BLOOD AND SOIL
Richard Walther Darré and Hitler's 'Green Party'
'Some of his ideas were novel and somewhat bizarre, but it is not a crime to evolve and advocate new or even unsound social and economic theories'.
—Judgement on Derré, TWCN, xvi, p. 555

'En effet, la haine est une liqueur précieuse, un poison plus cher que celui des Borgia—car il est fait avec notre saug, notre santé, notre sommeil, et les deux tiers de notre amour! Il faut en être avaré!'
Preface

This book is a political biography of R. Walther Darré, Minister of Agriculture under the Nazis from 1933 to 1942, and populariser of the slogan 'Blood and Soil'. As the title of the book implies, he headed a group of agrarian radicals who, among other issues, were concerned with what we now call ecological problems. While not a formal party grouping, they were a significant enough power bloc to perturb Hitler, Himmler and Heydrich. Although it was not possible to provide a comprehensive biographical study of the Green Nazis in the space available here, it is hoped that this biography of Darré will be a step in that direction.
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Historians are becoming more and more modest. It is now
customary to regard the writing of a history book as essentially a
collective act, where praise is due to the collective body, and blame
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Introduction

In 1930, European agriculture faced one of its worst depressions. Peasant movements, farmers’ leagues and agitation for land reform became politically active in many countries. In some, the rhetoric had left-wing overtones; in others, it carried a vehemently radical nationalism. Generally, it was populist and anti-institutionalism, and potentially violent.

In one European nation, a government came to power partly through the votes of disaffected small farmers. It proceeded to introduce laws establishing hereditary tenure for small and medium sized farms. The wholesale food industry was virtually abolished, and a marketing system established which set prices and controlled quality. Later, quotas were introduced. This corporation was run by a quasi-independent ‘quango’. Some two thirds of its farmland was taken out of the free market by the laws, and control of a farm which came within the regulations was made conditional on farming ability. A Back-to-the-Land programme was introduced, which established viable peasant settlements, and poured money into the rural infrastructure where the settlements were located. A drive to increase peasant productivity was introduced, which was remarkably successful in coaxing more productivity per hectare from the land, and in increasing intensive agriculture. The agricultural experiment lasted some six years, until the country went to war. While the legislation remained on the statute book, agriculture fell under wartime controls, and the Back-to-the-Land movement tailed off.

In the 1930s, the name of the man responsible for this legislation, this experiment in anti-capitalist agriculture, was widely familiar. Today, it is virtually unknown, except where academic text-book writers have mentioned him in passing as a trivial, insincere fool. The programme outlined above has been labelled with adjectives like ‘fanatical, irrational, insane, primitive, inhuman, monomaniac, brutal, bloody, reactionary, unproven’, and even ‘unprogressive’, a particularly crushing blow. The legislation itself has been described as unreal, Utopian, wishful thinking, not particularly original anyway, and
insincere. Primitive and mystical are probably the most commonly used adjectives, with insane running a close third. But why is this? Why should measures which have been advocated by people of all political persuasions as solutions to problems of land tenure and agricultural marketing in the Third World today be considered primitive and insane? The answer is, that the country in question was Nazi Germany. This has affected the history of its agricultural experiments in several ways. First, historians who specialise in one country tend in any case to see that country's problems and policies as unique. This applies with much greater force to historians of Nazi Germany. There has been a reluctance to examine these policies in comparison with those of the Successor States in the 1920s and 1930s, to say nothing of the problems of peasant societies today. The existence of a large (in comparison with Britain) agricultural population—some 29% in 1933—has been in part blamed for Germany's lamentable lack of western European humanitarian democracy, part of a structural political problem which prevented Germany, as Golo Mann says, fulfilling its true role in the world, that of being the first nation to combine advanced industrialisation with truly humanitarian, internationalist, social democracy. Reading history backwards has its problems, especially when it is done from the highly politicised (and nearly always social democratic) viewpoint natural to historians of Nazi Germany. The second problem is that the agricultural sector tends to be seen exclusively in its function of non-urban, hence non-urban liberal/democratic, obstruction to progress. German landowners, despite their homely, impoverished lifestyle, are associated with Prussian militarism and the German elite that ruled through the caste-oriented political structure of the nineteenth century, and never had had a good press, then or now (nor do they receive much sympathy in this work, in omission which the author hopes to rectify in a future book). Historians, then, who write about this sector which is associated with next-to-the-pig-sty at the lower socio-economic end of the scale, and beastly Junkers at the other. Third, National Socialist Germany is seen loosely (if mistakenly) by many historians as an extension of right-wing, neo-conservative, capitalist, authoritarian and elitist policies, coupled with an exclusivist, racist nationalism carried to the point of self-destruction. Historians who feel in themselves a warm sympathy towards neo-conservative, capitalist, authoritarian or elitist policies will shudder and go away, muttering as they go that Stalin was just as bad, anyway, but leaving the field open to internationalist social democrat sympathisers, who can only examine the exceedingly broad church manifestations of National Socialism (from technology, to art, architecture and science, for example) through their own progressive prejudices. Not unnaturally, they soon run out of categorisation capacity. Some recent work, scholarly and scrupulously annotated as it is, seems to consist largely of desperately strung together adjectives. National Socialism is romantic, and modernistic: it is technocratic and backward-looking. It is petty bourgeois and has aristocratic pretensions: it is reactionary and pragmatic. The frenetic air that characterises so much recent writing on the period—carried out, one must stress, by fine scholars—shows that an obstruction has been reached. How can one summarise simply and clearly a movement that moved from being anti-parliamentary and revolutionary to a mass, legal parliamentary movement: that had only six years of peace and five years of war: that rapidly ran the gamut from populist radicalism to dictatorship: that seems unique, yet shows continuity. How is one to label those Germans who continued to work under National Socialism, in the field of scholarship, science and, of course, everyday life? Are all their products, their achievements, their errors, too, to be considered as archetypal National Socialism? Might they have developed that way in any case? How can one distinguish what was German in 1933–45 and what was Nazi? The need so to distinguish is demonstrated by the tangle of conflicting categories that historians have created, so that on the whole one has to turn from political and diplomatic historians for a comparative and contextual examination of this period, to historical geographers, economic historians, historians who specialise in science, or architecture, and military historians. In many other areas of intellectual history, emphasis has shifted over the years from one aspect of a movement to another. Sometimes there is a consensus over what is the 'real' phenomenon. For example, Newton's gravity theory is seen as the real Newton, while his Rosicrucianism is seen as a kind of irrelevant extra. Marx, hardly taken seriously by academic economists until Joan Robinson revived him in the early 1940s, is now widely seen as an important theoretical economist in his own right, the last and greatest classical economist. But there is a sturdy and growing industry of those who feel that the real importance of Marx lies in his role as precursor of Hitler and all the ills of the twentieth century: racism, anti-semitism, genocide and Social Darwinism. This interpretation of the 'real' Marx may overtake and hide the Joan Robinson interpretation.
With Nazi Germany, it is not difficult to see its war-time policies as the 'real' Nazism, and everything connected with it up to 1939, and by extension up to 1933, as leading to that point. This interpretation has been strengthened by its role in maintaining the validity and necessity of immediately post-war Allied policies, and, indeed, to justify the paradox that we fought a war to save democracy and virtue in alliance with a power, Soviet Russia, which had already by 1939 carried out more murders, probably some twenty million, than Nazi Germany was ever to be responsible for, and that in peace-time. Many historians of the period had themselves played a part in shaping policy during and after the war: some had worked in British Intelligence. But the link between pre-Nazi and early Nazi ideas and later Nazi practice remains a problem; it is hoped that this book, by examining Darré's agrarian and eugenic policies, in concept and in practice, will contribute to establishing the simplest of historical data, what actually happened: 

WHY A POLITICAL BIOGRAPHY?

History is made up of men and men's actions. 'Men make their own history,' and in those rare epochs where that history is created on the basis of an idea it can be much easier to establish the clarity of an idea than the clarity of facts. Historians have an increasing awareness that 'under each grave-stone a world lies buried'; that the texture of reality is composed by a myriad of individualities.

German historians tend towards a theoretical approach. National Socialism, especially, has attracted the apparatus of conceptual frameworks and sociological categories. Categorisation is an aggressive act, and sociology is an aggressive science, even more than history. It is hard to deal with individuals in this harsh and impersonal fashion, which is why sociologists categorise people in groups. In the case of Richard Walther Darré, Minister of Agriculture and Peasant Leader from 1933 to 1942, we are dealing with a man who overturned many pre-existing theories, and who seemed to have performed the historically unacceptable. He affected the course of history by having the particular ideas and abilities that he had, at the right place and at the right time. A large tranche of National Socialism's voting support in the crucial election of 1932 came from the small farmers of the north and north-west. The influential farmers' leagues and Bauernvereine were taken over by cadres organised and led by Darré. He was the author of two best-selling works in the late 1920s which propounded the virtues of the peasant and the need to re-organise society through rural corporations. In short, it seems worth while to trace the life and career of one man, in order to see what deductions can be made from this particular case to the general.

This book is the political and intellectual history of a man described in highly coloured terms by admirers still living today as the 'last peasant leader'. It traces his ideas, his decision to turn to politics, the continuity of his views till his death in 1953, his successes and his vast, painful failure. It has wider significance because Nazi Germany was the one country in western Europe where radical agricultural policies were actually introduced, not just demanded. Darré becomes an important figure, then, in a way that other early Nazis are not. Fedor's Social Credit died without issue, unless one were to count Keynes, who was a fan of Darré's friend Gesell, one of Fedor's inspirers. Gregor Strasser, that very Prussian mixture of authoritarian socialism and social elitism, lost out to the south German influence by 1932. Fedor and Strasser did not see their ideas carried into effect: Darré did. That alone makes him significant in the world of revolutionaries. As was said of Bakunin, such men are necessary in the first days of the revolution, then they have to be shot. In its slow motion essence, that is what happened to Darré. Unexpected successes emerged from his legislation. Productivity on small farms rose; they became more efficient and more modernised. The demoralised farming population of Germany, especially the economically innovative but socially conservative north-west German farmers, recovered their self-image and confidence. But conditions remained relatively worse than in towns, and the drift from the land continued. Farms could not be seized by banks, but farms seized by banks before 1933 were not returned to their owners, and the improvement in agricultural conditions meant that farms were in any case less likely to be foreclosed upon. Above all, urbanisation continued. Autobahns and the many technical achievements of the 1930s stand out in our impressions of the social history of the period. The most significant conclusion to be drawn from a study of the results of Darré's policies is that they failed to have the dramatic results expected of them, and that is a conclusion that has serious implications for planners trying to aid peasant societies today.

In the discussion over what is and is not National Socialism, agricultural economics is of special interest, as it is an area where there is a clear continuity of personnel and ideas from before the First World War to well after the Second. There are only so many ways in which
one can evolve solutions to the problems of small peasant farmers, and if one wants to maintain them as a class, the solutions available shrink dramatically to the inalienability of land and the maintenance of prices. This continuity of ideas has perhaps been obscured by the dramatic propaganda value of the phrase 'Blood and Soil'. This slogan, coined in the early 1920s by a renegade Social Democrat, became virtually identified with National Socialist ideology, to the extent that a recent work on Nazi cinema actually called its chapter on ideology, 'Blood and Soil'.

The element in this slogan that concerns the link between people and land has been either neglected or jeered at uncomprehendingly, as recorded above. Yet in many countries today, including European nations such as Greece and France, and several States in the United States of America, farm purchase by non-nationals is either forbidden or tangle up with so many booby traps as to be made extremely difficult. The position in the Soviet Union is of course much more exclusive and racialist. Sometimes the rhetoric of nation and race and land is open, as with Israeli settlers in Arab lands in recent years. Then the urban liberal may feel a frisson of discomfort. But usually it is implicit rather than explicit. Peasants like to keep their land. They like to live among other peasants, preferably near enough to a town where their produce can be marketed, but far away enough to avoid pollution by the non-kin. These qualities are known to us: they are part of our mental furniture, part of what we mean when we say 'peasant'. We think it is rather cute. People have a right to their land, to their peasants. Sensitive observers even understand the gut dissatisfaction felt by all food producers when they exchange their produce for money. Market exchanges satisfy only when value is exchanged for value; and no one who has grown his own produce can feel satisfied with the exchange of his goods for money; because the produce he sells is the result of his toil and sweat, and what he receives is dead. There can be no equivalent. Hence the conundrum that no one is more money-grabbing than the peasant, yet no one more contemptuous of it.

Yet peasants have another quality; they may crave continuity, but they are also innovative. The agricultural surpluses produced by efficient peasant technology are thought to be the basis for successful industrialisation. This means that given the right marketing structures, it should be possible for efficient peasant production to co-exist with it. One agrarian historian has called this type of producer the 'smallholder technician of the future'. The populist, anarchist, political impulses associated with the European peasant may mean that he will not adapt to the urban hierarchy inherent in democracy; but that is not to say that he cannot survive literacy and television. The Russian agrarian economist, Chayanov, wrote a science-fiction novel in the dark days of 1921 in which he envisaged prosperous peasants (kulaks, perhaps) attending concerts in towns in their own aeroplanes, then returning to milk the cows. This vision of the independent, prosperous, free smallholder, so prominent in German agrarianism, is curiously similar to the English ideal of the yeoman farmer. That great neo-Englishman, Jefferson, wanted to see an America composed of independent gentleman farmers. Jefferson was elected an honorary member of the Bavarian Bauernvereine (Peasant League), of 1810. The American West provided inspiration to a German geographer and economist, von Thünen, who envisaged an economy based on farming, with large estates divided up among labourers who would be able to accumulate enough capital to buy their land after ten years work. Von Thünen, widely attacked by Marxist economists today as the founder of the idea of marginalism, left his land to be divided up among his own labourers, and is claimed by East Germany today as an early Socialist. He was an inspirer of Herbert Bucke, fervent National Socialist and Darre's successor as Minister of Agriculture, and also of Chayanov, the Soviet agronomist. The point of these apparently disconnected observations is that accepted political and social axes break down when ideas about peasant society and production are concerned. The small farmer, the peasant, is not just a vehicle for the townsmen's romantic or reactionary ideas; he can be seen as the core of society itself, the most productive, the most resourceful, the most innovative group of a nation.

At a time when accepted orders, ideas and structures were widely perceived to be collapsing, the peasant in Germany offered not a return to some golden age, but a sound, healthy starting-point to something new. Récuser pour mieux s'autoriser; to get rid of these existing constraints, seemed alluring to many neo-conservative intellectuals of the 1920s. German agricultural economics was traditionally a Volkswissenschaft; it had a social and sociological dimension. Agrarian ideas belonged to the pre-neo-classical tradition. The word 'peasant' in Germany did not have the connotation of servitude, or previous bondage to a landowner, that it has in English. To give an example of the small but tangible linguistic difference involved, hunting over peasant land with horses was forbidden in most German states in 1848; an example of the relative self-confidence enjoyed by the German smallholder. Part of
this confidence was reflected in the extent to which the small farmer was seen as the core of future agricultural productivity, and indeed, peasant farming showed an increase in both productivity (higher for small farms than for large farms from 1860 to 1925) and in the number of small farms, even at a time of acute agricultural depression.

Nazi rural ideology was a fusion of several different streams of ideas and benefitted from the strength of existing rural traditions. There was an anti-Prussian and anti-state element in peasant political behaviour. Small peasant producers were hostile to perceived market inadequacies and to credit constraints. The Land Reform ideals of Henry George found a home in German Land Reform movements of the late nineteenth-century: they differed from Darré’s plans in proposing a quasi-nationalisation of land through a land tax, but were similar in the basic ideal of the independent small farmer. Corporatist, anti-liberal economists found it easy to understand the idea of the peasantry as a separate Stand, as did the rather more liberal economics associated with Nordicist circles (who believed in the inherently freedom-loving nature of the northern Europeans).

Peasant production was in fact seen as materially superior as well as morally superior. The peasant would work harder, know his land better, be more economical in bought-in inputs, hand-dig his land, and coax more from the soil. The idea that peasant farming could be economically desirable, and lessen dependence on imported fodder and food, naturally gave impetus to the moral arguments—that the peasant represented ‘freedom, property, thrift’; ‘frugality, loyalty, hard work’. The desirable norm was the self-sufficient family farm of fifteen to seventy-five hectares; not too small, not too big. Many of the dignified, white-haired professors whose portraits can be seen adorning textbooks on agricultural economics became attached to Darré’s nonsense: they translated the words ‘Blood and Soil’ into a text-book for agrarian reform, for renovation of silo buildings, a good example of the way in which ideas change and reform as they sift through men’s minds.

Indeed, the typical agricultural economist who supported Darré and the Nazis in the 1930s would have been born in 1895, son of a village schoolmaster in a small village. He would be educated in a republican and atheistic tradition, but would acquire a theistic, but probably anti-recononcial religious feeling. He would write his dissertation on peasant productivity, as work adviser to a farmer’s union, and become a professor some time in the 1920s. He would visit Soviet Russia to help negotiate seed or horse-breeding stock purchases, and be roped in to help the infant National Food Estate after 1933. He would admire Darré’s support for the peasantry, and his attacks on the large landowners and ‘Prussianism’, but consider his tendency to write off all peasants south of Göttingen a mistake. He would weary of the slogan ‘Blood and Soil’ without relinquishing support for what he perceived Darréism to be about, be drafted into the SS advisory service in 1939, sent to Russia to improve milk production, write memos dissenting from German treatment of the Ukrainians in 1941, and be in and out of concentration camps until 1945. Then he would, after de-Nazification, take up a post again as an agrarian economist or historian or civil servant, and go on writing articles about the importance of the peasantry to the body politic, and praising Darré’s support for methane gas plants and small tractors. He would support the EEC Agricultural Policy with enthusiasm. His writings would have a curiously unanalytical and samey flavour that would puzzle and irritate later writers in Peasant Studies, caused by his inability to expand on his reasons for supporting the peasantry in post-war Germany. He would be utterly perplexed by liberal, free-market economics, and believe that England’s fields had grown only thistles since the Reform Act. The sight of the farmers of Schleswig-Holstein marching on Hamburg in the company of anti-nuclear Greens would stir a faint echo of memory, a sense of déjà vu. To a man who had helped pass a law in 1934 ensuring that new woodland plantings were composed of mixed deciduous and evergreen trees, who had seen nature reserves established, and assumed that afforested land was sacrosanct (not only was it not planned to cut down trees for peasant settlement but landowners offered to swap their arable land for publicly owned forest so that the public authorities could settle the arable land), an opinion poll that showed that 95% of Germans had heard of the dying forests, and that 74% of them showed great concern, would have caused no surprise. In a sense, this work should be dedicated to this man.

At the beginning of this introduction, I stated my premise, that Germany, in its 1930s agricultural policies, was the one European country that instituted radical tenure and price legislation in an attempt to solve the problems of peasant producers. Why, then, is it so often argued that German agrarianism was the product of a romantic, reactionary, fanatical reaction against industrialisation? After all, better-known ‘liberal’ states, Poland, Romania, Bulgaria, France, Italy, Spain, and Denmark had peasant parties and agitation for land reform, and, in the case of the Successor States, land reform did take place, albeit at the cost of an ethnically alien landowning class. Britain also had its
smallholdings movement, and in the Edwardian era, its land reform movement. The ideal of a kind of yeoman farmer as the basis of a nation was widespread in British colonial plans in the 1930s. These countries have nothing in common; they display quite different rates of industrialisation, ranging from early and complete, to late and impulsive, to non-existent. German fears about the disappearance of the peasantry date back to Frederick the Great, while the diminution of the tax base in Oldenburg in the 1820s, caused by mass peasant emigration, incited the creation of a settlement commission. Who Frederick the Great reacting against industrialisation? Was Freiherr vom Stein? One begins to wonder why it was that Germany went on modernising so very slowly, over so many decades, and reacting so much.\(^{19}\)

The value of comparative history is that it allows these easy clichés to be tested empirically. However, one fears that it will be some time before the work of economists and historians based on the work of Frey and Thrun and Warrner, creep into the straightforward political histories, and until that time the German desire to have a populated, prosperous countryside, farmed with tender loving care, will be seen as 'fanatical', simply because it was a belief held by men who found it possible to work with the National Socialist government in its early years. But if agrarianism was not backward-looking and primitive, what did it seek? Can one integrate 'rationalism' with the 'smallholding technician' ideal? One answer is that Darré and his circle laid stress on the innovative aspect of the small farm, and supported methane gas plants, small tractors suitable for small farms, and market garden machinery. When a British team of agricultural experts visited Germany after the war in search of new inventions, they were surprised to find developments in dwarf-rooting stocks for fruit trees, roto-tiller and spraying equipment, bulk manures, the dead zone and dung, and lightweight machinery. In some areas, such as fungicides and seed-cleaning machinery, the Germans were more advanced. These were all innovations designed to help the small farmer, and their success implies that if there had not been a war, Nazi Germany would have continued to develop its agriculture along these lines.\(^{20}\) It was not really as paradoxical as it seemed that German agriculture should be developing in this way in an era of technological change. Innovation implies the capacity to escape from old methods. Some of the large farms, large companies, banks, outworn institutions, and all the encumbered interest groups fighting over the economic corpse of the 1920s. Nature-based thinking tends to optimism, rather than to appeals to the past. Its essence is to be 'forward-looking', because of its inherent rejection of the old, the traditional. It emphasises youth, the young, the new, and this fits in with the demographic pattern of Nazi support in the late 1920s. When one agronomist exhorted his farmers to go 'forward, onward, avoiding the old errors', this was an archetypal National Socialist formulation: its similarity to the progressivist 'onward and upward' slogans of twentieth-century Britain is not accidental, because both were the product of a radical rejection of existing structures.

The word 'radical' is not used lightly here. The naturist thinker is always Antigone, not Creon. Nature is seen as a path which leads somewhere; it is a teacher. One goes to the natural world to learn from it, and returns with a series of lessons. Nature teaches that there is a truthful, real world, which can, through difficulty, be seized, grasped, and confirmed and verified. It exists objectively. Why is this apparently obvious attitude a radical one? Because conservative thought is either indifferent to this sort of realism—preferring criteria of social usefulness—or else translates reality to a metaphysical plane where it poses no threat to social stability. Socialists and communists believe in structures and, once in power, in stability. At heart, they do not want to rock the boat, they want to get in it.

But the man who goes to nature for his beliefs is rejecting these compromises. He may be of an unanalytical cast of mind, but he knows how to say no. He is inherently suspicious and bloody-minded. He suspects tradition, ruling classes, and lies, even holy lies. He prefers kin to caste. He can not, I think, be described as Utopian or mystical, just because he does not conform. If one defines Utopianism as the attempt to escape from 'the Wheel', then nature-inspired reformers are not Utopian.\(^{21}\) They go to nature to learn, and return with the recommendation that one clings to the Wheel, because it is the most sensible path of action. Whether or not Darré's premise that the northern European peasant was the most valuable and creative element in European civilisation was true, is unprovable. It could be argued that any act of political self-identification is irrational. Given his premise, Darré's method of argument and system of ideas was rational. His attempt to fulfil his political ideas through political action rested on the assumption that the institutions of a revolutionary state could be used to achieve revolutionary aims. It is this assumption that now appears irrational.

Certainly, Darré's ideology was something more than a purely teleological policy, though: something which is not completely
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amenable to analysis in terms of polycracy, productivity or eugenics in reacting against what he saw as the failed, finished institutions of his day, the cultural colonisation by western Europe and even America, Darré was implying a cultural criticism that he was not competent clearly to express, only to label. When Heidegger talks of the consumption mentality as 'the organisation of a lack', which exists only to fulfil the vacuum of 'non-Being', when he talks of 'the world which has become an unworld ... the desolation of the earth', he was vividly expressing a sense of alienation, of being lost in a vacuum of unreality, that lay behind Darré's thinking. Darré was to write before his death that he had been a fool to think that the Nazis could have repaired the broken link between man and soil, nature and God. But he continued to think that there was a tangible, real world, veiled by man's error, which could be reached, if only the veil could be torn aside.

The unnoticeable law of the earth preserves the earth ... in the allotted sphere of the possible which everything follows and yet nothing knows ... The birch tree never oversteps its possibility. The colony of bees dwells in its possibility ... It is one thing just to use the earth, another to receive the blessing of the earth ... in order to shepherd the mystery of Being and watch over the inviolability of the possible.

It is the core of my argument that one should not let the existence of the uniforms and the swastikas interfere with the evaluation of Darré's attempt to 'watch over the inviolability of the possible'. He was guardian of a radical, centrist, republican critique which pre-dated National Socialism, and still lives on. That the political development with which he and others associated themselves reversed and then destroyed that viewpoint is an irony that will echo and re-echo many times in this work.

CHAPTER ONE

Who was Darré?

1896-1924

Like many National Socialist leaders Darré came from outside Germany. Hess, Backe, Rosenberg, and, of course, Hitler, were all born outside the frontiers of the German Reich. 'Auslanddeutsche' were prominent and active in German nationalist circles, whether because of the shock of returning disappointed to a longed-for homeland, or the outsider's clearer perception of national ills. Not only was Darré born in Argentina, on 14th July 1896, but he did not see Germany until he was ten years old, when he travelled there alone to go to school. He was the son of a director of the trading firm Engelbert Hardt & Co., Richard Oskar Darré (who had emigrated to Argentina in 1876), and a half-Swedish, half-German mother, Eleanor Lagergren, daughter of a trader, who met Richard Oskar Darré in Buenos Aires. On his father's side, Richard Walther Darré was descended from a Huguenot family which had emigrated from northern France in 1680. His maternal grandmother was the daughter of a yeoman farmer in Lower Saxony. His maternal grandfather was a Swedish yeoman farmer, and his uncle was Bürgermeister of Stockholm. There were four children of the marriage: Richard-Walther, the eldest son, Carmen, Erich and Ilse. The home near Buenos Aires was in the prosperous suburb of Belgrano, a stuccoed three-storey house with a formal front garden, surrounded by trees, and a cobbled lane outside.

Darré's father, born in Berlin in 1854, was a typical member of the Berlinmercantile bourgeoisie, prosperous, educated and politically liberal. Although nineteenth-century Prussia is associated with cartels, étatism and militarism, this was also an era when German overseas traders and wealthy merchants were sympathetic to English constitutionalism and laissez-faire ideals. He admired the American educational reformer and feminist Ellen Keys, and in his memoirs, published in Wiesbaden in 1925, criticised the Prussian reaction to the revolutions of 1848. He had considerable contact with the English business and farming community in Argentina and Brazil, and many English friends. He considered a knowledge of the English language and culture essential for any serious businessman.
Before going to South America, Darré’s father began to train as an engineer, but switched to medicine half-way through his studies. Before he had finished, the family was financially ruined, and he had to leave university. The President of the Berlin Stock Exchange, Richard von Hardt, an old friend of the family, stepped in, and he was put through a commercial training course and sent to Brazil. He spent several years in Brazil and Argentina. In 1886, he became a partner of Engelsbergs Hardt & Co. in Buenos Aires.2

Having been forced to abandon the subject on which his heart was set, Darré’s father became a great believer in discipline and pronunciation. He brought up his large family in this spirit, quite unsuccessfully, since his emphasis on the gloom and misery of life was rejected by them in favour of a somewhat Utopian hedonism. This rejection of the father’s sternness was partly because, as Richard Walther observed on hearing of his father’s death, Richard Oskar Darré had not behaved ‘with that German virtue and honour he preached’, but drank too much, and was a womaniser. He was rumoured to have an illegitimate son, supposed to be half-Scottish, who was brought up with the rest of the family.3

Darré attended the local German school until he was 9 years old. He then returned to Germany, at first alone, ‘to be brought up as German’. He lived with Professor Elisabeth Gass at Heidelberg on pension, and finished his primary education at the local Volksschule, or primary school. In the autumn of 1905, he began in the Oberrealschule at Heidelberg, and remained there until 1910, when he was 16 years old.

His school work at the Deutsche Schule in Belgrano had been adequate; concentration, behaviour and all subjects received good marks, especially in languages. However, once at Heidelberg, his achievement level plummeted. His French and English remained good, but his German and history came in for heavy criticism. For the first year he was in the bottom three of his class of about thirty-seven. After that period his marks fluctuated to such an extent that no pattern can be deduced. Where he excelled in one term he failed in the next. He seemed dreamy, well-behaved, and lacking in concentration. How much of this was due to differences in teaching methods between Argentina and Germany, or how much due to Darré’s own attitudes, is hard to determine, but the change of educational methods and schools may have affected his reaction to his schooling, since when he left Argentina his marks for French, Spanish and German, for behaviour and effort, were ‘good’, while the school at Heidelberg complained of his lack of diligence and an ‘unsuitable manner’. After five years his marks and class position were still low. At the Evangelical School at Guumersbach, his marks quickly improved, with geography his best subject. Darré lost a year through his change of schools. His father was anxious that his son should learn something of the English language and way of life, and in 1911 he was sent as an exchange pupil to King’s College School, Wimbledon. He had a gifted science teacher there, who seems to have had a considerable effect on him. He left King’s convinced of the superiority of the English public school system to the more regimented German system, and with a fascination for English customs and political life. Another change followed in 1912, when he attended the Oberrealschule at Guumersbach for two years. His Abitur or university entrance examination was delayed by his changes of schools, and was now due to be taken in the Autumn of 1914. The war, of course, intervened.4

By the time he had left Guumersbach, his marks had improved, but it was clear that he was not suitable for an academic career, or for one of the professions. He was fond of open-air life. The vacations and the weekends were spent in excursions with his brothers and sisters, or with his school-friends. Outside school, however, he read widely and enthusiastically.

In Easter 1914, he attended the German Colonial School at Witzenhausen, south of Göttingen. Founded in 1898, in a large country house called Williamshof, in imitation of the English Colonial College and its training farms, it was designed to prepare future plantation administrators and farmers for the specialised conditions they would find abroad, and concentrated on practical farming, which was carried out on the 285 hectares of farm and market garden land owned by the school. Witzenhausen echoed Darre’s earlier brief experience of English education at King’s; the students were a self-governing body, carrying the aroma of the English prefect system. This system of self-government by student committees was held up by Darre in his later works as a model of education, because the system was less hierarchical than the normal Prussian one. Graduates of the school were awarded a diploma in colonial agriculture. It was an unlucky choice, since, after the war, this professional qualification was to prove inadequate in conditions of extreme unemployment, especially among the educated middle classes, while the loss of Germany’s former colonies made the specialised nature of the training virtually useless.5

During this period, Darré felt torn between the idea of returning to South America to farm, or becoming a soldier. When war broke out in August 1914, he volunteered at once for the German Army, joining
the Field Artillery Regiment no. 27 (Nassau) at Wiesbaden. He had spent one term only at Witzenhausen. Darré’s 1933 biographer reports that of the hundred pupils who had enrolled in Easter 1914 with Darré, only ten would return after the war, and of the others, thirty were killed, and another thirty were too badly wounded to contemplate a farming career. The fact that he had volunteered remained a source of pride all his life: the point was that Darré was still of Argentinian nationality, and could easily have avoided the war. He continued to have dual Argentinian-German nationality until 1933, when he became a minister; the Argentinian nationality then lapsed.

His wartime career was steady rather than spectacular. He served in two artillery regiments, both of which were virtually wiped out. He was wounded twice. In autumn 1916, in the Battle of the Somme, he received the Iron Cross, Second Class, and was sent on an artillery training course in January 1917. He was then promoted to reserve lieutenant. In July 1917, two shell splinters lodged in his left leg, and he was caught in a gas attack. He was then given a short home leave. He returned to the battles of Verdun and Champagne and the last push by the German forces into France in March 1918. In April 1918, he was transferred to the Field Artillery Regiment von Schmarthorst, 1st Hannoverian no. 10, and fought with them until October 1918, when he contracted a fever, and was sent to a base hospital. Some weeks later Darré emerged to find that Germany had surrendered. His diary notes:

One could see that politically speaking everything was in the air, but the total collapse of Germany was unexpected. The maddest rumours were everywhere. I myself was relieved from duty because of illness... I looked for wounded comrades and in general completely disregarded politics.

Darré and his fellow-soldiers suddenly heard the news from Kiel of the German naval mutiny and the election of a Worker’s and Seaman’s Council. On 7th and 8th November, 1918, his diary described how he saw ‘Bolshevik agents’ persuading soldiers to give up their arms and join the uprising. A soldier’s council was elected at his barracks, Darré and two other officers remaining to negotiate terms with the representatives of the Social Democrats. Darré’s family were living in French-occupied Wiesbaden. As soon as he had returned to his studies and was away from Wiesbaden, he joined a Freikorps regiment, the Hanover Freiwilligen (volunteer) unit.

Darré’s father was proud of his son’s wartime record. The family had produced doctors and soldiers in equal numbers for several generations. He even published a compilation of Darré’s letters home from the front, and of his war-time diaries. However, Darré himself did not dwell on his wartime experiences, apart from writing articles on field artillery tactics in 1923 and ’24. He joined the Stahlhelm, the German nationalist veteran’s association, in 1922 while studying at Halle, and remained a paid-up member until 1927. His health was probably permanently weakened by his war years. Between 1919 and 1923 he was under a course of homeopathic treatment for heart trouble and various nervous disorders. His regiment, the von Scharnhorst, had taken part in thirty battles between 1914 and 1918, and Darré’s record shows that his personal participation in the war probably included as many engagements, in a fighting capacity.

Although after the First World War Darré’s father mourned ‘all the inspiration... the joy, willingness of self-sacrifice, all hopes of victory, and happy future of the fatherland come to naught’, nonetheless, he retained at first much of his earlier liberal and pro-English spirit. His attitude was more moderate than some of the typically civilian attitudes of the war years, expressed in such matters as a hostility to the English and French language, and attempts to replace foreign loan words with German root words. Fines were levied on those who used French, English, Italian or Russian words. His attitude hardened after the First World War, when the family, now settled in Wiesbaden, found themselves in the French zone of occupation. Letters were censored, a pass was needed to move in or out of the zone, and currency restrictions were in force. Most of the family’s substantial funds were lost in the inflation of 1923, while the increasing nationalism and militancy of the Argentinian government meant that problems arose remitting funds from Darré’s old company in Buenos Aires. Darré’s father wrote regularly to his son, and the two exchanged political analyses as frankly as they could, although occasionally the elder Darré would observe that censorship had interfered with a letter. In late 1923 they agreed that it would be safer not to discuss politics any more in their correspondence.

The trauma of Germany’s defeat in 1918 was followed by a series of defeats at the Conference of Versailles. By the time the Allied Powers had satisfied the territorial claims of the new states, more territory and resources had been taken from Germany than anyone had intended. Reparations were set at an unrealistically high level. Feelings in Germany ran highest in Upper Silesia, where a state of near-civil war existed between Germans and Poles, and in the Rhineland, where
the French maintained an armed presence. The returning soldiers blamed the civilians, and especially the politicians at home for the defeat. This was partly because the defeat had been unexpected for many. The war in the east had apparently ended with victory. Under the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, signed in March 1918, the new Bolshevik government had made peace with Germany, and had ceded considerable territory to it, including former Russian Poland, the Baltic States and the Ukraine. Massive settlements were planned in the Baltic lands for some 250,000 German farmers. After the Armistice of November 1918, the army considered continuing the war in the east, the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk having been revoked by Russia, but rejected it as impractical. Not only was this newly won territory given up, but land which had been under German rule and occupation for many centuries. East Prussia lost its hinterland; Danzig, a major trading port, was cut off from the rest of Germany. The Worker’s and Soldier’s Councils, staged an uprising, the Spartacist revolt. The Social Democrats used the Freikorps to put down the uprising. These units went on to break the power of the Councils. In 1921 the Weimar Government began to put into effect Versailles clauses reducing the army to 100,000 men, two navy units under a Captain Erhardt led a putsch in Berlin. They declared a new government under Wolfgang Kapp, a civil servant, and General von Littowitz. After a few days the putsch faded away and Erhardt was imprisoned.

The violence continued throughout Germany. Marches and counter-marches, demonstrations and counter-demonstrations, left hundreds dead on Right and Left in the first few years of the Republic. Each political party, the SPD, the KPD and so on, had its own storm-troopers.

In January 1923, France and Belgium invaded the Ruhr in an attempt to force the payment of reparations. The German currency, already weakened, collapsed. By October 1923, trillion mark notes were being issued. That year saw a peak of nationalist feeling and bitterness, while Golo Mann considers that anti-Semitism was at its height just after the First World War. Separatist movements grew in Bavaria and elsewhere. The re-unification of Germany was only thirty to fifty years old, and regional sentiments were strong. In the Ruhr the French staged a separatist group which instigated an armed insurrection. Hitler’s November putsch was a by-product of all these circumstances. Propaganda harking back to the French occupation played a dominant role in the next twenty-five years.

Like many others, Darré found it hard to endure the period...
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immediately after the war. He attended a business school to learn book-keeping and shorthand, but felt ill at ease at home. His diary reveals resentment at the French street names and the presence of French soldiers. He missed the company of people of his own age and the comradeship of the army. Eventually, he decided to go back to the German Colonial School, and resume his agricultural training. There were many new applicants to the school, but a place was found for Darré because of his war record.20

By January 1919 he had met his future first wife, Alma Stadt, in Goslar, where she was at school with his younger sister, Ilse. He confided to his diary that as soon as he met her, he had an instinct that she would be his future wife.21 Alma became the friend he longed for. He wrote to her several times a week, and expressed to her his sense of inner weakness. "Look here, I will be absolutely honest with you. I wrote in October 1919. 'My own idleness causes problems. Life has tossed me about so much already, has played so many dirty tricks on me. I've become mistrustful. Not only against fate, but of myself. I've experienced too often how I can become weaker and weaker ... I need a source of strength to lean on'.22 Alma was not to be that source, and indeed Darré remained a solitary and mistrustful man, craving comradeship, but receiving instead the usual hectoring or bewilderment from his peers. His letters to his wife over the next ten years oscillated between displays of affection and violent reproaches. He leaned on her, but resented what he saw as her strong character. The tone of his communications shows a hectoring uncertainty: the need to teach and inform, but a fear of failure.

If one were to postulate a reaction against a stern father, who stressed the need for hard work, discipline and orderly business habits, one might expect to find a picture similar to the 1920s liberalism of England, after the Victorian sunset. Darré did in fact show many of these characteristics. His reaction led him to radical and revolutionary ideas, which, based on the humanism and republicanism of the Darwinian tradition, merged with the love of nature and the physical world inspired in late 19th-century Germany by Bölsche, author of Love-Life in Nature. He followed the cult of physical fitness. As early as 1905 the ten-year old schoolboy was winning prizes for swimming, and keeping a record of his achievements. He participated in running and swimming races at Giessen University in 1926, and sent the newspaper reports of his triumphs to his wife. He wrote to her about the virtues of the naked body. People resented nakedness, he argued, because the naked body expressed the truth of the inner person. You could not hide behind clothes.23

Darré tried to inspire Alma with his own enthusiasm for the cultivation and love of the body. He exhorted her to do gymnastics, and sent her a card by Fidus (Hugo Höppener), the Jugendstil illustrator, showing a naked man ecstatically greeting the sunrise on a mountain, his hair streaming in the wind. Their courtship remained platonic, though Darré wrote candidly to Alma, 'Physical love should be cultivated because it produces a certain release of energy (Entspannung der Energie) ... In nearly all marriages the key to unharmonious relationships is to be found in ignorance of these facts'.24 The engagement between the two was kept secret for a year.25

However, as they were contemplating marriage plans, Darré suddenly wrote to leave Witzenhausen. A brief letter arrived for his father, on 27th November 1920, announcing that the student Court of Honour had found Darré guilty of lying. 'Some months ago I told a lie to protect the reputation of a comrade', wrote Darré. 'I have now been held guilty by the Court'.26 'The judgment meant automatic expulsion. There were no recommissions. The family flew to his defence, and a campaign began to have his name cleared of the offence. Although Darré's 1932 biography mentioned that he had taken his Kandisprüfungsverkündigung at Witzenhausen, he was not in fact able to take his final diploma at the time. He was also expelled from the regimental union of his old regiment, which hit him particularly hard. Vigorous support from the teachers at Witzenhausen ensured that the verdict was quashed, but it took nine years, and it was not until May 1930 that he was awarded his diploma. However, the affair seems to have aroused a competitive spirit in his academic work and attitude to life in general that had been lacking before. He went to Halle-Wittenberg in 1922, and despite distractions from politics, his marriage, also of 1922, and the hyper-inflation, ended by producing a good degree.27

Immediately after the war, he was still contemplating migrating as a farmer to Argentina but was discouraged by the high price of land. The immediate aftermath of the First World War was a continuation of farm support prices and high land prices in Germany, fuelled by the incipient inflation, while South America enjoyed a boom from the world-wide shortage of food. Darré found that he would have to work for at least ten years as a labourer or gauchro before he could afford a farm of his own. 'It is a very healthy life', wrote his father doubtfully, 'but the work is extremely hard'. His heart problems, he pointed out, were hardly compatible with the brutally hard work necessary for a
settler in South America. In January 1922, Darré contacted an
Argentinian friend again, with a view to emigration, but received a
discouraging reply. His last enquiry about Argentina was in 1923.44

But his next step after leaving Wittenhausen was to work as an
unpaid farm assistant to gain practical experience. He began as a pupil
on a peasant farm in Upper Bavaria; but the farm was sold after three
months, and the new owner did not want him. Darré then worked as
an assistant milker on a farm near Baden. Three months later there was
a vacancy for an apprenticeship as farm manager in Gut Aumühle,
Oldenburg, starting July 1921. Darré enjoyed working with animals—
he had asked his father if he could run a stud-farm in 1917.

Darré found his experience of farm pupillage in Pomerania
surprisingly rewarding. He decided to find a smallholding which
would support his wife and himself, and his wife helped him
help finance him. He wrote to private and public land agencies looking
for a small farm, but they were either unavailable, or offered at
a prohibitive price. In some cases more than a million marks were being
asked for part-shares in run down farms. In December 1921, Gut
Aumühle changed hands, and the new owner brought in an old army
friend, with no experience of farming, to take Darré’s place. At this
time, he began to make bitter references to the treatment of old
soldiers in Germany, and the loss of German territory in the East. He
noted that Admiral Horthy in Hungary had given his veterans land,
and complained that the German plans to distribute farms to soldiers in
the east in 1918, had come to nothing. In his second book, Neudel, he
was to stress the Horthy experiment.29

Darré’s family had all been affected by the political and economic
disasters. His aunt was now penniless, and decided to train as a teacher.
His father seemed bewildered at the speed at which his prosperous,
newly united country had lost, not only its colonies, but German
territory. The German Colonial School had circularised its pupils’
patents in late 1918, warning that economic recovery would be
impossible without access to raw materials. The family funds were tied
up in South America, though friends helped to smuggle some money
to him. Darré’s younger sister, Ilse, sent him a card in 1920 which
showed a bearded peasant and his young son gazing across a river
into storm clouds, while the peasant pointed out ‘the Fatherland’.30

In 1922, Darré moved to Halle, to study for an agricultural degree
at the Friedrich-Witte University, Halle. Here, he found a pleasant flat
with a garden. He was constantly in debt, and Alma took over his
financial affairs with his approval, and wrote to his father on money
matters. He found his dependence on his father embarrassing, and
wrote a long letter explaining that the war was responsible for his
delayed professional training. His studies at Wittenhausen now
appeared to be useless, since he could not use them as credits towards a
degree in Halle. In Germany, unlike England, terms spent at one
university can normally be set towards degree requirements at another.
His younger brother, Erich was studying for a doctorate at Marburg.
Like Darré, he was inspired by H. S. Chamberlain’s work, and wrote,
‘If I had time, I would like to busy myself with theories of inheritance
and the racial question’.31

His half-brother was small and dark, a contrast to the four tall,
fair-haired children. His successor’s widow speculated that this may
have helped to stimulate Darré’s interest in racial questions. When his
shorthand teacher had her first child, Darré mused on the quantity of black
hair the child was born with; it would soon go and be replaced by
light-brown hair, which had happened with them all. Certainly, there
was no black hair in the family, he pointed out. He seemed to have
acquired an interest in medical matters from his father, who followed
the latest scientific discoveries in biology, and recommended works on
physiology and heredity when his son began his farm pupillage in
1921. When he began to study animal breeding, as part of his
agricultural degree at Halle, his father again sent him book lists, and
discussed ‘Darwin and Haeckel’s theory of evolution’ with him.32

The collapse of his earlier plans left Darré in limbo. He spent much
of his spare time reading a range of authors, from the great German
classics to best-selling historical novels devoted to past German heroes
who had struggled to conquer what was now lost. Darré read the
classical political authors, Houston Stewart Chamberlain, Langbehn and
Lagarde. He also acquired a thorough grounding in German literature,
reading Goethe, Schiller and Walter von der Vogelweide. Though
never academically brilliant, he seems to have acquired a good general
knowledge of German culture, specialised as his own training was. One
letter home jokingly quoted a lament from von der Vogelweide when his
money failed to arrive, another, criticising an attack on
Protestantism by Count Keyserling, discussed Rousseau, Bentham,
Eichendorff and acquired the songs of the Frankforter Volksliedverein.
He admired the ballads of Härries von Muschhausen, especially those dealing with the peasant
soldiers of the eighteenth century. He read Wanderjahre of an Engineer,
by Max Eryth, one of the nineteenth-century founders of the German
Agricultural Society, and novels about colonial adventures and farming. His reading of Lagarde’s *Deutsche Schriften* and Lagarde’s biography led him to criticize German education bitterly. He thought there had been a decline of general knowledge since the 1860s. ‘How horribly empty today’s education is.’ He criticized the ‘humanistic schools’ for not teaching Latin, ‘a sound foundation for other languages’. English should certainly be taught ‘because of the USA, though Yankee English is not exactly classical English... Spanish is as important today’.33

His best work at Halle was in studies on animal breeding. This was carried out under a Professor Frölich, who was and remained a supporter of Darré and his ideas. He was later to suggest his name to the Nordic Ring, together with three other Professors who had taught him at Halle, as possible sympathisers. With the compulsory courses on agricultural subjects (which included meteorological observations, breeding, geology and chemistry), Halle offered courses on ‘Racial Hygiene; its Possibility and Aims’ (lectures given by Dr Drigalski, ex-army officer and member of the Society for Racial Hygiene), Social Policy, Property Policy, the Versailles Peace Treaties, Plato, Ancient and Modern Philosophy, Hegel’s Social Philosophy, Psychology and Medieval German Constitutional History. Mineralogy, plate tectonics and other physical sciences were also optional. Because of his studies at Witzenhausen, Darré was excused optional courses, but the range available is interesting. Just before his final exams, he sold an article, ‘Animal Migrations; a clue to the Aryan Homeland’, for 22.50 Mk.34

After he had taken his farming degree at Halle, he spent a post-graduate term at the University of Giessen working on animal breeding with Professor Krämer, another academic with interests in eugenics and heredity. He was offered a post as administrator of a German farm settlement in South-West Africa; but he had decided that his future lay in Germany, and became more and more interested in nationalist politics. He now (1926) wrote his first influential political article, ‘Internal Colonisation’, which attacked ‘dreams of empire’, not only because Germany was unlikely to regain her lost colonies, but because he saw empire as immoral and destructive to the concept of the German homeland.35

He kept in touch with those of his former comrades and fellow pupils who did emigrate. This may have helped him to escape the desperate insularity and Eurocentricty of many other Nazi leaders. Later friends commented that he seemed more aware of the non-German world. One friend wrote from Mexico, ‘Today I am a trader, and I have no idea what I will be doing tomorrow. In Germany people who change their professions are despised. In America, that attitude is unknown... If you don’t, you would be laughed at as stupid. In this respect at least American education is valuable.’36

It was rash of Darré to turn down the post in South-West Africa. By 1925 he had a farming diploma from Halle, but a doctorate was virtually essential to join even the Civil Service. His more highly qualified friends were now taking unpaid apprenticeships on farms while waiting for some public position to become available. With 50,000 agricultural civil servants already out of work, he found himself practically unemployed. The Wilhelmine bonanza for the civil service had come to an end. The Prussian Ministry of Agriculture refused to accept his practical farm work of 1921, and he thus failed to qualify for an important post in the Ministry or even the County Agriculture Office. Now thirty-one years old, married and with a child, and without prospects, he had never lived with his wife for longer than a vacation, and the marriage already showed signs of strain.

When he was about to leave his first wife, in 1927, his younger sister reproached him with having become exactly like their father in his unfeeling egotism towards women.37 The endless and nagging sense of duty imposed on the younger Darré by the elder produced a chronic sense of weakness and inadequacy in the younger man. The fact that his studies were prolonged unnaturally—long even by German standards—and that he was kept by his father and father-in-law for a decade, produced further defensiveness and resentment. His ideals were of manliness, honour and strength. In 1911 and in 1919 he had dreamed of being a soldier. Yet he found himself obliged to present himself to his father with an account of his ‘achievements’ as the age of twenty-nine, and had no economic independence until the age of thirty-three. In 1919, when Darré was twenty-four years old, and after four years on the Western Front, his father wrote to reproach him for spending money on dancing lessons.38 In later years Darré reacted by combining manic punctiliousness and military correctness in public life with personal charm and sensitivity in private life. Those who became his friends, especially many of his women friends, remained faithful for decades. In his political activity, his insecurity and self-doubt revealed itself in an almost obsessive cunning, plotting endlessly in the jungle around him, while he remained able to take unpopular long-term views on economics and politics with a visionary flair which was alien—and unwelcome—to those around him.

