

Resume on the Ideological Background of Nazi Agrarian Policy

NATIONAL SOCIALIST GERMAN LABOR PARTY (NSDAP)

REICH LANDERSHIP

Reich Office for Agrarian Policy

Bavariaring 21

The Reich Leader

Munich

De\Rei

16 April 1939

Dear Hotz,

On the return journey from Vogelsang I mediated once more on the hours I spent on the Vogelsand and on everything in this respect connected with our work.

These ideas I then recorded during the quiet days of my Easter stay at Neran in the form of brief notes, which, after my return I compiled in a letter to you. Thereby I was guided by the thought of giving once and for all as it were a general outline of the work of the Reich Office for Agrarian Policy. I know of course that you are completely familiar with this general outline, only up to now I have never expressed it so briefly before as here.

In the following therefore, I will give a resume of what has been passing through my mind since Vogelsang and what the hours of quiet contemplation in Neran allowed to develop into a definite train of thought:

(Page 2 of original)

In the same way as we succeeded in rescuing the concept of "Peasantry" by snatching it from the quagmire of wishy-washy, vague liberal ideas, clearly defining its character and endowing it with a full meaning ("Peasant" and "Farmer" were, so to speak, the abstract waste products of this refining process), so now we must elaborate upon the meaning of the concept "State idea of Blood and Soil", in order to offset it against all other concepts, which,

like “Nation”, “Empire” (also “Reich”), “Largo Space Economy” even “Monarchy” allow or could allow the idea of blood to be warped, turned, blurred or even clouded.

As for the prerequisites of an understanding of this idea of state, I have expressed my views, if not very coherently, o.g. in “The Free Peasantry of Lower Saxony and Franconian State Power or State Administration” – the “Marriage of Church, Large Estates and the Christian Nobility of the German Nation, to a community of Interests” etc.: in addition perhaps, my report in Marienburg 1934 to the State and Regional Peasant Council.

Perhaps in this connection, the following which I jotted down in note-form years ago may also be said: In the beginning, nations take their place in history with a definite feeling of being individually chosen, which they trace back to their tribal god, their private god so to speak, as for instance is still the custom and practiced today in a modern state like Japan. This feeling of nations being individually chosen is now superseded by the doctrine of Christianity, propagated by Jews. Christianity preaches the universal mission. As its doctrine refers to a nation being chosen, its universal mission is by reason of its propagation by Jews in effect the stabilization of the idea of the Jewish people being the Chosen Race: the various tribal gods are replaced as it were by the private god of the Jews as the one true god.

Jewry succeeded in establishing this faith by constitutional law in the old Roman Empire, converted to Christianity under the Caesars, whereby it not only secured a state guarantee for the prerequisites of its existence but also found the means to keep the Empire of the Caesars under its control through the doctrine of Christianity interpreted by Jewry.

In the “Kaisertum” (Empire) – the word is of course only the Latin pronunciation of the word “Caesar” – the imperial idea of Ancient Rome under the Caesars meanwhile converted to Christianity, was transplanted by the Franks to German soil. This development begins with the conversion of Clovis

to Christianity and reaches its peak and temporary conclusion with Charles the Great.

For us Germans, namely, this development does not actually begin with Charles the Great but with Otto the Great, because Otto the Great derived the German national consciousness, i.e. the German state consciousness which King Henry I, father of Otto the Great had first established, from the Christian belief of being the Chosen Race through the coronation of Otto as emperor. Thereby (Page 4 of original) the idea of the German Emperor became basically not de jure but de facto Jewish. The only question to be settled yet was whether the Emperor wielded his temporal power (executive) as the direct representative of God or by order of the Pope as his agent upon earth. Very wisely King Henry I avoided being anointed Emperor.

Once this policy of empire in German history had been definitely embarked upon, all discussion on questions of ideology or even Christianity was bound to shake the state of the German Emperors and the German people to their foundations. The German people only thought of itself as a “nation” in relation to Christianity, and any discussion on Christianity was bound to shake the structure of its existence as a state. Thus it is not so much the predisposition of the German people to ideas of principle which plays such a large part in its unhappy political history, as rather the ideological basis of its political existence. Whenever its ideology and political efforts went hand by hand – o.g. in the case of the German Order of Knights in Prussia before 1410 – political personalities and abilities multiply to an absolutely staggering degree.

The Holy Roman Empire of the German nation snuffed out in 1804 without a sound. The *interregna*, the empires of the Habsburgs and the Hohensollorns were not able to survive because they formed their ideas of the state on non-German i.e. Christian ideas interpreted by Jews and did not build up their idea of the state on the people, the blood.

