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The central focus of this thesis is to rediscover Julius Streicher and to determine whether his actions merited the same punishment as other persons executed for war crimes. Sources used include Nuremberg Trial documents and testimony, memoirs of Nazi leaders, and other Nazi materials. The thesis includes seven chapters, which cover Streicher's life, especially the prewar decades, his years out of power, and his trial at Nuremberg. The conclusion reached is that Streicher did have some influence on the German people with his anti-Semitic newspaper *Der Sturmer*, but it is difficult to ascertain whether his speeches and writings contributed directly to the extermination of the Jews in World War II or simply reflected and magnified the anti-Semitism of his culture.
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CHAPTER I

THE GALLOWS

On 16 October 1946, at 12:00 AM, the convicted inmates of the Nuremberg Prison were ordered to dress in their court clothes. After the first six Nazi War criminals were hanged, white-helmeted guards came for the next prisoner, Julius Streicher. They found him in his pajamas, lying on his cot, reading. Streicher rebelliously stated that if they wanted him to go someplace then they could dress and carry him. The muscular guards handcuffed his wrists, bodily lifted him, and forced him into his clothes. Rudolph Hess, in the next cell, heard the commotion and shouted, “Bravo Streicher!” The guards then escorted him through the gymnasium door.¹

At the foot of the gallows Streicher deliberately would not give the United States colonel his name, “You know it already,” he said, and instead shouted, “Heil Hitler! Heil Hitler!” He was the only condemned Nazi at the trial to salute Hitler. “For the love of God, Julius,” the prison chaplain pleaded, “tell them your name and get it over with.”²

² Time Magazine, 68 (28 October 1946): 34.
Hitler. "For the love of God, Julius," the prison chaplain pleaded, "tell them your name and get it over with."²

While being marched up the thirteen steps of the gallows Streicher cried out, "Purim Festival 1946!" This statement was an effort at irony and referred to the biblical Book of Esther which describes how Haman was executed on the very gallows he had intended for all of the Jews in exile. At the top of the stairs Streicher spat at the executioner Master Sergeant John C. Woods and told him, "The Bolsheviks will hang you one day." As the black hood was being placed over his head he said, "I am now by God my father." His last words muffled through the hood were, "Adele my dear wife." The executioner pulled the lever, and his body dropped from sight behind the black curtain. The rope creaked as it moved back and forth. The forty witnesses present during the executions heard an eerie moan persisting behind the curtain. Woods descended the steps, vanished behind the curtain, and soon the moaning stopped. At 2:14 AM the four Allied doctors pronounced Julius Streicher dead.³

Today Streicher usually dismissed as a rude, anti-Semitic, sadistic pornographer, a description that is not entirely unjust. Yet this man whose crude personality made enemies of former friends and who was held in contempt even by many of his fellow Nazis, was persuasive to millions who lived in a civilized nation. What sort of man was he and how much influence did he

² Time Magazine, 68 (28 October 1946): 34.
³ Ibid.
command? That is the central theme of this work, which will rediscover Julius Streicher. It will determine what Streicher’s contemporaries thought about him, and assess how much influence he had over the German people. This work will attempt to determine if Streicher was simply a target of opportunity for the victorious Allies or whether his actions merited the same punishment that Hermann Goering or Joachim von Ribbentrop received.

One most important of the primary sources used for this thesis is the official transcripts of the Nuremberg Trial entitled, *Trial of the Major War Criminals Before the International Military Tribunal*. This multi-volume set gives the verbatim record of Streicher’s testimony and cross-examination concerning his involvement in Nazi Germany. Another useful source is the multi-volume set of prosecution documents used for the trial at Nuremberg entitled, *Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression*. These documents contain many excellent primary sources and include speeches and articles by Streicher.

No study of Julius Streicher would be complete without scrutinizing the infamous anti-Semitic newspaper he controlled from 1923 to 1945, *Der Sturmer*. Other major sources include, *Hitler’s Secret Conversations*, edited by Martin

---

Bormann and Hermann Rauschning, *The Voice of Destruction*.  
Jeremy Noakes and Geoffrey Pridham, *Documents on Nazism: 1919-1945* contain records of some of Streicher's conversations with Hitler, as well as conversations and speeches Hitler made referring to Streicher.  


Two other invaluable sources are the books written by the United States psychologist and psychiatrist who had intimate contact with the prisoners at Nuremberg, including Streicher; respectively G. M. Gilbert's, *Nuremberg Diary* and Douglas M. Kelley's, *22 Cells in Nuremberg*.  

Finally, Telford Taylor, the assistant prosecuting attorney at the trial, later wrote an excellent study entitled, *The Anatomy of the Nuremberg Trial*.

There are not as many biographies or publications about Julius Streicher as there are about many other Nazi notables. Streicher himself left almost
nothing printed. Much information concerning Streicher's thoughts and political activities are missing. He claimed that he had little time to write anything, but probably a more significant explanation for the void comes from a statement his wife, Adele, made during her interrogation at Nuremberg. In March 1945, when American troops were driving through Bavaria, Streicher and his wife burned bundles of documents, correspondence, journals, and books that he thought would incriminate him. There is also a great vacuum of information about his early years living in Nuremberg and as a result, historians often contradict one another in presenting his biography. This work will look at these historical conflicts and provide a proper biographic background.

The thesis is organized into seven chapters. First, the thesis explores Streicher's life. Then, the thesis looks at the history of anti-Semitism, a subject that dominated the Nazi belief system. Streicher's paper, Der Sturmer is focused upon, and then the Nuremberg Trial is scrutinized. Finally, the thesis will summarize what has been discovered about Streicher's life, and what other writers think about Streicher and his case. The reader will be able to understand what sort of man Streicher was, how much influence he had over people, and whether or not he merited execution, compared to other Nazi leaders.

---

Julius Streicher, the last of nine children, was born on 12 February 1885, in Fleinhausen, a small village fifteen miles west of the Bavarian town of Augsburg. His father, Fredrich, a schoolteacher and ardent Catholic, prided himself on knowing all of the rules and regulations of the Church. He tried to instill his beliefs and knowledge of the Church in his children as a strict disciplinarian. Some writers believe that because of his father's almost obsessive adherence to religious rules, Julius gave up religion soon after he left his childhood home.¹

In November 1903, Julius became a schoolteacher like his father. He was transferred to the Nuremberg school system as an administrator and teacher for first and second classes of girls in September 1909.² Streicher later described his early years in Nuremberg as his "years of political development."³ The city of Nuremberg apparently appealed to Streicher because he lived there for most of

² Ibid., 26.
his life until his forced departure in 1940. Nuremberg has a rich history, and played an important role in Nazi Germany. Built in the eleventh century near the Franconian Mountains overlooking the Pegnitz River, it became home to many artisans and merchants. Nuremberg is the birthplace of the brass gunlock, the clarinet, and Albrecht Dürer, the famous German painter. It is where the Holy Roman Empire held its diet and kept the crown jewels. Nuremberg became an industrial center, and many artists made it their home. Because of its rich heritage, the Nazis called the city the Treasury of the Reich.4

In early 1914, Streicher and two other men, Otto Wintermanatetl and Julius Nuremberg, organized a political club called Young Progress (Jung Fortschritt).5 Two titles of some of the speeches delivered by the organization are: “Voting Rights and Voting Duties,” and “The Development of the German Economy and the Tasks of the Industrial Classes.”6 Missing from the titles is the topic of anti-Semitism. Anti-Semitism had not yet emerged as a political issue for Streicher.

When World War One broke out, Streicher joined the 6th Bavarian Infantry Regiment. His unit was immediately sent to the front in France where he became a cyclist in a machine-gun company. Streicher’s behavior was reckless which was unusual for a front line soldier. He constantly volunteered for dangerous missions. When he carried a message under heavy enemy fire, he

---

5 Varga, Number One Nazi Jew-Baiter, 26.
6 Ibid.
received the Prussian Iron Cross second class and was later promoted to the rank of non-commissioned officer. In April 1916, he received the Austrian Silver Medal with Crown, and in July 1917, he was officially promoted to Lieutenant of a machine-gun platoon. The promotion was highly unusual for the time because most officers came from aristocratic roots only. After Rumania joined the Allies, Streicher was sent to the Italian front in January 1918. For his courageous conduct under enemy fire he received the Bavarian Military Service Medal, and the Iron Cross, first class.\(^7\)

Streicher's heroics on the battlefield exemplified an unusual personality trait which he retained to the end of his life. The trait was a willingness to fight recklessly despite the serious outcome of his actions. His irrational fearlessness explains many of his outlandish deeds discussed later.

After Germany surrendered, Streicher went home to a very different Nuremberg than the one he had left. He found civilians baffled and upset with the German capitulation. Questions abounded in the cafes and beer halls. How could Germany surrender when its leading generals, Paul Von Hindenberg and Eric Ludendorff, had just stated that victory was at hand? It was humiliating to the German citizens that the Allies blamed the whole war on Germany. It was even more humiliating that the Allies insisted, through the Versailles Treaty, that Germany was responsible for paying reparations. Germans called the treaty the

Versailles Dictat. A few years later, the Reichsmark, Germany’s currency, lost its value at an incredible rate. Nuremberg had to turn off its street lights because the city could not afford to keep them on. Streicher not only observed how jobs were lost, but he also observed how faith in the government was lost. Streicher would eventually come up with an answer as to why the country was in such chaos.

As people gathered in the beer halls to discuss these political and economic crises, political clubs grew. Political parties existed for every kind of dissident. It is estimated that there were at least fifty political parties in Bavaria alone in 1920. A common theme that millions of Germans accepted was that the Jews were to blame for the devastating German defeat. Streicher became convinced of this notion and for the first time he started to speak against the Jews. After becoming once again a full-time school teacher, Streicher joined a growing movement opposed to the Socialist regime of the new Bavarian Republic. The party was called the Society for Protective and Defense Action. (Shultz und Trutzabund). Streicher became an occasional speaker, speaking against the Jew, who led the new Bavarian government, Kurt Eisner. Soon Streicher became known as a strident anti-Semitic speaker.

---

9 Ibid.
In 1919, the people of Germany elected a National assembly which met in the town of Weimar and the assembly drew up a republican constitution. The new government, known as the Weimar Republic provided for a president elected directly by the people, and a ministry responsible for the lower house or Reichstag. The democratic government came under constant attack from opposing groups within Germany, namely Monarchists, Communists, and Socialists.

Part of Streicher's success as a speaker, both in public and in the beer halls, was because of the popularity of criticizing the Weimar government. Like other speakers, Streicher preached about the Volkisch, a vernacular term in the German political language meaning that race was the soul guide to the judgment of right or wrong and that race alone should be the basis of building a united German political system.

Streicher joined another party in Augsburg, just west of Nuremberg, called the German Working Community (Deutsche Werkgemeinschaft). The party spoke on a platform of Volkisch and anti-Semitic issues and claimed to represent the working man. Streicher always believed himself to be on the side of the working man, and he started a weekly newspaper for the party propounding the party's ideology as the working man's cause. Later, Streicher found that the circles in which the party moved were too small for his active, fighting spirit. So

---

in April 1920, Streicher joined a newly founded organization, the German Socialist Party (Deutsch-Sozialistische Partei).\textsuperscript{13} Part of its political tone was anti-Semitic and anti-Catholic. Streicher started a weekly newspaper for this new party entitled the Deutscher Sozialist (German Socialist).\textsuperscript{14} Streicher published the party’s ideologies, offered his opinions, and wrote more and more articles on racial doctrine.

Streicher began to have a large following in the new party.\textsuperscript{15} His political success was due in part to the fact that anti-Semitism was enthusiastically excepted in Franconia (Northern Bavaria), where prejudice against Jews was deeply rooted. He liked the attention it got him.\textsuperscript{16} Some Jews stood up to his baiting and sued him in court. On one occasion he received fourteen days in jail, but the sentence was overturned in an appellate court.

Why Streicher suddenly became so fervently anti-Semitic is difficult to know. What was the reason for Streicher’s anti-Semitism? Anti-Semitism may have filled the vacuum for Streicher left behind when the community of the trenches had been replaced by a disintegrating and defeated nation. One writer suggests that Streicher was jilted by a Jewish girl.\textsuperscript{17} Others suggest that Streicher had

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{13} Varga, \textit{Number One Nazi Jew-Baiter}, 35.
\item \textsuperscript{14} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{16} Varga, \textit{Number One Nazi Jew-Baiter}, 308.
\item \textsuperscript{17} Deutsch, \textit{Hitler’s 12 Apostles}, 155.
\end{itemize}
some Jewish blood in his family tree. An early associate of Streicher claims he said, "You have to have a good dose of Jewish blood in your veins to hate that race properly." Streicher evidently liked the reaction he got out of people when he spoke of Jews. During his interrogation after his capture in 1945 he stated:

Anyone who wants to become well known in the world need only touch on the Jewish questions. Anyone who wants to write about the Chinese or Japanese, or whatever it is, Indians, that would not interest anybody in the world. That is proof of the Jewish problem because there is an immediate reaction if anybody says a word about the Jews.

Jean-Paul Sartre may have suggested a reason for Streicher's anti-Semitism. Sartre points out that most of the twentieth century racists belonged to the lower middle class that possessed nothing. "They have chosen anti-Semitism as a means of establishing their status as possessors." Satre goes on to say that by labeling the Jews as inferior, the racist affirms at the same time that he is part of the elite, a notion that was not too dissimilar to the anti-Negro racism of the Southern United States. Since Streicher was a school teacher, which was considered the bottom of the civil service in Germany, he could use anti-Semitism to immediately raise himself to a higher class.