In December 1918, Darré’s Argentinian pass, signed by the
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Argentinian Vice-Counsel at Wiesbaden, had shown a hony, oval face, with large blue-grey eyes, cropped fair hair, gaunt marks around the eyes and nose, and a full mouth pressed firmly together. By 1925, the sombre expression had disappeared, and his face had begun to take on the slightly fuller appearance it was to retain all his life.39

1925-1929

After his written exam at Halle in February 1925, Darré worked for a further term as 'Voluntary Assistant' under Professor Fröhlich until June 1925, when he took his oral examination. This was marked 'very good', and he thought of working on a doctorate at Giesen. During his semester at Giesen, in 1925-6, he again specialised in animal breeding, this time with Professor Krämer.40

Between 1925 and 1927, Darré published fourteen articles on animal and plant breeding, including works on the origins of the Finnish sheep, and seed breeding exchanges between East Prussia and the Baltic. This subject obviously pulled together many of his diverse interests, and, despite his late academic start, his work seemed to show promise. He hoped, indeed, to publish his Gisern work but failed.41

In June 1926, he was offered a post in East Prussia, as organiser and representative for the East Prussian Warm Blood Society—Trakhener Stud. The work was unpaid, but Darré would receive travelling expenses, and a visit to Finland was offered, to help organise a fair for the East Prussian Chamber of Agriculture. He was interested in the idea of working in the east. The practical and organisational work looked attractive, and he planned to work on a doctorate in his spare time. By now, he was thinking of supporting himself through journalism, as his first two political articles, 'Inner Kolonisation' and 'Rathenau' had been published, (although for a pitance; fifteen and twenty marks respectively) but the prospect of immediate involvement with a cause seemed attractive. The four years of war, his delayed studies, the disaster of Witzenhausen, meant that while he craved for and needed responsibility, he had no field of action. He had been a romantic, a lover of the outside life. Plans for colonial adventures had dribbled away through a mixture of ill-health, dilettantism and uncertainty. He was a comrade who could not trust his friends, suspicious and quarrelsome. He had striven to be a conscientious son to a father always suspecting him of dilettante attitudes, and failed, but now of his own accord began to look for involvement in practical affairs. From being disorganised and thoughtless, he became punctilious and methodical. From resenting control and discipline, he began to demand them from himself as well as those around him. Ambitions aroused, he believed his old faults were conquered, and his energies ready for use. If the East Prussian Studbook Society for Warm-Blooded Trakhener Horses wanted his services, he would throw himself into serving their interests, especially if he could combine that with serving Germany.

The story behind Darré's six months in the Baltic is hard to disentangle. The various biographical notices in the Deutsche Führer Lexicon, the Neue Deutsche Biographie and his 1933 biography all disagree with each other. His personal files show that he spent much of the time investigating an intrigue on the part of the commission house dealing with the Russians who were interested in buying the Trakhener horses with Prussian credits. Before discussing the possibilities behind his stay, it might be as well to explain the terms 'Warm Blood' and 'Trakhener'.

In the world of horse-breeding, there are cold-blooded horses, warm-blooded horses and thoroughbreds. Cold-blooded horses are for heavy work, warm-blooded horses can be used for riding. The famous warm-blooded breed of East Prussia was from the Trakhener stud, whose symbol was a double anler. It was a small, tough animal, with some English thoroughbred mixture. It was strong enough to work as a farm horse, but excellent as a cavalry animal. It was the fighting horse par excellence. In the 1920s, the Trakhener Stud sold thousands of brood mares and stallions abroad. Among the interested purchasers was the Soviet Government. The Weimar Republic, in 1922, had signed the Treaty of Rapallo, which agreed certain peace terms and trade agreements between Germany and Russia, while on 12th October 1925, the German-Soviet Trade Treaty was signed. These Treaties aroused violent opposition among the right-wing end of the nationalist spectrum (while the National Bolsheviks, together with figures like von Seeckt and General Schleicher, supported links with Russia as geo-politically inevitable). Under the Versailles Treaty, serious restrictions had been placed on Germany's diplomatic representation abroad. Because of this, Prussian ministries were known to use apparently innocuous agents and company representatives abroad as undercover negotiators and collectors of information—in short, as spies. The Prussian Ministry of Agriculture was noted for its tendency to lend itself to this practice.

Economic factors were involved, too. There was a surplus of grain products, and prices were low. Prussia was anxious to arrange
February 1927 he told his wife that he was the 'German secret negotiator, to fight on economic matters between the Baltic and East Prussian Agriculture', which suggests that he was one of the undercover agents mentioned earlier.  

In 1927, Darré went to Lahis, in Finland, as representative of the Agricultural Animal Breeding Association, and was asked to study the organisation of small dairy farmers in East Finland at the same time, after a report by a friend and supporter, Professor Carl Metzger, agricultural representative at the German Embassy in Helsinki, was sent to the Prussian Ministry of Agriculture.  

In May 1927, he sent a desiring letter to Metzger, asking him to help find him a permanent post in the Baltic. He referred to his dependence on his father, and added, 'It may seem funny, but this is a very serious time for me, and I can't even afford clothes... If I could go to Finland officially, then it would give me an inside position, and much greater scope... This is the psychological moment for me.' A few days later, he heard that six new consular posts had been created, and in August 1927, he applied for a post as expert agricultural adviser and representative for the Baltic on behalf of the East Prussian Ministry of Agriculture. He was officially appointed in May 1928, after months of knocking on doors in Berlin.

Among others, he contacted Dr von Lösch, president of the German Schutzhunde, on the advice of Dr Edgar Jung, who told Darré that Lösch had 'great influence in the Foreign Office'. His plans for supporting East Prussian agriculture in the Baltic through barter agreements was laid before the President of the German Chamber of Agriculture, Brandes, by von Behr, who confided in Darré that Brandes was wholly in agreement with them. This was an important backer, as he headed the umbrella organisation of all German agricultural chambers. Darré acquired considerable knowledge of the highly organised structure of German agriculture during this period. For one year, indeed, he was a member of eight separate agricultural and eugenic organisations.

In the summer of 1928 he was sent to Riga as representative of the East Prussian Agricultural Chamber. The intervening year was spent with his parents in Wiesbaden, where he wrote his first book Das Bauernum als Lebensquell der nordischen Rasse (The Peasantry as Life-Source of the Nordic Race).

His years in the Baltic and the visits to Finland confirmed Darré's liking for the north German, and his view of them as a deeply rural people, threatened by internal decay and external threat. He referred in November 1926 to what he saw as his special role.
It does look to me ... as if my life's fate will be bound with East Prussia, as if God had called me to fight for East Germaness. I suspect that here in the East I might one day fulfill my life's mission, but we can only wait and see.

He was so absorbed in his work that in February 1929 he refused to return to Wiesbaden, in response to a telegram that his father was seriously ill. 'I can't leave the important negotiations with the Latvian Government,' he telegraphed back. Three days later his father died. Darré's comment was, 'When I think of the miseries of my father's marriage, my own reproaches are strangled.'

His service in the Baltic ended with an argument with the ministry officials in Berlin over seed-breeding exchanges between Finland and East Prussia. He claimed the quality of the seed was poor. The matter was taken up in Berlin, where a court hearing found that Darré was right. However, he had aroused such animosity that he was recalled to Königsberg in June 1929 and waited some months for a new post to be found for him. He expected the National Ministry of Agriculture to take over his post, and offer him a new posting in January 1930. However, he had dearly lost favour. He claimed in his interrogation in 1947 that the political implications of Das Bauernum led the Berlin ministry to refuse him service in East Prussia, and offer him a post in Ecuador instead but his 1933 biographer states that Darré resigned after Stresemann refused to accept proposals on agricultural trade between East Prussia and the Baltic States. This is possible, though there is no supporting evidence. In December 1929, he resigned his position. Later, wild rumours were to fly round the coffee-houses of Berlin that Darré had been sacked for illegal deals concerning Polish rye, that he was being blackmailed by a German industrialist who supported Darré as Hugenberg's successor. There seems to be no proof to support these rumours, which were recanted in the memoirs of a KPD man who worked for the NSDAP in the early 1930s; but their existence and propagation hints at the controversy and resentment that were to surround Darré in his political career. He was later able to win support from the small, self-made but German, who, like himself, was an outsider in Germany's complex interest group structure. Insofar as this was understood by organisation men of the right and of the left, it aroused resentment.

During these years, he began to show an ability to fire others with enthusiasm, to organise and to administer. He also continued to quarrel with most of his superiors, while managing to attract vigorous support from some. In general, Darré was capable of clear-headed, sometimes cynical, sometimes original, radical and persuasive insights. However, he was chronically suspicious of his confères. This lends a sad and ironic flavour to his emphasis on the virtues of the English public school spirit. At this stage in his life, these quarrels reflected not so much his combative nature as the mediocrity entrenched in German provincial administration.

**POLITICS AND ANGER. 1923–1926**

In Spring 1925 the President of the Republic, Friedrich Ebert, died. Hindenburg, the 78-year-old head of the German armed forces during the First World War, was a candidate for the presidency, and was elected with a million-vote majority against a Communist and a centrist candidate, after the first election produced a stalemate. The election, like the revolution of 1918-19 and the insurrections, meant further violence. In Halle, the Stahlhelm took to the streets on behalf of Hindenburg. Darré took part in the marches and demonstrations. He described them enthusiastically, in an essay rejected by one journal.

The Café Orchestra began playing the Erhardt song 'Hakenkreuz to the Stahlhelm', and there was a roar of applause ... The march was headed by nine young girls in gym costume. They were so clean and fresh ... It was inspiring to think that future German mothers would be girls like this with such healthy and supple bodies ... Why had 'Red Halle', blood-red Halle in 1919, become 'Red-white-blue[er] Halle'? Because of the presence of over a thousand students of agriculture, energetic war veterans. The march surged forward unstopably.

In 1923, when the French and Belgian troops occupied the Ruhr, it was the Stahlhelm who sang the forbidden 'Deutschlandlied', and the old army song, 'We will hammer the French, and win' (Siegreich wollen wir Frankreich schlagen), a song whose refrain was, 'when you go away, we'll be there', phrases which recall chillingly the millions of corpses on the Western Front. 'In summer, 1922, it was risky to wear the Stahlhelm insignia in public, especially at the time of the Rathenau murder. Three years later, the Stahlhelm rules the streets in Halle.' Darré attended Stahlhelm rallies and veteran's reunions (banned, but held under the guise of a 'Prussian Day'), between 1922 and 1925.
He was to comment in December 1925, when he moved to Giesse
University for a term's graduate work, that it was a quiet unpolitical
town, with none of the day-to-day political intensity and involvement
of Halle, which was polarised between its large SPD and KPD
working class, and supporters of nationalist parties. Darré had noted
several times between 1922 and 1925 that 'red workers' were drifting
into the 'fatherlandish' movements, but commented from Giesse that
it was good not to be attacked in the streets by Communists just
because you weren't a worker. 'While the Stahlhelm in Halle had lost
five dead and badly injured during 1925, here you can ask the worker
the way or the time of day without fear.'

Darré had moved well to the right of his family by 1923, although
within ten years his siblings and their spouses caught up, and became
enthusiastic NSDAP members. He analysed the attempted murder
of November 1923 in Munich for his father, suggesting that it had been
'cleverly smashed' by the Bavarian Right to discredit Hitler. The left-
wing press, he thought, blunted real differences of interest between
right-oriented groups.

If you stand on the left (by which I mean the left-wing of the
People's Party—Centre Democrats—Social Democrats then
Militarism-Ludendorff-Anti-Semitism-Von Kahr-Bavaria is seen
as a unity, to be fought against as an ethical duty.

Darré attributed Kapp's opposition to the fact that Hitler's movement
had support among workers 'contrary to expectations', that Hitler was
trying to unite the Social movement, and had attracted support
because Kahr was corrupt. 'Hitler may be a hothead, and not have a
very political mind, but he represented a growing protest movement,
that could not be crushed by force alone, in the way that Kapp's
military Putsch could be crushed.' Darré prophesied that it was essential
to keep a close watch on 'this extraordinary current of ideas' in future
months, years and decades, 'not because I want to defend it, or because
it lies close to my heart, but because no one will understand Germany's
internal politics if they don't.' He interpreted Hitler's working-class
support as due to the economic failings of the republic, but 'I will be
surprised if a man appears who can produce productive work for
them, instead of destroying themselves and others in wild opposition.'
Darré pointed out that the national army, under von Seeckt, had not
supported the rebellion, and suggested that Captain Erhardt had been
allowed to escape from prison in order to help crush Hitler in
Munich.

Was Darré more sympathetic to National Socialism than he was
prepared to state in writing, especially to a disapproving father? In
February 1923, worried about his lack of political involvement, he
decided to express his feelings in a dramatic gesture, and, with a group
of friends, joined the DVVP, or German People's Freedom Party. In
March 1921, an agreement had been reached between Hitler and Von
Grüé, leader of the DVVP that the latter would have a free hand in
north Germany. NSDAP members complained that the DVVP was
insufficiently radical and too conservative. 'The poster inscribed "Jews
and National Socialists are forbidden membership" was still fresh in
our memory', wrote one Nazi farmer in 1937. Darré told his wife that
the membership was growing rapidly and came mainly from the
workers. 'The völkisch movement could never crystallise here as it could
in Bavaria under Hitler.'

So ... a new political party was founded on a purely national
socialist basis, i.e. unceasing struggle against all Jewry and
Parliamentarianism. .. In this I am now to the right of the
German nationalists, and according to Wiesbaden ideas I belong
in the mausoleum, at least according to the Frankfurter Zeitung,
which is the Bible with you,

he told his wife. His membership lapsed the next year, and appears to
have been completely inactive. Darré failed to mention it in his NSDAP
application in 1930, and always described himself as a latecomer to
party politics. He failed also to mention it in his interrogation by the
Allies in 1945, and while there were obvious reasons for playing down
his early political involvement with the Allies, he could only have
gained kudos by stressing it with his Nazi colleagues. His 1933
biographer claimed that Darré and a friend, Theo Habicht (see below,
p. 75) had thought of joining the NSDAP in Wiesbaden in 1928, but
had decided against it because of the damage it might do to their
employment prospects. Certainly, Darré's wife joined the Wiesbaden
branch of the NSDAP.

Darré's letters to his wife between 1923 and 1925 often attacked
what he variously called Jewry, the Jews and Jewishness. Yet in his
published works up to 1929 there were no anti-Semitic statements.
Darré's position seems to have been that he was a political anti-semit, and
felt no personal animus towards particular Jews. His position
regarding Jews and race will be considered later in the book; this
section will deal with his views in the early 1920s.

Many of Darré's attacks on Jews were because he associated them
with democracy. There seem to be two separate points here; firstly, why did he so associate them, and secondly, why was he so anti-democracy?

Democracy in Germany at this time was not a buzz-word of approval; in fact, in some circles it was an insult, as, in earlier times in England, to call someone a Jacobite, a Tory or a demagogue was an insult. Indeed, Gladstone had protested when called a democrat, as he considered the insult was so bad as to be outside the boundaries of acceptable parliamentary abuse. Many Germans outside the traditional conservative Right saw a democratic parliament as a means of abusing working-class power against the small businessmen, the farmers and the army; further, they saw it as essentially ‘undemocratic’, in that democracy was seen as a cover under which powerful vested economic interests could manipulate the population, a view entirely shared by the Communists. The popular press, the cinema, the legal system, were seen as a means of manipulation, not as a vehicle of the people. Many modern studies of the 1920s have examined the extent to which the pre-1914 social structure was retained. Industrialists, generals and landowners are presented as engaged in a continuous and vicious fight against the frail, struggling forces of democratic virtue. There must have been, of course, industrialists who retained their possessions and fortunes through war, revolution and hyper-inflation; army officers who still held their posts, and landowners who had not been forced to sell their land for worthless currency in 1923. But the usefulness of physical assets as a hedge against inflation can be exaggerated. You cannot pay bills or buy bread out of bricks and mortar. The effects of the inflation were to render fixed incomes and pensions valueless, to bankrupt many creditors, and to interfere with internal trade. This, together with the effects of the war-time blockade, had meant years of hunger and sickness. In 1919, 90% of all hospital beds were occupied by TB cases, British observers in Germany such as Keynes commented on the starving children, the faces yellowed by shortages of fats. One striking feature of photographs of German crowds in the 1920s—as in Britain in the 1930s—is the gaunt faces. Farmers were prepared to cede their goods, but reluctant to sell: what could industrial workers offer to men who would not accept worthless currency? Up to 1925, unemployment remained high, and the Weimar government’s attempt to palliate conditions for the urban workers by means of high welfare benefits had to be paid for, in part, by squeezing the farming community. This inequality of tax burdens was a major factor in farming support for the NSDAP in the early 1930s.

German nationalists held democracy responsible, and tended to consider ‘Jewish democrat’ to be one word. Certainly, there were Jews among the new government, and some commentators, like Thomas Mann, saw this as an index of a new humanity and tendency to socialism. The statistical disproportion was hardly surprising. Conservative and monarchical structures tend towards exclusivity; in Europe such structures traditionally excluded Jews: not always literally, as legal constraints against Jews in the professions, in land-owning and in the non-Prussian army were abolished in nineteenth-century Germany. But many successful Jews felt that they were not fully accepted, although a kind of parallel hierarchy developed in the social and economic expansion of Wilhelmine Germany. The social democratic governments that emerged from the collapse of the European empires in the early 1920s contained a high proportion of Jewish members, as did the Marxist revolutions of Russia and Hungary, not to mention the leaders of the revolutionary council in Germany. Russian Jews were the most likely of the Russian minorities to have the language skills and foreign contacts necessary to become ambassadors to and negotiators with other countries, and were thus more noticeable. There are, of course, methodological problems in making generalisations of this kind, but they are problems unique to this area. If Croats had emerged in prominent positions in several European nations during the 1920s, it would have been a matter for considerable comment. If the movements associated with prominent Croats were seen as hostile to traditional nationalist values, it would have been commented on adversely. German nationalists, especially the less conservative ones, reacted in this way to the prominence of Jews in democratic and socialist movements, while nationalist German Jews seemed to switch their allegiance from the lost Wilhelmine empire to Zionism in the 1920s.

Since the Second World War, people have become infinitely more sensitised to the issue of labelling people or groups in a pejorative way, and especially when those concerned are Jewish. Generalisations have continued to be made about other groups, tribes, nations and races, both is historical and scientific works and in everyday life. But there is a convention that it is perceived as anti-Semitic to label someone a Jew if the context is pejorative, but methodologically sound to label someone a Jew if the context is favourable. For example, writers in the 1920s (including Keynes) who labelled the early Soviet leaders as Jewish have been attacked as anti-Semitic; but Trotsky could be labelled as Jewish once he began to oppose Stalin. Einstein is usually
Who was Darre?

labelled as Jewish, although not a practising Jew; but anyone writing about 'the Jewish criminal Stavisky' would be perceived as anti-Semitic. This leads to problems in understanding the mentality of 1920s Germans. If one were to write that Jews have always been in the forefront of movements designed to liberate the poor and oppressed, that they have always taken up the cudgels on behalf of trade unions, idealistic internationalists and victims of superstition, one would be saying, objectively, exactly what the völkisch writers of the 1920s were saying, that Jews supported Socialism and atheism, and opposed conservative nationalism. For the historian, a more important aspect is, not whether these accusations were anti-Semitic, but whether they were true. Only then can the perceptions and motivations of the time be understood.

Darre, in his anti-Semitic pronouncements, was not only supporting conspiracy theories, he was trying to construct a model of the future, insofar as it would affect him and his family. He thought that Jews in various countries would automatically act in support of their fellow Jews elsewhere, and would automatically change their national allegiances when they felt their interests threatened. He thought that Jewish interests had brought America into the war, because they saw that 'Albion's star was sinking', and that only America and Germany could stand alone; they chose to support America. He asserted that the Jews supported a United States of Europe because 'seen from the financial-technical—i.e. Jewish—point of view' this was the most efficient way to control industrial production; the Dawes plan was a means to that end. Darre thought that the völkisch movement was the one danger to this plan, but that the 'farcical failure of the Hitler putsch' meant that it was impotent. At the time of the Locarno Pact negotiations, he argued that France was waiting for Germany to collapse. He admitted what himself as Jewish sense of identity and tribal feeling, but resented it too. 'The Jews think they have the right to build up land in Palestine as much as they want, but we in Germany must not do so'. He argued that Jews wanted to deny nationhood to others because they saw it as a danger to themselves, but claimed the right to nationhood. He ended a trade against this damnable concept of internationalism ... Marx, Lassalle, both Jews' with the prophetic comment:

The choice is now between nationalism and internationalism; that is, between anti-Semitism and pro-Semitism ... and I think I can safely say that 90% of students are anti-Semitic.

Modern scholars have agreed with this estimate. During the 1920s, Jews were excluded from many student associations. One such association was refused a grant from the Prussian Ministry of Education unless it accepted Jews, but preferred to forego the grant rather than change their rule. The fact that ministries opposed anti-Semitism among the young enhanced its attraction.

In short, when Darre associated the 'Soviet star' with the Jews, he was expressing a widely held view of the time. He thought the post-war economic chaos a result of trying to enforce the international debt system, and associated manipulative democracy with Jews. His main attacks in his letters were reserved for France, but it was so obvious to him that France was an enemy that he did not blame her for her hostility. He decided that the nationalist movement in Germany was the only movement prepared to defend Germany against France, and organised expatriate, inside and outside Germany, was the undying core of this nationalism for power-political reasons. This was a political anti-Semitism which should not be confused with his Nordic racism.

The 1920s certainly saw an attempt to build a new economic international order, with sporadic attempts to incorporate two 'rogue' powers, Germany and Russia. From January 1924, indeed, Germany knew stabilisation and economic growth to a remarkable extent. The new mark was introduced, and an American banker, Charles Dawes, evolved a new system for reparations. This was known as the Dawes Plan, and recommended that reparations payments be balanced by Germany's ability to pay each year, and was followed by American capital flows into Germany. Unfortunately, this early example of debt rescheduling ran into problems. The capital was short-term money, funnelled into long-term investment. When the American crash of 1929 came, the money was withdrawn, leading to the near-collapse of the German economy. By 1932, six million men were unemployed. The Dawes plan had been attacked from the first by German nationalists, firstly because it accepted the idea of reparations, and secondly because it was seen as a means of extending the hegemony of New York bankers (and, by extension, the Jews). Every attempt to negotiate with other nations by the Weimar Government was attacked as a betrayal of German interests.

The rapid political changes, the loss of territory and 'face', the economic misery and uncertainty, went along with an explosion of intellectual discontent. 1920s Germany was in many ways similar to a Third-World post-colonial society in its mentality, existing institutions seen as alien and hostile. Anything was possible given the human will.
Nothing was possible, given human inadequacies. In this ferment, Darré began to develop his extraordinary package of ideas. Like a more nationalistic Che Guevara, he opposed capitalism and the town. He sought a new form of corporatism, in which farmers would govern themselves, and factories become unnecessary. Most elements of his views were not original, and some of their sources will be discussed in the next chapters. What was original was the fusion of these elements into a unique combination of messianic despair and voluntarist optimism. This gave him his force, his following, his brief triumph and eventual inevitable failure. The force of the ideas developed in the 1920s drove him to seek office in the 1930s. It was to prevent him from compromising with Hitler, and led to his downfall.

CHAPTER TWO

Odin’s Ravens

We live today in an age when the desire to return to one’s ethnic and cultural roots is taken for granted. Even the most internationalist intellectuals make exceptions in their dogma for the fashionable minorities: the Bretons, the Basques, the Orcadians, the blacks, and threatened, or supposedly threatened Third World tribes. There is a tendency to assume that majority groups cannot be threatened, and therefore cannot attract the sympathy or interest of the observer. Majorities are out; minorities are in. Volumes have been written about this strange intellectual quirk, and this is not the place to try to investigate it. It may, however, be useful here to remind the reader that most groups can, objectively speaking, be threatened, whether majority or minority. Germany for much of the 19th century was a potential majority scattered over and among minorities. At this period the ‘nationalities question’ meant the right to national self-determination of Germans, Magyars, Italians and Poles, four major European groups whose ethnic boundaries did not coincide with their political boundaries. The search for roots was not confined, in short, to the German romantics. The discovery of ancient graves, complete with bodies helped to inspire an interest in physical anthropology, and in France and Scandinavia, history was now seen as the result of conflicting racial and tribal forces. Who were the people of Bronze Age Europe? Where did they come from? How were language groups related to ethnic groups? What was the pattern of settlement and colonisation of Europe?

By the late nineteenth century, new self-conscious groups were emerging. These included the Balkan states, and those Slav nations invented by the agile minds of a handful of Oxford historians. They also included the Scandinavian countries of northern Europe, the Nordic nations. Nordic has become a word associated so exclusively with Nazi propaganda that it is always a surprise to encounter it as a value-free description of Denmark, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and Finland, which is how the word is still used. Originally, the word simply meant northern, and became commonly used to describe the
tribes of northern Europe, along with ostische, westische and südische, although it was temporarily substituted for 'Aryan' in the 1920s. Nordic was not co-terminous with Aryan, Indo-European or Germanic. Aryan originally referred to the tribes of the Iranian plains, and was used as such by Darre in the 1920s. 'Indo-European' referred to a language group.  

Some definitions of 'German' seem absurdly wide, as when H.S. Chamberlain used the word to mean all non-Mediterranean and non-Tartar peoples (i.e., to include, 'Germanic Celts,' and 'Germanic Slavs'). This was the racial definition, used as a catch-all to ensure that famous German heroes, such as Luther, did not slip through the net. The later categorisation of northern Europeans into five or six sub-races cut across national boundaries, but this time our across existing concepts of Germanness, too. As was pointed out at the time by anti-Nazi journals, many Nazi leaders were themselves non 'Nordic'. However, the common notion that all Nordics were supposed to be blonde is misconceived.  

Nordness had its appeal in England, too. English nationalists and populists were inspired by the world of the sagas and Norse myths. William Morris, J.R. Tolkien and C.S. Lewis are among those who looked for inspiration to the treeless hills of the north, the wide, sandy dunes and the chilly seas, in part because of the appropriation of the natural and the spontaneous carried out by Arnoldian celtophiles. In his autobiography, C.S. Lewis described his yearning for 'Nordness', and his reaction on opening the Rackham illustrated Twilight of the Gods,  

... this was no Celtic or sylvan or terrestrial twilight ... Pure Nordness engulfed me: a vision of high clear spaces hanging above the Atlantic in the endless twilight of Northern summer, remoteness, severity ... the same world as Baldr and the sunward-sailing cranes ... something cold, spacious, remote.

In 1922 a work called Rassenkunde des deutschen Volker (Racial Handbook of the German People) was published by Hans Günther, and became a best-seller. It differed from earlier popular works on race and culture in its deliberately scientific attitude and analytical vein. The völkisch writers of the late 19th century had concerned themselves more with art, culture, civilization and spirit than with quantitative physical distinctions between groups. They wrote in the tradition of German idealism. Günther, working from recent developments in physical anthropology and eugenics, argued that mankind was divided into races which differed in physical structure and mental character. The highest type was the Nordic, comprising the populations of Scandinavia, north Germany, Holland, Britain and the United States. The inclusion of the United States may seem surprising, but the USA was still seen by some as an Anglo-Saxon country. For example, Lenz, co-author of a text-book on biology, had called on the USA to lead a 'blonde international' after the First World War.  

The Nordic movement that arose in the 1920s was first a pan-national and a cultural one; it searched for ancient northern myths and sagas, and, especially in Denmark and Germany, it emphasised the rural nature of the Nordics—in fact the peasant adult education movement known as the Bauernhochschulbewegung had its origin in Denmark. The Nordics were seen as racially and culturally threatened. They were surrounded by other groups, split between nations, without their own territory or unity, and their birth-rate was declining, as was the German growth rate since 1912. However, most Nordics jibed at supporting breeding communes of the kind suggested by Willibald Henschel in Varius in 1907. The close, monogamous family was seen as essentially Nordic.  

Despite his scientific attitude to physical, measurable differences, Günther's analysis of mental characteristics was superficial, in the anecdotal, descriptive fashion rendered respectable by Max Weber. Nordics were reserved but trusting, creative, had a sense of justice, and were good fighters. Mediterranean peoples were lively, unscrupulous, charming, etc. A description of physical differences between groups and races is still part of physical anthropology, but scientists on the whole have been relieved to leave to journalists generalisations about the spiritual qualities of different groups, except where they relate to quantifiable elements, such as differences in glandular secretions or brain structure. This is not to say that sensitive, perceptive comments about groups have no role to play, still less that they should be banned, but it was unfortunate for Günther and other racial writers that they tended to confuse their own common-sense perceptions (notoriously a bad guide for scientific comment) with the results of carefully conducted surveys. In the case of Chamberlain, who in his later years abjured Darwinism in favour of a vitalist philosophy, his anti-semitism seemed to lose its strictly racial content, and become more culture-oriented.  

For the German Nordics, Scandinavia was seen as the rural ideal. Hans Günther married a Swede, and lived in Sweden during the 1920s for some years. Scandinavian writers were popular. Knut Hamun and
Selma Lagerlöf depicted a stern, hard-working, but deeply satisfying peasant society. The peasant was strong, inarticulate, but superior. In Scandinavia, where there were very few Jews, there was little anti-Semitism in the Nordic movement; instead, animosity was directed to the petty bourgeois townsmen and bureaucracy as the enemy of the peasant. The town meant administration, taxes, small-mindedness and tuberculosis. Adventurous industry was acceptable; it meant opening up the land with roads and railways, and scope for individualism. Anti-Semitism was scarcely visible in the published writings of the German Nordicists, but certainly the Jew was identified as 'the enemy' of the Nordic movement in Germany, something that emerges more clearly from their private correspondence.9 The exclusive and tribal character of the Nordic movement meant that Hitler's National Socialism could never fully absorb it. The Nordic and Northerners as the best, the most important part of the German heritage. In doing so, they excluded the Catholic parts of Germany, including the blonde, blue-eyed German Catholics of Austria and much of southern Germany, also the Rhinelander states. The Nordeics preferred Protestantism to Catholicism, because Protestantism was seen as the Northern reaction to an alien Christianity, a move back to the purer, more individualistic spirit of the north. The National Socialists, on the other hand, especially in office, offered a movement of German unity above particularistic loyalty. When Darré started a group in 1939 to study northern customs and report on eugenic questions, he did so at a deliberate gesture of defiance, and in conditions of semi-secrecy. One of the most important early Germanic racialists, Lanz von Liebenfels, had his writings banned in 1938 while other occultist racialists were banned as early as 1934. Schulze-Naumburg's 1930 plans for a 'high-quality racial core' were also laid in secret. The fissionable nature of Nordic thinking was recognised and feared by Goebbels, certainly, well before 1933.10

The main eugenic interest among Nordicists was to preserve what they feared was a dying group. It was a defensive concept, a fact which is obscured with talk of 'Supermen' and 'Master Race', phrases which are rare in Nordicist writing. What was at issue was not the breeding of a superior race, but the preservation of a threatened race. This theme of Nordic vulnerability was to be prominent in Darré's work, especially where the Nordic peasant was concerned. Here, the threat lay not only in a decline of the birth rate, economic hardship, cultural decay, but in urbanisation.

Darré began to read Günther in 1923, and in 1926 was given an immensely popular völkisch work, Julius Langbehn's Rembrandt als Erzieher. Langbehn was interested in cultural history more than scientific racial questions (the first, 1890 edition of his book contained no mention of the Jews, although in later editions, two anti-semitic chapters were added). He combed European history for great Germans, or great men of German stock. 'German' was always a fluctuating and difficult historical and ethnic concept, and it was easy to write Germans out of European culture by re-labelling. The borders of the German states and confederations had fluctuated so much that German identity was in a state of permanent confusion. There was a sense, especially among intellectuals, that their moral and psychic space was insecure. There was a national inferiority complex. Not only did political parties after 1871 include the word German in their formal titles; the full title was always used; the German National Party, and so on, despite the fact that national identity could not be taken for granted. Ernst von Salomon, the conservative Weimar intellectual, writer, and former Freikorps member, wrote in 1951 that, born in Kiel before the First World War, he was a Russian, not because he was born in Schleswig-Holstein, then under Prussian rule, but because of his ancestry—although his father was born in St Petersburg, and his mother in England. He explained that this was because he had no 'biological connection' with Kiel, St Petersburg and England. This comment encapsulates one of the main distinctions between German identity and that of other European nations. In England, for example, nationality had a territorial quality, but historically, the German concept of German was so little linked with territory, that the 1848 liberal Frankfurt Parliament had proposed to give the vote to all German émigrés living outside Germany, be it in America, Russia or elsewhere in Europe. The identity problem was exacerbated by the fact that the two largest and most powerful German states, Prussia and Austria-Hungary, both had substantial non-German populations; in fact, they were multi-racial entities. From Herder onwards, 'German' had been defined largely in terms of language. What Langbehn was trying to do was to define Germans in terms of ethnicity.12

He set out to establish an idea of German that was to be found in art and culture over the centuries, wherever people of German ethnic stock had settled. He located the full flowering of this Germanesque in Rembrandt, who came from the Netherlands, a point not lost on Langbehn's nationalist critics. Langbehn was uninterested in party politics and the German Reich, and was attacked for implying
that the Prussia-dominated German state after 1871 was in some way inferior to the Netherland. ‘Will Germany rule the world if every German becomes a Rembrandt? Will this rescue us?’ asked an anonymous author in the 1890s. ‘Holland and Switzerland are presented as ideal states, but what would become of German power if this idea were carried through?’ This comment encapsulates the opposition between the ‘Greater Germany’ answer to a search for German identity, and the power-political, common-sense answer, which was to rely on a Prussian-dominated Germany. Langbehn’s weakness lay not so much in the idea behind his work, unpopular as this was with many powerful groups in the thrusting expansionism of Wilhelmian Germany, as in the wild over-simplification of his pronouncements. He idealised the peasant, seeing him as the true aristocracy. This idea at once coincided with and codified Darré’s thinking.

The Lower German (Niederdutsche) is a born aristocrat in character. No one is more recognisably aristocratic than the true peasant, and the Lower German is always a peasant. The peasant, like the farmer of North America, the English Lord, the old Mark nobility and the South African Boer, belong spiritually and physically to one and the same family.

He quoted to his wife. Langbehn cited Cromwell as the typical peasant (sic) turned king, whose eyes were ‘grey and fearsome as the North Sea’. Darré criticised Langbehn for being one-sided, and found Cramerblain and Günther more inspiring, possibly because they were less concerned with cultural and spiritual elements.

Along with his reading, and a sense of rootlessness, went a growing obsession with his own ancestry. His sister Carmen shared his interest, and visited Sweden to track down their ancestors there. He was pleased to find a noble Norwegian ancestor in the thirteenth century, as well as sixteenth-century French Darrés, and addressed the Halle Genealogical Society several times while a student.

He described Günther’s Rassendruck as ‘wonderful’. He meditated, ‘I feel tremendously drawn to the Lower Germans and Lower Saxons—I am probably more Lower Saxon than really Nordic in Günther’s absolute meaning of the word.’ He told his wife to soak herself in Günther’s book Style and Race, so that their children could be brought up ‘Nordically’.

Good, 100% Nordic children cannot come from our marriage. But you could bring them up in such a way that their Nordic blood, in so far as it is prominent, feels at home in their upbringing.14

Darré found in Günther’s highly complex and finely tuned categorisations an explanation for his unhappy home as a boy. His parents had failed to cope with the problems caused by his ‘mixed blood.’ He commented in his second book, Neueh, on his sense of uprootedness and search for Germanness. ‘One kills the German soul if you remove the countryside where it was born ... For a child brought up in the terribly cold spirit of the American milks, it is impossible to understand German myths’ tales and legends.’ His younger brother Erich, now working on a doctorate at Marburg University, he described as ‘a Nordic dreamer through and through’, who had also not learned to cope with the problems of the Nordic heritage. If he had been brought up in Nordic circles he would not have got mixed up with coffee-house intellectualism.’ He concluded that much of what he had always considered personal weaknesses of his own character and manner (dreaminess, indecision, anger) were probably the result of his heredity ‘although one can escape from some of these characteristics’, he added, with that puzzling mixture of a belief in heredity and in will-power and environment, that was to characterise his later political views. For example, at this time he described Prussia as a successful mixture of types and races, held together by political tradition and will, a position he was later to oppose.15

His article on ‘Internal Colonisation’, which will be discussed in the next chapter, was followed by a jeu d’esprit on Walter Rathenau’s pre-First World War racial concepts. Rathenau was the millionaire Jewish son of an industrialist, who became Foreign Secretary under Ebert and was murdered in 1922 by a nationalist group. One of their grievances, according to Salomon, an accessory to the murder group, was that Rathenau, as a Jew, had no right to be a German nationalist, and further, was a fascist. Rathenau had been influenced by Germanic racial ideas, which he combined with the peculiarly liberal imperialism of the type associated in Britain with Joseph Chamberlain and Cecil Rhodes.16 The article began by announcing that Nordicists were wrong to attack Rathenau, and gave extracts from Rathenau’s pre-war work Reflections, such as, ‘Voluntary, instinctive respect rests completely on racial perceptions. One would rather obey a noble, white hand than clever arguments.’ Or, The task of the coming time will be to breed and to train up the dying or impoverished noble races needed by the world ...
Man must follow this course deliberately, as used to be done by Nature, the course of 'Nordicism'. A way of life which is physical, full of endurance, severe climate and solitude.

Rathenau stressed the need to breed a new ruling nobility from Aryan stock, and talked of exciting pure Nordic blood, and imitating natural eugenic processes in order to produce a stronger Aryan race. Race, eugenics and new nobilities were in the air both before and after the First World War. For example, in 1921, the son of a Prussian nobleman and Japanese mother, Count Coudenhowe-Kalergi, wrote a pamphlet, New Nobility, in which he advocated the breeding of a new master-race which would rule Europe. Two master-races already existed in Europe, the Germans and the Jews; they should join to breed an unbeatable super-nobility, he argued. Despite this somewhat unexpected conclusion to his argument, Kalergi was on the invitation list to the National Peasant Council meetings during the Nazi regime, although it is not known whether he attended them (he was then in Switzerland). Kalergi, whose grandmother was a friend of Houston Stewart Chamberlain, was a founder member of the European Movement after the Second World War. Another supporter of a joint German-Jewish aristocracy, fighting democracy together, but not interbreeding, was Dr Oscar Levy, editor of Gobineau and Nietzsche, who reproved Gobineau for not paying enough attention to the blood of the Jewish nobility. Levy was to defend Nietzsche after the First World War against the charge that he had inspired German soldiers. Darré knew perfectly well that Rathenau was merely expressing the intellectual fashions among ambitious Wilhelmine businessmen, but, tongue in cheek, he announced his desire to show that Jews could be splendidly racist. The article caused a stir among Nordics, and was immediately reprinted, without permission, by smaller periodicals. He followed it up two years later by a further collection of racist quotes, adding this time Disraeli's well-known pronouncement from Coningsby that 'Race is the key to world history'.

The Rathenau article was important because it introduced Darré to Nordicist circles, and people who were to play a major part in his life. They included the founders of the Nordic Ring, a loose collection of Nordicism groups, which aimed at coordinating all the Nordic movements. Established in January 1926 by Hanno Konopaek-Konopka, a top civil servant (Ministerialrat), and his wife, Princess Marie Adelheid Reuss zur Lippe. They published Nordische Blätter and Konopaek was later to edit Die Sonne. Darré and Marie Adelheid promptly formed a close political alliance, and became personal friends. Darré called her his 'Little Sister', and was godfather to one of her children. She edited several collections of Darré's writings. He lectured her on eugenics, and sent her reading lists.

Other members of the Nordic Ring included Erdrinprinz zur Lippe, later to work for Darré, and a member of the 1939 Society of Friends of the German Peasantry, and a Baltic German, Freiherr von Vetinghoff-Scheel, an émigré to Germany who lost his lands in the Baltic to the Russians, and later lost his farm in Germany through the Depression. His daughter, Charlotte, became Darré's secretary in 1929, when they stayed with Paul Schultz-Naumburg in his home, Burg Saaleck, and she was to be his second wife. Vetinghoff-Scheel was the author of Grundzüge des völkischen Staatsgedankens (Foundation of Populist National Constitutional Ideals), which demanded the exclusion of Jews from public life. Charlotte von Vetinghoff-Scheel is remembered as a polished, elegant, well-educated 'gentlewoman' (it is interesting that the English term was used). Frau Schultz-Naumburg was a match-maker. The young daughter of a Baltic nobleman was a better companion for their admired friend than the unseen, difficult wife, living in semi-separation. Darré, who missed the close contact with his own brothers and sisters, now married, liked Charlotte's family. His jokey, sketch-scattered letters now went to Karen von Billbeck, Charlotte's sister, as well as to Marie Adelheid. He found Charlotte, who was ten years younger than he was, attractive and companionable, and fell in love.

They became secretly engaged, and he wrote to tell Alma. The marriage had more or less broken up in 1927, partly because of the strain of constant financial problems, the separations, and partly because of Alma's jealousy over Darré's friendships with other women. Although he did not have the reputation of a womanizer, he found it easier to form close and affectionate relationships with intelligent, lively women than with men. The daughter of the landlord at Gut Ausmühle had continued to exchange letters with Darré for the next ten years, for example. Also, Alma, while a strong-minded woman, and thus the 'source of strength' that Darré wanted, had known him through the days of his failure; now that he had found a niche, he seemed to develop the confidence to break away.

Many months later, in January 1928, Darré gave notice of his decision about a divorce up to Charlotte (known as Charly), but told Alma that he regarded Charly as his real wife. Nonetheless, he mused wistfully on the Japanese habit of having first and second wives. Alma tried to understand exactly what she had failed
to supply. Had he been happier at Szaleck, the asked? Darré responded that it was not happiness that he had found, but an inner freedom: he now felt able to draw on his own strength. It is unclear whether politics had anything to do with the break-up. Charly’s father, who belonged to the Nordic Ring, was probably more sympathetic to Darré’s views than the hard-headed merchant, Jacob Sadt, Alma’s father. But Charly, despite the fact that she had been unconventional enough to become secretly engaged to a married man and, once divorced, married him—surely unusual behaviour for a well-brought-up girl of good family in those days—remained unconnected with politics, apparently through reticence. She seldom appeared at public functions, and did not involve herself in party matters. Yet she obviously provided some strength and inspiration for Darré to draw on, and the marriage was a close and happy one. He still continued to write to Alma until 1931, and the correspondence was resumed in 1945, until his death in 1953.

Darré was first contacted by Marie zur Lippe, asking him if he supported the Nordic Movement, and suggesting that they publish his Rathenau article. He replied doubtfully that his interests were in ‘scientific animal breeding’, and that he did not really have anything to offer the Nordicists. He did send her a list of those of his former teachers at Halle and Giessen who were potential sympathisers, and interested in ‘racial science’. Professors Krämer, Frolich, and Holdtrefiess, Konopath, however, refused to contact them on Darré’s recommendation, until he knew more about their stance. ’Mere racial hygienists are not always on our side’, he noted. ’Professor Pohl of Hamburg, for example, although a racial hygienist, is half-Jewish’. While there was a tendency to ascribe Jewish blood to anyone whose ideas differed in any detail from the party-line Nordicist, Konopath’s attitude is a useful reminder that racial hygienists, eugenicists and antisemites were not co-terminous.

Marie Adelheid had signed herself ‘with Nordic greetings’; but Darré ended his reply with ’German greetings’, the first time he used this nationalistic form, and a gesture that signified the secondary role Nordicism was to play to peasant problems for him. By late 1928, in Neuael (p. 29), he reverted to the term ‘Germanic race’, adding, ’on the Nordicist race’, according to whichever expression is fashionable.

The Nordic Movement was based in Berlin and other parts of North Germany. One Nordic Conference held in June 1930 (or Braunschweig, according to the Wölktisch calendar then in vogue), was fairly typical. Hans Güther, by that time appointed Professor of Racial Hygiene at Jena by Frick, the National Socialist Education Minister of Thuringia, spoke on the education of youth in Nordic thinking. Darré summarised the ideas of his book in a talk entitled ’Blood and Soil as the Nordic Race’s Foundation of Life’, and Schultz–Naumburg gave an illustrated talk on the Weimar University of Architecture, Arts and Crafts. The Conference was attended by members of the Nordic Ring, the Fighting League for German Culture, the German League, the League for German World-View, two university groups, the Northern Order, the Nordic Youth Group, the Society for Northern Beliefs, and the German Richard Wagner Society. The emphasis was on youth and culture. One group that attended, the Ahnenvere Leage, was later to be incorporated into the SS. None of these talks concerned eugenics or racial hygiene. However, a strong racial feeling underlay the cultural and educational interests.

The Nordic Ring considers its first and most important task after the bringing together of all Nordically minded people, and the creation of a racial nucleus (Rassenkern), the planned propagation of Nordic ideals.

wrote Konopath on the foundation of the Nordic Ring.

The group held meetings once a month. Between 1929 and 1930, they heard talks on Viking battles, Darré on old Nordic family customs, the Nordic world-view, and the Berlin Theatre. Marie zur Lippe led a discussion entitled ‘Is the Nordic Idea materialistic?’. A speaker from Oslo gave an illustrated talk on ’The Effects of Civilisation and Racial-Mixing on National Strength’.

Most of the speakers were German, with a scattering of members from Scandinavia. Only one speaker came from Britain, a German linguist who had been a member of the Allied Commission after the First World War, and apparently stayed on in Germany. He wrote an attack on the French behaviour in Germany in 1929, and in 1933 was to greet Hitler’s rise to power with the call ‘England erwache’. There were Nordicist groups elsewhere—such as the well-known circle around Johann von Leers, who then lived in Munich. Darré met him in 1927, and kept in touch. D von Leers spoke fluent Japanese, and later became a professor at Jena University. He seems to have worked for the German Labour Front up to 1939, and to have been an SS member. Darré wrote to Hitler to vouch for Leers’ reliability in 1939. His wife believed herself to be the reincarnation of a Bronze Age priestess, and held regular meetings at their house, where she would
wear barbaric gold jewellery. Other guests included an Austrian who had renamed himself Weissthur, the White Thor, to the irritation of some of the more aristocratic guests, who pointed out to each other that Weissthur's real name was more plebeian. George Mose, in his book *The Crisis of German Ideology*, rather tetchily criticised von Leers for still being a sun-worshipper in the 1950s, as if the experience of Nazism should have put anybody off sun-worship. But the rejection of Christianity and search for Nordic myths and religions long pre-dated National Socialism, and outlasted it, while Theosophy and Anthroposophy should also be seen as part of this rejection of organised religiosity. One consequence of the quarrying of pre-Roman northern European customs was the formation of Druidical groups in Germany. Ironically, the German Order of Druids was caught in the National Socialist anti-Masonic law of 1935, and was closed down, despite an appeal to Darré, protesting to the last that they were not Freemasons but good, German Druids.24

Darré brought a new element into the Nordic movement. His training in agriculture, his farming experience, his animal breeding, his liking for evidence and argument, and his capacity to inspire enthusiasm and activity all galvanised the movement. He may have been seen by the later Nazis as an unworthy dreamer, but compared with the Nordic Ring he was tough and practical. At least, this was the role he adopted; the plain man of science, the sensible, forthright polemict. He blossomed among his new friends. He moved among them as an outsider, but, perhaps for the first time in his life, as a superior outsider; more experienced, practical and worldly. He began to write lively and charming letters, more relaxed than the somewhat turgid defensiveness of his published works. He sent a postcard of sultry brunette Pola Negri to Konopath, with 'If Only I were Blonde' (a contemporary song) written in mauve pencil on the back. Konopath was not amused. Darré had had these enthusiasms: the sun-worship, the physical culture and nudism, the free love. He understood them, but had outgrown them, forced in part to do so by economic pressures and by his experience with the Baltic farmers. With his military bearing, loyalty and enthusiasm for the cause, and attractive appearance, he became socially popular.27

Despite an occasionally condescending attitude, he did not attack his fellow Nordicists directly, but his writings often depicted 'urban romantics, vegetarians and nudists' as being foolishly naive in not understanding Germany's real problems. He rejected reformation for outright revolutionary change. He found an enemy—liberal, atomised, nomadic capitalism. Before he joined the Nazi Party, he was careful not to attack Jews in his writings. And he found an aim, to attack urban life, and to improve the race through eugenics. He was offering the sensitive an ideal, and the bewildered a clear line of action. Later, Darré was to be written off by the Nazis as a useless theoretician, but during the 1920s he was seen as daring, radical, but above all a practical man of action. Men who see on a long term basis nearly always conflict with those who support or are committed to existing structures. To those geared to making what existed work, Darré was a dreamer, because he called for total change; however, his fellow Nordicists were not so committed; they were searching for a new society, and new structures and here he could offer detailed prescriptions.

Although his career prospects remained bleak, he found increasing fulfilment in writing. Six months after leaving Giessen, he began work on an essay about the link between the Nordic people and the peasant. Hans Günther had sent him a copy of a work by Professor Fritz Kern, also a member of the Nordic Ring. This book, *Arbik und Stammbaum der deutschen Bauern, Racial Types and Genealogy of the German Peasant*, published by Lehmann in 1928, set out to show that the peasants of Germany belonged to the Dinaric race, and that the Nordic inhabitants had formed a non-agricultural, horse-riding, ruling class. Kern's book was copiously illustrated with pictures of hideous, goitrous German peasants squatting and bracypenal. According to Kern, Nordic traits were nomadic by nature, and treasured their horses and their ships. They had originally come from the steppes of eastern Europe, and, far from being reshaftie Bauern, were incapable of staying in the same place for long.28

This argument deeply offended Darré's own concept of the Nordic, which was of an inherently peasant race, always rejecting urbanism for the rural life, unless forced off their own land by unscrupulous capitalists and landowners. Further, 'nomad' was a code word among the circle around Schulze-Naumburg for the international, cosmopolitan, rootless eastern European Jew. Darré had written a pamphlet on the attitude of different races to the homeless pig, in which he argued that the reason why Nordics liked pork and Semites did not was that the pig symbolised a settled, peasant existence; it was not a suitable animal for a nomadic way of life. For Darré, everything bad in history came from the nomadic spirit. Capitalism evolved from the roberger tribes of Arabia, and spread to Germany via the Teutonic Knights, who acquired the capitalist spirit from the Arabs in Sicily.
The hierarchical, leadership principle similarly came from the absolutist east. Bolshevikism was a cover for nomadic exploitation of settled communities. Concrete buildings and flat roofs, soulless, mechanistic international architecture—everything symbolised by the Bauhaus was 'nomadic'. If the Nordic peoples could be shown to be a nomadic aristocracy who ruled in Germany over foreign races or tribes, it would undercut Darré's justification of nation and race, to which a close bond between people and soil was absolutely fundamental. His original essay grew into a long, unwieldy book, originally entitled Peasants and Warrior. He described it to Günther, who answered that he did not fully agree with Darré on the essentially peasant nature of the Nordics, seeing them rather as 'Faustian' wanderers. Nonetheless, he should send his work to Lehmann for publication, as his side of the story needed to be put, and Darré was 'one of the few who really understands how great a role the racial question plays'.

