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INTRODUCTION

By 1938 the infamous Nazi regime had infiltrated German life to the extent that children’s books (not to be confused with educational documents) containing Nazi propaganda were published in the tens of thousands. Jew-baiting teachers used these books as teaching tools, giving the content of the book credibility (Bytwerk 172). Out of the anti-Semitic children books published, one stands above the rest as an exemplar of the Nazi methods: *Der Giftpilz*, or *The Poisonous Mushroom*, was a book published by a semi-private Nazi publication that furthered the Nazis’ superstitious, Jew-hating ideology. Masked in this children’s book, an über narrative unfolds, leaving “…little question regarding the intended Nazi solution to the “Jewish Problem” (Mills). This book treats the “Jewish question,”(a racial question of what should be done with the Jew) as an imperative, utterly necessary for survival. Specifically targeting children, *Der Giftpilz* employs simple narrative elements which cleverly twist the simple content to inundate children with a sense of Nazism’s moral ground and Germanic cultural identity. With basic rhetorical devices, *Der Giftpilz* was able to help children form their identity and interpret what they saw in real life according to a superstitious Nazi ideology.

BACKGROUND

The story of *Der Giftpilz*’s creation begins in the 1920s with Julius Streicher, one of the most elementary and ardent Hitler fanatics in the Nazi outfit. He was assigned to the task of indoctrinating Germany’s most impressionable citizenry, providing constant fodder through various publications for indulging in discussion of “the Jewish question.” Julius Streicher was never extremely intimate with the top Nazi outfit; he was just a
lackey, carrying out simple propagandistic missions. His principal project during the Nazi years was *Der Stürmer*, an anti-Semitic newspaper. He used this project to stay in cahoots with Hitler; far from ingenious, the paper was an explicit collection of shallow gossip and cruel speculation designed to inform the garden variety German about the latest in anti-Semitism. It was supplemental reading compared to the plan envisioned by the more notorious Goebbels. Hitler thought *Der Stürmer* accompanied Goebbels’ plan nicely as it added to the general population of lies (Herf 207).

The Nazis began as a political party seeking to restore Germany to power, but they became much more than just a political party; their politics were a superstitious ideology that flooded the minds of Germany’s citizens. Their Education Ministry explicitly prepared a war-minded society. The educational curriculum labeled everybody non-Aryan a target. Hitler was to lead Germany into freedom against all oppressors (Education in Nazi Germany 21).

One of these oppressors, perhaps the main one, was the Jews. They were the scapegoats for every problem Germany ever had. Although they were German citizens, Nazism could not accept that they were in fact regular Germans. Hitler and his regime were keen on the idea that children are the progenitors of a given ideology. *Der Stürmer* published two children’s books to reinforce that point, *Der Giftpilz*, and *Trust No Fox on His Green Heath And No Jew on His Oath*. *Der Giftpilz* was an astonishingly clear representation of the Nazi agenda, and was later admitted as evidence in the Nuremberg trials as such (NIzkor). Streicher, his publishing house *Der Stürmer*, and Fips (an infamous Nazi cartoonist) marched on the unsuspecting minds of the German youth.
through these books, providing a symbolic world that interpreted the proper life Nazism had designed for Germany.

By 1938 the Nazis had effectively quarantined “undesirables” in Germany. By the time *Der Giftpilz* was published, Jews remaining in Germany were outcasts, and an impoverished group; thus, when German children happened upon the Jew, the concepts and illustrations within *Der Giftpilz* emphasizing Jews as outliers were validated by the conditions that had been imposed upon the Jews, with the establishment of the Nuremberg laws in 1935. Basically, the Nazis created an ideology and along with it a real life example of said ideology. By quarantining the Jews, Nazis made the Jews look more threatening than they had looked previously, and made it easier for Germans to hate them. They validated their own fabricated ideology and superior cultural identity.

**THE RHETORICAL COMPONENT**

The primary theoretical backdrop for this study is Fantasy Theme Analysis (FTA); a rhetorical methodology crafted by Ernest Bormann in the early 1980’s. I will address the finer mechanics of FTA in a later chapter; however, a brief introduction is warranted here to ground this study. Bormann’s concept was based on Robert Bales’ interpersonal communication research regarding group process and fantasizing. Freud proposed that individuals connect with certain aspects of life, ingest them, and then recall them later to create a vivid internal fantasy world built upon the symbols accumulated. Bales and then Bormann theorized that groups function in much the same way: connecting with a concept or symbol, the group would pass the symbol back and forth, much like an individual’s mind would on its own. When a group generates identification
through symbols, they become an integral aspect of the group’s symbolic world. Essentially the person or group is living in a world created by their own ability to elaborate and fantasize; these symbols are perpetuated to the extent the group experiences and elaborates upon them.

Bormann’s original question, and the point of origin for his contribution to rhetorical theory, was, “Could skillful communicators design dramatizing messages with an eye to a target audience and deliver those messages in such a way that others were brought into participation in the fantasy?” (Bormann, Ten Years, 291). The discourse takes on a life of its own, and if the fantasy is powerful enough, it carries a rhetorical vision, which is a persuasive vision that helps make sense of and inform interactions in the real world. If groups function the way that Bormann theorizes, then a body of discourse has severe persuasive implications for society’s groups; for instance, what messages are getting “caught up and chained out,” as Bormann characterizes the process of perpetuating myths, and who is creating them?

THE INTERCULTURAL COMPONENT

*Der Giftpilz* is ripe for analysis from an intercultural approach, because its rhetoric inherently pits two cultures against one another. The Rules/Systems intercultural approach to communication as championed by Mary Jane Collier and Milt Thomas seeks to understand how cultural identities are negotiated through the use of symbols and intercultural interactions. Intercultural communication inherently strives at understanding those aspects of culture that are different from one’s own. We (as intercultural beings)
have a self-perceived identity, as well as an identity thought to be “attributed to self by other” (Collier 304). These two features of cultural identity have a few implications.

When the avowed identity matches with the ascribed identity, relationships form, causing trust, intercultural competence and identity validation. When avowed identity and ascribed identity do not match, friction occurs, causing intercultural distance and identity creation. *Der Giftpilz* thus acts as a wedge between Jewish and German culture, accentuating difference. The methods used by *Der Giftpilz* to identify and alienate cultures should be further explored.

The study of intercultural communication and rhetoric grant me the opportunity to examine those rhetorical devices that give *Der Giftpilz* its symbolic content of identity negotiation. Propaganda does not create anything new, rather it employs that which already exists in order to redefine and refashion reality, and/or identity (Ellul 33). Through the positioning of symbols *Der Giftpilz* creates meaning, and thus a lens for interpreting cultural and rhetorical identity.

Propaganda can redefine that which an individual knows well, transforming experience into utter fantasy and delusion (Ellul 11). When a propagandistic fantasy is directed at children, a demographic presumably more impressionable and still in the process of forming their beliefs, a subsequent society can emerge that is biased, prejudiced, and hateful towards other societies they have encountered mostly as the Other.

This study employs FTA and Rules/Systems approaches to analyze *Der Giftpilz*, uncovering techniques used to depict and teach Germans to recognize the Jew as the
Other, and describing the deliberate formation of the German identity that is accomplished through that recognition.
IMPLANTING THE JEWISH QUESTION

The overwhelming complexity of the National Socialist Propaganda Ministry’s program was masked in seeming simplicity, placing emphasis on simple concepts like will, hope, and power. Scholars have addressed many factors and characteristics at work in the propaganda machine; however, the intersection of education and propaganda has not been extensively covered. More specifically, the use of rhetorical technique in propagandistic educational material has not been treated at all. It is the premise of this section that Nazi propaganda makers concentrated special and significant energies towards fertilizing German youth with ideology that would cultivate them into their future fighting force. This propagandistic manipulation is characterized by the saturation of mass media with an overemphasized dramatic self-image and a long-term vision for totalizing ends.

LONG-TERM VISION, RETURN ON INVESTMENT, EDUCATION

Nazi propagandists attempted to realize their grandiose vision by focusing a long-term plan of action on constituents of a sustainable, low risk demographic, capable of fulfilling Nazi ideals. The greatest return on the Nazi investment was realized in children, much more than in adults, because presumably, children are especially impressionable, and still in the process of forming their beliefs.

Vilifying the Jew while vindicating the German, Hitler assumed the inherent racial right of the Aryan race and its drastic need to manipulate the collective mind. The primary form of this manipulation was the introduction of “the Jewish question,” and for Hitler, this question was a simple matter of science. Darwinian evolution, in a Nazified
view, justifies eugenic science to the extreme. Hitler intended to wipe out the racial
groups he considered “undesirable” in pursuit of the eugenic ideal of racial purity. For
Hitler, “desirable” was the pure blooded Aryan. This purity was found in all Aryans, but
specifically persuadable children needed to be inculcated with the ideal of Nazi purity
and given answers to the “question” of reacting to the threat posed by the presence of an
inferior race.

Scientific justification permeated Nazi propaganda and ideology, beginning with
the premise that the fittest survive. However, the Nazis furthered the idea of racial
superiority through the added proposition that the dominant survive. The Nazis and Hitler
claimed that the survival of Germany was threatened by the contamination and/or
poisoning of the Aryan race. A victory over this contamination depended on a concerted
struggle against the enemy; the youth would have to know this well if they were to
dominate. Hitler shaped this assignment by stating, “Let us educate the German people
from their youth up with that exclusive recognition of the rights of their own nation and
cease to taint the heart of the child with the curse of ‘objectivity’…” (qtd. in Education in
Nazi Germany 22-23). His statements were precursors to the drastic means eventually
taken to maintain racial superiority.

