



[The issue of uniqueness has been around for several years. It has been discussed and debated extensively, though by no means definitively, to everyone's satisfaction. At times the dispute has generated more heat than light, largely *not* on philosophical grounds, not even on semantic ones. Though the question of uniqueness has centered primarily on the qualities of the Holocaust, it has far broader ramifications than just for this single (and singular?) genocide. At issue, no less, is the fundamental question: is each incident of genocide so distinct from another that comparison is unproductive, a *cul-de-sac*? Can each case be examined by itself divorced from other like cases?

The following essay by Professor Gunnar Heinsohn may concern itself primarily with the Holocaust in mind as an event apart; yet it is more than that. Its analysis could be a model for teaching the incomparability of any genocide besides the Holocaust.

By agreement with Professor Heinsohn, a "rebuttal" essay will follow his contribution in a subsequent issue of *Genocide Research*. We hope the readers will be drawn into this debate with comments of their own. The editors in particular are interested in promoting this dialogue in order to promote the comparative approach, namely, the speech for both similarities and dissimilarities.]

What makes the Holocaust a uniquely unique genocide?

GUNNAR HEINSOHN

Jewish "race" but not Jewish faith as target of the Holocaust?

It was not for their faith that the Jews were persecuted in Hitler's day—that is precisely why the extermination campaign astounded the Jews and the rest of the world. It was as if forces of hatred and destruction unparalleled in recent history—forces whose potency was unsuspected by the peoples of the so-called enlightened world—had burst forth from the depths of the human soul.¹

Leni Yahil has summarized a scholarly consensus by ruling out the Jewish faith as the aim of Hitler-Germany's genocide of the Jews. There is much less agreement about what Hitler was actually aiming at. Yet, a majority of authors would probably settle for racist anti-Semitism, i.e. a program of strengthening a German-Aryan master race by purifying it of "inferior blood." There can be no doubt that the annihilation of European Jewry was justified time and again in terms of racism by German perpetrators including Hitler himself. In public Hitler has employed every brand of anti-Semitism to carry out his genocidal agenda.

He has sided with Christian Jew-haters, with jealous economic or intellectual competitors of Jews, with supposed victims of “international Jewish finance,” with Slavic nationalists, with Baltic anti-Bolsheviks, etc. All these alliances betray Hitler’s flexibility in carrying through his objective. Yet, what exactly was it? After all, personally he did not believe in racist anti-Semitism. This can, last but not least, be gleaned from a correspondence to Martin Bormann on February 3, 1945:

I have never been of the opinion that the Chinese or Japanese, for example, are racially inferior. Both belong to old cultures and I admit that their tradition is superior to ours. [...] I even believe that I will find it all the easier to come to an understanding with the Chinese and the Japanese, the more they persevere in their racial pride. [...] Our Nordic racial consciousness is only aggressive toward the Jewish race. *We use the term Jewish race merely for reasons of linguistic convenience, for in the real sense of the word, and from a genetic point of view there is no Jewish race.* Present circumstances force upon us this characterization of the group of common race and *intellect*, to which all the Jews of the world profess their loyalty, regardless of the nationality identified in the passport of each individual. This group of persons we designate as the Jewish race. [...] The Jewish race is above all a *community of the spirit*. [...] *Spiritual race is of a more solid and more durable kind than natural race.* Wherever he goes, the Jew remains a Jew [...] presenting sad *proof of the superiority of the ‘spirit’ over the flesh.*²

Hitler did not only understand that there was no Jewish race in a biological sense but he had the same insight regarding the Germans or any people. Again, he expressed this in private—even before 1933—because he had no intention to forego the bloody help of the racists:

A people in today’s political sense is no longer a racial unity, a pure racial community. The large migrations of world history, wars, periods of enemy occupation, but also natural mixing becoming ever more frequent through international trade, have caused *everywhere*, within the borders of a state, all existing races as well as mixtures of races to live together.³

Much closer to racism was Hitler’s attitude towards Slavs. Yet, he only harbored a personal dislike for Czechs.⁴ The Slavic nations as a bloc he considered as unqualified for statehood and, therefore, as easy prey for his conquest of settlement space (*Lebensraum*). It is interesting to observe how Hitler—in his second book which was written in 1928 but only published after the war—has evaluated Slavs in connection with Jews to point out from another perspective that his own anti-Semitism cannot be identified with racist anti-Semitism:

It is only natural that in the Bolshevik revolution Jewry took leading positions in all fields of Russian life. Slavdom [*Slaventum*] as such and out of itself lacks any organizational talent. It is not capable to build states and to preserve them. If you pull out all non-Slavic elements out of Slavdom its state structures will immediately collapse.⁵

Though Hitler’s planned solution for the Slavic states was quite final and definitely genocidal on an enormous scale—we will come back to that—there

was no persecution of the strong Slavic element within Germany or anywhere else outside the Slavic territories.

Only when it came to black Africans did Hitler show himself as a full-blown racist. The relevant passage from *Mein Kampf* is significant because Hitler condemns them in the context of an attack on the Jews. It is directed against the Jewish code of ethics—e.g., “Are ye not as children of the Ethiopians unto me, O children of Israel?” (*Amos* 9:7)—but in no way against a Jewish “race”:

From time to time magazines call the attention of the bourgeoisie to another case of the first Negro ever to have become a lawyer, teacher, even a pastor or star tenor or the like. While the feeble-minded bourgeoisie marvels at this miraculous feat of trained performance, full of respect for this fabulous result of present-day pedagogy, the Jew slyly takes advantage of the opportunity to construct new proof of the correctness of his theory of the *equality of human beings* which it is his mission to hammer into the heads of the nations. It does not dawn on the degenerate bourgeois world that in truth what we have here is an offense against all reason, that it is outrageous lunacy to keep drilling a native anthropoid until one is convinced of having made a lawyer of him.⁶

Although Hitler placed no people below the black Africans, the SS never received a command pertaining to the “final solution of the Negro question.” For the colonial territory to be gained in Africa, strict Apartheid was planned in order to keep the Africans in permanent servitude.⁷ Nevertheless, according to an estimate by the Swiss historian Micha Grin, some 2,000 black women and men were deported from Germany and the occupied territories to concentration and internment camps. Though they were not destined for systematic annihilation hundreds of them perished.⁸ Four hundred Afro-Germans had been forcibly sterilized by 1937.⁹ Yet, others lived in Germany through all of the Nazi period.¹⁰ Hitler’s treatment of the black Africans demonstrates the inappropriateness of the view that Auschwitz was the product of an extreme form of racism. Hitler did indeed cultivate such a form of racism. But it was leveled at “the Negro.” According to the logic of the racist theory, Hitler’s main war should have been waged against black Africans. But since it was waged against Jews, reasons other than those of racism must be investigated. Is the Question as to the Contents of Hitler’s Own anti-Semitism “unanswerable” and, therefore, the Holocaust Inexplicable?

Brigitte Hamann’s 1996 study *Hitlers Wien* came as a shock to many researchers because for the period of Hitler’s life in Austria (1889–1913)

no anti-Semitic statement of the young H. has been transmitted. [...] Why anti-Semitism became the ultimate focus of H.’s career cannot be answered from his time in Linz and Vienna. This development belongs to later years. In 1919 [after World War One was lost by Germany; G.H.] he already used very aggressive anti-Semitic phraseology.¹¹

What Hitler had learnt in Vienna was Social Darwinism, his belief in the victory of the strong over the weak. Yet, that could be learned in every European city. In Vienna, however, Hitler had not yet understood that it was the Jewish code of ethics that stood in the way of applying the rules of the animal kingdom to humankind.