The Lehmann publishing House published Deutschlands Erneuerung, which had taken Darré's articles between 1926 and 1928. They also published medical textbooks, and works on racial hygiene and eugenics. Lehmann, generally regarded as one of the most extreme nationalist publishers of the 1920s, was interested in works on the German peasantry. Darré's work, therefore, combining as it did eugenics, Nordicism, and the peasantry, found a welcome home with him. He followed the progress of the book closely, asking Darré to stress eugenic measures, especially the sterilisation of the hereditarily sick, but criticizing his outspokenness on sexual matters. Both Lehmann and Günther criticized Darré's style. The first draft of the book was over a thousand pages long, and included pages of long quotations from other writers. Darré assumed that his readers were idiots, and laboriously spelled out every single point. 'Your letters are so interesting,' complained Günther to Darré: 'How is it that you write so badly?'

Darré set to work to rewrite the book, apparently unshaken by the criticism. The result was a densely textured work, which still hammered home every point. The proof-reading was carried out by Richard Eichenauer, a fellow-Nordicist and university friend of Darré's, who later defended him from attack by patriotic feminists like Sophie Rogge-Börner. Günther then persuaded Darré that he should alter the language, and delete words of foreign origin where possible, a request seconded by Lehmann. This was part of the reaction against non-German cultural phenomena referred to earlier. The 1920s radical right, in its concern for Germany's linguistic and cultural heritage, had developed a self-conscious use of words of German, as opposed to Latin, French or Greek derivation. This affected medical and other scientific writing especially. Darré gave such words as Sterilisation and Kastration, following them with the German-rooted equivalents, Unfruchtbarmachung and Entmannung. Later Konkubine was replaced by Kebweik, Mutationen by Neubildung.

Similarly, archaisms were revived, and compound words adopted. Bauerstand and Bauerntum were words which had no direct modern equivalent. However, it was not a poetic or archaic style, but one which 'mixed erudition, allusion and empirical observation; which used both intellectual sources and popular ones'. Darré liked to start a work with a careful delineation of the position he was going to oppose. He moved slowly and ponderously into attacking position, then would assertively make his point, following up each tangential hypothesis of opposition as it occurred to him, in long, convoluted sentences.

In the space available, it is impossible to cover all his writings and ideas—especially as Darré was a most prolific writer, producing fifty-six articles between 1925 and 1930, besides his two long books. In the next chapter, the most important elements in his early books and articles will be discussed. Not only is Nazi agricultural policy inexplicable without an understanding of his ideas, but their revolutionary nature needs to be stressed. Most past and present interpretations of Darré, whether they see him as unworlly philosopher or prototype chairman of the Milk Marketing Board, have failed to do so.
CHAPTER THREE

The ‘Sign from Thor’

BLOOD AND SOIL

In the Introduction, some of the puzzled interpretations of ‘Blood and Soil’ have been mentioned. By 1940 it was a cliché which, as Konrad Meyer, head of Himmler’s planning office, and Goebbels both wrote, had been ridden to death. It was one of those phrases that so perfectly fitted a concept, a mood of the time, that no definition seemed necessary. And since then, the term has been used to cover a range of Nazi propaganda ideas, Nazi cinema, processions and so on. Use of the phrase is usually confined to discussions of National Socialism, although Isaiah Berlin comments that Disraeli’s commitment to ‘blood and soil’ was more acceptable than the ‘insane’ ideas of that Nazis. At the Nuremberg Trial, in 1948, the trial judge is reputed to have leaned over and asked Darre’s defence lawyer, Dr Hans Merkle, ‘Exactly what is “Blood and Soil”?’ In response, Merkel slammed down photographs of sturdy peasant men behind the plough, and healthy peasant women with their children and said, ‘This, my Lord, this is Blood and Soil.’

But of course, while the glowing images of man and harvest were obviously a part of the idea, it meant more than radiant health and high farm incomes. What it implied most strongly to its supporters at the time was the link between those who held and farmed the land and whose generations of blood, sweat and tears had made the soil part of their being, and their being integral to the soil. It meant to them the unwritten history of Europe, a history unconnected with trade, the banditry of the aristocracy, and the infinite duplicity of church and monarchy. It was the antithesis of the mercantile spirit, and still appeals to some basic instinct as a critique of unrootedness. Certainly, it was not a means of romanticizing rural life. National Socialism possessed the endurance of the peasant rather than his bank balance, and was far from the ‘happy, smiling peasant’ supposed to typify the Nazi picture, while Deutsche Agrarpolitik showed the farmer as an intelligent technician. What was the origin of the phrase and did it change significantly over the decades?

In the early 1920s, August Winnig, the ex-Social Democrat who found the SPD too internationalist, brought the phrase into political prominence. His programme included keeping peasants on the land and improving the physical condition of Germany’s working class, a continuation of the great debate over German industrialisation of the late nineteenth century. Georg Kenzler, himself a Transylvanian German who was expelled from the enlarged State of Rumania in the 1920s, meant by ‘Blood and Soil’, the title of a magazine he founded in 1927, an integral link between the tribe and the land, a link to be defended by blood, if necessary. One pan-European nationalist group of the 1980s proclaimed ‘Blood and Soil’, to be ‘What we mean by nation, everything we got from the magic fluid of our ancestors, and from our sacred land; these are the eternal truths the Marxists can never know.’ The phrase seems to have acquired more mystical overtones for today’s radical nationalists than it had for the German nationalists of the 1920s. Darre took this phrase, and wove it into his own work, which set out to show the absolute primacy of the peasantry.

In his two major works, he defined the German peasantry as a homogeneous racial group of Nordic antecedents, who formed the cultural and racial core of the German nation. Peasant stock provided the source of population for urban growth. Since the Nordic birth-rate was lower than that of other races, the Nordic race was under a long-term threat of extinction. It was also threatened by urban life itself, as Nordics felt ill-at-ease in towns. Since the urban rate of population increase was lower than the rural one, it followed that as the peasant stock drained into the town and there ceased to breed, the peasantry, and hence the core of the nation, would die off. Darre stressed that the peasantry could not be replenished from the towns. The urban population had lost its racial and spiritual capacity to become peasants again. This point separates him from most late nineteenth-century land reformers such as Flursheim and Damaschke, together with others who wanted urban workers to ‘return to the land’. ‘Blood and Soil’, a phrase which in England has somewhat abaitoir-like connotations, was intended to express this unity of race and land.

Darre did not see all nations as possessing this characteristic. Other races and groups had different imperatives. He described the Mediterranean peoples, such as the classical Romans, the Spanish and others, as combining a vigorous individuality with a need for a strong state; whereas the essence of the peasant nature was to be anti-state, but to have a strong communal feeling: kin rather than class. He was
enthusiastic about the Chinese, who he saw as the other great peasant nation, but Semitic and Tartar peoples were nomadic, and lacked the urge to settle on the land. This meant that they failed to develop habits of thrift, law and self-government, and remained intrinsically opposed to the peasants of other nations, whom they would always exploit if they could.

These kinds of distinctions, these excursions into the true soul of a nation, were also made by other nationalist writers. Spanish nationalists, for example, liked to contrast Mediterranean traditions with northern European ones. They saw the Mediterranean peoples as essentially more civilised than the eternally primitive Germanic tribes of the north.\(^5\) For them, of course, civilisation was a good thing, not a dirty word.

Germany, for Darré, was a failed giant. It had been culturally conquered by a series of alien ideas. These included Christianity, the expulsion of Charlemagne in 1525; the latter is derived from 'hateful racial elements'. Darré reserved most of his venom for the German equivalent of well-meaning Fabians, accusing them of looking at the symptoms of the problem rather than its economic, social and racial roots. He saw land reform as a means by which the peasant remnants would be contaminated by urban workers from an ethnic rubbish bin. He argued that capitalism destroyed the peasantry, by splitting farmers from their land, by encouraging a mercantile attitude. Once the peasants had gone, Germany could no longer defend itself, and its downfall was inevitable. National renewal was impossible without the 'life-source', the peasantry. So Darré presented a choice between inevitable doom and a radical, painful effort towards a new society.\(^6\)

Not only did he hammer at a reformist attitude, which merely tinkered with the problem, but at a romantic appreciation of rural life. 'Sentimental and edifying discussions of the evils of modernity, and the superiority of a pure and noble German soul', or 'urban romanticism' were frequent targets.

Urbanised intellectuals think they can cure the problems with allotments and home ownership, with 'urban' settlements and homesteads, with vegetarianism and nudism, without noticing capitalism's diabolical sneer at the idea that [these things]... can make the system healthy again.

How was the 'system' to be rectified? 'If we want to build a truly populist state, then we must build it from the agricultural realm.'
Industry and trade will be incorporated into the national economy according to its needs. This conflict of Nordicism and peasantry, which, as mentioned earlier, was not common among his fellow Nordics, was the rationale for his proposal to form Hegeshe, or hereditary holdings. Society would divide into corporations, each forming a self-governing chamber, and only farmers from a Hegeshof would have a vote. The Napoleonic Code sub-division of farms would cease (this only applied to western Germany in any case), and primogeniture would be introduced. Foreclosure on sale of farms would be forbidden. Younger sons would form the militia and the governing class, leading to the gradual formation of a peasant state within a state. Because food producers held the whip hand over parasitical cities, and because of the cultural and racial vitality of the peasant world, it would conquer the town: the pays riel would triumph. The Hegeshof was the forerunner of the Hereditary Farm Law of September 1933. Although the corporatist element was not included in the legislation, the rest of the original plan was incorporated without much alteration. In a later chapter, the results of the experiment will be examined.

For the survival of the peasant state, protection would be needed, both from competitive capitalist methods of food production, and from malevolent manipulators of the world's commodity markets. An autarkic trade structure would help protect the fragmented mercantilist forces within destructive Germany. Darré proposed a national marketing authority, which would incorporate all primary and secondary food producers (i.e., biscuits as well as milk), and deal with distribution and sale of food. There would be quality controls, but no crop quotas. Here, there were precedents for the idea of taking farming out of the market economy. Eventually, Britain was to establish various marketing boards in the 1930s, and Hugenberg evolved a marketing board in 1932, which some writers have seen as a forerunner—even inspiration—of Darré's, but Darré's plan came from Gustave Ruhland, Professor of Political Economy at Freiburg, who was charged by Bismarck with examining the effects of the depression on European agriculture in 1884. Ruhland became adviser to the Agrarian League of the 1890s. His agitation against commodity trading in the 1890s had actually led to the closing of the Berlin Stock Exchange, according to his English translator. His three-volume work, System of Political Economy (Berlin, 1908), proposed a controlled marketing system for agriculture, and was a profound influence on Darré, who tried to have his work re-published. He organised study groups among his agricultural economists, to produce proposals on Ruhland's lines for his proposed marketing corporation in 1931-2. The marketing corporation obviously had a potential for political corporatism, and when it was established in October 1933 aroused interest in other European countries, especially France, where corporatist philosophy was especially strong.

Since dissatisfaction with current marketing was so prevalent, Darré was able to attract a good deal of sympathy for his plans. As the National Union of Fertilizer Retailers pointed out bitterly in a telegram to General Schleicher in 1932, no one was interested in the problems of the retailer. If Nordics were equated with a rooted peasantry, so the cultural qualities of the peasantry reflected its Nordicism. Peasant motifs in German art, past and present, were later to be distinguished by Darré in works on peasant culture which he commissioned. Deutsche Agrarpolitik and Ool carried articles on peasant customs and ways of building, farming.

The rural architecture of the settlement projects so dear to his heart had to reflect peasant building traditions. This was particularly popular with farmers who had complained of the institutionalisation of Weimar architecture, with its flat roofs, leaking metal windows and unsuitable concrete walls. Buildings made of local timber and stone, with roofs steeply pitched against wind and snow, seemed more sensible. The attack on fashionable 1920s architectural modernism, a style which rapidly became entrenched in an era which saw some 75% of all housing put up by public authorities, came from many quarters. Hans Günther attacked 'the housing projects of radical architects' as 'the work of the nomads of the metropolis, who have entirely lost any concept of the homeland', while the Dresden Professor of Architecture saw 'nomadic architecture' as inferior to 'folk architecture'. Nordics emphasised the Asiatic nature of flat roofs, while farmers found themselves colonised by local government architects who put up Bauhaus type cowsheds. Both objected.

It was an architect, known for his imaginative and radical designs before the First World War, who was to offer Darré hospitality when he became unemployed in late 1929, and who first introduced him to Hitler. Paul Schultz-Naumburg's country house, Burg Sailer, in Thuringia, was a centre for volkisch activists and peasant ideologues, such as Dr Georg Kestler, the refugee from Transylvania mentioned earlier, former Astamans member, and editor of the magazine Blood and Soil. Schultz-Naumburg wrote in 1940 that the Fiehshof, or
hereditary family-sized farm, expressed a divine law of order in the world, and that Blood and Soil, also, was an undying law of nature. The interesting point about him is that he was a successful professional man, leader of the progressives before the war, who began to feel in the mid-1920s that national architectural styles were under attack by a cosmopolitan, heartless, featureless modernism. Frick sacked Gropius from the Bauhaus and made Schulz-Naumburg head of a new architectural university, which concentrated more on crafts and the applied arts. Most of its ex-members emigrated (although one modernist architect, Mies van der Rohe was a signatory to a patriotic appeal by Schulz-Naumburg in 1933). Those who have suffered modernist architecture since, at the whim of the public authorities, may feel that in this one point, at least, the radical völkisch men of the 1920s were utterly right.¹⁴

A pantheistic religion feeling replaced organised religion for Darré and his circle, sectarian differences being subsumed in this attack. A naturistic holism was seen as compatible with the commitments to rationalism and the scientific approach. It is interesting to compare here the pre-First World War pantheistic rationalism of Haeckel, the biologist, and founder of the Monist League. Haeckel wrote in 1905,

> While occupying ourselves with the ideal world in art and poetry ... we persist ... in thinking that the real world, the object of science, can be truly known only by experience and pure reason. Truth and poetry are then united in the perfect harmony of monism.¹⁶

Darré's call to rescue the peasantry and renew the Nordic race was legitimised for many of his readers by its interweaving with more widely discussed and accepted issues: eugenics, population policy and peasant development. His claim to serious learning marked him off from many völkisch writers of the period. Coudenhove-Kalergi, for example, mentioned in chapter Two, prefaced his call for a new nobility with a ringing declaration that mere scientific veracity was irrelevant. Darré and the eugenic movement, however, demanded attention to scientific principles. Lenz, geneticist and racial hygienist, and co-author of a text-book on eugenics, attacked his critics for being unscientific in 'maintaining that biology contains humane principles ... We know, on the contrary, that science is value-free.'¹⁷ ... We must follow the facts of human heredity wherever we take us, a position very different from that of the völkisch Langbehn, 'the final end of

science is to deliver value judgments.'¹⁸ Scientific relativism is to be found both in Engels and in the New Left today. Despite the constant charge of 'mysticism' levelled against Darré, he believed in the existence of an objective, unalterable truth, and in the possibility of reaching it, if only the state and the 'old order' could be swept away. In Das Bauernum, especially, Darré had aimed at a great work of popular synthesis, like Bölcke's Living Life in Nature which had inspired him in his youth. It was designed for a large readership, and was written, not as political polemic, but with near religious intensity. Despite the two hundred references in this book, he failed to cite Spengler anywhere because, Haushofer argues, Spengler's pessimism and determinism would have undercut his argument.¹⁹ Darré's belief that suitably argued evidence could convince others was untypical of the quasi-existential German Right of his time. Given Moeller's distinction, 'The Left have Rights, the Right have understanding', it is perhaps indicative of the extent to which Darré was totally revolutionary that in this he conformed neither to Left nor to Right: imperfect in both reason and understanding, yet reaching for both with an almost febrile intensity.²⁰

The anti-church campaign was as much a part of this rationalistic, republican attitude as it was nationalist. It would be quite wrong to imagine that it was merely a propaganda exercise. In fact, from a Nazi point of view, it was counter-productive. But for Darré's small circle, which later included Rosenberg on this issue, the anti-Christian, and pre-Christian ethos was strong. Rosenberg noted in 1934 that 'the SS, together with the peasant leader [Darré] is openly educating its men in the Germanic way, that is, anti-Christian.'²¹ Hitler, who frequently called on an unaffiliated, unsectarian God in his speeches, left his public position unconfirmed, but Darré mentions his surprise at hearing Hitler 'openly' describing Christianity for what it is—a religion for Unvemenschten' in front of a respectable mixed Nazi gathering.²² In 1934, Darré called on the NSDAP to declare its full opposition to the clergy, and in 1942 he felt 'a great sense of liberation' when his second wife decided to leave the Church. Native religion was better than imported Christianity, just as native law was better than the Napoleon Code, or the Civil Code introduced in 1896, which favoured the creditor over the debtor. Darré underwent a religious experience in 1934 at the base of a large standing stone in the Odenvall. 'What we experienced at the February Stone was a sign from Thor', he wrote.²³

The attempt to interfere with peasant Christianity was often unpopular, and pagan calendars sent round to farmers were torn up.
Some of the attempts to instil this fundamentalist approach were simply trivial, in fact comic, as when Darré circulated a request not to call pets, seeds and vegetables by the names of the Norse gods: he attributed it to a 'circle of reactionary colouring'. But of course, it one was reading of an attempt to prevent pets and vegetables being called 'Mohammed' in a Muslim country, it would seem understandable. In Britain, many religious groups would object if a cabbage was called 'Mary Mother of God'. The very fact that it is hard for us today to take Darré's circular seriously indicates the desperate nature of the rearguard action he was fighting, in trying to awaken interest in the old German religion.24

Darré continued his link with the Nordic Ring during the 1930s, and, on appeal from Rosenberg, helped to recruit members for the faltering group in 1936. Contact was maintained with the Danish peasant movement, and joint 'Nordic Gatherings', at which Danish gymnasts participated, were held until the outbreak of war. But contacts between the Third Reich and Scandinavian countries gradually declined. A close federation between Scandinavia and Germany was not one of Hitler's major policy aims, whatever the rhetoric, and the Nordic movement found itself squeezed out. Eventually, members operated on the periphery of influence, in danger of harassment by the security forces.25

Peasanness was linked with the need for a healthy upbringing, fresh air and exercise, wholesome bread. It merged oddly with the spirit of the urban health reform movement of the 1920s, attacked by Darré in 1931 as 'romantic'. He started a Peasant University, which stressed physical fitness. He boasted that the gym and undeveloped children of agricultural workers became, after a few weeks, healthy and bright enough to challenge the 'prevaling cliché of the dumb, fat and clumsy peasant'.26

But how was the peasant spirit defined? Culture could to some extent be demonstrated by preserving and analysing peasant artefacts and customs that existed. The spirit was more difficult to determine, but to Darré it was everything that was sane, whole, balanced and healthy. 'All that I want is to realise the following perception: Confucius x [times] Lycurgus x Old Rome x Prussianness and the Nordic idea equals Germanness.'27

The picturesque nature of this prescription should not obscure the underlying seriousness—and bleakness—of his commitment to the restoration, maintenance and increase of the peasantry. His writings on peasant culture are indeed notable for one omission: they contain little that is sensuous, spiritual or emotional in their appeal, and in this comparisons with English ruralists of the 1920s and 1930s falter. He was concerned with the morale and survival of the peasantry. It was survival or death, for if the peasant went, with him went nation, racial identity and creativity—in short, history itself. The danger was total: defence must be absolute, down to the most minute and particular detail.

'LITTLE GERMANY'

A State consists of three things ... a people, their national territory, and a State authority [Staatsgewalt]. These three ... possess an internal connection. It is precisely this connection between the people and its territory and political order that gives that order its particular characteristics: it is modelled from the organic form of the people. The character of our State will not be determined by foreign areas, as occurs in the great colonial Empires—nor through foreign nations.28

What did Darré envisage as the ideal Nordic peasant state? How true is the allegation that it was essentially imperialistic, that 'Blood and Soil', in Tucholsky's striking phrase, 'started Green but became Bloody-Red'? Later chapters will describe in detail the history of Darré's efforts to oppose imperial expansion in the late 1930s. But this 1935 formula clearly emphasised the close link between land, culture, people and State. It associated nationhood with the mixing of labour with the land and had 'Little Germany' overtones. While return of Germany's lost colonies was never Hitler's primary aim (continental revision of the Versailles Treaty came first), there was a sizeable group in the Nazi leadership, as well as in the more conservative older elements in Germany, who strongly supported it. The Blood and Soil group around Darré became noted for its opposition to colonial adventures, and Darré wrote an introduction to a work called Why Colonies? in 1934, making this point forcibly.29 At this stage it might be useful to start by looking at a key passage, which appeared first in 'Attitude and Task of the Farming Population', DE, 1930, was reprinted in 1934, but was deleted in 1940.30

The article attacked imperial expansion, but considered various solutions for Germany's (alleged) overcrowding. Not only did Germany not have colonies for settlement, but overseas settlements lost touch
with the homeland, 'a colossal stupidity from the national biological standpoint'. Population control was 'a castration morality'. He urged instead the reclamation and resettlement of Germany's old lands in the Baltic and Poland, the 'most obvious place' for a Germany 'already embroiled in the Eastern problem'.

Of course, by omitting these words in 1940, Darré was deliberately passing up as attempt to align himself with the regime, and instead disassociated himself from the actual eastward invasion that had taken place in 1939.

Darré's attitude, though militant, concentrated on the return of previously German territory.

The German people cannot avoid coming to terms with [the Eastern problem]. The Slavs know what they want—we don't! We look on with dumb resignation while formerly purely German cities—Reval, Riga, Warsaw[are] and so forth, are lost to our people. Why shouldn't other German colonial settlements of past centuries—Breslau, Stettin, even Leipzig or Dresden—be next in line? But this would mean submitting to a dangerous error. The German people cannot avoid a life or death struggle with the advancing East. Our people must prepare for the struggle ... only one solution for us, absolute victory! Furthermore, the concept of Blood and Soil gives us the right to take back as much Eastern land as is necessary to achieve harmony between the body of our people and geo-political space. [Darré's underlining].

It was on this rock—to confine German revisionism to previously German land—that Darré finally broke. Outside what he deemed to be German or formerly German territory he wanted no part of territorial expansion. Hitler, however, had attacked any variant of Internal Colonisation as pacifist, urging territorial expansion instead. Although Darré was not a Baltic German, he shared their feelings about the German minorities trapped in the newly independent Baltic States, which, like newly-independent countries everywhere, had turned on their own minorities, and were in the process of expropriating and/or expelling them. During his period in Finland and East Prussia, he had seen something of the problem at first hand. Hitler, of course, was attuned to a different set of interests, while the conservative nationalism of Weimar Germany still longed for the glories of the old Reich.

Edgar Jung, lawyer, and influential author of Herrschaft der Minderwertigen a member of Othmar Spann’s corporatist and elitist circle, and friend of von Papen, corresponded with Darré at length on the future of the Baltic States vis-à-vis Germany. Jung supported a 'Greater Germany imperial ideal', which would incorporate the Baltic States and various national minorities from Central Europe. He saw the day of the völkisch nation as over, and attributed problems in the Baltic States to the problem of 'hoohlan nationalism' there, among the Estonians, etc. Darré, however, rejected the power-politics ideal of a Germany ruling the splintered nations of the North.

Given his differences with the neo-conservative intellectuals, and his attacks on Christianity and the German nobility, it may at first sight seem surprising that these Catholic intellectuals and nationalist nobles seemed attracted to, as well as challenged by, his ideas. After all, their conservative nationalism was a world away from his radical racialism.

The sympathy was due to Darré's fusion of biologically racist ideas with the idealism and voluntarism of Moeller and Spengler, writers who were not themselves biological racists. His belief in the organic link between peasant and soil went further than mechanistic eugenics. In this, he bridged the mystical fervour of messianic political thought in Weimar Germany, with the mainstream eugenic and agrarian reform of the established political parties. His new contribution was the revolutionary, almost nihilistic radicalism. But it was expressed in a new and striking way: not in the existentialist pronouncements of a Moeller, but with the specific, detailed proposals of the earnest social reformer.

Furthermore, in his eugenics, Darré was appealing to a movement which cut across the party political spectrum. There were social hygienists on Left and Right, besides a fringe of, on the whole, right-wing racial hygienists. Two prominent members of the Social Democratic Party, Alfred Ploetz and Grotjahn, were especially concerned at the genetic implications of the welfare state which they supported. A eugenics policy was needed as 'a corrective to the otherwise inevitable degeneration that would ensue'. The anti-Semitic element seems negligible; many geneticists and eugenicists were of Jewish origin. The racial hygiene movement was concerned also with infant health care, abortion, and a variety of problems then considered hereditary, such as alcoholism and tuberculosis.

The marriage certificate was first urged by Agnes Bluhm in 1905. As in Britain, returning armies after the First World War brought back with them a very high rate of syphilis, and in 1920, the National Medical Council debated whether to introduce compulsory health certificates before marriage, this to include an investigation into genetic
background. Eventually, marriage advice centres were established in most urban areas, where they offered voluntary counselling on hereditary problems. Some of Darré's more extreme proposals, which will be discussed later, appear less strange in this context. Since eugenics and racial hygiene are sometimes presented as a specifically German obsession, it is perhaps worth mentioning that America was the first country to introduce compulsory sterilisation for hereditary defects in some States, together with a compulsory venereal disease check before marriage: that Russia and Sweden started institutes for Eugenic Research in the 1920s, and that to this day there are several European countries (and some US States) where a health certificate before marriage is compulsory.

The winner of the Social Darwinist essay competition of 1900, Schallmeyer, described himself as a 'radical democrat', who wanted to educate society towards a 'progressive eugenic awareness'. Fabians in Britain, including Bernard Shaw and Beatrice Webb, supported eugenic action as a progressive, modern measure. So Darré's intra-racial eugenics was taken as that of a well-meaning, socially concerned, compassionate reformer. He was working within an established social and intellectual framework.

Logically, this meant that conservatives often attacked Darré. For example, in 1939, an Action Française writer criticised Darré's racial theories as 'comic to the highest degree' and a 'labouratory experiment'. He considered it a typical example of Germanic solidarity and excess. Lenz, however, the progressive eugenicist, approved Darré's idea of the hereditary farm.

Darré's mixture of cogent polemics and scientific fact was useful propaganda for the committed nationalist movement, and his publisher made every effort to push the works. They appeared on many a völkisch reading list, along with Varna, Ludendorff's book on the Jesuits, Macaulay's and works on practical astrology. Although for the first two years (1928–30) only 1400 copies were sold, some 150,000 copies were sold within the decade. Darré's work focused on so many current controversies, including the existing debate about the meaning of the concept of race. Völkisch writers, with their concentration on anti-semitism, had included cultural, spiritual and religious determinants. The biological-racial Social Darwinists discussed wider racial differentiations—negroes, not Jews. Neo-conservative writers tended to concentrate on the endangered racial élite within a single population pool. Darré's own arguments were defensive, but the defence was against expected attacks on his 'materialistic philosophy', rather than on his unkindness in thinking in racial terms at all. He saw his recommendations for sterilisation of those with non-communicable but hereditary diseases as a kindness, rather than as brutality. He argued that it would enable the victim to enjoy a normal sex life without worries about his children's fate.

His first book had described the German peasantry, the endangered life-source of the nation. In his second work, A New Nobility From Blood and Soil, written at Burg Sazlecker between December 1929 and March 1930, he described in more detail exactly how the new society would work, and how the new nobility would be formed.

BREEDING A NEW NOBILITY

Racial bodily conformity alone is not enough to mark the State with the spirit of the predominant race, if a spirit alien to the race remains predominant in the State. The German State, the Third Reich which we seek again, cannot be realised just by selection with a predetermined physical shape for sole aim. For this reason, we have to instil the real German ideals of the State into the spirit of future German youth.

In order to accomplish this, Darré turned to English education as a model. He believed that it produced a communal team spirit by cultivating instinct and social feeling. It emphasised character and team sports, the principle of 'government by the governed'. In short, the main function of education was civic maturity, 'if we summarise... Fichte and Savigay'. German education was founded on 'the Prussian barrack system'. In a barracks it is impossible to create the self-disciplined, self-ruling duties... It is hierarchically and authoritatively regimented. But his support for a self-governing community included admiration for the military virtues. He praised the teachings of von Moltke, Schirmhorst and Schlieffen. 'To them is due the salvage of the German state from the hands of the assassins and looters in the years after 1918', while von Seeckt's autobiography gave useful advice for the young:

The essential thing is action. It has three phases; decision, born of thought, preparation and action itself. In all three phases the will directs. The will is born from character. This last is more
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decisive in action than enthusiasm. Spirit without will is worthless; a will without spirit is dangerous.

Darré concluded, with enthusiastic eclecticism, 'These words of von Seeck's demonstrate the possibility of uniting the educational system of England and Germany.'

This criticism of German education differed sharply from the generally accepted picture, and indeed, from the admiration for German technical and commercial education, both before the First World War and since. To suggest that German education was too individualistic is almost as heretical as to suggest that Germany lacked ruthless efficiency. To ally the criticism of excessive individualism with a critique of excessive autocracy, appears to compound the confusion. Yet there is a connection. Darré saw the mindlessness of the autocratic hierarchy as encouraging a petty-minded type of competitive striving. Both qualities were alien to the initiative and intuition he wanted to inculcate, and the correct educational process could set free the human will. Indeed, man's capacity to control the environment, added to human control of eugenics, could mean that the solution of all social problems was in sight, given a fully scientific attitude. 'At the beginning of all eugenics is the human will,' he wrote in Eugenics for the German People (1931). Darré saw the latest advances in knowledge in the biological sciences as enlarging human freedom by enabling human material to be manipulated. Research should be left to qualified experts, but 'the question, what should one make of the one-and-for-all given hereditary factors, what is needful and what is unnecessary among this genetic pool...is in the first place a political matter.'

As explained before, Darré alleged a causal relationship between German 'peasantness' and Germany's national survival and creative capacity. The new peasant nobility, secure on its inalienable farmstead, would replace the existing old, worn-out, despised ruling class. It would also correct the tendency of the 'best blood' to die out through warfare and lower birth-rates. Breeding aims would include bravery, health and intelligence, and concentrate on the peasant, whose tribal attitude to family and children had once been instinctive, but which had been debased through contact with alien, mercantile lifestyles.

Now, a better understanding of Mendelian laws would soon enable the laws of heredity to be codified, and the 'genetic inheritance' which had ensured centuries of creative achievement, would be preserved.

This argument owed much to the now little known works of Madison Grant and Lothrop Stoddard, two American writers, who,

before and immediately after the First World War, complained that the Anglo-Saxon element in America was becoming submerged by non-Anglo-Saxon immigration, and that intra-racial decline was taking place, the upper classes breeding themselves out, while the 'Jukes' inherited the earth. Darré read of their ideas in Günther's Racial History of the European Peoples (London, 1927). However, Darré laid greater stress on the role of the human will, which he fused with the belief in biological determinism. His specific recommendations bore out this voluntarism. He argued that it was impossible to know whether a 'rogue gene' might recur, so any young German who could support a wife should be able to marry: but his wife's heredity must be checked. State intervention should be confined to investigating the character and health of young men, and educating them to choose a wife 'correctly'. Here, the eugenic role of the woman was seen as more important than the man's. The man, the achievement-oriented, voluntarist, creative element, could prove this worth by achievement and status. The woman could be gauged only by her child-bearing potential.

This argument brought abuse on Darré from all sides. Fellow Nordics were often opposed to purposive breeding. Günther said it was a 'chicken-farm mentality', and it was seen as an attack on family values. Despite Darré's stress on the monogamous nature of Nordic marriage, he was accused of suggesting polygamy. The Young Nordic League called his proposals 'unscientific, immoral, an oriental kulturwissenschaft. One girl member reproached Rosenberg for allowing Darré, 'a man who wrote such an immoral book', to speak at a meeting on German culture. He managed to annoy men and women alike by picturing the woman as an equal (if separate) partner, the adult, healthy, responsible mother. This ideal, with its emphasis on the natural, and the beauty of womanhood was more attractive to intelligent women despised ruling class. In which Zola and Fontane had presented their passive, sofa-lounging female victims, and was obviously close to the patriotic feminism of late nineteenth-century Germany. But it also brought him unwelcome attentions. He complained in 1934 that he had to cope with every kind of attack, 'the outbursts of hysterical women, who annex the holy idea of breeding to their own lack of erotic restraint. Not only the more eminent women attacked him. He shocked a jocular Nazi women's gathering at a party, especially the women guests, into total silence when, after the birth of his second child, he announced that if the baby had not been 'all right', he would have had it exposed. Women were to be classified into four groups: those whose
marriage was to be encouraged, those whose marriage was merely permitted, those who could marry but not have children, and those who must not marry. The latter group included madwomen, prostitutes and recidivist criminals. Natural children would be assessed separately.  

Darré stressed his association of the town with miscegenation, the danger of uncontrolled introduction of inferior blood with natural children. One thinks of the large towns, where the dark-skinned student, the coloured artist, the Jazz trumpeter, the Chinese sailor, the fruit merchant from Central America, etc., .. feel perfectly at home, and can often leave behind an eternal souvenir.

Again, we find a note of fear, a sense of the nation as helpless victim of the exploiter. What Darré failed to mention here, perhaps because it was too fresh in his readers' minds, was the so-called 'Black Peril', Schwarze Gefahr, as the Moroccan and Senegalese troops used by the French occupying force in the Rhineland were called by volkisch writers. But he was trying to write moderately and defensively, in order to appeal to as wide an audience as possible, and also to avoid recent and limiting historical references to what was meant to be a scientific programme for social reform. Out, too, went references to von Seeckt's role as Freemason, or victim of Freemasons, comments on the number of top army officers who had Jewish wives, and other outbursts which appeared in his early letters.

Darré's discussion of the mechanism of eugenics implies that he and his circle had considered the problems involved. How could racial 'quality' be defined? Qualities in different races were equal but different. The problems was to understand the limits of the possible. Following Günther, but without Günther's somewhat journalistic concept of the mental qualities of the different races, Darré argued that there were no completely pure races; that interbreeding had gone on for hundreds of years in Europe, but that there were pockets of original peoples here and there, and that Mendelian laws resulted in a patchwork of different genetic distributions, with one racial type dominating another, rather than a homogenised 'melting-pot'. Even if an individual possessed racial purity, 'if not carried on, it will effectively manifest itself'. So selection had to continue for generation after generation. By selecting desirable genetic combinations in the children a racial creation would take place. 'The idea of an original race leads to racial chauvinism ... but the idea of eugenics leads to a normal utilitarianism.'  55

The ideal of this selective breeding was Nordic man, the long-lost, half-forgotten progenitor of Germanness, and the Nordic ideal was enshrined in the peasantry. But the Nordic race could not be created just by exhorting Nordic peasants to have children. Race by itself was not a sufficiently strong factor to determine the form of the state, if what existed was alien to the racial spirit. 'The great currents of world thought circulate too profoundly.' Thus, a revolutionary transformation had to take place in the form of the state before it could be adapted to the intuitive political ideals of the Volk. Here, mechanistic eugenic determinism became subordinated to a more integrative social philosophy. 'To the material facts of race must be added the consciousness that it must have the kind of conditions that are proper to it, so that it can really create itself, so that the earth can be in some way prepared, so that the corn can begin to grow.'  56

This apparent dichotomy runs through Darré's writings on eugenics, race and the state, and reveals his awareness of factors not amenable to deterministic analysis. He defined the state as a reflection of the customs of a homogeneous tribe; but it must also, because of its capacity for negative and destructive effects on the Volk, play a formative role. It was not neutral. The need for identification of people and state stemmed from this definition. Once fixed in form, the state tended to be invulnerable to pressure from below. So institutions that did not reflect popular custom and feeling had to be abolished by force.

Since his 1933 legislation attempted to put his major ideas into practice, it is worth looking at Darree's actual method of racial selection, once he was given the opportunity. It does seem to demonstrate that a coercive racial selection was not envisaged, and lends emphasis to the distinction, drawn earlier, between a defensive intra-racial eugenics, which aimed to prevent the disappearance of a group, and the expansionist super-stud mentality popularly associated with Nazis. Under the Hereditary Farm Law, only farmers of German and similar stock, who could prove descent back to 1800, could inherit the protected farm. To the annoyance of many radical Nazis living in border areas, this definition included Polish farmers, who were also enraged at finding their farms were not only inalienable but cut, their blow, unsaleable. The nationalist press in Warsaw took up their cause.  57 The SS marriage order, implemented in 1931 by Himmler with Darrée's help, made SS approval for its marriages a condition of
could the inner intuition necessary to rule be maintained, and caste distinctions avoided. Such distinctions 'conserve, they do not create'.

This criticism tellingly displays his lack of conservative orthodoxy, which traditionally seeks order and continuity, as opposed to spontaneity and radical reassessment. His criticism of capitalist meritocracy clearly had something in common with that of Weber and Pareto, and recognised the problem of a non-egalitarian society, where classes lose their natural leaders. But his attempt to combine stability, justice and flexibility in his ideal society was drawn more from a private vision of an ideal, tribal society (though one, apparently, shared by the Nuremberg trial judge, who criticised Darré for not realising that true democracy was invented by primitive German tribes, 'long before there were any Jews there'). The identification of cultural and racial factors formed a self-correcting circular system: if a Nordic race could be re-created, it would govern according to old Nordic ways, providing that existing institutions were abolished. Peasant intuition, wisdom and the mutual recognition accorded by independent freemen, would ensure harmony and good sense.

This ideal was not Utopian, a description that implies the argument that, if the laws of nature could be abolished or transcended, man would be better or happier. The argument was rather that, if man lived according to the laws of nature, becoming aware intuitively of his links with the world around him, he would be better and happier. The attempt to escape from these bonds could only fail, and lead to a cycle of industrial growth, collapse and misery.

The vision of the Nordic peasant soul portrayed, by Darré was ambiguous. The peasant was strong, the source of all productiveness and creativity. But he was also fragile; his soul could not survive cities, capitalism or industrialisation. Darré was driven by his fear for the Nordic peasant, yet his political support was attracted by his projection of its strength. The defensive, racial element later became lost in ministerial practice, in exchange for pursuit of peasant productive potential.

During Darré's early years in office as a minister, close friends and backers absorbed his view of the peasant as inherently vital; the source of national health, fertility and creativity. This eventually mutated into the belief that the creative, entrepreneurial smallholder could contribute to, and co-exist with, industrial society. His belief in the sensitivity of the Nordic soul, its endangered quality, was abandoned by others, including some of his followers.

In any case, a serious contradiction remained in his fusion of
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spiritual and racial elements. He argued that peasant cultural continuity, the living tradition, was lost in urbanisation. But he also argued that peasantess was genetically inherent in the Nordic people. If this was so, then there was no reason why 'souid Nordic stock' could not be rescued from the towns and returned back to the land. By arguing that peasantess could not re-emerge from submergence in town life, he subordinated his racist argument to his concept of spiritual peasantess, and, if necessary, wrote off the 70% urban population of Germany. This was not an 'unworldly' tangent to his philosophy, but an essential part of it. Whether in fact he would have carried out his beliefs is open to considerable doubt. Just as, when it came to the crunch, he was unable to bring himself to exclude peasants of Jewish ancestry from the Hereditary Farm Law, it seems most unlikely that he would have excluded all townsmen in practice.

It is probably apparent from the foregoing discussion, that Darré was a strange mixture of visionary and realist. He used his selected scientific arguments, learned references and agricultural knowledge in pursuit of a goal whose nature was extremely radical, even in those days of ferment. He saw the re-socialisation of Germany as the only viable alternative to inevitable national destruction. The next chapter will discuss how he came to think, mistakenly, that Hitler's movement towards the peasant vote in 1930 was his opportunity to carry out his aims. Darré was, indeed, to turn his way to an invincible position in agrarian circles, through the optimism, passion and energy produced by this conviction, and was to obtain ministerial office. Hitler found Darré a useful theorist and organizer for a period of crisis, but when Darré kept faith with his own vision, he was, like many other revolutionary ideologicals, discarded.

CHAPTER FOUR

The Conspiracy

Blood and Soil is regarded today as one of the fundamental elements of Nazi ideology, and Darré is seen as a standard National Socialist ideologue. How did he come to enter politics, and how was it that he became an activist in the NSDAP? In many ways, Darré does not fit the Reichsleiter type. He joined the Party late, in May 1930; he was from a once wealthy, upper middle-class background, and he had no background as a party political activist, despite his brief membership of the DVFP in 1923.

He had become acquainted during the late 1920s with National Socialist activists and sympathisers, most of them living in Thuringia, and interested in two things: peasant-agrarian problems and the decline of German culture. He knew Theo Habicht, and Habicht was Gauleiter of Württemberg in 1928 before going to Vienna. Habicht also knew Himmler, and was a Party speaker. Darré kept in touch with him after his first meeting with Hitler. Darré stayed with Schultze-Naumburg on and off, between 1928 and 1930. As mentioned earlier, Schultze-Naumburg was a respected architect, who had been a leader of the progressive movement before 1914. His country house was a centre of party activity as well as a meeting place for Nationalist ideologue sympathisers.

There, Darré met Hans Hofeder, a NSDAP member who infiltrated the Arntmann group in 1927, and died violently in 1929 and to whose memory he dedicated New Nobility. He also met various neo-conservative intellectuals there. He knew Hans Johst, playwright and author of a popular work on Schlegel, met Jungers and, later, Heidegger. He was befriended in 1929 by Dr Hans Severus Ziegler, editor of the Thuringian NSDAP Gaunen newspaper. Ziegler, one of the radical peasant ideologues of the circle, admired Darré's work, and wanted him to work for him as a journalist and political organiser. Darré also met Günther at Saaleck, in January 1929 after three of correspondence. Kowaspath was a frequent visitor, and joined the Party shortly after Darré.

Despite these contacts, Darré did not join the NSDAP until he was offered a post within it, and his approach seems to have been almost subversive. Despite his strongly nationalistic feelings in the early 1920s,
Darré's main interest by this stage was the plight of the peasantry. He had tried to found a 'Union of Noble German Peasants' in 1928, with Dr Horst Rechenbach, later to liaise between Darré and the SS Race and Settlement Main Office; but it foundered in the agricultural depression. Darré now got together with Kenzler, editor of Blood and Soil, to organise and finance a 'nationwide network of cells among radically-minded peasants', and it is supposed to have asked Ziegler to finance the idea, but had first thought of approaching Hugenberg, the head of the German Conservative Nationalist Party, for finance and help for a political agrarian organisation: his publisher, Lehmann, persuaded him that it would be a waste of time, and suggested that Hitler might be more interested in the idea. This suggests that Darré was looking for a party to carry out his programme, a political machine to infiltrate for his own views, rather than entering the NSDAP as a committed loyalist.

In 1930, the NSDAP agricultural manifesto appeared, designed to appeal to the farming vote. The authorship of the manifesto is not known for certain—indeed, for decades it was assumed that Darré had written it, but according to Erwin Moszner, Keeper of the Seal to the National Peasant Council, it was produced by Konstantin Hielr, head of the NSDAP Department II (Labour) and Himmler, though Gregor Strasser, Feder, Kenzler himself, and Werner Willikens have also been put forward as possible authors. In many ways it foreshadowed later Nazi policy, calling for hereditary, inalienable farms, and debt relief, but there were references to the need for unity between town and country, the desirability of industrial development in the east German provinces, which Darré and his circle could not have approved. The manifesto was openly a party political document, and emphasised national and infrastructural economic aims as well as agricultural reforms. When Darré first read the manifesto, he was interested enough to copy it down word for word. Despite their reservations, he and Kenzler were struck by the document's opportune appearance, and decided that it offered potential for their own plans. There is an undated document in the archives of the NSDAP Agricultural Office, obviously by Darré, which was written for Hitler some time between 1930 and 1933, and which discusses the possibility of a peasant coup, to be carried out by force against Germany's big cities. This may have been Darré's first offering to Hitler in 1930.

The correspondence between Darré and Kenzler was couched in conspiratorial terms, using hints and initials. On April 12th, 1930, Darré wrote,
The Conspiracy

On 7th May 1930, he wrote to Ziegler that 'Frau Sch.-N.' was making arrangements to catch Hitler 'for a couple of hours or for a weekend' through Frick. At this stage, his publisher, Lehmann, wrote offering to pay him 600 marks a month if he would work for the NSDAP in Munich as their agricultural organiser. The letter still exists, though ironically enough Darré's account of his recruitment to the NSDAP, with his salary paid by outside sources, was not believed by his U.S. Army interrogator, in 1945.\(^{11}\)

Ziegler was dismayed at the prospect of losing Darré to the Brown House. A letter to Hess, refusing the post, was despatched, but not sent after phone call from Hess himself.\(^{12}\) Darré took up his activity for the Nazi Party in June 1930, his salary paid for by his publisher, and possibly other private sources. One writer suggests that a small Munich industrialist, Pietzsch, also financed Darré's salary.\(^{13}\) Lehmann's intervention over the salary suggests a certain ambiguity in Darré's position. Although Lehmann, who died in 1935, was the only neo-conservative publisher who continued unhampered by the Nazis after 1933, the fact that he virtually bought Darré's way into the NSDAP gives some idea of the extent to which Darré must have been seen as an outsider.\(^{14}\) The idea that Darré was soft on the Jews did not help, and he never became one of the favoured inner circle around Hitler. His party number was high, around 230,000. He was one of the very few late party members to achieve high office.

Darré took up his post in June 1930. He moved to Munich with Clarly, whom he married in 1932. Saaleck was still a centre for what was now avowedly Nazi activity, and in mid-June he returned there for a conference with Goebbels, Frick, Goering, Rosenberg, von Schirach, Günsche and Konopath. Konopath became a member of the Race and Culture department of the NSDAP Dept. II.\(^{15}\) Eventually, co-operation distinguished between him and Darré, who discarded first Schulze-Naumburg then Konopath, as his interests shifted more and more to agricultural problems, and away from the field. 'Keep Paulshütten out of Party disputes, he would only get them back to front', he wrote, of the ageing architect.\(^{16}\) He wrote to NordicRing members apologising for delayed letters, and saying that agricultural problems left him no time for the Nordic Ring. Konopath sank into obscurity, and in 1932 his magazine, Die Sonne, was taken over by the Skål, a secret volkisch order of elitist, revolutionary principles, which will be discussed in the next chapter.\(^{17}\)

He missed Saaleck, but there were compensations in Munich, such as evenings spent with the Bruckmanns, and Darré remarked with awe that 'In this very house Houston Stewart Chamberlain stayed ...', an indication as to how strongly Chamberlain was admired among the National Socialists.\(^{18}\)

His contacts with Hitler in the Brown House in Munich were few, and he was obviously in awe of him. 'Even I, as his adviser, can scarcely get to see him,' he noted, and told inquirers who wanted to contact Hitler to first make contact with Frau Bruckmann instead.\(^{19}\) One letter to his ex-wife was written on note-paper headed with an impromptu picture of Hitler, presumably standard issue for top Party members. Other letter-headings included pictures of the Deutsche Eck in Coblenz, and the Sam-Souci orangery in Potsdam. He referred to the 'atmosphere of the leader, of leadership' in another letter explaining that he was too busy to keep up his private correspondence.\(^{20}\) These letters, though, seldom included comments on politics. When they did, they had that lecturing, didactic and public tone which Darré was prone to adopt with his first wife. He told her one anecdote about Hitler and Hindenburg which sheds some light on the NSDAP reaction to Hindenburg's refusal to appoint Hitler as Chancellor after the 37.4% Nazi vote in July 1932. Hitler had been sent damaging material about Hindenburg, which he had refused to use. The result was that the Jesuit Brüning gave Hindenburg 'dictatorial powers' when Hindenburg became Chancellor and Hitler's head could be 'on the block' at any moment. The lesson he drew was that ruthlessness was necessary in politics.\(^{21}\)

Most of his letters concerned his daughter, Didi, of whom he was very fond, and complaints about money worries (in September 1932, Reichsleiter salaries were halved, and payment was often delayed),\(^{22}\) Darré, despite his formal, inflexible bearing, loved children, and they always responded to his sensitive and perceptive approach to them. One visit from Didi had to be put off because of an election campaign in Germany and there were problems with others, because of Darré's occasionally homeless state. He moved from furnished flat to furnished flat, occasionally staying with friends, while paying half his salary over to Alma (a situation which continued until she married again). Despite financial problems, and the embarrassment of acquiring a new, pretty and younger wife with no home to take her to, he felt relief at the separation. He asked Lehmann for money to help pay for the divorce. Lehmann, who admired Alma's strength of character, was shocked at the separation, but Darré insisted to him that he could not have carried on his political work with her, and needed to break free.\(^{23}\)
Darré continued his weekly letters to his ex-wife until he learned that his daughter had contracted tuberculosis and needed expensive hospital treatment. He wrote an unpleasant letter to Alma, accusing her of neglecting Didi, and demanding that she pay the medical costs. While it is always difficult to judge ex-martial quarrels from the outside, his attitude here seems appalling, and understandably enough, Alma broke off the 'deep and warm friendship' that Darré had vowed in mid-June, 1930. Oddly enough, he seemed proud of the letter, and kept several copies of it in his files, although it clearly showed the frantic anger of a man under stress.24

THE BROWN HOUSE 1931-1933

Given Darré's interest in corporatism, one would have expected some degree of sympathy between him and other early Nazi theorists, such as Feder and Otto Strasser. However, he regarded Feder as too urban-oriented, and Strasser as an incipient Bolshevik. One of his early diary entries refers to the 'rather Communist inclinations' made by Strasser's black Russian smock and red shirt.25 Strasser's corporatism, however, did stress 'Germanic self-determination' rather than the 'Fascist satrapy', and Darré later found more in common with Gregor Strasser, head of the Party's Agricultural Organisation until Darré took over.26 Strasser told Lehmann that Darré was 'doing first class work'. Darré described Strasser as 'with the right ideas, very clever, but generally not easy to handle ... Once you win him over, he's a powerful ally'. The relationship became more difficult as a row developed between Strasser and Hitler, which ended in Strasser's resignation.27

He made a good impression on men like Otto Wagener, ex-General Staff Captain, corporatist and follower of Feder, who Himmler told of Darré's 'wide knowledge of the world' and agricultural expertise.28 Darré's Newadel, more readable and polemical than the earlier Das Bauerwesen, was a good introduction to these Nazi circles. His views on land division and settlement appealed to the 'urban' Nazis because of their implicit hostility to conservatives and landowners. The young Heinz Haushofer, son of General Karl Haushofer, was taken to meet Darré and Hess in Munich in late 1930, and was struck by Darré's ideas and interest in the now-neglected Gustav Ruhland.29 The agrarian adviser to the Pan-German League, von Herberg, visited Lehmann and asked to see Darré, and Class, author of pre-war nationalist best-seller, If I were Emperor, head of the Pan-German League, also wanted to meet him. Ernst Hanfstengel, script-writer with UFA and old friend of Hitler's, insisted on reading New Nobility before visiting England, in case he was asked about it by the English press. Altogether, Darré had become a major figure in radical nationalist circles.30

But what lay behind Hitler's sudden need for an agricultural expert? Why did he think the German farmer was ready to vote for the Nazis? How committed was Darré to the Nazi Party, and why did he think his plans for a peasant rebellion belonged there? How true was Darré's later claim that his usefulness to Hitler gave him more independence than the other Reichsleiter?31

German agriculture is widely seen as split into two extremes, the small peasant farm, and the Junker landowner. This picture is exaggerated, as the typical Junker farm was about 1000 ha. in size, and much of that would be barely usable. In short, the Junker 'latifundia' were more the size of a substantial tenant farm in England than the Scottish landowner's 20,000 acres, and changed hands more often, showing greater social mobility than England's landed elite, according to a recent study.32 The apparently inefficient small peasant farm had shown surprising growth potential between 1880 and 1925, indeed, at a time of agricultural depression, this sector had grown more than any other.33 In many ways, the small farm was more resistant to depression, economic controls and inflation than the heavily mortgaged large farm. In 1914, some 30% of Germany's population still lived on the land. The east Eichan Junkers usually farmed their own land, and in many ways had more in common with the small farmer than either had with the large estates of the south-west, often the remnants of Holy Roman Empire holdings. However, the Junkers had considerable political power. They presented themselves as the backbone of the nation, and attracted subsidies and other protective measures which sometimes affected small farmers badly. Political divisions, as represented in the farming organisations, were minimal, and essentially, both groups wanted protection from marketing problems. One potential source of political divergence lay in the fact that peasant areas of Germany, such as the Rhineland and Bavaria, had a large Catholic population, and Catholic peasants tended to vote for the Centre Party, while larger farmers voted for the DNVP conservatives. There was one substantial group that fitted into neither category, the small-medium farmers of Lower Saxony and Schleswig-Holstein. Here, the land was fertile and intensively farmed, and productivity per hectare in Lower Saxony was higher than anywhere else. The inflation
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of 1923 was more damaging to this category than to the heavily mortgaged large farm, whose debts were in some cases wiped out. The boom of 1925, fuelled by short-term American investment, encouraged the most advanced farmers in north and north-west Germany to expand. Dairying and market gardening thrived on the heavy black soils of German Frisia. The ‘Red Earth’ settlement associations of Westphalia bought up land at high prices for smallholdings. But these areas were trapped by the Depression of 1929 which pre-dated the crash of 1929. High levels of debt combined with a drop in food prices and very high taxation levied by the Social Democratic Prussian parliament to pay for urban workers’ social welfare. Of course, all German agriculture was affected, but the farmers of north and north-west Germany, traditionally liberal voters, felt especially penalised. They had been exhorted to invest and expand, and were now going bankrupt, whose ‘died-and-stick’ farmers had kept their heads down and kept their farms.33

By early 1928 nearly half Germany’s farms were making a loss. Average profit levels had dropped to a mere eight marks per hectare, while taxes and other government burdens amounted to an average 26 marks per hectare. In some cases, interest rates were 10% (a real interest rate of 6.7%).34 The result was a spate of bankruptcies and foreclosures. Large farms were hit, because in an emergency it was possible for them to sell off some land, though there was deep psychological resistance to splitting up estates.35

This agricultural emergency resulted in sporadic armed resistance on the part of the farmers, which nearly led to civil war. Farmers bombed tax offices, and shot off rifles at foreclosure auctions. ‘These “protesters” were often the best educated and most widely travelled. Unlike the peasants who had exploded in eastern Europe in the 1920s, they found an ideology ready and waiting in neo-conservative radicalism. Prussian intellectuals and ex-Freikorps activists like von Salomon pounced in to help, with the impassioned patriotism of the beleaguered minority, rather than the confidence of the powerful. Unlike the East Prussian grain growers, the north German small farmers were outsiders; they failed to fit the numerous interest group structures, and had the worst of all worlds as a result of the existing system of taxation and subsidies. In English terms, they were more like the Northern Irish, or Anglo-Welsh farmers, than like the East Anglian arable farmers, who had always had the ear of the Conservative Party. The black flag of revolt was raised in Schleswig-Holstein, its symbol a plough and a sword. One popular song of the movement began,

I put a bomb in the tax office, and dynamite in the county parliament,

phrases which are catchier in German.36 The refrain of the song called to Hitler, Ludendorff, Erhardt and Hugenborg for aid, a more eclectic group, in party-political terms, than might at first appear.