The only documented reason for Streicher's anti-Semitism is in his own political testament that he wrote during his captivity in the Nuremberg Prison. He told of the first anti-Semitic speech he gave before a large crowd. He recalls

---

18 Bytwerk, Julius Streicher, 48; Varga, Number One Nazi Jew-Baiter, 32; Deutsch, Hitler's 12 Apostles, 155-156.
19 Bytwerk, Julius Streicher, 48.
20 Varga, Number One Nazi Jew-Baiter, 308.
that when he finished his speech, he felt certain that he touched his listeners
and so he gave a silent prayer because at that moment, he knew that he had
found his fulfilling purpose in life.\textsuperscript{22} He wrote that he was also influenced by
Madison Grant's \textit{Fall of the Major Races.}\textsuperscript{23} Grant explained that the Nordic
Race is the most active race, and through the mixing of races, the Nordic Race
"will go down in a race of swamps."\textsuperscript{24}

Whatever the reason for Streicher's anti-Semitism, it is clear that between
1919 and 1921 he became such a fanatic on the subject that even the most
ardent of anti-Semites held him in awe. Even Adolf Hitler called Streicher the
pioneer of the anti-Semitic movement.\textsuperscript{25} His ceaseless tirade led to an almost
blind fervor that earned him the name of the "Number One Nazi Jew-Baiter."\textsuperscript{26}

From time to time in the early 1920s Streicher heard the name of Adolf
Hitler. Hitler was one of the numerous politicians without a job touring and
speaking at the many beer halls. He was Streicher's only rival in terms of anti-
Semitism and public speaking. Hitler's anti-Semitic experience came from his
early years in the cafes of Vienna, Austria, which supported an environment of

\textsuperscript{22} Varga, \textit{Number One Nazi Jew-Baiter}, 299.
\textsuperscript{23} "Interrogation of Julius Streicher, 7 October, 1945," United States Department of State, 
\textit{Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression, Office of the United States Chief Counsel for Prosecution of 
Axis Criminality}, (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1946), Supplement B, 
1545-1555, (hereafter cited as NCA).
\textsuperscript{24} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{25} Edward Peterson, \textit{Limits of Hitler's Power}, (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton 
\textsuperscript{26} NCA, 2:689.
anti-Semitic hysteria. Streicher went to Munich to hear Hitler speak at the soon to be famous beer hall called the Burgerbraukeller. "I saw this man shortly before midnight, after he had spoken for three hours, drenched in perspiration, radiant." Eugene Davidson and William P. Varga claim that Streicher said he had seen a halo around Hitler's head. He may have been awe stricken by Hitler, but in an interview by the Allies at Nuremberg in 1945, he said, "My neighbor said he thought he saw a halo around his head; and I Gentlemen experienced something which transcended the commonplace." Streicher planned to go forward in company with Hitler. Streicher paid Hitler an honorarium to speak in Nuremberg. It has been suggested from American historian, William L. Shirer and subsequent historians such as Otto Deutsch, Jeremy Noakes, Geoffery Pridham, and William P. Varga, that Streicher decided to take over the party to which Hitler belonged, the National Socialist German Workers Party or NSDAP (Nationalsozialische Deutche Arbeiterpartei). While Hitler was away taking elocution lessons, Streicher contacted Anton Drexler, who was the original founder of the NSDAP, and persuaded him to effect a transfer of the Party to Berlin where they would run it together, but

---

without Hitler.\textsuperscript{31} Hitler, warned by his friend Dietrich Eckart, ejected Anton Drexler and founded the new National Socialist Party. After this incident of 29 July 1921, Hitler became the undisputed "Führer," or leader of the party. None of the writers mention, however, how Streicher was affected by Hitler's counterstroke or how it affected their relationship.

Streicher and Hitler became two of the best known speakers for the movement in Bavaria during the early twenties. Streicher, well liked by the working class, enlisted a large following. Hitler, on the other hand, was a bit distant to the working class. Both were emotional speakers, but Hitler had the presence of mind not to let his emotions get in his way of political thinking. Streicher must have noticed this edge Hitler had over him because on 20 October 1922, Streicher basically transferred his whole party over to Hitler's party.\textsuperscript{32} Many scholars state that Streicher simply gave his party to Hitler.\textsuperscript{33} That is a misconception. What actually happened is that Streicher quit his party and declared his allegiance to the NSDAP and Hitler. Streicher told his followers in a speech to, "Join forces with the National Socialist Party, which is progressing out of the mutual struggle and to fight on in its ranks for common aims."\textsuperscript{34} Not only did most members of Streicher's former party join with Hitler, but members of

\textsuperscript{31} Deutsch, \textit{Hitler's 12 Apostles}, 157.
\textsuperscript{32} "Speech by Julius Streicher in Nuremberg, October 1922," Noakes and Pridham ed., \textit{Documents on Nazism}, 49.
\textsuperscript{34} Deutsch, \textit{Hitler's 12 Apostles}, 158.
other parties joined the NSDAP also. Streicher convinced more people to join (almost one thousand in all) than there were members of Hitler's NSDAP.

It was a major acquisition for Hitler in many ways. Obviously Hitler's party grew, but the acquisition of the new members bridged a gap to northern Bavaria from Hitler's headquarters in Munich in southern Bavaria. From northern Bavaria or Franconia, Hitler expanded out to the rest of Germany. He never forgot what Streicher did for him, a point Hitler mentions in his book Mein Kampf. A thankful Hitler created a separate Nuremberg group with Streicher at the head. An indication of Streicher's personal standing with Hitler is noted by the fact that Streicher was one of only four people permitted to use the German familiar du salutation in addressing Hitler. Streicher went to many cities in Bavaria and organized more groups for the party. In a conversation he had later, Hitler stated, "If one day I write my memoirs, I shall have to recognize that this man [Streicher] fought like a buffalo in our cause. The conquest of Franconia was his work." Hitler's highest praise for Streicher came later in the same conversation.

Despite his weaknesses, Streicher is a man of spirit. If we wish to tell the truth, we must recognize that without Julius Streicher, Nuremberg never would have been won over to National Socialism.

---

35 Ibid.
37 "Night of 28th-29th December 1941" Adolf Hitler, Hitler's Secret Conversations, Martin Bormann, ed. (New York: Farrar, Straus and Young, 1953), 127.
38 Varga, Number One Nazi Jew-Baiter, 47; Davidson, Trial of the Germans, 110.
39 "Night of 28th-29th December 1941," Hitler, Hitler's Secret Conversations, 127.
He put himself under my orders at a time when others refused to do so. That's an unforgettable service.  

Due to harrowing inflation, reaction to the French invasion of the Ruhr, and Streicher's ceaseless work, the party grew from 10,000 in 1922 to 70,000 in 1923. The majority of the new members came from the lower and middle classes. Streicher and Hitler toured cities together but, most of the time, Streicher spoke to crowds on his own. Hitler requested a local branch of the SA (Sturm-Abteilung), the party militia, to be with Streicher when he spoke. These brown-shirted brawlers made sure that no one attempted to shout him down. Also, they would attend meetings of opposing parties and stop the meetings by shouting down their speakers. It was not long before Streicher was the party sensation in and around Franconia.

As Streicher's power grew he made many enemies. He denounced local judges and called for the resignation of the mayor and police commissioner of Nuremberg. He also publicly criticized fellow members of the Nazi Party. There were groups within the party who were against Streicher and men on both sides were killed. In May 1923, to fight anti-Streicher forces, Streicher began

40 Ibid., 126.
44 Varga, Number One Nazi Jew-Baiter, 49.
publishing a weekly newspaper that would denounce his many foes. He named the paper Der Sturmer (The Storm). He used Der Sturmer as his forum to criticize his enemies, to promote Nazi doctrine, and to fight the presence of Jews and other ‘undesirables’. Others also used newspapers as their platform to promote themselves and Nazi ideology and they too included attention-getting articles fighting Judaism. For example, Wilhelm Stegmann, a storm trooper leader, used an anti-Sturmer newspaper to fight against Streicher. Joseph Goebbels before becoming Propaganda Minister, received attention from the Führer by publishing the Nationalsozialistische Schrift (National Socialist Letter). Though it became an official organ of the Nazi Party, it was also a way for Goebbels to shine before Hitler.

Adolph Hitler's political movement grew. With the backing of the World War One general, Eric Ludendorff, members of the Nazi Party decided to revolt against the government in Munich. The revolt became known as the Munich Putsch. On 11 November 1923, crowds gathered outside the Burgerbraukeller to begin the armed uprising. Hitler chose that day because it was a Sunday, so the government apparatus would be slow and the police and military would be slack. Two thousand men met at the beer hall and marched down the street arm in arm sometimes six men abreast. Munich’s downtown square filled with a

---

46 Ibid.
47 Ibid.
massive crowd. Streicher stood up in a truck and spoke to the crowd at many places to heighten their already high spirits. His harangue made an indelible impression on downtown Munich. Soon the Munich Police cordoned off the streets that led into the square of Odeonsplatz, behind the Feldhermhalle, a large public monument. Hitler, Ludendorff, and others stood at the front of the ranks. Streicher stood in the second rank. They marched up to the green uniformed police and stopped. No one wanted to be the first to cause any bloodshed. What happened next no one knows for sure. Some writers claim that Streicher fired the first shot or was seen springing out of the ranks and grabbing a policeman. In any case, sixteen National Socialists and three policemen were killed and more that one hundred people were wounded.

All of the agitators were arrested. Hitler and his friend Rudolph Hess, who would later become the deputy Führer in Nazi Germany, were delivered to the fortress-prison of Landsberg about thirty-five miles west of Munich. Streicher received a minor sentence and was set free long before Hitler and his other accomplices. The National Socialist Party was outlawed. Streicher, along with Hermann Esser, and Artur Dinter formed their own party, the Greater German

---

50 Ibid., 202.
52 Hanser, Putsch!, 386.
53 Ibid., 391.
Peoples Community. Streicher attempted to take over what was left in the ruins of the Putsch, but infighting and disunity among the former Nazi members created a chaotic mess that no one could lead.

When the prison released Hitler in late 1924, people looked for him to lead the squabbling mass of the old party and create a unified front. Soon, the Nazi Party was legalized and Hitler took charge. The Nazi Party divided Germany into thirty-two administrative regions known as Gaus. In each Gau Hitler assigned a party leader, called a Gauleiter, who would run the Nazi organization in that region. In 1925 Hitler appointed Streicher as Gauleiter of Franconia. Streicher ruled his Gau like a feudal lord. He looked smart and tough in his Nazi uniform. He was bald, stocky, wore shinny black boots, donned his Iron Cross medal, and carried a riding whip that he used often, but not for riding.

"Julius is not the worst of the lot," Goebbels wrote. Goebbels's description of Streicher was short and sweet. "Julius Streicher the 'hero' of Nuremberg. A typical Bavarian bum-rusher. 'You must have a meetings bell in every local branch.' That was all he had to tell us. Poor Hitler." As Gauleiter, Streicher toured Germany in an attempt to convert the people toward the Nation Socialist way of thinking. "Look toward Hitler," he shouted.

The government allows the Jew to do as he pleases. The people

---

58 "Diary entry, 24 October 1925," Ibid., 44-45.
expect action to be taken. You may think about Adolf Hitler as you please, but one thing you must admit. He possessed the courage to attempt to free the German people from the Jew by a national revolution. That was action indeed.59

Streicher became extremely active on behalf of Hitler and the Party. When Hitler went to towns he had not spoken in before, Streicher went with him, not only to speak, but to protect Hitler from those who might oppose him.60 Whether there would be a small audience in unfriendly territory or a large rally in Munich or Nuremberg, Streicher usually gave the opening speech.61 The crowds liked Streicher. Even Goebbels changed his thoughts toward the 'Bavarian-bumrusher,' by describing him in his diary as, "courageous Streicher."62

Streicher and Hitler became very good friends. One reason for their camaraderie was their common notion of the Jew. Both men felt that the Jew represented the very principle of evil.63 Streicher often visited Hitler and spoke on a variety of subjects from politics to religion; one subject they debated was whether or not Jesus was an Aryan.64 Hitler and Streicher had a great deal in common. Both were born of humble parentage, and both had an overbearing father. Both were involved in politics before World War One. Both men spoke at length, spent time in court, and spoke forcibly against the Catholic Church, the

59 Streicher speech in 1924," NCA, 2:691.
60 "Diary entry, 19 October 1925," Goebbels, Early Goebbels Diary, 43.
61 "Diary entry, 13 April 1926," Ibid., 77.
62 "Diary entry, 24 May 1926," Ibid., 86.
64 Ibid., 50-51.
Weimar Republic, Bolshevism, and Jewry. The two developed the idea of fatalism and often commented that their lives were guided by destiny and this destiny was linked to their country — Germany.

In 1928, Streicher was dismissed from teaching school. The major causes were because he accused many of his fellow teachers of teaching anti-German ideas to the pupils, he advocated that anti-Semitism form part of the required curriculum, and he had many unauthorized absences. His fellow teachers wrote an eighty page paper against him and the school board agreed to his termination. Streicher was so proud of his dismissal for charges against what he believed to be patriotic, that he added this incident to his Who’s Who biography. By the time of his dismissal, Streicher did not need the teaching job since he could rely on a stipend from his ever growing Der Stürmer.

Even though he no longer taught as a school teacher, Streicher still paid particular attention to the instruction of children and the youth of Germany. “We demand . . . the introduction of racial doctrine in the school,” he touted in a speech. He even had a book published that suggests how anti-Semitism can be introduced and instructed in the classroom. His rhetoric for children

---

66 Varga, Number One Jew-Baiter, 47.
67 Davidson, Trial of the Germans, 44.
68 Ibid.
69 Bytwerk, Julius Streicher, 45.
71 Ibid., 705-707.
involved the whole spectrum from puppet shows, introducing the evil "Crooked Nose" Jew, to speaking to thousands of children at youth hostels and Hitler Youth Camps. A report of Streicher's address to two thousand children at Christmas-time in 1936, states, "Do you know who the Devil is," he asked a breathlessly listening audience. "The Jew, the Jew," resounded from a thousand children's voices. For these activities he would later be charged with "Perversion of Youth."

On 30 January 1933, Hitler became Chancellor of Germany. He immediately proceeded to put his ideas into effect. Hitler ousted the Jews from the civil service. In Nuremberg, he ordered the construction of a huge parade ground, a stadium, and other buildings to hold massive party rallies to demonstrate the power and support he had from the German people in building a new Germany. After Hitler's ascendancy to power, Streicher's speeches became more poisonous, and his articles became more hostile. Though he was sued for slander and libel many times, Streicher knew that nothing serious could happen to him, especially being Hitler's friend. Streicher's efforts to help Hitler and the party were recognized by his being elected to a seat at the Reichstag and by being given the title of general in the SA (Sturm-Abteilung or the brown-
shirts). Both of these positions, however, were honorary, so Streicher never really took advantage of them.

Streicher was rewarded for his zealous anti-Semitic activities when Hitler appointed him as the national Chairman for the first boycott against Jewish businesses which was to begin on 1 April 1933. Streicher called for armed guards to stand in front of Jewish businesses in an attempt to dissuade people from buying Jewish merchandise. The action, however, created only sympathy for the Jews, so Streicher called off the boycott. Streicher and Goebbels blamed the boycott failure on pressure from world Jewry. This reverse did not deter Hitler or Streicher from anti-Jewish ideas, because Hitler was heard laughing, "Streicher has suggested in the next war Jews should be driven ahead of our attacking defense lines. They would be the best protection for our soldiers. I shall consider this suggestion."