(Page 5 of original)

The concept of the “nation” as it had developed since the wars of liberation, finally to become politically effective, is inadequate therefore. It is true it avoids the mistake of an *alien prerogative* inherent in the concept of “empire” but it too does not penetrate to the racial sources of the national life.

Neither does the concept of the “nation” yet suffice today to safeguard the concept of peasantry founded on the idea of blood. This is best proved by the fact that since 1933 we have been able, certainly, to make our people aware of the necessity for a food autarchy, thus a national food economy, but in effect this food economy achieved since 1933 is only permitted in connection with and as the basis of an imperial economic expansion; the idea of blood and peasantry is already once more felt to be a hindrance and an obstacle. One almost had the impression that certain economic circles consider our National Socialist food policy since 1933 as an underserved and unexpected stroke of luck in the switching over which has taken place since 1933 from the Atlantic-orientated liberal German economic expansionism of the pre-war period to an Eastern European economic expansionism, but after achieving stabilization of this reorientation in the export trade, would like to proceed nevertheless as soon as possible according to the principle “the Moor had fulfilled his obligation, the Moor can go”.

“The State Idea of Blood and Soil” on the other hand is based and actually depends in every case, under all circumstances, and in all its implications on the concept of the “peasant” derived from the idea of blood. The peasant on his hereditary farm is in the

(Page 6 of original)

meaning of the ancient Aryan-indogermanic-Germanic concept of “Odal” the central pillar of the state idea of blood and soil. Recognition of this fact is necessary in order not only to build up the whole edifice of ideas but also to maintain it. Therefore no concessions in the concept and idea of the peasant in the meaning of blood and soil i.e. in the meaning of Odal can be tolerated; for this concept is timeless, while questions of the economy of the peasant, his mode of life, his morals etc. will always be determined by the basic idea of

the peasantry and the times, thus represent a mean value which changes only very slowly, certainly, but in the last instance, is capable of change, and hence should never be dragged in as something essential in arguments of a basic nature on the peasantry.

Understood in such a manner, the state idea of Blood and Soil obliges us to master three main tasks:

Ancestral Reverence as the God-given racial and spiritual prerequisite of every peasant's existence on his hereditary farm;

Reverence of Work as the moral prerequisite for the continued existence of those living on an hereditary farm;

Reverence of the Breeding Idea and of Breeding as the necessary prerequisite for continuing the family line in a manner worthy of its forbears and hence in a manner as closely as possible in conformity with God's vital laws.

(Page 7 of original)

All other questions and tasks, such as questions of religion, manners, morals, economy, space etc. are thought out to their conclusion, after all only deductions drawn from these three fundamental tasks, which derive from the concept of peasantry in the "Odal" sense – a concept which first gives life and meaning to the state idea of Blood and Soil. If one takes this Odal idea as the spiritual and moral axis of the idea of the peasantry, all tasks which we have to master in our sphere of work can be comprised in the one sentence:

Blood and Soil: Our fate!

Blood and Honor: The Law!

Here I mean by "Honor" all those imponderabilities which are born with us and whose presence depends on the nature and purity of our blood, thus facts which can never be perpetuated by dogmas, clauses, institutions, precepts etc. but must continually be re-awakened in the young of every generation in order to be perpetuated: hereby care must be taken not to see in a "training act" or even in memory "drill", the essence of education, such as is still our method of teaching for the most part today. This system is in its present form

Jewish (Christian) and aims at ignoring the law of blood and using the memory as a means of giving outward standards of conduct with the help of dogmas.

We do not “awaken” in the young person the feeling for what is good and bad, right or wrong, but we hammer into him through memory, standards of conduct which act like a police traffic regulation, applied to morals and can be observed just as well by a member of the Nordic race as by Zulu-kaffirs, in so far as his inclination or the severity of the spiritual or material penalties seem to him to make it advisable to observe these traffic regulations. But our way is to see in a moral code the guiding stones and signpost towards an inner development which regulates our outward behaviour, whereby the limit of this inner possibility of development is determined by blood and can never be exceeded by an outward observance of instilled precepts. This moreover supplies the key to why precisely the idea of breeding becomes the prerequisite of a racial religion and moral code, because the quality of the blood is decisive for human behaviour; this again presupposes directly the reverence of ancestors as it is these who primarily decide the worth of an individual.

May I now say something briefly, as it were a few catch-phrases on the first three basic ideas mentioned, with respect to the work of the Reich Office for Agrarian Polity:

Re 1.) Reverence of Ancestors

.....