National Socialist attacks on finance capitalism and Jewish speculation were willingly accepted by men who saw creditors, banks and international commodity markets as the root of their problems. The Narodnik streak in the German Youth Movement supported the attacks on tax officials and bureaucrats. The ruling Weimar coalition saw nothing to be gained by subsidising these traditionally liberal men, while the DNVF was more concerned with subsidies for powerful agricultural producer groups. The protest movement was crushed by heavy repressive sentences in 1930. Ironically, this destruction of violent and anarchic action left the way open to the infiltration and propaganda devised by Darré. Now revolutionary action had failed, the farmers turned to a legitimate party that took their grievances seriously. The emotional Anabaptism which had underlain 1848 almost as much as the Peasants' War of 1525 welcomed the outspoken attacks on large landowners, banks and freemasons. Darré was not a brilliant orator; he offered the promise of restitution to the dispossessed, and future security. His speeches stressed the national importance of the Bauer, and the programme carefully worked out by him and his staff over the next two years corresponded to the perceived problems of the time.

Hitler’s need for the rural vote was based on a shortfall in the 1930 vote, although this was sharply increased from the mere 2.6% of the vote in the 1928 national election to 18.3%. Hitler realised he would have to increase the party’s attraction to new groups. The Protestant small farmers were an obvious choice, disaffected, nationalized, radicalised and split geographically between support for the conservatives and for the Liberal Party. Unlike the Catholic farmers, they had no party devoted to their own interests. There was a remarkable disparity in Nazi support between Catholic and Protestant small farmers, 73.9% in Protestant areas, to 12.3% in Catholic areas.37 This was one factor which the Catholic Centre Party already occupied Nazi ground in many ways. It was devoted to peasant interests, anti-big business, anti-big trade unions, covertly anti-semitic, anti-Communist, and had strong regional loyalties. The Nazi Party was a peasant party in Protestant areas, but a proletarian party in Catholic areas.
In June 1930, Darré organised a sub-division of the NSDAP Department 2 (Labour) into the Agricultural Organisation, a quasi-independent network of activists, and sympathisers, whose task was not only to infiltrate the farmers and peasants unions by electoral means but to discuss land reform, agricultural improvement, structural changes in tenure and other issues. He kept their activity moving through a daily stream of memoranda and orders. Most of these memoranda still survive, and offer a detailed picture of the way in which National Socialists organised their propaganda and propaganda activity. Unlike many other departments, Darré’s agricultural department in these early days did not waste time and energy in in-fighting. His leadership was accepted from the start, and it was recognised that few others could have shown the same combination of expertise, knowledge, and leadership. One post-war author refers to the ‘exceptional organisational and tactical abilities’ of the ‘National Socialist cadres’. He made a good impression on his fellow Nazis at this time, especially those below the rank of Reichsleiter, precisely because he was not an ‘old fighter’ but an outsider. He came from a higher social background than many old Nazis, and this again helped him in the first few years, when non-party political support was especially welcome to men who had been virtually full-time political activists since the war. Such activists, aware of the isolated nature of their lives, always seen blood as a breakthrough, a sign that they are beginning to win over ‘the others’. Darré belonged to a traditionally liberal family background, the wealthy merchant with overseas connections, and so represented a particularly unusual type of recruit. Hitler fan, Catholic, through his biographical portrayal of the Reichsleiter written in 1933, laid great stress on Darré’s elegant appearance, his good looks, his well cut suit and polished manners, to an extent which shows how useful he was to the party’s image.

Darré did not always reciprocate, and in the early days in the Brown House, some enmities were instant and mutual. ‘Goebbels hates me,’ he noted in his diary. ‘It must be because of his black blood’, a double edged crack at Goebbels’ dark colouring and his Catholicism. Within a few months, Princesse zur Lippe was complaining that Goebbels had given widespread publicity to a pamphlet attacking ‘the racial work of our friends’ [i.e. Darré], expressing not only personal animosity, but a deep dislike of Blood and Soil concepts. Darré told Konopathi that Goebbels did not understand ‘scientific racial concepts’, and hoped to use him in the Propaganda department to combat Goebbels' influence. Darré managed to win control of the AD journal Landpost from Goebbels' propaganda department. He also warned Konopathi about Himmler. ‘Many people laugh at him, but his influence over Hitler is greater than people realise.’

The Gauleitung, mostly old party members, were jealous of the independent nature of the Agricultural Department (or AD), and Darré’s direct responsibility to Hitler. Darré had made this independence a precondition of his work. He was in a strong position, not only because the party needed his combination of expertise and organisational ability, but because Hitler had taken the initiative in approaching and recruiting him. In January 1934, the Reichsleiter, or National Food Estate, the new marketing corporation, was again formally promised independence from the Party and direct responsibility to Hitler. Darré established an area network that paralleled that of the NSDAP. One report on the structure of the Agricultural Department in Saxony, demonstrates the simplicity. There was an expert adviser at Gau level, and 34 at Kreis level. 1100 NSDAP farmer members were active at farm and village level. Twenty-two party members were representatives in the Chamber of Agriculture. There were 40 speakers who specialised om farming and party matters, while Saxony AD had sent four members to the State and National Parliament. From the Gauleitung point of view, much of this effort could have been better used in strictly Party matters. In the early 1930s, the situation was accepted because it was recognised that Hitler needed to capture the rural vote if the NSDAP was to win an election. But by January 1933 the party was in a stronger position, and the leadership of Saxony ordered the Saxony AD to reduce its strength by 33%, allegedly to save money, but in fact to stave off AD competition. Riecke, a Gau adviser on agriculture (i.e., a member of the NSDAP organisation), who was later to be second-in-command under Herbert Backe, Darré’s successor, wrote dismissively in his memoirs of Darré’s ‘Blood and Soil efforts ... The Westphalian peasants, among whom I worked, had quite different worries.’ Riecke was dismissed as agricultural adviser after 1933, and worked for the volunteer labour force thereafter.

Where the AD broke new ground, and began to approximate to the planned farmer’s corporation, was in its system of expert advisers. There were nine such experts in Saxony alone, each with an area of expertise, such as market gardening, agricultural co-operatives, settlement, and fowls. They were accompanied by seven more advisors.
on general peasant affairs, such as education, debt and appropriation problems, and insurance. Darré insisted that all agricultural experts had to be farmers. Party members were trained in special courses laid on by the AD. In one such series, five local areas trained 700 members on how to become elected to positions in the agricultural unions, such as the Landbund, how to recruit peasants in small villages, how to speak at public meetings, and how to write letters on political subjects to the local newspapers. The intensely regional nature of Germany's political life and press meant that each area needed to produce its own propaganda, quickly, flexibly and effectively, so that local issues could be used where necessary. The Saxony report estimated that some 18,000 to 19,000 letters, cards and pamphlets were produced between January 1932 and January 1933, while 50 directives were sent round internally. All areas were canvased at least once, even the most remote, and meetings were held on Sundays normally between 130 to 400. Darré quickly became a popular speaker, not so much for rhetoric and bonhommie as for content. The German farmer was a political animal, already organised into various farmers' unions, and producer co-operatives, and it was easier to reach a politicised group than it would have been to start from scratch. In December 1931, Werner Willikens, one of the AD's leading members, was elected president of the Landbund, a major success for the AD.

In July 1932, Hitler's Party attracted the largest vote it was to have before gaining power, 37.4% of the vote. In a system of multiple minority parties, it was an overwhelming victory. The north German Protestant farmers and village and small towns had voted for Hitler—averaging some 78.8%. In some areas in the Geest, Nazi votes were 80-100% of the total. The smaller the village, the larger the proportion. As a reward, Hitler told Darré he might be offered the Prussian Agricultural Ministry if the NSDAP came to power. At this stage, Darré was not expecting a position in the national government.

He insisted that special attention be paid to the agricultural co-operatives, especially the Raiffeisen ones, because they were completely independent of state finance. One AD member reported in February 1933 that over 40,000 co-operatives were represented in the Raiffeisen group. 'With a few exceptions, the whole farming population is organised in co-operatives or societies and is bound to one or more.' The implications of this fact for the proposed new marketing corporation were considerable. It meant that much of the basic groundwork was already done, that farmers were psychologically attuned to protection against market fluctuations, and to the idea of cutting out the marketing middleman; further, that a pool of experienced administrators already existed.

AD activists were helped in their organising by the fact that there was general agreement about the failure of the market economy in agriculture. The only question was how should it be reformed. The activists went as far as opposing leasehold tenure. Instead of tenancy leases as a means by which the young farmer could make a start, and the smallholder extend or diminish his holding according to market conditions, they opposed the renting of land as a capitalist phenomenon, an unwanted intrusion of the mercantile world. This, if Darré's plans were to be implemented, had serious implications for the land market. In 1925, 12.6% of all agricultural land in Germany was rented, and 80% of farms between two and five hectares. The quickest and simplest way for farmers to expand was to increase the amount of land rented on a full- or part-time basis, but the agricultural depression of the late 1920s reduced the proportion of rented farmland, and in 1933, only ten per cent of farmland was rented. The development of leasehold tenure came under attack from a range of political groups, although the Weimar Constitution of 1919 had granted tenant farmers considerable security of tenure. Both the SPD and the DNVP objected to cost-effective and profit-oriented farming in principle. For the SPD land reformers, followers of Henry George, leasehold tenure represented the exploitation of the peasantry. They supported land nationalisation, or at the very least, the nationalisation of rent. For the German conservatives, it increased the danger of splitting up the large estates, and loss of control over land use. The concept of the peasant as a profit-seeking businessman, able to buy and sell his land at will, was opposed to all Darré and his staff stood for.

They attacked the concept as an inheritance of nineteenth-century liberalism. According to them, it took an atomised, individualistic view of the farmer, who became merely part of a mercantile ethic. For the Nazi agrarian radicals, the small farm was the core of the nation, crucial to its physical, moral, cultural and racial health. As the source of the nation's vitality, the small farmer could not be left to suffer under market forces.

Darré also attracted intellectual support from those who supported the peasantry for quite other reasons. One school of thought saw small farms as more productive, in terms of net deliveries per hectare, than large ones. There was resentment against subsidised competition from large landowners, and especially the unpopular Osthilfe, a special
subsidy to east Elbian grain growers. The peasant was doubly the victim, paying taxes to support the subsidies, and having to pay more for his fodder. The AD under Darré revived large landowners as 'bacon-tariff patriots', and he gleefully circulated their counter-attacks, accusing him of being worse than the KPD.34

The AD's attack on leasehold tenure was accompanied by the demand to settle farmers on inalienable medium-sized farms. The campaign to win over the peasants and small farmers was helped by Darré's opposition to the large landowner. Darré's friend Theo Habicht published Deutsche Länderei in 1928, a book which attacked large landholdings, and Darré used his figures in his 1930 New Nobility.55 The AD was united in support of a programme which would divide up the great estates. This did not attract as much opposition as one might expect from large landowners, since their great uncertainty of their future, while others supported the idea of peasant settlement on nationalistic grounds. As long ago as the late 1890s, the chairman of the Agrarian League had called for state intervention—if necessary, by nationalisation—to prevent the dismemberment of estates in private hands.56 However, at this time, some of the large farmers began to realise the implications of the state aid they had been receiving (and receiving) for decades, and began to move towards a stronger view of property rights.57 The German conservative party saw Darré as a dangerous radical, which of course, he was, especially to their interests, and any attacks by landowners were proudly circulated to the members of the AD. One anti-Nazi landowner, Prince zu Löwenstein, in an article called 'The Radicalised Village', claimed that thirteen million small farmers had been won over to Hitler. 'A pre-condition of winning the fight against National Socialism is to ... ensure that Communism doesn't fill the vacuum left by Right-radicalism.58

There were signs that, in their desperation, farm-workers in East Prussia were voting for the Communist Party, and Darré, after commissariat a report on the economic situation of state domains in East Prussia, sent in a team to win the tenant farmers over from the German Nationalist Party.59 While General Schleicher, the 'Socialist General' who was shot in 1934, was flinging subsidies around in wild abandon to the Bavarian egg producers, the grain growers of East Prussia, and the dairy operatives of Lower Westphalia, telegrams began to land on his desk about the fact that farmers were oscillating between the KPD and the NSDAP.60

During this period, arguments about peasant productivity had developed controversial political overtones. Support for the large landowners was linked to the DNVP, the heavy industrial sector, and an ad hoc interventionist line on the part of Brüning on agricultural subsidies. This bloc called for the retention of high grain prices, and even talked of the 'duties of the consumer towards national production'. However, the more dynamic, export-led section of German industry, always more sympathetic to laissez-faire ideas, favoured a 'modernised and capable peasant agriculture', which should be incorporated into a more competitive industry. Market responsiveness and varied cropping were the ideals; Holland and Denmark the exemplars. One later writer for the RNS, and editor of the reports of the International Conference on Agricultural Science, the highly respected agrarian economist Constantin von Dietze, wrote a report for the Chamber of German Industry in 1930, which emphasised the virtues of market oriented peasant farming. His co-author, Karl Brandt, emigrated to America in 1934-4, where he wrote articles which, among other things, criticised the Junkers for their backwardness, obscurantism, and continued political power. Darré's background of overseas trading expertise gave him natural allies among many trade-oriented and technologically aware businessmen.55

Darré's hitherto unused abilities came into play during these three years. He moved with absolute certainty, laying down a clear ideological line that appealed to many of his members, but also responding to their ideas. His nose for corruption and intrigue kept his members on their toes. His analyses and predictions of motives and behaviour were often proved accurate, excepting only the power of fascist fanaticism, where, as with all Nazis, he grossly underrated its efficacy in increasing production. Darré's group was more exclusive than the NSDAP, which had formed a loose alliance with the DNVP, the Stahlhelm and others, at Harzburg (the so-called 'Harzburg Front'). His farmers were not to belong to the Stahlhelm, because the leader was a Freemason. The press and cinema empire controlled by Hugenberg was a cheat, pushing an anodyne, 'bourgeois' line. 'Die Tat', the nationalist, intellectual journal controlled by Eugen Diederichs, also had masonic connections. About the only group outside the AD whose cross-membership was encouraged, was the Allgemeine SS, in 1937 a group of a few thousand part-time volunteers. Darré recommended his members to visit their local SS groups, to see if they could be useful, a condescending attitude that seems comically inappropriate in retrospect, but which reflects the relative status of the SS at that time.62

Darré's main ally now was Heinrich Himmler. The Race and
Settlement Office of the SS was established in 1932, largely through Darré's efforts, according to his diary, and his affidavit at the Nuremberg trial. (The function and scope of this office will be discussed at greater length in a larger chapter.) In the affidavit, he described his motivation for founding the Racial Office as being to "try to instill in German society a sense of fair play and public-school spirit that, he claimed, was taken for granted in English society at all social levels.63 However, odd this may sound, it is clear that Darré sensed a lack of co-operation and community spirit in German society. Given his own experiences, that is not surprising. The emphasis on this Volksgemeinschaft does suggest that it was deficient to begin with. It has by now become a historical truism that the National Socialist government was structurally chaotic, and consisted largely of factional in-fighting. While this may have been so in the 1930s, it has seemed better at building motorways and motor cars than at handling its own dimensions—quite apart from internal political opposition. It is one of the many ironies of Darré's life that he envisaged the SS racial elite as a means of bringing the British public school ethic to Germany.

Darré and Himmler were both interested in the agrarian question. Himmler was a trained farmer, like Darré, but he had had no practical experience, and relied on Darré for factual information, and it is probable that Darré, seven years older than Himmler, had influenced the latter in this area. Both men were interested in peasant settlement, and Himmler became liaison officer between the NSDAP and the Artamani in 1930.64 However, Himmler was interested in Indian philosophy and the occult, and had several Indian friends and contacts in the 1920s and 1930s, partly because he was drawn to these Aryan Nazi sympathizers, but partly because of the political importance of the Indian pro-German nationalists. Too much can be made of the importance of bizarre cultism in Himmler's activities—he is supposed to have sent a party of SS men to Tibet in order to search for Shangri-La, an expedition which is more likely to have had straightforward espionage as its purpose—but it did exist, and was one of the reasons behind the split between Himmler and Darré that took place in the late 1930s. All the same, Herbert Backe thought that Himmler's growing romanticism and mystic interests was a result of Darré's influence, and while Darré was not interested in the occult, which he had revered at in the Nordic Ring, he was capable of inspiring others with his own enthusiasms, and many of his ideas re-emerged through Himmler in a perverted form in later years.65

CHAPTER FIVE

The Nazi Minister

In June 1933, Darré was appointed Reichsbauernführer, National Peasant Leader, and also Minister of Food and Agriculture. In September 1933 he presided over the creation of the Reichsminister for Rail and Roads, translated here as the National Food Estate, the agricultural marketing corporation. By 1936, Darré's authority had waned, and between 1939 and 1942, the year he was deported, it was effectively nullified. The story of Darré's years in office is deeply intertwined with that of his successor in 1942, Herbert Backe. In 1936, Backe was nominated to represent agriculture on the Council for the Second Four Year Plan, and from being second-in-command in the Ministry of Agriculture, he came to be preferred to Darré. He was seen as a more reliable, straightforward administrator, and an efficient and loyal technocrat. From 1939, he was given the title of 'Leader' of the ministry.

The Ministry of Agriculture rose in terms of its share of financial resources from eighth largest ministry in 1933 to the fourth largest in 1944. Its budget rose seven times between 1934 and 1939, compared with an 'average increase of 170%' for all ministries.6 But it lost its political power. Backe, Darré's successor, only held on to his tenuous position by supporting Hitler's policies, while Darré remained loyal to his principles and lost power. The two men had worked closely together between 1931 and 1934. They pushed the Hereditary Farm Law and the Marketing Law through a largely conservative and hostile cabinet in 1933, and fought to keep agricultural settlement as the preserve of the National Food Estate, when the Ministry of Economics called for more 'urban settlements'. But by 1936, neutral hostility was so great that Backe was appealing to Goering and Himmler to remove Darré, while Darré was issuing a stream of defensive memoranda and letters.

The reason for this shift in authority is crucial to a history of agrarian ideology under the National Socialists. Was there a significant ideological dimension to this feud, which still persists among followers and friends of Darré and Backe? Or were revolutionary political activists particularly prone to such squabbling—in that the habit of
intensive opposition to the existing political system was hard to break, and had to be directed somewhere? Was the Ministry for Agriculture particularly affected, or was it symptomatic of Hitler's method of internal party rule, symptomatic of the multiplicity of competing offices established after 1933? The relationship between Darré and Backe does seem to illuminate certain problems of Nazi ideology, style and policy.

One interesting side-issue is what exactly Backe's ideas were. He was, and is, often referred to as a non-ideological figure, a practical man with no interest in cranky ideas about Blood and Soil. Goebbels, Keitel, Speer and many modern authors have taken this line. However, Backe, a trained economist as well as a farmer, had a firm commitment to a planned economy which is hard to reconcile with the picture of the pure pragmatist. He was one of the young Nazi intellectuals, a friend of Fritz Giesche, Victor Witte and Ferdinand Fried Zimmerman. He was also accused of having 'fantastic goals', because of his attitude to de-collectivisation in Russia, but this was due to his fear of losing a harvest during a changeover of methods—a 'pragmatic' preference which was unsuccessful in this case, and, it will be argued, typically so.

This chapter will argue that Backe's motivation, ideas and style as a human being sheds important light on the nature of National Socialism. His belief in planning, action and need for loyalty to a leader led him to join a secret, revolutionary group in the early 1920s. Several members of this group were to hold high office in the Third Reich, among them Theo Gross of the Racial Office. Backe, however, has remained a shadowy figure, perhaps because he was not prosecuted in the IMT Trial at Nuremberg. Even his name has suffered distortion into Wilhelm and Ernest Backe, instead of Herbert Backe, by Speer and Robert Koch. He committed suicide in 1947, after months of solitary confinement, and his name did not figure prominently in the 1949 Wilhelmstrasse Trial which included Darré as defendant (Case XI).

But Backe was nominated by Hitler to the Dönitz cabinet of April 1945, and was respected and trusted by Heydrich. Many of his peers saw him as a prominent and representative intellectual. While agriculture and the peasantry played an important role in his ideas, he placed national politics first, and his loyalties gradually came to clash with Darré's, the more so as Backe's admiration for Hitler grew, and Darré's admiration, such as it was, waned.

I realise that my tension and nervousness are a result of my development being distorted—hindered and destroyed: my hatred of the authors of this destruction [Russia] came about as a result of that.

This uncharacteristically introspective analysis by Backe indicates that his 'distorted' development is worth examining. Such an admission is rare in the autobiographical literature of NSDAP members, and indicates something of Backe's uncompromising honesty. In his prison jottings of 1946, he laid down his own version, in which each phase of his life was shown to give rise to certain thought processes, and an examination of the documentary evidence from 1918 to 1945 bears out his analysis quite closely.

Backe, like so many other National Socialists, began as a member of a beleaguered minority. As a German national, born in Batum in 1889, he entered the Tiflis State Gymnasium in 1905, at a time of increasing and sometimes violent Russian nationalism. His father, a Prussian merchant, committed suicide while Backe was about fourteen years old, and Backe had to work his way through secondary school. Russia's rapid modernisation between 1900 and 1914 was accompanied by a fierce hostility to all national minorities, and was followed by wartime persecution of many minority groups—Germans and Jews were the chief targets. Backe, a civilian alien, in the Urals, while his elder brother fought in the German army. He was exchanged to Germany in 1918 via Sweden, on condition that he was not conscripted.

The attempt at forcible Russianisation produced fear and contempt in Backe: the hardships of internment, resentment. His first-hand experience of civil war atrocities meant that his hatred extended to the Bolsheviks, although he always kept an admiration for Russia's potential for achievement. His family had lost everything during the war, and were penniless. Backe now had to keep three young sisters, a sick mother, and an elder brother studying engineering. He worked for six months in factories in the Rhineland, while taking his Abitur. When Backe lost his factory job in the post-war depression, the family moved to Hannover, where he worked as a drainage labourer in the nearby meadows. When the girls were old enough, and physically strong enough to find work, Backe trained for his agricultural diploma, again working his way through university. He began to study at Göttingen in 1920-1. Vacations were spent working for board and lodging only as a farm agent, as Darré was to spend months doing in 1922. He took his diploma in 1923, with good marks. In
many ways Backe was typical of the uprooted and dispossessed 'nouveau pauvre' of early 1920s Germany. He commented in his 1946 *Grosser Bericht* that 'lest this situation of an uprooted family appears particularly striking, in fact there are millions of Germans in a similar situation'.

His first experience of Germany, therefore, was one of defeat and bitterness. He felt 'deep disappointment' at the behaviour of the Germans, which was also a typical reaction for the returnee. He had hoped to find a community at least united in defeat, but instead saw 'egotism and materialistic strife ... the middle classes fighting among themselves,' and contemplated emigration. This sense of disillusionment and mutual rejection in a collapsing 'homeland' helped push Backe into radical and militant attitudes in his early political activities. He refused to join a political party during the twenties because he believed in a supra-party communal spirit. He clearly had a deep need to identify with a group, to operate within a closed community. His calls for sacrifice in the service of the nation, his emphasis on the value of self-denying behaviour, expressed the need to enlarge the self within a greater whole which is so common in the political drive and rhetoric of countries where the Protestant confessions are a prominent cultural feature. It is interesting to note that on the two occasions when this strong drive was denied in Backe, in 1918 and in 1946-7, his reaction was a self-punitive one: a desire to emigrate in 1918—and hence removal from the desired object, Germany—and thoughts of suicide in 1945, culminating in an actual suicide in 1947. Certainly, the draft testament he left behind is ample evidence that his suicide was motivated not by a sense of guilt or disillusionment with National Socialism, but with a world that he felt had betrayed his ideas.

Backe's first employers in Hanover were all acive Nazis, but he seems not to have thought of joining the NSDAP himself until he met Dr Ludolf Haase, then a medical student in Göttingen, in 1922. Backe agreed to join the SA, but still refused to join a Party; and Haase paid his subscription in secret. Backe had resented his inability to fight in the First World War, when his elder brother served in the German army, and he now threw himself into marching and bill-posting. But his role was not confined to strong-man: he soon became the most admired brain and ideological mentor for the Göttingen circle of activists. Haase, as a schoolboy before the First World War, had formed an anti-semitic group in Hanover, and continued distributing leaflets in 1918-22. Several members of this small group in a quiet agricultural area were later to hold high party office, and Haase later wrote, 'When one of our members ... founded the racial policy office of the NSDAP, this was no accident'. Backe, von Gronow, Meinberg and Gross, all held top posts in the Third Reich.

In the last chapter, the takeover of *Die Sonne* by the Skald Order in 1932 was mentioned. Haase was a founder member of this secret society, which was banned by the Nazis after 1933 because of its allegedly masonic nature. An undated secret report on the Skald written around 1936 mentions Haase and Gross, but not Backe, who was also a member, according to his widow, and Princess zur Lippe. Heydrich was later to investigate Backe because of the Skald link; he concluded, shortly before his assassination, that Backe was 'all right'. When Haase became a civil servant in 1942, Hitler had enquiries made, but not on finding that Haase worked under Backe, he told Heydrich that there was no need to worry: Backe's loyalty was legendary. Haase is rumoured to have approached Backe in 1933, when Backe became State Secretary under Daré, to pursue the aims of his secret society, to be told by Backe, 'I am not a rebel'.

Haase was galvanised by the radical, militant and anti-semitic rhetoric of the Munich Nazi in 1923, and formed a branch in Lower Saxony, which concentrated on 'good organisation and efficient personal leadership at all levels.' He aimed to bring together 'a group of really völkisch men ... round whom the masses would crystalise' when the right moment came. Backe was one of these leaders. He was the chief expert on Russia and racial policy. 'Not all our ideology came from books', wrote Haase; for among their sources of live information was 'PG Backe, who had a special knowledge of all Eastern racial questions'. Backe supplied the group with 'a knowledge of Russia, its men, its ... history, and its geography.' The group believed that Soviet rule in Russia could not last, and that in the welter of successor states that would arise from a dismembered Russia, Germany could seize land in the east, and German farmers migrate there in force. This was bluntly stated in 1923, in a speech calling for a new man as dictator to unite Germany, throw out the Poles and Czechs, prevent France from hindering Germany's rise. Social legislation, currency reform, and a new land law ... Our colonial future, however, lies in the east, where a new land beckons when Jewish rule in Russia should collapse.
Backe’s support for this aim was useful for the Gött ingen radical s. The nationalists were split on the question of Russia. As mentioned in chapter One, conservative nationalists as well as social democrats saw Germany’s only possible future in a pact with the other ‘rogue’ state, Russia; but Hitler’s criticism of the Treaty of Rapallo was that the Russians should ‘shake off their tormentors’ before a Treaty could be signed. Backe took a re alpolitik view rather than an idealistic one. Despite his contempt for the Russians, he recognised Russia’s potential in terms of raw materials and human resources. He sarcastically attacked the idea of a Russian-German war in 1925, when many nationalists supported the idea:

Who will put élite troops against Russia? France or England? No. It will be German troops who will be used to pull the chestnuts out of the fire. A war against the Soviets cannot be lightly undertaken. It would become the whole Russian nation engaging in a national fight for freedom against Western capital ... He should not become the enemy of the Russian people. Germany’s future lies in the east, economically, as well as politically. Currently, we cannot have close links with Soviet Russia, but that is unavoidable. Backe appears to have taken a radical stance on other matters, including anti-semitism and revolutionary methodology, although here again, caution should be used in using Haase where he is the only source of information. He supported the idea of a revolutionary élite, drawing heavily on Lenin’s What is to be Done? He rejected parliamentary tactics aimed at achieving power legally within the Weimar system. Whether or not to go for parliamentary power was a matter for considerable dissent within the early Nazi Party up to Strasser’s resignation in 1932, but Backe was not only hostile to ‘entryism’, but opposed to the Nazi belief in a mass movement. In his notes for a speech in 1923, he wrote of his preference for a minority élite who would form the leadership of a secret revolutionary group to further the revolutionary cause. The élite would of course represent the true feelings of the masses, as opposed to Bolshevism, where the minority had organised itself to oppose the will of the masses. Leaders of a truly völkisch movement would eventually incorporate the masses through a process of ‘organic development’. Typically, Backe went out of his way to praise those Soviet leaders whom he considered to be competent organisers and planners, as opposed to the more populist, intellectual and Jewish end of the spectrum. ‘Lenin, Rykov, Chicherin, Krylenko, Dzerzhinsky, are worthy of admiration. Unworthy: Trotsky, Kamenev, Zinoviev, Lunacharsky,’ etc.²⁰

Why was the Russian question so central to the ideology of the northern Nazi radicals in 1923–5? They considered the Greater Germany dream, the old nationalist aim of uniting all German-speaking peoples, as the ‘purest pacifism’. They demanded a ban on emigration to America, the incorporation of Flanders, Holland and Luxembourg in a common customs and currency union, and colonisation of the Russian borderlands. Backe, took pains to distinguish this plan from imperial adventurism, ‘no solution for the victors or the conquered,’ and presumably welcomed German settlers being accepted into Russia as benevolent improvers of the quality of life, and of the quality of Volk. Backe and Haase both advocated a strict eugenic policy, not to create a superior élite so much as to purge the nation of those suffering from hereditary defects. Their attitude to Jews seems to have been tougher than that of Fedor, Strasser, and other more urban-oriented Nazis. Although quoting approvingly the Eckhart-inspired lines in the 1925 Party Manifesto, ‘We will fight the Judeo-materialistic spirit within and outside ourselves’, Haase and Backe also warned that Jews would not be accorded the usual rights of foreign nationals within Germany, and that any alliance with Jews in other countries would be prevented, ‘and any return made impossible once and for all’. Backe’s strong will and polemical abilities, his tough attitude and comradeship, were prized in Gött ingen, and he was a great loss to the group when he dropped all political activity and moved to Hanover to work on a doctorate in agriculture. Haase commented in his memoirs that Backe had been especially ‘important during the early time of struggle, not only because of his sharp thinking and uncompromising stance, but because of his ability to create a rounded Weltanschauung’ and his ‘characteristic toughness, which so many Germans lacked.’²² At Hanover, Backe became research assistant to Professor Obst at the Technische Hochschule. Obst, who had worked with General Professor Karl Haushofer a year earlier, was a geo-politician whose book England, Europe and the World helped to stimulate Backe’s views on security and Germany’s need for a European trading zone which he expounded in his thesis. A plan to visit Russia as agricultural adviser for the Hanover Chamber of Agriculture fell through when the Russian Government vetoed Backe’s name: in 1927, his doctoral thesis was rejected on the grounds that it was a work of political science
rather than agriculture. Backe suspected political bias against him, and the political implications of the work were considerable, as Backe argued in his conclusion that the colonisation of Russia by Germany was a geo-political inevitability. When Obst was obliged against his will to dismiss Backe, he decided to ignore politics and concentrate on farming. After another year spent working for Obst and lodging only, Backe married the daughter of a Silexian industrialist, who had worked as an assistant to Obst, and who was herself a radical nationalist, who corresponded with Spengler, and knew the Bruckmanns. She strongly supported agrarian radicalism. His father-in-law provided enough capital to take on the tenancy of a neglected state-owned farm near the Harz mountains, where Backe was able to put his ideas into practice, using small-scale farm machinery, and consolidating and improving what had been a seven-field system. Although the rent was low, the venture coincided with the onset of the Depression, and the collapse in food prices.23

Between 1929 and 1931, when his first meeting with Hitler took place, he rejoined the SA. His wife recounts that he did this because his farm labourers were SA men, and he felt it his duty to join them, an interesting sidelight on noblesse oblige. Backe used to go with his men to nearby Braunschweig, where the forbidden brown shirt could be donned, and a march proceeded. In 1931, he stood as candidate for the NSDAP in the election to the Hanover Chamber of Agriculture, but lost in the second ballot to a candidate from the Landbund. In July, 1931, Backe had an article on Germany’s trade and agricultural problems published in the National-Socialist Zeitung Werner Willikens, a friend of Backe, already working with the NSDAP AD, showed Darré the article, who wrote enthusiastically to Backe, asking him to write for the AD. Despite the ‘strong impression’ that Hitler had made on Backe, he refused to become involved, giving as reasons his need to work on the farm, the economic crisis and his own lack of literary talent. Darré asked him to edit Ruhland’s works, and again Backe, who had not read the System of Political Economy, although he had enthusiastically quoted Ruhland in 1925, refused, through lack of time. His wife, who had read Darré’s two books with fervent admiration, wanted Backe to join the AD and become more active in the NSDAP. The two men exchanged attacks on the profit motive in agriculture (‘not reconcilable with the peasantry’) and jeered at recent English legislation on smallholdings.24

Backe had failed to formulate exact agricultural policies when he met Darré in 1931. The fact that Darré had formulated such policies, and was offering concrete solutions, meant that Backe could throw his energies into implementing Darré’s plan without being aware of any possible conflict of views. Here again, Backe’s need for a complete, rounded view of a given project was an important factor. His goals were immediate. Well rounded, well thought-out processes had to be followed by potent action and the necessary will to carry it through. In this sense, the two men complemented each other in the first few years of their joint activities. Backe’s failure to formulate policy was not because Backe had lost interest in agricultural policy during his years as a practising farmer, as the article published in 1931 which attracted Darré’s attention developed his belief that the world trade system was in a state of collapse, and with it agricultural productivity, in so far as it was geared to international markets: it was more a failure to consider smallholder’s interests. Backe’s insistence, Backe read Darré’s two books, and wrote in a second article that Darré’s suggested restructuring of German society around the small farmer was the only answer to the ‘social problem’. Darré was impressed by Backe’s points, laid out with a compulsive air of certainty, and asked Backe to visit a Weimar conference in October 1931, to instruct the agricultural department personnel in macro-economic matters.25

Backe refused the invitation. He felt little interest in ideas about self-governing corporations that were being examined at this period. Similarly, although he approved Ruhland’s criticism of the international commodity system, (‘so absolutely classic...banks and finance capital above all were the gainers from these events’), Ruhland’s proposal for agricultural syndicates made no appeal. Darré later decided (quite wrongly) that Backe’s lack of enthusiasm in the invitation meant that his later interest in the AD was spurious, and he wrote after the Second World War that Backe was infiltrated into the NSDAP by Ludolf Haase and the Skald. Indeed, he referred during the war to the ‘Hanover clique’, whenever Haase or Backe appeared near him in Berlin. This was a source of continual agitation to Backe, because of the investigation by Heydrich.

It was only after hearing Hitler speak to the SA at Braunschweig in the autumn of 1931 that Backe decided to visit Munich, and see what was happening there among the National Socialist agrarian activists.

In the first flush of Darré’s enthusiasm and energy, the slight friction over Ruhland was discounted. He was recruiting whatever talent he could find, to work in the AD and its nationwide branches. Nothing could have been more generous than his attitude to Backe, his respect
for Backe's polemical abilities, his encouragement and advice, both political and personal, and his acknowledgement of Backe's role in the early rise to power. In fact, if anything, he exaggerated Backe's abilities. Backe had a gift for stating a situation in terms which appeared to be cogent and analytical, but which, if scrutinised closely, turned out to consist of sweeping statements of principle, without much backing in argument or logic. His need for a superficially orderly thought-system reflected not 'pragmatism' but the need for a highly structured framework of ideas which would provide the certainties he needed. Nearly every memorandum and letter he wrote contained the words Klarheit and grundsätzlich; it hardly needs an elaborate exegetical or psychological analysis to guess that this virtual obsession with the need for mental clarity and a firm basis expressed its lack in Backe's make-up. Because of this, he could be influenced by potential leader figures. First Darré, then Hitler, held his allegiance in the NSDAP. When Darré's divergence from the National Socialist path became clear in the late 1930s, Backe had no difficulty in deciding which to choose.

His wholly misleading vein of certainty appeared when he finally visited Munich in January 1932. He heard Hitler address the assembled Gauleiters, and the GaAs agricultural advisers; many of whom Backe already knew from his old SA days. Hitler's speech stressed the importance of the agricultural sector to the German nation: 'Our highest aim is not only to win the city workers ... the NSDAP is not only a party of the cities, but is today the greatest peasant party,' a speech which impressed Backe, for a revealing reason: 'Hitler unified the entire political problem into one simple line.' Backe addressed the Landesgruppenführer, the agricultural cadre leaders, at the same conference, at Darré's suggestion, and spoke about world agriculture. In the discussion that followed, Backe was asked at the gap between the well-formulated, unified ideology presented by Hitler, and the 'lack of clarity' of Darré and his co-workers. This criticism was not made specifically, as he simply accused Darré's group of ignoring 'agriculture's real problems and the necessary measures'. But a look at his specific criticism of the agricultural department shows that what he was attacking was the lack of a single, basic ideological attitude. 'An all-embracing analysis of the forces active in economic Backe was lacking—a precondition for alleviating conditions on the land.' Instead of concentrating their ideas on the collapse of world economic relationships, he was disgusted to find the LBF discussing the Genossenschaften, the Landbund 'and other organisations, such as the Artamanen movement, tariffs, the importance of rent'. Backe's reaction reveals the inadequacies of his yearning for an integrative, holistic approach. The tactics adopted by the NSDAP AD were all-important to the eventual takeover of power. Each of these apparently trivial 'single issues' had to be carefully considered to see whether it was absorbable by the NSDAP or an irritant, and tactically the method paid off.

In order to play his part in Darré's programme of infiltrating the Agricultural Unions, Backe stood as National Socialist representative for election to the Prussian Agricultural Chamber, and became a member in April 1932. He disliked this episode. Contact with parliamentary methods reinforced his earlier contempt for them. 'German parliamentarianism will never carry out the necessary economic reforms,' he wrote.27

During 1933, the two men co-operated closely. The existence of a common Conservative enemy in the shape of Hugenberg, Minister of Economics and Agriculture, from January 1933 to July, when Darré took over, and von Rohr, Darré's most trenchant Conservative critic and Hugenberg's State Secretary, enabled Backe and Darré to make common cause in the fight to keep the AD going, and take over from Hugenberg. The Conservatives still had a majority in the Cabinet at this stage. Early in January 1933, Darré sent a telegram to Backe asking him to help lay the AD proposals before Hitler, in view of the worsening agricultural situation. Although agriculture was beginning to pull itself out of the long depression, few realised this at the time, and prices were rock bottom. The request gives an indication of Darré's lack of confidence in his own abilities to persuade Hitler, his reliance on Backe, but also his sense of security about his own position. Three weeks before the Nazi takeover of power in March 1933, the two men worked closely on the report, which was given to Hitler verbally at a meeting. Backe did most of the talking, as the most persuasive of Darré's staff, and Hitler approved a statement calling for the need for a 'total change of the agricultural marketing and production structure.' The AD staff sent a postcard to Ms Backe, which reads: 'Dear Ursula, everything went as it should. Ht. Your husband did very well, Willi of course the report was wonderful, Darré.28

Darré's single-mindedness in pursuit of the enemy was now turned against Hugenberg, whom he described as a 'blockhead', and von Rohr. He sent open letters to Chancellor Schleicher, using a polemical, reproachful, tough tone. Hugenberg rapidly passed a debt interest
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reduction law, which keys interest rates for farmers below two per cent, but this was not enough to prop up his position. He then, although not previously known for anti-semitism, made a strongly-worded speech on foreign policy and racial matters in London, during the summer of 1933, possibly in an attempt to maintain his position in the face of Nazi attacks. However, the conservatives, shocked at the speech, asked Hitler for Hugenberg's resignation, which Hitler was happy to grant, as it removed a powerful member of the DNVP from the cabinet. Von Rohr was another threat, typifying the conservative opposition to the proposed agrarian legislation.29

The planned new marketing system, for example, was forcefully opposed by him, because von Rohr realised that the end of Brüning's draconian deflationary measures should see an upturn in economic confidence, and that agriculture should share in the upturn. He feared that to introduce rigidity into the agricultural system by limiting mobility of land use, restricting credit and controlling prices would prevent peasants reaping the expected benefit. Another area of dispute was the AD plan to divide up large estates and settle peasants on them. Hugenberg, especially, opposed this. A legislative basis for this proposition already existed in the Weimar Constitution, which permitted the seizure of land without compensation 'in the interests of the State and the community'. In order to protect himself, Hugenberg went some way to meet the Nazi radicals. He installed a Reichskommissar to oversee dairy production, a measure of which Backe approved, as the 'first attempt at controlled marketing', and a 'success'. Hugenberg pressed for his debt legislation to be retrospective. While this attempt to defuse hostility between himself and the radical Nazis was proceeding, von Rohr also kept a low profile, writing enthusiastic speeches about Blood and Soil with no apparent qualms, during the spring of 1933, but attacking Darré and his policies during cabinet meetings.30

However the AD, led by Darré, were determined to 'break into the ministry', knowing that their survival as a group of well trained, highly motivated agricultural experts and planners depended on it. The NSDAP was waiting for them to put a foot wrong; their relative independence was feared and coveted. Hugenberg, leader of the DNVP, and a millionaire in his own right, owner of a chain of newspapers and film companies, seemed a dangerous enemy. Darré looked for support among the peasant community: 'Send your former leaders to the devil. What have they ever done for you? Suffering and hunger, hunger and suffering,' he wrote in an article that provoked the National

Landowners' Association to complain to Funk of its strident tone. He sent a telegram to Hitler on 4th April, calling for a radical turn to government policies. Looking back after the war, Darré seemed the logical choice for minister30 but at the time he had to force his way through to government level.

One means was the Prussian parliament, which provided Darré's first victory against Hugenberg.33 In April 1933, Darré and Backe met him to try to win his support for the proposed new marketing laws, and to discuss the new Prussian Inheritance Law. The latter was to provide a 'dry run' for a national inheritance law. Hugenberg refused to give way on either proposition. He disapproved of institutionalising controlled prices, and agreed with von Rohr on the potential problems of the Inheritance Law, which would immobilise land transactions. Goering, Prime Minister of Prussia, was approached instead.34 Hans Karel, the Prussian Minister of Justice, 'seized the initiative' on 15th May, 1933, after a conference with Willikens, and pushed the Prussian Inheritance Law through the Prussian Parliament against the opposition both of Hugenberg and the Prussian Minister of Agriculture.35

This was a triumph for both Darré and Backe, who had jointly drafted the law, and Darré later wrote generously of Hans Karel's role in 'performing a historical service'.36 On 4th May, 1933, Darré was elected the chairman of the council of all agricultural organisations, the Justiz Vorstand, when Darré had been job hunting in 1928. Hugenberg promised Backe that he would be State Secretary as soon as Darré had control of the Ministry for Agriculture. Backe was still his 'closest co-worker'. He wrote that 'Darré was wonderful', although he found many of Darré's personal staff inadequate, there either because of their name and status, or because of past services to the Party. Darré's ability to make rapid decisions and think ahead was impressive, and Backe felt that at last he had worked at something important with the Prussian Inheritance Law.37 In fact, the Prussian Inheritance Law had to some extent legalised existing north German primogeniture customs. The real problems lay in the future, when the law was extended to areas of Germany that had known the Code Napoleon for nearly 130 years, and were used to multiple sub-division of the land among the heirs.

Between May and June 1933, Hitler was pressed by Schacht, von Papen and Hindenburg to retain Hugenberg. 'For Hitler, my opposition to Hugenberg is a problem: I have the peasants, while Hugenberg has the position of power that he built up,' wrote Darré. Hindenburg invited Darré to visit him in order to ask him not to 'destroy the great estates'. The visit went well socially, as the two men
found a common enthusiasm for the Hanoverian horse; but nothing was agreed on the vexed issue of land tenure. However, as mentioned earlier, Hugenberg's attempt to extradite the Nazis in his London speech alarmed his fellow conservatives, and in June 1933 he resigned from the Government, giving Darre and the AD a free hand. On 14th July 1933, the Reichsgesetz über die Neubildung Deutscher Bauern, the Law for the New Formation of a German Peasantry, was passed, giving the AD its new guise of Agricultural Policy Office a free hand to organise peasant settlement. However, it appeared that a bargain had been struck behind Darre's back. Despite his apparently powerful position as head of the Ministry of Agriculture and national peasant leader, the Law for the New Formation of the German Peasantry limited settlement to land which was available for purchase on the open market, plus land owned by the state, in need of reclamation. Nor were the necessary funds forthcoming from the Finance Ministry.

The National Inheritance Law increased pressure on the settlement department. The younger sons of those farmers now subject to the rules of primogeniture had been promised new farms and smallholdings as compensation for their loss of prospects. Nonetheless, the AD refused to be deterred by the stumbling block over funds. They hoped that the shortage of money would be only temporary, and during August and September Backe and Willikens worked steadily on the draft law. 'As peasant leader Darre is splendid, he has instinctive common sense,' Backe wrote in August. Even a year later, his wife could note in her diary, 'Herbert says Darre's work will be seen as the great success of National Socialism ... the RNS staff are realists itself ... without Darre's vision and large-scale political aims, nothing could have been achieved.'