Even after gaining power, Hitler still had a soft spot in his heart for Streicher. He went to Nuremberg in 1934 to visit Streicher on Streicher's fiftieth birthday. 15 September 1935, was a red letter day for Hitler's and Streicher's Germany. The Nuremberg Laws were declared to the public which defined Reich citizenship through "German Kindred Blood," and disenfranchised German Jews by declaring them to be non-citizens. These declarations were called the
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Nuremberg Laws or Decrees because they were announced during a rally there. Streicher was not involved in forming the laws, but he applauded them just the same.
CHAPTER III

GAULEITER OF FRANCONIA

As if Streicher's behavior was not aggressive enough, as a Gauleiter he literally wielded a cracking whip. He held court in taverns and beer halls and would hire or fire people on the spot. Many enemies were sent away one way or another. He involved himself in every aspect of local government. When Streicher was sued in court, he would interrupt the proceedings with lengthy speeches to influence the outcome. He was brought to court at least a dozen times during the Weimar period alone.\(^1\) *Der Sturmer* was shut down or banned thirty times before 1933. Hitler got tired of Streicher's blunders, but never withdrew his support; as a result, anti-Streicher forces eventually faded away. Hitler even testified for Streicher in court once.\(^2\)

In a high profile trial, when Nuremberg Lord Mayor Hermann Luppe sued Streicher for slander, Streicher was convicted. But the attention Streicher gained made him look far more significant than in fact he was.\(^3\) As Goebbels

\(^3\) Bytwerk, *Julius Streicher*, 22-23.
noted in his similar experiences in Berlin, the main thing was to be noticed.\(^4\)

Streicher served various amounts of time in jail from slander suits, but in the long run, he won on appeal.

He was accused for sadism many times. The best known case of his beatings was against Professor Steinrueck where he whipped the professor for saying that it would have been better for Streicher to have died than those in the SA, referring to the Röhm Putsch where some members of the SA were killed.\(^5\)

He beat the professor until he [Streicher] passed out.\(^6\) Then he was overheard bragging to his colleagues remarking, “Now I am relieved, I really needed that!”\(^7\)

Streicher was also accused of rape and sexual misconduct.\(^8\) On one occasion he took his son Lothar to the city jail and inquired into the sex lives, particularly about masturbation, of three youths who were arrested for robbery.\(^9\) His sexual obsession probably was reflected in the enormous pornography collection he maintained.\(^10\) He also had a large number of writings in Hebrew, and he claimed that he collected Hebrew literature to learn about the 'enemy.'

---


\(^{7}\) Ibid.

\(^{8}\) Varga, *Number One Nazi Jew-Baiter*, 59.
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In May 1935, Streicher organized, in Nuremberg, the first large scale rally of the Anti-Semitic World League, aimed at promoting a European-wide agreement for legal restrictions against Jews.\(^{11}\) The event attracted thousands of anti-Semites from almost all of the European nations. Streicher was not only the number one Nazi Jew-baiter, now his Jew-baiting was world wide.

Many Nazi members despised Streicher partly because of his racial fanaticism, partly because of his belligerency, and partly because of his personal immorality.\(^{12}\) Streicher would accuse many party members of criminal acts, or he would spread vicious rumors about them. Goebbels heard from a friend that Streicher had called him, "literally dangerous."\(^{13}\) Goebbels reacted by writing a poignant letter to Streicher and a letter to Hitler asking for Streicher to be removed.\(^{14}\) Yet while traveling through Nuremberg, Streicher met Goebbels at a cafe, and they reconciled their differences.\(^{15}\)

To secure better public relations, Streicher performed many good deeds and made sure that news of them were published in his new daily newspaper, the *Frankische Tageszeitung*. He visited the poor, and the sick, and he frequently spoke to children's groups. "His smile never fails to throw young children into
convolutions," said the New York Times. Streicher attended birthday parties for old party members, and he would receive visiting dignitaries. For his annual Christmas dinners, he invited former members of the Communist Party who were imprisoned at the Dachau concentration camp near Munich. Many saw him as a genuinely benevolent government leader. By the mid nineteen-thirties, he had become a Nuremberg institution.

Hitler was constantly asked by many party members to get rid of Streicher. In a conversation, Hitler explained why he did not dismiss Streicher. "How many times I've heard it said in the Party that a new man should be found in such-and-such a post... But by whom will you replace the present holder?", referring to Streicher. "When all's said, it was the Gauleiters themselves who asked me to be indulgent with Streicher... there was no comparison between the faults he committed and his recognized merits, which were brilliant." 

Gregor Strasser countered Hitler's justification for keeping Streicher by writing that Hitler, "overlooks the fact that the total rejection of [Streicher] throughout the Reich is being outweighed by [his] theoretical usefulness within a limited area." 

---

Hitler never brought Streicher to Berlin after the Nazi seizure of power, but always kept him at arm's length away from inner activities. Many writers such as Richard E. Conot, Randall L. Bytwerk, and William P. Varga, say that Hitler kept a distance between himself and Streicher because most other party members abhorred the man.\textsuperscript{20} Although this idea may be true in part, the major reason is suggested by a pertinent comment that Hitler made. "It's not fair to demand more of a man than he can give. Streicher has not the gifts of a great administrator."\textsuperscript{21} Obviously, Hitler thought that Streicher had some intellectual limitations. Whatever the reason, Streicher was not part of any major decisions or meetings that shaped things to come. Though Streicher made a few speeches in Berlin, he had absolutely no influence in the Hitler government. This fact must be stressed, because later, it would become a major point of controversy.

In 1938, the Nazi government tightened its grip across Germany. Nazi lecturers began to fill vacancies left by the many professors who resigned because the government took control of the universities. "If one put the brains of all university professors into one side of a pair of scales," Streicher said in a Berlin speech, "and the brain of the Führer into the other, which side do you


\textsuperscript{21} "Night of 28-29 December 1941", Hitler, \textit{Hitler's Secret Conversations}, 128.
think would sink?"  

On August 10, Streicher pulled the lever on a crane that started the destruction on a synagogue in Nuremburg. A week later, a new decree ordered all Jews to take the names of Israel or Sarah before their existing first names. On September 27, Jewish lawyers were forbidden to practice in Germany. On October 7, all German passports belonging to Jews were invalidated, to be replaced by special identity cards. Streicher's speeches became even more inflammatory: "The Jew no longer shows himself among us openly as he used to," he preached. "But it would be wrong to say that victory is ours. Full and final victory would have been achieved only when the whole world is rid of Jews."

Streicher's paper was filled with even more acid:

*Der Sturmer's* 15 years of work of enlightenment has already led an army of initiated millions strong to National Socialism. The continued work of *Der Sturmer* will help to ensure that every German down to the last man will, with heart and hand, join the ranks of those whose aim it is to crush the head of the serpent Pan-Juda beneath their heels. He who helps to bring this about helps to eliminate the devil, and this devil is the Jew.

By 1938, many countries had closed their doors to the inundation of immigrants from Central Europe. Poland and Austria began anti-Semitic legislation to expel recent Jewish immigrants. The United States began to raise

---

its barriers to Jewish immigration. There was nowhere for the Jews to go. These restrictions frustrated many Jews who were trying to move away from the many constraints forced upon them. On 7 November 1938, in Paris, France, a frustrated Jewish teenager named Herschel Grynzspan shot and killed Nazi functionary Ernst von Rath. The assassination was used by the Nazis as a necessary excuse for inaugurating a coordinated reign of terror against the Jews.

Goebbels, as Propaganda Minister, instigated Germany's first pogrom. All Nazi leaders had been warned to stand by for action against the Jews for action on November 9th. Streicher took a lackadaisical approach to the pogrom. While asleep in bed he was wakened by SA commander Hans Gunther von Obernitz to start the pogrom. Streicher simply yawned and said, "If Goebbels wants it, then that's all right by me." Then he turned over and went back to sleep. He probably felt that he had done his part thirteen weeks earlier with his destruction of the synagogue. In the Kristallnacht, the SS (Schutzstaffel) and the SA went berserk. Over 20,000 Jews were arrested, of whom 36 died, 101 synagogues were burned down (fire departments helped to burn them), thousands of homes
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were damaged, 7500 shops were destroyed, and as a final blow, the hospitals closed their doors to Jews in need.  

The night was modestly named by Goebbels as 'Kristallnacht,' because one could hear the crystalline glass windows of Jewish shops shatter in the frosty night air. Heinrich Himmler, head of the SS and later the Gestapo, wanted Streicher to open a concentration camp near Nuremburg to help with the sudden influx of detainees, but for reasons unclear, Streicher did not want a concentration camp in his Gau.

Many citizens inside Germany denounced the acts of violence of Kristallnacht. The events were heavily reported in the world press, but governments only perfunctorily condemned Kristallnacht. The indifference of the world to the tragic events in Germany gave Hitler a free hand to deal with the Jews as he saw fit. As a result, Kristallnacht became the preamble to the Holocaust.

Streicher became heavily involved in the Aryanization of Germany. Aryanization was the program where a German of Aryan blood could legally purchase Jewish property at a fraction of its value. Most of the profit made by the reselling of a house would go to the government. Streicher began purchasing destroyed Jewish homes after Kristallnacht. He bought and sold the

---
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ruined Nuremberg synagogue to the City Council. He soon amassed a great fortune, because the proceeds he realized never made their way as far as the state. A multitude of Nazi officials, like Goering and Himmler, indulged their greed as Streicher did, but it would be only Julius Streicher who would be called to answer for his avarice later.

Well before the late 1930s, Streicher had a great many enemies, but he demonstrated that he had the ability to survive challenges to his leadership. He had run off one mayor, defeated two police captains, and sent some people away to the concentration camp in Dachau. Himmler, temporarily in charge of the Nuremburg Police Department, appointed Dr. Benno Martin as the new Captain. Martin proved to be a shrewd man, keeping Streicher happy and still running his department as he wanted. When Streicher threatened to whip Martin once, Martin opened a file on Streicher and kept every item he could find against Streicher, no matter how trivial. That file did not come to light until the Goering incident in February 1939.

Streicher coveted a country cottage near Nuremburg called Veldenstein. Goering had owned it for sometime and his visits to Nuremburg only exacerbated Streicher's desire of ownership. At the time of Goering's
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marriage, *Der Sturmer* published a photograph of Goering's bride shopping at a Jewish store. It was a dig at Goering. Three years later when Goering's wife was awaiting the birth of their child, a man working for Captain Martin overheard Streicher tell some people at a bowling alley that he had heard a rumor that the pregnancy was a product of artificial insemination, and it must be true because Goering was so fat and pompous. 38 Word got to Goering who became enraged. Such an allegation had gone beyond the permissible, even in inner party feuds. Martin gave Goering the huge file of evidence he collected on Streicher. 39 Goering got permission from Hitler to open a fact finding commission on Streicher and Streicher was summoned to Berlin. 40

In February 1939, the commission brought a number of charges against Streicher. In the end, he was found guilty of pocketing money from the Aryanization program (though Goering was guilty also) and the commission ruled that Streicher was "Unfit for leadership." 41 All of the Nazis, from Hess down called for Streicher's removal. Hitler had little choice, but to follow the majority voice of the party. Hitler decided to remove Streicher from Nuremberg without stripping him of his titles. Streicher had to retire to Pleikershof, his country estate outside of Nuremberg. He was banned from visiting the city, but
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he could continue to publish *Der Sturmer*. In a conversation Hitler had two years later he stated:

> I have a bad conscience when I get the feeling that i've not been quite fair to somebody. When I go to Nuremberg, it's always with a feeling of bitterness. I can't help thinking that, in comparison with so many services, the reasons for Streicher's dismissal are really very slender... I cannot dream of holding a rally at Nuremberg from which the man who gave Nuremberg to the party is banished.\(^42\)

Nevertheless, from February 1940, until the end of the war, Julius Streicher spent all of his time on his country estate. His only contact with the outside world came from his courier from *Der Sturmer*, and from the various newspapers to which he subscribed. He became so out of touch that his mind grew confused.

In Berlin, away from country pleasures, Hitler decided that a "final solution" to the Jewish problem must be implemented while the war continued.

Compared to the rest of the Third Reich, only a few people knew about "the final solution," including retired Streicher. Later, on 19 January 1942, Reinhard Heydrich called into session the infamous Wansee Conference named after the suburb of Berlin where it was held.\(^43\) Nazi and government officials attended the conference to decide the fate of the Jews.\(^44\) The conference decided the best


\(^{44}\) 40,000 Jews and Gypsies had already been murdered in gas chambers in Chelmno, Poland. The Wansee Conference was the bureaucratic confirmation of the Jewish problem.
policy would be to round up the Jews from all parts of Europe and send them eastward to work in labor camps. Hard enough work, it was believed, would result in significant loss of life. With the conclusion of the conference, what had been fragmentary, and tentative, was to become comprehensive and efficient.\textsuperscript{45} The technical services such as railways, the bureaucracy, and local bureaucracy would work together towards a single goal.\textsuperscript{46} The elimination process would now begin. Within a few weeks after the conference, the first poison-gas chambers in concentration camps were built in Poland. Responsibility for carrying out the extermination process was given to Himmler and his aide Adolf Eichman. The policy of extermination went forward until the camps were overrun at the end of the war.

While these barbaric events were unfolding, Streicher stayed on the Pleikershof farm genuinely interested in his crops and animals. "He wrote an article in \textit{Der Sturmer} that a "final solution" to the Jewish question might be the forced relocation of all European Jews to either the state of Israel or to the French island of Madagascar.\textsuperscript{47} This notion of relocation to Madagascar was discussed as early as 1937, but it was decided as impractical at the Wansee
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Conference because of the ongoing war. \textsuperscript{48} Evidently, not only was Streicher out of touch, but he was also behind the times in terms of the Jewish question in Germany. Eventually, however, Streicher recalled that he observed how Germany was well on its way to dealing with the problem without resorting to deportation. \textsuperscript{49}

In the last days of the war, Streicher, like Hitler, married his mistress Adele after realizing the war was lost. The couple went south and rented a room in a farmhouse. In an ironic and bazarre coincidence, he was captured by a Jewish-American officer, Major Henry Blitt, on 23 May 1945. Blitt recalled that Streicher was unkempt in old clothes and shaggy beard; he acted distant and confused and looked like a broken down old man. \textsuperscript{50} He was a shadow of his former self, both physically and mentally. Streicher and his wife were taken to a police jail in Freising, northeast of Munich, where he claimed he was tortured by some United States soldiers. \textsuperscript{51} This allegation probably is true and will be discussed later.

