't understand this at all, and naturally the others can't understand it either. They did not enter the war for this reason. They did not enter and are not at war because they were irritated by the form of the state. They are capable of embracing the vilest type of government when necessary and of fraternizing with it. No, no, it is not a question of a form of a government, but other reasons which brought them previously into a war against the German state.

At that time England was the principal initiator of this struggle, England, which during 300 years ... through a continuous succession of bloody wars subjugated roughly a quarter of the globe. Because at that time it wasn't as if one day a few Indian princes or Indian localities or Indian representatives proceeded to London with the request "Britishers, come to India, reign over us or lead us," but it was the English who went to India and the Indian people did not want any British and tried to get rid of them by force. (Static-part of the sentence unintelligible). People once subjugated to be kept in subjugation.

By force they made one state after another pay them tribute and become their servants. ... this force, which scents business everywhere where a state of disturbance exists, our international Jewish acquaintances. In this manner England has subjugated the world over a period of a few hundred years; and, to make secure this conquest of the world, this subjugation of people, England endeavors to maintain the so-called balance of power in Europe.

This means in reality that it endeavors to make sure that no European state is able to win over a certain measure ... and perhaps in this way rise to a leading-role in Europe. What they wanted was a disunited, disintegrated Europe, a Europe all of whose forces completely offset one another.

To reach this goal, England conducted one war after another in Europe. She has seen first its powerful position menaced by Spain. When they had finally conquered Spain, they turned their attentions to the Netherlands. When Holland seemed to represent no further danger, British hate concentrated itself against France. And when finally France was crushed with the help of all Europe, to be sure, they then imagined that Germany must be, of necessity, the one factor which might possibly be suited to the unification of Europe.

Then it was that the struggle against Germany began, not out of love for the nations, but only in their own most sober interests. ... it was said, it turned against the Jews, who, in every struggle between nations, know how and are capable of making profits and winning wherever there is confusion and wrangling. It is well-known that they have always been the instigators of unrest among the nations, because they were able to profit only in time of unrest, and because a period of peace might lead to reflection and hence, also, to an insight into the ways of these evil-doers of all nations.

When, in 1914, a world coalition against the German Reich of that time was first brewing, ... they ... for a justification. They then said, "Germany must first of all be freed from its Kaiser." This, of course, should have been of no concern to the English, but rather an internal matter for the German people. But the English always feel concerned for other nations, and for that reason they wanted to free Germany of its Kaiser, then as now.

They said: "It is Germany's militarism which makes the German people unhappy and oppresses them."

The English are everywhere against the oppression and against the misery meted out today. Finally, they said, "There shall be no more war. Therefore let us wage war upon war." A wonderful, enticing, splendid perspective. If only one wanted to apply it in retrospect. That means, if one wanted to say, "We agree that war is an injustice because only brutal force decides war. We will eliminate all coercion. Hence we will abolish everything arisen through coercion up to now."

A very difficult beginning, indeed, because the whole world hitherto has been built up in accordance with the principle that might makes right. But still it would have been wonderful if England had led the way to the rest of the world in its abhorrence of war in this manner, that it would have liberated the fruits of its own wars, that is, that it would have placed them again at the disposition of the rest of the world. If England had done that, if it had therefore declared: "We abhor war. Therefore, we will immediately return South Africa; because we won it through war. We hate war. Therefore, we will return the East Indies; we also won those in a war. For instance, we hate war. Therefore, we will also leave Egypt; because this also we have subjugated through force. We shall also retire from the entire Near East; because this also became ours through force."

It would have been a beautiful gesture, to have declared war on war in this fashion. However, the struggle against war meant something entirely different in England; namely, this war against war was interpreted to mean every possibility of making good the injustices already existing in this world;

...

and so finally they take the power from him who has power, and all possibility of power from him who has none.

It is about the same as the attitude we recognize also in domestic policy, when people say: "We want no change in the social order. He who is rich is to stay rich; he who is poor must stay poor. As things are, so are they willed; and as they are willed, so they are to remain; for man should not rise against that which is once willed, because it is so."

You know, my comrades, our National Socialist conception, on the other hand. We see in each state and at each moment of this world the evidence of a never interrupted process of life; and it is impossible to say at a certain moment, "Here ceases this evolutionary process." And it lies in the nature of the complete evolution of all things that every stabilization of this life process must lead to extinction. It lies, on the contrary, in the essence of Nature, that ever and again ... are created and stamped out.