After enthusiastic discussion, Goslar was chosen as the new peasant capital. Goslar was an early medieval town in the foothills of the Harz mountains, the capital of the Holy Roman Empire in the tenth century. Its history as a mining, farming, independent city state conformed to Darre's ideal of the republican freeman, and suited his admiration of the Renaissance city states. He knew Goslar from his sister's schooldays, and his mother was buried there. Furthermore, the countryside around the little town was unspoilt; gently rolling hills where sheep grazed, while to the south stretched the Harz mountains. He decided on Goslar as a suitable centre for the reburth of peasant Germany after examining photographs of this serene landscape. Peasant festivals were held on the slopes of the Buckeberg, rallies attended by up to half a million farmers, and often addressed by Hitler. The National Food Estate's meetings were held in the hall beneath an old hotel, over the town hall. It still has its medieval paintings on the beams. The dream was to make Goslar the centre of a new peasants' international; a green union of the northern European peoples. Here he made speeches condemning the 'Führer' principle and attacking imperial expansion. Visitors flocked to him. Organic farming enthusiasts from England now welcomed Darre's plans, and admired the hereditary tenure legislation. Representatives from Norwegian and Danish peasant movements joined the conferences on 'Blood and Soil'. The real heart of the middle of agricultural ministry, National Food Estate, NSDAP Agricultural Office, Peasant Leader's Office and personal Minister's office lay in the National Peasant Council's Keeper of the Seal, and this too centred on Goslar. Here, the personal files of all members, who included the Reichsführer, Gauleiters and all Landesbauernführers, were kept, together with correspondence with the far-flung, decentralised National Food Estate offices. The first holder of the post was an old Halle friend of Darre's, Richard Arzumer, who was killed in a car crash in 1937. He was succeeded by a Gauleiter Eggeling.

But as early as 1933, the first hint that Darre's large-scale aims might become out of step with those around him had already appeared. Economically, he is inclined to erect ambitious intellectual structures—getting things basically right, because he can see ahead, but the flight of his thoughts is too quick. He sees at once aims which could only be reached in a century or in decades'. Backe's assessment was right. Darre's very ability to stick to his radical views, which had been such an asset in the Kampfzeit, was now becoming a liability. He refused to admit that the revolutionary time was over, and that for his companions the time for consolidating power and power bases had come. When Darre and Backe visited Schmit at the Ministry of Economics in early September 1933, to discuss the proposed Debt Relief Law, Backe found Darre's unexpected remarks about trade policy and tariffs an embarrassment. While he regarded Schmit and Posse as politically 'unsound', he sided with them when Darre expounded his radical proposals to de-industrialise Germany, to leave the cities to decay, and to concentrate resources on the land.

However, Darre still supported Backe as von Rohr's successor. Von Rohr opposed the Inheritance Law in a Cabinet discussion of October 22nd, 1933, at which Darre's survival as Minister came into question. It was in part due to Backe's persuasive lobbying of Schacht and other
opponents that the Inheritance Law went through, and Darré dedicated the first copy of the National Law Journal containing the EHG to 'my dear Backe, to whom the birth of this law owes so much'. Both men considered this law, and the National Food Estate Law, which erected a marketing board to supervise and purchase all primary and secondary agricultural produce, as the 'liquidation of Hardenberg' (Darré), the 'complete demolition of the last 150 years' (Backe), and so on. 'The Inheritance Law is the deathblow to Reaction, and all that is implied by the large landowner [Grossgrundbesitz].'

To some extent, this was wishful thinking. What Darré had done was to give small to medium sized farms (originally seven to 75 hectares) the same legal protection against foreclosure and sale as the large entailed estates had. This did not make their competitive position stronger. Darré had not even begun to strike the deathblow at the Junkers which he sought, and which the estate owners themselves were beginning to fear. So he managed to pass the Entailed Estates Law (Fidei-Kommissgesetz) which dissolved the remaining 1400 or so entailed estates. This act, by 'ending the feudal millennium', introduced the capitalist one, rather than the allegedly idyllic pre Bauerlegung era. By removing all restrictions on use, pension obligations, life interests, and other barriers to land mobility and alienability, fully capitalist relationships were introduced to entailed land-holdings. Junker power did weaken, but this was due to the complete shift in power structures under the Third Reich. The new armed force, the SS, the increase in meritocratic ideas, the attempt to open up the civil service, and the increase in government posts, all demanded a more open recruitment policy. The middle management class, the foremen, the scientists, the NCO and Major levels in the army, these produced Hitler's most devoted followers in the 1930s. Agricultural legislation by itself played little part, despite Darré's sincere intentions.

In any case, entailed estates were a symbol rather than a real force: they formed a numerically tiny minority of estates over 500 hectares, although a higher proportion were in noble hands. Here Darré was a victim of the current preoccupations of his time about the backward, feudal nature of the Junkers, while at the same time attributing Junker power to the Hardenburg reforms of 1811-16, a myth that persists to this day. The result was a strange kind of shadow play. Although Darré no longer represented a real threat to large landowners, once his land division plans were passed over, he was still feared. He attacked the Junkers fiercely in 1934 at Starkow, to the enthusiastic applause of 30,000 peasants. He complained of an "agricultural plutocracy" in a speech to the German Agricultural Society in 1933. In January 1935, a new Settlement Act was passed, which increased the pre-emptive powers of government land purchasing agencies, although not increasing their funds. Small wonder, then that Darré was feared by the conservaties, and admired by his fellow radicals, despite the lack of real result.

Once the 1933 legislation was passed—in the case of the National Food Estate, with remarkable ease, considering the still somewhat Conservative cabinet—new problems emerged. Backe's enthusiasm began to wane. The creation of the marketing system had been satisfying: the job of enforcing it was more difficult.

The first obstacle was the heavy debt burden carried by German farms. Backe had planned a Umschuldungsgesetz, which would have divided up agriculture's debt burden equally between all the Erbschaft, so this was too much for a partly Conservative cabinet to swallow, and the law was thrown out on 14th October, 1933. Backe was mystified by the hostility to the draft law. Farms in the east were three times more in debt than their equivalents in the west. Eastern farms which had invested heavily in machinery and increased productivity were the worst hit. He failed to understand why farmers in the west should object to 'sharing the burden' of their brothers in the east, and taking over their debts at a low rate of interest. When the law was dropped, and a plan to fix interest rates at two per cent adopted, Backe observed critically that this showed that Hitler had dropped his corporate ideals, and was beginning to think from a nation-state viewpoint.

Other difficulties arose. The staff needed to control production levels and distribution was a huge expense which was funded by the farmers themselves. Furthermore, Germany had begun 1933 with low food reserves, and although the 1933 harvest was good, that of 1934 was poor. Darré's reaction was to ask Schacht for foreign currency to buy fodder for livestock, to enable the 'fats gap' to be closed (Germany produced about 50% of her fat requirement). He was to wage a three-year battle of speeches, letters and memorandum against Schacht, who was determined to avoid inflationary measures. He attacked Schacht for economic liberalism at the 1934 Bauerlegung. He told Hitler that Schacht was to blame for problems with foreign trade. However, Hitler received these tirades with passive inaction, which became active resistance in mid-1934. Goering and other party leaders began to criticise the marketing corporation for lack of co-operation, a hostile attitude, and inefficiency. Darré's request for a further price
increase for livestock producers was refused by Hitler. The request involved a loss of face for Darré, since he had fended off a previous concerted attack by a group of Gauleiters by telling Hitler that cereal prices (and hence bread prices) should not be raised, knowing that Hitler supported a policy of cheap food for the workers.

Darré and Backe had requested this meeting with Hitler, which took place on 5th July, 1934. Darré was concerned with prices for producers, while the attacks on him concentrated on consumer prices. At this stage, one of life's basic problems had emerged in all its stark reality; that you cannot have a policy of dear food and cheap food at the same time. During the changeover to distribution controlled by the RNS, wholesale-retail margins shot up temporarily, as reports up to 1936 show. It has been argued that official figures do not reflect the true rise in retail food prices. The consumer is not interested in Hitler's own economic views, but was blamed on Darré's inability to interest Hitler sufficiently in agricultural problems. Goering's plan was an attack on the RNS ethos, since the agricultural advisers were meant to substitute education and advice for the self-correcting mechanisms of economic competition. Both Backe and Darré smarted under Goering's attacks. In an attempt to find allies, Darré was even driven to compromise with Ley, in 1935, in the so-called 'Bückerberger Agreement'. According to this arrangement, the National Food Estate joined the German Labour Front, and replaced the Labour Front's agricultural labour section. They agreed to contribute funds in exchange for sharing some of their welfare arrangements, such as supplementary unemployment insurance, free holidays, and so on. This move was unpopular with farmers, who were not anxious for their agricultural labourers to join an external and powerful body. Goering fell on this sign of weakness, and drafted a law whose effect would have been to dissolve the National Food Estate, under the guise of simplifying the corporation's structure.

Backe was taken by surprise by Darré's vacillation over Goering's move. He waited for Darré to go to Hitler and demand Goering's dismissal, and when he did not, decided that Darré was 'a flop: internally weak and insecure, and lacking in courage'. Backe himself had moved away from Darré's long-term and supra-political aim of a peasant-based Germany, which would 'lead to the racial renewal' of the German people. The 'Battle for Production' had been launched in November 1934, and this led him back to his main interests of the early 1920s, the belief that Germany's agricultural problems were inextricably bound up in the world-wide economic system. He wrote
The Nazi Minister

to 1936 that he was searching for 'an economic principle that would embrace the whole of the economy, not just agriculture', and tried to define his ideas by studying economists, such as Sombart. His concern was about Germany's lack of self-sufficiency in raw materials and some foods. In order to create a new economic system, Germany had to be able to survive without dependence on multi-lateral foreign trade. This was not so much because of boycotts against Germany, the loss of colonies, etc., but because Backe saw this as the 'new' system, a 'new' idea, into which Germany, first of all nations, had been forced by post-war circumstances. To define the 'new idea' precisely proved more difficult, but as it was seen by Backe and his circle a matter more of spirit and will than of pedantic definitions, the imprecision did not matter.55

At the highest party levels, Backe's success in the fight for higher productivity was noted, and his aggressive nationalism approved. Backe was sociable, unlike Darré: a good companion with whom to drink and talk for an evening. He was loyal, intelligent, and above personal ambition. In 1936, he was appointed agricultural representative to Goering's Council of the Four Year Plan.

The genesis of this appointment was ironical. Darré had asked the Ministry of Economics in March 1936 to set up an enquiry into foreign currency, raw materials and food, as part of his battle against Schacht and the share of foreign reserves allocated to agricultural imports. Goering was put in charge of the investigation, with Schacht as a last-minute substitute for Bloemerg. This 'fixed' the committee, while Schacht wrote a memorandum on foreign exchange on 23rd April 1935. Early in May, Hitler ordered Goering to form a new committee on raw materials to examine national autarky. Both Darré and Backe attended the first meeting of this committee, at which 19 Ministers were present.

In June, Parchmann, an official in the Forestry Office, and a keen admirer of Backe's, recommended him to Goering as a gifted economist. Backe now represented the agricultural sector on Goering's committee on the organisation of raw materials and currency, which met on 6th July, while on the 15th, he was formally nominated to the Council. The Second Four Year Plan Council was convened on 18th October 1936, and Backe was appointed agricultural representative. This marked a shift of power from Darré to Backe. For other ministries, figure-heads were co-opted to sit between the council and the ministers, but by placing the gifted and articulate Backe in this role, Darré had effectively been demoted. 'The personal union between Backe and the Food and Agriculture Committee means that (there)

will always be a lever against me', wrote Darré, who pushed first a National Food Estate novelty, then himself for the post. He added in his diary, in his first criticism of Backe, 'Now Goering will understand what I have to put up with. Backe's Russian nature ... talk, talk all night, never action'.56

Were Darré's fears for his position alone? One problem with tracing these power plays and strategies is that it is easy to assume that personal position alone was at stake. But here Darré was aware that he was virtually the sole 'bearer of the peasant ideal. If he went, there would be nobody to take his place. However it was also obvious that if he stayed, he would be a lone voice. The day of drastic social reshaping, of revolutionary fervour, was gone, and ideas of ignoring the worker interest in favour of the peasantry were not popular, especially with Hitler. Well aware of Gouletier hostility to the RNS, his special concern, Darré feared that Backe might be prepared to renounce his relative independence and corporate structure. Certainly, the Four Year Plan, with its centralised planning and war economy, was a death blow for peasant socialism.57 Backe realised that a modernised and highly organised economy was the natural development for the 'new Germany'. He was attracted by the prospect of a German empire, while Darré recognised the 'preference for an empire over internal strength and defeat for his beliefs. However, he had lost his touch for political campaigns. Not realising this, he kept hitting out at his foes, often using irrelevant quibbles about competence that other ministers found tiresome. He was perhaps vain enough to want to cling to office, despite the expected disaster, but not sufficiently vain to lay aside his beliefs for the sake of ambition.

The constant arguments and frustration affected Backe's health, already weakened by his hardships in youth, and he spent some time in a sanatorium for heart cases. Goering became concerned at the extent to which his usefulness was affected by the disagreements within the ministry, and told Backe to return to Berlin to discuss the matter. Backe's main complaints at the ensuing meeting were that Darré could not control his staff, who were pretty useless anyway, and that Darré had no understanding of economic questions. He forcefully criticised Darré's indecision and vacillation, his lack of judgment, and his tetchiness. Goering was obviously tempted by the idea of getting rid of Darré. He mused that it would be a mistake to assume that the National Food Estate had the whole-hearted support of the peasantry—even Himmler, Darré's great friend, would agree to that. However, he finally
decided, regretfully, that it would be impossible to sack a Nazi minister without damaging the reputation of the other Nazi ministers.58

While Darré sat at home nursing an Achilles tendon strained in a 400 metres race, Backe visited Himmler at Tegernsee, in September 1936. He found him ‘impressive, but hummulous and tense’. Himmler repeated Göring’s point about the need for unity as far as the public were concerned. A lack of unity had been the rock on which all such movements had founded in the past, and he saw it as his special task to maintain unity whatever the cost. After Himmler stressed Darré’s past services to the party, the fact that ‘he had been absolutely necessary for the movement’, Backe cooled down his complaints. He now directed his attack to Darré’s subordinates, winning Himmler’s favour in this by accusing them of wanting to raise agricultural prices—a move Hitler opposed (‘Himmler especially impressed’). Himmler ended the session by promising to have a word with Darré, and warning Backe against Moritz, one of Darré’s staff members, because he was suspected of being Jewish.59

Darré heard about these visits, and responded vigorously, but soon found that it was one thing to lash out in 1931, attacking the Landbund, attacking Die Täi, and the Stahlhelm because of its Masonic connections, and quite another to go for the top Nazi leaders in 1936. He could not even protect his own men. One Kreisau agent was dismissed and imprisoned for six months in 1935 for repeating an allegation heard at a Goslar Peasant Festival that Blomberg and most of the senior army officers were Freemasons.60

For Darré, it was a reversal to the 1926 days when he sent secret reports on corruption and treachery to unconcerned, uninterested committee members. His judgment had gone. For example, in response to a purely formal note of condolence from Göring (Darré was bedridden for several months in 1936) he replied with inappropriately condescending congratulating Göring on his progress with the Four Year Plan, assuring him of his support, and promising him the benefit of his advice whenever necessary. He then set down his considered judgment of Backe’s faults. That he should do so to Göring, a Backe supporter and keen opponent of himself, shows a lack of common sense, and suggests a considerable isolation from ordinary human relationships. Unlike Backe’s letters, Darré’s outpourings were smoothly written and articulate, drafted, redrafted and polished, but their contents were painfully misplaced and misdirected. Darré may have realised this to some extent: there is an air of justifying himself before posterity, regardless of the effect on his correspondent.61

In his three-page attack on Backe, he praised his ‘academic intelligence’, but criticised him for a lack of political awareness, this supposedly a result of Backe’s Russian upbringing. The core of the current argument was that Göring had asked Backe to collect some statistical material from the RNS, and Darré, unable to produce it, had blown into a rage. He had a genuine defence; collation of statistics had been handed over to the National Statistics Office in order to avoid duplication of effort. Peasants had complained that they were financing a purely governmental activity via ‘their’ corporation. Each point that Darré made in his own defence was logical, and, taken in isolation, even relevant, but the absurdity of writing a droning, 16-page letter to a busy Minister, one who was not noted for his tendency to study documents closely, and one who would certainly not support the writer on the matter concerned, displays, more clearly than all Darré’s letters at this time, the reasons for his growing isolation.62

He drafted his letters shut up alone in an office, insisting on the best standard of typing, just as he insisted that his SS bodyguard should always be the prescribed military distance behind him as he went to his office. But contemporary photos and newreel film show a soft-shelled, uncertain exterior that could not have fooled his contemporaries.

Backe’s visit to Himmler at Tegernsee had occurred at a time when Hitler was drafting the drive for economic self-sufficiency which was later to become the Four Year Plan directive of 18th October 1936. While Backe’s appointment divided the Ministry of Agriculture staff, the memorandum of 4th September 1936 united them in a belief that Hitler was at last relinquishing the shreds of the market economy that had persisted since 1933. Darré exulted that Hitler had ‘made a thorough-going attack on economic liberalism which left Schacht perplexed and helpless’, while Backe heard from Paul Körner of the Ministry of Economics on 7th September, announcing that Göring had received ‘new guidelines for all our work’ from Obersalzberg. Both men saw Hitler’s action as expressing a commitment to the gebundene wirtschaft, and the imminent break-up of the agrarian radical was halted. Backe felt that Hitler’s speech of 4th September—‘We are not concerned with a bit of butter here, or more eggs there, our first duty is to ensure that the broad masses of our people can work and serve, and protect them against the horrible suffering of unemployment’—was a ‘wonderful vindication of three years’ hard work’. Even when addressing the Wehrmacht, Hitler took the opportunity to emphasise the Socialist element, and Darré extracted the juicy bits for Landpost.
No nationalism can really exist right now which is not determined in a Socialist way by the Volks community. And no one is a true National Socialist for whom the emphasis fails to lie on the word 'Socialist'. Here, in this concept, is what lends impetus to our era.83

Hitler's apparent rejection of economic liberalism temporarily consoled Daré for Bace's rise to power, and both men had high expectations of the proposed Four Year Plan. Daré hoped that Goering, led by Friedrich List. The weakening world trade system, the growing threat of sanctions against Germany, seemed to make autarky inevitable. 'He whom the world rejects must reject in return—because in the world economy, goods can only be exchanged against goods', wrote Bace. However, this simple law held good within Germany, too, and Goering's management of the Four Year Plan failed to be the expected bonanza for the agricultural sector. The council was not the expert committee of unbiased technocrats which was the core of National Socialist economic ideals. Bace complained that because of Goering's 'optimistic dictatorialism', many important decisions made on paper round the council table were never put into effect. The 'same old party hack' were appointed, instead of the council of experts. Furthermore, Goering's views of agricultural priorities were affected by an apparently trivial matter: his devotion to the chase. Constant complaints from farmers whose lands had been damaged by hunting landed on Goering's desk. This infuriated Goering, and gave him no reason to share the Ministry of Agriculture's commitment to a successful class of small farmers. Goering, who had taken charge of the Forestry Office, did create nature reserves and landscape protection areas in Germany, many of which still exist. But his lack of sympathy towards the agricultural sector was affected also by his dislike of Daré, whom he considered an impractical mystic, Daré's opposition to the large landowners, of whom Goering was one, and, perhaps more importantly, by his realisation that Hitler had lost interest in the peasantry.84

Bace's own ideas for improving Germany's food supply, including land reclamation, the introduction of fish farms, increased mechanisation, artificial fertiliser use, and so on, seldom received more than a bored response around Goering's council table. It was impossible, he complained, to interest Hitler in silo building, or the need for modernised dairy production. At one showpiece event, the International Dairy Conference of August 1937, attended by academic

delegater from all over the world, Goering made a speech that left a distasteful impression on the autarkic agrarian radicals:

No country can withdraw today from the world economic system. No country can ever say again, we decline the world economy, and are going to live and produce for ourselves alone.85

Nonetheless, Bace could share in the vision of a strong new Germany, and had enough in common with the top Nazi leadership to be able to co-operate with them in war preparations. Daré could still produce sensible, if long, policy documents on productivity and other practical issues, but his known belief in de-industrialisation and massive social change made it inevitable that he would be passed over by Hitler and Goering. If he had not begun to undergo a serious deterioration in personality at this time, Bace, though, was admired and while nobody was prepared to listen seriously to his proposals, there was a general gut conviction that Bace, being a practical sort of man, could de-finitely produce food when it became necessary. How, precisely, would be his problem. Bace responded emotionally to this expectation: dutifulness and the need to serve, to belong, drove him on. 'I have to force myself to work harder and harder, because I feel the necessity of achievement,' he wrote revealingly. 'But Daré lacks this discipline. I still have something to achieve, and I must live towards it ... I have to go this way, even if the decay and ruin of my former travelling companion Daré means that he can no longer walk with me.86

But Daré had not yet chosen the path to total retreat. On his return from a long illness in January 1937, he appealed for loyalty. He was aware of the problems of a division of authority, which had been brought about by Bace's role in the Four Year Plan council. The fragile network of authority which strung together the RNS, the Ministry of Agriculture and the peasant leader depended on the fact that one man headed all three. Daré's first act back in the office was to circulate a memorandum calling for unity and support to Bace and his colleagues. The support did not materialise, not because Daré's stuff disliked him, but because they were genuinely perplexed as to whom to obey. Several meetings called by Daré in February 1937 broke up in disagreement, sometimes angrily dismissed by him. For example, one meeting was convened to set up a working party to discuss the increases in productivity demanded by the plan. The group decided
that the marketing corporation was the most suitable instrument with its established local network of farming experts. But Backe then announced that while he could accept Darré as chief in his (Backe’s) capacity as State Secretary, he could not do so as a member of the General Council, and that this should be clarified as a preliminary to any action which might be taken. Darré, with some justice, remarked that one could not have two ministers running the same ministry, and dismissed the meeting. Darré was now retreating into the National Food Estate, which he saw as a bulwark against economic liberalism, that enemy to Blood and Soil and the peasant ethic. Any attack on his own authority was seen as an attack on its crucial role. He had the support of the lower-level staff here, but proposals for improving its efficiency were ignored by the four State Secretaries. It is an interesting comment on the nature of the totalitarian dictatorship of the Third Reich that a man with so many offices, titles and apparent power was as unable to enforce cooperation from his civil service equivalents as would be a minister in a democratic government. Darré argued that agriculture faced problems that were insoluble because of extraneous factors. Two bad harvests running had caused concern to the army. Germany’s balance of trade was worsening, and rearment was causing a shortage of agricultural labour. No marketing system in the world could cope with a shortage of land, men, machines and of produce. Nor could these evils he remedied without structural change at the top; the policies of Schacht and Goering would have to be altered.

Given his basic premises, this was a justified analysis. But Backe considered the demand to be wholly unrealistic. Darré responded that to attempt reform within an unsustainable political structure was unrealistic. The result was that both men began first to suspect, then to despise the other. While attacks from other party organs could still produce unity (for example, Goering’s proposal for a grain monopoly in July 1937 found a united defence), more fundamental divisions between Darré and the Nazi Party were beginning to surface. Backe tended to confine his criticisms to Darré’s character, not understanding the psychology of a man who could feel defeated from the outset, yet be unable to retire. He blamed Darré for not approaching Hitler more often when the RNS came under fire, attributing this difference to moral cowardice. He decided that Darré was probably afraid of being ‘caught out’ in factual questions, and preferred an isolation which Backe believed was damaging the National Food Estate’s already precarious position.

It is true that Darré liked to rely on Backe to produce telling statistics at short notice. On a visit to Italy before the war, Mussolini asked both men what proportion of Germany’s population were peasants. It was Backe who returned the figure, one, after all, crucial to all Darré’s policies. Mussolini, incidentally, was horrified at the answer. How could a nation produce enough food for itself if only 25% of its nation were peasants, he asked rhetorically. But Darré’s hesitation about approaching Hitler over the head of other Reichsleiter was because he had never enjoyed Hitler’s close confidence and trust since the first meeting with him at Saaleck. At root, Darré was a one-issue man, and he liked to use Backe as his front man, because he knew how committed Backe was ideologically and emotionally, to National Socialism, which he perceived as Hitler’s attempt to implement the ‘New Idea’ which he thought had germinated in the apparent collapse of Western capitalism after the First World War. This entailed a belief that the survival of the National Socialist power structure was all-important, while Darré retained sufficient objectivity to criticise the path Germany was following. He had, after all, made a conscious decision to use the NSDAP for his own beliefs back in 1930, and behind his depression and lethargy of 1936-7, the flood of quarrelsome memoranda, the endless drafts for letters designed to rescue inconspicuous personal points of honour, lay his growing realisation that he had made a terrible mistake.

His very successes of 1931-3 proved ruinous to his later political manoeuvres. They gave him the impression that forthright aggression would always triumph. The Christian Landbund leadership, the Raiffeisen co-operatives, and all the other bodies which had fallen like ninepins under the combination of his infiltration programmes and peasant discontent, were a different problem from the Nazi leadership. Men who had been demoralised by war-time defeats and post-war events, and who lived in the expectation of failure, could be bluffed into defeat; Himmler, Goering and Hitler, with a record of success and an ethic of complete ruthlessness, could not. Darré found that by 1937, with the peasant vote no longer needed, he had lost his power base. His wishes were circumvented or simply ignored.

Yet in many ways, this man, regarded now as a complete mystic, a fantasist, a romantic and a dreamer, was fundamentally more clear-sighted than the Nazis. He had never fitted in easily with institutions and structures, and was unable to regard them as important. Probably he underrated the value of the cohesion, continuity and security that can arise from such bodies, but then that would have been a conservative position, and Darré was not a conservative. He had seen
political frameworks undergo revolution, not just in 1933 but in 1918-1919. They were not sacred. Radical change had occurred through what seemed to him the general recognition of pressing necessity, and he saw no reason why it should not happen again, when such a change was clearly necessary to produce the desired effect. Governments were merely man-made, and subject to variation at human will; the laws of agricultural productivity, of historical development, were not.

An example of this attitude is Darré’s apparently irrelevant canvassing of the need for organic farming during the 1930s and 1940s. Backe was irritated by Darré’s insistence on a long-term policy to improve the humus content of Germany’s soil (‘Darré muttering about organic farming’), and continued to call for nitrogenous fertiliser to be made available for agriculture. Supply failed to improve. Nitrogen was actually a net export during the war, and productivity developed after a war-time peak of 1917-18. The long-term programme of soil improvement could have been put into effect in the late 1930s, and helped agricultural production during the straitened war years.

Another ideological divide became apparent in the emergence of Germany’s territorial ambitions. Although it might seem obvious in hindsight that National Socialist Germany would be forced to seek foreign conquests to obtain raw materials, to fulfill party promises, to relieve inflationary pressures—Darré seems to have believed that he could influence the party away from its militarist as well as its urban elements, perhaps because his point of contact in early Nazi days had been the peasant-oriented Thuringian branch. Darré was not to support the invasion of Russia, and he was equally shocked by theRibbentrop-Molotov Pact, which he thought gave too much strategic land and railway access to Russia, and displayed over-Machiavellian cunning on Hitler’s part. Darré protested to Hitler in 1937 when the latter began to talk of his Russian ambitions: he would confine settlement projects to German territory, together with settling East Prussia and the Baltic area more heavily with German farmers. ‘The Ostsie is our imperium’, he argued, and was an early supporter of the return of the ethnic Germans from Russia for German settlement.

He saw the Four-Year Plan as a ‘blow to liberal economic thinking’ faltered when the link between autarky and preparations for war became clear. War meant the ‘non-agricultural economy’. In 1936, the outcome of what was seen as a choice between full-scale ‘foreign adventurism’ and the controlled economy seemed uncertain, and Darré speculated as to whether Goering would go one way or the other. But when policy appeared more defined, Darré wrote that he would ‘lay aside my earlier source of strength, the belief that I was working for a German Revolution, as an idealistic Utopia’, and in April 1939, ‘As a result of our foreign policy, there is such a brutal, heavy industrial economic imperialism abroad, which makes one anxious for Blood and Soil ideals—Germany a colossus with feet of clay ... the Protectorate will be a failure without some common tie of blood [Blut und Boden]’. These are phrases which spell out clearly the inherent opposition of national to imperial ideas.

On the other hand, although Darré had fairly consistently conceptualized his ideal state, and could see where Nazi Germany’s developments opposed it, he had failed to think through the problems of achieving that ideal state while not destroying the ideals in the process. The problems of revolutionary aims versus revolutionary methods has perturbed political revisionaries from Plato to Lenin, and is too large a problem to analyse here. Nonetheless, it is fair to ask exactly where Darré thought the ‘Baltic’ ended, and what kind of struggle he envisaged in order to gain control of it. How did he imagine the Ostsie was going to be made available to German peasants without creating the necessary tools for achieving the task? How was war to be induced to acquisition of the Baltic? Not just factories, tractors, nitrogen, tanks, aircraft, but the war machine capable not merely of conquest but of the resettlement of an already occupied territory, together with the sustenance and subsequent development of the settlers—all were to be provided from a home base poor in raw materials. It should have been clear that the very process of conquest would have corrupted the conquerors; that the men who were to carve out a living from the land for the sake of Blood and Soil would have found it hard to resist the spoils of war. The very faults that Darré had diagnosed in German society, the unco-operative, vulpine competitiveness, the tendency to retreat to a deliberately unintuitive bureaucracy, the loss of faith and sense of defeat among German farmers, could only be enhanced by his prescriptions.

There were three areas where Darré was prepared to ‘go to Hitler’—if he could force him to receive him—and these were peasant settlement, the shortage of agricultural labourers, and organic farming. He was given short shrift on all three. Soon after the first agricultural legislation of 1933, Darré called for a voluntary code among farmers, through which labourers would be provided with a smallholding by their employers, in exchange for one day’s work a
week. The labourer's holding was supposed to be large enough for self-sufficiency. Darré wrote at this time that the 'new modernity' lay in farming units which were designed to produce the maximum self-sufficiency, because the day of mechanised cash crop farming was over. In 1937, he called for a halt to industrial expansion, and in July, visited Hitler to discuss the 'catastrophic shortage of farm labour'. He suggested either importing ethnic Germans to work as agricultural labourers, or slowing down industrial expansion. He wanted legislation to stop the Landflucht, the flight from the land, but Bäcke and Himmler, who were present at the meeting with Hitler, were contemptuous. Darré continued to write memoranda attacking the importation of Polish labourers. The thought of bringing in Poles to fill the place of German peasants who had gone to the factories was intolerable to him. It was a bitter irony that a party which he had joined to further the peasant cause should persecute over its apparent destruction. One historian calls Darré's diagnosis of this intransigent realistically based as its conclusions were unassailable; to cut arms production drastically, to remove inflationary overheating from the economy'. This description could be applied to many of Darré's campaigns: realistically based, but unassailable. 

Hans Kehrl records a speech given by Darré in April 1937 to an educational conference. He bemused an originally sympathetic audience by discussing 'philosophical theory' in an 'unclear and wordy fashion', losing the interest and sympathy of his listeners. Hitler is reported to have complained about Darré's 1937 speech at Goslar: 'The peasants certainly aren't interested in listening to all that peasant philosophy stuff'. Darré had obviously lost his political instinct. His preoccupation with theory reflected his knowledge of the failure of his mission, his realisation that his convictions were no longer shared by others, and his need to persuade them. 

For Bäcke, public alignment with Darré was now an embarrassment, although he was well aware that agricultural productivity increase was faltering in the late 1930s. He did not take part in Darré's fight for the abolition of the entailed estate in 1938. The abolition of the entail was another paper victory for Darré, and probably a gesture made to the radical agricultural sector by Hitler in a year in which Party unity was particularly needed. Darré saw his law as a threat to the Junkers, and so did they. They flooded him with social invitations, and for two months, while Darré drafted the law, he was wined and dined by various members of the nobility. He even received invitations to meet Goering at the K rawhall. He agreed with Goering to provide a protection clause for private forests, to prevent their division and sale. Goering then sided with Darré at a meeting with the Justice Ministry, and against Gütter, agreeing that 'dynamics should not be put into cold storage.' 

Hitler signed the law of 6th July 1938, but it is doubtful if he would have done so if he had expected the Fides-Kommissgesetz to create havoc among the large landowners. After all, the entail had prevented the full utilisation of land. Entails meant pensions, provisions for care of dependants, obligations to families and employees. The new law's provisions for compensation for the loss of legal interests in the property were designed to ensure that the estate remained a viable farming unit. If the holder of a life interest could not be compensated without stripping the estate of some resource necessary to its productivity, then the holder went without compensation. This was the extent to which the law envisaged the need to maintain the estates as viable production units. As argued earlier, the effect of this law was to remove the vestiges of neo-feudal community obligations, and institute maximum flexibility of tenure and alienability of land. If the law had been a real blow to large farmers, it is doubtful whether Hitler and Goering would have agreed to it. In 1933 the large estates had been poor, ripe for bankruptcy. An attack on the entail then would have meant forced sales, sub-division and settlement. By 1939, most large farms were more profitable, and land prices had risen. Despite the fact that Darré regarded this law as his last achievement, a final blow against his enemies the capitalist, anti-Blood and Soil landowners, all it did (or would have done if the war had not intervened) was to force them into more market-oriented behaviour than before. Hitler in August 1939 spoke to his assembled generals of the 'devastating food crisis that could grip Germany within a few years', and may well have seen the Entailed Estates Law as a means of increasing food production.

This brief moment in the sun helped Darré to pull himself together, and for a few months relations with Bäcke and his staff were harmonious. The constant notes issuing from his office were addressed to 'Dear Herbert': he visited the Backes at their farm, and stood Godfather to Bäcke's son. Hitler had expressed pleasure when the 1937-8 harvest was seen to be a good one, and told Darré that such a harvest was worth twenty-two divisions to him. Although the 'achievement', insofar as the improved harvest was a result of governmental activity, belonged more properly to Backe, Hitler tactfully applied the compliment to Darré, and indeed, as far as overseas
visitors were concerned, Darré still had the title and dignity of minister. He was invited by Hitler to meet the Italian agricultural minister, and they planned in advance what to say to him. 'Refer him to Hungary for extra food', was Hitler's advice. 'We've got enough troubles of our own'. Darré received the Hungarian and Rumanian agricultural ministers in early 1939, while in July 1939 he organised his last International Congress of Agriculture held in Germany, and was flattered by the attendance of the Polish agricultural minister. Indeed, encouraged by his success with the Enlisted Estates Law, he began to draft a new law in conjunction with Backe and Dr R. Harmering, the RNS's legal adviser, to create a new ministry which would combine the Agricultural and Economics Ministries into one vast planning and marketing organisation.99

Darré intended this proposed corporation to be the RNS writ large. By re-organising industrial production on the lines of a co-operative marketing system with fixed prices, agricultural price stability would be made easier, and industry gradually brought to see the virtues of corporatism. Backe agreed. He felt that the Four Year Plan council was failing to mobilise German resources in sufficient quantity, and lacked organisational ability. More concentrated effort was needed, more efficiency and more productivity. One centralised planning department should replace the existing jumble of authorities. He could not see how Germany could win the forthcoming campaign of disorganisation and sloth, as he described it after the war, warch shaken off. The difference of attitude here was significant, with Darré thinking in terms of long-term reform, and Backe of the approaching conflict. In any case, unknown to Darré, the last props of his authority were being pulled out from under him. The one programme which was at the heart of his ideas—agricultural settlement—was threatened, and glowing 1939 the crucial transition of power to Himmler took place, which will be discussed in the next chapter.99

Backe responded to the prospect of conquest by reverting to his early Göttingen ideas about the need to colonise Russia's grain producing areas. He envisaged a restructured Europe, one unit from Brittany to the Urals, dominated by a strong Germany, and reasonably self-sufficient in food and raw material production. Russia would be Europe's 'bread-basket'. Both Backe's geo-political analysis and his devotion to the geographer and economist J. von Thissen (who developed a theory regarding efficient use of land resources based on closeness to markets) led him to disregard existing nation-state boundaries in planning the future Europe. Backe's study of Russia in the mid-1920s led him to predict the imminent collapse of the economy, and a decline in agricultural production. He rightly expected the Soviets to concentrate on industrial development rather than on improving agricultural infrastructure. He remarked that in the course of neglecting agriculture for industry Russian agriculture would be starved of resources, while industry could never develop in Russia because of the inadequacies of the population. Russian lack of creativity and initiative, together with Russian sadomasochistic attitudes to their rulers, going back so far to Ivan the Terrible, meant that Western-style industrial development could never succeed without the introduction of more creative and competent outsiders. The Germans, in fact, would act as an amalgam of colonists, managerial executives and studs. Russia deserved invasion, because her attempt to industrialise was tantamount to an act of war against the West. Her ordained role was to produce food for Europe. These arguments matched with Hitler's, and the fact that the renowned expert on world food production and on Russia propounded them, must have been a factor in his eventual invasion plans.100

In 1942, Backe was to have his thesis on Russian grain production finally published, along with a work on Europe's food balances. He wrote admiringly in 1943 that 'the Russian Bolsheviks cling on to their culture'. He was not a man to look for deliberate revenge for his treatment in the hands of the Russians between 1910 and 1918, but certainly affected his view of them. None the less, his tough line seems to have been a result of his obsessive sense of identification with what he saw as German interests, a longing for large-scale, orderly planning, and a paternalistic sense of duty, rather than a result of innate brutality. He had a strong instinct that the Germans were a defenceless, sacrificial entity ('We are the victims and not the creators of this world') who had to be protected, if necessary, through ruthless and revolutionary action. His Spartan ethic applied to himself as well as others. He refused to allow his wife to remove their belongings from Berlin during the worst of the bombing, because it would 'set a bad example to others', and refused her permission to travel to Berlin to see him in 1945 because the trains were 'needed for carrying refugees'. In fact, given the lack of apologies produced by most countries during their period of occupation, it is interesting to question whether so many German felt obliged to rationalise and excuse their aggressive policy during the war. Backe brooded throughout the war on an 'it's either them or us' line of argument, but he never faced up to the crucial misjudgment he had made regarding Russian food.
producing capacities, a misjudgment that may have been due to the fact that, like many Russian experts during the 1930s, who had left Russia before 1920, at a time of relative plenty, he had very little idea just how disastrous the effects of the collectivization programme had been.82

In January 1941, Backe produced a report on Russia's food producing capacity which estimated a potential far greater than the two million tons of grain Germany was receiving under the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact. Backe told Goering he was prepared to guarantee the report's accuracy, and Goering showed it to Hitler, on whom it apparently had a 'decisive effect'. On 30th May, Backe flew to Oberalszberg to confer with Hitler, Lammers, Bormann and Keitel (Darré was excluded) over the invasion plan and Backe's prediction that 'every country in Europe could share the Kornkammer'. The stringent Backe on his organisation of rationing, he asked him to come to see him with Russia was given to Backe, who was under orders to keep the whole thing secret from Darré ('with Darré over secrecy of Russian preparations', his wife noted).83

Secrecy was now carried to considerable lengths as far as Darré was concerned: clearly, he was no longer trusted. Bormann, especially, had become an enemy. Darré despised Bormann's uncouthness, and his ill-treatment of women. Bormann distrusted Darré, and especially his commitment to organic farming, and, by implication, the Anthroposophists. Even before the invasion of Poland, Darré had been unable to gain Hitler's ear. His memos piled up unread on Hitler's desk, but after 1939 his continual and open hostility produced not just mockery from Goering and Goebbels but exclusion from political life.84

One constant correspondent, Erich Dwingler, a best-selling 1920s novelist who bought a farm in 1930 (the self-imposed silence of the internal émigré did not prevent him from reading the National Food Estate with suggestions on farming and food policy throughout the 1930s), records a visit to Darré in April 1942, and described his 'somewhat too fleshy face, the eyes which had something in them of the animal at bay, the well cut suit', and Darré's reiteration that he was now a powerless man, and had been for some years. Darré confirmed to Dwingler that the Russian invasion was to supply Germany's food surplus, not displayed instead 'nailed imperialism' which would 'finish off the peasantry'.85 He was permitted to sit in his office and keep the title of Minister, but it was on paper only. From 1939, Backe was described as acting head of the Ministry in its annual budget. It took Darré two or three years to grasp his position fully. He kept up a sporadically friendly correspondence with Backe, warning him over Bormann in 1940, and sending him a long review of his own book, written in the friendliest of terms, in 1941. Backe, having achieved some autonomy at last, felt compassion towards him. After all, Darré had been his ideological mentor for some years, and on occasion Darré's concentration on food-rearing plans still seemed admirable rather than ridiculous. He commented that 'Goering is realistic but not good on fundamentals (grundsätzlich). Darré is the reverse', but none the less, blamed Darré for 'the fact that the peasantry were in an ever weaker situation' when faced with 'sarcasm over his pessimism and the peasantry in general' from Goering and Funk. Even as late as 1940, Hitler tried to parry Backe over Darré, and called a meeting with the Ministry of Agriculture staff where, after complaining for the third time, he asked him to compromise with Darré (who was currently campaigning against an agricultural study undertaken by the Ministry of Agriculture). Backe refused bluntly. He told Hitler that there was no point in trying to reconcile the conflicts caused by the virtual incorporation of the RNS National Food Estate into the Ministry of Agriculture, and Darré's resentment of the fact.86

Goering issued a decree on 13th January 1941, concerning meat rations, the fact was kept from Darré until well into February. An angry correspondence with Backe ensued. Darré continued to circulate indignant memos and notes, and in June 1941 another row erupted, when in front of other staff he accused Backe of secrecy over the Russian preparations. Backe answered caustically that bureaucratic formalities were unimportant, and only realities mattered, a heavy blow at a man who equally disliked bureaucratic formalities, but, having been their victim, had tried to manipulate them against others. He refused to sign the rationing decree issued in April 1941. Backe reluctantly visited him in person to try to get the necessary signature, and Darré took the opportunity to try to explain his point of view. He complained that his task had been to rescue the peasantry, not to prepare them for war. 1933 had been a year of victory for the National Food Estate, but the Führer had diverted the nation's energies into building Autohöhen and other rubbish. Blood and Soil was a lost cause, but so was the war; the concessions made to Russia in the 1939 Pact had lost Germany the war with Russia before it started. 'He looked terrible, nose red, reading and muttering' noted Backe in an angry outburst. 'What he does not realise is that it is he who is
shattered, not his work.... still, it's my problem now.' He went on to attack Darré harshly as a gambler and schemer, a worthy man who—and this was obviously the key to the attack—was trying to 'scribe his own inadequacies to the Führer... that Genius I feel an unspeakable contempt for him,' concluded Backe. 'To attack Hitler... I myself am only a talent. I am happy to be a second-in-command, to work without personal ambition for the greatest.... In that I am completely Prussian.'

The very next morning Backe clarified his position still further, by describing a meeting with Heydrich and Landfried on the problems of raw materials. 'I was filled with joy to find that Heydrich was fighting for Nazi ideals. We were bound together, without a word being spoken.' But Himmler would 'collapse just like Darré, within three years at the latest; no accident that they were friends for so long', a prophecy that was to be fulfilled almost to the day. The link with Heydrich was not fortuitous. Backe felt a strong sense of community with him. He considered that they both suffered from capricious, vacillating, inefficient superiors in the shape of Darré and Himmler, a point also made by Heydrich's biographer. Both men placed their undoubted intellectual gifts at the service of a belief in planning as an aim in itself. The essential voidness of the concept, the impracticality of dictatorial technocracy, was observed by the enervy of the commitment. Backe's admiration of and comradeship towards Heydrich also reflects his sense that 'Nazi ideals' were lacking in their immediate peers. Two years later he wrote with respectful admiration of Franz Hayles, then Leiter des Einzelhandels, that he was 'Nazi and young and unbroken'. This suggests that 'unbroken' Nazi radicals were becoming thin on the ground. Shortly before Heydrich's assassination he was charged with investigating Backe, because of the late's link with the Skald, and is supposed to have sent a message to Backe on his deathbed to the effect that he had cleared him of any disloyalty. This meant a great deal to Backe.

Darré in 1940-1 attempted to fight back where he felt the seriousness of a situation demanded it, but lacked the nervous strength to put his case convincingly. He suspected that Backe was wildly overstating the figures on prospective grain production, and kept badgering the Ministry of Agriculture on the issue. He realised from bitter experience that Backe believed his own propaganda, the statistics which Darré feared were unreliable. 'Figures given to Goering as "political" figures were somehow transformed into "statistical" figures', he noted bewildered in August 1941. In 1939 and in 1940, he had sent reports to Hitler alleging that Backe had falsified food reserve figures, and managed to reach Brückner, an adjutant to Hitler, in 1940, attacking both the Four Year Plan prognosis of food production and Backe's prediction of food production in Russia and Germany. It seems true that Backe was prepared to bend the truth if necessary to convince Goering of the righteousness of his plans. He was working all hours on the task of estimating Germany's food stocks and choosing National Food Estate personnel to take over Ukrainian collective farms. He feared that the effect of the invasion had not been worked out in terms of its effect on Germany's army production potential.

The food situation in Russia was to be a disaster from Germany's point of view. Backe had little idea of how badly forcible collectivisation had affected conditions in the Ukraine, or that the grain sent to Germany by Russia in 1939 and 1940 had had to be squeezed out of a near starving peasantry by force. Now, together with the damage they themselves had caused during the advance, the German armies found scorched earth—literally—and burnt crops. The further east, the worse the situation; nothing harvested, nothing in order—the Russian harvest uncertain, the Russians almost starving. In Germany, potatoes and sugar beet lying under the snow. The vast grain reserves the Germans had expected to find in Russia were simply not there. By December 1941, Backe could note that 'the entire eastern army area cannot be fed from Germany', at a time when the Ruhr potato crop had been ruined by frost. Backe's 'pragmatism' was shown up by this reversal of expectations. His policy over collective farms was that they had to be retained to avoid diminished food production in case the changeover caused chaos. It was a mistaken decision. Agricultural productivity did not pick up in the Ukraine until concessions were made to the peasants in 1942-3, but by then, the army was retreating, leaving huge quantities of tractors, gasoline plants and steel waiting on railway stations and on the steps. If one is to judge from Russian reports of their endless agricultural disasters since the war, some, indeed, may be lying there today.

These were the errors of an ideologue: a National Socialist totally committed to a credo which relied on the ethic of the Volksgemeinschaft. Backe, the archetypal National Socialist, underestimates the speed with which people, even self-bound farmers, even Russians, could respond to financial incentives. Since he envisaged a society fuelled by self-sacrifice and duty to the community, it is not surprising. Darré was formally demoted in 1942 as Minister of Agriculture, and
Backe took over as ‘leader of the ministry’. Remaining true to his Spartan values, he refused the title of ‘Minister’ until 1944. Both men had been uprooted and declassed. Both had unused and wasted abilities. In a time full of ironies, it is perhaps one of the deepest that Darré, the vain, difficult, unco-operative, intriguing politician, should have stuck to his beliefs, and that his prescriptions should so often have been the right ones, given Germany’s position. Backe, the more upright, honourable and straightforward man, presided over the mass destruction of German agriculture, and witnessed the looting and expropriation of all farmers, large and small, by the Russian invaders he had always feared, in 1945. Trusted by Hitler to the last, he was nominated to the Dönitz cabinet of April 1945. In 1947, he committed suicide after several months of solitary confinement. A letter which reached him shortly before his death told him of the sufferings in the eastern zone of some of his closest friends under the Russians. It must have seemed 1917 all over again.

Darré, the stubborn individualist, went on to fight his corner till his death in 1953. In politics, as in art, ends and means, the virtue of the performer and the virtue of the end result, are strangely unrelated.

CHAPTER SIX

‘The Praetorian Guard led by a Jesuit’

WAS DARRÉ GUILTY?

Four years after the war, in what became known as the Wilhelmstrasse trial, Darré was found guilty of the plunder, spoliation, enslavement and expropriation of ‘hundreds of thousands of Polish and Jewish farmers’. In view of the fact that he was Ministre d’Agriculture in name only during the relevant period, was this verdict a miscarriage of justice?

In chapter Three, the concept of Blood and Soil was discussed in relation to intra-German racialism. It was argued there that Darré’s concern was with rescuing a threatened minority from decay and possible extinction. Nonetheless, Darré seems to have presided, if in a titular fashion, over the resettlement of the ethnic Germans, the Volksdeutsche, in western Poland. He was the formal head of the ministry until 1942, and it was men from that ministry and from the National Food Estate (now incorporated into the ministry) who were sent out as civilian administrators under the military and SS aegis of the Wehrmacht and Himmler, to aid the Resettlement Corps in Poland. Furthermore, Darré had been head of the sinister-sounding SS Race and Settlement Head Office until 1938, and took a close interest in it during the 1930s, even soliciting funds for it in 1932 to fulfil his ‘new nobility’ visions. Although Darré tried to resign from the SS in 1938, but was prevented from doing so by Hitler’s order, it is still a reproach against Darré’s ideology that his visions of a peasant nation led inexorably to imperial plunder and land seizure; that agrarian fervour ‘stared Green and ended Blood-sy-red’, in Tucholsky’s phrase, and that the close tie with the SS seems to confirm this allegation.

The following two chapters discuss this issue. The first looks at the inception and structure of the SS Race and Settlement Office, and argues that it was at first a cardboard edifice, not nearly as important as its name suggests, and that early SS settlement was peripheral, a matter of a few part-time volunteers trying to sneak men and resources past the National Food Estate Settlement Office, and helping to build haystacks in Frisia. SS settlement outside Germany was from 1938, and
took place without Darré’s consent and above his head, after a series of complex manoeuvrings. An important turning-point in the power of the SS was the creation of the first SS Land Office in Prague, so while these institutional details are regretfully Byzantine, they are essential to an understanding of the underlying issues.

Chapter Seven looks at the details of ethnic German resettlement, and examines the extent to which Darré and his ideology were relevant to this improvised programme. During the early part of the war, plans were appearing and disappearing like the Cheshire Cat in *Alice in Wonderland*, and internal arguments about competence were proceeding among different SS offices, with Himmler holding the ring between them. It does emerge that some part of Darré’s ideas had percolated through to the SS managerial level, especially where the social reformist, well educated intellectuals were concerned, but it seems that this process was indirect, and involved a rejection of what was seen as outdated romanticism. What came to be at stake was the belief, simple and non-ideological, that truly to possess a territory, it had to be settled by the possessors. Twentieth-century history amply demonstrates that this belief was not confined to the SS. So here, as in the question of agricultural productivity, it was the practical, populist element in Darré’s ideology that has survived.