During his first day of captivity, Streicher revealed to soldiers and reporters a glimpse of his contradictory and violent behavior. In an interview, he responded to questions in a quiet and sincere manner explaining that he meant no real harm to Jews and even tried to protect them. He fell silent for a time,
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fixed his eyes on some soldiers standing outside his cell and suddenly screamed: "Jews, Jews, Jews! Since I was taken in all I've seen is Jews." He followed this outburst by a rush of words describing his absolute contempt and hatred of "all things Jewish."\(^\text{52}\)

Streicher could be kind and gentle to his friends and suddenly turn aggressively violent against them. Streicher's anti-Semitism developed into an obsessive crusade that dominated all his activities as recorded in his last year at Nuremberg.\(^\text{53}\) To grasp an understanding of Streicher's obsession with anti-Semitism, or for that matter anyone who professes anti-Semitism, then one must have a knowledge of how anti-Semitism began, and why it became so widespread in Nazi Germany that it could lead a civilized nation to commit genocide.

\(^{52}\) *Time Magazine*, 68 (4 June 1945): 39.

CHAPTER IV

ANTI-SEMITISM

What exactly is anti-Semitism, and how did it originate? Anti-Semitism is the hatred of the Jewish people. The earliest surviving accounts of the Jews date from circa two thousand B.C., when Jews were one of the many Semitic peoples in the Near East. The term Semite is used irresponsibly when referring to the Jewish people, because in fact it means a specific language showed by certain Arabs and Eastern Mediterranean groups. In the tenth century B.C., Jewish political power reached its height under King David and King Solomon. The first pogrom against the Jews is described in the book of Esther in the Old Testament. The Jewish religion forbids Jews to bow down to any person or god other than the Creator. In the story of Purim, the failure of Mordecai, the Jewish-Persian official, to bow down to Haman, the top aid to the king, created conflict. All Jews everywhere were to be hanged for disrespect, but in an ironic ending, Haman was hanged on the very gallows intended for the Jews.

The conflict between observing the Jewish religion and being sensitive to local customs was the basis for much anti-Semitism. Some examples are that Jews observed strict dietary laws, and Jews could not, according to their law, work on the seventh day. In addition, people who observed minority religions were willing to make sacrifices to the gods of their host countries. With few exceptions, Jews refused to do so. Also, Jews were not supposed to marry outside their faith, and most did not.

Enlightened ancient political leaders often granted privileges and exemptions to Jews because they were aware of the Jew's religious conflicts. Other groups who were not granted these privileges and exemptions often resented this special treatment. Jews maintained their traditional dress and continued to wear beards and earlocks even when styles changed among their hosts. The result was that Jews became more easily identified as a stereotyped culture which had ramifications beyond religious differences.\(^2\)

Historically, there are three stages of anti-Semitism; Classical, Christian, and Modern, each having its own basis of distrust and hatred. Classical anti-Semitism followed the Purim story. Roman Emperor Tiberius deported four thousand Jews to the island of Sardinia. Emperor Caligula, in 38 A.D. instigated a major pogrom against the Jews in the Roman Empire.\(^3\) The Romans


\(^3\) Ibid., 7.
crushed Jewish revolts in 73 A. D. and 135 A. D., and scattered the survivors out of Judea. For over a millennium, the Jews never possessed their own country or nation-state. Through the centuries their physical existence depended on protection by Gentile or non-Jewish authorities of host countries.  

In Northern Europe, Jewish merchants under Charlemagne began settling in France and the Rhineland in the eighth century A. D.  

After the fall of the Western Roman Empire, Christianity began to consolidate its control on Europe by denouncing all other religions from Zoroastrianism to Judaism. Christian anti-Semitism’s main argument is a separation of religions. The basic argument was that the Jews are responsible for Jesus’ death, and therefore all Jews everywhere are guilty. Christian mistrust of the Jews went a bit deeper than mere guilt. As long as Jews rejected the revelation of Jesus, they challenged the Christian’s conviction that Jesus is the Messiah. If the Jews, the chosen people of God, shunned the messiah that God had promised them, then something was wrong. Either the Jews or the Christians were led astray and since the Church could not contemplate the latter, it had to be the Jews who
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committed the grievous transgression against the Lord. Therefore, Jews were considered as "agents of Satan, demons in human form, and killers of God."^{8}

The first story of ritual murder began in the Middle Ages, and it would follow Jews well into the modern age. *The Life and Passion of Saint William the Martyr of Norwich*, written by Thomas of Monmouth, contains the first known description of an alleged Jewish ritual murder.^{9} William of Norwich's son was found murdered and no one knew for sure who killed him. Thomas Monmouth, while compiling his work on Saint William years later, decided to investigate the murder from whatever information he could gather.^{10} Thomas concluded that little William was the victim of a Jewish ritual murder. The story was picked-up in another book, *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, which states that the Jews of Norwich caught little William before Easter and tortured him in the same manner that Jesus was tortured. On Good Friday the Jews hanged William on the cross, like Jesus, and buried him, but their deed was supposedly uncovered by Thomas of Monmouth.^{11} This improbable story spread throughout Christendom and sparked many similar stories that lasted for generations.
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Beginning around 1290, Jews were expelled, in turn, from England, France, Germany, and finally in 1492, Spain. The exiles from Spain fled mainly to North Africa and became today's Sephardic Jews, while those in northwestern Europe moved eastward to Poland, Lithuania, and the Ukraine to become the Ashkenazic Jews.\textsuperscript{12} During the Crusades (1096-1272), Crusaders on their way to the Holy Land massacred all "infidels" who refused to be baptized to Christianity. Thousands of Jews were killed. Hitler mentions in his previously unpublished book, now called \textit{Hitler's Secret Book}, that he wanted to "Teutonize" the various countries and peoples of Europe.\textsuperscript{13} Hitler created the term \textit{Teutonize}, resurrecting the Crusaders known as the Teutonic Knights who undertook the mission to convert and control east Prussia and west Russia by force. When the Black Death broke out in Europe between 1347 and 1350, it was almost inevitable that Jews would be accused of poisoning the wells to overthrow Christendom.\textsuperscript{14} Thousands of Jews were slaughtered despite papal prohibition.\textsuperscript{15}

During the Reformation, Martin Luther started out his Reform by urging tolerance to the Jews and calling for an end to persecution. Later, however, for reasons that remain unclear, Luther changed his mind and spoke some of the
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most rancorous language ever used against the Jews. In 1543 he wrote that the Jews, "are nothing but thieves and robbers, thoroughly evil, poisonous and devilish lot are these Jews . . . and still are our plague, our pestilence, and our misfortunes."\(^{16}\)

A constant vein in anti-Semitic thought is the impression that Jews are involved in a sinister and deadly conspiracy to rule the world. This myth of the Jewish world conspiracy began in the Christian era, and continued into the modern era.\(^{17}\) According to the myth there exists a secret Jewish government, which through a world-wide network of camouflaged agencies and organizations, controls political parties and governments, the press and public opinion, banks and economic developments, with the single aim of Jewish dominion over the entire world.\(^{18}\)

Around the eighteenth century, the Jewish community came into the age of enlightenment. Instead of being a people with no history, many Jews saw themselves as a homogenous group possessing a long lineage. In the middle of the nineteenth century, the Jews were becoming assimilated throughout Europe.\(^{19}\) Many Jews fought in wars, owned banks and factories, and worked their way up the political and administrative ladders. According to Hannah

---

18 Ibid.
19 Arendt, *Totalitarianism*, xii.
Arendt, after the assimilation, anti-Semitism played a role in everyday conversation with the people since only then, "did Jews aspire to play a role in non-Jewish society." No longer were they confined to only a religion; they could now be condemned on economic and political levels.

Modern anti-Semitism is based not only on religious grounds, but takes it a step further with arguments in scientific, pseudo-scientific, and racial concepts. A plethora of writers such as Lothrop Stoddard, Madison Grant, and Count Joseph Gobineau pushed forward new ideologies that race is the decisive factor in history, not politics, geography, or economics. The new Social Darwinists spoke up and said that species must be maintained, and superior species or races had the right to stamp out the inferior ones.

William Marr, a German writer, created the term 'anti-Semite' which replaced the previous cruder term, 'hater of Jews.' Marr founded the "League for Anti-Semitism," and advanced the view that Jews constituted a distinct racial group that was both physically and morally inferior. Marr claimed that there was undisputed scientific evidence that the Jews were predisposed to be a slave race while the Aryans, which included the Teutonic and Nordic peoples, were
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the "Master Race." The term 'Aryan', used by the Nazis to refer to a race, was used irresponsibly. It actually refers to a type of dialect, not a race.

The racial theory could be found elsewhere around the world as well as in Germany. The pseudo-scientific views of writers such as Edouard Drunon and Houston Stewart Chamberlain became popular in many countries. In general, these writers claimed that the history of mankind came down to a precise struggle between spirituality found in the German race and materialism found in the Jewish race. Many notable figures held to racial ideas and anti-Semitic views such as the British political figure Oswald Mosley and American car manufacturer Henry Ford. Henry Ford published a mult-series diatribe in the newspaper *The Dearborn Independent*, where he claimed that the Jews were guilty for the loss of the horse and buggy age. This claim coming from Ford is an awkward one considering that Ford himself contributed greatly to the loss of the horse and buggy age through the mass production of automobiles. Ford also charged the Jews for starting wars, lipstick, and short skirts. On 11 September 1941 the American hero Charles Lindbergh warned a huge rally that if the, “British, the Jews, and the Administration stop agitating for war, there will
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be danger of involvement." Even a Roman Catholic priest, Charles Edward Coughlin spoke to audiences on the radio against the Jews. Patriotic units (as the priest called them) were organized in Brooklyn and other cities and violence began in 1939. There were at least twelve anti-Semitic newspapers founded in the United States before World War Two. Germany had deep roots in the anti-Semitic tradition, and as it burgeoned forth into a new modern industrial nation, it also burgeoned forth with the modern anti-Semitic dogma.

Germany had risen to become the strongest economic, military, and political power in Europe. Between 1870 and 1933 Germany emerged as an actively powerful nation. Its fate was interwoven with the Jews because the two greatly helped each other. From its inception to 1933, Germany won more Nobel prizes than any other country, about thirty percent of the whole, and Jews provided nearly a third, and in medicine, a half. Germany was the first modern nation to achieve universal adult literacy. Between 1870 and 1933 its universities were the best in the world in almost every discipline. Why could a highly civilized nation turn to senseless brutality against the Jews? Daniel Jonah Goldhagen in,
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Hitler’s Willing Executioners, states that, “German society in the Middle Ages and the early modern period was thoroughly anti-Semitic, and the view was shared by elites, and more importantly the common man.” In modern Germany, a chief component of anti-Semitism was the defeat of World War One. Germany entered the conflict as a rising confident nation, but after much sacrificing they lost. To use the Jews as a scapegoat seemed to be the only way to stop the grieving. Another effect of the war was great social change. Before the war Germany was one of the most law-abiding nations in Europe. The fury left by the defeat and the Versailles dictat created civil unrest and social riots. Though anti-Semitism existed in Germany before the war, it became vicious and violent after the war. Chamberlain and Grant’s ideas of the racial struggles were adopted by the volkisch movement. This viewpoint, shared by a minority in Germany, grew as the Nazi Party grew.

In Germany, the so called ‘Jewish problem’ based its arguments on the modern notion of race. Medical practitioners and anthropologists became race scientists under pressure from the Nazi government. Anthropologists attempted to find the ideal Pineland species by measuring skulls, but one single type of a skull classification could not be found. No one knew why at the time. Jared Diamond published an article in the anthropological journal, Natural History, in
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1993, where he suggests the reason why no single race can be found by measuring skulls is because changes in bone structure along with skin tone, hair, and eye color occur at a fast rate in a species living in a new environment. The process is called natural selection first theorized by Charles Darwin. In an irony of ironies, Diamond states that the Jews, the Germans had termed as an "inferior slave race", were the Ashkenazic Jews. The Ashkenazic Jews originated from the Caucasus as part of the Khazars who converted to Judaism around 670 A. D. .


The Caucasus is where the white humans originated and is where the Germans believed the Aryan race had begun. The irony is, that if there is a pure bloodline that leads back to the cradle of the Caucasus, it would be the Ashkenazic Jews who currently lived in Eastern Europe, because they had a more direct link to the Caucasus cradle than the Aryan or Nordic peoples.

National Socialists promoted the principle of race and race hygiene. Only German blood was for German citizens so there was to be no marriage into other races. Commissioned by Himmler in 1932, Walter Darré worked on the pedigree for the planned breeding of an elite race of Herren (Master-Race), "above all in the SS, . . . tested on principles employed by all cattle-breeder's

Ibid., 14-16.

Himmler decreed that members of the SS could only marry by special permission, which could not be granted until the couple had undergone searching biological testing. \(^{40}\) "Just as we have again produced the old Hanover type of horse from sires who had little of the purity left," Darré told Hitler, "by means of recessive crossing . . . the new German aristocracy will be a pure breed in the literal sense of the term." \(^{41}\) Part of the race hygiene program consisted of rounding up the mentally retarded and the handicapped and liquidating them. In other words, liquidation was part of the Nazi eugenics program.

Some Jews in Germany fought back against the Jew-baiters. In the early 1920s some Jews invaded the beer halls where Nazi speakers spoke to audiences of five thousand or more, but the invaders in turn usually received shouts and beatings. \(^{42}\) German Jewish war veterans protested loudly and wrote letters to Nazi officials indicating that they wanted to be part of Germany's renewal process also. \(^{43}\) The veterans organized parties called the Makkabi and the Jewish Front Line Soldiers. As part of their counter-attack they started a newspaper in Nuremberg entitled, the *Anti-Sturmer*, later called, *Der Licht* (The Light). Police records disclosed orders forbidding assimilation groups, those
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Jews who still wanted to be a part of German society, from speaking, but permitting Zionists to speak at meetings, Zionists being those Jews who believed in immigrating from the Germany to start their own state.\textsuperscript{44} Despite these countering efforts, as Nazism grew, so did the persecution of the Jews.

In the 1880s, Jewish emigration from Eastern Europe to the United States accelerated, topping off in the decade 1900-1910, when more than 100,000 Jews annually reached the United States from Russia alone.\textsuperscript{45} Most of those who remained in Eastern Europe were killed in the Holocaust during World War Two.