That means therefore that from the domestic life of peoples the ... must be freed of poison, that they cannot be locked up in social orders, that in the domestic life of peoples it is impossible to reach a stabilization of financial circumstances, but that domestically, too, one must take care that a continuous stream of fresh blood rises from below toward the top, and that

everything above which is lazy because it is sluggish should die, because it must die, because it is ready to die.

And so the talk of war on war has been proved quite false. The best proof for that is that the moment the war was over, the conditions for a new war could by no means be avoided, nor the instruments for waging the new war, either. It would have been a wonderful gesture if after the disarmament of Germany, as it ... had been looked after, then England, America, and France had also disarmed. We suggested it to them often, begged them to at the time of the Weimar Republic, and still later demanded that they do it.

They considered it not at all. On the contrary, the wars went on. Only the defeated people, the German people, lost every prospect ever in this world to change its condition once more for the better.

The methods which they used in the first World War were like those with which they are fighting today. At first the war from outside, and war in the form of creating coalitions. Here fits a piece of Churchill's shamelessness, who says today: "England was never in a position to carry on war by herself alone against Italy or Germany." But this same man has through his lieutenant year after year given out promises of guarantee to the whole world. Then he himself admits that they were never in a position to fight alone.

But they guaranteed the Baltic states; they guaranteed the Balkans. They went on around: Every state in the world, they declared, needs a guarantee. Great Britain will put her whole strength behind them and will protect them. Today this same arch-liar says: "But we were really never in a position to carry on the war alone." But that is right; even in the World War they were not in a position to carry on the war alone. Therefore they cooked up a coalition against us of world-wide extent.

The methods have likewise remained the same. Promises to all those of little faith, the credulous, or stupid, who wanted to trust these promises, moreover, the attempt to allow their own interests to be represented with as much other blood as possible.

It must always be remembered that the British world empire in the 400 years of its origin had to shed in countless wars, barely 10% of the blood that Germany needed to defend alone its bare existence, and in spite of that, we have always lost always more and more. This truth is connected with the second British method, that is, with the method of division. In that time that the British Empire had its origin, Germany tore herself apart. There were at that time modes of thought that we no longer understand, modes of thought of a religious kind, that unfortunately were fought out only with the sword, modes of thought that became horrible among the people, that seem insufficient to us in their inner being. Only these grievous internal struggles, that cost the German people endless blood, gave England the opportunity in this same period, to raise up a world claim, that never belonged to her either in number or in significance. Then I must always point out that it is not true that we Germans are like upstarts, but if one wants to talk about upstarts, then it is unconditionally the English and not ourselves! We have an older history, and in a time when Europe had a powerful German Empire, England was a quite insignificant, small, green island.

In the last World War the possibilities of this splitting up lay in another sphere. Afterwards the religious problems did not provoke any more bloodshed, especially since the priests themselves would not have been ready any more to sacrifice their lives for these causes.

After the impossibility of involving the German people in the dark interior crisis, (there was) a new possibility of the parties' game. We lived through it then. The parties of the right and the parties of the left, which further broke up in a dozen bourgeois aspects, in a half dozen proletarian aspects, and ever split up some more, and having begun with these parties, from the bourgeoisie of the bourgeois center up to the KPD (Communist Party of Germany), succeeded (this refers back to the parties of the right and left) in undermining and breaking down the German people slowly from within. In spite of that, the course of the war was a glorious one. The years 1914-1918-they proved it: in which not even the opponents triumphed.

A low, common revolt was plotted by Marxian-demoralizing-Liberal-Capitalistic subjects-behind all of it as a driving force was the eternal Jew. They brought Germany to its collapse at that time. We know this today from the verdict of the English themselves, that they at that time in 1918 were at the end, just before their own collapse, when perhaps a quarter hour before 12 o'clock the revolt in Germany was realized. Only the cowardice of the then rulers, their indecision, their halfway measures, their own uncertainty brought it on. And so the First World War could not alone be lost by the merit of our opponents, but exclusively by our own fault.

The consequences of this collapse in November were not that world democracy stretched out open arms to Germany, were not the concern of others to free the German people from its burdens and to lift the German people to a higher standard of