The Nazis believed that the Jews were the biggest evil and the destroyer of the
world, namely the contaminator of blood. Mein Kampf, Hitler’s treatise and the Nazi
proof-text, possessed a pseudo-scientific racial theory: in summary, that “human culture
and civilization on this earth are inseparably bound up with the existence of the Aryan”
(Bytwerk 42, qtd. in Education in Nazi Germany 21). Furthering their own significance
while creating a perceived struggle against “culture destroyers,” the Nazis labeled
themselves “culture bearers” (Blackburn 51). Everything revolved around the “iron law of nature,” which assumed “the prerequisite for improvement of the species lies, not in the union of the superior with the inferior, but in complete victory of the former” (qtd. in Education in Nazi Germany 20). Fighting for culture and improvement of the species was enough justification for Nazism to fight against those (mainly the Jew) who attempted to hinder their growth as an Aryan nation. The negative outward focus of the Jewish Question was a means of inculcating German culture with the goal of domination.

In his book The Politics Of Memory, Herbert Hirsch writes how regimes motivate people to commit genocidal acts: “The way to motivate people to commit such acts is to manipulate their historical memories by creating myths designed to stimulate their racial, ethnic, or national hatreds that feed violence” (9). The acts of genocide, according to Hirsch, were due to the manipulation of history and the creation of myth; the concept of eugenics was big enough to house both. Furthermore, Hirsch states that “People are not born with memory or with political ideas,” but that through the deliberate suppression or manipulation of memory, a regime could effectively persuade the youth to realize and enforce whatever political beliefs they wished (Hirsch 109). Citizens with the least resistance are prime targets for political revolution and manipulation; the youth are the most vulnerable of all because they are not only empty of political memory, but require little to no reprogramming.

One specific reason why German youth in the 1920’s and ‘30’s could be so easily targeted and manipulated was due to “relatively strong feelings of personal inadequacy, which was very true of the defeated Germans living under the terms of the Versailles treaty” (qtd. in Casmir 17). This statement is all the more true regarding German children
who speedily joined the Hitler youth during 1928-1933 because of the “developmental deprivation this cohort of German children suffered in terms of prolonged hunger, absence of parents, loss of the war, revolution, occupation, and inflation” (Blackburn 10). Blackburn explains that this deprivation caused a void to emerge in the German psyche; the proof is in the Hitler Youth movement and its membership.

Even though the Nazis destroyed or integrated all prior governmental organizations into their regime, the Hitler Youth was greeted with relative joy because of what it provided; sport, competition, pocket knives, etc. These accessories promoted an obedient youth culture and assisted in inculcating German society with a high-tension, militarized ethos, designed to transcend individualism for the sake of National Socialism (Blackburn 3).

The ultimate pillar of the long-term manipulation plan was an educational system that indoctrinated students into the Jewish question and offered them a palpable enemy. Blackburn quotes Bernhard Rust, Hitler’s Minister of Education, saying that the goal of unifying the youth was “…the beginning of a process of transformation whereby the total life of the people was to be refashioned in harmony with the philosophy of National Socialism” (qtd. in Blackburn 12). Eugenic calculations were empirical according to the Nazis, and the youth were the perfect group of malleable spirits.

The German was taught to identify with national interests by adhering to the primary commandment of Nazism: the right to bear culture, which included the right to destroy that which threatened national preservation. Autonomy was conferred according to their racial rights. Through the portrayal of Germany in Nazi educational materials, the
student came to believe in Germanic racial responsibility and the nation’s destiny as world leader.

Nazi history, as depicted in the textbooks, was not a chronology but a drama that explored the destiny of Germany as a world-dominating power. Blackburn states that the historical drama of National Socialism had five premises: “(1) life is struggle (2) the individual is nothing without the Führer (3) the folk is the future (4) compatriots are comrades of fate (5) the blood is most valuable inheritance” (Blackburn 38). In other words, life is a struggle because the blood is the most valuable inheritance; and the Führer will carry the German people into the future. Hitler’s racial experience and his impeccable qualities gave children someone to idealize and parents someone to put their hope in.

The Nazis’ presentation of German history as a drama, not a chronology, enabled them to abuse the German self-image and counterfeit the nation-Führer relationship. They were able to express basic Nazi racial postulates while emboldening more recent history over the less applicable. Unlike most history books, this “reverse” chronology was a means of giving “…more credence to the most recent of events,” while presenting history as a struggle of blood and racial supremacy (Blackburn 38). The Führer persona began all textbooks, rather than ending them. Nazi history, constructed backwards, made textbooks that depicted the Führer pulling Germany out of the economic and social mud.

It behooved Nazi education to explain the long-term struggle of racial and national superiority as a vital context for the reconstruction of their society. To aggrandize the Aryan myth, youth education portrayed race, struggle, and most of all, the inevitability of war as themes central to the story of their imminent dominance and divine
Blackburn elaborates that “The new German Schools were to help create a militarized society that would both purge the national spirit of foreign impurities and promote a high-tension ethos that accepted war as a normal condition in a life of struggle” (Blackburn 12). The new Germanic ideology hoisted the flag of Aryan superiority, visible for all to see, and because of youth education, the flag was identifiable by all. War would ultimately demonstrate their assumed military superiority, but in terms of educational propaganda, establishing a sense of nationality took precedence: it is easier to fight a war when you are part of a group with purpose.

There is a collection of quotes in a pamphlet published by two English investigators in 1938 revealing how, “Germany is educating their young on the virtue of war” (Education in Nazi Germany 71). The pamphlet reveals the Nazi vision of the inevitability of war under Nazi leadership. And it was understood that this war would be a struggle. For the Nazi, life was struggle, and to be strong in life one must confront that struggle. Dr. Helmut Stellrecht, Senior District Leader of the Military Education of German Youth, claimed that “one is not drilled into being a soldier, but one is born and educated to be a soldier…” (qtd. in Education in Nazi Germany 14). Simply put, in Nazi ideology, soldiers were generated, not indoctrinated. This is a frightening insight into Nazism; they saw their children as inevitable soldiers, awaiting battle. The quote by Stellrecht continues: “It is important to begin this military education as early as possible and to carry it on systematically until in actual army service steel is forged from the iron, strong enough for whatever effort it may be called upon to make” (qtd. in Education in Nazi Germany 14). The rhetoric normalized war as inevitable and necessary; the education revealed young Germans to themselves as soldiers.
Convinced that the German youth would bring the German people into the racial future victorious, the revamping of the educational system was done explicitly for the purpose of preparing the war mind. In 1936, the Nazis demanded that all teachers abandon their membership with any other party other than Nazi; they would consequently be trained on racial knowledge (Pine 15-16). To maximize the Nazi efforts in reflecting National Socialist ideology, the youth’s educational system was overhauled to teach racial superiority and the norm of war. Alfred Rosenberg is quoted, “Our task is to write History anew,” which meant exposing Germany’s historical nemesis, the Jew (Pine 50). Education became military service, “well calculated to prepare the war mind” (Education in Nazi Germany 23). More educational importance was placed on physical strength than strength of intellect, and competition between youth was emphasized; running was no longer a thing of leisure or sport, it was now for honor.

THE JEWISH QUESTION

To build the Jewish question and conspiracy, Josef Goebbels, Reich Minister of Propaganda, played off of previously elaborated-upon themes that pointed to an enemy with a long backstory. Casmir notes that one “...must have or create some proof that such an “enemy” is both in a position and willing to become a threat to his listeners” (Casmir 16). The Nazis constantly placed the domestic and international Jew at the front of periodicals and public propaganda displays, creating the sense of a palpable worldwide threat. Goebbels constantly reminded his listeners of this “already existing common cause or emotionally acceptable target” (Casmir 16). As a means to warrant war, the Jewish
conspiracy and question depicted the Jew as a palpable threat at home and a definite threat from afar.

Nazi propaganda’s Jewish question dominated discourse through many mouthpieces: journalists, Party Speakers, and teachers, as well as public ceremonies, radio, and transportation. While keeping up a façade of occupational autonomy, mass communication was merely a vessel for Nazi propaganda’s hateful ideology. In other words, every faculty at hand was employed to enrich that message and make the Jewish question simple, forceful, and concentrated (Hirsch 22). Nazi ideology was communicated with broad strokes, thereby mitigating potential confusion and contradictions, making the Jewish question no question at all. The most explicit example of the “broad stroke invention” was called “the big lie” (Blackburn 7).

To explain, this is a lie so big it is impossible to corroborate, and therefore also impossible to refute. The larger the lie, the harder it is to find evidence to oppose it. The “big lie” for Nazi propaganda came in the form of the Jewish question: what will the world do with the Jews? Specifically, what will Germany do to save the world from the Jew? The international Jewish conspiracy therefore acted as a way to say that the Jews were the puppet masters of the earth’s foreign leaders and also the world economy. This claim was explicit in *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, which predates Nazi propaganda by 20 odd years.¹ With large amounts of presumed proof stacked against them, how could the Jew, or their advocates, prove they were *not* part of an international conspiracy?

---

¹ *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion* is a spurious account, written around the turn of the 20th century, of
The connections between the Jew and international control were thin. Goebbels worked every angle to depict any and all opposition to the righteous Nazi agenda as direct proof of Jewish involvement and their puppet mastering of world events. A few examples are as follows: (1) President of the United States, F.D. Roosevelt, was consistently propagandized as the “henchman of the Jews” (Herf 128). (2) Regarding the Russian campaign, in posters and headings Nazi propaganda connected the Bolsheviks with the Jews. For example, “Stalin and Jews are one” or “It would be an insult to animals if one were to call the features of these largely Jewish tormentors of people bestial” (Bachrach 124). (3) Daily newspapers exposed the international Jewish enemy at every turn with every event. The more the Nazis did to aggravate and assert their complex of divine right on the world, the more the world fought back, which provided more fodder to demonstrate the truth of the international Jewish conspiracy.