According to Goldhagen, when the Nazis assumed power in Germany, they found themselves the masters of a society already ingrained with negative notions about Jews that were ready to be mobilized for the extreme form of anti-Semitism -- elimination.\textsuperscript{46} According to Martin Gilbert in his comprehensive book, \textit{The Holocaust}, tens of thousands of Jews were not Jews, in their own eyes, because some were children of Jewish converts and others had grandparents who had converted.\textsuperscript{47} But Hitler had redefined “Jew” as a question of purity and race, declaring “that the mere ‘taint’ of a Jewish ancestor made it impossible for a person ever to be a ‘true’ German, a member of the ‘Volk’.\textsuperscript{48} Germany, during
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the Nazi period, held an almost universal belief that the Jewish influence, by nature destructive, should be eliminated irrevocably from society.\textsuperscript{49}

Julius Streicher kept up his part of the anti-Semitic tradition in his newspaper. He wrote anti-Semitic articles quoting from Madison Grant, the Talmud, and even the local merchants' sentiments. His subject matter came from the ideas of Modern, Christian, and Classical anti-Semitism. Streicher said proudly that, "Streicher and \textit{Der Sturmer}, they are one and the same."\textsuperscript{50} The final ingredient for a full understanding of Julius Streicher lies in the pages of \textit{Der Sturmer}.

\textsuperscript{49} Goldhagen, \textit{Hitler's Willing Executioners}, 48.
CHAPTER V

DER STURMER

As already mentioned, Julius Streicher began publication of Der Sturmer in May, 1923 in an attempt to combat his political enemies in the press.\(^1\) The subtitle for Der Sturmer read, "The Nuremberg Weekly for the Fight for Truth".\(^2\)

The paper was obviously a fighting publication. The title Der Sturmer, developed by Streicher, was similar to those of other Nazi publications like Der Angriff (The Attack) or Die Flamme (The Flame).

In the 1930s, Streicher had built a large staff, but he retained control of what appeared in the paper. Most of the editorials carried his name after 1933, when it was safe to take credit, and other articles were written according to his instructions.\(^3\) He would read much material on the Jews, underline in red what he thought useful, and lesser writers would recast the indicated passages into proper form for the paper.\(^4\) His sentences were shorter than the average for
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written German and his vocabulary was elementary. Editor Ernst Hiemer stated the reason why.

The *Sturmer* is the paper of the people. Its language is simple, its sentences clear. Its words have one meaning. Its tone is rough. It has to be! The *Sturmer* is not a Sunday paper. The *Sturmer* fights for truth. A fight is not fought with kid gloves. And the truth is not smooth and slippery. It is rough and hard.

Hitler wondered where Streicher got his constant supply of new material. Streicher got some of his material from a huge Hebrew literature collection he obtained largely from what he had taken out of synagogues before they were burned. Streicher also employed a renegade Jew to research information on alleged Jewish atrocities in the Medieval period. Letters from readers provided additional material for Streicher’s articles dealing with local issues. *Der Sturmer* devoted an entire section to letters from readers.

Nuremberg politics and local issues were of little interest to readers outside Nuremberg, so Streicher turned to the standby of sensational journalism — sex and crime, preferably together. His main source for articles of nationwide interest came from other newspapers. He subscribed to six Jewish newspapers
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as well as some two dozen daily papers from large German cities.\textsuperscript{12} What Streicher could not put into words he supplied by pornographic illustrations which left nothing to the imagination.\textsuperscript{13} By today's standards, the pictures would be mild, but in Streicher's time, the pictures presented to the public were considered pornographic, and parents were upset about the exposure to their children. Before 1933, Streicher's paper got away with printing such yellow journalism because of the environment in the Wiemar Republic. Wiemar was, by German standards, an ultra-liberal society and one of the effects of its liberalism was to remove most restraints from the press.\textsuperscript{14} Streicher had a liberal license for insults and for sexual and pictorial expression.\textsuperscript{15} After the Third Reich took over the German government, \textit{Der Sturmer} was the only form of pornography openly permitted in the Third Reich.\textsuperscript{16}

In December 1925, Phillip Rupprecht (pen name FIPS) joined \textit{Der Sturmer}'s staff as a cartoonist of outstanding cruelty. His illustrations became as synonymous with \textit{Der Sturmer} as Julius Streicher himself. Rupprecht drew thousands of revolting anti-Jewish caricatures, usually fat, ugly, unshaven, drooling, sexually perverted, bent nosed, and pig eyed figures.\textsuperscript{17} While
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Goebbels saw the caricatures as humorous, Hitler saw the humor as a weapon for the National Socialists.\textsuperscript{16} The illustrations and accusations did not stop with Jews alone. Other Nazi enemies were also attacked: the Bolsheviks, Freemasons, blacks, communists, Slavs, gypsies, and homosexuals.\textsuperscript{19}

Who read Der Sturmer? It was the one periodical that Hitler always read with pleasure, and from cover to cover.\textsuperscript{20} Hermann Rauschning, an early acquaintance of Hitler's stated that, "He [Hitler], was simply on thorns to see each new issue of the Sturmer."\textsuperscript{21} Writer Robert E. Conot stated that “no one had taken Der Sturmer seriously except the pubescent youth and harried housewives for whom it represented daring reading.”\textsuperscript{22} Ironically, many early readers of Der Sturmer were Jews who gave Streicher valuable financial support by purchasing the paper.\textsuperscript{23} Copies went all over the world to German-speaking people. It could be found in the United States, Canada, Argentina, wherever large German populations were located.\textsuperscript{24} Robert Ley, the Nazi labor leader, ordered his followers to subscribe to Der Sturmer.\textsuperscript{25} Though Der Sturmer was not an official organ of the Nazi party, loyal readers built thousands of display
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cases all over Germany.26 People could walk by and view the latest cartoon by FIPS, or glance at the large headlines like; “The Jews Are Our Misfortune,” and, “The Murder of the 10-year Old Gertrud Lenhoff in Quirschied.”27 Particularly after the Nuremberg Laws of 1935, the readership of Der Sturmer became enormous.

Different figures are given on Der Sturmer's circulation. Most sources agree that while the paper was limited to the Nuremberg area the circulation grew from about 2,000 to 25,000 between 1923 to 1933.28 In 1935, Streicher hired the professional publisher, Max Amann, the man who published Hitler's, Mein Kampf. Amann expanded the paper to a nationwide circulation. Randall Bytwerk in Julius Streicher, indicates Der Sturmer reached 473,000 in 1935.29 Robert Conot in, Justice at Nuremberg, claims that the paper reached 600,000 in 1935.30 Telford Taylor in, The Anatomy of the Nuremberg Trials, claims that the paper sold from 600,000 to 800,000 before 1939. But, according to Taylor, circulation went down to 15,000 during the war.31

27 Ibid.
29 Bytwerk, Julius Streicher, 57.
30 Conot, Justice at Nuremberg, 382.
31 Taylor, Anatomy of Nuremberg Trials, 379.
Profits from the sales of Der Sturmer gave Streicher the opportunity to buy out the publisher of Der Sturmer and the finances to purchase two more publishing houses.\textsuperscript{32} Between 1934 and 1938, Streicher’s firms published a variety of newspapers, magazines, and books, including the NSDAP’s official publication in Franconia entitled the Fraenkische Tageszeitung.\textsuperscript{33} Streicher published anti-Semitic books for children to read in school (four editions in one year) and racial works from lecturers at Berlin University.\textsuperscript{34}

Some headlines in a single issue of Der Sturmer were, “Jewish Race Polluters at Work,” “Jew Regards Women as Fair Game for Himself,” and “Fifteen Year Old Non-Jewess Ravaged.”\textsuperscript{35} Other issues warned people against Jewish dentists and doctors who would rape their patients while the patients were under anesthesia.\textsuperscript{36} A special paper by Streicher claimed that once a Jewish sperm is inside a woman, her bloodstream is poisoned.\textsuperscript{37} Der Sturmer published a ridiculous story about a Polish count who forced a neighbor’s Jewish serfs to climb trees and call out “Cuckoo”. The count shot them and declared he killed cuckoos, not Jews. And to appease his neighbor he gave him ten of his
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own Jews. While Nazis might have laughed at this story, they still shook their heads at the presence of Jews.

A subject that Der Sturmer published often was Jewish “ritual murders.” On 1 May 1934 a special fourteen page issue of Der Sturmer, of which 130,000 copies were sold, about alleged Jewish ‘ritual murders.’ The issue was exhibited in display cases around Germany, and showed an old engraving of four rabbis sucking the blood of a Christian child through straws. Eleven columns listed purported ritual murders from 169 B. C. to 1929. An article in April 1937 describes what is alleged to happen when ritual murder takes place, where the blood is mixed with the bread and drunk by the Jews in their religious feast. A photograph in the same April 1937 issue purports to show three Jews ritually murdering a girl by cutting her throat, with blood pouring to the ground. The caption read, “Ritual murder at Polna. Ritual murder of Agnes Hruza by the Jews Hilsner, Erdmann, and Wasserman, taken from a contemporary post card.” There were a multitude of articles, photographs, and illustrations that described in depth devilish ritual murders from the Middle Ages to recent days. Some readers complained about the atrocious articles, but most did not.
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“Streicher is reproached for his Sturmer,” Hitler said. “The truth is the opposite of what people say: he idealized the Jew. The Jew is baser, fiercer, more diabolical than Streicher depicted him.” Catholic clergy were silent and for the most part they seem to have concurred, despite official teachings, with Der Sturmer’s description of the crucifixion of Jesus as being the first instance of Jewish ritual murder. Many other Christians saw the terrible events of the pogroms and anti-Semitic articles as proof of God’s curse on the Jews.

Streicher published letters to Der Sturmer from notable figures such as Himmler and Baldur von Schirach, who was in charge of the Hitler Youth. Himmler and von Shirach complimented Streicher on his excellent work regarding the “enlightenment” and “popular way” Der Sturmer has shown “the enemy of humanity.” Streicher must have found out at his Pleikershof farm about the executions happening in the east because in a Der Sturmer article published 4 November 1943, Streicher wrote:

It is really the truth that the Jews, so to speak, have disappeared in Europe and that the Jewish reservoir of the East, from which the Jewish plague for centuries beset the peoples of Europe, has ceased to exist.
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After 1933, when the Nazis gained power, the paper reached a semi-official status, though it lacked the standing as an official party paper. A Prussian nobleman, Count Henckel Donnersmark, filed a lawsuit at the High Civil Court in Berlin, demanding a retraction of an article against his father and step-mother in which it stated that his father died mentally and spiritually degenerated and his step-mother was Jewish.\textsuperscript{49} The judges handed down the ruling that since Henckel could not prove the accusations false, Streicher was innocent of slander. Elsewhere in Germany, citizens were arrested for criticizing Streicher or disparaging his \textit{Sturmer}.

During the war, while Streicher was forcibly retired to his Pleikershof farm, and every material available was being used for the on-going war, Hitler wanted the paper, and whatever else was needed for \textit{Der Sturmer}, to continue to be produced. In his dairy, Goebbels wrote:

\begin{quote}
Hitler sent word to me that he does not desire the circulation of the \textit{Sturmer} reduced or that it cease publication altogether. I am very happy about this decision. The Führer stands by his old Party members and fellow fighters and won't let occasional trouble and differences affect him. Because he is so loyal to his co-workers, these, in turn, are equally faithful to him.\textsuperscript{51}
\end{quote}

The United States Prosecution at the Nuremberg Trial wrote that without Streicher and his propaganda, the Himmlers, the Ernst Kaltenbrunners (head of
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Gestapo), and the General Stroops could not have done their dirty work. But others also published anti-Semitic material. Goebbels, for example, wrote a multitude of anti-Semitic articles. Although not as base as Streicher's publication, undoubtedly they were of greater influence because they were published in more than three thousand daily newspapers throughout Germany. Hans Fritzsche, as Radio Propaganda Chief, spoke a great deal on anti-Semitism over the air waves to avid listeners, or rather captive audiences. Goebbels, however, was the most influential person in Nazi Germany after Hitler. Streicher's Der Sturmer had its place in the anti-Jewish rhetoric, but Goebbels' published work as Propaganda Minister presumably had a greater authoritative impact.

Der Sturmer was published for twenty-two years and crudely proclaimed hatred to many people. Its legacy lasts today. After typing Der Sturmer on a search engine for the Internet, "The Julius Streicher Memorial Edition," of the 1934 ritual murder special edition popped up, printed and translated by the New Christian Crusade Church in Louisiana.
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During his peak years as Gauleiter, Julius Streicher strutted arrogantly on the sidewalks of Nuremberg, exhibiting authority with his ever present riding-whip, outfitted exquisitely in his tailor-made SA uniform with shiny black boots.\(^1\)

A few weeks after the collapse of Germany his appearance changed considerably. His face and bald head were marked with dirt or paint, and he was dressed in a collarless, dirty blue striped shirt and ragged trousers.\(^2\) Streicher acted hesitant and confused, and looked like a broken, disreputable old man.\(^3\)

Streicher and his new wife, Adele, went into hiding in a farmhouse between Munich and Innsbruck. There, he heard his name mentioned during a radio broadcast listing the Nazi officials who had been classified as criminals and who were being hunted to stand trial for "crimes and atrocities committed during the war."\(^4\) Traffic on the road in front of the farmhouse was heavy with American
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vehicles, but in his innate arrogance and confused state he refused his wife's warnings and brashly painted watercolors on the front porch in the open. A thirsty American major of Jewish ancestry saw the old man on the front porch and ordered his jeep driver to drive to the farm-house to ask for some milk.\(^5\)

Major Henry Blitt, not knowing the identity of the old man, but familiar with the infamous anti-Semite, began to chatter politely and inquired about having a glass of milk. Streicher retorted arrogantly that he was a visiting artist and knew nothing of the dirt-farmer who was the owner of the house. Blitt then scrutinized the bearded man and exclaimed, "You look like Julius Streicher!"\(^6\)

Unthinkingly, Streicher blurted, "How did you recognize me?" Then, realizing too late what he had done, Streicher tried to calmly act friendly and told Blitt that he was mistaken. Streicher mumbled too late. Blitt pulled out his pistol and quietly, but sternly commanded, "Put your hands up, you're under arrest!"\(^7\)

Streicher was taken to jail near Wiesbaden, where he later claimed that he was beaten by American soldiers and paraded around naked, with a crown of thorns on his head, and a plaque around his neck on which was written "Julius Streicher, King of the Jews."\(^8\) He was moved to the Central Continental Prisoner of War Enclosure near Mondorf. While at Mondorf, Streicher wrote a fifteen thousand word political testament which told of his anti-Semitic origins, his

\(^5\) Heydecker and Leeb, *The Nuremberg Trial*, 43.