After anti-Semitic Vienna had been identified by many researchers as the seedbed of Hitler's personal anti-Semitism they now had to learn that he actually sided with the Jewish oppressed. This was summarized by one of those scholars, Gordon A. Craig, in his review of the English translation¹² of Hamann's book:

Hamann tells us of a stormy discussion in 1910 about Empress Elizabeth's veneration for Heinrich Heine, in which Hitler defended the [German-Jewish] poet and regretted that there were no statues to him in Germany. In other discussions in the men's hostel, he was reported to have praised Maria Theresia's great reforming minister Joseph von Sonnenfels and Jewish musicians like Mendelssohn and Offenbach. He had Jewish friends with whom he discussed religious questions and the future of the Zionist movement and upon whom he could rely for loans and other help in his worst times. He always preferred to sell his watercolors to Jewish dealers, because he thought that they were more honest and gave him better prices. No reliable source has reported Hitler making any anti-Semitic remarks in his Vienna period; on the contrary, he was known to have expressed admiration for the courage with which the Jews had withstood a long history of persecution.¹³

As late as 1938, after Germany's annexation of Austria, the dictator personally saw to the safe emigration of his venerated Jewish family doctor from Linz, Eduard Bloch.¹⁴ Whenever Hitler saw fit, especially after 1930 in addresses to industrialists, he delivered speeches in which anti-Semitism played no role at all.¹⁵ It is most of all the striking absence of *Radau-Antisemitismus* (rowdy anti-Semitism) in Hitler that has brought many a student of the Holocaust to categorize it under the inexplicable. Germany's leading cultural weekly, *Die Zeit* (author Karl-Heinz Janssen), judged Hamann's book as a starting point "after which Hitler research can fully begin for the first time." The most successful Hitler biographer ever, Joachim Fest, after Hamann's 1996 book, regarded the question as to the content and origin of Hitler's anti-Semitism as "unanswered and perhaps unanswerable."¹⁶ Ian Kershaw, author of "the classic Hitler biography"¹⁷ of our time,¹⁸ two years later was no less prudent than his German predecessor: "Hitler has demonstrated in the most terrifying way what we are capable of. Yet, Auschwitz lies at the limit of explicability. Historians can describe how it got that far but why it happened is a completely different question."¹⁹ One of the most gifted of the younger researchers in Germany, Ulrich Herbert—though not without hope for future progress—could only agree with Kershaw:

Simply to state the inexplicability of the [Holocaust] event will lead nowhere. [...] Since a theory of the Holocaust is lacking [...], the desire for understanding this event can only be fulfilled through time and again occupying oneself with it.²⁰

The Nestor of Hitler research in the English-speaking world, Alan Bullock, told Ron Rosenbaum in 1998: "The more I learn about Hitler, the harder I find it to explain."²¹ And yet, scholars share a strong feeling that "Hitler was the culprit who gave all the other culprits their chance."²² Eberhard Jaeckel did not see it differently: "There are still unanswered questions. We will have to turn our attention to Hitler once more. He stood alone at the top!"²³ Yehuda Bauer, Israel's outstanding Holocaust expert, added confidence that new insights in that

direction should be possible: “Hitler is explicable in principle, but that does not mean that he has been explained.”²⁴ Could it be that there is a way from Hitler’s principles to understand him in principle? This author is inclined to think so.²⁵

Hitler’s first principle: strengthening Germany through the extermination of Germany’s weak

On November 5, 1937, Hitler addressed the highest military leaders of Germany to summarize his political grand design. The protocol (*Hossbach-Protokoll*) of this four-hour meeting became one of the most important pieces of evidence in the Nuremberg Trials (1945/46) to prove Germany’s intention to commit crimes against peace as well as crimes of war. The protocol, completed on November 10, 1937, stated:

The prime goal of the policy of Germany is the safeguarding and preservation of the population masses as well as their increase. Thus, one has to deal with the problem of space.²⁶

Hitler-Germany’s program of systematic exterminations began on September 1, 1939, with “full-blooded Aryans.” It affected the mentally handicapped including newborn, as well as soldiers severely wounded during the war launched against Poland on September 1, 1939. Some 300,000 patients in some 600 German psychiatric clinics were destined to be killed in gas chambers or by injections. Some 70,000, including an unknown number of soldiers, had been murdered before internal resistance brought this secret action of “euthanasia” to a provisional standstill in November 1941. It was a public sermon (August 3, 1941) by the Catholic Bishop of Muenster/Westphalia, Clemens August von Galen, which eventually forced Hitler into a reluctant tactical but by no means final retreat (50,000 more patients were killed later):²⁷

If one is allowed forcibly to remove one’s unproductive fellow human beings then woe betide loyal soldiers who return to the homeland seriously disabled, as cripples, as invalids. [...] Then, it is only necessary for some secret edict to order that the method developed for the mentally ill should be extended to other “unproductive” people, that it should be applied to those suffering from incurable lung disease, to the elderly who are frail or invalids, to the severely disabled soldiers. [...] Woe to mankind, woe to our German nation, if the holy commandment of God, “Thou shalt not kill,” pronounced by the Lord amidst thunder and lightning on Sinai, engraved by the Lord upon the conscience of mankind from the very beginning, is not only violated, but if this violation is tolerated and its commitment goes unpunished.²⁸

The reference of the Bishop, a conservative and nationalist prelate, to Sinai may be revealing. Why mention the Jewish *locus* of the law at all? Why this demonstration of Christianity’s Jewish side, its *Verjudung* (Jewification) as the Nazis would say? In the first edition of Volume I of *Mein Kampf* (1925), Hitler had written: “The exposure of sick, weak, deformed children, i.e. their annihilation, was in reality a thousand times more humane than the deplorable lunacy of our present-day time.”²⁹ Where, for example, infanticide is replaced by prophy-

lactic birth control, and every child born is thus a wanted child, the “obsession” emerges

of “saving” even the weakest, even the sickest, at all costs. [...] A stronger race will banish the weaker ones, for in the end the instinct to survive will always break the ridiculous bonds of a so-called humanity of the individual, allowing the humanity of nature to take its place, a humanity which destroys the weak to provide space for the strong. Therefore, he who wants to ensure the existence of the German nation through a self-limitation of its reproductive process is depriving it of the future.³⁰

Hitler did not leave us in the dark regarding the identity of the originator of this so unnatural “humanity”: “In recognition of the consequences [of birth control], it is not, coincidentally, the Jew above all who so skillfully sets about embedding such mortally dangerous ideas in the minds of our people.”³¹

At the 1929 party convention in Nuremberg, Hitler publicly opposed the “Jew’s train of thought,” citing an older—Indo-Germanic—right:

If one million children were born in Germany per year and 700,000 to 800,000 of the weakest eliminated, the final result might possibly even be an increase of strength. The worst danger is that we are interrupting the natural selection process ourselves (by caring for the sick and weak). ... The most far-sighted racial state of history, Sparta, systematically implemented these racial laws.³²

When the killing of the handicapped was fully under way, on December 4, 1940, a High Consistory of Stuttgart, Reinhold Sautter, engaged, in a private discussion Eugen Staehle, Hitler’s official in charge of the gassing facilities in the psychiatric clinic of Grafeneck, Wuerttemberg. Staehle reprimanded Sautter urging him to stop the transgression of a divine law, saying “The fifth commandment: ‘Thou shalt not kill,’ is not a commandment of God at all but a Jewish invention.”³³ Basically, Staehle let Sautter know that the clergyman—though probably not a friend of the Jews—was *verjudet*, like all the churches, a victim of Jewification.

Hitler’s people knew about the “Jewish invention” of the prohibition of killing, no less than the Bishop of Muenster. There was an indirect dialogue going on between the two sides. Of course, we cannot prove that Staehle’s statement was made according to highest orders. Yet, we know that he himself is not on record for having carried out investigations on the history of the Occidental code. We know, however, that he hit upon a correct observation—the civilization of the world did indeed receive its law forbidding murder from Judaism: “Thou shalt not kill” (*Exodus* 20:13; *Deuteronomy* 5:17).