The basic difference between Darré and Himmler was that Darré was a rural tribalist, and Himmler an imperialist with romantic racial overtones. Darré took seriously his own analysis that a nation could only be built upon an organic link between soil and Volk, but Himmler dreamed of a Greater German empire. While Darré had originated the Hegehof idea (later to be modified into Himmler’s Wehrbauern concept), he had intended it as the basis for restructuring German society, not as a means of creating a ruling class for an Empire, or rewarding successful generals.1

Darré had to go, not only because he lacked the ruthlessness to implement Himmler’s plans, but because he had come to realise that his dream of a peasant nation had little to do with Himmler’s plans for the SS, the ‘Prussian Guard under Jesuit leadership’, as he described it in 1938.2 In some ways, the SS-State envisaged by Himmler had also moved from the original image of the NSDAP. Hitler, especially in his speeches, had presented National Socialism as the creation of the Greater Germany, purged of its alien and treacherous elements, a vision which could be perceived as an extension and fulfillment of nineteenth-century nationalism. This was what seems to have attracted the support of the majority of Germans.3 Himmler’s vision of the pan-European state, with a German and Germanized administrative elite, demanded the creation of a new kind of man to rule it. The ideal SS-man would be linked with the land, but would understand technology, and have mastered it. He would be efficient, able and unhampered by ties of class. This plan to create an élitist superman, which in many people’s minds today is synonymous with National Socialism, was arguably different in kind from the cosy Volksgemeinschaft image presented by the NSDAP during its early years. It is interesting that even as late as 1940, Himmler thought it necessary to keep his plans a secret. Where the NSDAP’s emphasis on community feeling exposed its real lack in Germany, Himmler’s training and organisational methods managed within a few years to create a tightly knit and loyal group of skilled technocrats, together with a disciplined and skillful fighting force in the manner Waffen SS. Between 1936 and 1939, the SS’s position in agriculture was weak, even though SS indoctrination emphasised the peasantry and rural life.4 The 1939 plan to resettle the Volksdeutsche5 in the newly incorporated areas of the Warthegau, Posen, Danzig-West Prussia, Upper Silesia and Zichenau produced major alterations in the agrarian administrative structure, as detailed arrangements to settle the returning ethnic Germans took precedence over internal agrarian settlement. During the same period, a mere 619 new holdings were established within Germany, whereas some 35,000 farms were created for the Volksdeutsche.6

Whereas the Sudetenland appears to have been absorbed by German agricultural institutions without significant change, the war in Poland in 1939 produced a different order of priorities into the thinking of ambitious and competent officials. Konrad Meyer, ex-Ministry of Agriculture official and land planning expert, who took over Himmler’s land planning office in Berlin for the Reichtskommissariat für die Festigung deutschen Volkstums (RKFDV), indicated this conflict and the agrarian lobby’s awareness of their loss of status at the end of the peace-time period, when he describes how RNS officials became demoralised as the static model of Darré’s peasant policy became deeply affected by industrial and economic growth. Only defensive answers were given to critical questions. A resigned attitude reigned.7

At the same time, the SS were growing visibly in power and influence, and as a result, many members of the agrarian departments
SS involvement in the settlement programme did not occur until 1939. The extent and depth of its activity in this area has been exaggerated in later histories, partly because of SS power during the war, and partly because of the apparent continuity signalled by the existence of the SS RuSHA during the 1930s, a body whose level of activity at that time did not correspond with its grandiose title. Other bodies were concerned with the change in authority from the Ministry of Agriculture to SS organisations, notably the RKFDV, but also the Hitler Youth Land Service, the Berlin Land Office, the Vo-Mi Stelle and the Prague and Austrian Land Offices.

Koehl describes in his monograph on German resettlement policy the methods by which Himmler organised SS infiltration into Volksdeutsche agencies, to win control of ethnic German settlement, and to persuade Hitler that he was the most suitable man to control the programme. This resulted in the Führer Decree of 7th October 1939, which established the Reichskommissariat, and although the Decree did leave control of 'settlement by farmers' in the hands of the Ministry of Agriculture (possibly due to Herbert Bache's influence), Himmler's role as Reichskommissar gave him the chance, which he utilised to the full, of dominating German resettlement activity in eastern Europe.

This decree saw a final breach in Darré's relations with Himmler. Up to 1939 the two men had been friends, Bache, in fact, blamed Darré for inciting a romantic streak in Himmler's character, and the two men did share a common enthusiasm for pre-Christian Germanic religions, traditions and myths. However, Darré's growing alienation from the party leadership, and Himmler's tendency to range himself with the existing powers (anyone who could move from being Stroesser's devoted secretary, to Darré, to organising the Sicherheitsdienst and SDP in eight years certainly demonstrated ideological flexibility), emphasised a profound gulf in the ideas of the two men. Between 1919 and 1931, agrarian ideology seems not to have touched Himmler's political life. He was to all intents and purposes the perfect bureaucrat. The process of outstripping Darré had begun in 1936, when Himmler decided that SS settlement should be an independent matter, while 1938 began with pressure from Himmler on Darré to resign his position as head of the Race and Settlement Office (RSHA) a step which Darré considered a 'wound in the flank of the peasants struggle, a disaster for the peasants'. He resigned in February 1938. In March 1939, Pancke, under Himmler's orders, successfully ousted the Ministry of Agriculture from effective control of land in the
Sudetenland, the reason given being, interestingly enough, that a successful SS settlement programme there would lend weight to an SS takeover of the same programme in Germany. In late as March 1939 the programme of agricultural settlement within Germany was still seen as a tempting prize, a mean of creating an SS, land-based elite.

Where most Nazis dreamed simply of revising the German border to what it had been before 1918, Himmler had greater plans. Not only were five to six million Poles and Jews to be evacuated to Respolit, not only were the Volksdeutsche to be resettled in the incorporated areas, but the whole of the east was to become a substitute to Germany for her lost colonies. In a speech in October 1940, Himmler attacked what he called ‘ivory tower concepts of colonies, of open doors and new homelands’. Instead, the east was to be an economic area, a source of raw materials to be developed according to Germany’s needs. After the war, new cities, industries and farms would be built under SS leadership.

In trying to trace the genesis of Himmler’s later career, historians have struggled with a paucity of material; there are early diaries, two brief articles published before 1933, an undated article on farming, and the probable part-authorship of the NSDAP Manifesto on Agriculture of 1930. One diary entry by Himmler does refer to possible emigration to the East, and some writers have tried to see a continuity between this entry, and the alleged membership of the Aris modes group in 1931, and the planned SS state of 1940. This interpretation suggests that Himmler, having been strongly influenced by Darré in the early 1930s, then proceeded to carry out Darré’s programme, while discarding Darré the man. However, an analysis of the planning documents and organisational struggles within the SS between 1938 and 1942 demonstrate that while agrarian ideology of a Darréan nature strongly influenced SS members at middle and lower levels, their attempts to implement peasant settlement were frequently delayed and even halted by Himmler, because Himmler was set on the potential empire in Russia, and subordinated ideological aims to power struggles. As with Darré, Himmler wanted agriculture to play an important role after the war, but his main purpose, to alter the demographic, political and geographic map of Europe, should be differentiated from Darré’s Germanic Baumwiek. Himmler’s plan was to develop the east into a mighty industrial empire, to re-allocate the workshops and mine the raw materials, using a helot class of Poles and Jews, toasted away in Russia. Himmler’s wartime planning documents, while not of very great value in determining the course of events, are certainly of value in determining his intentions. We know from his subordinates that all such documents had to have his line-by-line consent. They demonstrate that apart from the stress on the desirability of a medium-sized farm structure—and even this point could be dropped by Himmler on the whim of the OKW—the motivation of the two men was entirely different, a difference as great as the difference between Cobbett and Joseph Chamberlain.

Indeed, it can be argued that Himmler’s plan for exploiting eastern Europe and Russia, far from being a direct result of the agrarian ideology of the 1920s and 1930s, was in many ways its opposite, and went further than the political expansionism that characterised Germany from 1890 onwards. It was imperial and not nationalistic, technocratic instead of organic; authoritarian, where Darré sought, however unrealistically, to unwind state power.

Not all these subtleties were clear to Darré’s subordinates. Indeed, Gaulper Eegeling, formerly Keeper of the Seal for the German Peasant Council, wrote to Himmler in 1940, asking him to back Darré, because the farming population had become increasingly disaffected, and saw in Darré’s eclipse a symbol of their own. Furthermore, Himmler had developed a considerable admiration for practical east of mind of the RNS experts, and preferred dealing with them to the ministerial civil service. Darré in the meantime withdrew to his campaign on organic farming, and his Society of Friends of the German Peasantry (a group he started in 1939, with a view to protecting peasant interests from the implications of the war, and the defeat which he foresaw), while intermittently attacking Himmler and the establishment of the RKFDV. Ironically enough, one of the most important methods used by Himmler to take over much of the Darréan mythos was the Race and Settlement Office founded by them both in 1934, and a discussion of the gradual vivifying of the eastward edifice may help to explain some of the later complexities of loyalty that arose in 1939 among Darré’s followers.

EARLY SS SETTLEMENT AND THE SS RACE AND SETTLEMENT OFFICE

Although the basic tenet of the Race & Settlement Office lay in the SS Marriage Order of 31st December 1931 through which permission had to be obtained by SS members for marriage, and the prospective spouse racially examined by the SS Race Office, it was not until
Himmler's decree of 21st September 1934 that the office was effectively established as an independent vehicle for the ideological education of the SS. It was to bring about a close connection with the peasantry, and realise the aims of Blut und Boden. Although the peasant theme ran through the office, the Settlement Division had the lowest but one number of officials manning it: two, as opposed to the ninety SS men working in the Sipperrat. This indicates the lack of importance accorded to SS settlement; none the less, the training courses for SS members included education in fundamental concepts of Blut und Boden and the Daréran theme was emphasised in other ways. For example, each department had a Bauern representative, who wore the Odal rune as an insignia.

Darré was head of the RuSHA until February 1938, when SS Gruppenführer C. Pancke took over. In July 1940, Otto Hofmann, and in April 1943, Richard Hildebrandt, succeeded to the position. The racial department had been established to propound the view that all history, ethics, law and economics are determined by blood, and worked largely on theoretical questions. It actually was run by Dr. Reischle, second-in-command of the RNS, and greatly admired by Darré, whose biographer he was. In 1939 he was sacked by Himmler, courteously enough, for being a 'Darré man', and replaced by a Dr. Schultz. The Racial Office itself was hived off from RuSHA in 1938, and became part of the Lebensraum office.

The head of the office was in the Ministry for Agriculture, and a close friend of Herbert Backe, headed the settlement division, which was supposed to deal with settler selection, applications and homestead settlement; all of these were matters which in fact were dealt with by the Ministry of Agriculture settlement department. In 1936, Backe took over from Willikens, and three new departments were created, but no significant change in activity occurred. In March 1941, the RuSHA took on the role of welfare office for the Waffen SS, especially those members who were of peasant origin, and later on in the war ran convalescent homes for wounded members of the Waffen SS.

The fact that two prominent members of the Ministry of Agriculture, Backe and Willikens, were successively leaders of the settlement division of the RuSHA seems to emphasise the importance of this office. However, it must be stressed that the real activity was going on in the Ministry of Agriculture itself, and the positions of Backe, Willikens and Reischle emphasised RuSHA's weakness rather than its strength. They were there to lend it authority and status, their role largely confined to signing letters and bulletins.

The cross-membership existing between the Ministry of Agriculture, the National Food Estate and the SS, implies an identity of purpose which did not really exist. The upper echelons of the agrarian lobby, such as, for instance, all Landesbauernführer, had always been encouraged to join the SS, partly because of Darré's original connection with the formation of the Race & Settlement Office, and partly because of the early friendship between Himmler and Darré.

During the war, the agricultural experts employed outside German territory were normally given SS ranks. Cross-membership in the SS continued well into the war, as indeed was inevitable, since no fully autonomous SS units seem to have existed before that. There was a certain amount of cross-membership in the SA, including Gustav Behrens, peasant representative in the RNS. But in general such membership was discouraged. Darré disliked the SA, considering them to be largely urban in composition, stupid and overbearing.

The first SS settlement project was in 1935, the Gemeinschaft der SS-Siedler und der Nordensee. It soon encountered difficulties, largely because the SS-men who were building the settlement were doing so in their spare time. It was at this time that Himmler complained to Harnening, of the RNS settlement department, that settlers were divided into 'pure organisers and romantists'. Despite this bad start, Himmler wrote the following year to Darré, stressing that details were not as important as precipitating action. Darré's odd handling of Himmler's request was connected with his growing fear of Himmler's power. Aware of his own weak position, and Himmler's interest in taking over settlement activity, Darré had tried to engage Bormann, of all people, to support him against Himmler as early as 1935. However, after a certain amount of winning, dining and plotting, Bormann disclosed Darré's approach to Himmler, who seems to have been amused rather than alarmed. The result was that Darré began to evade Himmler's letters and verbal requests about SS settlement from 1935 onwards. But during 1936, a barrage of requests came to Himmler to make room for SS-men in settlement villages. These were passed on to Darré. Clearly, although Himmler had always wanted the RuSHA to establish SS settler communities, it was not a high-priority issue, and the principles of comradeship, mutual loyalty and support which his orders to the SS emphasised, conflicted visibly with the principle of economic viability.

The exchange of letters with Darré—still 'Richard' and 'Heini' at this stage—suggests that Himmler's interest in SS settlement arose more from pressure from his staff than from some long hidden plan of his.
own. Himmler decided on a pilot scheme and the building of an SS settlement village, the first to be formally supported by the SS Head Office. It was put in hand late in 1937. It indicates Himmler’s growing interest that Dr Kummer demanded six-monthly reports and asked the local SS unit to help supply emergency hay and straw.48

This was the first indication of what was to be Himmler’s way in to the settlement programme—confidential co-operation with Kummer, head of the Ministry of Agriculture Settlement Office. It was at the same time, late in 1937, that the Race & Settlement Office, after hearing from Himmler, announced to Kummer that they wanted to see SS settlements increased, and suggested Pomerania. Himmler agreed enthusiastically, promising that land would be made available for the SS from the amended Osthilfe procedure, whereby indebted estates exchanged land in return for government subsidies. Kummer, of course, was not supposed to syphon off settlement land and funds to the SS; either nobody noticed what was happening, or they were too frightened of Himmler to complain. Kummer also gave detailed instructions to the SS section leaders on how to avoid conflict with other settlement offices, together with the NSDAP at Gauf level.49

Writing to Himmler, Kummer spoke even more frankly about potential institutional conflicts, indicating the extent to which the SS was distrusted by other groups within Germany in the 1930s. Even Darré was alarmed at news of the ‘Faulhof’ project. The first result of the publicity which surrounded its founding was that he indignantly demanded details of it, including the relevant cost estimates. Kummer kept Himmler advised of Darré’s reactions, and suggested that

In my capacity as a member of the SS and not as a civil servant, the Northern SS section should at once organise their own SS activity, since close co-operation between the settlement authorities and the SS is lacking.50

These authorities had a high proportion of pre-Nazi civil servants, and possibly for that reason were more hostile to the SS. Certainly, Kummer alleged that these same authorities were ‘ganging up’ against the SS, together with Landesbauernführer from the National Food Estate, and that both groups had Darré’s support.

Land acquisition for those SS projects encountered the same difficulties that faced the Ministry of Agriculture. Domaine land was seldom available for settlement, while the OKW supported the existence of large estates on the grounds that they were the only effective farms.

This discussion of early SS settlement activity brings out several points which have not emerged clearly in the literature concerning either the SS and agriculture, or the SS’s relationship with other institutions between 1933 and 1939: first, that SS settlement was a late phenomenon in the Third Reich, despite the emphasis in its own propaganda on Blut und Boden; second, that the head of settlement in the RLM was plotting with the head of the SS to bypass his own ministry, and specifically the man who had propounded the notion of settlement in the first place, Darré. It demonstrates the degree of hostility existing between the National Food Estate and the SS, despite some degree of interstocking membership at top administrative levels, and the extent to which the Settlement Office and peasant education department of the RuSHA remained a sideline until 1937. Kummer saw no difficulty in working towards what he assumed to be Himmler’s aims, having always been a keen German expansionist, obsessed with the need to expand and strengthen the German border in the east. He promised Himmler land for the SS via Osthilfe, in order to ‘create important racial and political support for the Führer’s policies east of the Elbe’.52 Indeed, Kummer, chief financial adviser to the Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Innen kolonisation for many years, was writing to Darré as early as 1933, that settlement in eastern and northern Germany had to serve the national interest and ‘maintain the armed political situation’.

This implied a complete reversion to Wilhelmine and Weimar concepts of eastern settlement, and a final rejection for Darré’s ‘Bauernreich’, and helps to demonstrate the continuity that lay behind what became a key SS programme, poorly carried out and unfinished as it was: the establishment of a Volksdeutsche barrier to possible dangers from the east. The value to Himmler of the SS settlement programme in Germany seems to have been a pilot project. Himmler himself referred to the need for a ‘copybook exercise’ in settlement in late 1938, for the RuSHA to obtain the ‘foundation and experience for a future huge settlement proceeding’, and although he did not state where the future proceeding would take place, it was presumably to do with the ethnic Germans.53

Among ordinary SS members, however, there was enthusiasm for settlement on German territory, although most SS members were enrolled in non-agricultural posts. In December 1937 all leaders of the Death’s Head Division were asked to find out how many of their members were suitable settler material, and how many members came from peasant backgrounds.54 Interestingly, the collusion of these simple
statistics was ordered to be kept secret 'to prevent unrest among units'; presumably, settlements were so desirable that jealousy and competition had to be avoided.55

Another initiative which emerged directly from local SS section leaders showed again their interest in increasing the SS link with the land. The Saxony Landesbaurrectionen agreed with the local SS leader to form SS agricultural units, which would work with the local RNS members in helping to organise settlements.56 Darré forwarded the idea to Himmler, who had no objections.

Despite the apparent co-operation of the Gesellschaften in Saxony and Swabia, who offered no opposition to the SS recruitment drive among young people for the agricultural units, activity in this area continued to be merely marginal and local.57 Yet, if ideological 'correctness' was any guide to success in the Third Reich, such projects should have been more effective, for the ideological reasoning behind the formation of the SS/Reichshilfstruppe groups was strongly emphasised in the recruitment literature. One directive stated:

The SS is part of the NSDAP. Its members are increasingly selected with a view to their racial value. Their racial excellence can only be perpetuated if the SS is rooted in the peasantry. Herein lies the deeper meaning of the concept Blut und Boden: all young men from the countryside should be SS members. The SS Landesgruppen will be the future racial crack-troops of the peasantry.58

In reality, evidence suggests that the link between countryside and SS-men was less significant than the propaganda suggests. Statistics on exactly how many SS-men came from peasant stock, but among the long-servig SS-men who had received farms by 1941 many had done badly through lack of experience.59 The fact that their wives were usually from an urban background was an added drawback. This lack of success was despite a compulsory two-year training course.60

When the right candidate was available,61 then (despite grand claims that shortage of money must not be allowed to deter applicants), money for SS settlement was a major issue, as it was for many other settlement departments in August 1935. Pancke, who was now head of the RuSHA in Darré's place, warned Himmler that the RuSHA's choice of suitable settlers was being curtailed by 'a shortage of money among settlers'. Pancke conferred with Walter Granzow, an RNS official who had been promoted to be head of the Deutsche Siedlungshilfe after a failed attempt to oust Darré.62 and Granzow agreed to provide bank funds of three to eight million Reichsmark.63 He refused requests for more on the grounds that some ten thousand settlements had been in financial difficulties in the last year alone, and had received six million Reichsmark.

After the creation of a Protectorate in 1938, the RuSHA looked to the Sudetenland to provide a supply of cheap, if not free land for settlement. It tooks the fight for SS settlements into a new area and brought new room for manoeuvre, plotting and power-seeking, all areas in which the SS agrarian ideologues proved adept.

**THE LAND OFFICE IN PRAGUE: SS INSTRUMENT FOR INPROPRIATION**

SS settlement activity found its suitable vehicle in the shape of the Deutsche Akademie für Agrarwissenschaft (DAG), or German Restsettlement Society, the largest of the settlement societies re-organised by Darré between 1933 and 1936. In 1939, the company was still in private hands, and when its manager suggested to Darré that the shares should be nationalised, Darré agreed, seeing the proposal as a move away from 'capitalist concepts'. He ordered the shares to be sold to the Dresdner Bank at a beginning. He was unaware that von Gottberg, an official in the RuSHA, had secretly told Riecke, Bäck's second-in-command, to the Ministry of Agriculture after Bäck replaced Darré in 1942, that he was interested in purchasing the shares on behalf of the SS.64 When the purchase was completed, the Dresdner Bank told Darré that the two government officials who had bought the shares were Gottberg's nominees. Gottberg now controlled the DAG. Darré protested to Himmler that he had disbanded the earlier settlement societies because of their 'strongly capitalist orientation', and that, if a single SS unit controlled the company, the interest of Germany and of the settlers would be unprotected. On Himmler's order, von Gottberg submitted a reply which, interlarded with the standard jargon about the need for a healthy peasantry and volkisch economic policies, invoked Wehrmacht support and contained the delicate threat: 'Nobody is likely to take responsibility for destroying such vital measures.'65 In other words, the whole exercise was in order to establish SS farmers in Germany, many of whom were approved by the Wehrmacht, and side-tracking the hostility that would otherwise be encountered. The share purchase is dated at some fifteen months before the date on which the DAG was alleged as the
Nuremberg trials to have been acquired for the purposes of expropriating land in the East. 56 In spite of Himmler's dislike, the management of the DAG was left strictly alone, and proved the ideal instrument for organizing large-scale settlement of ethnic German peasants in Lorraine, Danzig-West Prussia, the Tyrol and the Danubian area, and by 1940 was being used for this purpose by the SS. 57

In 1937, the SS had formed a non-profit-making corporation to buy up church land in west Germany standing empty as a result of the closure of the Catholic Orders by the state. The society, the Deutsche Reichsverein für Stiftungsfreiheit, or DRV, was registered in Berlin, where it bought shares in the DAG with the help of the Prague Land Office. Hildebrandt, Pancke and von Gostberg were on the Board of Management, while Theo Gross, first head of the Prague Land Office, was liaison officer with the NSDAP. Although registered as an ordinary share company, its articles stated that it was not an 'economic commercial enterprise', but looked after the welfare of all German settlers, coordinating the available facilities of various German counties 'according to the National Socialist Weltanschauung'. This in effect meant a potent anti-church bias, that came into full force in south and west Germany, as well as in Austria, and in the Protectorate with its strong Catholic church. As their 1940 report pointed out, 'The ideological fight against the political power of the church takes a new turn with this instrument' (the DRV), which claimed to be merely returning to the German people property expropriated over hundreds of years by the church. 58 The society 'have nothing to do with the SS—exactly why was not stated—and Pancke reported to Himmler that the best way to insert SS influence was to set up a Land Office, with Himmler as leader, and RuSHA men providing the personnel, to 'maintain SS influence'.

If, through the work of the SS and RuSHA members in the Sudeten area we can achieve an example of correct and healthy settlement, then the moment will be brought nearer when the SS, under the spur of true achievement, will be able to take over the Settlement Office in the old Reich as well... the work of the Settlement Office [of the RuSHA] will remain trivial unless the whole area is decisively altered, an opportunity which now offers itself in the Sudetenland—either that or spend millions. 59

—presumably a reference to the possibilities of seizure without compensation of evacuated land, or land under the control of the Gestapo.
Parcels of land were seized from Czechs in the Sudetenland by the Gestapo, the only area in 'Greater Germany' where this procedure seems to have been followed (although the RNS IDF for the Saarland reported mass evacuations from land holdings). Acquisitions in the Sudetenland averaged 520 Reichsmark per hectare, whereas compensation prices in Thuringia, for example, were 2,600 RM per hectare.

A puzzled reference by Lammers to Pancke's draft suggestion for the Prague Land Office survives. In the same month that Pancke wrote to Himmler, October 1938, Lammers noted that a member of Henlein's staff in the Sudetenland had negotiated a draft Führer-decree with someone in the Chancellery on the regulation of land use in the Sudetenland, proposing the creation of a Land and Settlement Office which would be completely independent of the central authorities, with the exception of the Four Year Plan authorities. Lammers minced that the Minister of the Interior thought the proposals 'impossible', while none of the departments concerned could be found to admit knowledge of the matter.77

Himmler appeared to favour any plan put on him for extending SS authority—as long as it could be done without too much friction. The establishment of the Prague Land Office in 1938 was important. It was the first example of SS institutional imperialism at work outside the Altreich borders. Darré, the RMLE and the RNS were all successfully bypassed, and the Ministry of the Interior's objection over the raising of the SS's success in a small and hitherto unimportant SS office in gaining control in the occupied territory was a step towards collecting all the racial offices under Himmler's control, a fait accompli by the end of 1939.78 It gave scope for the first massive transfers of land, property and people.

Darré, meanwhile, had attempted to resign from the SS—a brave move blocked by Hitler on appeal by Himmler79—and with his gift for acquiring the hostility of influential opponents by unjust political manoeuvring, had begun a campaign against von Gottberg, the official behind the SS takeover of the DAG. Complaining as he would later of 'SS Cheka methods used in the Sudetenland against Germans',80 Darré wrote SS Führer von Gottberg, [now] leader of the SS Land Office in Prague. A drunken riot involved with gangsters. The evacuation policy in the Czech area, yes, but slowly. Gottberg has gone worse. On this, it must be said that my ordinary administrative facilities could not have coped with this 'de-Czeching' of Bohemia and Moravia, because to do this 'legally' would have required extensive preparations over a long period of time, at least, as long as the German government valued appearances before the outside world.81

—a startling comment from someone who was still a minister of the government, and one which revealed again his alienation from what was happening.

In an attempt to further his campaign against von Gottberg, and at the same time rescue his own concept of peasant settlement, Darré contacted Gustav Pancke in May 1939 (at that date Pancke was still head of the RSHA) to try to win him over. Darré's diary records only the discussion over the planned Wehrbaumen villages on Germany's eastern border, but Pancke's notes, drawn up immediately after the meeting in Darré's house, show the attempted negotiation in detail.82 Darré first told Pancke that von Gottberg was trying to establish a Land Office in Prague over his head, and suggested that Kunster should replace Gottberg. Unfortunately for Darré, Kunster was now in disgrace with the RSHA. He had criticized the DAG to a Landesbauernführer83 and Pancke commented ironically that co-operation with Kunster would be difficult, since he attacked all Race and Settlement projects. Darré then turned to Himmler's Wehrbaumen concept, which entailed a fortified village of some thirty families, governed by two or three SS men who would also be trained soldiers. Darré attacked this idea of combining farming and fighting, and again propounded his own belief in a peasantry closely rooted to their own land, drawing a parallel, once again, to the colonisation of the West in America.

Pancke did express agreement on the basic idea of strengthening peasant representation: 'I hope that one day every Minister and State Secretary will be a farmer's son', but he differed substantially on the rationale for settling 'relatively uncivilised areas in the East': it was not to possess the land in some rootless, mystical way, but to form economic ties with the Altreich which would bind the two areas together irrevocably, as far as marketing, production and industry were concerned. He also doubted whether a pool of suitable peasant families existed for what Darré had in mind. Did such 'adventurous and romantic families really exist'? Darré's proposal for future co-operation became vague at this point, and Pancke retied in bewilderment, suspicious about Darré's intentions. Thus, Darré's attempt to win over Himmler's man on issues, both organisational and political, where there was considerable disagreement, had the opposite effect.
The shift of emphasis from establishing a large-scale SS settlement programme within Germany—the aim as expressed in Pancke's letters to Himmler in 1938—to creating what was eventually an SS ruled empire in Poland and Russia, was clearly foreshadowed in this conversation.

The invasion changed the focus of attention for many of the agrarian ideologues, as the example of Konrad Meyer was to show. Shortly after the creation of the RKFDV, Himmler summoned Meyer to Warsaw, and asked him to take over and expand the RKFDV planning office. Meyer, who had occupied academic posts before the war as an expert in land planning and utilisation, accepted. He commented after the war that relations between his office and Darré remained tense until Darré's dismissal as minister in 1942, whereas 'relations between the RKFDV and the Ministry of Agriculture remained undisturbed, we understood their political line of action and defended it. What can one say about the Secretary Backe'? Darré's public response to the news of the formation of the Reich Commissariat was to call a conference of representatives from the Ministry of Agriculture, the National Food Estate and the Settlement Societies to discuss their mutual expertise in agricultural settlement. He wrote in his diary: 'Harmingen tells me that all settlement in Poland shall be carried out by the SS... This is the most decisive defeat of my life.'

Although much of the ensuing correspondence between Darré and Himmler, and Darré and Lammers, stressed questions of ministerial competence, and although the trial judge at Nuremberg considered that the disagreement between Darré and Himmler was over power rather than ideas, it is clear from Darré's campaign that issues of vital ideological importance for him were at stake. He wrote to Lammers, for example, enclosing a book on Anglo-Irish history, saying that if the Polish resettlement was not carried out 'from the point of view of creating a sound land law', it would end with the same kind of strife that had characterised England's relations with southern Ireland, the north, according to Darré, having been stabilised through a yeoman-farmer pattern of development, while the south had been patterned on English neo-feudal land holdings, large estates and rented holdings. This was a development of Darré's belief that independent farmers were more likely to identify with the nation, and less likely to behave as hostile nationals. The letter does leave unclear the extent to which Darré was prepared to dispense the Polish farmers in the incorporated areas, beyond, that is, the question of exchange of populations, generally envisaged by Germans at that time. It is possible that he was thinking of a mixed German-Polish occupation, both farming according to the Erbhof ideal. Certainly Darré had never been as anti-Polish as many of his colleagues, as his dispositions for allowing Polish farmers to become erbhofändig under the EHG make clear. However, what was more important to Darré than humane considerations about the existing Polish settlers was the need to avoid a colonial situation, the nightmare that had bedevilled England's relations with Ireland. He was also looking for a looser socio-political structure than was generally envisaged, one the Jeffersonian connotations of which are indicated in his comparison with the American colonisation of the West: the farming population was to be bound more to the soil than to national or economic entities. In contrast, the emphasis on technocracy, development and efficiency that developed in the SS-state (which is not to argue that the SS-state was efficient in practice), included the notion of a link with the soil because it fitted practical data, the given belief that social man needed such a link, and that a society ordered on such a basis would be more efficient.

The controversy over whether settlement was intended to take place within an enlarged German border or whether it would consist of an armed incursion into lands east of Poland, obviously carried implications which went to the heart of Nazi ideology.

By 1938 Darré observed the growing power of Himmler and the SS with alarm. Heinrich Himmler has the soul of the SS firmly in his hand'. He was one of the first observers of SS power to comment on the growth of their economic power; he claimed in early 1939 that Himmler was deliberately infiltrating his men into positions where they could 'hold the purse strings'.

The substratum of policy disagreement was not a negligible element in Darré's attempts to protect his sphere of power, since he was convinced that a settlement programme carried out by the RNS—using the Erbhof legislation, and replaing dwarf farms into viable units—would be different from and superior to SS-led expansion, with their emphasis on economic activity and, Darré believed, then hostility to the peasants. When a draft Ostmärkeseite appeared in April 1939, Darré was astonished to find that it would have taken all power, effectively, from the RNS, and he immediately complained to Lammers. Even Lammers saw to it that the draft was withdrawn. In this issue Himmler's attempts to convince Hitler that resettlement was a political matter rather than an agricultural one. To this end, the SS controlled the Ve-Mi-Stelle, and had achieved close links with several ethnic German communities abroad, particularly in Eastern Europe.
Himmler's own plans for eastern settlement, surprisingly similar to the Weimar Internal Colonization movement, concerned the dangers of Polish migration into border areas, and emphasised the notion of a border defended by militant peasants of pure German blood. Naturally, Darré also wanted the German borderlands to be as densely populated as possible with German peasants, but this was secondary to his main vision, and he could not be described as 'imperialist' in his aims. For example, he commented in March 1939, 'Protestorate declared: now possible to have a colony within our borders. Only bearable if the Volk feel a Blutegendanke, God knows what will happen.\(^{95}\) The whole dimension of the 'national interest' seemed to escape him, while Himmler's interest lay on the militant and expansionist role of the SS in the east.

Germany, unlike Poland and to a lesser extent Hungary (which both had Wehrbauer policies), was a highly industrialised and technologically advanced country which was currently planning an aggressive war, that Himmler should have been thinking in terms of Cossacks, Poles and feudalistic Hungarians, to promote a plan which implied a defensive military position and a reasonably stable border area (else why settle it?) demonstrates a curious unrealism. Certainly, Wehrbauer settlement was a very limited exercise, when it finally took place.\(^{96}\) The failure of Himmler's plans fully justified Darré's criticisms of them. May 1939. "Pancke, the new head of RuSHA, held talks with Kummer and Darré concerning the proposed Wehrbauer. After watching the pacetime settlement programme founder in Germany through a shortage of land and money, Darré was now presented with the full might of SS power being thrown behind a programme which he considered contrary to the ideals of Blut und Boden, and quite unrealisable anyway. He did not fight his campaign well. Prepared to develop the implications inherent in his own views—writing in June 1939 that the "state and its spirit must be wound down, Megalopolis will decline"\(^{94}\)—Darré entered into a condition of incoherent rage that his slogans should be used by men who intended something quite different.

On hearing that the task of resettling the ethnic Germans had been given to the newly established RKFDV\(^{99}\) in October 1939, Darré wrote a long letter to Lammers claiming that the RNS alone had the special knowledge needed to resettlement, those expropriated by Polish land reforms. He insisted, with his usual tactlessness, that SS-men were the wrong choice to carry out the job, because they were particularly unpopular with the peasants, and any such connection would arouse resentment. There seems to have been little evidence for this claim, but Darré's next point was more valid: that the SS would not know how to create viable holdings from the 'dwarf holdings' common in the Warthegau. Darré's criticism of the Wehrbauer concept was then made openly for the first time. If the word meant simply a yeoman peasantry, able to defend themselves against bands of marauding Polish migrants, then the ordinary Bauern was perfectly suitable for the task. If a 'Cossack type of border protection' was at issue, then Darré demanded a clarification of what precisely Himmler thought he was playing at, since such settlement implied the existence of garrisons, and the superiority of such a military force over the farmer. In that case, the normal border garrisons and motorised troops would be more effective than the Wehrbauer, who were neither fish nor fowl,\(^{98}\) too ill prepared for a modern war, and too involved in military relationships to develop into a self-sustaining unit.

Unfortunately for Darré, this sensible analysis appeared too late in the course of a long letter to repair the impression of a man merely fighting for his bailiwick. Darré's next step was to send a ten-page memo to Himmler about the background of the Baltic Germans from Estonia and Latvia who were expected 'any minute.'\(^{97}\) Darré set out their history and told Himmler that he had laid a comprehensive plan for their resettlement before Gustav Stresemann in the 1920s. Himmler replied two weeks later, with a dig at Darré's expert knowledge: he alleged that the supposedly hundred per cent bauernfahig settlers from the Baltic in fact were mostly from the Baltic towns, while the remainder had acquired enormous latifundia through the old Hanse League (sic). and Himmler really did not feel able to reproduce the same conditions in the German area.\(^{98}\)

Himmler was clearly not prepared to compromise with Darré, and it was only through Bäcke's intervention that some marketing corporation personnel were eventually 'borrowed' by the RKFDV and the Vo-Mi-Stelle for the task of organising ethnic German settlement, but by now under the effective authority of Bäcke and the Ministry of Agriculture rather than Darré.

Fundamental responsibility for the resettlement of the ethnic Germans lay with Himmler and the RKFDV, specifically with SS-Brigadegführer Ulrich Greifelt, head of the RKFDV till 1942. Throughout the war, there had to be contacts with the Ministry of Agriculture over questions of ensuring harvesting, and transporting produce, so that while unconnected with resettlement, the Ministry of
Agriculture was involved in the administration of food production in the occupied areas. Regional farming advisers, known as Kreislandwirten were installed, who were responsible for ensuring food supplies locally, but had nothing to do with the question of land ownership. Within the framework of the Four Year Plan, the Hauptverwaltung Oste was administered by Winckler (who had undertaken trustee work during the Weimar period). Darre’s replacement by Backe in 1942 meant that a new phase of co-operation between the RKFDV and the Agricultural Ministry began. Backe made an effort to retain Himmler’s favour, while endeavouring to maintain the level of food production in the incorporated areas; he may also have supplied an element of factual information for Himmler, who lacked a technical background in agriculture. Backe’s promotion obviously simplified matters for Himmler, who no longer had to cope with Darre’s tendency to play at Machiavellian politics, while at the same time trying to salvage his own aims.

CHAPTER SEVEN

Poland: Germany’s Ireland?

CRANARY OR PEASANT’S PARADISE?

In November 1939, Wilckens, State Secretary in the Ministry of Agriculture, wrote to Himmler as Reichskommissar, suggesting that the function of the new Reichsgaue (the Wartheland) was to be for purely German peasant producers.

No title to the new land should be handed out, because after the war, priority must be to Volksdeutsche peasants and soldiers who fought for it. This is morally right, also the way to produce as much as possible from the land.

Nothing could more clearly encapsulate the joint role the Volksdeutsche peasants were to play than this request. But a different plan was to use the conquered acres of the east to establish large estates on the Prussian pattern, to produce grain and potatoes with hired Polish labourers. This was favoured by Goering and the German High Command, while Himmler, despite his penchant for the Wehrbauer concept, favoured in practice the demands of the landed aristocracy.

The imminent arrival of hundreds of thousands of returning Germans turned the balance in favour of an attempt at a peasant-type settlement, at least as concerned the Volksdeutsche. Such an operation, however, necessitated the large-scale deportations which were associated with the re-settlement programme in the incorporated areas, and which have drawn attention away from other aspects of these events.

The existence of two quite separate plans for the area—the raw material-pool-corn-corn-chamber, and the Germanised peasant nation—was complicated by the improvised nature of everything that took place between 1939 and 1945. As plan succeeded plan, order succeeded order, and reorganisation succeeded reorganisation, great care has to be taken to distinguish what was actually happening in the incorporated areas from what the most recent pronouncement had demanded was to
happen. For example, one might well wonder how it was that the 'Z-Aktion' of 1942 which expelled Polish dwarf farm smallholders from their holdings in the Warthegau, could find any Polish farmers in the area at all, considering that at least three orders had already emerged from various offices to deport them to the General-Gouvernement. A year later, hundreds of thousands of Polish farm labourers were deported to Germany as conscripted farm labourers, workers who would not have been available for that purpose if previous deportation plans had been implemented.

Even the exact whereabouts of the border between Resstpolen and the new German county was a last-minute arrangement. One RuSHA adviser wrote scathingly to Himmler in October 1939 that the plan to incorporate Kraków, 'the very centre of Polish culture' into a newly created 'German' area was madness, and would only damage Germany's reputation.

The administration of western Galicia is overburdened with such problems and in chaos, while continuing uncertainty over the future nationality of this or that administrative area increases the existing chaos.

The Police Chief at Bromberg, SS GF Hildebrandt, commented in November 1939 that room had to be found in his area for another 10,000 Wolhynien Germans, who were 'in the first place to be considered as successors to the Poniatowski villages', meaning presumably that the unfortunate Wolhyniens would be used as armed settlers to fight their Polish neighbours in the countryside. The argument in favour of using the Volksdeutsche as Währherrs tended to be produced, understandably perhaps, by SS Police Chiefs and by Himmler, while the argument in favour of peasant food production came from members of the National Food Estate drafted as agricultural advisers after the outbreak of war. Members of the RuSHA advisory staff were strongest in their advocacy of deporting (or Germanising) the Polish population, and replacing them with Germans, for both racial and food production reasons. One suggestion that seems not to have been made was to try to increase food production using existing Polish agricultural organisational methods. Not only had numerous studies of Polish food production between the wars revealed the fact that production had dropped by between twenty and forty per cent in formerly Prussian areas, but a special study commissioned by the National Statistics Office in July 1939 described Warsaw, Lodz, Silesia,
Goslar becomes Germany's National Peasant City. 1934.

Darré (second from left) waits to address a meeting in Goslar. Behind him the wheatleaf symbol of the National Food Estate, superimposed on a swastika.
Above: This picture of Darre's birthplace in Belgrano, Argentina (1896), was sent to him in 1936 by a N.S.D.A.P. youth group in Argentina.
(Gestet Archive.)

Below: Darre here gives an after-lunch pep talk to the leaders of the National Food Estate, at a farm belonging to one of them. 1934/5.
(Mrs. N. Buch.)

Nuremberg postcard. 1935.
Top: Darré was shown the medieval ex-monastery behind the Imperial Palace at Goslar. Here he points it out to his wife. Darré was vehemently anti-Christian.
(Mrs. N. Barker.)

Left: Commemoration stone at Goslar.

Right: Hitler addressed the Harvest Festival Rally at the Buceberg, 1935.
(Mrs. N. Barker.)
Galicia and Kielce as 'agricultural deficit areas'. Germany had doubled the number of cattle, and four times the number of pigs and goats per capita, ten times more arable land and twenty-five per cent less forest.

More than one-third of the agricultural land belongs to farms of less than 2 ha, some one-fifth up to 5 ha. No surpluses worth mentioning could be brought to market—even with sensible management—given these farm sizes. A large part of the remaining ground is forest. An example of what is produced by the larger farms: one 200 ha farm we took over, which on the whole had not suffered from the war, presumably thus not lost any poultry. Some 28 ha of fish pools delivered 8–10 cwt, of fish a year! The rye was enough for the agricultural labourers, and the manager grew his own food. You can see from this example what large and medium farms are going to produce for urban consumers.10

Another report to Himmler commented that Polish land was 'uneven, lacking in natural resources, exhausted and extremely wet, with no natural drainage'.11 Thus, a mixture of contempt for Polish farmers for having fallen behind Russian standards, and the fact that areas like Galicia were in any case among the poorest peasant farming areas in Europe,12 led inexorably to the decision to deport Polish farmers and substitute 'good German peasants' in their place. A vivid impression of the poverty of the Polish countryside is given in the diary of a Nazi administrator in the incorporated areas in 1941:13 'Everything is primitive, poverty stricken and filthy. With the German settlers from Russia, things are much cleaner, but otherwise little different... I was told that people actually lived in holes in the ground round here. I saw poverty stricken villages... unpainted houses, reed thatched roofs, reed and clay walls... farmhouses without solid floors or even plaster.'

In fact, the extent to which Poland was virtually an agriculturally undeveloped land was well recognised by local officials. However, the implications of this fact, the resources and effort that would be needed in order to make Poland and the incorporated areas net contributors to Germany's food requirements, were consistently ignored by administrators in Berlin, where eyes were fixed on the Polish rye exports in the last two decades. One report which showed the unfavourable conditions in Polish agriculture compared to Germany...
pondered on where the 'agricultural surplus area' was in Poland, continuing hopefully that it was in the west. But, 'the area [Warthegau] is in its current structure and density of population a deficit area, and in no way a corn chamber, the assumption which is heard all over the place in Berlin'.

This report contained an early detailed plan to carry out the population transfer which was at once to turn the Incorporated Areas into an agricultural surplus area, and settle it with German peasants. He recommended evacuating double the number of Poles and Jews for the number of planned German immigrants; all Jews, and the Polish intelligentsia would be immediately deported, while the 'indigenous population' would be investigated for possible Germanisation. This meant that a large number of Polish citizens were envisaged as remaining in the area. Mayer, appointed Himmler's chief planning officer in late 1939, called for a population balance of fifty per cent Germans, and fifty per cent Poles, with a land holding of thirty to forty per cent. Himmler, however, addressing SS leaders in Danzig in October 1939, prophesied that in fifty years' time, some twenty million German settlers would be living in Posen-West Prussia—although he wanted settlements to be kept at least 10 km from the Polish border.

The land would be free; cheap labour would be available from Polish workers. Forests would provide wood. All that had to be paid for was electricity, piped water, sinks and baths. Like most of Himmler's proposals for Wethausen settlement, this bears out Baek's comment that Himmler's settlement ideas were 'vague, theoretical and not based on practicalities'.

The vague Himmler's promises, the more detailed were the recommendations of the RuSHA officials. Gustav Paecke recommended that peasant settlement be confined to western Galicia and the southern part of Upper Silesia, so that Polish industrial areas should be spared any evacuation measures. He requested the Höhere SS und Polizei Führer to direct all settlers to the south. Hildebrandt also wanted to avoid disturbance to the Polish economy, and suggested drawing up lists of farms which were essential to the Polish economy, to avoid arbitrary disturbance'.

As the months dragged on and homes had to be found for hundreds of thousands of Volksdeutsche refugees, the arguments over the best way to use the new 'colony' continued. One member of the SS planning department for land in the east visited Gauleiter Greiser in February 1941 with detailed maps of planned re-settlement in the Warthegau. He argued that even if every centimetre of Polish land were to be farmed by Germans, the population would still be only one quarter German, because 'the removal of the Polish agricultural and urban proletarians will be a much more difficult task than that of peasant settlement', and that unless the existing agricultural structure was changed, the existence of Polish farm labourers made 'true Germanising' impossible. Gauleiter Greiser objected that 'the task of the Warthegau is to produce grain, grain and still more grain—a grain factory, and that is why it has been incorporated into the Reich', to which the RuSHA adviser replied with arguments so characteristic of the peasant producer-advocate that it is worth quoting in detail.

I answered that fats and milk were needed more and more, and peasant farms were more productive in these areas. While this was certainly no time to start experimenting, there was undoubtedly evidence that peasants produced more than large landowners from the same land, especially with the aid of machinery. Only the peasant could make the Warthegau a German county—he alone rendered the Polish labourers redundant.

However, Greiser reiterated that Goering had expressly ordered grain production to be the main crop, using large farms and Polish labour. The aim of 'Germanisation' was excellent in itself, but would take thirty or forty years. With the inhumanity typical of the reformer mentality, the RSS adviser made the counter-proposal that Polish labourers' families should all be deported to the General Government in order to induce their menfolk to follow them. Finally, Greiser's 'reactionary adviser', Segmund informed the Race and Settlement office that Goering had ordered that Poland's agricultural structure should remain unchanged, with the single exception of dwarf farm consolidation. Only the large estates could produce corn, or breed herds of pedigree cattle. An agricultural leading class was needed, and furthermore, the demands of wealthy men who wanted farms needed satisfying—something stressed by the Wehrmacht. It is mere fantasy to talk of 5,000 new farms by 1941. You yourself know how all these great plans of the R.F. [Himmler] end up.22

This interchange of opinions tells us several significant things about the development of settlement plans in the incorporated areas. First, that even before the invasion of Russia, which put a stop to ambitious re-settlement projects, very little had been done in the way of Germanising the Wartheland as originally planned. Second, that
Goering's orders as head of the Four Year Plan, and minister in charge of the economy in the eastern territories, were to leave the existing Polish agricultural structure in place. Third, that Himmler's impressive sounding decrees and plans were widely regarded as being romantic fantasies, and should perhaps not be taken too seriously by historians today.

For example, in December 1940, one of Himmler's Anordnungen stated that

to create opportunities for settlement, it is necessary in the Incorporated Areas to give peasant settlers a greater share than before of farms seized from Polish and Jewish hands—40 per cent instead of 25 per cent of the agriculturally usable acreage.23

whereas, the analysis of the implementation of these plans shows that Germanised land in the Warthegau comprised barely ten per cent of the agriculturally usable land by May 1941.24

Again and again, the need to ensure that the 'recaptured' province would become and remain German was stressed in writings of 1940-1.

The character of this land is not determined by the formal property ownership of large estates and domains, as long as the necessary peasants and agricultural labourers are of Polish blood; a realisation achieved by Wilhelmite Germany far too late.25

wrote one agricultural expert, and 'Only the Neubildung deutschen Bauernums' could neutralise the danger of having to use Polish elements26 as agricultural labourers.

One writer urged that all racial undesirables should be sorted out and put into labour battalions, but were on no account to be sent east, because Himmler planned a 'blonde province' there,27 a remark that was also quoted by Pancke in a letter to Himmler.28

Between 1939 and 1940, therefore, the very period when the Volksdeutsche were due to be resettled, the exercise was still in the planning stage. Broadly speaking, the Race and Settlement's propaganda had a sharper racial content than that of writers like Kummer, Schöpke, Haušofer, and others who approached the resettlement from the small-peasant tradition of German Agrarpolitik. In 1940, the new head of the RusSHA, Hofmann, sent Himmler a copy of Das bevölkerungspolitische ABC, which discussed the movement of populations in terms of the right to survive of the superior group,29 whereas Kummer, in a series of speeches made in 1940, talked more of the value of German settlers to the nation's security, and quoted the old German folk-song that had become the theme song of the Artamaten—'Over the green, green heath, there is a better land'—as signifying the continuity of the Volksdeutsche re-settlement with the (alleged) peasant colonisation of East Prussia.30

Schöpke stressed the high fertility of the German colonies in Russia, with their population increase of ten to twenty times in a hundred years. He saw the ethnic Germans as a vigorous source of renewal for the agricultural population, whose presence would enable foreign agricultural workers to be repatriated after the war.31

Many of the writers who had propounded the virtues of peasant production supported 'Germanisation' of the Wartheland for the same reasons. Dr Otto Anhagen, whose dissertation in 1930 had compared the productivity of small and large estates, reported enthusiastically in 1940 on the possibilities of exchanging populations on Germany's eastern border. He referred to similar plans drawn up during the First World War.32 Members of the Economic Geography Institute in Königsberg also drafted proposals for settling the 'New German Area' in September 1940, arguing that complete Germanisation could only take place through peasant holdings of fifteen to twenty-five hectares.

Some saw the specifically productive aspects of the venture as a challenge. One writer described the flat, largely uncultivated plains of the Warthegau, exposed to cold drying winds, and lacking in hedges and shelter belts. The winters were long and cold, while roads, electricity, drainage and schools were largely lacking. But

With the new land in the East, it will be easier to create new forms than in the Altreich ... a new beginning ... we do not have to struggle with established habits, as in the old villages of the West.34

Seldom can the modernisation drive that ran in tandem with the support for small farms have been so clearly expressed; significantly, this article appeared in Neues Bauernum. However, the implications of what was involved in creating a viable, modernised agriculture in a conquered land seem not to have been considered to any extent; because of the emphasis traditionally and incorrectly placed on the shortage of land within Germany, the availability of 'free' land in
Poland was seen as a cure-all for all the shortages of resources that had beset German agriculture.

