February 25, 1927

Marion J. Eison, Vice-President
Greenberg Publishers
271 East 57th Street
New York 22, N. Y.

Dear Mr. Eison:

The book, *20 Days in November*, written by Charles M. Kelley and published by you, undoubtedly offers quite interesting reading. It contains some new—partly novel and partly revealing—information on the personalities of the main Nazi criminals and reproduces a very characteristic treatment, "Life ofvice*" by Robert Ley, especially written for Mr. Kelley.

However, we must admit that the portraits of Nazi criminals are not always quite conclusive. In his characterization of the author diagrammatically sets up and applies Freud's psychological patterns and labels. Yet, while quite successful in developing Streicher's compassion and sense of "responsibility" phenomena and other elements of antisemitic life, Streicher's psychoanalysis proved to be much less fruitful in the explanation of Nazi personalities as a whole. There it more or less encounters with standardised generalizations like "Freudianism," "Unfähige-Mensch," etc., which convey only little knowledge. The author's frequent use of expressions like "father's substitute," "father's substitute," "masochistic structure of his personality" belongs to the same category.

But very conclusive, either, is the manner in which the author puts the single criminals into five different groups: "The Policy Makers," "The Gurus," "The Businessmen," etc. Rudolf Hess, the "Children's Father" (p. 97), occupies first place among the "Policy Makers." Hessling certainly belongs in this group. But does he, the creator of concentration camps, the leader of the Luftwaffe, chiefly responsible for the destruction of Rotterdam, Coventry, Burma, and hundreds of other cities? The sources of the blood purge of 1934 who said of Hessling: "I would rather have a thousand men than to lose one"

"Hessling's" (p. 24) — does he not belong in the group of "Gurus" too? Just does he, "one of the most powerful figures in German economics" (p. 13)? Not belong with such men right to the group of "Businessmen" than the master-builder Hans Frank or the greatest charmer of human history, Fritz Sauckel? By the way, in the whole characterization of Frank and Sauckel there is not a single word which explains their acceptance into the "Businessmen's group," whereas all their actions and deeds clearly show that they are not only one "Businessmen" who similarly and迫不及待ly pursued — the business of destruction on a stupendous scale.

Yet, all these won points appear quite insignificant in comparison with another defect of the book, which attempts to solve sociological and historical problems from a purely individual psychological point of view. In both these fields — sociological and historical — the book displays very little knowledge indeed. Yet, for instance, the author's explanation of Hitler's rise to power: "Hitler found
a people previously conditioned to several explosive ideologies frustrated by denial — or depression — and homogeneity" (p. 6). For not the same true of the French people after the war of 1914-18. Yet, just the contrary happened there — democracy was resurrected. Yes, it, perhaps, because there was no Hitler in France. But the author asserts that "normal individuals like Adolf Hitler, suffering from hystericism and obsessive complaints, can be found in any psychiatric clinic" (p. 125), and there were certainly enough psychiatric clinics in France at that time. Meaning to the assertion that the German people were "homogeneous" (i.e., lumped with a sense of solidarity). The whole history of Germany is a continual refutation of this assumption. Goethe said once: "The Germans believe only in themselves, and not even one of them tried to satisfy exclusively himself. He is not interested in what his neighbor is thinking or doing" and Hitler said on March 23, 1937 in the Prussian House of Lords: "We are not individuals and we are not isolated. We are 100 million strong." Germany was the last of all European countries to achieve unification — the greatest achievement of Bismarck's lifetime personality. Even on the very eve of the 1914-15 war against France Bismarck did not know whether Germany would fight with her against France or with France against her. And, finally, the last words: When the Weimar Republic brought a short-lived period of political freedom to Germany, crowds of independent parties and groups violently fought one another for power. In learning, the author describes the situations: "There were at that time about fifty organizations — call them parties — of Social Democrats in Germany" (p. 55). And the fact that, despite all this fragmentation and heterogeneity, Hitler and his gang were able largely to unite Germany by using an idea: the myth of the master race, world domination and racial anti-Semitism, has several reasons deeply rooted in the history of culture and history of the German people. But the author of "The Nazi Years in Germany" is so little aware of the very existence of this problem that he boldly substitutes for it a meaningless label — "homogeneous" and his own conclusion that a man like Hitler "can be found in any psychiatric clinic."
yet they were, according to an old saying, that long row of "heroes," which, the moment a real "figure" puts itself at the head of them, suddenly becomes a vast number.

In order to establish a Nazi-like state, many features must be present and work together to produce a perfect Nazi social and political climate, economic exploitation and instability to satisfy any essential needs, narrow strata and readings above among larger masses of the population and, finally, diabolical thoroughness of a protection leadership. Not one of these fundamental factors can be found in American patterns quite the contrary is the case. No wonder that every time a would-be totalitarian leader appears on the scene, he is liquidated in short order either physically (Hitler) or politically (Mussolini, Chiang).

But one can deny that there exists in America an exact social problem with clearly visible forms of discrimination against certain minorities roentgenographically complexed by racists Nazis. The only question is, how strong are those American Nazis? We all know that the bullies of militarism can be found in almost every human organism, yet only in weakness and obsessed organism does this disease break out. Nazis are like cancer—a healthy organism does nothing to fear from him. And America, with her old democratic traditions, with civil liberties deeply rooted in her social structure and ideological attitudes, with her comparatively great "freedom from want" and "freedom from fear"—America has most powerful reserves with which to fight any form of totalitarianism threat. One should bear in mind that even the most powerful could be tyrant in helpless as long as he does not succeed in building up a strong following fanatically devoted to his art organized as an obedient instrument of terror and oppression. Either easily found in Germany millions of 30 and 40, when he openly and for any years drilled for their arduous job, but in America in France and England I have never seen such pitiful and the leaders of the Rhine men or of our Smith and they have own smaller chances for success.

Douglas H. Kelley's depiction of his conception of Nazis to Americans is so basically wrong that we can hardly believe that any reasonable and even slightly informed person would accept it. But we are afraid that many an American student or officer will be very pleased to hear that the dreams of a Nazi-like state could so easily come true. He will "put ideas" and restate his activities, which, to be sure, will not be in an American "Third Reich" but any equivalent causes some trouble. This, unfortunately, will be the most probable effect of Douglas H. Kelley's uncritical and unjustifiable assertions.

In the hope that these observations may be of use to you, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

Jacob Robinson
Director

June.