Pagan authors of antiquity already reported on the extensive elaboration of this Judaic law. It is the first to comprise protection of the newborn, whose killing was allowed in the Greco-Roman cultural complex when called for by considerations of birth control or health. In 300 BCE, for example, the Greek philosopher Hecateus of Abdera was positively astounded by the fact that the Jews raise all of their children.³⁴ In the first century CE, the major historian of the Roman empire, Tacitus, wrote of the Jews, “It is a mortal sin to kill an

unwanted child” (*Histories* Vol 5).³⁵ Philo, a Jewish scholar from Alexandria, explained the connection between the “Thou shalt not kill” and charity in the first century CE:

At the same time an even greater [wrong] is prohibited [for the Jews], the exposure of children—an atrocity which is common practice among many other peoples as a consequence of their innate misanthropy. [...] But who might better be called man-haters than the haters and ruthless enemies of their own children? Only a fool could believe that persons who have treacherously treated those bound to them by descent will show kindness toward strangers. Those who lay their hands on their children, suffocating and suppressing the first breath of life with an insensitivity both brutal and horrible, as well as those who throw them into a river or sea, weighted with a heavy object to make them sink faster—such persons themselves provide the clearest proof of their identity as killers and child-slayers. Others take the children into the wilderness to abandon them—in the hope of their preservation, as they say themselves, but in reality to subject them to the most dreadful ruin. For all the man-eating beasts approach unhindered to help themselves to the children, the grand feast served them by the children’s former guardians, those primarily committed to their preservation, father and mother; and the relics are gnawed at by the birds of prey which then come flying down—if their attention has not been attracted earlier, for if it has been, the birds will fight the beasts for the entire body. (*De specialibus legibus*, Vol III, p 20).

The most important passage of the Torah—for all forms of Judaism—emphasizes the sanctity of life as the core of the law and as a value identical with goodness (“the good law”):

See, I have set before thee this day life and good. [...] I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing: therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live. (*Deuteronomy* 30:15, 19)

Not until the year 318 CE was the Judaic prohibition against infanticide enacted by the Roman empire under Constantine the Great, never again to be formally expunged from the criminal statutes of the Occident and the Europeanized nations.³⁶ India, under the British, outlawed infanticide in 1839.³⁷ In about 1900 Japan had done the same.³⁸ In 1949, China followed suit.³⁹ Hitler’s circle had fully understood that the prohibition of infanticide is not a law of nature but a moral principle created by man—by “the Jews”—and, therefore, also abolishable by man.

Hitler’s second principle: strengthening Germany through the conquest of settlement territories (*Lebensraum*) and the extermination of their inhabitants

In the speech of November 5, 1937, to his top brass Hitler was prepared to meet resistance when coming to the decisive point in relation to the prospective role of the German military:

The only way to achieve our goal [safeguarding and preservation of the population masses as well as their increase] would lay in the winning of a larger living space [*Lebensraum*]. This may appear as dreamlike to you [...] I am not dealing with winning new people but

with agriculturally usable space. [...] To the solution of the German question there is only the way of force and that can never be without risk.⁴⁰

Within the Nazi party Hitler elaborated on such ideas much earlier. At the beginning of the 1930s, he met Hermann Rauschning, the Nazi leader of Danzig who later became his opponent and published a book on this meeting:

Our lawyers and lawmakers make a fundamental error in assuming that one can *create life with a code of laws* and a constitution./Our revolution is not merely a political and social one. We face *a tremendous upheaval of moral principles* and the spiritual orientation of man. With our movement *the intervening age, the middle age*, has come to its end. We terminate a wrong path of mankind. *The Tables of Mount Sinai have lost their validity. Conscience is a Jewish invention.*/It is our duty to depopulate, just as it is our duty to provide appropriate care to the German population. We will have to develop a technology of depopulation. What do I mean by depopulation, you will ask. Do I intend to eliminate entire peoples? Yes, more or less. That is where it will lead to. Nature is cruel. We therefore have the same right. [...] For centuries people have been driveling on about the protection of the poor. The time has come to address ourselves to the protection of the strong from the inferior. One of the most important tasks of an eternally valid German politics will be to use every possible means to prevent the further growth of the Slavic peoples. Natural instinct commands every living being not only to defeat the enemy but to destroy him. In earlier ages there existed the *good right of the victor to exterminate entire tribes, entire nations.*⁴¹

There is a long-standing controversy regarding the authenticity of Hitler's statements in Rauschning's report. The essential—though not word-for-word—correctness of Hitler's tone is supported by mainstream historians (e.g. Schieder,⁴² and Broszat⁴³) whereas others—including right-wing exponents like Haenel⁴⁴—refuse to acknowledge Rauschning as a historical source (e.g. Tobias⁴⁵). This author chooses a middle course, i.e. draws on passages borne out by statements of Hitler made at other times and in other contexts. The fact that Rauschning never supplied stenographic notes of his encounter with Hitler and that his text contains interpretations of Hitler's ideas is indisputable for all participating in the controversy. Basic ideas of Hitler reported by Rauschning strike one as being not only original but rich in consequences. Should one want to reject them as a basic source one would have to acknowledge Rauschning himself as the creator of these unusual thoughts. Yet there is no evidence whatsoever to support the assumption that the formulations by Rauschning being examined here are derived from his own research.

Strikingly similar to Rauschning's report from the early 1930s is a protocol of Hitler's adjutant, Major Engel, for January 20, 1940, when Hitler was bathing in the victory of the first Eastern war (Poland, 1939) and preparing the two Western wars (France/Holland/Belgium as well as Denmark/Norway, 1940):

F. [*Fuehrer*] says literally "The war is in this respect [...] a good opportunity." Already in antiquity entire peoples have been eliminated. Peoples were deported in passing.⁴⁶

On August 11, 1939—twenty days before launching the offensive against

Poland—Hitler reassured his Swiss counterpart, High Commissioner of the League of Nations for Danzig, Carl Jacob Burckhardt:

If I have war to conduct, I would rather conduct war today than tomorrow. I would not conduct it like the Germany of William II, which constantly felt pangs of conscience about the full employment of its armed force. I will fight ruthlessly to the end.⁴⁷

On November 11, 1941, Hitler, in a private discussion, gave his view why Germany had lost World War I:

We experienced it during the World War: the only country which was religious was Germany, and that was the country that lost.⁴⁸

How does one have to read statements like these or the passage reported by Rauschning—“The Tables of Mount Sinai have lost their validity, Conscience is a Jewish invention./In earlier ages there existed the good right of the victor to exterminate entire tribes, entire nations”? On December 5, 1940, Hitler approved the plans of the *Wehrmacht* to attack Soviet Russia and to annex it up to the Ural Mountains, i.e. up to the border of Asia.⁴⁹ From different sources it becomes clear what Hitler meant with his announcement from November 5, 1937: “I am not dealing with winning new people but with agriculturally usable space.”

Basically, the program for the Soviet Union was the same as in the first Eastern war, against Poland. On August 22, 1939—ten days before the attack—Hitler, once again, had attuned his generals and admirals to his new *Weltanschauung* of winning space but not its inhabitants. Admiral Canaris, the chief of German intelligence (*Abwehr*), had conveyed this to the British:

Genghis Khan drove millions of women and children to their death, consciously and light-heartedly. [...] I [Hitler] gave the order—and I will have anyone who utters even a word of criticism shot—that the war aim does not consist of reaching certain lines but of the physical destruction of the enemy. It is for this purpose that I have assembled my death’s-head squads, for the time being only in the East, with the command to *send [every] man, woman and child of Polish descent and tongue to their death, mercilessly and pitilessly. Only by these means can the Lebensraum we require be gained.*⁵⁰

After Germany’s own mentally handicapped and the seriously wounded German soldiers, the Polish elite became—in late September 1939—the third group to be exterminated by Hitler-Germany: “There must be [Hitler on October 2, 1940] no Polish members of the elite in occupied Poland. Where they exist they have to be killed—even if this may sound hard.”⁵¹ His party’s race-political office [*Rassepolitisches Amt der Reichsleitung der NSDAP*] had already demanded in Autumn 1939: “In the long run the complete deletion of the Polish nation [*Polentum*]⁵² must be achieved. Within eight weeks in Autumn 1939, *SS-Einsatzgruppen* killed some 40,000–70,000 Poles (including family members) with university degrees—many of them Jewish and nearly 2,800 of them Catholic priests.⁵³ Up to the end of the war 750,000 Poles were forcefully deported from their homes—with a high killing rate in often deadly conditions of cattle wagons or winter death marches.⁵⁴ Simultaneously with the killing of Poland’s elite, the SS began with the ghettoization and massacres of the Jews of