Re 2.) Reverence of work

On this subject I have already said what is essential in my publications between 1925 and 1933, particularly in my books: Basically there are only two types of human beings: the human being who produces values by his work and the human being who consumes values without working. The first type begins with the tiller of the soil, as he, by producing food, first creates the prerequisites to enable work in any form at all to be performed for any length of time; the second type begins with the human being who is a parasite on

nature without any activity of his own, particularly in the case of the nomad. The first type was perfected in Aryanism, the second in Jewry. The Old Testament admirably represents this age-old contrast in the story of Cain (a nomad shepherd) and Abel (the tiller of the soil). Fraternal strife therefore begins in the history of humanity, by the parasite, himself incapable of work, yet coveting the values of another man's labor (the nomad), slaying the man who produces values (the tiller of the soil) in order to get at his possessions. No animal species knows the struggle of

(Page 11 of original)

organized groups within the species; only the struggle of one species against another. Man alone knows war as the struggle of organized groups of men among themselves. War of course presupposes a struggle for something, i.e. the presence of a value which justifies the struggle for the one Party at least. All avowal of the moral value of work is Aryan and begins with the tiller of the soil. Thus only Aryanism made work the basis of an ideology and allowed its kings to follow the plough as the most noble form of avowing this ideology.

.....

On the other hand the opposite of the Aryan, the Jew, has quite logically built up his ideology on his aversion to work, i.e. for the Jew, work is a curse and consequently the Jew develops parasitism into the essence of his religion. What even the most primitive man can do, namely gain a livelihood in this world by parasitism, becomes for the Jew the highest goal of his religious aspirations: he wants to devour all the nations. It says so in the Bible!

From this basic recognition of "work" and "parasitism" a straight line leads to today's economic doctrines: on the one hand an economic order characterized by the modern process of the division of labor, an order based on the ideological recognition of labor and hence one which logically must proceed from the labor of the peasant in order to end in an ordered economy (Marketing

(Page 12 of original)

Order of the Reich Food Estate – Marketing Order of the Hanseatic League, Economic Order of Ancient Egypt etc.): on the other hand on economy of the

parasite. – Every economic order, regardless of its origin, which falls to Jewish domination ends by the “host” nation becoming a trading nation through liberal or “Manchester” methods, finally, if the corresponding prerequisites are given, to be ruined by advanced capitalism dominated by the banks.

At first sight it seems to be a game with words to make a distinction between “trader” and “merchant”. The difference, however, will become clear, if one goes back to the origin of the development.

The trader is nomad in origin, and arose with the nomad either from the necessity of bartering captured booty at a most favorable profit for other products he either needed or desired, or purchasing necessities of life which he did not possess, but must possess in order to live, against some values or other he did possess (cf. the market transactions of the Nord-West African nomads). The essence of this procedure is that a difficult situation or a surplus of barterable articles induce the person concerned to enter into a barter deal, whereby the advantage and profit of the barter deal is the decisive factor for the person concerned, not whether the other partner recovers his expenses. The trader’s profit from a barter deal, therefore, is dictated by reasons of pure personal gain. Advantage alone is the decisive factor, independently of the sense or nonsense of the affected deal.

(Page 13 of original)

The merchant has his roots in the peasantry and arises as a result of the economic development of the division of labor processes from the economic order of the peasant community, which processes require intermediaries. In this case however, the process of the division of labor in the economic development is the decisive factor, and the idea of meeting requirements governs the transactions in which process the merchant participates at an adequate intermediary profit.

It is clear that the transition from merchant to trader can become fluid and make the analysis more difficult. In Lithuania the Jew controls the market and “seems” therefore, to fulfill purely economic tasks in the purely rural area, i.e.

to become a “merchant”, whereas in the liberal economic system real merchants seem to become traders. This, however, is not decisive. For, if one goes back to the beginnings, the personal profit from an exchange transaction is seen to be decisive with the trader, independent of the basis of the transaction of goods affected, whereas with the merchant it is the role of intermediary in the process of the division of labor genuinely designed to meet the requirements within a national economy or several national economies amongst each other.

Re 3.) Reverence of the Breeding Idea and Breeding

.....

(Page 19 of original)

A whole essay could be written on each idea, and probably this letter could be considered as a disposition for a book and written. Only, gladly as I would do this, fact leaves me too little time today. It seems all the more necessary to me, however, to elaborate upon these basic ideas when we resume our work in the Reich Office for Agrarian Policy.

Heil Hitler!

Your

(signed) Darro

Source: Yad Vashem Archives NG1285, N11\919\6