In 1941 Goebbels was given “evidence” that expanded anti-Jewish propaganda and “proved” a conspiracy existed; it ultimately furthered the Nazi justification for genocide against the Jew/non-Aryan. A Jew in New Jersey wrote a book advocating for sterilization of the German nation.2 Goebbels pointed to this work to say that the Jews were the progenitors of a genocidal suggestion against the German people (Bachrach 128-29). The proof, albeit manipulated, proved that an international Jewish conspiracy existed that aimed to keep Germany crestfallen.

The international Jewish conspiracy was a fully functioning propagandistic technique because of its “broad strokes” and dependence on Nazi-dominated discourse.

---

The Jewish question was the center of all the newspapers, thereby exposing the international and domestic demon and justifying his murder. Both the international and domestic Jewish questions served as perfect excuses for the Nazi to claim justification for war.

**TOTALIZING PROPAGANDA**

To create and maintain the Jewish Question, Nazi propaganda required total communicative control. If contradiction materialized, it was swiftly squashed, because it had the power to demolish the Nazi system of lies. The Nazi system dealt with the sizeable amount of propaganda by effectively quarantining free speech, ensuring the façade of Nazi unity, which created an inborn fighting force by revealing an alleged threat at home and afar. Because no opposing explanation existed, and free speech was essentially quarantined, little to no proof contradicted the Jewish question. Totalizing and comprehensive, the Nazi propagandistic technique censored the citizen, legitimized the party, and built a sustainable, unified, inborn fighting force. Congruently, Nazi propaganda, through spoken word, mass media, and public spectacle, efficiently communicated faith, fear, racial supremacy, hate, and obedience.

Propaganda is a term that only achieved notoriety in the early 20th century. Nazi propaganda gave the people a sense of security, something they had not tasted since their defeat in World War I. Joseph Goebbels was the most significant propagandist of the Nazi regime.³ He was the mastermind and in charge of the production of propaganda material from the beginning of the regime to its end. He was named the Propaganda

---

³ Otto Deitrich, Max Amann, and many others were also integral elements to the Nazi machine. I treat Goebbels here because he was, for all intents and purposes, the mastermind behind the manipulation of Germany and the world. For the most part, others were simply administrators of Goebbels’ elaborate plan.
Minister of the Nazi party early on. In that position, according to Bramsted, Goebbels contributed “in four decisive ways.” (1) He brought the “Socialist element to a party that had begun as a purely middle class affair” (thus bringing the general population into the fold). (2) “He had won Berlin and thereby prepared the way for seizing power in the Reich.” (3) “He had worked out the style and technique of the Party’s public ceremonies.” (4) He created “The Führer Myth” (Bramsted 198). Goebbels, once in power, devoted himself ”to the task of manipulating and deceiving the Germans and the outside world” (Bachrach 63-66). He made it a priority that “the whole educational system, theater, film, literature, the press, and broadcasting” be used “as a means to the end of preserving ‘the eternal values’ of the German people” (Bachrach 63-66). This meant dismantling institutions of democracy, controlling the press and radio, and in particular, creating myths. In addition, all cultural organizations were brought into the machine, enabling Goebbels “to set up a robot culture” (Sington and Weidenfeld 104).

The Nazis had assembled a vast system of total organizational hierarchy with Hitler at the top; it was implied that insubordination would not be tolerated.

The Nazis used fear-creating threats as a means of control and a way to justify their ideological action. Fred Casmir, published in Today’s Speech, explains that through Hitler “Fear creating threats…were used in two ways: as an internal controlling force in his own party and as a means of identifying any enemy outside his own party against whom Germans in general could vent their rage as a type of release mechanism” (Casmir 15). Nobody dared disagree with Hitler and the Nazis because of this fear, and arguably that is why so many ordinary people did horrible things. Hitler always worked off the

---

4 Berlin was a tough nut to crack. Goebbels generated months of journal entries describing his attempts to figure out how to win over Berlin. It took time, but what he did in Berlin, he subsequently did everywhere.
assumption that the masses were “stupid and forgetful” and that “in political matters feeling often decides more correctly than reason” (qtd. in Bytwerk 43). Hitler used fear and other emotions to place Germany and its enemy into a “rhetorical straightjacket” (Bytwerk 55).

To gain control of the citizenry through fear, Hitler and Goebbels needed to set some concrete, illustrative examples. One such example was Hitler’s old personal friend Ernst Roehm, leader of the storm troopers, who “…was executed when he refused to commit suicide with a proffered weapon” (Casmir 16). He showed disloyalty and was thus made an example of. No matter the connections one might have, extreme measures were taken to guarantee adherence.

After the Roehm incident, hundreds more were killed for giving an impression of disloyalty; it was made clear that everyone was expendable. Therefore, “‘We all approve always, of what the Führer does.’ To do otherwise meant certain death, even to close friends” (qtd. in Casmir 16). It is revealing when Bytwerk comments that in some ways there were no censors; “there were other methods in place for that” (90). The publication Der Stürmer, which I treat in another section, furthered this type of censorship by exposing citizens as Jews, or non-Jews with Jewish sympathies. In Der Stürmer’s newspapers or posters, these citizens having been exposed as enemies of the Reich were defenseless against their ideologically possessed constituency. Through fear, “they [the Nazis] wanted absolute cooperation but” in the end “settled for citizens who caused no trouble” (Bytwerk 160). This creation, maintenance, and then controlling of insubordinates created a cohesive public unity allowing for further control over information.
By its very nature, Nazi propaganda could not contradict itself, because then the propagandistic system of lies would come tumbling down. Possible threats of contradiction, informational or otherwise, had to be dealt with to ensure the unity of the message, and the perceived unity of the party. Censorship ensured consistency, avoided possible contradiction for future propaganda, and promoted a united front; combined, these elements ultimately “encouraged silence” (Bytwerk 132).

Censorship and/or control guaranteed consistency of the message within the Ministry departments, in addition to tempering the opposition. The message came via traditional organizational systems because they were the most relatable and reputable. “In special pamphlets, such as “Unser Wille und Weg” (Our Will and Way), precise directions left little to chance. Local organizers were told how and where to place party posters, how to tailor language for different audiences” (Bachrach 39). To further exercise censorship, the Nazis created a Central Press Bureau, where “every newspaper and periodical…had to be submitted before publication” (Sington and Weidenfeld 133). Issued daily, Press directives were an added value because censoring by directive ensured the integrity of the newspapers while enabling “the greater part of the surviving German press to keep the appearance and façade of real independence; and this . . . had the incidental advantage of deluding opinion abroad” (Sington and Weidenfeld 118-119).

The Nazis thus created a humorless censoring system for the mechanism it operated, the citizenship it wished to manipulate, and the opposition. Censoring as illustrated came in many forms but in many instances the Nazis did not have to censor: they simply dominated the industry.
With Hitler’s appointment to Chancellor on January 30, 1933, the Nazis kicked out the free press, driving them into exile. Bytwerk explains that “…totalitarian states must quarantine objectionable ideas…otherwise they spread…therefore you must encourage silence” (132). From then on, every journalist living under the Reich was a member of the Reich League of German Press (Herf 18). By preemptively quarantining the largest group of prominent voices, the Nazis ensured their message was not contradicted. Regardless of the department involved, information disseminated from the Ministry of Propaganda had strict guidelines. In many specific instances, “Goebbels determined the main lines and points of propaganda,” making sure his instructions were carried out (Bramsted 92).

Essentially political tools, journalists were confidential agents of Goebbels who were organized into “The Card Index,” which was an index in alphabetical order by region and special subject, so on “short notice,” teams could be dispatched to foreign countries to take over already existing newspapers (Sington and Weidenfeld 63). This strategy ensured dominance of the discourse in the targeted area as well as helping to deal with insubordinates. The press possessed three informational “guidelines”: news for immediate publication, information material for indirect use, and confidential directives (Bramsted 90). These directives indicated to the propagandist what to avoid and/or emphasize, or whether to obscure important issues, information, and/or conclusions.

Journalists were not the only profession targeted for their public influence. Another group, known as the Party Speakers, embodied “the bewitching power of the spoken word” (Casmir 15; Sington and Weidenfeld 33). The German people were powerfully moved by a public speaking technique that inculcated citizens with Nazi
values. Casmir notes the German educational tradition was to be suspicious of a “skilled rhetorician,” however, Hitler and Goebbels gave them something to believe in (Casmir 15). Goebbels understood that propaganda and speech needed to be pragmatic, not theoretical, stating, “The academic propagandist is useless…” (Bytwerk 42). Hence, Goebbels made sure that the speeches and the Party speakers were treated with extreme precision to safeguard efficacy. He thought public speaking was so important the Party Speakers were “one of the most highly organized pieces of machinery in the whole Party” (Sington and Weidenfeld 33).

These Party Speakers were trained in two distinct areas: “ideological and technical” (Sington and Weidenfeld 34). They had to endure intense training on all aspects of Nazi ideology and be proficient in all its workings. The Speakers were ordered into a “complex hierarchy and a number of grades and groups suited to different situations and audiences and adapted to various kinds of propaganda campaign” (Sington and Weidenfeld 36). This exactitude of training and cataloguing of speakers ensured the precision of the message. It also created a prestigious intellectual pursuit for young men wishing to help the Reich in a more eloquent fashion. The eloquently spoken word served Nazi propaganda with greater intensity than other media because it was so perfectly orchestrated and personal. This sort of skilled production drew German citizens by the thousands to grand halls and gatherings to hear the theatric speeches of the Third Reich.