Poland as a preliminary step to the “Endloesung” (final solution) as can be concluded from Heydrich’s statements on September 21, 1939.⁵⁵ In the Soviet Union, Germany’s attack with an army of 3.5 million soldiers took place on June 22, 1941. “‘A ridiculous hundred million Slavs’,” Hitler proclaimed [on August 6, 1942], “will we absorb or expell?”⁵⁶ Already in June 1940, Heinrich Himmler, chief of SS and police, had informed twelve leaders of the SS that “30 million of the Slavic population”⁵⁷ of the Soviet Union were to be killed outright. “Twenty-nine million”⁵⁸ were to be worked to death to lay the infrastructure for some 20 million German settlers. The remaining 30–40 million were to be expelled to Siberia—with a killing rate of such deportations reaching some 30 percent or 10–13 million. The expelled were even to keep their leader, Stalin, whom Hitler characterized, on July 11, 1941, as one “of the most extraordinary figures of world history.”⁵⁹

On June 25, 1941, only three days after the attack against the Soviet Union, the Holocaust began—not yet with gas but with mass shootings of Jews by SS units, *Einsatzgruppen*, and local collaborators wherever the German front included a Jewish community. Gassing of exhausted Jewish slave workers began in August 1941 in gas chambers of the euthanasia program within Germany. On September 3, 1941, experimental killings in gas chambers were started in Auschwitz-Birkenau. The killing with gas trucks was introduced on December 5, 1941, in Chelmno.

All seemed to go according to Hitler’s program with the Soviet war. Another *Blitzkrieg* of between two weeks and up to a few months was expected by nearly everyone. Half of the Soviet air force was destroyed on the ground right at the beginning of the war. The chief of staff of Great Britain already prepared itself for Stalin’s defeat around August/September 1941.⁶⁰ Hitler, meanwhile realized his extermination policy:

I can imagine that many are astonished: How can the *Fuehrer* destroy a city like Petersburg! When I see that the species is in danger, ice-cold reasoning takes the place of feeling: I see only the sacrifice demanded by the future if no sacrifice is made today. [...] Petersburg is to disappear. *Here one must revert to antique principles*; the city must be razed to the ground. Moscow as the seat of the [communist] doctrine will [also] disappear from the face of the earth. I feel nothing when I raze Kiev, Moscow and Petersburg to the ground.⁶¹

The recipe of moving back behind the “Tables of Mount Sinai” to “antique principles” was set in full motion. We know that, eventually, Hitler-Germany failed. Therefore, the death toll did not reach the planned 70 million. Yet, around 11.5 million perished. Some 8.2 million Soviet civilians⁶² as well as 3.3 million prisoners of war⁶³ were killed in addition to the soldiers who died in battle and the Soviet Jews killed in the Holocaust. That is something to consider for anti-Semitic admirers of Hitler. If only one out of two Slavs killed by his forces belonged to the anti-Semites, then the German leader took the life of 5–6 million of their rank and file.

In the cold language of comparative genocide research one could say that

Hitler's movements against Slavic peoples—Czechs,⁶⁴ Poles, White-Russians, Ukrainians and Russians—were textbook genocides. They were monstrous crimes but not enigmatic like the Holocaust. Historians ascertain that archaic war was “ecological in motivation: it redistributed land from the weak to the strong,” for which traditionally the methods known as “displacement of the weaker party” and “annihilation” sufficed.⁶⁵

That was Hitler's recipe from early on: “The one and only goal of Germany's foreign policy lies in space in the East,”⁶⁶ he wrote in 1928. He waited only four days after taking power to let the German High Command know on February 3, 1933, about this strategic ambition: “Conquest of new *Lebensraum* in the East and its ruthless Germanization.”⁶⁷ The chiefs of army and navy did not believe him. One participant recalled that after Hitler had left the gathering the phrase by Schiller was quoted: “The word is always bolder than the deed” (“*Stets kecker war die Rede als die Tat*”).⁶⁸ The admirals and generals were not ready for genocide. As professional officers they had internalized the laws of warfare and had no intention to break them. Later, they were only too willing to make Germany a world power and go to war for their *Fuehrer*. Yet, to kill prisoners of war, to eliminate civilians, to shoot women and to smash babies was not on their agenda. Hitler understood this only too well.

Cleansing the Germans from Judaism's principle of the sanctity of life by eliminating the Jews

In hindsight, we know a lot about the crimes of the *Wehrmacht* and not only of the SS. But Hitler was worried to the end that he would fail in his re-education of the average German male. After all the purges of his officers' corps it still did not function as ordered. General Blaskowitz—chief of staff in occupied Poland, a devoted German nationalist and soldier—did not only show a lack of ruthlessness. He collected information on the atrocities of the SS units and the *Einsatzgruppen* killing the Polish elite and sent it—on November 27, 1939—to his superiors in Berlin. On February 2, 1940, he demanded—together with General Ulex—to use the *Wehrmacht* to round up the SS units and remove them:⁶⁹ They wrote to Berlin:

The army views the SS and the police [under SS command] with abomination and hatred. Every soldier feels disgusted and abhorred by these crimes committed in Poland by citizens of the Reich and representatives of the state. He does not understand how such atrocities—taking place, so to speak, under his protection—can go unpunished.⁷⁰

Hitler had prepared himself for his soldiers' “pangs of consciousness” and, therefore, had kept his genocidal policy a secret—as he had done with “euthanasia” within Germany. Other than with “euthanasia,”⁷¹ however, there was—very much like in the Holocaust—no order signed by Hitler himself to eliminate Poland's elite.⁷² The orders came from the SS to whom Hitler had given verbal orders. Reinhard Heydrich, chief of the SS-police, wrote on July 2, 1940:

The orders for the police were so radical—e.g., the order to liquidate many Polish elite circles amounting to the thousands—that, of course, could not be conveyed to the commanding officers in the field or to their superior staff [in Berlin].⁷³

The Germans—as Hitler saw it—were still in the grip of the Jewish code of ethics or Jewified Christianity. On January 20, 1940, his adjutant reported him saying:

The *Wehrmacht* is still running to the drumhead services. [...] But, at the same time, the education of the SS points to the right direction. It would prove that—with the right ideological education—one can be courageous without God.⁷⁴

The SS education especially assaulted the Jewish commandments pertaining to charity and the protection of life. In the place of love, honor was demanded; in the place of sympathy, duty.⁷⁵ The removal of Jewish ethics from Christianity was, however, estimated to be a tremendously difficult task, for from the beginning this religion was “subjected to decomposition/destruction [*Zersetzung*] by the Jews.”⁷⁶

There can be no doubt that this education went back to Hitler’s own ideas. On February 17, 1942, at his headquarters, he lamented that:

The same Jew who once smuggled Christianity into the world of antiquity and destroyed it, that wonderful thing, has now found another weak spot: the dazed conscience of our present generation. [...] Peace can only come by way of a natural order. The order demands that the nations merge in such a way that those who are capable lead. He who is inferior thus obtains more than he could ever achieve on his own. This order is being destroyed by the Jews.⁷⁷

It is important to understand, however, that the theological conflict between Jews and Christians—the son saving the God of Abraham against the salvation coming from the Son sacrificed by the God of Christianity—is of no importance to Hitler, though, of course, he readily employed the Christian resentment deriving from it.