\(^6\) Ibid.

\(^7\) Varga, *Number One Nazi Jew-Baiter*, 18.

influences and beliefs. The other Nazis totally avoided him, and they were so embarrassed that he was considered one of them that they would leave the room when he entered. Only Robert Ley, Hitler's former Labor Minister, would sit with him in the dining room. Streicher was eventually moved to Nuremberg to await trial with the rest of the defendants. He was glad to be in the midst of surroundings familiar to him from his many incarcerations in the Nuremberg Prison during the 1920s.

There were discussions during World War Two about bringing the Nazi war criminals to trial at the end of the conflict. Many of the exiled governments in London, such as Poland, Norway, Holland, Czechoslovakia, and Belgium, set up their own commissions for war crimes, but were too weak to enforce any action. The Soviet Union was closer to the United States' position on a trial. President Franklin Roosevelt did not want to think about a possible trial until the conflict was closing down.

In the summer of 1944, when the Wehrmacht was in an easterly retreat through France and Belgium, the importance of war crimes trials was stressed by the public, especially with the knowledge of Soviet-liberated death camps in Eastern Poland. The United States took the initiative with at least seven different federal agencies that had immediate concerns about the war crimes

---

9 Varga, Number One Nazi Jew-Baiter, 296-300.
10 Ibid., 296.
11 Ibid.
questions. They were the departments of State, War, Navy, Treasury, and Justice, the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), and the White House itself.\textsuperscript{13} The War Department emerged as the dominant organization.\textsuperscript{14}

U. S. Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson, accepted a memorandum from Colonel Murray Bernays, a successful peacetime New York lawyer who created the "Nuremberg Ideas," and sent it to President Roosevelt. The "Nuremberg Ideas" were the proposals for trying individuals for war crimes. Bernays was aware of the atrocities against Allied prisoners and others committed by Nazi organizations like the SS. He was also familiar with the demands from the American Jewish Conference calling for the punishment of Nazi crimes against German Jews during the prewar years. But the State Department viewed these prewar crimes as outside the scope of the laws of war.\textsuperscript{15} Thousands would be guilty so, instead of having thousands of trials, Bernays devised the method of just trying the top Nazi leaders who would represent the entire organization.\textsuperscript{16} For prewar crimes, Bernays reasoned that if members of the Nazi organizations had agreed among themselves before the war began to commit violations of the laws of war when war came, their conduct prior to the war would be punishable as a part of the conspiracy to commit wartime atrocities.\textsuperscript{17} Roosevelt endorsed
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the plan, with one addition. The Nazis were to be charged with the crime of waging "aggressive" war or what the indictments later termed "crimes against peace," the first such charge in legal history. In the end, the individual defendants were responsible for: (1) crimes against peace, (2) war crimes, and (3) crimes against humanity.

Roosevelt took the basic summary of the proposal to the Yalta Conference. Since neither the British nor the Soviets came up with any better ideas, the United States' proposal was adopted. The United States and Great Britain pushed for an international court for the allied nations to sit in judgment that would include France. The Soviet government agreed and proposed that the court be named the "International Military Tribunal."

After the German surrender, the four powers met in London to work on procedures for the trial and the wording of the indictments. On 8 August 1945, the London Charter was signed; it attempted to legitimize the proceedings of an International Military Tribunal (IMT).

The London Charter set out the responsibility of the trial and proposed that the trial be held in the American zone of Bavaria. Nuremberg was the largest city in the American zone and was the only city large enough to hold a trial of
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that magnitude.\textsuperscript{22} When American soldiers marched into Nuremberg, however, it had been declared ninety-one percent destroyed owing to sixteen Allied bombing raids.\textsuperscript{23} The main reason Nuremberg was chosen to hold the trial was because the Palace of Justice was one of the only large buildings in all of Germany that had survived Allied bombings.\textsuperscript{24} So, American troops worked diligently to refurbish the rest of the city for the trial.

Streicher was not on any of the long lists the Allies had for the major war criminals. Only when the British learned that the United States was to prosecute conspiracy did they add Streicher to this original list.\textsuperscript{25} The list grew to twenty-four who represented a wide spectrum of Germany’s political, military, and industrial leaders.\textsuperscript{26} Eventually, twenty-two defendants sat in the dock.\textsuperscript{27}

The courtroom, in the Palace of Justice in Nuremberg, was built to seat four hundred spectators. The prosecution drew evidence from 300,000 affidavits and

\textsuperscript{26} Shnayerson, "Judgment at Nuremberg," 132.
\textsuperscript{27} Ibid. Martin Bormann, head of the Nazi Party, was tried in absentia; he was thought to have escaped from Germany. Two indicted persons were not tried: Robert Ley, the Nazi Labor boss, hanged himself in the Nuremberg prison, and Alfred Krupp, the key industrialist, was in 1945 reduced to a vegetative state after a series of strokes and consequently unable to defend himself.
meticulous German documents so voluminous they filled six freight cars.\textsuperscript{28} Elaborate preparations for simultaneous translation were made.

The defense counsel selected for Streicher was German attorney, sixty-three year old Dr. Hans Marx. Marx was a capable lawyer, but he was not up to the task. One example of his shortcomings came, according to Robert E. Conot, when he conducted a cross-examination on behalf of the SS, whose counsel was absent.\textsuperscript{29} Marx seemed to be a busy man and had no time for Streicher's digressions. Streicher thought that his being an authority on anti-Semitism (self-proclaimed) should comprise the principal strategy for his defense.\textsuperscript{30} Marx disagreed and as a result of their opposing views, neither Streicher or Marx had any confidence in the other. Streicher was charged with counts One and Three of the indictment: having conspired to commit aggressive warfare and having committing crimes against humanity. On 1 September 1945, the legal proceedings against Streicher were initiated in a series of interrogations conducted under oath principally by Colonel Howard Brundage of the United States Army’s judicial section.\textsuperscript{31}

Brundage inquired into Streicher’s long-lasting fanatical campaign against the Jews. In one key question, Brundage asked if the concentration camp

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{28} Ibid., 126.
\bibitem{29} Conot, \textit{Justice at Nuremberg}, 303.
\bibitem{30} Varga, \textit{Number One Nazi Jew-Baiter}, 313.
\end{thebibliography}
atrocities were the result of Streicher's preaching race hatred for as long as he did to as many as he did? Streicher's answer suggested that he believed he was no more guilty of inciting mass murder than other well known people of many countries who publicly preached anti-Semitism.

Anti-Semitism is all over the world. There are about 12 anti-Semitic newspapers in the United States. Mr. [Henry] Ford published an article in one of his newspapers. Radio Priest [Charles] Coughlin can speak openly in the States. [Sir Oswald] Mosely in England pronounced anti-Semitism in the open, and if the declaration about race hatred which I preached would lead to mass murder, we would have had a mass murder right here in this town of Nuremberg. This is the most anti-Semitic city in Germany. There are millions of people in Germany who heard my speeches in which I declared: "The question of the Jewish race has got to be taken care of the legal, international way." I openly and repeatedly declared that, "Who hits the Jews or one Jew, helps them," and I openly declared that it does not solve the problem of the Jewish question.

When asked if he always advocated the removal of the Jews from Germany, he replied that in his paper he had proposed that, "... the Jewish question should be solved by the Jews forming a national state, just like any other nation, and should create a home there." Streicher went on to say that words used in Der Sturmer like exterminate, annihilate, and liquidate did not mean mass murder. He stated that he was outside of Hitler's inner circle long before 1933, and that he knew as much of the Polish invasion as the average German citizen. His denial that he saw Hitler frequently is corroborated by the surveillance by
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Police President Martin. There was no documentary evidence linking him to Hitler’s military plans and campaigns. Streicher would often respond to straightforward questions with long diatribes completely irrelevant to the subject, which Brundage had to cut off at times. The interrogation lasted for several days where eventually the Allied forces released Streicher’s wife, who had also been in jail. The United States psychologist, G. M. Gilbert, gave each of the defendants a copy of the indictments to sign and asked each of them for a brief statement of his opinion. Streicher’s comment, not unsurprisingly, was, “This is a triumph of World Jewry!”

Streicher became the talk of the jail, sometimes attracting audiences with his antics. “Jesus Christ! Will you look at him,” said a guard while passing by Streicher’s cell. Earlier, the guard watched in disgust while Streicher exercised in the nude, all parts flopping. Now Streicher was washing his face in the toilet bowl. Hitler’s one time adjutant witnessed Streicher brushing his teeth in the toilet bowl and stated that, “Streicher is either insane or a very great criminal. I rather think the former is the case.” Streicher was shunned by his captors and fellow inmates and usually ate alone during meal times. After the suicide of his
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one friend Robert Ley, no one ate with him or even spoke to him. Streicher had attempted to be friendly with Hans Fritzsche, who was Reich Minister for Radio Propaganda, and who Streicher considered a fellow journalist. Fritzsche told Streicher that he thought Der Sturmer was a detestable rag. "Whenever I saw that muck quoted in the foreign press," Fritzsche hissed at Streicher, "I winced." At that point Streicher spat in his face. Goering told the other defendants, "At least we did one good thing. We got that prick Streicher kicked out of office." Streicher did not cooperate with his lawyer. Streicher's lawyer could not prepare an adequate defense because Streicher would go into lengthy tirades on anti-Semitism. Therefore, Dr. Marx requested in a written motion a postponement to gain time to gather more evidence. All four judges denied the postponement. They thought since no one else requested a postponement then they would not grant Marx one. The judges also thought that Marx had enough time because, as in the words of British Justice Hartley Shawcross, "Counsel has got a week from the filing of this answer until the commencement of the Trial."
Streicher lost the confidence of his lawyer. Since Streicher did nothing apart from rambling on about anti-Semitism, Dr. Marx wondered if Streicher suffered from a diseased mind.\footnote{Gilbert, Nuremberg Diary, 9.} Marx asked for a psychiatric examination of Streicher. The Soviet Prosecutor agreed. During the Soviet prosecution's interrogation of Streicher, Streicher stated that everything he had done came from a Zionist's point of view.\footnote{IMT, 1:152.} This unexpected statement led the Russians to wonder if Streicher was sane. As a result, the tribunal ordered a psychiatric examination of Streicher.\footnote{Ibid., 1:153.}

The G. M. Gilbert stated that Streicher rambled on, "like the perseveration in an obsessive-compulsive neurosis or an organic psychosis. There is neither sadism or shame in his attitude, just a cool, apathetic obsessive quality."\footnote{Gilbert, Nuremberg Diary, 73-74.} In his book, 22 Cells in Nuremberg, American psychiatrist Dr. Douglas M. Kelley stated that Streicher's anti-Semitism was fanatical and, "Medically, it represents a true paranoid reaction."\footnote{Douglas M. Kelley, 22 Cells in Nuremberg: A Psychiatrist Examines the Nazi Criminals (New York: Greenberg Publisher, 1947), 142.} Streicher's mentality rated the lowest IQ on the psychological tests given to all of the defendants.\footnote{Gilbert, Nuremberg Diary, 9.}

When Streicher was examined by the psychiatric commission, he turned the examination into another oration on anti-Semitism.\footnote{Ibid.} He lectured the
psychiatrists and explained how he devoted twenty-five years to the study of the Jewish problem, and how he knew more about it than any one else.\textsuperscript{55} When the doctors asked Streicher to undress, the female Russian interpreter went to the door and turned her back. According to Gilbert, Streicher leered and said, “What’s the matter? Are you afraid of seeing something nice?”\textsuperscript{56}

To a forensic psychiatrist, the word insanity means a mental state of such a nature and degree that it prevents a person from distinguishing between right and wrong and from adhering to the right.\textsuperscript{57} In the report of the examination, while the psychiatrists thought that Streicher suffered from a neurotic obsession, they concluded that he was sane.\textsuperscript{58} Therefore, the court ruled that Streicher was fit for trial. Writer and witness to the trial, Rebecca West, wrote, “Streicher was pitiable, because it was plainly the community and not he who was guilty of his sins.” She went on to describe him as, “a dirty old man of the sort that gives you trouble in parks, and a sane Germany would have sent him to an asylum long before.”\textsuperscript{59} The ruling was not a complete surprise. If the same psychiatric commission could see fit to conclude that Rudolf Hess, a man who clearly exhibited unsound mental behavior, was sane, then Streicher should have passed the examination as one of the most normal of human beings.\textsuperscript{60}
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Streicher's incarceration was by no means a pleasant one. Streicher was sent to his cell where he fell asleep. Streicher's guard motioned for the guard next to him to come over. Streicher's guard had fashioned a tiny hangman's noose from a piece of string, and dangled the string in front of the spotlight directed into the cell where the light projected the shadow of a full size noose against the back wall. The guard banged on the door and awoke Streicher, who sighted the shadow of the swinging noose and let out a blood-curdling scream. The guards laughed uproariously. United States Colonel Burton C. Andrus, the commander of the prison, received a complaint from Streicher and other prisoners and defense counsels. His response gave no comfort. Andrus created a form letter to cover all complaints. It read, "You are entitled to nothing under the Geneva Convention, which your country repudiated. . . . Your treatment here is superior to any treatment ever accorded by Germany to any of its prisoners, foreign or domestic."

On 20 November 1945, Lord Justice Lawrence banged the gavel bringing the trial into session. Flood lights in the refurbished courtroom warmed the new
green curtains and crimson chairs. Two rows of Nazis sat in the dock surrounded by American soldiers. The immaculate ex-Coldstream Guards officer, Lieutenant Colonel M. C. Griffith-Jones (Junior Counsel for the United Kingdom) made the opening statement against Streicher.

My Lord, the case against the defendant can be, perhaps, described by the unofficial title that he assumed for himself as "Jew-Baiter Number One." It is the Prosecution's case that for the course of some 25 years this man educated the whole of the German people in hatred and that he incited them to persecution and to the extermination of the Jewish race. He was an accessory to murder, perhaps on a scale never attained before.

The preceding defendants had been buried under a multitude of documents establishing their guilt. But Streicher was not involved in any military decisions and he played no role in German politics since 1940. All of his Nazism was bound into anti-Semitism, and most of it was embodied in his journal, Der Sturmer. All of Griffith-Jones’s presentation was comprised of Streicher’s speeches and publications, mostly articles and editorials from Der Sturmer. No witnesses would be brought forth against him. Without a doubt Streicher played a major role in sowing the seeds of anti-Semitic atrocities, but was that truly a crime under international law? Telford Taylor claims that only in his conclusion did Griffith-Jones address any legal issue, and it was "very summarily," at that.