For further dissemination of the propaganda, “all available means” were employed (Aristotle 24). First, the ceremonies and productions were half semi-religious rite and half threatening mass demonstration, with “the solemn atmosphere of a religious festival service” leading citizens toward a feeling of awe (Bramsted 215). The big
demonstrations were designed to draw attention to Hitler, “the apex of a pyramid,” and demanded in their guidelines no fewer than 150 search lights, 30,000 flags, and 110,000 people in attendance (Bramsted 215). These ceremonies furthered Nazi ideology by the procession and spectacle with which they were executed. Secondly, the radio was of great benefit because of its scope. In fact, the ministry was “self supporting and funded by radio license fees” (Bytwerk 60). In order to move the word through their citizens swiftly and without contradiction, the Nazis produced a “peoples’ radio/receiver,” even for low-income houses (Bytwerk 60). This stimulated radio as a primary source of revenue, and at the same accomplished their totalizing goals.

Another unique method for controlling the message was the subtle promotion of foot traffic. For example, in 1939 there were 25 cars for every 1000 German citizens (Herf 29). The low disbursement of automobiles suggests there were many German “pedestrians,” who could be bombarded with wall posters and visual propaganda as they travelled to and fro. “A passerby could, within a few seconds, pause to see the latest Fips cartoon, or devote the several minutes necessary to read any of the generally brief articles” (Bytwerk 59). If the reader lost objectivity, for even a moment, the only thing available for him/her to grasp was the “answer” to the Jewish question, written in bold red letters everywhere: “Jews are guilty for everything” (Herf 208).

In the midst of this this institutional domination, the persona of the Führer provided on a dynamic backdrop that aggrandized the dramatic self-image of the German people, innovatively empowering the chosen and targeting the oppressed.

---

5 Philipp Rupprecht, pen name Fips, was a prominent cartoonist for Streicher are the Stürmer.
Propaganda related the drama with a spotlight on the Führer as savior, seer, and philosopher, which facilitated the idealization of the Germanic self-image. Within Nazi rhetoric the citizen was able to see his or her national Germanic life unfold; Der Führer was thus headlining the dramatic history of the National Community. The rhetoric and propaganda operated in such a way that the citizens felt close to the Führer and his goals; in many instances, citizens made the Führer’s goals their own. The Führer was projected as “Hitler-the greater German-the Führer-the Prophet-the Fighter,” an idol for children, a savior for adults (Bramsted 201). These themes of Hitler’s greatness assisted identification on various levels. Bramsted states “Any totalitarian system is bound to aim at a maximum identification between the directing leader and the directed masses…” Hitler was therefore depicted as a “charismatic superman and as a fellow human being” (Bramsted 197). In this way Goebbels crafted a relatable deity, claiming, “The Führer’s words are seeds in the people’s hearts” (qtd. in Bytwerk 17). Hitler became a leader “picked by “destiny”…“a man of the people” who restored German glory, created hope for the future, and sought to create a harmonious national community that would eliminate conflict between the working and middle classes” (Bachrach 75). Hitler himself stated that he thought it was his divine duty to get rid of the Jews; he was merely “G-d’s instrument for doing so” (Herf 262).

CONCLUSION

The Nazis’ educational textbooks “looked at war as a purification rite which distilled the racial qualities necessary to ensure the continued preeminence of the Volk in history” (Blackburn 35). If war was inevitable, soldiers were needed; the youth were the
easiest for the Nazis to recruit because they were primed for the information, low risk, and provided the greatest return on the Nazis propagandistic investment of inculcating the war mind. The long-term goal of the Nazis was to recreate their society the way they wanted; the more immediate aspect of that long-term goal was to fight a war, which would require devoted soldiers.

Blackburn shares with us an important insight into the psyche of the reprogrammed reader of Nazi history, which is that the reader would experience a heightened sense of Nazism, while losing himself in the process. He states a “constantly accelerating momentum [of propaganda] pushed the reader…into a state of mind in which restraint and objectivity were lost” (Blackburn 44). With the vast amount of censorship, coupled with educational propaganda, Nazis made their youth into a fighting “robot nation.”

Children provided the principal return on the Nazi investment, because the youth’s beliefs do not need to be reprogrammed, but are rather educated and molded. As Nazism marched “towards a better future,” dominating meant convincing their population of an imminent threat that required war to avoid certain annihilation (Blackburn 41). Nazi ideology claimed the Jew was the “devil in human form” coming to destroy the world, therefore, Germany, the leader, must be ready. Germany’s march was not just one of boot over soil, but boot over mind.
THE HISTORICAL WEIGHT OF DER GIFTPILZ

On January 30th of 1939, Hitler brought a more radical anti-Semitism to the fore: the Final Solution (Herf 49). Simply put, the Final Solution was the ultimate plan to exterminate the Jewish people. Thanks to the use of myth and paranoia under National Socialist ideology, the final solution appeared to be the only logical answer to the “Jewish problem.” A potent source revealing Nazi goals for the Final Solution was the children’s book Der Giftpilz: The Poisonous Mushroom. From the ideology masked in this children’s book, a plot would unfold leaving “…little question regarding the intended Nazi solution to the “Jewish Problem” (Mills).

When considering 1938 in Nazi Germany, Der Giftpilz is probably not the first thing that comes to mind. The Nazi movement escalated fairly rapidly and in its rise there were warnings of its immense radicalism regarding the supposed “Jewish problem”: Hitler’s anti-Semitic rants, Streicher’s even more rabid rants in Der Stürmer, anti-Jew legislation from the Reichstag in 1935, and finally Kristalnacht. But Der Giftpilz and its qualities also symbolized a threat, warning the world as to the level of normality Nazi ideology had reached in Germany: enough to print anti-Semitism specifically for child consumption. The Nazi redefinition of German normalcy sanctioned the creation of Der Giftpilz, which was distributed to children as evidence of the domestic and international Jewish threat. The impact of Der Giftpilz is shown by its use as evidence in the Nuremberg trials, its contemporary international condemnation, its connection to Julius Streicher’s popular Nazi newspaper, Der Stürmer, and finally in its educational use.

Der Giftpilz is evidence of the disgusting lengths gone to by the Nazis to acquire power and and achieve their Final Solution. They had to depict an enemy so grotesque
that it justified its own murder. In the 1930s, warnings circled the globe regarding their barbaric ways, but those warnings went unheeded by the majority until the mid 1940s. The invasion of Poland in 1939 pushed the Final Solution forward. A year later *Der Giftpilz* was published. In this case, the historical weight of *Der Giftpilz* is in its explicit targeting of children as objects for propaganda in ways that would make the Final Solution inevitable, because a well-indoctrinated youth population would then be capable of seeing the plan to its finish.

Testimony given during the Nuremberg Trial showed that *Der Giftpilz* was culpable of abusing all age groups, not just the youth. In “Propaganda and Children during the Hitler Years,” Mary Mills claims that the importance of *Der Giftpilz* and other anti-Semitic children’s books is demonstrated in their admittance as evidence during the Nuremberg Trial. She writes, “Because they were admitted as evidence and document the practices of the Nazis, these books have an authenticity that sounds a very persuasive warning and sends shock waves of horror in reaction to the evil that is presented to young children” (Nizkor). The Nuremberg Trial recounts:

A flood of abusive literature of all types and for all age groups was published and circulated throughout Germany. Illustrative of this type of publication is the book entitled *Der Giftpilz*. I offer in evidence Document 1778-PS, Exhibit Number USA-257. This book brands the Jew as a persecutor of the labor class, as a race defiler, devil in human form, a poisonous mushroom, and a murderer. This particular book instructed school children to recognize the Jew by caricature of his physical features, shown on Pages 6 and 7; taught them that the Jew abuses little boys and girls, on Page 30; and that the Jewish Bible permits all crimes, Pages 13-17.

Mills writes that the above account is enough to illustrate the significance of *Der Giftpilz* as an influential piece of propaganda. The purpose of the Nuremberg Trial was to bring to light and judge the Nazi war machine on all counts. However, those who judged the
Nazis after the war were not the only ones who condemned works like *Der Giftpilz.* Even Propaganda Minister Joseph Goebbels wrote in his diary on May 29th, 1938: “Streicher has published a new children’s book. Terrible stuff. Why does the *Führer* put up with it?” (Calvin).

*Der Giftpilz* was thus one warning sign for the world to awaken to the reality that the German political system had been driven to the abyss. At the time of its production, Nazi and anti-Nazi alike criticized *Der Giftpilz.* Mills discusses an English version of *Der Giftpilz* that appeared in England in 1938. It was the work of “The Friends of Europe,” who opposed and protested Nazi leadership by publicizing their missteps. As part of that group’s efforts to record "accurate information about Nazi Germany for use throughout Great Britain, the British Empire, the U.S.A., Europe and wherever the English tongue is known," they published a translation of *Der Giftpilz* as a clear representation of the cruelty Nazi ideology inflicts upon its followers (Heimer).

Rt. Rev. Dr. H. Hensley Henson, Bishop of Durham in 1938, wrote the foreword to the “Friends of Europe” publication of *Der Giftpilz.* He cautioned that Germany’s religion of Blood and Race posed a “menace to Christendom” and further exhorts "all who desire to form a just estimate of the anti-Semitism of the German State" to read *The Poisonous Mushroom* (Friends of Europe 3). Out of all the propaganda Rev. Henson could have chosen, he chose this clearly illustrated children’s guide to anti-Semitism. He had faith that the book would speak for itself.

Herbert Dunelm, in a note in the Friend’s publication preface, stated that *Der Giftpilz* was also advertised in *Der Stürmer*’s weekly rag. He quoted a *Stürmer* article referencing *Der Giftpilz* as, “A *Stürmer* book for young and old. “*The Poisonous*
“Mushroom” is the most convincing book of this kind…hundreds of thousands will read it with enthusiasm” (Friends 3). In many ways Giftpilz’s popularity can be tied to Der Stürmer’s popularity, which began in 1923 with Julius Streicher’s drive to create a private newspaper aimed at political retribution. Nevertheless, like the Bishops warns, all on its own “The Poisonous Mushroom…is dangerous to civilization itself” (Heimer 5).