Hitler’s evaluation of the concept of conscience most probably transforms ideas originating with Friedrich Nietzsche. He had studied parts of his writings in Landsberg prison in 1923. Nietzsche had written in 1882:

Sin is a Jewish feeling and a Jewish invention, and in view of this background to all Christian morality, Christianity was in fact out to “Jewify” the entire world.⁷⁸

The conviction of the “Jewification” of Christianity was also preached in Hitler’s political camp by Erich Ludendorff, Germany’s chief of staff at the end of World War I. In 1929, in the magazine *Ludendorffs Volkswarte* he had the figure of a “Rabbinerfrau” (rabbi’s wife) say:

The Germans came indeed from the woods and the groves; they had strong gods who were heroes fit to fight; they were pure, proud and strong; it was good to slay the enemy, and blood vengeance was their foremost principle. But they were to be robbed of all of these things—they were given Semitic Christianity.⁷⁹

When attacking the Soviet Union—20 months after the Polish war—Hitler

was still not sure about a sufficient killing mentality of the *Wehrmacht*. On June 6, 1941, he gave order to kill every “Kommissar” (basically every member of the Bolshevik party in the Red Army) captured in battle:

They are not to be recognized as soldiers and, therefore, are not under the protection of the international laws of war. After separation they are to be finished.⁸⁰

Hitler insisted that “these ‘tasks’ are so difficult that one could ‘not demand them from the army’.”⁸¹ Therefore, the army had only to turn over communists to the SS which, then, did the killing. Yet, on October 18, 1942—nearly 16 months into the Soviet war—Hitler still was angry with the *Wehrmacht*:

He would know very well that the army followed orders—e.g. the kommissar-order—only reluctantly or not at all. That is to put blame on the High Command willing to turn the soldier’s profession into a caste of pastors. How many other things would have been left undone if he had not had his SS.⁸²

Nevertheless, the re-education of the German male had made some progress. On September 23, 1941, General Field Marshall Wilhelm Keitel, head of the Supreme Command of the *Wehrmacht*, defended the killing of the Kommissars as the “extermination of an ideology” which he “condoned” and “approved.”⁸³ Was the Holocaust also the “extermination of an ideology”?

In September 1943, Hitler formulated as his legacy that “the SS is the best he leaves to his successor. [...] The formation of the *Wehrmacht* in the future Aryan state has to take place under the control of the SS.”⁸⁴ To turn the entire German military into a gigantic death squad, to change every German male into a killer was no small task, a program with no end in sight as Hitler already had noted in 1928: “Wherever our success will lead us it will only be the starting line for a new battle.”⁸⁵ This would not work if the soldiers were time and again exposed to the Jewish code of ethics with the sanctity of life at its core. One cannot prepare to eliminate millions and millions and, simultaneously, made to listen to “Thou shalt not kill” or to “Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself/And if a stranger sojourn with thee in your land, you shall not vex him. But the stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself” (*Leviticus* 19: 18; 33 f). Already in August 1930, Hitler had diagnosed the influence of this code: “In every human being the Jew destroys the natural instinct of self-preservation.”⁸⁶

Unlearning the Jewish-Christian code by doing the opposite became one of the major measures during the second Eastern war. Two codes of law (subsumed under the term “Martial Jurisdiction Command”) were issued by Wilhelm Keitel on May 13, 1941: (1) the “Handling of Crimes Committed by Enemy Civilians” and (2) the “Handling of Crimes Committed by Members of the Armed Forces and its Attendants against Native Citizens.” The latter command gave the simple soldier a license to kill without being court-martialed:

Deeds of members of the *Wehrmacht* committed against enemy civilians must not be prosecuted even if the deed constitutes a crime of war.⁸⁷

More than 10 million German men serving on the Eastern front between 1941 and 1945 were encouraged to kill civilians and prisoners of war at will and so they did. Massacres and the burning of entire villages occurred in hundreds of cases by army units or even by individual soldiers.⁸⁸ Attempts of high-ranking officers to control this behavior were to no avail because the highest commander—the Fuehrer—was behind this practice.

It was part of his program to remove the influence of “the Jew,” “the racial tuberculosis of the nations”⁸⁹ from the German mind. According to Hitler’s convictions a successful removal was only possible if the living carriers of the disease—the respect for life—were treated like other infectious germs, i.e. were killed off. As early as August 7, 1920, he had put this idea into words:

Do not think that you can fight a disease without killing the causative agent, without destroying the bacillus, and do not think that you can fight racial tuberculosis without seeing to it that the nation is freed from the causative agent of racial tuberculosis. The influence of Judaism will never fade as long as its agent, the Jew, has not been removed from our midst.⁹⁰

“The Jewish race is above all a *community of the spirit*,”⁹¹ he underlined nearly a quarter of a century later. What is the power to *zersetzen* (destroy) this spiritual bacillus? Four priests—three Catholic one Protestant—were hung on November 10, 1943, in Luebeck because they had followed the model of Bishop von Galen and distributed his sermon with its “‘Thou shalt not kill,’ pronounced by the Lord amidst thunder and lightning on Sinai.” Their crime was *Wehrkraft-Zersetzung*,⁹² the destruction of a soldier’s will to fight and to kill.

One does not find the term *Zersetzung* (decomposition or destruction) in the encyclopedias dealing with the Holocaust⁹³ though it is frequently applied by Hitler to describe the work of “the Jew” as the destruction in the sense of the decomposition of the readiness to kill. With our Nazi “movement the intervening age, the middle age, has come to its end,” Hitler had declared at the beginning of the 1930s. He may as well have called it the age of destruction.

In Catholic philosophy, since St. Augustine’s fourth century CE, the middle part of its tripartition of human history was called the *era sub lege* (period under the law). It defined the time from the law of Moses to the incarnation of God as Jesus Christ. The first part was called the *era ante legem*, the period before the law of Moses (“Thou shalt not kill!”). Its barbarity was defined by the absence of a prohibition against homicide. In the Christian view, the first age had the worst reputation; Hitler, however, wanted to recreate it. The third Christian age, the *era sub gratia* (period under the grace of Christ lasting to the end of days) was as much an aberration to him as the period under the law of Moses.⁹⁴

Why was the Holocaust a uniquely unique genocide? Conclusion

The Holocaust was “uniquely unique”⁹⁵—this author claims—because it was a genocide for the purpose of reinstalling the right to genocide. Hitler was not unprecedented in ruthlessly and massively breaking the commandment “Thou

shalt not kill!"; he was irreducibly distinct from other megamurderers by abrogating it.

Of course, Hitler's intention to eliminate the Jewish code of Occidental ethics did not lead right away to the extermination of Europe's Jewry. Discrimination, expropriation, expulsion, and annihilation through slave labor were preliminary steps on the "twisted road to Auschwitz."⁹⁶ The turn from merely pushing the Jews into misery to murdering them outright, the acceleration or the slowing down of the killings, the exploitation of the opportunities of the war, the ambitions of competing Nazi leaders and minor bureaucrats trying to impress their Fuehrer, the mental state of the slaughterers, the material needs of the German military and occupation regime—all these deadly factors are dealt with in thousands of articles and books. They give us an ever more accurate anatomy of the Holocaust. This work is far from complete. Israel Gutman—chief historian of Yad Vashem—has declared on August 29, 1999 that "the most interesting subject for scholars now is the role played during the Holocaust by local communities: people, churches, underground movements and newspapers. The focus is on mutual relations between Jews and non-Jews, and on personal and individual recollection and testimony."⁹⁷ It is, thus, not so much the anatomy of the Holocaust and its environment but the anti-Jewish motive of Hitler as its initiator that lacks explication.

If Hitler went against the Jewish code it does not come as a surprise that not only Jews, but also every Christian daring to defend his Jewish heritage, i.e. the commandments regarding love and protection of life fell prey to Nazi persecution. In the first Hitlerian model province—the "Warthegau" annexed from Poland—the Lutherans were put under Nazi control. Not before the age of 21 could one join the church—and then only after having obtained permission from an SS panel. The Polish Catholic clergy was targeted to be killed. The German Catholics were deprived of the Concordat privileges which were confined to the 1937 borders of the *Reich*. German Catholic priests of the *Reich* were forbidden to visit the new province.⁹⁸ Even Hitler's Berlin secretary of state for the churches was not allowed to go there.⁹⁹ However, for a Christian to be taken away by Nazi authorities and killed he had publicly to stand up for the values of life and love whereas Jews—as their "incurable" carriers—could not even save themselves by renouncing their faith.

Whereas SS men were expected to be ready to kill right away and the many million soldiers of the Eastern front learnt killing by doing, the Hitler Youth became the subject of the most systematic education aimed at the deletion of the Jewish code of ethics. *Der neue Glaube* ("The new belief"), for example, replaced "Thou shalt not kill" with neo-archaic commandments concerning the "eternal struggle":

You shall not spare the enemy, but meet him with grim resistance, for he desires to be slain by you.

His mission is to goad you, and your mission: to vanquish him.