Griffith-Jones concluded,

in the early days he preached persecution. As persecutions took place he preached extermination and annihilation; and . . . as millions of Jews were being
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exterminated and annihilated, he cried out for more and more. That is the crime he has committed. It is the submission of the Prosecution that he made these things possible . . . which could never have happened but for him and others like him. Without him the Kaltenbrunners, the Himmlers, the General Stroops would have had nobody to carry out their orders.  

This conclusion was eloquently stated, but again the question arises: was the publication of a German newspaper in Germany, no matter how blood-thirsty or invective, an international crime? Also, as Taylor points out, what did Streicher’s paper have to do with Streicher’s indictments under Counts One and Two which was the business at hand?  

According to trial procedures, the defendants themselves were allowed to make opening remarks before undergoing cross-examination by opposing counsels. Writers claim that Streicher made a very poor physical appearance in court. His shaven bullethead, his gum-chewing, and his fulminations about being surrounded by enemies did not put him in a positive light. Largely because the Allies showed movies of the horrors found in the concentration camps at the start of the trial, the other Nazi defendants tried to distance themselves from anti-Semitic notions, while Streicher was positively glowing on the stand in his self-assured expert knowledge of Jew-baiting.

Dr. Marx therefore, had two tasks before him. He had to convince the court that there was insufficient evidence that Streicher had incited the killing of the
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Jews, and he had to prevent Streicher's hateful reputation and loathsome appearance from influencing the Tribunal's decision. The critical argument was the nature of incitement. Streicher and many other Germans incited the persecution of Jews before the war, but under the London Charter those acts were not international crimes. Most Jews in Germany had been deported shortly before the war began. After Germany seized Poland, Jews were sent eastward to extermination or forced labor camps; that was certainly criminal. But, by that time, the German government had thrown Streicher from office, and his voice was only heard through *Der Sturmer* which had a small circulation of 15,000 during the war. Streicher had no connection with anyone who was actually carrying out the holocaust. Dr. Marx called Streicher to take the stand.

The first thing that Streicher said was that he had been beaten up by American Negro soldiers after his arrest. This testimony was struck from the record on United States Prosecutor Robert Jackson's motion, because if the testimony was permitted, the court would have to conduct an investigation. When Streicher was asked to give a short description of his career he stated instead that his defense counsel, "has not conducted and was not in a position to conduct, my defense in the way I wanted." Streicher listed several reasons. Dr. Marx became bitter at Streicher's remark and therefore asked the court that
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he, "be relieved of this task of defense." Dr. Marx refused to remove him, and in a fatherly way, told Marx to proceed. Dr. Marx asked many yes or no questions dealing with Stretcher's party activities and anti-Semitic publications, but Streicher went into lengthy answers and strayed away from the subject. His diatribes brought several objections from Jackson, several warnings from the court, and only aggravated Marx even more than before, however, Streicher was not deterred from his harangues.

Through the long and laborious process of Streicher's speeches, Marx traced Streicher's record in the party and his activities during the war. Marx made a solid argument that Streicher could have had only a slight impact, if one at all, on the fate of the Jews. Marx made little effort to present Streicher as a human being worthy of the law's protection. In fact at the end of the argument Marx said that he had, "a difficult and thankless task," as defense counsel and left Streicher's guilt or innocence "in hands the Tribunal," seeming to wash his own hands of Streicher.

Either by loss of confidence in Streicher, his abhorrence toward him, or by being upset at Streicher's speech-making, Marx, in referring to Der Sturmer's Jewish ritual murder special editions asked, "Why did you now in 1935 stir up again this doubtlessly grave matter?" Streicher was indignant.
"I should like to ask my counsel to express no judgment as to what I have written," retorted Streicher, "to question me, but not to express judgment. The Prosecution are going to do that." Streicher's response created an uproar in the court that was more than Jackson could stand. Jackson objected and said that Streicher was not willing to conduct his case in an orderly fashion and that he should, "be returned to his cell and any further statements that he wished to make to this Court be transmitted to his Counsel in writing." Justice Lawrence ignored Jackson and asked Marx to continue. Streicher's direct examination lasted little more that half a day.  

During a recess, Gilbert observed how Streicher went back to the dock and looked around for signs of encouragement or approval, but everyone had their backs turned to him. While in the mess hall, Gilbert over heard Joachim von Ribbentrop, Hitler's one-time foreign minister, tell Streicher that he could say if he wished that Ribbentrop was not a fanatic anti-Semitic. Defendant Alfred Rosenberg, the Nazi philosopher, then urged Streicher to tell how Jewish writers were attacking the Nazi regime so that the Nazi writers were justified in retaliating. Gilbert observed that Rosenberg had been trying to sell that notion.
to all of the defendants who had testified, so far without success, but Streicher agreed to bring it up.87

After lunch, Streicher again took the stand, now for cross-examination. British Lieutenant Colonel Griffith-Jones, the prosecutor, knew that his task was to portray Streicher as one who incited the persecution of Jews.88 The prosecution spent considerable time demonstrating that Streicher had a bad reputation.89 The evidence used was the captured information that the Nazi High Commission, headed by Goering, used against Streicher.90 The core of the case against Streicher came down to whether he had advocated extermination of the Jews while knowing that such extermination was the settled policy of the Nazi Government.91

Griffith-Jones mentioned that Der Sturmer sent its photographic reporter in May 1943 to get a first hand report from the Jewish ghettos in the East. “Now you have heard what was happening in the ghettos in the East during 1942 and 1943,” said Griffith-Jones. “Are you telling this tribunal that your photographer went with his camera to those ghettos and found out nothing about the mass murders of the Jews?”92

“Yes,” responded Streicher, “otherwise he would have told me.”
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Griffith-Jones turned to an article in the August 1943 edition of Der Sturmer.

"You quote in that article from the Swiss Jewish newspaper, the Isrealitisches Wochenblatt, "The Jews in Europe, with the exception of those in England . . . have, so to speak, disappeared from Europe and the Jewish reservoir . . . has ceased to exist."

"The word disappear," retorted Streicher, "does not mean extermination en masse."

"Very well," said Griffith-Jones. Referring to a 2 March 1944 edition of Der Sturmer he read, "Eternal night must come over the born criminal race of Jews so that eternal day may bless awakening non-Jewish mankind."

"That is an anti-Semitic play of words," replied Streicher. "Again it has nothing to do with the great political aim."

Griffith-Jones responded. "It may be an anti-Semitic play of words, but the only meaning it can have is murder. Is that not true?"

"No," said Streicher.

"You know do you not," inquired Griffith-Jones, "even if you do not believe the figures that millions of Jews have been murdered since the beginning of the war. Do you know that? You have heard the evidence have you not?"

"Yes, I have to say, evidence for me is only the testament of the Führer," answered Streicher. "There he states that the mass executions took place upon his orders. That I believe. Now I believe it."
Griffith-Jones said, “Even if you didn’t believe it when you were reading this newspaper more or less regularly, when your cameraman had been to the ghettos in the East, did you think it right to go on, week after week in your newspaper crying for the extermination, murder, of the Jews?”

Streicher answered,

That is not correct. It is not true that murder was demanded week after week. And I repeat again, the sharpening of our tone was the answer to the voice from America that called for our mass murder in Germany — eye for eye, tooth for tooth. . . . if I had known what in fact happened in the East, then I would not have used these quotations at all.

When asked about an article he wrote in a 9 January 1944 edition of Der Sturmer, Streicher explained that the example that Germany was setting to the other nations of the world was the advocation of a Jewish state.

Griffith-Jones referred to more articles by Streicher written in another issue of Der Sturmer. “Will you turn to the next page, 25 May 1944; and I remind you that these are all after you must have read of the murder in Isrealitisches Wochenblatt. I quote the second paragraph: ‘. . . the germ of the Jewish world plague must be destroyed, root and branch.’ Are you saying there when you say ‘must be destroyed root and branch’ — did you mean to say, ‘ought to be given a Jewish national state’?”

Streicher answered, “Yes. It is a far cry from such a statement in an article to an act, or to the will, to commit mass murder.”
Griffith-Jones read another article by Streicher. "When it loses its struggle, Judaism will be ruined, then the Jew will be extinguished. Then will Judaism be annihilated down to the last man.' Are we to read from these words: Provide the Jews with a national state?"

Streicher answered, "That is the vision of the future. I would like to call it an expression of a prophetic vision. But it is not incitement to kill 5 million Jews. That is an opinion, a matter of belief, of conviction."

"Do you think that it would have been possible to carry out the extermination of 6 million Jews in 1921," asked Griffith-Jones? "Do you think the German people would have stood for it?"

Streicher responded,"... No, it would not have been possible. The prosecution himself has said here that since 1937 the Party had full control of the people."

Griffith-Jones then demanded, "Was it possible to exterminate people in that way only after some 20 years of incitement and propaganda by you and other Nazis? Is that what made it possible?"

Streicher said, "I deny that the population was incited. It was enlightened, and sometimes a harsh word may have been directed against the other side as an answer."

"I have no further questions," closed Griffith-Jones.93
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Writers William P. Varga and Randall L. Bytwerk, believe that Griffith-Jones clinched his case against Streicher when he got Streicher to admit that he subscribed to or read the Jewish newspaper, *Isreralitisches Wochenblatt*. This admission seemingly proved that Streicher was aware of the killing of the Jews that was occurring in the East at the same time he was calling for stringent anti-Jewish measures. Apparently, the Tribunal came to the same conclusion.

At the recess Gilbert noted a contemptuous reaction from defendant Hans Frank, who as Gauleiter of Poland had sent millions of people to their doom. Frank hissed, "The swine did not know anything about the murders? I am the only one who knew anything about it! How can he lie under oath like that? I seem to be the only one who knew anything about it."  

Gilbert wrote that Fritzsche said, "Well, they've put a rope around his neck after all; at least our end of the dock thinks so." Gilbert visited Admiral Karl Doenitz, the last to lead the Third Reich, in his cell. Doenitz mentioned that none of his naval officers would ever have touched Streicher's dirty sheet even with a pair of tongs. Then he mentioned that he hoped some day to get as far away from this mess of politics and propaganda as he possibly could.
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Dr. Marx cross examined Streicher. Marx showed how Streicher had nothing to do with implementing the large-scale extermination of the Jews, but he could do nothing to offset the prosecution’s case relative to Streicher’s intent to incite after he had knowledge about the death camps. After he dismissed Streicher from the stand Marx called Fritz Herrwerth, an employee of Streicher’s at Der Sturmer. Marx asked him, “What observations did you make during your stay at Pleikershof about the attitude of Streicher with regard to the Jewish question? What was that about the Isrealitisches Wochenblatt?”98

“Well, what do you want to know about the Isrealitisches Wochenblatt? Herr Streicher received it.”

“Did he receive it regularly?” Asked Marx.

“Yes, I believe I can say quite certainly,” answered Herrwerth, “I always saw large bundles of newspapers of the Isrealitisches Wochenblatt. They came continually.”

“All right,” said Marx. “Did Streicher speak at times about his knowledge of the happenings in the East?”

“Well,” replied Herrwerth, “Herr Streicher did not know anything at all about it. At least that is my conviction.”

Marx inquired, “Did you, then, ever speak to him about it?”

---

"Not that I know of," Herrwerth answered. "I did not know anything about it myself."

After he dismissed Herrwerth from the stand, Marx called for Adele Streicher. Her testimony was innocuous affirming that her husband was a good man, and the prosecution did not feel the need to cross-examine her.

Dr. Marx then called Ernst Hiemer, editor and writer for Der Sturmer, as a witness for Streicher. Hiemer confirmed Streicher’s statement that Streicher did not believe the reports to be true that Jews were being killed.59 But, in a devastating turn for Streicher, Hiemer went on to say:

In the beginning he decidedly said that these reports could not be true. Then he became uncertain and said that perhaps they might be true. I had the impression that either the detailed manner of the reports in the Swiss press had convinced Streicher that these things had actually occurred or that Streicher, from one source or another, either through personal contact or through letters, had received knowledge that these happenings were actually taking place in the concentration camps. To that I ascribe his change of view.

Marx asked, "And when was that approximately?"

At which Hiemer answered, "I cannot give you the exact date, but I believe it was in the middle of 1944." Marx and Hiemer together, even though they were for the defense of Julius Streicher, had just reiterated the prosecution’s case that Streicher had knowledge of the exterminations while he called for the same drastic measures.
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Marx also called a Nuremberg jurist, Friedrich Strobel as a defense witness, although he seemed more like a prosecution witness. Marx asked Strobel about Kristallnacht.

"I wondered at the time whether Streicher really had a lucid interval and realized how harmful that anti-Jewish action was," answered Strobel, "or whether his vanity was wounded, or whether he felt that a too quick and radical extermination of the Jews would put an end also to his own importance."\textsuperscript{100}

On 30 April 1946, Dr. Marx concluded his case.\textsuperscript{101} After three months the prosecution rested, capping off their work by another movie showing more Nazi horror displaying macabre human skin lampshades, and shrunken Jewish heads submitted as evidence.\textsuperscript{102} Justice Lawrence's gavel fell announcing the adjournment for deliberations. Telford Taylor later claimed that," . . . neither direct or cross-examination had resolved the difficulties in solving Streicher's fate."\textsuperscript{103}

At the beginning of the deliberations, Major Robert Stewart, Judge Parker's aide, sent the judges a legal study in memorandum form. He mentioned that though Streicher was an unappetizing, fanatical old Nazi, his case still needed some legal arguing for a capital sentence.\textsuperscript{104} A. F. Volchkov suggested that
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Streicher’s personal contacts with Hitler were important to his case.\textsuperscript{105} Judge Biddle’s notes read:

\begin{quote}
I blurt out that I think it is preposterous to hold a little Jew-baiter as a conspirator because he was a friend of Hitler’s or a Gauleiter or Nazi. Lawrence bridles and says I have bad manners. Parker pours oil on the water, and says that . . . Streicher has nothing to do with planning or conspiracy.\textsuperscript{106}
\end{quote}

There was some confusion with the judges. All four of them thought that Streicher was guilty on Count Two, war crimes, which he was not indicted under.\textsuperscript{107} Three of the judges considered Streicher guilty under One and Two. Lord Lawrence felt that the evidence dealing with Streicher’s anti-Semitic activities before World War Two could not be treated as war crimes of conspiracy, which was originally why the British put him on the list, but Lawrence immediately dismissed Count One, conspiracy to plan war.\textsuperscript{108} On September 10, with no sign of doubt or need for discussion, the judges unanimously voted Streicher guilty under Count Three, crimes against humanity, and condemned him to death by hanging. Of the other defendants eleven were sentenced to death, three were sentenced for life in prison, four received lesser prison terms, and three were acquitted.