The Der Stürmer/Verlag publishing company produced Der Giftpilz. The company became Streicher’s, as well as others’, personal bulletin for bashing the Jews. Nobody measured up to Streicher’s anti-Semitism, except for the Führer himself. Pagaard writes that, “Of Hitler's most dedicated anti-Semitic followers, none was more enthusiastic in his race hatred than Julius Streicher” (193). The newspaper produced by Streicher’s publication house was named Der Stürmer (The Attacker) because “the paper would storm the red fortress…” (Bytwerk 51). Because of his enthusiasm, Streicher gained access to the Führer and to the policy-making process. In addition, as Pagaard observes, Streicher had “…significant informal influence on [educational] curriculum…through his publishing firm, Der Stürmer” (Pagaard 200). Understanding the background and impact of Der Giftpilz first requires some grasp of his newspaper’s reach.

Der Stürmer was a weekly newspaper full of gossip, sensation, and filth. A reader could find it at a newspaper stand or in one of many display cases scattered about the public domain. Herf, in his book The Jewish Enemy, states that during that period of time the “visual presentation of propaganda in wall newspapers was of great importance” (Herf 29). Propaganda was transmitted with the support of the Nazi atmosphere and their use of space. Photo 69601 in the Yad Veshem photo archive shows Nazi SS men walking
by Der Stürmer’s wall posters (Archival Signature: 139BO2). Another item from the archive captures an exclusive “Der Stürmer” poster box presenting that week’s gossip and scandalous filth. The atmosphere instituted by the Nazis thus simplified the task of advertising Der Stürmer and other Nazi publications, making it more accessible and widely discussed.

In addition to its role as a staple program of public street propaganda, Der Stürmer’s popularity was extensive in its own right. Bytwerk notes that at its peak, Der Stürmer was selling roughly five hundred thousand copies a week, and that “the enormous circulation of the Stürmer was in itself evidence of its official popularity…” (59). Streicher became a rich man from the circulation of the Stürmer, and was referred to as “World Jew-baiter No. 1” (Grunberger 58). From the weekly printings to the thousands of letters from the readership expressing their support, plenty of evidence exists to show that Der Stürmer made its mark.

Letters from the youth population praising Der Stürmer were published often. The following quote comes from a well indoctrinated boy in 1935, and reflects the youth’s clarity on the Jewish question; something he attained from the Stürmer:

Although I do not have a regular subscription, I have bought each issue of your paper for a full year from a newsstand. You will not believe how eager I am to see each new issue; a week between issues is too long. Although I am young, with your help as a teacher I have recognized with deep conviction the deadly enemy of national life, world Jewry. There is no one I hate or despise more than this devilish Hebrew trash which has brought so much misfortune to our part of the world… I will close by saying that the battle the Stürmer is fighting is the best of its kind. World Jewry is the Devil in human form. Rip the mask of falsehood from their ugly faces. Reveal them and their criminal law, the Talmud! (Bytwerk 173).

Such a child would be fully primed to receive Der Giftpliz as his companion to the Jewish question—a collectors item: an illustrated book, in color! Streicher didn’t hesitate in
printing photos of children studying the Jewish question, since such pictures affirmed the mission of the *Stürmer* (Bytwerk 172). These pictures often showed children reading Streicher’s publications and thus served as advertising for increased readership. Moreover, these pictures should have been a warning regarding the reach of Nazi propaganda.

If one piece of Nazi propaganda can be worse than another, *Der Stürmer* accomplished that task. *Der Stürmer* was known as a “fierce and filthy rag” (Bytwerk 51). It included “sexual material [that] naturally made it interesting to young people; the *Stürmer* became the Nuremberg equivalent to an American boy's clandestine copy of *Playboy*” (Bytwerk 53). The audience of the *Stürmer* was Hitler Youth types and young soldiers, who expected racy articles with a little bit of skin; Streicher gave them what they wanted. Although some Nazis found *Der Stürmer* objectionable, it was nevertheless hailed by Hitler as a thorn in the Jew’s side that must not be withdrawn.

Streicher was second only to Hitler as the enemy of the Jews. Hitler once said, should “Streicher fall and [I] ban the *Stürmer*, world Jewry would howl with glee…I will not give them that pleasure” (qtd. in Bytwerk 33). The *Stürmer’s* essential role was “…seeing that each German…views the Jewish question as the crucial question to the nation and the honor of having put racial thought in popular language” (qtd. in Bytwerk 59). In other words, if Streicher got citizens talking and thinking about the Jewish question, National Socialist ideology would expand and be further inculcated into the fabric of German society. Hitler thus expressed that “One must never forget the services rendered by the *Stürmer*” (qtd. in Bytwerk 55).
In 1936, because of the influence Der Stürmer had gained, Streicher published a teacher’s manual on how to educate youth about the anti-Semitic question. Simultaneously, Der Stürmer endorsed two illustrated children’s books expounding anti-Semitic theory to enter into Nazi educational curriculum. At the peak of the regime’s strength, Streicher published these works for teachers and children as companion guides to anti-Semitic ideology. These books were elementary, but Streicher published them with special attention, “To reach those…for whom even the Stürmer’s style was too advanced…” (qtd. Bytwerk 172).

Fritz Fink, Streicher’s collaborator on this project, stated the objectives for the teaching manual:

Our children must know that Jews remain Jews, despite baptism, despite the fact that they have lived in Germany for hundreds of years, despite the fact that they dress as we do and have given themselves German names. They never take on our way of thinking. They remain Jews, hucksters, usurers, swindlers, criminals, because language, baptism, and domicile do not change the blood (Fink).

The message was exact, clear, and supported by the Nazi apparatus. Following the teacher’s manual came the two illustrated children’s books. In 1937, an 18-year-old student named Elvira Buerer wrote the first one; Don’t Trust a Fox in a Green Meadow or the Word of a Jew. It is significant in its uniqueness—the work of a youth. However, Buerer’s book would never match the sheer intensity of the message in Der Giftpilz.

Der Stürmer published Der Giftpilz, following Don’t Trust a Fox by one year, in 1938. These “Story books were specifically dedicated to propounding Nazi ideology to children and they played a significant part in this regard” (Pine 57). Written by Ernst Hiemer, the concluding lines of Der Giftpilz portend a “final solution,” stating that
“Without solving the Jewish Question, [there can be] No salvation for mankind” (Hiemer 54). This was the simple message children were meant to take from National Socialism.

*Der Giftpilz* went through 4 printings, totaling 40,000 copies (Bytwerk 172). This number may not seem to be a large publishing run; however, Bytwerk comments that the *Poisonous Mushroom* was “…widely used by Jew-baiting teachers in the classroom” (172). Even if the publication was small, the message was mighty. A possible reason for the small run could align with the reason for *Der Stürmer’s* drop in circulation post-1940, which was “in part due to war time paper shortages” (Bytwerk 63). By 1945 the paper would be cut from 16 pages down to four, which is what it started at in 1923. Hitler did however assure “…enough paper for Streicher to keep going” (Bytwerk 63).

*Der Giftpilz* is a perfect representation of what hate is capable of doing to a society’s system of justice and education. The propaganda machine furnished Nazi journalists, teachers, and propagandists of every type with an abundance of fodder aimed at reeducating everybody, especially the young. Streicher knew the Jews well. He studied them his entire professional life. From *Der Stürmer’s* “filthy rag” to Hiemer’s *Der Giftpilz*, we can witness the gross rhetoric crafted by those wishing to further discrimination and hate. The impact of *Der Giftpilz* is illustrated by its use as evidence in the Nuremberg trials, in its contemporary international condemnation, in its connection to Julius Streicher’s popular Nazi newspaper, *Der Stürmer*, and finally in its
educational use. *Der Giftpilz* illustrates to humanity the darker capability of words and ideas; namely, the ability to inculcate fresh minds into a system built for destroying those deemed undesirable.
METHODOLOGY

FANTASY THEME ANALYSIS

Methodology in rhetorical criticism emerges when a critic sees theoretical potentialities in a critical artifact. Theory gestures toward possible application; methodology applies theoretical assumptions to an artifact. A method begs its holder to use the theory and artifact to mold new knowledge. Under these premises I have chosen Ernst Bormann’s Fantasy Theme Analysis (FTA) as a reasonable method for analyzing this specific facet of Nazi propaganda. Advocates of FTA continue to gain insights into, as Bormann puts it, the “dual components of language,” which have the capacity to illuminate rhetorical understanding: “…discursive logic, [and] creative imagination” (Bormann, Ten Years 289). Since FTA has its critics, I will first disclose the components of Bormann’s FTA methodology, then treat various criticisms FTA has endured. Once FTA’s rudimentary form is exposed, I will expound how, despite criticism, FTA is a valuable methodology for elucidating certain rhetorical artifacts. Because FTA intersects with rhetoric and intragroup communication, FTA allows a critic to illuminate social fantasies related to public discourse, ultimately the purpose of this thesis.

In 1970 Robert Bales published Personality and Interpersonal Behavior. His work led to insights concerning the human psyche, and how small group fantasy is created. What emerged from Bales’ work was an account of the “dynamic process of group fantasizing” (Bormann, Fantasy 396). Bormann’s work is a derivative of Bales, but “turns to rhetorical criticism and claims that a similar process occurs in public discourse” (Williams 13). Bormann realized FTA could demonstrate “how dramatizing
communication creates social reality for groups of people,” which could further “examine messages for insights into the group's culture, motivation, emotional style, and cohesion;” in short, FTA could prove a message’s rhetorical component and its value (Bormann, Fantasy 396). In this way, Bormann focuses on rhetorical messages that transport individuals into “a world which somehow seems even more real than the everyday world” (qtd. in Bormann, Fantasy 398). Bormann developed Fantasy Theme Analysis as a method to elaborate upon group fantasy themes, fantasy types and rhetorical visions, the elements of a dynamic process of symbol sharing he called fantasy chaining.