Fear not that one day no enemy will remain to you; new ones will always come forth. All vermin is fertile to a point of excess, and usurious; hence it forces us to combat it.¹⁰⁰

On March 14, 1943, Hitler himself praised the first signs of success in his endeavor to mold the German army into a large-scale, militant SS. Very young men in tank divisions of the *Waffen SS* had helped to overpower superior Russian units in Kharkov to whom the *Wehrmacht* tank divisions had already submitted:

The young people of the Hitler Youth fight fanatically, [...] young German fellows, some of them sixteen years old. These Hitler lads usually fight more fanatically than their older comrades.¹⁰¹

The supposedly unanswerable question as to the content of Hitler's own anti-Semitism is answered by this author by pointing to Hitler's deadly animosity to the very core of the Jewish faith—the sanctity of life. Hitler wanted to reintroduce the archaic rights to (1) infanticide—to strengthen Germany internally by killing the handicapped¹⁰² including the newborn and to (2) genocide—to give Germany strategic superiority externally by annihilating the monotheistic people of the Ten Commandments whom—as distinct from the Ancient Israelites—he regarded as the first abolishers of these archaic practices. To Hitler the sanctity of life was the ultimate Jewish *Weltanschauung* which could be eliminated like any other ideology—e.g. the communism of the commissars in the Red Army—by exterminating its “carriers.”

Soon after 1918, Hitler had reached the conclusion that Germany could have won World War I if it had acted more ruthlessly, i.e. if it would have shed all respect for life and the laws of war. He seriously—albeit wrongly—believed that only the German Reich had been weakened by the adherence to “religion” and “pangs of consciousness.” He was convinced that in that war Germany “did not even think of resorting to really aggressive means.”¹⁰³ Not to repeat this outcome of Germany's “Jewification” (*Verjudung*) became the focus of his entire political career.

In the cold language of the computer age one could say that Hitler smashed the hardware—Jewish men, women and children—to destroy the software—the Jewish code of ethics. The German males were entrusted with the wearisome and bloody work of permanently conquering the vast Eastern *Lebensraum* territories to be emptied of their inhabitants. To perform these massive genocides, the Germans were to be relieved of the inhibitory effect caused by the infection of the Judaic “Thou shalt not kill!” Hitler understood that the implementation of a neo-archaic code of killing would require generations—a “work for a hundred years” (Alfred Rosenberg).

To this very day, Holocaust researchers are convinced and, at the same time, puzzled that “Nazi Germany ranked the murder of the Jews over the war effort.”¹⁰⁴ Yet, the war in the East constituted not so much a war but a series of gigantic genocides for which the Germans had to be trained whilst they were executing them. There are very few studies¹⁰⁵ taking these genocides into

account when trying to understand the Holocaust. The elimination of the Jewish code of the sanctity of life by exterminating the Jews was—in Hitler’s mind—meant to boost the *genocidal* effort in the East as well as every future war conducted by the Germans.

Notes and References

1. L. Yahil, *The Holocaust: The Fate of European Jewry* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990 [original Hebrew 1987]), p 5.
2. H. Trevor-Roper and A. Francois-Poncet, eds., *Hitlers Politisches Testament. Die Bormann Diktate vom Februar und April 1945* (Hamburg: Albrecht Knaus, 1981), pp 66, 68, 69; italics G.H.
3. O. Wagener, *Hitler aus naechster Naeh: Aufzeichnungen eines Vertrauten 1929–1932*, H. A. Turner, ed. (Frankfurt am Main: Ullstein, 1978), p 288; italics G.H.
4. B. Hamann, *Hitlers Wien: Lehrjahre eines Diktators* (Munich/Zurich: Piper, 1996), p 32.
5. A. Hitler, *Außenpolitische Standortbestimmung nach der Reichtagwahl Juni–Juli 1928* (1928; first published as *Hitlers Zweites Buch*, 1961), in *Hitler: Reden, Schriften, Anordnungen. Februar 1925 bis Januar 1933*, Vol IIA, with an introduction by G. L. Weinberg; G. L. Weinberg, C. Hartmann and K. A. Lankheit, eds (Munich: K. G. Saur, 1995), p 118.
6. A. Hitler, *Mein Kampf* [1925/27], people’s edition in one volume (Munich: Franz Eher Nachfolger, 1930), pp 478 ff; italics G.H.
7. R. Giordano, *Wenn Hitler den Krieg gewonnen haette. Die Plaene der Nazis nach dem Endsieg* [1989] (Munich: Knaur, 1991), pp 140 ff.
8. B. Schaefer, afterword to the German edition of M. Mailet, *Schwarzer Stern* [1990] (Berlin: Orlanda Frauenverlag, 1994), p 188.
9. M. Opitz, “Rassismus, Sexismus und vorkoloniales Afrikabild in Deutschland” [1986], in K. Oguntoye, M. Opitz and D. Schultz., eds, *Farbe bekennen: Afro-deutsche Frauen auf den Spuren ihrer Geschichte* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch, 1992), p 58.
10. Cf. the memoir of H.-J. Massaquoi, ‘Neger, Neger, Schornsteinfeger!’: *Meine Kindheit in Deutschland* (Bern: Fretz und Wasmuth Verlag, 1999).
11. B. Hamann, *Hitlers Wien: Lehrjahre eines Diktators* (Munich/Zurich: Piper, 1996), pp 498, 502.
12. B. Hamann, *Hitler’s Vienna: A Dictator’s Apprenticeship* [1996] (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999).
13. G. A. Craig, “Working Toward the Fuehrer,” *The New York Review of Books*, March 18, 1999, p 35.
14. B. Hamann, *Hitlers Wien: Lehrjahre eines Diktators* (Munich/Zurich: Piper, 1996), pp 56 ff.
15. D. Grieswelle, *Propaganda der Friedlosigkeit: Eine Studie zu Hitlers Rhetorik 1920–1933* (Stuttgart: Enke, 1972), p 193.
16. J. Fest, “Der Auftrag kam von Hitler,” *Die Woche*, November 29, 1996, p 39.
17. I. Kershaw, *Hitler, 1889–1936: Hubris* (London: Allan Lane, 1998).
18. G. A. Craig, “Working Toward the Fuehrer,” *The New York Review of Books*, March 18, 1999, p 32.
19. I. Kershaw, “In gewisser Weise war er der Mann ohne Eigenschaften: Die Geschichte Hitlers ist auch die Geschichte seiner Unterschaetzung. Ein Gespraech mit Ian Kershaw, dem Verfasser der neuen großen Hitler-Biographie,” *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, October 1, 1998, p 44.
20. U. Herbert, editor’s introduction, *Nationalsozialistische Vernichtungspolitik 1939–1945: Neue Forschungen und Kontroversen* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer-Taschenbuch Verlag, 1998), pp. 65 ff.
21. R. Rosenbaum, *Explaining Hitler: The Search for the Origin of his Evil* (New York: HarperCollins, 1998), p 7.
22. C. James, “Blaming the Germans: The much lauded revisionist study of the Holocaust [by Goldhagen] goes too far,” *The New Yorker*, April 22, 1996, p 50.
23. E. Jaeckel, “Der SS-Intellektuelle: Bedurfte es keiner Befehle Hitlers, um die Vernichtungspolitik in die Welt zu setzen?,” *Die Zeit*, March 29, 1996, p 18.
24. R. Rosenbaum, *Explaining Hitler: The Search for the Origin of his Evil* (New York: HarperCollins, 1998), p 7.
25. The following thoughts extend ideas first developed seven years ago in G. Heinsohn, “Umweltapokalyptiker und ökokrieger: Die Zukunft des Völkermords,” in Landeshauptamt Stuttgart, Kulturamt/J. Wilke, eds, *Zum Naturbegriff der Gegenwart. Kongreßdokumentation zum Projekt “Natur im Kopf,”* Stuttgart, 21–26. Juni 1993 (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Problemata Frommann-Holzboog, 1994), Vol 1, pp 225–260. A more detailed study appeared as G. Heinsohn, *Warum Auschwitz? Hitlers Plan und die Ratlosigkeit der Nachwelt* (Reinbek: Rowohlt, 1995).