Justice Lawrence read the finding relating to Streicher:

\begin{quote}
Streicher’s incitement to murder and extermination at the time when Jews in the East were being killed under the most horrible conditions clearly constitutes
\end{quote}
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persecution on political and racial grounds in connection with War Crimes, as defined by the Charter, and constitutes a Crime against Humanity.  

This conclusion is inconsistent considering that the three Western judges acquitted and set radio propagandist and anti-Semite, Hans Fritzsche free. No one demonstrated a connection between Fritzsche's radio propaganda and the atrocities. The judges did not consider this point in Streicher's case. In the knowledge of their confusion of the counts against Streicher and the judge's refusal to heed Major Stewart's memorandum, that mentioned though Streicher was an unappetizing, fanatical old Nazi, his case still needed some legal arguing for a capital sentence, on the surface it appears the judges' minds were already made up before the deliberation. The fact that Streicher was confined to his farm during the war was not brought up in court. Neither was the fact admitted that after 1939 he had no contact with Himmler, Hitler, or any government agency dealing with Poland or the East. Although Stewart attempted to have the judges discount the importance of Streicher's "unsavory character" because it bore "little relevance to the main charges against him," they could not overcome it. Was there a significant connection between wartime public declarations of anti-Semitism in the Reich and the actual killing process in the East? There is a difference between burning down the local synagogue and the efficient mass murder machine mounted by Eichmann and Heydreich.
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No one can deny that Streicher was of low character and probably could have been convicted of other charges in another jurisdiction, but his trial did not prove a direct connection between Streicher's exhortations and mass murder.

On 1 October 1946, at 2:50 P.M., almost one year after the trial began, the British Judge of the Nuremberg Trial for Nazi criminals called the sentencing phase of the trial into session. The United States Judge, Mr. Francis Biddle, felt sick and miserable. The U.S. assistant prosecutor, Telford Taylor, later claimed that he was glad that he did not have to read the sentences. One judge called the defendants before them, one at a time. After several sentences were read, the elevator doors opened again. This time defendant Julius Streicher marched out and put on the headphones for translation. "Defendant Julius Streicher, on the count of the indictment on which you have been convicted, the Tribunal sentences you to death by hanging."

After hearing the sentence, Streicher angrily tossed down the headphones and loudly stomped back into the elevator. When visited in his cell by Dr. Gilbert, he said with a crooked smile, "Death, of course. Just what I expected. You must have known it all along."

One final step remained for those who received capital sentences: an appeal to the Control Council. As outlined in the London Charter, a Control
Council would hear pleas for clemency. The Control Council might reduce or alter sentences but not increase their severity.\textsuperscript{116} Streicher's council contended that his client's alleged crimes were not sufficiently related to aggressive war to support his conviction, and therefore he made a plea for clemency.

Jackson wrote a letter to Berlin, where the Control Council was sitting, taking the position that since the defendants, "... had not rendered any service [help] whatsoever to the prosecution, there were no grounds for clemency."\textsuperscript{117} This view is odd because usually the defense does not volunteer to help the prosecution, and this view would have rendered any anti-Hitler activities, like that of defendant Albert Speer, irrelevant.

The Control Council, with representatives of the four major powers, would be the last effort of four-power cooperation in World War Two.\textsuperscript{118} Of the members of the Control Council, the situation of the British representative, Air Marshal Sir Sholto Douglas, is well documented. He received a signal from London which deeply concerned him.\textsuperscript{119} It came from Ernest Bevin, the Secretary of State for the Foreign Affairs for Great Britain. Bevin explained how
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he wanted the Nuremberg Trial to end and was particularly concerned about the pleas for clemency. Douglas wrote that the signal bothered him greatly.

I regarded myself as being in a judicial position, and I did not think that the Foreign Secretary or anybody else had any right whatsoever to tell me what I should do, and that it was up to me to give my verdicts according to my conscience alone.  

Douglas wrote Bevin back stating that all decisions were left up to the Control Council itself. Douglas's reply from London, as the result of a Cabinet meeting, was a long personal signal. It stated that Douglas was not the Commander-in-Chief, a Colonial Governor, or the Home Secretary. It further stressed that it was not for the Control Council to reduce or mitigate the sentences, and it was the view of His Majesty's Government that no alteration in the sentences would be in his best interest. Finally, Sholto Douglas was told that if any of the other members of the Control Council wanted to alter the sentences, he was to refer to London for instructions. In a related matter, Jackson sent the Council a note directing the Council to deal with the petitions as a matter of policy; that there should be no review on legal grounds, though the Charter explicitly gave the Control Council the authority to do so.  

Douglas was in a quandary. One of the main issues that he was going to consider in the appeals for clemency was the way in which orders were given to the German military leaders by the heads of the Nazi state and how the orders
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were observed. One cannot just say that “I was following orders,” because, as
Douglas believed, conscience plays a vitally important part. “Now I was being
told that my beliefs and feelings in the matter, my conscience, did not count: I
was to accept orders.”

When the council met, there was some confusion on how to conduct the
proceedings. The Soviet representative, Marshal Vissily Sokolovsky, wanted no
delay and just wanted to sign the petitions the way they were. Douglas assumed
the reason for Soviet impatience was that Sokolovsky had already received his
orders to dispose or reject any appeals as quick as possible. On 10 October
1946, the Control Council rejected all appeals and confirmed all of the death
sentences. Telford Taylor later commented that Douglas was too wise a soldier
to cross swords with the Foreign Office. Curiously, this episode is not
mentioned in Bevin’s two volume biography.

The next day, the lawyers were notified of the Control Council’s decisions,
and they informed the condemned convicts and their families that all petitions
were denied. The defendants now had five days to live. General Wilhelm Keitel
wrote his memoirs in those remaining days. Goering committed suicide. The
acquitted Hans Fritzsche sent a memorandum to the Tribunal. “It may be difficult
to separate German crime from German idealism,” wrote Fritzsche. “It is not
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impossible. If the distinction is made, much suffering will be avoided for Germany and for the world."\textsuperscript{126}

During the preliminary deliberations of the formation of the tribunal in London, The British had opposed hangings and supported using a firing squad.\textsuperscript{127} Their experience in political executions had taught them that posterity remembers the victim's dramatic last appearance better than the reason for the execution. As a result, the Allies agreed to shroud the lower portion of the gallows in a black curtain. The Nazi officers abhorred the idea of being hanged. They did not mind being shot, but hanging was for traitors. Goering killed himself because according to his suicide note, "I will not facilitate execution of Germany's Reichmarschal by hanging!"\textsuperscript{128}

The night of 14 October 1946, was a long one for those in the Palace of Justice at Nuremberg. Twelve were hanged. It was charged that the executions were cruelly bungled. Cecil Catling, an expert on hangings, declared that there was not enough room for the men to drop, which meant that their necks were not properly broken and that they must have died of slow strangulation.\textsuperscript{129} In addition, Catling claimed that they were not properly tied, so that some hit their heads on the platform as they went down and tore their noses off. The U. S. Army denied this story, but witnesses claimed they saw ten men choking to
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\textsuperscript{129} \textit{Time}, 48 (29 October 1946): 34.
death; "Ribbontrop struggled in the air for twenty minutes." Eventually, the ghastly night was over: some of the Nazi leaders were dead, and the witnesses who were there from the beginning of the trial went home.
Twelve trials took place subsequently in Nuremberg, and many more war crimes trials took place in other countries, mostly for atrocities against the Jews.\(^1\) With the onset of the Cold War, however, leaders of the United States and Britain became more concerned with opposing the Soviet Union than with punishing war criminals.\(^2\) In the 1950s, commutations and pardons were handed out at high rates.\(^3\)

Many persons have looked at the *Trial of the Major War Criminals Before the International Military Tribunal* from 1946 to the present, and have noted a number of problems. United States Senator Robert Taft, a conservative of the war crimes era, argued that the Trial of the Major War Criminals involved ex post facto law -- the crimes had been defined and a court had been created only after the acts had been committed.\(^4\) The United States Constitution does not allow the prosecution of criminals under ex post facto laws, so what advantage was
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3. Ibid.
4. Ibid., 438.
there to use it under world justice? The Nuremberg trial had no precedent for trying the defendants for crimes against peace, crimes against humanity, conspiracy, and organizational guilt, because only war crimes were recognized under international law. And if aggression was a crime, then why did the Russians sit in judgment of the Germans when the Russians had helped Germany to carve up Poland?

In a memorandum sent to the War Department, United States General Lucius D. Clay brings up a point from the soldiers' point of view. Referring to soldiers in Nazi organizations being tried as a part of the whole organization, Clay wrote that it "is not a sound principle as individual participation may warrant substantial difference in punishment to be awarded."\(^5\) Even the chief justice of the U. S. Supreme Court called the trial a "legal lynching."\(^6\) Telford Taylor states that the American and French judges who were appointed had no experience on the bench as judges. Also, Taylor claims that the choosing of defendants was handled carelessly.\(^7\) The American and British prosecutors paid little attention to their better informed lawyers and German experts on which defendants to use. For example, Goebbels' immediate subordinate, Otto Dietrich, would have made a much better defendant than Fritzsche.\(^8\)


\(^6\) Perisco, Nuremberg: Infamy on Trial, 324.


\(^8\) Ibid.
Supporters of the trial argued that Germany, by launching the war and conducting it barbarously, had violated the international obligations that Germany had signed: namely, the Geneva Convention, the Hague Rules of Land Warfare, the Kellogg-Briand Pact outlawing war, and other treaties with neighboring countries. As a result, the court was not ex post facto, but merely the legal machinery for enforcing international law.9

Another lapse to consider is that the defendants got, at best, mediocre legal representation. The lawyers selected for defending the criminals were those that the Allies deemed as reputable, non-Nazis who were in Germany. There were not many top-notch lawyers with those qualifications to be found in war torn Germany. German lawyers spent five months before the trial coping with major handicaps. Many grew to detest their clients, and all were unfamiliar with the adversarial cross-examination used in the United States and Great Britain, which would be used in the war crimes trials.10 The lawyers also had to cope with the tendency of the Americans to withhold key documents before introducing them in court.11

So far as Julius Streicher was concerned, almost none of the authors who wrote close to the time of the Nuremberg trial thought there was any question
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9 Ibid.
11 Ibid.
about the capital sentence Streicher received. Indeed, to them the trial itself was "conducted in solemn dignity and with a high sense of justice." One early writer, Otto Deutsch, wrote that, "The blood of millions is on Hitler's head," and he goes on to say that Hitler's twelve advisors, Streicher included, "share his guilt and become twelve Apostles of evil, disciples of the anti-Christ." Today, writers do not easily lump Streicher in with the rest of Hitler's advisors. In contrast to earlier writers, contemporary writers such as Bradley F. Smith, Joseph Perisco, and Telford Taylor believe that Streicher's case and particularly his execution are troubling.

Telford Taylor writes that the tribunal was callous and unthinking in the way it handled Streicher's case, but the tribunal was perhaps influenced by the likelihood of negative public reaction if Streicher got anything less than the worst. Bradley F. Smith focused on whether there was any provable connection between Streicher's articles and speeches and the actual mass murder machine of the SS. The prosecution at the trial thought that there was a significant connection between them. Prosecutor Griffith-Jones believed that
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16 Taylor, Anatomy of Nuremberg Trials, 599.
17 Smith, Reaching Judgment at Nuremberg, 213.
when Streicher knew that atrocities were actually taking place and he still called for the extermination of Jews, "root and branch," then he was just as guilty of the murders as those who physically committed them. In other words, the prosecution claimed Streicher incited the populace into killing Jews. Contemporary writers like Taylor and Smith are not as sure as the prosecution was over fifty years ago. Did Streicher's rhetoric really create the genocidal acts? Did it matter if he knew that the atrocities were happening? Put simply, did Julius Streicher cause mass murder?

Streicher's first anti-Semitic speech did not cause people to go out and kill Jews. The first publication of Der Sturmer did not cause the construction of gas chambers. Eventually, however, violence did occur. The gas chambers were built. Ultimately, action was taken. Perhaps it does not even matter if he contributed little compared to the propaganda of Goebbels or Fritsche because, in the eyes of blind justice, he was guilty from the fact that he contributed to the extermination process.

Yet, Francis Biddle, the American judge at the trial said, "I think it is preposterous to hold a little Jew-baiter as a conspirator." Indeed, if Streicher was convicted of Jew-baiting then should not all others who preach hatred against Jews, or hatred to any group, also be convicted?
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18 Taylor, Anatomy of Nuremberg Trials, 380.
Streicher was not convicted for what he said before the war. The Allied
Prosecution convicted him for preaching anti-Semitic hatred at the time that
exterminations were taking place in Poland and elsewhere. Once Streicher
knew of the existence of the exterminations or even pretended that he knew,
then he was guilty of contributing to the exterminations. Streicher’s guilt
becomes a foregone conclusion.

Whether Streicher should have hanged is the more appropriate question.
Did he deserve a capital sentence? The answer to this question depends on
how much he contributed to the extermination process. Unfortunately, his
contribution is difficult to assess. The fact that Hans Fritzsche’s radio
broadcasts of official Nazi anti-Semitic messages were judged as
inconsequential to the extermination process only makes the question of
Streicher’s contribution more difficult. Contemporary writers evidently believe
that Streicher did not deserve a capital sentence because they reiterate the facts
that Streicher was never a part of Hitler’s inner circle in Berlin, and that he was
banished to his farm during the whole period of World War Two. Perhaps earlier
writers thought that the hideousness of the mass murders made these facts
irrelevant.

Judging by Streicher’s questionable mental stability that he exhibited in jail,
this writer does not believe Streicher should have received a capital sentence.
Hannah Arendt writes that there is a difference between the educated class who
decided to dislike the Jews and to support anti-Semitic doctrines and the "crackpots" who believe anti-Semitism was a foundation on which a political, social, and economic system should be built. Streicher is in the "crackpot" classification. He used anti-Semitism as an attention-getter, he believed anti-Semitism to be a foundation on which an academic curriculum could be standardized, and, as Sartre pointed out, he was able to use anti-Semitism as a means of raising himself out of the civil servant lower class by condemning the Jewish race as a whole, all classes included. The present writer agrees with Rebecca West, who wrote, "a sane Germany would have sent him to an asylum long before." He probably would have been committed or arrested long before, if he had not been protected by the most powerful man in all of Germany, who happened to have a soft spot in his heart for the "little Jew-baiter."
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