Hirokowa et al. in the book Small Group Communication: Theory and Practice, defines the theoretical term fantasy to mean “…the creative and imaginative shared interpretation of events that fulfills a group’s psychological or rhetorical need to make sense of its experience and to anticipate its future” (Hirokowa et al. 41). Sonja Foss in Rhetorical Criticism: Exploration and Practice states “Fantasy themes tell a story about a group’s experience that constitutes a constructed reality for the participants” (Foss 98). Furthermore, fantasies “are designed to create a credible interpretation of experience - a way of making sense out of experience” (Foss 99). Fantasy, therefore, assists the elaboration of messages, themes, and types affording participants a coping mechanism within the drama of experience.

Fantasy themes illuminate “the content of the dramatizing message that sparks the fantasy chain” (Hirokowa et al. 42). The theme or themes become part of group communication and identity. Fantasy themes are collected into a group-account, and if “‘the group discussion becomes temporally and spatially dislocated…’ a recollection of
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6 Hirokowa et al. published the 8th edition of Small Group Communication textbook. I treat it here for its uncomplicated and straightforward definitions regarding FTA and its components.
something that happened to the group in the past or a dream of what the group might do in the future could be considered a fantasy theme” (Williams, 12). Charles E. Williams, published in the *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, develops the concept of fantasy themes, stating that “These values and attitudes provide the group with an entire set of acceptable and unacceptable behavior and attitudes. Those attempts at dramatizing that are not caught up and chained out by the group do not become part of their repertoire” (Williams 13). Meaning, that groups possess a collective memory, knowledge, and ideology that promotes “acceptable and unacceptable behaviors and attitudes” (Williams 13).

While fantasy themes “provide artistic and comprehensive form[s] for thinking about and experiencing the future,” fantasy types account for “stock scenario[s] repeated again and again by the same or similar characters” (Hirokowa et al. 43). *Fantasy types* amplify themes, offering, “typal classifications [that]…present only a general plot line” (Hirokowa et al. 43). If fantasy themes are the content that spark the chain, then fantasy types are manifest categories of possible dramatic behaviors within the chain.

To explain the chaining process, Williams clarifies: “How the other group members respond to the dramatic statement determines whether or not it becomes a fantasy theme within the group. If the group accepts the dramatic statement, it is ‘chained out’ among its members” (Williams 12). Bormann, like Williams, noticed how important the fantasy chain is for the critic, insofar as the chain has “The explanatory power…to account for the development, evolution, and decays of dramas that catch groups” (Bormann, Fantasy 399). The chaining process that follows brings the latent content to manifest dramatic reality. To begin the process of fantasy chaining, first, “A member dramatizes a theme that catches the group and causes it to chain out” (Bormann, Fantasy
399). If accepted, the group takes the theme and elaborates on its meaning until fantasy types and rhetorical visions become evident. FTA thus reveals a dynamic input-output relationship between the message and the theme, the chain along which themes are circulated, and finally the resulting rhetorical vision.

Bormann further describes how the chaining process operates within groups; “a theme...catches the group...[and chains] out because it hits a common psychodynamic chord or a hidden agenda item or their common difficulties vis-a-vis the natural environment, the socio-political systems, or the economic structures” (Bormann, Fantasy 399). If struck, the “psychodynamic chord” or “commonality” among the group would echo “as a coping mechanism for participants in the drama” thus creating an ideal mode of behavior (Bormann, Fantasy 400). If the producer of the message has intimate knowledge of “the people’s” situation, he/she can exploit the situation to deliberately generate group fantasies, which Bales understands as “more real than the everyday world” (qtd. in Borrman, FTA 398).

Firstly, this means that the chaining out process happens only in groups; second, the message is something other than the here and now; third, the group connects with a drama that catches on, transporting them to that rhetorical ground, finally chaining out to expose the rhetorical vision, the motive, a rhetorical movement.

A rhetorical vision worth its salt “accounts plausibly for the evidence of the senses so those who pick up the dramatic action and find it personally satisfying are not troubled by contradictory evidence...” (Bormann, Fantasy 400). The fantasy teeters between reality and rhetorical vision, where if connected with the psyche of the people/group, the fantasy will topple toward the rhetorical, becoming more acceptable
than “common-sense experience” (Bormann, Fantasy 400). Bormann states that, “A viable rhetorical vision must accommodate the community to the changes that accompany its unfolding history” (Bormann, Ten Years 292). That means a rhetorical vision is latent content within the message, pushing participants toward the vision embodied in themes and types. Nazi propaganda, for instance, possessed an explanatory framework, not just for the nation’s state of being, but for all of history as well. The Nazis created a rhetorical vision that, as Bormann would put it, would focus on “anxieties aroused by times of trouble, [and] by the evil defined within the social reality” (Bormann, Ten Years 292).

To uncover the rhetorical vision embedded in an artifact, the critic should “examine: the social relationships, the motives, the qualitative impact of that symbolic world” (Bormann, Fantasy 401). Bormann states that a body of discourse carries with it a possible drama and rhetorical vision. In other words, a vision can be linguistically constructed to create a venue for possible drama. The technique a propagandist, or the creator of the message, might use is “…essentially that of intentionally dramatizing highly emotional fantasies drawn from an established rhetorical vision to induce neophytes to share them” (Bormann, Ten Years 291). A fantasy theme analyst, John F. Cragan, observes, “A rhetorical vision is a blend of discursive material, here and now events, and fantasy themes which are woven together to form a drama that is credible and compelling” (Cragan 5). The interpretation of reality, by a body of discourse, can be driven so deep into the social strata that the individual no longer needs to choose to adhere. Bormann perceived this in his research: people or groups, who do not participate in the fantasy initially, are compelled to because the drama is so vivid. Bormann states
that “typical plot lines” become the connection between all “communication contexts” inspiring “a response reminiscent of the original emotional chain” (Bormann, Fantasy 398). For the fantasy chain to be activated, consistency in themes and types must be present to create a “rhetorical vision [that can be] propagated to a larger public until a rhetorical movement emerges” (Bormann, Fantasy 399).

MOHRMANN’S REFUTATION

The above discussion outlines FTA and its components; but in testing the credibility of any academic inquiry, criticism is inevitable and necessary. To contextualize, FTA’s history began with Bormann’s original theory, published in 1972 by the Quarterly Journal of Speech. In 1978 it became a topic of discussion at a colloquium during the Minneapolis Convention of the Speech Communication Association (Bormann, Ten Years 287). Then, in 1982, G.P. Mohrmann, a Professor of rhetoric at U.C. Davis, reopened the FTA conversation, questioning the theory’s foundational framework. In addition to presenting at the colloquium in 1978, he produced two enriching articles in 1982 that revisited the FTA of the 70s, in addition to revealing possible theoretical gaps therein.

Mohrmann’s criticism names two foundational features of FTA as problematic. Both criticisms rely heavily on Bales’, and subsequently Bormann’s treatment of Freud’s dream-work process, which Bales appropriated and connected to the fantasy-work process. Bales is heavily addressed by Mohrmann: his contributions are crucial component to Bormann’s work on fantasy themes. Bormann states, “most of the attempts to make a rhetorical criticism of small group communication proved relatively barren
until...Bales provided the key part to the puzzle when he discovered the *dynamic process of group fantasizing*” (qtd. in Mohrmann 114). FTA assumes that groups have the same fantasy construction as do individuals. Therefore, from Freud to Bales, and then Bales to Bormann, Mohrmann’s condemnations are as follows: first, the “transactional imperative,” and second, “an instrumentality for fantasies to which Bales could hardly subscribe” (Mohrmann 117). Although Mohrmann makes many assertions, the criticisms I treat here are the most salient to my discussion. Mohrmann probes FTA advocates for answers to many theoretical problems; some of his queries are as follows.

The transactional imperative operates from the Freudian premise of dream-work, assuming that groups and individuals “day-dream” about their reality. Fantasy differs in that interpersonal interaction is paramount: individuals communicate back and forth with others, thus creating group visions to the extent that the other interlocutors identify with, and creatively respond to the original message – this being the “transactional imperative.” Fantasy-work is restricted to group interaction, prompting Mohrmann to say: “A thoroughgoing Freudian, Bales appears to synthesize individual and social discontents in [Dramatizes (sic) and group fantasy]” (Mohrmann 111). For Bales, “the individual may be preoccupied by “daydreams or reveries;” which led him to propose that group fantasy is “a corresponding phenomenon” (Mohrmann 111). However, generalizing and appropriating Freud’s theory to fantasy-work has its dangers.

By Mohrmann’s account “The undercurrent of fantasy apparently overlaps those giving rise to dreams, but the dream-work of the individual is private and unconscious,” whereas the work of fantasy “is produced by the mind awake and aware of its functioning” (Mohrmann 111). What Mohrmann wants to say is that just because the
process is known to happen in individuals (that is, it is observable in a controlled environ), does not mean it happens for groups; or, better stated, it is not observable in groups (or is at least harder to observe, because a lack of a controlled environ).

Furthermore, these two processes happen in entirely different states of consciousness.

The transactional imperative is problematic for Mohrmann because it cannot be explained or analyzed; unless the social group in question is somehow confined to a lab, the interactions are almost impossible to track. Therefore Mohrmann claims that the connection between Bales and Freud is compromised: “Alone and asleep, the search for harmony manifests itself in dream-work; awake and in the company of others, that search manifests itself in fantasy-work. The difference is crucial” (Mohrmann 112). Therefore, “If Bales' conception of fantasy cannot be severed completely from Freudian theory, he enters significant qualifications” (Mohrmann 113). This is where Mohrmann proposes to Fantasy Theme analysts that unless these issues are addressed, the method is compromised.