The next section of this chapter will show the extent to which the plans failed, although in terms of agricultural productivity, considerable improvements appeared under the leadership of RNS advisers. What is surprising in these early enthusiastic plans is to find Darréan ideas about the need for a Germanised medium-sized farm structure surviving in such a strong form at middle and lower levels of the SS, as if a form of counter-penetration had taken place. Himmler, with his plans to develop an industrial raw material empire in the east, had taken over re-settlement, and Darré had returned to obscurity. Yet many of Darré’s supporters continued to work for the eventual triumph of their own agrarian aims in the incorporated areas, convinced that they had the support of one of the most powerful men in the Third Reich, secure in their dominant aims: to modernise agriculture by reforming its structure, and to reform the agricultural class system. Whatever Hitler’s motives for the Volksdeutsche settlement, SS planning documents leave no doubt about what they thought was their function: to provide the necessary demographic material for Germanising the Warthegau, to strengthen the then border area; and to improve agricultural productivity by cutting up the latifundia.

The existing situation was a blueprint of everything the SS planners opposed, from the hierarchical class structure to the unproductive and unproductive agricultural proletariat, the unused potential of the land and the racial/cultural mixture. In December 1940, a report of the result of one year’s resettlement activity again attacked the idea of making the Warthegau a haven for a German upper-class landed gentry, using Polish labourers. This attack was from the SS Race and Settlement office, and demonstrates how deeply Darré’s anti-Junker views had penetrated the new planning bodies under Himmler. Indeed, it is possibly for this reason that the old RUS advisory staff had been dissolved by Himmler in late 1939. Their criticisms of Goering repeated, almost word for word, remarks made by an RNS member at Darré’s settlement conference in June 1940: the faults of Inner Kolonisation, which created a German upper class using Polish labourers, to the detriment of the nation, must be avoided.

These were Darré’s points; however, unlike Darré’s speeches, SS plans were couched in the language of practical policy. Phrases like Blut und Boden were missing, and the SS’s opponents in this matter—Goering and the Wehrmacht High Command—were seen as reactionaries with outdated unscientific beliefs, whose obsessions about the social and economic value of large estates would soon enter the dustbin of history. This belief in a more egalitarian farm and land ownership structure was seen as the modern, progressive and scientific norm. Clearly, this interpretation was worlds away from Darré’s rationale for peasant farming, yet equally obviously it had been inspired and influenced by it. Himmler’s romantic interest in medieval German history seems not to have linked up with the ‘forward-looking’ workers in the RuS and RKPDV, while in his practice, Himmler was unenthusiastic about altering the Polnisch farm structure.

REFELTUNG DER VÖLKERDEUTSCHEN

In September 1939, the ethnic Germans who were to be involved in the re-settlement programme fell, broadly speaking, into two categories. There were those ethnic Germans who lived well to the east of the incorporated areas, such as the Baltic Germans who had lost their land under the Estonian, Lithuanian and Latvian land reforms of the 1920s, and the more pressing problem of the German colonists from Besarabia and Wolhynia, some 160,000 people who had originally been invited to settle by Russian and Russo-Polish nobles, after 1815 and 1863 respectively. Under the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact, Russia agreed to repatriate these German colonists, who lay in the path of their invasion of eastern Poland. The second category was that of the ethnic Germans living in situ in Polish and Czech provinces which had been German/Austrian before the First World War, together with the 750,000 or so refugees who had left the Polish borderlands between 1919 and 1939, considered by Germany to be refugees with a right to compensation by the Poles. The ethnic Germans still living in Poland were referred to as Reichsdeutsche by the German administration after their invasion of Poland, a fact that confused the issue at the Nuremberg trials, where the judges thought that the Reichsdeutsche in Poland were recent immigrants from Germany; the reverse was the case. By 1942, it was estimated that some 500,000 people were involved in the resettlement programme.

Despite Hitler’s well-publicised remarks about the South Tyrolean Germans, for example, just sailing down the Danube to the Black Sea, and finding a home there, the thrust of the re-settlement was defensive rather than expansionist, and was seen as a definitive consolidation of German territory. Homes had to be found for
hundreds of thousands of refugees, and the incorporation of the newly conquered territory in the east was the answer to many problems. There was the hope that it might include part of the rye-growing area that had contributed to Poland's massive grain exports before the war; the population density was half that of Germany's, which meant, it was thought, free and empty territory for settling farmers, while the Volksdeutsche would fill the gap caused by the lack of German immigrants from the Altreich prepared to go east. They would provide an indisputably Germanised population in land that would now be German forever. Never again could plebiscites and percentages be a weapon used against land colonised by German settlers.

This application of the concept of self-determination and ethnic identity as a basis for nationhood—a complete reversal of the expansionist liberalism of 1848, that proposed giving German nationality to all Germans anywhere out of Germany's territory embittered by decades of strife. German claims of ill-treatment of their minorities in the inter-war years were not a figment of Nazi imagination, although, ironically enough, anti-German activities appeared to have receded in Poland after the German-Polish Friendship Treaty of 1934. There are great difficulties in judging the true extent of atrocities against German civilians after 1939. For example, the massacre of German civilians at Bromberg in September 1939 was inflating Rosenberg to a figure of 50,000, while the post-war Polish government admitted to 300. Contemporary accounts, and the war-time trial of those responsible suggest that the real figure of deaths was over 5,000. Militant Polish ex-soldiers and members of nationalist fighting units had been given priority as new settlers in the Polish border areas where the 'Poniatowskie' villages were formed, a fact that makes the mutual hatred and fear between Germans and Poles on the border easier to understand. These remarks are not intended in any way to excuse either the German invasion or the evacuation measures that followed it, but rather to help to explain the attitude of the German planners and administrators of the re-settlement programme, men who were not monsters, but who implemented a plan that caused endless suffering.

The total amount of territory annexed to form new German counties in the east was 102,800 sq. km, of which some seventy-five per cent had been German territory before the First World War. German law was introduced gradually, including the Reichsnahrstand Marketing Law, which came into effect in January 1940. Approximately eighty per cent of the twelve million population were Polish, 4.5 per cent Jewish, and some 15.5 per cent German. The proportion of Jews within the population was considerably smaller than in eastern Poland, as the main areas of Jewish settlement lay in regions which had been Russian and Austrian prior to 1918.

The RKFVD decree of October 1939 authorised the Reichsführer SS to create new settlement areas, protect the Deutsche Volksgemeinschaft from 'damaging influences', and above all, organise the return of Germans living outside the boundaries of Germany. Clause 3 of the decree gave the task of creating 'new peasants' to the Ministry of Agriculture, under the RKFVD's jurisdiction.

The RKFVD's creation was a shock to the Race and Settlement Office (now called the RuS) which had expected to run the resettlement. Local staff offices had been established in Danzig, Silesia and West Prussia for the event, and detailed maps had been drawn up of each parish by the Race and Settlement advisory staff, work that was later taken over by the SS planning staff in Posen and Lodz under Konrad Meyer. Negotiations took place with the civil government in the occupied area in October, the office offering to place itself under the jurisdiction of the local governor, but Himmler set up a parallel organisation of planning experts which rendered the Settlement advisory staff effectively redundant. In late November, 1939, they were transferred to the SS under the aegis of the police chief in Danzig, SS Gruppenführer Hildebrandt, jointly to run Land Offices for the implementation of the 7th October 1939 decree in Silesia, Danzig and Posen.

Pancke suggested immediately organising his new underemployed staff into Vorkommandos who would be sent into villages to evacuate the Polish inhabitants, and prevent them destroying livestock or crops. He accompanied this idea with a request for funds to cover weapons, transport, and so on, and an exemption from Wehrmacht military duty, and gave details of estates that could be taken over for use as SS training farms (Lehrgüter). This enthusiasm was restrained by a meeting with Himmler some days later, when the representative of the civil government, SS Freiherr von Hoheluhe, was present. Himmler ordered that the proposed Land Office be subjected to the RKFVD office, now under SS Brigade-Führer Greifelt. As for the training farms, he agreed that suitable land (especially if formerly owned by the church) should be seized and prepared, but that no training of 'new peasants' should be carried out while the war was on. The plans went into absurd detail, but the memorandum of this meeting shows that while Himmler's
directions about co-operation with the police, and his administrative orders, were clear, his ideas about the actual settlement of formerly Polish villages were not, and that Pancke’s enthusiasm to begin operations was being heavily controlled from the centre.92

The Race and Settlement Office had been financed at the beginning of the war from the Prague Land Office, but by December 1939 this source of funds had dried up.93 Pancke sent Himmler some of their reports, to ’show what excellent work they are doing’,94 setting South Tyroleans in Kreise Saybusch, but Himmler seemed, if anything, alarmed at the veer and speed of the operation: ’The work they have performed is certainly interesting, but to my mind is at this moment premature. Where exactly are these RUeS Beratung people now, and what are they working on?’95

Later, he was to apologise indirectly to Pancke for the dissolution of the RUeS advisory staff, and the takeover by the RKFDV:

Your own position [as head of the RUeS] does not play any special part in my work as Reichskommissar, because in fact I would otherwise like to give the RUeSMA perhaps an even greater task; however, the joint role would endanger relationships between us and all the Ministries, which is not to be sneezed at.96

Between December 1939 and December 1940, events seemed cannily to rush ahead of planning, but, Cassandra, the resettlement proceeded, amid complaints that the SS was being starved of funds by the Ministry of Agriculture, and attacks on the Settlement societies for ’interfering with ethnic German re-settlement’.97 Von dem Bach apologised to Pancke that only 1,000 people a day were being evacuated from Upper Silesia, instead of the planned 4,000. With no central water supply in most of the Polish towns, and the danger of typhus in the summer months, establishing transit camps was itself an easy task.98 The planned rapid evacuation of Polish farmers was not taking place, and all large buildings that seemed suitable were bought by the RKFDV for temporary accommodation for the Volksdeutsche.

In December 1939, the plan was to evacuate 400,000 Poles to make way for around 200,000 Volksdeutsche, of whom some 120,000 were expected immediately, most on foot. Categories for deportation to the G-G included all Jews, Polish peasants whose land was being taken for the Wohlbytnen German, and any Poles related to those killed in the fighting, who were described as a security risk.99

The Wohlbytnen Germans did not in fact begin to arrive until the spring of 1940, after complex negotiations with the Russians, and the implementation of a refugee treaty concerning those Poles (some 60,000) who had fled to Russian-occupied territory after Germany’s invasion, but who now wanted to return. RUeS officials went to Russian-occupied territory to oversee the evacuation of the Wohlbytnen and Bessarabians. Uncertainty surrounded their evacuation: Pancke claimed that he was not told to prepare for their arrival until February or March 1940.100

The colonists arrived with the minimum of luggage and possessions. They were confined to fifty kilos per family, and had concentrated on bringing with them seeds and farming implements. ’The negotiations with the Soviet Union went without friction; the officials were extremely korrek’, commented Hoffmeier approvingly, adding, ’It was sometimes difficult to communicate with such completely opposed points of view. Also, one had to get used to the fact that time and punctuality in general meant nothing to the Russians.’101 This meant hours or days waiting at stations at temperatures sometimes twenty degrees below freezing, while lost train carriages were found, and Soviet officials borrowed pencils and paper from the Germans. Even under war-time conditions, the incorporated area was a paradise of plente compared to areas under Russian rule. However, more panic-stricken confusion awaited the unfortunate Volksdeutsche in Germany, where no one seemed to be in charge of the project, or to have any idea of how many people were involved.102

Pending the provision of suitable farms, returning ethnic Germans were placed in transit camps within the Reich as well as in the incorporated areas. The Waffen SS, with its chronic shortage of manpower, recruited as many of their youths as possible, while families were sometimes split up by recruitment by labour organisations to work in the Altreich. The National Socialist Welfare Organisation helped with the provision of furniture and clothes, while the RKFDV provided pocket money for those in camps, and other welfare services.103

Evacuation orders regarding Polish farmers were strict in their allowances of furniture and livestock; the farmers were supposed to leave behind heavy furniture and cows and horses. However, in practice, they seem to have taken all they could with them, while the buildings and crops that remained were often damaged by relatives of the evacuated Poles. In many cases, the evacuated Poles were moved only to the next village along, and the re-settled Volksdeutsche feared their presence.104
The returnees varied considerably in their experience of farming, their abilities and education. Besorbian Germans turned out to be especially difficult to settle in farms, and in December 1940 Himmler ordered them to be put into labour battalions instead.65 Relations between different groups were sometimes tense, as indeed they were between returnees and the old-established Reichsdeutsche families in the incorporated areas.

Himmler had ordered in January 1940 that ‘despite the joy these Germans feel on returning to their homeland, every encouragement must be given in order to make their adaptation to the new surroundings, and the rebuilding of their lives easier’.66 But among the substantial element of integrated Reichsdeutsche, usually estate owners and managers who had intermarried with Poles over generations, the newcomers were despised rather than welcomed as racial comrades. In the eyes of the SS administration, many of these integrated Germans had ‘gone native’, and became quite Polish in their lifestyle; they presented a special ideological problem to the administrators of the newly conquered territory. Those Reichsdeutsche who own or manage large farms have personal friendship with Poles and drink with them. Unfriendliness towards the Volksdeutsche is commonplace.’67 What was even worse, some Poles were too friendly with the Reichsdeutsche. Local NSDAP welfare workers found their sense of nationalist propriety offended when they heard, for example, Polish maids singing German nationalist songs in a Reichsdeutsche household.68 Class loyalty appeared to be a stronger force than racial solidarity in relations between the new immigrants and the old, at least, where large and medium landowners were concerned.

By mid-1940, thirty-five camps had been established around Lodz and other towns in the eastern zone of the incorporated areas, most of them adapted from empty factories and summer homes. 120,000 people had passed through them by summer, while by the end of 1940 some 500,000 Poles had been ‘Germanised’ in West Prussia, Upper Silesia and the Warthe land. Up to this date, the idea of a peasant settlement was still dominant. ‘The work has just begun. The external incorporation of land must march together with internal Germanisation . . . Volk borders are more decisive than national ones’.69 Some ethnic Germans, however, were reluctant to return to rural life, especially the Baltic Germans.70

The shortage of labour in agriculture and industry—in Germany especially—overtook re-settlement plans by the end of 1941. The transports of Poles to the G-G were suspended in March 1941 because of the shortage of labour71 by which time some 400,000 Poles had been evacuated and 167,450 ethnic Germans settled in their place. The SS Planning Staff at Posen called in vain for further evacuations, arguing that after the war was over, American-European relations would be at a low ebb, and that refugee German settlers from North America could be expected to arrive.72

The Planning Staff did their best to help the Volksdeutsche settle in, providing libraries and language courses for them, and attempting to find suitable tradesmen to the right jobs.73 The attitudes of the Poles were far from entirely hostile to passive, with even some active friendliness shown to the new arrivals in their often desperate straits. Greidelt commented, ‘In general, the Polish section of the population have not shown themselves to be friendly to the German resettlers and the resettlement commandos, but have also not been directly hostile’.74 This situation was not to last.

The easiest answer to the joint problems of shortage of labour and Polish resettlers (both from the Russian-occupied area and the G-G), was to conscript Polish men and women as forced labour, and deport them to the West, to work in Germany and France.75 Polish dwarf farms provided most of the workers, and the smallholdings that were vacated were then consolidated for German resettlement. In fifteen parishes around Lodz, over 500,000 hectares were resettled in this way (half by Volksdeutsche peasants, and half by returning Germans from the old Reich). The SS planning staff at Lodz complained that this still left 750,000 hectares locally in the hands of Polish smallholders, which could be made into 40,000 medium-sized farms, which would break the Polish influence, and enable the land to be used for intensive fodder production, more animal rearing, sugar beet and vegetables.76

Obviously, RNS ideology had found fertile ground in the SS Planning Offices at Posen and Lodz, and indeed there was a considerable increase in food production in the occupied areas under their management; however, whether this was due to resettlement or to the doubling of tractor numbers and import of ploughs and drills from Germany, is unclear.77

The implementation of more intensive and mechanised farming encountered the problem of land shortage. When the Germans invaded
the Wartheland, there were 3.2 million agriculturally usable hectares, but the first priority in a plan drawn up by the RKFDV Land Planning Office was to set aside nearly 500,000 hectares for afforestation, as well as 100,000 hectares for the Wehrmacht, and 620,000 hectares for new roads, industrial areas, suburbs and so on. This immediately cut down the available agriculturally usable land to 2.6 million hectares. 800,000 hectares of this was allocated in 1941 to the Volksdeutsche, although they settled only some 300,000 hectares.79 Despite the available free land, the existing houses and buildings which had belonged to evacuated Polish farmers, attempts at intensifying farming suffered from the lack of labour and machinery that had beset German agriculture in the Altreich. Difficult climatic conditions were exacerbated by the lack of hedges and copses; a long winter and a dry spring produced problems that had to be solved by altered farming methods. 'The aim must be to confine cattle rearing to one cow per two hectares, and have an intensive arable rotation of sugar beet, catch crops and potatoes for pig feed', wrote Hermann Prieben in *Neues Bauernum*. He attacked ideas about peasant autarky as mere sentiment, and called for more machinery, artificial fertiliser and aids for milk production to be made available to the new farms of the Warthegau.80 Under the trustee system, whereby German farmers were sent out to manage Polish farms, production improvements did come about. However, by December 1942, re-settlement had virtually ceased (which did not stop Himmler laying down directives for cultivation and planning).81 By December 1942, only the 35,000 or so new Volksdeutsche farms remained of the 'blonde province'. Every aspect of the original plan, save only the increase in food production, had failed. Even racially, 'in exceptional circumstances, persons of mixed race are to be admitted to the Reich'.82 Germanisation in the incorporated areas meant in effect the attempted Germanisation of some eighty-five per cent of the existing population there, while those Volksdeutsche still in transit camps at the end of 1942 were utilised for labour battalions in Germany.83 Perhaps fortunately, they had developed 'a certain fatalism as a result of war and revolution'.84 This necessarily brief look at the Volksdeutsche re-settlement programme has obviously ignored many factors which are important in a wider context. One problem is that the welfare aspect of the programme was considerable, and dominates the archival material. As Koehl points out, the picture that emerges from the RKFDV and RuSHA documents is overwhelmingly one of humaneness, with caring personnel distributing pocket money and showing ethnic German wives how to mend clothes. This took place, however, against a background of forced evacuation, dispossession, draconian anti-Polish legislation and racial bitterness that must be mentioned here, if only to clarify the position of the new settlers who are the subject of this section.85

While frequently the subject of personal kindness from the Polish majority, the ethnic Germans were also obliged to build up homes and farms from scratch, in conditions of poverty and shortage. Many no longer spoke fluent German, but were expected to demonstrate the virtues of German culture to their Polish neighbours. Understandably, they were subject to sporadic physical attacks from partisans and Polish villagers. Far from being the new German homeland which they had been promised, the incorporated area was an alien territory of flat wilderness stretching endlessly into mournful sultry swamps, where the unprotected emptiness of the eastern horizon exacerbated the fundamental agoraphobia of many of the settlers.86

It emerges clearly from the reports, diaries and memoirs of the German administrators that the resettled Germans suffered a poverty as great as that of the Polish villagers, despite the efforts of welfare visitors and other officials. Furthermore, many of the new settlers came from farming communities where techniques were primitive. New methods had to be learnt, with concomitant delays in successful production.87

For most of these groups, their eventual fate was worse than if they had remained behind, for the end of the re-settlement period was poignantly tragic. Driven west by the advancing Russian army, murdered en masse by Polish partisans, subject to every unstrammelled atrocity that troops fuelled by years of hate propaganda and reaction to the terror of the Einsatzgruppen could devise, the degree of their destruction will probably never be known for certain.88 Along with the many millions of East Prussians who fled west in 1945, all that was left of the ethnic German returnees at the end of the war was an inchoherent, fragmented body of survivors. Not only did several hundred years of European history disappear with their physical demise, but their fate was to be either ignored or interpreted as the just deserts of German imperialism.89

German agricultural settlement was not an integral part of Himmler's institutional expansion, but was an obsession of his staff, and popular with the majority of SS members. Himmler appears to have seized the opportunities offered in 1938 when settlement ideology was
conjoined with the sudden prospect of territorial expansion. Jan Gross suggests in his work on Poland under the Nazis that the Nazi creed was incapable of coping with the concept of empire, that both Nazi racialism and its emphasis on institutionalised 'personism' was incompatible with the creation of a real 'New Order'.

Himmler’s importance lay in the fact that he, almost alone among many other Nazis, was ideologically and temperamentally capable of thinking in imperial terms. This helps to account for his rapid seizure of power in the occupied territories; Himmler was a new phenomenon in National Socialism, representing its (perhaps inevitable) transformation into the full Fascist state: imperialist thus anti-nationalist; elitist not populist; seeking the efficient, planned—and rootless—European super-state. This dimension helps to account for the fact that by 1944 more than half the German SS were foreign-born. The role of the Eastern European settlement in Himmler’s plans was to provide a valuable element of apparent continuity of aim through Konrad Meyer’s Land Office; through the appeal to the old German desire to recover its lost empires and consolidate its frontiers. It helped to camouflage the qualitative distinction between SS hegemony in occupied Europe and previous ambitions, but its real purpose was to open the door to strategic control of a new empire in the east.

In the pursuit of that empire, Himmler discovered that racial purity could give way to a super-racial and supra-national categorisation that magically enabled a vast source of manpower to become available. By re-labelling, people could be drawn into the system and ranked on a scale of Germanism. The concept lost racial and national meaning, and became a means of grading usable human material, ‘began to acquire an achievement dimension’. The Volkssturm became a subterfuge to procure potential citizens of the New Order: loyal, healthy, and possessed of five fingers on each hand.

For many SS personnel in Himmler’s empire, the well-being of the ethnic Germans had been of intrinsic importance; the correspondence between SS offices stressing importance of settlement as late as January 1945 is evidence to that effect. However, control of the ethnic German re-settlement programme by Himmler played another role in the SS’s drive to total domination, by enabling them to control land use and distribution in the occupied territories, it put them in control of possibly the most vital raw material in all the conquered territories—land itself. There was no inevitability about the emergence of this domination. Himmler had to compete against Rosenberg, Commissar for the East, the Four Year Plan civil authority, the Wehrmacht High Command administration, as well as the Foreign Ministry and Ministry of Agriculture. The story of that struggle is not part of this work; what is involved here is the interplay of agrarian and racial ideology behind the most comprehensive attempt to institute German peasant settlement between 1933 and 1945.

That barely a third of the returned received farms, and that the remainder worked in German factories or lived in transit camps all over the Altreich shows, once again, the extent to which the apparent ideological aims of the Third Reich were subordinated to the aim of maintaining control, of survival at all costs. There can be no doubt that the re-settlement of some 250,000 people within eighteen months was a major achievement compared with the lethargic New Peasant settlement over the previous seven years; yet after the invasion of Russia, when the war can be said to have entered its most ideological stage, re-settlement virtually ceased. When the aim of racial and national rescue competed with the aim of imperial expansion, the latter came first.

Clearly, there was an ideological component in the re-settlement programme, which affected its mechanics in particular. It was assumed that peasants would continue to farm, that a peasant territory would be more truly ‘German’ in a populist sense. It was also an improvised response to a sudden emergency, a ‘dictated option’, and the fusion of Darréan Blut und Boden ideology, demographic-national aims, and agrarian reform in coping with this emergency has been the subject of this chapter.

In 1940, Himmler had announced that German, (Altreich and Reichsdeutsche) settlement would have to wait until after the war. Barely one year later, the invasion of Russia completely terminated any possibility of implementing the Volkdeutsche programme, so that the revamped version of agricultural settlement suffered the same fate as the earlier programme. Nevertheless, it has been suggested that German agricultural settlement was a cause of German expansion into the Ukraine and Russia. While food production certainly was important in Hitler’s calculations, German settlement there seems not to have been envisaged. The bulk of the re-settlement planning was carried out—often after the event—at has been described—between 1939 and 1941; it faltered after that date, and settlement ideology can hardly be blamed for Himmler’s exploitative aims in the east for a new ‘source of raw materials’. As for the deportation of half a million Poles from the Warthegau, the reduction to ghettos and final evacuation of its Jewish population—the first was only in part
CHAPTER EIGHT

The Green Nazis

Today it would be difficult to ignore fears about erosion, the destruction of animal species, anxieties about factory farming, the social effects of technology and the loss of farmland. Such issues are discussed constantly in the mass media, as well as in the output of special interest groups. When Rachel Carson wrote *Silent Spring*, she focussed the world’s attention on the ecological destruction caused by pesticides and other chemicals in the lakes and earth of North America. What has become known as the ‘ecological movement’, especially the party-political ‘Green’ aspect, implies also a broadly-based cultural criticism of the development of western civilisation. Its emphasis on technology, foreign trade, the division of labour, its urbanisation and inherent anomie are all seen as social and spiritual evils. Labour-intensive energy conservation, autarky, re-cycling resources and living close to the land are seen as inherently good.¹

On the whole, ecologists do not call for a return to pre-industrial ways of life as such. They tend rather to stress research into new forms of technology which are more suitable to small communities, and which would avoid damaging the balance of nature to the extent observable today. Where ecologists have moved into party politics, they are associated with international and pacifist sentiment which is collectivist in spirit, and propounds re-distribution of the earth’s resources—sometimes re-distribution of life’s miseries—with the zeal of an inquisitor. These ideas are more dominant in northern Europe and America than elsewhere. Although there is a small ecological movement in France, it has remained insignificant in terms of its political and social influence. It is in Germany, above all, that the Greens have obtained their greatest influence and publicity to date.

It is not widely known that similar ecological ideas were being put forward by Darre in National Socialist Germany, often using the same phrases and arguments as are used today. He began to campaign for these ideas, especially organic farming, from 1934 onwards, and during the Second World War stepped up the effort to introduce organic farming methods into Germany. After the war, as a broken, discredited

connected with the planned exchange of population for the purposes of the re-settlement, the second not at all. The conscription of Poles for labour in Germany was more a consequence of the untramelled, exploitative ideology of the Nazis at war than of any rural ideology, and certainly not Darre’s. Acts of revenge taken on Poles who had been members of nationalist groups; the oppression and corruption of a conquered people after an invasion: these also can hardly be laid at the door of the plan to re-settle ethnic Germans in the incorporated areas. Yet because of the plan’s emphasis on race, as opposed to nationality, it has attracted special vilification. Clearly, any programme of forced evacuation and dispossession involves great suffering. But whether the programme was inspired by a desire for national expansion, ideological hegemony or racial consolidation (as exemplified respectively by Polish, Russian and German expansion between 1918 and 1945) hardly affects the experience of the event either for those who suffered or for those who survive.
politician, he continued to write about soil erosion, the dangers of artificial fertilisers and the need to maintain the ‘biomass’, until his death in 1953. Two decades later, these ideas about man’s relationship with nature and the organic cycle of animal-soil-plant-man as organic farming, had gained wider attention. Today, they have crossed political boundaries, and adherents can be found across the political spectrum. They have, in fact, become part of everyone’s mental furniture. Were Darré’s ecological ideas integral to his other views, or were they irrelevant? Was it just an embarrassing accident that he should have hit on questions which preoccupy us today? Was there a serious ecological movement in the 1930s that was able to co-exist with National Socialism? Or was it in a sense ‘alternative’, as—I have argued—could be said of Darré’s ideas?

The two decades before the First World War saw the growth of the Wunderwügel, the roaming bands of students who took to the woods and mountains of Germany in search of new ways of life. They were opposed to urban anomic and alienation. At the same time, the works of Rudolf Steiner and the Anthroposophy movement were gathering support. While accepting Darwinian evolution, Steiner, an Austrian Catholic, propounded spiritual, vitalistic ideas, and feared the despoliation of the earth. His ideas included astrology, reincarnation and the importance of magnetism. But it was his opposition to the exploitation of the soil that was the most influential element. The German Youth Movement had a potent back-to-the-land element, that was more practical and communally-oriented than Steiner’s individualistic emphasis. After the First World War, several agricultural settlement groups were formed. They had a Tolstoyan flavour, and one quoted Gandhi’s attack on industrial society, ‘Machinery is the Greatest Sin’. Self-help and the Spartan ideal characterised these groups, which aimed to re-settle the German borderlands in the east. Their magazines carried songs and pictures in the spirit of the pre-war Youth Movement, whose illustrator, Fidus, lived in a wood with a large family, rather like Augustus John. Fidus, described by one writer as a ‘jugendli liebey’, was an old man when the Nazis came to power; Darré sent him enthusiastic greetings in 1938 on his seventieth birthday.¹²

Much of Darré’s influence among serious agriculturists came from the fact that his programme combined economic as well as moral arguments in favour of the peasantry. However, his attitude to technology as it affected the peasantry (technology which was needed for higher productivity) varied. For example, in a post-war work, Darré, writing under the pseudonym Carl Carlsson, attacked technology for dissolving ancient forms of being. It created new forms of social organisation—the market as overlord, the division of labour (on and between different farms) and an exploitative attitude to the land. He described the petrol-driven engine as a technological form that should have profoundly altered the relationship of peasant to technology: it did not do so because industry and government were obsessed by large farms, huge machines and the examples of American and Russian large-scale farming.³ Here again we come to a further facet of Darré’s opposition to the entire structure of German life as it had developed. Monumental size, latifundium scale—the whole concept of Spengler’s megalopoleis, were in Darré’s view the result of culturally destructive foreign influences: and all institutions—law, church, education—were the product of the victors, and must go. This was clearly an anti-conservative stance, and the similarity of these ideas with today’s Third World anti-colonial movements is not surprising. Germany in the 1920s was reeling from defeat and a cultural inferiority complex. This helps to explain the explosion of dissatisfaction, radical revolt, and desire for a new society that characterised Weimar Germany.

Steiner’s ideas did not put the peasantry first, nor did they show much interest in farmers as a group. His emphasis on individual personality and development, astrology and reincarnation, made no appeal to Darré. In fact, he had a running battle with Seifert, a landscape architect who specialised in ‘embedding motorways in the landscape ... organically’, and who worked for Dr Fritz Todt. Todt accused Seifert of being a fanatical ecologist in 1936, but by 1939 the two men had compromised.⁴ Seifert was probably the unnamed but influential ecologist in the TdL Organisation who, according to Backe, in 1939 persuaded Hitler to put a stop to any further rural improvement in Germany, on the grounds that drainage and similar projects would ruin Germany’s water table (shades of the Amazon Forest today).⁵ Seifert criticised Darré’s land improvement schemes, arguing that they would lead to a dust bowl, as in North America. He described the modernisation of German agriculture that was taking place under Darré as a disastrous interference with ecological balance, which would lead to fungal and insect infestation. He saw agricultural practice to mimic nature according to the most stringent organic farming prescriptions, avoiding weeding, ploughing or monoculture. Wild plant life should be left to provide a source of disease resistance potential.⁶ Darré responded that the RMEL was concerned for Germany’s ecology ‘as far as this is possible, without
endangering the safety of the nation', and described Seifert's articles on magnetism and other Steiner ideas as 'false, fantastic scribbling'. Seifert's view on the benefits of wild nature was a 'Rousseauian concept'; then, as now, an insult among nationalists, implying a Utopian and simple-minded optimism about Nature and the natural man. 'Healthy' and 'sick' were man-made concepts, he argued; insects and bacteria were as 'natural' as their prey, but man had the right to protect himself.

While the battle for life among all species expresses itself everywhere freely in the free state of nature, this is not permissible with cultivated plants, because man must intervene for reasons of self-preservation in order to guarantee ... its harvest for man's own food supply ... The present want of space within German territory forces us in ever increasing ways to make the soil more and more serviceable.7

Here, Darré dissociated himself from the 'Nature-before-man' arguments of the extreme ecologists. His emphasis on the essential artificiality of human life, the need to direct nature, parallels his belief in the need to protect man, the domesticated animal, from the effects of domestication. This, as Kond Lorenz's biographer has argued, was a common view at the time.6 Indeed, it is hard to dispute the fact that man no longer exists in a state of nature. This was one of the preconceptions of all interventionist social reformers; that, once away from a state of nature, man needed scientific guidance and control. Darré's twist to the argument was that it was necessary to live more naturally, to be closer to nature, in order to guide and control the harmful effects of over-civilisation. In his enthusiasm for using the latest scientific discoveries to improve society and become less scientific, Darré showed his inheritance from the Darwinian radicals of late nineteenth century Germany, and especially Haeckel, founder of the Monist League, and much admired by Bölsche, the populariser of biology. Haeckel's views on the nervous system fused Darwinian natural selection with some Lamarckian factors, and towards the end of the century, his monist materialism became more and more a monist vitalism: his holistic view of the world was similar to Darré's (indeed, he is supposed to have invented the word 'Ecology').9

Steiner was an enthusiastic supporter of evolutionary theory, and wrote several essays on Darwin and evolution before the First World War. He felt that evolutionary theory could blend with spiritualist determinants. Steiner's followers were to branch out in several directions, including Theosophy, and the religious character of these developments interested Darré.

However, he gradually realised that many of Steiner's arguments could be useful, and he became prepared to adapt them, announcing that he would rename 'Biological-Dynamic agriculture', the Steiner term, 'organic farming'.10 He commented in August 1940, just after his organic farming campaign began, that he saw the peasant as a biological function in the body politic (Volkkörper) ... The peasant's agricultural activity [is] not just a matter of production, but a means of maintaining the idea of Peasant-ness itself. 'Biological-dynamism' was compatible with peasant farming. In its complete disavowal of industrial projects—artificial fertiliser, mass-produced grain, insecticides—it rejected industrial capitalism. The alleged discovery of a letter from a major chemical firm, proving that it had instigated an attack on organic farming, helped to confirm Darré's stance (unfortunately, the letter itself disappeared from the files after their capture by the Allies).11

Whatever the emphasis, Darré always rationalised his views. He claimed in public to support organic farming because it seemed the sensible way to farm, producing nutritious food without damaging the soil; privately, because it helped the peasant cause. He supported methane gas plants and suitable machinery for small farms. In 1935, he claimed that 'our forefathers had always unconsciously venerated trees and other living plants. We now know that plants gave us useful and desirable chemicals, so that old plant physiology was unconsciously very efficient.' This remark was followed by two pages of chemical analysis of plants, drawn from a technical article in a scientific journal; a good example of Darré's tendency to justify ideas with scientific data, presented in a journalistic but well-organised way.12

Steiner's philosophy attracted several prominent NSDAP members, including Rudolf Hess, and lesser functionaries, such as Dr A. Ludwig, land planning officer in Hess's office, and Ludolf Haase, brought into the Ministry of Agriculture after 1942 by Backe.13 Steiner's mysticism, individualism and dislike of organised politics made his followers suspect to the Gaue. He moved the movement's Utopian and pacific tendencies, and formed a rival neo-religion of powerful persuasiveness. Heydrich criticised it in October 1941, in a letter to Darré, for being an elitist philosophy 'Not a Weltanschauung suitable for the whole nation, but a special teaching for a closely
confined circle’, and remarked that although currently masquerading as a nationalistic German ideology, it was fundamentally oriental in nature, and unsuited for ‘a Germanic people’.14 Backe’s papers contain a cryptic message from Gauleiter Eggleing, the man in the powerful position of Keeper of the Seal after 1937, referring to Himmler’s interest in ‘organic ideas’ after Darré’s fall.15

Darré wrote several articles on ecological themes between 1933 and 1936. Some were on the dangers of erosion, some on the lessons of the depression for agriculture. His work looked at the example of America, and dwelt on the anti-erosion measures carried out under Roosevelt. Large farms, he argued, had been hit harder than smaller, more self-sufficient farms. It now might be more ‘economic’ to use horse-drawn ploughs than combine harvesters.16

As the Nazi government began to tighten up on its opponents many of Darré’s supporters began to face harassment. Darré, by now, faced suspicion. But contemporary journalists refer to him as a prominent and popular figure. While Darré fought in meetings for higher food prices and more resources for agriculture, farmers who followed Steiner’s ideas were pestered by local NSDAP men.

Food production and self-sufficiency were a major preoccupation for Germany at this time, and the Reichsnährund was interested in ways of increasing both. Although not a follower of Steiner himself, Darré had several supporters of Steiner on his staff and was exposed to their arguments. While Steiner’s emphasis on astrology, meditation and magnetism made no appeal, Darré realised that it was opposed to ‘liberal, mechanistic’ ideas. He lifted from the movement its belief that the soil was a living organism, part of a vital cycle of growth and decay. If this cycle was tempered with, valuable nutrients would be lost, and affect the food eaten by man.17

Steiner asked Dr Eduard Bartisch to start a farm on organic lines, in the sandy soil of the Mark. Bartisch founded a society for organic farming, and was also an active Anthroposophist.18 The experimental farm at Marienhöhe kept crop returns and studied farm figures in their monthly journal Demeter, together with appeals for more hedgerows, shelter belts, drainage and organic compost. Occasionally, the inner spirit of the movement was revealed by quotations from Steiner:

We need a better knowledge of man,
Health through natural living,
Harmony between Blood, Soil and Cosmos.
Life reform as a national aim,

Knowledge and Life,
The Rule of the Living.19

Undeterred by party hostility, the organic farmers campaigned to win over Darré and his staff. They invited Nazi ministers to visit their farms. The National Food Estate held a meeting in 1937 with Hess, Bormann and Darré, to discuss the question.20 At this time, the ‘Battle for Production’ for more food was in full swing. It emphasised interested use of artificial fertilisers, together with better seeds and livestock. Hess, who, together with several members of his staff, supported Steiner, was in favour of experimenting with organic farming, while Bormann strongly opposed it. The meeting ended inconclusively, but by 1940 many RNS members had been converted by the results at Marienhöhe, particularly after its humus-rich soil managed to produce a good crop during a prolonged drought. Reports favouring organic farms appeared in Landwirt in 1940.21

Darré seems to have become fully converted to organic farming by May 1940. He realised that organic farms were more self-sufficient in terms of bought-in fertilisers and insecticides, and heke more in line with the self-sufficiency aims of the Ministry of Agriculture. The anti-capitalist implications appealed, too. Organic farming rejected industrial capitalism as well as the products of the big chemical companies. Darré organised a campaign to persuade the top Nazi leaders to support ‘biological-dynamic’ farming. He argued, ironically in the circumstances, that ‘now that the war is over, we can concentrate on these matters’, a phrase which gives some idea of his lack of contact with the top Nazi leadership at this stage. He circulated a questionnaire among all Gauleiters and Reichsleiters, disassociating himself from Steiner’s mystical ideas, but proposing that information should be collected on the virtues of organic farming. He had prepared his campaign carefully, squeezing a loosely worded promise out of Göring that he could go ahead without interference, and stressing that he fully supported the principles of the ‘Battle for Production’.22

Surprisingly, given the tense moment in Germany’s history, the campaign aroused a great deal of interest. All the leaders replied except Hitler. Out of the replies still on file, seven were in favour of organic farming and Steiner, three unsure, three hostile because of the link with Steiner, and nine just hostile, mostly because of the wartime conditions. Surprising support emerged in the form of Hjalmar Schacht, Darré’s old enemy. He told Darré that he was in complete sympathy with his views on German agriculture, despite their
disagreements ‘on details’ in the past and was horrified at the ‘hypertrophy of the agricultural sector’, the ‘capitalistic concentration in individual hands’ of recent years. He regretted the extent to which Darré’s originally good concept had been turned into its complete opposite, and offered any help he could. A strange irony here; no less an opponent than Hjalmar Schacht, apparently won over to Darré’s viewpoint, at a time when it was too late for either man, and far too late for Darré’s Agrarpolitik. Bornmann and Goering both reacted angrily against what they saw as an attempt to interfere with existing methods of food production. Darré tried to see Hitler, but was warned off by Backe, who advised Darré that Hitler had ordered protection to be removed from ex-members of the Anthroposophist Association.

The campaign was interrupted by Hess’s flight to Britain in May 1941. On 9th June, the Gestapo seized anyone who was known to support Steiner, including members of the NFÖ, later Darré’s defence lawyer at Nuremberg, and Dr Eduard Bartsch, editor of Denner, copies of which were seized and destroyed. The few remaining copies today are in Himmler’s files. Pharmaceutical works making organic products were also closed, with the exception of the Welda factory (still in existence) which Otto Ohlendorf managed to keep open. Seifert complained to Darré that all members of the National Union for Biological-Dynamic farming had been searched. Despite a letter from Bornmann, warning Darré that Hitler was behind the arrests, Darré, undeterred, appointed a working committee on organic farming, and wrote to Himmler and Heydrich asking them to stop arresting and harassing his farmers (and others, such as the nudists).

Some extent of Heydrich’s view of organic farming allied to the panic of his post-Hess investigations can be gauged from this extract from a letter to Darré of 18th October, 1941:

I have had far-reaching investigations made into the connections between Anthroposophy and biological-dynamic farming in recent months. From a report on Anthroposophy, which I enclosed, it appears that bio-dynamic farming emerged from the spirit of Anthroposophy, and can only be understood in connection with it. In practical terms it is obvious that Dr Bartsch, especially, of Bad Saarow, is at the same time a dedicated follower of Anthroposophy, and the leading representative of bio-dynamic farming. Despite its temporary appearance of German nationalism, Anthroposophy is essentially oriental in its nature and origin.

Even Darré’s ardent supporters felt that his timing was faulty and that he had gone too far. One member of his staff described his action as ‘grotesque and politically dangerous’. But after the flurry of arrests caused by Hess’s flight had died down, Darré continued to collect material on ‘biological-dynamic’ farming.

Bearing in mind Heydrich’s persecution of the Anthroposophists and all their works, it is surprising that so many did support organic farming. At this time, the Anthroposophists were the dominant proponents of these ideas, and it is interesting to note that the brave handful of top Nazis who resisted Heydrich in this matter had their children educated and cared for by Anthroposophists after the Second World War.

The campaign for organic farming was too much for Bornmann to swallow. He had been investigating the Steiner groups before Hess’s flight to Scotland. By March 1942, he had persuaded Hitler to demote Darré formally as Minister in favour of Herbert Backe. It is surprising that Darré had lasted as long as he had, and this was partly due to Hitler’s notorious reluctance to be seen to discard Ministers. Darré regarded Hitler’s conduct of the war as bound to lead to defeat, and said so. He continued to complain that Hitler had ‘betrayed Blood and Soil ideas’. His dream of a Jeffersonian republic of small farmers seemed to belong to another era.

One keen organic farmer, Rolf Gardiner, had visited Darré in Goslar before the war. He owned an estate in Dorset which he wanted to make into a centre for rural revival. In 1940, he broadcast on the BBC, describing his previous admiration for Darré and his ideas, and attacking the use made of them by the NSDAP. He contacted Darré in 1951, and told him that the development of the English organic farming movement had been due to his inspiration. According to Gardiner, a group of like-minded people had met at the beginning of the war to found the ‘Kinship for Husbandry’ movement which had a cross-membership with the ‘Soil Association’, started at about the same time, and the most influential organic farming group in Britain. Others have referred to the same group and its meetings in 1939-40, and several members seem to have been pro-Darré, although not pro-Nazi; so this statement may well be true. The English sympathisers also had experimental organic farms. Gardiner, incidentally, tried to start a ‘Rural University’ on his estate, which later became a trust for organic farming and reforestation. John Stewart Collis, author of The War Forbids the Plough, worked there during the Second World War.

Denner was revived after the war, despite the disappearance of
Marienhöhe into Russian-held territory. Today it is a symbol of quality for health-food products, and the movement has branches in America and Australia. Sometime after the East German revolt of 1951, Bartsch's son wrote to Darré that 'the spirit of Marienhöhe still lives and breathes.' These words, perhaps intended as comfort, were prophetic.

CHAPTER NINE

Catharsis

It is some indication of Darré's continuing importance in the general public eye that his dismissal of 1942 was kept as secret as possible. A brief statement was issued explaining that he had temporarily left office due to illness. Backe refused to accept the title of minister until 1944, and retained his title as leader of the ministry. 'He is the most suitable person, despite all his faults of character,' admitted Darré. Interestingly, the dismissal was mentioned by the BBC German language service, who broadcast a version of events highly favourable to Backe, and stressing Darré's reputation as a useless dreamer, and Backe's as a practical man. It seems obvious on reading it that detailed gossip about events in the Berlin ministries was available to the writers.

The excuse of illness was widely accepted. Darré's health had in fact been poor since 1937. He suffered from asthma, eczema, the liver trouble that would eventually kill him, and all the ills of the chronically politically frustrated. Already by 1939 he had found himself alienated from the world around him, even to the extent of shrinking from entering a bar or café. Eyewitnesses describe how where Goering's appearances at Goslar would attract warm applause, and afterwards he would sit drinking with his supporters, Darré would create a circle of withdrawal, so that the party spirit would appear only after his departure. He was by now a hyper-sensitive, shrinking man, maintaining his self-image only through sporadic fits of rage and aggression, and even, quite unrealistically, contemplating joining up in 1940, to 'escape mechanical coercion, the appointment book, everything that ties me to the office by the ankle', to 'recreate the spiritual Western Front against capitalism'. He added in his diary, 'I have become unsuitable for a normal life of civilian ordinariness ... Organically, I feel healthy, but somehow used up'.

After his house in Dahlem-Berlin was bombed, he moved with his wife and daughter to a chalet on the Schorfheide, a nature reserve outside Berlin, but was allowed to retain a small office in Berlin until 1944. He called it his Chancellery, and from it he continued to correspond with other ministers. Sometimes ministerial matters were
referred to him in error; and this could gum up the works quite badly, as papers landing on his desk simply remained in an ever-increasing geological stratification. Occasionally, staff from the Ministry of Agriculture would descend on him to try to clarify some paper work; an occasion of mutual dread.3

This period between his dismissal and the end of the war was the saddest of his life. After 1945, he recounted how rumors were spread that he was mad. "It is a much greater torture to be persecuted and despised by one's own compatriots than it is to live in the prisons and concentration camps of the victorious enemy ... First of all I was considered an idealist, then a romantic, then a rebel, then a defeatedist, and last of all a fool."4 His diary largely consisted of vituperative rantings between 1942 and 1944, and this section was destroyed in 1945 by his wife in 1970, because she felt it showed Darré in such a bad light. He had joined the great army of the non-men again. As in 1919 and 1926 there was no place for him; this exile was infinitely worse. With all authority lost, his Cassandra warnings went unheeded. The war went as badly as he had predicted, and his reaction to meeting Backe in an air-raid shelter in April 1945 in Berlin was to tell him that he was now justified in his opposition to the war.5

Darré gave himself up to the Allies in Thuringia on 14th April, 1945, and was sent to Spa in Belgium, where he wrote a report on the food situation. He seems to have envisaged the Allies appointing him as minister for food, and even taking over the food ministry, and offered many suggestions about the role of the RNS and food production. His first reaction to his imprisonment seems to have been that he could at last be avenged upon his enemies in the Third Reich, and he was eager to co-operate. During 1946 and 1947, he wrote accounts of his activities for his captors and a history of the Agricultural Department from 1930 to 1933. He wrote a short book called The Stage Management of the Third Reich (Deutschland), which he hoped to publish to help keep his family, who were now being cared for by other members of the family and friends. Hans Kehr recounts that he shared a cell with him for a while, and described his lively charm of conversation and manner, his infectious enthusiasm for ideas. Another interesting sidelight on Darré in prison comes from the memoirs of a German Jew, Erwin Goldmann, who shared a cell with Darré for a few days, and described him briefly. British and highly regarded by his captors. Goldmann adds that Darré was sympathetic to Zionism, and had helped to train Jews to go to Palestine before the war.6

Gradually, he realized the seriousness of his position. His first interrogation, which took place ten days after his capture, revealed a truthful account of his connexions with the NSDAP and his experience in office, with the exception of the omission of his membership of the DVFP in 1923, something that was, as mentioned earlier, omitted from his application to join the NSDAP.7 The picture was disbelieved by his interrogator, who decided that Darré had cooked this story together in the ten days since his capture. While he was later to be disingenuous about the racial element in blood and soil fundamentals, arguing that it was irrelevant in practice, he was in general a truthful witness. He irritates the interrogators by denying knowledge of sinister wartime activities. The judgment of his evaluating officer in 1947 was that he was unreliable and untruthful, a judgment that would have been more convincing if he had been able to spell Darré's name correctly, and if any arguments had been advanced for the judgment.8

What does emerge clearly from all his interrogations is the ignorance of the American interrogators of the structure and functioning of the Third Reich. The whole process seems to have been motivated by a vengeful incompetence, in part fuelled by the salacious hate-propaganda of the American Press. Even as late as 1946, the mass suicide of Russians who had fought for Germany and were to be repatriated back to Russia, was headlined by the USA Army paper Stars and Stripes as 'Red Traitors Dachau Suicide Described as Inhuman Orgy.'9 Darré found his hereditary farms described as 'Toutonic Breeding Centres.'10 He was assumed to have a detailed knowledge of events in the incorporated areas up to 1945, and even when his argument that he had not held governmental authority there after 1939 was accepted, he was pressed for months in 1947 for information about others. His life of guile, manoeuvres, and intrigue, his efforts to cope with hostile Nazi ministers now stood him in good stead, as he was able to counter the threats and blackmail of the interrogators with his old mixture of quibbles about competence, dumb insolence and bored persistence. He also suffered less of a shock from the discovery that he was seen as a war criminal than did many other high ranking officials, because he was accustomed to being regarded as an enemy.

The ignorance of the interrogators about Darré's activities was perhaps surprising. They had had a mass of captured documents to show them something of the detailed workings of the Third Reich and the conflicts of authority. Of course, the early information had never been unbiased. Of the very nature of things, little first-hand
information could be available to them until 1945, only such intelligence as they could acquire in wartime through refugees and spies. There was plenty of rumour, and the stale coffee-house gossip of capital cities at war. But it is surprising that the Hereditary Farm Law, copies of which abounded, and which was brief and clear enough, was interpreted as a means of stealing land from Polish farmers. In Germany, part of the war-time Germanising concept. Darré's lack of real power after 1939 must have become known to the Allies from their captured documents, and indeed, the BBC broadcast referred to earlier had obviously been based on some genuine and personal knowledge. Eventually, Darré became unhelpful to the Allies. Unlike many stauncher Nazis he refused to give evidence against others. His affidavit on the SS for the SS Trial in 1949 (Case 8) was remarkably candid about his racial aims, his decision to use the "Jewish phenotype" as a negative to make the Germans more racially aware; but refused to enter into speculation about later SS activities, or accuse others. This took some strength of character, after four years of imprisonment and threats of prosecution. Darré's name was 'among those canvassed for inclusion in the Nuremberg Trials, but it duplicated other, even stronger candidates for inclusion,' and he was not prosecuted as a major war criminal in the 1946 Nuremberg trial, held under the joint auspices of America, Russia, Britain and France.