26. F. Hossbach, "Niederschrift [of November 10, 1937] ueber die Besprechung in der Reichskanzlei am 5.11.1937 von 16.15 Uhr bis 20.30 Uhr," in F. Hossbach, ed., *Zwischen Wehrmacht und Hitler 1934–1938* (Wolfenbuettel/Hannover: Wolfenbuetteler Verlagsanstalt, 1949), p 207.
27. During the so-called "wild euthanasia" between November 1941 and December 1944 another 30,000 are killed. To this figure has to be added the death of 20,000 patients tracked down in Polish and Soviet psychiatric clinics.
28. H. Portmann, *Kardinal von Galen. Ein Gottesmann seiner Zeit. Mit einem Anhang: Die drei weltberuehmten Predigten* [1948] (Muenster: Aschendorff, 1961), pp 357 ff.
29. W. Hammer, *Adolf Hitler—ein Prophet unserer Zeit? Dialog mit dem "Fuehrer" (III). Ideologische Aspekte* (Munich: Delp, 1974), p 21.
30. A. Hitler, *Mein Kampf* [1925/27], people's edition in one volume (Munich: Franz Eher Nachfolger, 1930), p 145.
31. A. Hitler, *Mein Kampf* [1925/27], people's edition in one volume (Munich: Franz Eher Nachfolger, 1930), p 149.
32. H.-W. Schmuhl, *Rassenhygiene, Nationalsozialismus, Euthanasie. Von der Verhuetung zur Vernichtung "lebensunwerten Lebens," 1890–1945* [1987] (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1992), p 152.
33. H.-W. Schmuhl, *Rassenhygiene, Nationalsozialismus, Euthanasie. Von der Verhuetung zur Vernichtung "lebensunwerten Lebens," 1890–1945* [1987] (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1992), p 321.
34. M. Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism. Volume One. From Herodotus to Plutarch* (Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1976), p 29.
35. M. Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism. Volume Two. From Tacitus to Simplicius* (Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1980), p 26.
36. Cf. G. Heinsohn, "Theorie des Toetungsverbotes und des Monotheismus bei den Israeliten sowie der Genese, der Durchsetzung und der welthistorischen Rolle der christlichen Familien- und Fortpflanzungsmoral," in J. Mueller and B. Wassmann, eds, *L'invitation au voyage zu Alfred Sohn-Rethel* [Festschrift fuer Alfred Sohn-Rethel zum 80. Geburtstag] (Bremen: Unibuchladen Wassmann, Contribution No 7).
37. Cf. L. Panigrahi, *British Social Policy and Female Infanticide in India* (New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1972).
38. Cf. I.B. Taeuber, *The Population of Japan* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1958).
39. Cf. Ping-ti, Ho, *Studies in the Population of China, 1368–1953* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1959).
40. F. Hossbach, "Niederschrift [of November 10, 1937] ueber die Besprechung in der Reichskanzlei am 5.11.1937 von 16.15 Uhr bis 20.30 Uhr," in F. Hossbach, ed., *Zwischen Wehrmacht und Hitler 1934–1938* (Wolfenbuettel/Hannover: Wolfenbuetteler Verlagsanstalt, 1949), pp 209 f, 212.
41. H. Rauschning, *Gespraechе mit Hitler* [1938] (Wien: Europaverlag, 1988), pp 189, 210, 129ff; italics G.H.
42. Th. Schieder, *Herrmann Rauschnings "Gespraechе mit Hitler" als Geschichtsquelle* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1972).
43. M. Broszat, "Enthuellung? Die Rauschning-Kontroverse" [1985], in M. Broszat, ed., *Nach Hitler. Der schwierige Umgang mit unserer Vergangenheit* [1986] (Munich: dtv, 1988), pp 249ff.
44. W. Haenel, *Herrmann Rauschnings "Gespraechе mit Hitler"—Eine Geschichtsaelschung* (Ingolstadt: Veroeffentlichungen der Zeitgeschichtlichen Forschungsstelle Ingolstadt, 1984).
45. F. Tobias, "Auch Faelschungen haben lange Beine. Des Senatspraesidenten Rauschnings 'Gespraechе mit Hitler'" [1988], in H. Corino, ed., *Gefaelscht! Betrug in Literatur, Kunst, Musik, Wissenschaft und Politik* (Frankfurt am Main: Eichborn, 1990), pp 91 ff.
46. H. v. Kotze, *Heeresadjutant bei Hitler 1938–1943: Aufzeichnungen des Majors Engel* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1974), p 71.
47. E. Deuerlein, *Hitler. Eine politische Biographie* (Munich: List, 1969), p 144.
48. H. Picker, *Hitlers Tischgespraeche im Fuehrerhauptquartier. Vollstaendig ueberarbeitete und erweiterte Neuauflage mit bisher unbekanntem Selbstzeugnissen Adolf Hitlers, Abbildungen, Augenzeugenberichten und Erlaeuterungen des Autors: Hitler wie er wirklich war* [1951] (Stuttgart: Seewald, 1976), p 77.
49. Cf. A. Hillgruber, *Hitlers Strategie: Politik und Kriegfuehrung 1940–1941* [1963] (Bonn: Bernard & Graefe, 1993), pp 367, 543 ff.
50. Cf. Deutsches Auswaertiges Amt, *Akten zur deutschen auswaertigen Politik 1918–1945. Aus dem Archiv des deutschen Auswaertigen Amtes, Series D (1937–45), Vol 7* (Baden-Baden: Imprimerie Nationale, 1956), p 171; italics G.H.
51. M. Broszat, *Nationalsozialistische Polenpolitik 1939–1945* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1961), p 23.

52. M. Broszat, *Nationalsozialistische Polenpolitik 1939–1945* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1961), p 24.
53. M. Broszat, *Nationalsozialistische Polenpolitik 1939–1945* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1961), pp 44 ff.
54. M. Broszat, *Nationalsozialistische Polenpolitik 1939–1945* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1961), pp 100–102.
55. A. Hillgruber, *Hitlers Strategie: Politik und Kriegfuehrung 1940–1941* [1963] (Bonn: Bernard & Graefe, 1993), p 519, n 11.
56. A. Speer, *Der Sklavenstaat. Meine Auseinandersetzung mit der SS* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1981), p 422.
57. P. Witte, et al., eds., *Der Dienstkalender Heinrich Himmlers 1941/42* (Hamburg: Christians, 1999), p 172.
58. A. Speer, *Der Sklavenstaat. Meine Auseinandersetzung mit der SS* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1981), p 421.
59. A. Hillgruber, *Hitlers Strategie: Politik und Kriegfuehrung 1940–1941* [1963] (Bonn: Bernard & Graefe, 1993), p 540, n 21.
60. Cf. E. L. Woodward, *British Foreign Policy in the Second World War* (London: HMSO, 1962), p 153.
61. A. Speer, *Der Sklavenstaat. Meine Auseinandersetzung mit der SS* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1981), p 422; italics G.H.
62. Cf. G. A. Kumanev, “The German occupation regime in occupied territory in the USSR (1941–1944),” in M. Berenbaum, ed., *A Mosaic of Victims: Non Jews Persecuted and Murdered by the Nazis* (New York/London: New York University Press, 1990), pp 128–141.
63. Cf. A. Streim, *Die Behandlung sowjetischer Kriegsgefangener im “Fall Barbarossa”* (Heidelberg: Mueller, 1981).
64. Some 50,000 members of the non-Jewish Czech elite as well as the left were killed. Two million out of the 7.5 million Czechs were destined for elimination, the rest for absorption. Cf. D. Brandes, *Die Tschechen unter deutschem Protektorat* (Munich/Vienna: Oldenbourg, 1969/1975), 2 Vols.
65. J. Keegan, *A History of Warfare* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1993), pp 101, 387, 29.
66. A. Hitler, *Außenpolitische Standortbestimmung nach der Reichtagswahl Juni–Juli 1928* (1928; first published as *Hitlers Zweites Buch*, 1961), in *Hitler: Reden, Schriften, Anordnungen. Februar 1925 bis Januar 1933*, Vol IIA, with an introduction by G. L. Weinberg; G. L. Weinberg, C. Hartmann and K. A. Lankheit, ed. (Munich: K. G. Saur, 1995), p 119.
67. T. Vogelsang, “Neue Dokumente zur Geschichte der Reichswehr. Nr. 8,” *Vierteljahreshefte fuer Zeitgeschichte*, Vol 2, 1954, p 435.
68. T. Vogelsang, “Neue Dokumente zur Geschichte der Reichswehr. Nr. 8,” *Vierteljahreshefte fuer Zeitgeschichte*, Vol 2, 1954, p 436.
69. H. Krausnick, *Hitlers Einsatzgruppen: Die Truppen des Weltanschauungskrieges 1938–1942* [1981] (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch, 1985), p 84.
70. H. Krausnick, *Hitlers Einsatzgruppen: Die Truppen des Weltanschauungskrieges 1938–1942* [1981] (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch, 1985), p 84.
71. The order reads: “Reichsleiter Bouhler and Dr. Brandt M.D. have been commissioned under order of responsibility to extend the powers of certain doctors, to be appointed by name, in such a way that persons judged to be incurably ill can be granted euthanasia on the basis of a critical assessment of their condition. Signed: Adolf Hitler.” Cf. H.-W. Schmuhl, *Rassenhygiene, Nationalsozialismus, Euthanasie. Von der Verhuetung zur Vernichtung “lebensunwerten Lebens,” 1890–1945* [1987] (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1992), p 190.
72. M. Broszat, *Nationalsozialistische Polenpolitik 1939–1945* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1961), pp 19 ff.
73. H. Krausnick, “Hitler und die Morde in Polen,” *Vierteljahreshefte fuer Zeitgeschichte*, Vol 11, 1963, p 207.
74. H. v. Kotze, *Heeresadjutant bei Hitler 1938–1943: Aufzeichnungen des Majors Engel* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1974), p 71.
75. B. Wegner, *Hitlers politische Soldaten: Die Waffen-SS 1933–1945* [1982] (Paderborn: Schoeningh, 1990), p 51.
76. B. Wegner, *Hitlers politische Soldaten: Die Waffen-SS 1933–1945* [1982] (Paderborn: Schoeningh, 1990), p 69.
77. H. Picker, *Hitlers Tischgespraeche im Fuehrerhauptquartier. Vollstaendig ueberarbeitete und erweiterte Neuausgabe mit bisher unbekanntem Selbstzeugnissen Adolf Hitlers, Abbildungen, Augenzeugenberichten und Erlaeuterungen des Autors: Hitler wie er wirklich war* [1951] (Stuttgart: Seewald, 1976), p 106.
78. F. Nietzsche, *Die froehliche Wissenschaft* [1882, 1887] (any edition), aphorism 135.