Instrumentality of FTA, by Mohrmann’s account, is questionable because it is grounded in foundations that it disregards, while assuming a “configurational determinism” that doesn’t exist. Mohrmann labels this chaining-back-and-forth process a flawed model, because FTA critics require a certain level of consistency in the dramas for it to be credible. Mohrmann aptly quotes and adds emphasis regarding one of Bormann’s statements about the level of sameness required for a message to transfer from one group to another. This line of argument further notes that the process of chaining out cannot be properly analyzed, because the group dynamic compromises consistency and the “transactional imperative” implies the necessity of human interaction for chaining-out
process to be observed. Mohrmann states that this has an adverse effect on FTA as a theory. As Mohrmann attempts to dramatize his own hypothetical situation, he grabs for his dusty *Playboy* in astonishment, questioning how he will interact with it; “With the dream-merchants pandering everywhere, possibilities are almost without number, but how can there be any true interaction of a transactional nature?” (Mohrmann 116). He leaves this question to be answered by FTA advocates.

**JUSTIFYING FTA AS A METHOD**

Bormann responded to Mohrmann’s refutation with an article that same year, 1982, where he defends FTA as a developing theory that has brought about plentiful discussion, study, and results. Bormann states, “My claims in 1972 were that fantasies are shared in all communication contexts, that there is a connection between rhetorical visions and community consciousness, that sharing fantasies is closely connected with motivation, and is an important means for people to create their social realities. These are no longer promising hunches. They have been supported by research results” (Bormann, Ten Years 289).

Bormann offers justification and clarity for his theory by revisiting his original goals, restating that his research question was rhetorically based, seeking to answer “Could skillful communicators design dramatizing messages with an eye to a target audience and deliver those messages in such a way that others were brought into participation in the fantasy?” (Bormann, Ten Years 291). Bormann notes that Bales’ concepts would be incomplete without “the conscious, intentional, and rational elements that a rhetorical dimension would imply” (Bormann, Ten Years 291). Therefore Bormann
comes to the conclusion that “fantasy accounts not only for the irrational and non-rational aspects of persuasion but...provides the ground for the rational elements in communication as well” (Bormann, Ten Years 291). Bormann does not advocate for Freud, but finds Bales’ treatment as a gateway to possible understanding on a greater scale.

FTA is not so much rooted in Freudian theory, or even Bales’ for that matter; rather, it holds those theories in esteem, while forging a new path of rhetorical criticism. Bormann states, “Rhetorical criticism on this model would become therapeutic and the critic would have to be able to read the messages and interpret their deeper symbolic meaning in order to plumb the group's psychic depths” (Bormann, Ten Years 290). Bormann views the criticisms against FTA as superficial, whereas they imply that “we must start with a borrowed theoretical whole-cloth and [that] if we do not, we are somehow theoretically flawed” (Bormann, Ten Years 293). He does not claim that a theoretical whole-cloth is bad, but does think we should not wait for that cloth to keep us warm. Rather we must forge on, “in which the theoretical cloth is woven as we do the studies” (Bormann, Ten Years 293). Claiming superficiality while explaining his methodology, Bormann concedes to Mohrmann’s “mythical Playboy” and states, “Granted that every individual has unique experiences, the question is how do they manage to communicate with one another, cooperate in social endeavors, and come to share symbols and interpretations of their experience?” (Bormann, Ten Years 295).

Mohrmann’s final rejoinder was less than satisfied, in that he tendered Bormann’s reply at best “a commemoration of research and publication in the annals of fantasy theme analysis...” (Mohrmann, Peroration 306). Although it may be true that Bormann
did not address all of Mohrmann’s concerns explicitly, the above discussion of Bormann addresses salient aspects of FTA, its utility, and its authority as a theory for illustrating message interaction in and between groups.

In the process of explaining how FTA works and what the critic should do, Williams criticized Bormann’s failure to offer specific guidelines as to how FTA could be successfully practiced. Nevertheless, while exposing potential “gaps” in Bormann’s theory, he offered the prospective critic guidelines for conducting FTA which help the analyst understand the inner workings of the theory. Williams states, “As in most rhetorical approaches to criticism, the goal is to arrive at the motivating force behind the rhetoric and the nature of that motivating force. At first reading, the fantasy theme approach seems promising” (Williams 15). Regardless of one’s opinion on FTA, the fact is, there are gaps. Bormann himself says that we need to “ride ideas hard,” implying that neither FTA, nor any other theory, is a finished product, but that they grow through interdisciplinary criticism.

The gaps Williams uncovers are as follows: “The first is how many speeches must a critic have in order to effectively conduct a fantasy theme analysis. The second and third gaps concern themselves with the “catching up” process. How can the critic establish that the audience has indeed “caught up” a particular theme? The fourth “gap” deals with a time factor. How long does it take for this theme to be “caught up” and “chained out” through an audience? Finally, what of the chaining process itself? How is it identified and then linked back to the speaker?” (Williams 15).

First, how many pieces of rhetoric are required for a proper sample size that can prove a fantasy has penetrated groups? He answers that a case study might be acceptable
if there is a certain repetitive drama within a particular speech or piece of discourse, and if that drama showed up as having caught up the people, then possibly it may be sufficient” (Williams 16). Therefore, other pieces of rhetoric should be considered congruently with historical evidence, to provide a holistic approach to the nature of ideas (Wrage 457). This brings to mind the next few gaps, all of which are concerned with the process of chaining; specifically elements of time, history, and media prowess.

The criticism leveled by Williams simply states that not enough attention was given to the original conversation of chaining. Nevertheless, Williams asserts that time, duration and frequency, are important factors to measure in the chaining process because they determine what type of data the critic will require in order to prove the “catching up” of a group. Bormann states this as well, stating that the rationale for FTA as a method is, “…that a fantasy theme or type or rhetorical vision is important on the basis of its frequent appearance in messages…” (Bormann, Fetching 130).

That being said, in conducting FTA, a critic needs to tread “Very cautiously” (Williams 18). Williams does not condone the free-for-all-criticism Mohrmann portrays FTA to be; however, while he exposes the gaps he sees in FTA, he offers practical advice for conducting this research. The first step for the critic is to define the audience in which he or she can observe the developing chain. Next, collect evidence to suggest that the group was caught up in certain fantasy themes. To assist this venture, Williams states that, “…letters to the editors of newspapers, minutes of the meetings of various organizations, and the like can provide the critic with a good indication of the importance of the drama (indicating it has been caught up by the audience) and the extent to which it
is known in the community at large (indicating that it has been chained out)” (Williams 18).

Finally, Williams cuts the ribbon, unveiling a better-articulated FTA; he states, “By discussing the ways in which participation in the dramas serves to create for the participants a social reality, the critic may be able to explain certain behaviors and possibly predict others” (Williams 19). This predictive quality is especially appealing because it may be able to uncover mechanisms that prompt group members to action.

Fantasy theme analysis is a theory that uncovers the “magic” of rhetorical discourse through observation of the chaining out of fantasy themes and types over time. The process of fantasy chaining, according to Mohrman and Williams, can only be experienced over time, because a message sent out needs time to catch audience; once the message has been “caught up,” the critic then can analyze the original message and audience response, ultimately exposing the vision that was latent within the original message. Essentially, fantasy themes and types within the message can alter reality over time into what Bormann calls the “rhetorical vision.”

FTA operates over time. My artifact is not a piece of discourse that took place over time per se; it would seem then that the method is deficient. However, I find FTA to be a productive method for this artifact because multiple narratives are employed over the span of the book; that is, these mini-narratives operate as independent bodies of discourse, which over the span of the work promote a vivid fantasy. When looking at discourse and the audience’s response (i.e. chaining process), we see that time grants space for the messages to take root. Der Giftpilz is constructed of 17 mini-narratives; the messages take root within the rhetoric as the reader experiences it from beginning to end.
The characters within the narratives essentially play out the fantasy chaining process, all the while fostering within the reader a basis for identity creation and future action against the antagonist.

THE INTERCULTURAL COMPONENT: A RULES/SYSTEMS APPROACH

In addition to looking at this document rhetorically, it behooves our research to also analyze Der Giftpilz in terms of its intercultural component. Being that the narratives are dynamic interactions between Jew and German, examining this document interculturally gives substance to this research’s otherwise unconventional use of FTA. Because intercultural theory offers a way to analyze rules, norms, and meanings, it is assumed that identity formation will take place to the extent that the interaction is intercultural.

In their essay “Cultural Identity: An Interpretive Perspective,” Mary Jane Collier and Milt Thomas argue that intercultural communication has the ability to form and manage cultural identity. They define “intercultural communication as contact between persons who identify themselves as distinct from one another in cultural terms,” and culture as “a historically transmitted system of symbols and meanings, identifiable through norms and beliefs shared by a people” (Collier and Thomas 100, 99). These scholars seek to study the intercultural aspects of communication to illuminate “the web of meaning” in discursive interaction (Collier and Thomas 105).

In another essay regarding interpersonal alliances, Collier relates two concepts for understanding cultural identity: avowal and ascription. Avowal is how we see ourselves in a given context: “a perceived identity enacted by self.” Ascribed identity, on the other
hand, is how we think others see us in a given context: in Collier’s words, “the individual’s perception of the identity attributed to self by other” (Collier, Friendships 304, 304). Basically, when individuals or groups judge themselves, they not only take into account how they view themselves, but also how others view them. If an individual from another culture ascribes characteristics to me that do not match with my avowal, friction ensues. But when the avowal and ascription match, the product is cultural competence.