However, it was to play an important part at the trial. His 1949 trial took place under the aegis of the American Government, and was part of what was known at the Wilhelmsstrasse, or Ministries Trials, after the street in Berlin where many of Germany's national ministries had been housed. He was tried jointly with, and sometimes separately, including civil servant von Wetzäcker, Scherwin von Kroisig, ex-Foreign Minister and Protector of Bohemia, Walter Schellenberg, and Paul Körner of the Ministry of Economics. They were a varied group in conviction, experience and activity, including pre-Nazi conservatives, Nazi ministers, career civil servants, and Schellenberg, widely regarded within the SS as its cleverest intellectual, and, after Heydrich, one of the most dangerous. Some of the judges had doubts about the concept of a joint trial, and these were raised in a dissenting judgment which will be given in more detail later.

The news that he was about to be prosecuted left Darré in a state of near-suicidal depression. His physical state was poor, he was in and out of the prison hospital, and he was worried about his family, especially during the bad winter of 1947, which saw famine in Germany, and strikes among the starving labour force. His elder daughter came to visit him at this time, and described how much his spirits had been lifted by the presence of his defence lawyer, Dr Hans Merkle. Merkle, who had been called in 1933 from a thriving legal practice in south Germany to join the legislative drafting team at the RNS, was a superficially dry, sober, calm man, with a deeply imaginative streak. He found Darré in despair, and managed to inspire him with hope and determination again, probably, indeed, giving him back the will to live. Merkle saw Darré as a tragic hero of Shakespearean proportions, a King Lear figure. He persuaded him that there was one more chance to justify himself to 'the grandchildren of today's peasants' (as Darré had written in 1939) and to defend his old beliefs and actions. The result was a defence that was remarkably blunt and uncompromising by Nuremberg standards. It defended Blood and Soil and the idea of a peasant Germany in a way that interested the judges, who seemed to be attracted to some of Darré's ideas as well as puzzled by them.

The 'Ministries case' was the longest of all the Nuremberg trials. There were eight counts. Some defendants were charged with all, others with some of the accusations. Count One concerned Crimes against Peace, and Count Two, the Common Plan and Conspiracy, charges which worried one judge because of the difficulties of proving joint conspiracy to wage war, and the juridically novel nature of the notion of a crime against peace. Since all the Allied powers, including America, had in their time waged aggressive war, a doctrine was introduced preventing the German defendants from arguing in their own defence, 'Well, you did it too'. Count Three concerned murder and ill-treatment of POWs. Count Four, atrocities and offences against German nationals on political, racial and religious grounds, was quashed at the beginning of the hearing, and Count Two was thrown out later in the trial. Count Five concerned atrocities and offences committed against civilian populations and where Darré was involved was divided into three parts; first, racial policies and Jewish
extermination, second, compulsory expropriation of Jewish land at
under market value, and third the compulsory expropriation, enacting
and expulsion of Jewish and Polish farmers in the incorporated areas.
Count Six concerned plunder and spoliation in the occupied territories,
which in Darré’s case meant Poland. Count Seven was the slave labour
charge, and Count Eight alleged membership in criminal organisations.
The judgment of the International Military Tribunal was introduced as
prima facie evidence that certain crimes and conspiracies had occurred,
and the defence was not permitted to query these findings (e.g., that
members of the Reichsführung, the National Leadership Corps, was a
crime).\[17\]

Compared with the trials carried out in the heated atmosphere of
1945–6, the American-run Ministries case was carried out in a more
scrupulous and legal manner. The charges were carefully examined,
and as mentioned earlier, two were rejected as having no legal
foundation. A dissenting judgment on the judicial status of conspiracy charges
and individual responsibility came from Judge Leon Powers, something
that would have been unimaginable in the International
Military Tribunal (IMT) trial, although it was not read in open
Court.\[18\] The conduct of the trial did present other problems. Men
with varied careers and governmental wartime responsibilities were
being tried together. Much of the translation was carried out hastily
and faultily. Prosecution documents were not made available to the
defence until they were read out in court, and often not then. There
was little care taken to check the authenticity of the documents. Use
of a document in the IMT was assumed to prove its authenticity.
Prosecution witnesses did not have to submit to cross-examination
from the defence.\[19\]

Some of the allegations against Darré look bizarre today. For
example, much was made of the avaricious nature of the National Food
Estate Marketing Law. It was claimed that from 1933 it was a means
of preparing for an aggressive war. Such actions as preparing ration
books and stockpiling food were alleged to be criminal preparations
for a war of aggression, although Britain, certainly, had been
contemplating rationing schemes since 1936, on the recommendation of
a Parliamentary Committee, and produced ration documents before
the Second World War.\[20\] Charges of plunder and spoliation in
Poland, Count Six, omitted to mention that much of the food
imported from Poland was re-exported to other areas, such as Austria,
Czechoslovakia, Belgium, Norway and France. Food was also exported
to Poland. An odd impression was given by this omission. There was

more food available in Poland during the war than in west Germany’s
industrial areas, and the peasants and the Ukrainian minority,
especially, did well.\[21\] German administrators in Poland found a
countryside grossly impoverished by their own standards, where the
most basic agricultural infrastructural requirements had to be imported
from Germany. The idea that Polish factories were solely

dismantled from these rural areas where peasants were so poor that
they had only mud floors and gaping windows was widely regarded in
post-war Germany as a fantasy, presumably inspired by the Russian
and Allied dismantling of German factories, railways and scientific
equipment that took place between 1945 and 1949.\[22\] Reference in
the trial judgment to the German ‘pretence of payment’ must have rung
more strongly on German ears, since no such pretence was being made by
the Allies after the war.

In the judgment of 11th-13th April, 1949, Darré was acquitted of
Count One, crimes against peace, on the grounds that ‘he did not
attend Hitler’s conference where plans of aggression were
discussed’, and his one letter to Goering which discusses his plans to resettle ethnic
Germans in the east did not provide evidence that he knew there
would be an aggressive war. Charge Two was thrown out generally.
He was found not guilty on part of Count Five, the charge of anti-
antisemitism leading to Jewish extermination, but his attack on Jews
and democracy was singled out for comment. The tribunal argued, Darré’s
speeches attack Jews and democracy, but he also attacks the Prussians
and Prussianism… Except, in an authoritarian state, it has not yet been
suggested that to hold such views is criminal.\[23\] He described Darré’s
reference to ‘Prussians, Jews and Jewish ideas’ in his anti-semitic
speeches as ‘window-dressing’. The implication seems to be that to ban

criticisms of ‘Jews and democracy’ might lead to a ban on attacks on

Prussians and Prussianism, which would never do.\[24\]

Darré had not played down his anti-semitic statements, but put
them in context as political weapons used to defend and further his
own position in the 1930s, and stressed his lack of anti-semitism in his
two books, published before he joined the Nazi Party. Perhaps the
Jeffersonian tone of the ideal of a self-sufficient, racially homogeneous
yemen peasantry came over. Certainly, Darré received a surprisingly
sympathetic hearing. ‘Some of his ideas were novel and somewhat
bizarre, but it is not a crime to evolve and advocate new or even unsound
social and economic theories’\[25\] a judgment that gives some
indication of how persuasive Merkel’s arguments had been. To allow
such autonomy to ideas previously presented as intrinsic to Nazi
ideology displays a considerable shift of opinion from the interrogations of 1945.

The compulsory purchase of Jewish-owned farmland at settlement valuations was, however, a clear breach of all accepted legal principles, and Darré was rightly found guilty, although the additional argument that the theoretical difference between the speculative value of the land and its settlement value somehow helped pay for Germany's war effort, remains unproven.26

Darré was found guilty of 'callousness but not of criminality' in overseeing the different rations made available to different sections of the population in Germany. The trial concerned itself specifically with Jewish rations, but there were multiple gradations concerning different categories of worker, age group and nationality, not to think of POWs, labour levies, voluntary workers.27 The most important finding in Count Five was that Darré was guilty of expropriating and reducing to serfdom hundreds of thousands of Polish and Jewish farmers in the course of the ethnic German resettlement, as recounted briefly in chapter Six. The court found that Darré's differences with Himmler were the result of power struggles, not of ideology, and referred in this connection to Darré's letter to Laumers, where he claimed to be better prepared for settlement projects than Himmler's SS men.28 But the loss of factual authority does not seem to have been sufficiently taken into consideration. The actual letter shows that Darré thought the SS would not understand the special needs of peasant farmers, and he argued that the RNS had overseen internal German peasant settlement since 1939. However, the court interpreted the letter to mean that Darré had been specifically preparing for the Polish resettlement, and it was a major factor in his being found guilty. Despite this confusion, it is obvious from Darré's early works that he did support the aim of German settlement in the Baltic and in former German territories, although intra-German settlement was his main theme. One is bound to ask, would Darré have overseen the resettlement of the incorporated areas if he had had the authority to do so, or would he have refused because it was inhumane. Surely the latter course would have been most improbable. Nonetheless, one must refer also to his strictures against von Gottberg's actions in Czechoslovakia in 1938, quoted earlier. Clearly, humanitarian considerations were part of his viewpoint in this matter, if only because he was sensitive to Germany's need for a favourable world opinion. One defence of Darré would be that the Poles had brought it on themselves by dispossession of 700,000 German farmers in the 1920s from the borderlands, but any such point was disbarred from the tribunal, and would in any case make no legal sense. Possession, force and conquest are, and must always be, uneasy bedfellows with international principles. My own conclusion is that the finding of guilty made moral sense, even if legal nonsense, as Darré had no authority in the matter. 29

The question of Darré's degree of anti-semitism in the 1930s is a complex one, and deserves fuller discussion. His circle of Nordic racialists had not been noted for anti-semitism, although Lehmann, his publisher, certainly saw Jews as hostile to the Nordic movement. The author of a monograph on Günther comments that while National Socialism was unthinkable without anti-semitism, anti-semitism was not a valid criterion for Nordic thought.30 Darré's first two books, which upheld the Nordic idea as a positive racial ideal, did not mention Jews, except in two footnotes in Das Bauernstum, where he praised Jewish racial pride. There was a distinct change of content and emphasis on this issue in his articles and speeches between 1929 and 1936, and while sincerity and opportunism are entwined in his work, especially once he became a Minister, it does seem that Darré moved from a position of disinterest in 'the Jewish question' to stressing it between 1931-5, to disinterest again when his political position weakened.

In 1926, Darré had written in praise of Rathenous's racial theories and opposition to democracy, complaining that the Nordics had no idea what 'the Jew Rathenous' really believed about the Nordic race and the value of breeding, an exercise which clearly meant to tease respectable Jewish non-racist democrats as much as it meant to provoke the Nordic movement; and two years later he defended himself against attacks by völkisch opponents by quoting seven more pages of Rathenous.31 In 1928-9, he criticised all Semitic peoples, together with Tartars and other nomadic tribes, for their nomadic spirit. He analysed nomads and peasants in terms of a genetically transmitted mechanism for cultural distinctions.32 In Neudel he plagiarised Günther: 'The real core of Jews has pure blood, although one cannot talk of the Jews as a separate race in the sense in which racial theory is understood'. Jewish and Polish minorities in the Ruhr were cited in Neudel as examples of non-assimilated Germans. 'It is not always necessary to think of 'Jews from the east'; the Polish islands in the industrial part of Westphalia, for example, are also strange to us.' 33 Here Darré was directing his arguments to anti-semitic readers, and trying to broaden their attention. Was Darré engaging in self-censorship in avoiding anti-semitic tirades in these works? This
seems unlikely, as Lehmann published many anti-semitic works, and would have welcomed such attacks from Darré.

In his two books, the Jews are not presented as a racial danger or physical threat. After he joined the NSDAP, the cultural-racial dichotomy of nomads versus peasants focused on the Jews as a typical urban and capitalist minority group, Darré subsuming nomadism with capitalism. This dichotomy was used to emphasise the supposedly non-nomadic nature of the rural German. But how could a cultural feature, such as the inherent dislike of urban life by true Germans, be transmitted genetically? He suggested that while there was as yet no scientific explanation for this peculiarity, it probably lay in the different ways nervous systems reacted to the environment. He argued that Jews liked urban life, and that their breeding rate remained as high in towns as in the country, which proved they were natural city-dwellers. Following up his theory, Darré examined different behavioral patterns between domestic rats and wild rats. He claimed that domestic rats were affected unfavourably by the environment, and ceased to breed, while wild rats were unaffected, and continued to breed, and for that reason, wild rats were used for experiments by scientists. There had to be a genetic mechanism at work which controlled this group behaviour. While there is clearly a pejorative element lurking behind Darre's identification of Jews with urbanisation, it is not rendered programmatic.34

Similarly, Darré in 1927, in the colourfully titled 'Pig as Criterion regarding the Nordic and Semitic Peoples' [DE, 3, 1927] used a real cultural distinction—dietary differences between different peoples—and rational argument to reach his suggested conclusion. He rejected climate as a cause, and suggested that religious prohibitions were effects not causes. The reason Semites hated pork and Nordic peasants loved it, was that the pig was a symbol of the settled way of life. They were hard to rear by nomads, and thus disliked, and this dislike gradually became a dietary prohibition to symbolise an anti-agricultural attitude. Interestingly enough, a similar argument, obviously arrived at quite spontaneously, is used in a recent work on the history of food, where the author gives the same reason for dietary prohibition of pork among Semites: she argues that the dislike of pigs was borrowed from nomadic Nordic tribes, who themselves dislike pigs because they abhorred agriculture.35 Darré included Tatars, Arabs and other eastern peoples in his nomad category, not singling out Jews for special attack.

The lack of anti-semitism in Darré's two major works attracted unfavourable comment from Hitler in 1930, comment which was passed on to Darré when he was angling for a meeting with him, as described in chapter Four.

A.H. has been falsely informed over my Bauerntum insofar as he believed that I didn't sufficiently interpret the Jewish problem in terms of their parasitical essence. Briefly and clearly, you can see from these few indications how things stand.

At first sight, this seems straightforward enough. Hitler thought he was soft on the Jews, but Darré, in describing this criticism, takes care to describe them as parasites, so clearly he is not soft on the Jews. But after all, Darré had certainly not sufficiently 'interpreted the Jewish problem' in his books. Read in the context of the conspiratorial correspondence with Kenstler, it may be that Darré was preparing for the public shift in attitudes which would enable him to join the Nazi Party in specifically repudiating the allegation that he failed to make the Jews the essential core of the world's problems.

From 1931, he associated 'Jewry' with rootless, urban capitalism, which he defined as a system of exploitation and plunder, deriving from the landless nature of nomadic tribes, and their habit of conquering and plundering others. In an attack on Damaschke, he alleged that the Land Reform movement was Jewish-inspired, and represented the re-emergence of the old anti-Semitism between peasant and nomad. Land Reform was inspired by Ricardo, a Jew. Ricardo's theory of rent attacked land ownership, and was taken up by anti-peasant Jews and pacifists. Nineteenth-century land reform was collectivist, and called for land nationalization, 'the typical nomad dream, droners who would live off the produce of the man of the soil, parasitical'.36 Of course, the attack on land nationalization was not made from a property rights standpoint, and his own proposals assumed strong collectivist measures. But he differentiated his own socialism from 'Jewish socialism' by claiming that he was racist, benevolent and patriotic, while Damaschke was inspired by a malevolent hostility to the Nordic peasant, and a desire to infiltrate right-thinking groups. This attack was clearly opportunistic, in that Damaschke, while inspired by Henry George, was a co-founder with Naumann of the Nationalsozialer Verein. In many ways, he was a typical social reformer, teetotaller, volkisch figure of the period, and is described by one historian as anti-semitic.37

In late 1934, Darré wrote of the 'counter-concept' of Jewish nomadism. He ascribed the peasant wars of 1525 to 'the eternal
representative of all international finance capital, the Jews'. International Jewry attacked old peasant freedoms. The Jew was both nomad and trader. Profit was inherently opposed to the peasant ideal. The peasantry was presented as an anti-mercantilist bastion during this period up to 1935. Darre's circulars to the National Peasant Council, a body of high party dignitaries, usually contained anti-Semitic arguments. They served to stress his absolute soundness on this key issue, while enabling him to present the peasantry as the Stand most worthy of Hitler's support. By 1936, Darre was enunciating classical conspiracy theories.39

Of course, like other Nazi ministers, Darre was subject to pressure from below, both from the peasantry and from the Nazi activists, who, in 1934-5, complained that Jewish traders could join the RNS, and operate in German agriculture.40 None the less, pressures against Jews as a racial group, as opposed to the idea of a Jew as representing unpopular market forces, were weak in rural areas.41 Although the Jewish cattle dealer was a stock target for anti-Semitic peasant attacks from 1880 on, in practice peasants sometimes protected Jews from Nazi attacks. As late as 1940, it was only under strong pressure from Kaltenbrunner (later head of the RSHA after Heydrich's assassination) that Jewish-owned land was finally bought-out compulsorily. Correspondence between Backe, the then minister, and local officials, shows the programme's unpopularity, while there was massive foot-dragging by officials in formerly Austrian areas.42 Darre's circular to his staff tried to clarify the confused legal situation on the employment of Jews within agriculture after the Nuremberg Laws of 1935.43 But he called specifically for anti-Semitic boycotts to cease, while calling for placards to be placed in town centres proclaiming, 'Race is the key to world history.'44 This was more provocative than it seemed. He was arguing that hostility to Jews was not only inhumane, but encouraged a materialistic, envious attitude among the perpetrators, based on an inferiority complex, not on a racially positive ideal. Not only was this playing with fire in the atmosphere of the time, but the words suggested were even more dangerous, as they were the well-known quotation from Disraeli's Coningsby.

The picture that emerges from the contemporary documents is certainly not that Darre was in any way pro-Jewish, but that he did not want his own pro-Nordic programme to be absorbed by an emphasis on negative anti-Semitism. He encouraged 'positive racial education' by publishing pictures of healthy young gymnasts. In 1934, embarrassment arose when a half-Jewish cover girl modelled the cover of Neues Volk. The girl, a Viennese actress, left for America before the mistake could be detected.45

Darre also supported agricultural training camps for Jews to go to Palestine, and told local National Food Estate officials not to bother about Jewish ancestry if it meant that good peasant stock would be excluded from becoming honorary German farmers under the Erbhofgesetz.46 So was he a closet anti-semit who came out when it was safe to do so, or did he adopt a public stance against the Jews to shield a weak position? He was certainly influenced by friends like Rosenberg. When Hor-Belisha was appointed Minister of Defence in Britain, Darre wrote in his diary, 'Now England is a Jewish instrument of war'. He forwarded an article published in a French journal to Hitler which discussed Hor-Belisha's allegedly Moroccan Jewish parentage. The diary entry would hardly been part of a public stance.47

On the other hand, Darre was not perceived by others as having persecutory feelings towards Jews. The Hereditary Farm Law, while it excluded Jews from the role of honorary German peasant, did not itself interfere with specifically Jewish land ownership. Perhaps his private outbursts represented a generalised and endemic anti-semitism of the time, rather than an accord with the inner circle of Nazi anti-semites. Darre was also found guilty of plunder and spoliation in Poland, although here, too, his lack of real authority at the time should have been taken into account, since this lack was not seriously disputed by the tribunal. But his successor, Backe, was no longer there to try, and public opinion demanded a victim. Bearing in mind the sufferings of the victorious powers, this was not surprising. The Russian government, in particular, needed a scapegoat to blame for the miserable condition of Poland, now undergoing an undeclared and secret civil war, and the hunger and spoliation of the eastern borderlands, largely caused by Russian looting and atrocities. In this charge, as in many Nuremberg allegations, one seems to see a mirror image of many of the post-war problems.48

The last serious charge was that of using slave labour for agriculture. Darre was not found guilty, on the interesting grounds that it does not appear that at that time (1940) there was any demand for forcible recruitment by the agricultural authorities, nor that any action was taken by the General Council of the Four Year Plan for such forcible recruitment; and that there was no satisfactory proof that Darre 'ever suggested forcible recruitment'.49 This was an
understatement, indeed, since he had vehemently argued against such a
recruitment.
Darré was cleared of Count Eight, I, of being a member of a
criminal organisation, the SS. In view of the fact that he had been
intimately involved with the SS between 1931 and 1938, as well as
being a member, this may seem surprising. However, the fact that he
had attempted to resign in 1938, and had been kept on the rolls against
his will, and that he had resigned his office in the Race and Settlement
Chief Office, was taken into consideration. The judgment seems to
imply that the SS was not a criminal organisation before 1938. He was
found guilty of being a member of the National Leadership Corps.58
The sentence was seven years, and consideration was given to the
four years already spent in jail. Darré was fortunate not to have been
tried in 1946 along with Streicher, Ley, Goering and other leaders. His
sentence was lenient, especially since he did not benefit from the
growing realisation of the true nature of the Russians by the other
Allies, as did the Wehrmacht officers and industrialists.
Certainly, Darré was lucky to be found not guilty of charges of
anti-semitism, but unlucky to be found guilty of dispossession of
Polish farmers. Both were really miscarriages of justice. Assuming anti-semitic
statement to be a crime, he was guilty.

Between 1947 and his death in 1953, Darré received hundreds of letters
addressed to him as ‘Herr Minister’, or ‘Dear and Honoured Minister’. Indeed,
one acquaintance commented that imprisonment was in a sense
a boon to him, as it restored his lost status. As far as the Allies, too,
were concerned, he was once again the Minister.
This support from outside also helped to lift his morale, and was
the culmination of a long process of returning mental health. Bad as
the post-war period was, it was the awakening from a bad dream for
him. Now, gradually, a world in which the man of good will, the
industrialist, was less capable of judging the human capacity for
moral good, was being rediscovered, and Darré’s vision of the most sensible, practical and fully
fulfilled way to live. He followed T.H. Huxley’s view on the essentially artificial
nature of civilisation; man had become a domesticated animal, and
needed careful cultivation to maintain a viable society. This entailed
not only eugenic and intra-racial ideas (German peasants being deemed to
be German already) but environmentalist improvements in infant
nutrition, gymnastics and fresh air for the young, and other pro-
proletarian, neo-Lamarckian ideas. Shortly before his death, Darré wrote to
a young follower of Steiner who proposed to farm a smallholding on
organic lines. He began by encouraging the general aim, which he saw
as a pioneering goal comparable to nineteenth century settlement
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abroad. He went on to disassociate himself, kindly, from the more extreme views on "biological-dynamic" farming, then argued that over the centuries man had suffered the loss of two kinds of relationship: the relationship to the organic strength of the soil and earth, and secondly the relationship to God, who lives and works in everything in this world. Prior to the appearance of 'materialistic philosophy', the peasant had been the link between man and God. This holistic trinity, peasant-nature-God, was the only way for man to fulfil himself. Darré added that he had been a fool to think that the Nazis were the ones who could repair this link.  

Rolf Gardiner resumed contact, writing first to an ex-member of the RNS. Several letters were exchanged between him and Darré, and Jordan Jenkins, ex-agricultural adviser to the BUF and proponent of smallholdings, probably on Gardiner's request, sent Darré his writings. But Darré was cool. Gardiner's generous and selfless gesture in offering friendship to a man who was, after all, a convicted Nazi war criminal, was not really appreciated. His attack on the RNS and, to some extent, Darré, in his broadcast in 1940, after accepting German hospitality during the 1930s, had never been forgiven. The radical Nazis had no idea of the atmosphere in wartime Britain, and the strength of public opinion.  

Admiral Horthy who had encountered Darré when the two were imprisoned at Spa, Belgium, in May 1945, tried to meet him when he passed through Berlin, but he was ill in a clinic in Berlin, and unable to keep the appointment. Thirty years ago, Horthy had distributed land to his veteran soldiers, and Darré had alluded to this in Neudorf. Horthy may have heard of it through the Hungarian veterans who had contacted Darré in 1930 after the publication of his book.  

Another move to form a German 'Soil Association' was made in December 1952, when Darré met the Town Clerk (Oberstadtdirektor) in Goslar at the Hotel Niedersachsischer Hof, and made notes about a society to be called 'Mensch und Heimat'. Its function would be to further 'organic ideas, a healthy soil and care for the homeland' (Heimatpflege). The society would have to be officially registered and incorporated, and much of the discussion turned on how this was to be done. Darré could find financial support from his brother-in-law, and legal backing from the ex-RNS lawyers, possibly Merkel, but was perturbed about his own involvement. 'How to avoid the accusation of being a "naziistische" organisation, while retaining some influence,' he jotted. During the years after his release, he wrote steadily, articles with titles like 'The Living Soil', 'Peasant and Technology', and 'Mother Earth'. The articles on organic farming were usually inspired by English works, such as those by Sir Albert Howard, Sir George Stapledon, and Lady Eve Balfour, although he also referred to the USA's 'Friends of the Soil', and American efforts to combat erosion. In 1953, he enthusiastically reviewed Lady Eve Balfour's The Living Soil. As in the 1930s, he wrote on the American dust bowl, this time under the pseudonym of Carl Carlsson, and called for Germany to adopt soil protection measures of a similar kind to America's 1947 anti-erosion law, in the local press, and in a journal published by an old Wissenhausen friend, in South America.  

His articles attacked large corporations for ignoring the possibilities of new technology which could help the farmer. He opposed exploitative attitudes to the land, factory farming, and an 'agricultural class of labour', all caused, in his view, by contemporary technology. He especially criticised industry and government for their obsession with the virtues of large-scale farming, and demanded encouragement for machines which would help the peasant farmer. As in the 1930s, though, he hailed the development of the small, petrol-driven tractor and machinery useful for market-gardening. He energetically propounded the virtues of methane gas plants for small farms; such plants could produce energy from composted dung and other waste materials.  

By the summer of 1953, Darré was too ill to continue. An appeal was launched to pay for his medical care, and among those contributing were political enemies who won the less respected Darré's commitment to the agrarian sector, men like the head of the Bavarian Farmer's Union, who insisted on paying something out of his own pocket. He went into a clinic in the Leopoldstrasse, in Munich, helped by his sister-in-law and long-term close friend, Karen von Billbeck. He was soon unable to write, and scribbled an apologetic last note to his first wife, Alma. There he died on the 6th September 1953 from liver failure exacerbated by jaundice. His death was marked by some guarded obituaries in Germany, but aroused little interest.  

During the war, Darré liked to walk on the Steinberg, a mountain overlooking Goslar, where there was a pleasant leads' school. Attendance here for a year was compulsory, and they owned a field, where Darré planned after the war to build a centre for farmer's wives and their children, with a canteen, a library and sports facilities. The field in Goslar now boasts exactly such a building, erected in the early 1960s by the local farmer's union, and looked after by a former peasant
leader, but it holds no reference to Darré, and any trace of Darré and the National Peasant City have long since disappeared from Goslar. The hotel, Der Aachsmann, where the medieval basement was used for RNS rallies, was closed for decades, and only recently opened, now under new ownership, and with largely Turkish staff. The town itself found its population doubled by refugees from Thuringia, in the Russian zone, and refugees from Poland. It is hardly surprising that Goslar's monument to Blood and Soil, with its wheat sheaves, its Odal rune and the swastika, was dismantled; perhaps unsurprising that after Darré's death, the Christian Democrat mayor of Goslar, exiled by the Nazis, tried to prevent his burial in the town cemetery, where he had long reserved a place next to his mother. It was the Social Democratic Town administrator, who shared Darré's interest in the organic farming movement, who insisted that he should have the place. But both men attended the 'honorary citizen's' funeral, as, according to the local paper, did hundreds of Goslar citizens. Dr Winter, who had written to King's College School, Wimborne, on Darré's behalf in 1933, laid a wreath from the German Colonial School at Wittenhausen. The gravestones have long since been removed from the mounds of earth where the bodies of other members of the National Peasant Council, based at Goslar, were buried, but Darré's grave retains its stone, a large plain slab under whispering pine trees, in the corner of the secular cemetery where Guderian and other military leaders are buried. There is no name on the stone, but an allegedly family shield, bearing a strange resemblance to the Nordic quasi-religious symbols of the 1920s—enclosing the pagan symbol of eternity, a snake with its tail in its mouth, carved around a rune S with a bar through it—and the withered memory of twelve red roses cast on the grave by his sister in 1953. From the stone, it is possible to look up to the Steimbarg, where the Peasant House is just visible. Before 1945, each small town had its 'Darré-Haus'; now one only is rumoured still to have the name on the door, in East Germany. Goslar typified Germany's attempts to wipe her memory clear after the war. It took eight hundred years before the old imperial palace was rebuilt in the nineteenth century: one hopes it will not be so long before the brief episode of Goslar, the National Peasant City, can be enthused again, examined and remembered.

In both of his main points, the need for man to be linked to the soil, and for the maintenance of the vitalist cycle of soil-growth-decay, Darré was directly in the tradition of much of today's 'Green' thinking.

In his belief in a peasant international, stretching from England to the Baltic, he expressed that element of anti-expansionism and anti-imperialism which characterises writers from Cobbett to Goldsmith who have propounded the peasant ideal.

It may be argued that it is impossible to take seriously any ideas put forward by a minister of the Third Reich. Darré was a racist; does this not put his ideas beyond the pale? Can his writings after the Second World War be taken seriously when it is most unlikely that he would have been allowed to publish works on the virtues of Nordic Man? Can his interest in organic farming be anything other than window dressing for support for a vicious, brutal regime?

Of course, it is unlikely that Darré would have been able to publish book reviews, even under a pseudonym, propounding the survival of the Nordic race 'in 1951. However, as early as 1930, he seems to have put his Nordicism second to his peasant ideals, and was certainly criticized by members of the Nordic Wing for doing so. But in any case, intra-racialism is an intrinsic part of the peasant ideology, although it is unfashionable to stress this in the west today. The Third World and ethnic minorities in the west are more openly racist. The idea of a network of kinship is intrinsic to a definition of a peasant and, must by definition exclude those aliens to that network. The ideal peasant farm is oriented towards the long term, the family and the closure of the tribe. 'Peasants' cannot absorb alien cultures, religions and races, without the risk of self-destruction. Further, in Darré's case it is hard to criticise his sincerity, when he constantly put himself in danger of imprisonment or worse, and saw many of his friends and allies arrested for holding his own views, but none the less persisted with those views.

One returns to the paradox referred to in chapter Eight, that if National Socialism, as an ideology, had room for Darré's views, then it may be that currently accepted categories of early National Socialism will have to be revised to allow for the sincerity and, indeed, passion, with which a top Nazi leader held views on the environment, the ecology and the peasant. If the view is accepted that Darré's peasant ideology presented merely morphological and tangential resemblances to National Socialism, but is an immediate ancestor, in spirit as well as in detail, to the ecological movement of today, then the implications of current ecological ideas may have to be examined.

The continuity of his ideas, from the 1930s to the 1950s, is striking. By the early 1950s, the idea of self-sufficiency in energy and raw materials had become widely accepted. The Common Agricultural
Policy was to continue price support for small farmers, and to some extent, protection for smallholders. It was widely perceived among German farmers as a continuation of the old controlled marketing system, and welcomed for the same reasons. German émigrés in England, like John Papworth and F.E. Schumacher, popularised 'Small is Beautiful' ideas in a post-war Britain still dedicated to fashionable large-scale planning. Eventually, the anti-capitalist implications of the conservationist movement were recognised, and it became politicised. The old organic farming movement, with its innovatory search for new grasses, compost-making methods and self-sufficiency allotments, owing so much to German vitalist thought of the early decades of this century, became swamped in a vaguely 'alternative' movement, egalitarian, anti-nuclear (illogically, since nuclear power was cleaner, safer and less wasteful in terms of resources), and messianic. From recycling bottles and saving whales, conservationists became associated with feminism and other forms of exclusivist hysteria. When one is discussing the element of continuity in Darré's ideas, this break in the 1950s should be borne in mind.

One should, in short, perhaps distinguish between today's party political Greens—Levellers rather than conservatives—whose prescriptions are often as unrelated to environmental issues as they are draconian, and the more dedicated organic farmers, whether in Germany or England, who pursued an unpopular and often financially unrewarding path over decades, at a time when their ideas were not at all fashionable. The latter group seem to be dedicated to many of the same values as Darré and his contemporary ecologist and Anthroposophist sympathisers: the Greens bear more resemblance to those pre- and proto-Nazi groups that sprang up during the 1920s in an outbreak of quasi-religious prophecy and radicalism. Here there is room for research. But certainly it is time the contribution Darré and his followers made to twentieth-century ecological thought was recognised; it is at least arguable that without him the ecological movement would have perished in his time and place.

Conclusion

Despite the covert nature of his role in joining the NSDAP, Darré was virtually the sole creator and representative of agrarian theory within it in the early 1930s, recognised as the master and arbiter of all agrarian matters by his peers. His themes were: intensive peasant farming, localised autarky as a step towards national autarky, defensive and eugenically-oriented racism and a defensive racial nationalism. His profound anti-urbanism was a source of serious and eventually fatal conflict with the NSDAP, with its strong urban, lower-middle-class basis; and only his ability to attract peasant support, and his revolutionary, yet non-Marxist stance, made him palatable to the non-agrarian Nazis. Many serious agrarian experts and reformers approved of Darré's social and racial rationale for supporting the peasantry. Primarily, however, they saw the peasant movement as the most sensible and efficient way to develop German agriculture. After Darré's fall, his ideas were retained by the middle and lower-level agricultural administrators, but with more emphasis on their immediately practical aspects. The populist element in his peasant corporatism was also a powerful driving force for those SS staff concerned with ethnic German resettlement during 1940-1.

Between 1933 and 1938, many of the economic aims of National Socialist agrarian policy were successful. Productivity increased in nearly all sectors; national self-sufficiency increased, as did intensive peasant farming; these were all major policy aims. Economic failures came later, and were a result of the low priority given to agriculture during the period of war preparations. Later, war itself, and the misconceptions about possible food production in Eastern Europe, led to further neglect of German agriculture. The success of agricultural reform in the 1930s came about despite a multiplicity of overlapping and conflicting organisations, and the experimental problems of the marketing organisation. It was largely due to the relentless efforts of the middle and lower-level echelons of the RNS, together with the unremitting labour and ingenuity of the German peasant.

Given the limited time-span in which the National Food Estate was
effectively operative, and given the conflict between the drive for higher production and the need to protect farmers from the gluts and price collapses of earlier years, the achievement of the agricultural advisers in producing a self-sufficiency level of 81% by 1938 was considerable. This is especially so since after 1936, artificially high producer prices—most potent stimulus—became politically unacceptable. Wartime food production, too, was maintained as efficiently as was possible in the circumstances, and without the disasters of the First World War. That this occurred despite the interference of Göing, Himmler and the Wehrmacht High Command, the shortage of foreign reserves, machinery, fertiliser and government expenditure, is again a tribute to the competence of the RNS and R.MEL administrators—especially since many of the countries occupied by Germany during the war were food deficit countries. As the organisation of food production to cope with blockade and war had been another policy aim, this too must be counted as a considerable success.

During the war, unrealistic assessment in Berlin of the time, money, energy, machinery and vast amounts of fertiliser needed to render derelict and virgin Polish land fertile, was a constant hindrance; as was the obsessional belief among many top Nazis that free land existed 'over the green, green heath'. It became painfully and rapidly clear to the agricultural advisers and administrators sent to the Incorporated Areas and places east that such land needed more than agricultural infrastructure—roads, electrification, transport and housing. This was without the confusion and expenditure necessitated by a complete population transfer (as envisaged, if not fully implemented). Whatever Hitler's true motives for war, the Second World War was hopelessly misconceived in terms of food surpluses and living space, and Darré's pessimism about its results justified. Here, as elsewhere, his capacity to take a long-term view was vindicated by events, despite his reputation for unworthy impracticality. Wartime Europe did remain a food deficit area, and the RNS could never have changed that fact in the short term, because of the rogue factor of Russia. Russian agriculture lay in ruins, its grain-growing area devastated by collectivisation, well before Operation Barbarossa; it seems, indeed, to have remained in that condition to this day.

However, the question remains: given a localized, non-interventionist régime, would Darré's social policies for the peasantry still have been doomed to failure? Could the hardships inherent then in German peasant life have been ameliorated sufficiently to stop and reverse the flight from the land? The improvement of peasant living standards was a pre-requisite to any attempt to select a racial elite from among the peasantry, as without it, peasants would drift away from the land. Insofar as his ideas entailed the economic and social protection of the peasantry, there seems no reason to suppose that these features of his policies were anything other than viable. Indeed, the increase in small farm productivity that took place in the 1930s provided the perfect justification for such protection. But Darré's inability to distinguish—at least in his rhetoric—long-term plans from short-term necessities, hampered progress in areas where progress could have been achieved. It enabled critics of the rural ideal, in Germany as elsewhere, to dwell on the peasantry's supposedly anti-modern, anti-industrial, past-oriented and defensive tendencies, and to ignore the mounting evidence that peasant farming was a practical approach to the problems of securing the national food-supply.

Would a less fundamentalist approach have won concessions from the régime, or was there a real incompatibility between the demands of agriculture and the industrial expansion of the 1930s? Certainly, Darré saw peasant society and urban industrialism as mutually exclusive categories, and this was inherent in his vision, but was this division true in real terms? After all, the policy of encouraging increased peasant production was successful. Increased mechanisation, fertiliser use and altered product mix was a realistic strategy for the survival of the farmer in an industrialised society. Thus far, the small farmers and the urban world were complementary rather than opposed, whereas economic needs were concerned. On the other hand, while the rural ideal prevalent in the inter-war years was not especially past-oriented, stressing rather the need to break free of the shackles of a burdensome and oppressive past, it was certainly defensive. It envisaged an economically static society, and this, together with Darré's doom-laden scenario of urban decay, the choice of death or a painful survival, made it impossible for most Nazi politicians to support Darré's version of the peasant society. Even his followers, however sympathetic, had become reluctant to accept this vision by the 1930s, for the apocalyptic nature of his—and Weimar—prophecies was inappropriate to the spirit of industrial expansion and technocratic success that ruled Nazi Germany. In the face of the furious rate of change of German society and industry in the 1930s, Darré's society of stasis—an essentially defensive concept, opposed to economic growth—became impossible to maintain as an ideal, except in the very longest of terms.

However, there was an alternative inherent in Darré's vision. This was the strong, productive, creative peasant, the 'smallholding
technician of the future'. Such a figure could co-exist with industry, protected by the strongest possible weapon, the economic power of his productive capacity. This was the element of Darré's ideology that survived, and indeed, the decision to use price support and subsidy to favour the peasant rather than the large landowner was a major change from previous German policy, and one whose political implications were considerable. Further analysis of these implications is difficult, and perhaps redundant, since the loss of the Junker heartlands after 1945 would in any case have rendered this political change inevitable, and any rearguard action impossible.

The political implications of Darré's policies are more complex. Peasant populism was a strong factor behind the agrarian legislation of 1933, and a major impulse in Darré's support from the peasantry. However, this peasant populism was inherently hostile to large-scale institutions, especially those associated with the modern nation-state. Agrarianism was symptomatic by a republican radicalism opposed to hierarchy and supra-tribal organisation. It had no room for a political system that was not flexible, organic and spontaneous. While agrarian political groups were capable of maintaining their bargaining power within a modern industrialised state (and have done so to this day), the spirit of their self-image, the heart of the rural ideal, tended towards anarchy, a phenomenon noted during the peasant revolt of 1928-9. All normal political forms were seen as enemies, a suitable target for peasant cunning, and that untrammeled violence typical of their unvoiced, centuries-old sense of alienation and oppression. Not only did the attempt to create a corporatist-cum-syndicalist structure, the Reichsnährstand, contradict the spirit of the centralised National Socialist state, but as a means of giving the farmer political power, it involved a self-contradiction: peasant populism was inherently anti-state, but needed state legislation and protection to co-exist with the urban world it nourished.

Further, the racism inherent both in the web of peasant values and Darré's specific pan-Nordicism was hard to reconcile with nation-state boundaries; peasant tribalism was smaller-scale, while Nordic racism envisaged a Northern European 'green' union, spreading from Holland to Finland, in a loosely knit federation. But this had little to do with the aims of the Nazi Party, which, like most other German political parties between 1918 and 1933, was committed to restoring German power and territory to (as a minimum) its pre-First World War position. Darré's lack of interest in this aspect of foreign affairs would alone have unfitted him to be a Minister in the Third Reich.

But it perhaps fitted him for a post in any government committed to survival and expansion. The internal dynamism of the Third Reich seemed to lead inexorably to empire, for reasons which are still the subject of vigorous dispute, and which are outside the range of this work. This impal drive in turn entailed a fully fascist, 'from above' power structure with an essentially non-racialist, but elitist social base, which crossed national and racial boundaries in search of allies and ability. Empire entailed a strong central government, playing off some ethnic and national groups against others within it. No empire had ever survived without a cross-current of foreign influences, of exogenous cultural inputs. Darré's hostility to conservatism and imperialism was caused by his assessment of this inevitability, and the extent to which war and expansion would be to the disadvantage of the peasant; why, almost alone among Nazi leaders, he realised, and protested against the racial implications of importing foreign agricultural labours, while German peasants were recruited for death on the Russian front. In practice, Darré was obliged to subordinate his planned racial section, and the breeding of a peasant elite, to the more pressing need to preserve the existing peasantry. This subordination of racial theory to practical practice was characteristic of the Third Reich, not only in the areas of peasant settlement and ethnic German resettlement, where racial rhetoric gave way to more immediate imperatives, and not only under the exigencies of war; it was observable throughout its governmental practice. Even within the SS, supposedly the heart of the racial selection process, the practice of mass co-option of outside advisers and bodies meant that racial selection was secondary to that operation of an 'open, yet authoritarian elite' (Struve) except at its low levels, where racial selection was used to weed out the politically uncommitted after 1933. Certainly, the SS elite eventually became pan-European, losing even its national as well as its racial character.

If anything, agriculture displayed less inherent conflict between achivement-orientation and racial selection than elsewhere in the Third Reich; because agrarianism was necessarily more racialist, but because race selection of the peasantry was not an essential prerequisite of N.G. agricultural policy. Peasants, in a sense, were pre-selected. The vast majority of German peasants were Germanic by definition and self-assessment. It was intra-racial selection. Darré's plan to breed a SS nobility, that rapidly took a back seat after 1933, and as the peasantry continued to decline in numbers, it disappeared as a policy goal. In fact that Darré and his old friends among the 1920s
litterateurs such as Schultz- Naumburg and the Prince zur Lippe, took up eugenic plans in conditions of semi-secrecy in 1939 (as part of Darre's Society of the Friends of the German Peasantry) demonstrates the peripheral nature of this plan where government policy was concerned. The mass importation of foreign agricultural labourers was the final acknowledgment by the Third Reich that the German peasant's role as racial source material was to be abandoned.

But if Darre's racialism does not of itself create a coincidence with National Socialism, how is it to be classified? The implications of treating man as a biological entity had aroused controversy long before the rise of National Socialism, and the disagreements that emerged had little to do with the conventional right-left political spectrum. The belief that mankind was a part of the natural order, and subject to all the physical laws that emerge from a study of animals, opposed the idea, linked sometimes with Utopian, sometimes with Idealist or religious tendencies, that man was unique, and could not be subject to the same kind of classificatory process as the crested newt; a view expressed in the 1920s and 1930s not only by liberal and democratic opponents of the Nazis, but by German neo-conservatives, such as Spengler, Jung, Jungfer and Moeller. The view that supported racial typology was held by (among others), left-wing and progressive writers, such as Carl Vogt (who taught Houston Stewart Chamberlain at the University of Geneva); it accompanied a belief in scientific rationalism. Racial categorisation was not unique to National Socialism, nor was it a right-wing or conservative phenomenon. The racist element in agrarian and pro-peasant thought does not necessarily label it, therefore, as National Socialist.

What is at first sight closer to National Socialist and allied movements is the 'naturist' position, one end of a political axis where the determinant is the posture taken towards the limits of human adaptability. Darre was a naturist. He saw man's need to remain part of the natural world (natural in style, texture and spirit) as an immutable datum, dominating but not destroying the potential of the human will. This immutability of man's nature was not the immutability of the unchanging natural order inherent in the conservative position, but the product of a more radical stance. This radicalism, the mixture of voluntarism and determinist pessimism, resembles the proto-fascist movement immediately prior to and post the First World War; such movements, however, were not involved with agrarian arguments, which remained Darre's primary concern, so the resemblance does not really help to classify the agrarian movement under Darre in the 1920s and 1930s. A forceful argument was made by Nolte that the crucial drive behind National Socialism was the opposition to 'transcendence'. He defined this as the belief, common to liberals, Marxists, and most post-Enlightenment thinkers, that the boundaries and possibilities of nature could be transcended, that man's unique abilities gave him the opportunity of unlimited progress and adaptability. Fascism was an attack on transcendence, defined by Nietzsche as the great crime against Western culture, one inherent in its very origins. Darre fits this antitranscendence definition. But Nolte is surely mistaken in confining this political axis to National Socialists on the one hand and liberals plus liberal derivatives on the other. Naturism versus transcendence is a division that can be traced far back in European thought; and these categories do not fit a fascist-anti-fascist definition, nor, again, a right-left one.

Where the analysis can be applied to National Socialism—bearing in mind that it in no way applies to Nazi practice—is to the attack on materialism and exploitative technology made by diverse Nazi writers, including Hitler. They presented the spirit of exploitation and maximum utilisation of resources as a crime against nature, usually capitalistic and Jewish inspired. However, the degree of involvement in, and reliance upon these arguments is a limited and trivial factor in National Socialist thought, with the exception of Darre, who attacked the mechanophobe argument to its logical conclusion. Darre's obsession with the vision of man as a natural animal, his belief that the peasant was the link between 'a holy Trinity of Peasant, soil and God', had no room for extraneous inputs, such as loyalty to Hitler, or to the Nazi's watering down of the racial ethic to assist a perceived national-cum-imperial requirement. He combined practical arguments about peasant production with impractical demands for a revolutionary social purification, a near-nihilistic rejection of existing institutions, demands which could not possibly have co-existed with the NSDAP as it emerged after 1933.

We are left with the man who created an agrarian policy for the National Socialists, and brought into the NSDAP a large and significant section of popular peasant opinion and intellectual support. His fall left a joint legacy of disaffected farmers and devoted agrarian reformers, who continued to try to implement what they conceived to be his aims. After the Second World War, more of Darre's reformist ideas were implemented, in the shape of the peasant protection mechanism enshrined in the Common Market Agricultural Policy. The Messianic underpinnings of his holistic vision were forgotten, only to
Conclusion

re-emerge in today's apocalyptic ecological movement. Ironically, the practical implications were also part of a continuous line of German agrarian development. As elsewhere in the history of the Third Reich, it is the element of continuity, rather than the discontinuous revolutionary change, that is most striking.

Appendix

MARRIAGE ORDER OF THE SS, 31.12.31, MUNICH, PROMULGATED BY HEINRICH HIMMLER

1. The SS are a union of Germans of Nordic characteristics, chosen according to distinct aspects.
2. In accordance with the National Socialist conception of things, aware that the future of our people rests on selection, and of the hereditary conservation of racially healthy and sound blood, I hereby introduce the 'marriage approval' for all the unmarried members of the SS, to take effect fully after 1st January 1932.
3. The family, hereditarily healthy, and valuable on account of its German character (in the Nordic sense) is the envisaged purpose.
4. Marriage approval will be given or refused solely on grounds of race or of hereditary health.
5. All SS men who intend to marry are obliged to seek the approval of the Reichsführer of the SS.
6. SS members who marry despite their being refused permission are debarred; they can resign.
7. The decisions on marriage will be made by the racial office of the SS.
8. The racial office will hold the ‘SS family records’. The family of SS members will be recorded there after notification of marriage or official acceptance of the request to be recorded.
9. The R F SS, the Director of the Racial Office and the relevant officials of that office are bound by the code of professional confidence.
10. The SS are aware of making an important step forwards with this present order. Jokes, sarcasms and misunderstandings do not affect us; the future belongs to us.

signed HH, R F SS
Notes on Sources

Much of the Ministry of Agriculture’s file material was destroyed by bombing during the Second World War, and Darré and Backe both lost the bulk of their correspondence in the same way. Luckily, many of the issues and problems can be reconstructed by using other government material, and sifting through the papers of the Finance Ministry, the Reichschancellery, and the Hitler Adjutant files, etc., for agricultural material. Darré’s personal papers are divided between the Goslar City Archives, which has the pre-1933 section, and the Federal Archives at Koblenz, while his letters to his first wife, Alma, are at the Institute of Contemporary History, Munich. They are, however, restricted, as are Backe’s papers at the Federal Archive, Koblenz. Backe’s letters to his wife and his documents (passport, references, etc.) are on microfilm there, and his personal papers, while not copious, contain much that is of interest to the intellectual historian.

One source which presented some difficulty was Darré’s diary, which consists of typed extracts taken from his original diary by two friends, after the original was bought back from the Federal Archive, Koblenz by his second wife. She felt that it showed Darré in too bad a light. The original diary has been read by several historians and archivists, although it was unfortunately burnt in the late 1960s. After discussions with the two editors, and with the chief archivist at Goslar, where it can be read but not photo-copied, it seems clear that the typed version is perfectly valid. Its contents are often borne out by material in other private and governmental files, and the material left in does not seem to have been selected with a view to presenting Darré in a specially favourable light; for example, the attack on Hope-Belisha in 1939, and some positive remarks about Hitler. The editors’ claim that only material of a personal, prolix and libellous nature has been deleted can, I think, be accepted. One can only regret that so many of Darré’s scurrilous but sharp comments have gone for ever. However, I have tried not to base any one aspect of my interpretation on this document, and, for the same reason, have, wherever possible, avoided using defence documents presented at the Nuremberg Trial as a sole source.

It proved impossible to find a German copy of Neusadl, and I worked with the French translation of 1939, La Race. Page references to Neusadl are therefore to the French edition.

All translations, except that on page 64, are by the author.
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13. L. Wheeler, ‘The SS and the Administration of Nazi Occupied Europe 1938-1945’ (Oxford D. Phil. thesis, 1981), ‘Although Darré was removed from his post by Himmler in 1938, the RuSHA which had developed under his auspices was a powerful component of the Reichsführer’s network’, p. 27. This became true in 1940-41, but by 1943 the RuSHA had lost its importance: it was certainly not all powerful in 1938.
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