79. E. Ludendorff, *Judengestaendnis: Voelkerzerstoerung durch Christentum* (Munich: Ludendorff Verlag, 1936), p 2.
80. H. Buchheim, et al., *Anatomie des SS-Staates* [1965] (Munich: dtv, 1967), p 502.
81. H. Buchheim, et al., *Anatomie des SS-Staates* [1965] (Munich: dtv, 1967), p 452.
82. H. v. Kotze, *Heeresadjutant bei Hitler 1938–1943: Aufzeichnungen des Majors Engel* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1974), pp 130 ff.
83. A. Hillgruber, *Hitlers Strategie: Politik und Kriegfuehrung 1940–1941* [1963] (Bonn: Bernard & Graefe, 1993), p 530, n 62.
84. B. Wegner, *Hitlers politische Soldaten: Die Waffen-SS 1933–1945* [1982] (Paderborn: Schoeningh, 1990), p 314.
85. A. Hitler, *Außenpolitische Standortbestimmung nach der Reichtagwahl Juni–Juli 1928* (1928; first published as *Hitlers Zweites Buch*, 1961), in *Hitler: Reden, Schriften, Anordnungen. Februar 1925 bis Januar 1933*, Vol IIA, with an introduction by G. L. Weinberg; G. L. Weinberg, C. Hartmann and K. A. Lankheit, eds., (Munich: K. G. Saur, 1995), p 33.
86. E. Syring, *Hitler. Seine politische Utopie* (Berlin: Propylaceen), p 42.
87. N. Mueller, U. Loebel and U. Freye, *Europa unterm Hakenkreuz. Sowjetunion. Die faschistische Okkupationspolitik in den zeitweilig besetzten Gebieten der Sowjetunion (1941–1944)* (Berlin: Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften, 1991), p 130.
88. Cf., e.g. H. Krausnick, *Hitlers Einsatzgruppen: Die Truppen des Weltanschauungskrieges 1938–1942* [1981] (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch, 1985), pp 230–245.
89. E. Jaeckel, *Hitlers Weltanschauung. Entwurf einer Herrschaft* [1969, 1981] (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1991), p 56.
90. E. Jaeckel and A. Kuhn, eds, *Hitler. Saemtliche Aufzeichnungen 1905–1924* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1980), pp 178 ff.
91. H. Trevor-Roper and A. Francois-Poncet, eds, *Hitlers Politisches Testament. Die Bormann Diktate vom Februar und April 1945* (Hamburg: Albrecht Knaus, 1981), p 69
92. H.-W. Schmuhl, *Rassenhygiene, Nationalsozialismus, Euthanasie. Von der Verhuetung zur Vernichtung "lebensunwerten Lebens," 1890–1945* [1987] (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1992), p 351.
93. Cf., e.g. W. Benz, H. Graml and H. Weiss, eds, *Enzyklopaedie des Nationalsozialismus* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1997); I. Gutman, E. Jaeckel and P. Longerich, eds, *Enzyklopaedie des Holocaust. Die Verfolgung und Ermordung der europaeischen Juden* [Hebrew 1991; English 1993] (Berlin: Argon, 1995), 4 Vols.
94. For this historical periodicity, cf. G. Heinsohn, *Why Was the Holocaust Different from all Other Genocides?* (Bremen: Raphael Lemkin Institut, 1998), pp 18–65.
95. A term coined by A. L. Eckhardt and A. R. Eckhardt, "The Holocaust and the Enigma of Uniqueness. A Philosophical Effort at Practical Clarification," in I. G. Shur, F. H. Littell and E. Wolfgang, eds, *Reflections on the Holocaust: Historical, Philosophical, and Educational Dimensions*, Vol 450 of *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, July 1980, pp 165–178.
96. A term coined by K. A. Schleunes, *The Twisted Road to Auschwitz 1933–1939* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1970).
97. Interview with *Warsaw Voice*, September 5, 1999, p 6.
98. M. Broszat, *Nationalsozialistische Polenpolitik 1939–1945* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1961), p 165.
99. M. Broszat, *Nationalsozialistische Polenpolitik 1939–1945* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1961), p 174.
100. T. Fritsch, *Der neue Glaube*, 3rd edn (Leipzig: Hammer, 1936), p 169.
101. G. H. Stein, *Geschichte der Waffen-SS* (Düsseldorf: Droste, 1967), p 186.
102. The killing of supposedly socially handicapped also shows that race was not the subject. Those afflicted the hardest by these atrocious measures were the Sinti [from Sind = India] and Roma. These Gypsies were the purest Indo-Aryans living in Europe.
103. A. Hitler, *Außenpolitische Standortbestimmung nach der Reichtagwahl Juni–Juli 1928* (1928; first published as *Hitlers Zweites Buch*, 1961), in *Hitler: Reden, Schriften, Anordnungen. Februar 1925 bis Januar 1933*, Vol IIA, with an introduction by G. L. Weinberg; G. L. Weinberg, C. Hartmann and K.A. Lankheit, eds (Munich: K. G. Saur, 1995), p 94.
104. M. Berenbaum, "The uniqueness and universality of the Holocaust," in I. Charny, ed., *Encyclopedia of Genocide* (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 1999 [published 2000]), Vol II., p 568; italics G.H.
105. "To this very day, an integral documentation of the war against Poland and the murders committed in it is lacking./The largest deficit [in the research on Nazi-Germany] pertains to the exterminative war against the non-Jewish population of the Soviet Union." Cf. D. Pohl, "Die Holocaust-Forschung und Goldhagens Thesen," *Vierteljahreshefte für Zeitgeschichte*, Vol 45, 1997, pp 44–45.