Collier further notes that “we all hold ascriptions about others, and such ascriptions include prejudices and stereotypes. Such stereotypes and prejudices often serve to reinforce ingroup solidarity (our group is better than they are), but negative ascriptions from others can also affect self-esteem and evaluations of one’s cultural group” (Collier, Friendships 304). Since Der Giftpilz is a discursive work of contrast, it makes sense to turn to the rules/systems approach to understand how the elements of cultural identity apply.

Collier and Thomas predict, “The more the consistency in each individual’s ascription of the other’s cultural identity matching the other’s avowed cultural identity, the higher the intercultural competence” (Collier and Thomas 116). This means two things: (1) cultural competence is learned through the matching of ascription and avowal; and (2) the readers’ and characters’ intercultural experiences are magnified. Furthermore, Collier and Thomas also predict that “The higher the degree of intercultural competence, the higher the likelihood that the relationship will be developed or maintained” (Collier and Thomas 112). In other words, through the similarities in ascription and avowal, the
characters form and maintain a relationship with those who carry that same cultural competence.

Collier and Thomas’ definitions of culture, rules/norms, meanings, and core systems further assist the understanding of their interpretive model. Culture could be “any…symbol system that is bounded and salient to individuals” (Collier and Thomas 103). Rules and norms emphasize “the ‘how to’ of coordinated activity; that is, the motions to make or avoid in order to get along or get by” (Collier and Thomas 103). Meanings are analyzed through groupings or “‘galaxies’ that cluster around core symbols” (Collier and Thomas 103). Furthermore “metaphors, stories, and myths reveal important themes and dimensions of understanding communicated by members of a culture group” (Collier and Thomas 103). Lastly, the concept of core symbols is important for the theory: “cultures can be differentiated from one another by core symbols” (Collier and Thomas 104). The way to differentiate between these core symbols is by placing them on a continuum of “four dimensions of culture: individualism-collectivism, power distance, uncertainty avoidance and masculinity-femininity” (Collier and Thomas 104). A reader of Der Giftpilz would place the characters, scenes, and actions on each continuum, finding an incredible amount of intercultural friction that both identifies him/her with the German and alienates him/her from the Jew and weak German behavior and thinking.

Collier and Thomas make a few assumptions based on these elements of intercultural communication. First is an epistemological assumption, namely that:

Cultural competence is recursive with cultural identity; a person is a core member of a culture to the extent that he or she coherently articulates and understands symbols and follows norms. Identity can be interpreted as a continuous variable
by tracking the systematic similarities and differences between persons who are said to belong in some way to a culture group” (Collier and Thomas 105).

An ontological assumption follows which simply states that “everywhere persons negotiate identity” and it “varies contextually” (Collier and Thomas 106). These scholars believe that “cultural identity is important in describing and explaining intercultural communication” and want to track “the normative dimension of culture,” in so doing, watching identity unfold (Collier and Thomas 106).

Furthermore, the rules/systems approach establishes “a ‘track record’ in the identification of competencies in general, and cultural/ethnic competencies in particular” (Collier and Thomas 107). Competencies refer to the “rules and preferred outcomes” (Collier and Thomas 107). One looks for these preferred outcomes in the interactions “among friends…formal relationships…adviser-advisee…instructor-student” (Collier and Thomas 107).

The main idea of intercultural communication is the study of difference. Contrast and differences in the development of cultural identities can alienate one from and/or identify one with their cultural identity. As Collier and Thomas put this point:” “DeVos and Ross (1982) argue that identities are negotiated through a process of contrast of self to others and one’s group to other groups” (112). Furthermore, Collier and Thomas note “that identities function to define rules of comportment, create a moral commitment, and reinforce a sense of common origin” (Collier and Thomas 113). This means that identity and ideology are managed and negotiated through the persuasive intercultural chasm created by differences.
JUSTIFICATION FOR THE RULES/SYSTEMS APPROACH

The intriguing result of using FTA alongside an intercultural theory is that it adds an element of persuasive identity to the intercultural interaction depicted in *Der Giftpilz*, which ultimately accounts for the messages and meanings that are “transmitted from generation to generation, or from cultural group member to newcomer” by the book and other Nazi texts (Collier and Thomas 113). The rules/systems approach dissects discourse for its intercultural component, thereby revealing the persuasive identity that is formed through expressions of difference versus similarity. Presumably the rules/systems approach and FTA both search for explanations regarding future action and communication competence; through analyzing common themes brought out by interactions, these methods of analysis expose an intercultural symbolic world of the persuasive identity. Collier and Thomas believe, like Bormann, that “core symbols and emblems reify cultural identity from interlocutors” (Collier and Thomas 113). Thus, while FTA uncovers themes that construct a rhetorical fantasy world, rules/systems focuses on “identity [as a] combination of ideas about ‘being’ and the norms for ‘acting,’” such as that fantasy world represents (Collier and Thomas 113). Both theories endeavor to categorize themes and draw conclusions regarding the manifest symbolic rules depicted in intercultural interactions.

CONCLUSION

What time offers the critic concerning conventional uses of FTA, *Der Giftpilz* provides without the aid of time. When viewed like a timeline, regarding the reader’s experience from beginning to end, these mini-narratives effectively accomplish what
many conversations over time would. Though this approach is unconventional, I am looking at the discourse as the reader experiences it from beginning to end, searching for salient symbols that shape the rhetorical world of identity formation over the timeline presented by the book’s length. There is no coherent work in Der Giftpilz; rather 17 separate mini-narratives nurture a rhetorical vision of cultural identity. In that respect, a coupling of FTA with the rules/systems approach is the best method by which to search its narratives for themes that provide a dynamic web of meaning, which in turn effectively inform upon the process of creating hate through cultural difference. In short, these mini-narratives organize the reader’s perspective into a coherent rhetorical vision that promotes an ideologically rhetorical identity.
ANALYSIS OF DER GIFTPILZ

The main premise of Fantasy Theme Analysis is that rhetorical messages create an alternate/indirect reality. The themes catch on, causing the participant(s) to elaborate upon the fantasy, thus revealing the rhetorical vision latent within. In pursuit of my research questions I “code” the document into über-narratives and mini-narratives. Further divisions account for character, scene, and action, as well as the outcome/takeaway of the narrative. From this analysis and my categorization of narratives, I will describe the symbolic world and thus the rhetorical vision created in Der Giftpilz.

Throughout this chapter we will journey through Der Giftpilz’s narratives the way a reader would, highlighting the narratives’ use of fantasy themes and types. Again, fantasy themes are those concepts that are “the content of the dramatizing message” (Hirokowa et al. 42). These themes would assist the reader’s “recollection of something that happened…in the past” (Williams, 12). Fantasy types are those stock scenarios played out by stock characters, scenes, and actions. When the reader is greeted with a real experience, they can rely on the themes and types they have been provided with, saying something like, “Remember what (theme) happened to so-and-so (type) at that place (type).” The mini-narratives appearing in Der Giftpilz construct the symbolic world that builds an über-narrative and rhetorical vision.

Because FTA builds on stock scenarios and stock characters and actions, the following questions guide this analysis and are based on appearance, behavior, and elements of form. Regarding the Jew: how is the Jew’s appearance described? What physical attributes are highlighted? What behaviors are Jews involved in? Regarding the
German: What are the scenes? What does the narrative voice emphasize? What relationships are fostered? What is German appearance? And finally, what is German behavior?

In addition to focusing on the questions above for FTA, I will also focus on questions related to certain distinctive elements of form in the work: how is doubt/disbelief assuaged? And what is the purpose of the poems which appear in every narrative but the first?

**CH.1 POISONOUS MUSHROOM**

The first of the mini narratives begins with the “poisonous mushroom” story, a cautionary tale about the natural world. Franz and his mother are collecting mushrooms, but Franz is so excited he cannot control himself and has found no mushrooms because his head is in the clouds. Mother admonishes him for this and tells him “to search more diligently and spend more time looking at the ground than the sky!” Franz agrees and begins to look, and then he shouts “Hurrah! Now I have as many mushrooms as you…But I believe there are some poisonous ones among them!” Mother says they will go through them and pick out the poisonous ones. The narrator tells us they will first inspect the Satan mushroom, which Franz throws to the ground and steps on it after realizing it is poisonous. Another poisonous mushroom is identified, then mother finds two good mushrooms and proclaims
“one a stone mushroom and the other a champignion. One can eat them. They even taste very good.” While on their way home mother says, “Look, Franz, precisely as it is among the mushrooms in the forest, so is it among people on earth. There are good mushrooms and there are good people. There are poisonous, hence bad, mushrooms and there are bad people. And one must watch out for these bad people just like one must watch out for poisonous mushrooms. Do you understand that?” (4).

But mother does not stop there; she asks “And do you also know who these bad people, these poisonous mushrooms of mankind, are?...Franz proudly beats his chest.

“Yes, mother! I know that. They are the Jews (sic). Our teacher has already often said that in school.” Laughing, the mother pats her Franz on the shoulder. “Heavens, you are a very smart boy!” She continues, “Just like poisonous mushrooms appear in the most diverse colors, so do the Jews also know how to make themselves unrecognizable by assuming the most diverse forms.” This is where mother further explains, “Alright, so listen!” she says, “There are, for example, the peddler Jew...He says his wares are the best and cheapest. In reality, they are the worst and most expensive. One mustn’t trust him!” (6). This concept is repeated in the caption under the illustration. Franz refers back to the poisonous mushroom metaphor, drawing the parallel, “Just like the poisonous mushroom! One mustn’t trust it, either!” (6).7 Mother continues, “it is exactly the same with the livestock Jews, with the department store Jews, with the butcher Jews, with the Jew doctors, with the baptized Jews and so forth. Even if they camouflage themselves so...we mustn’t believe it. They are simply Jews and remain Jews. They are poisonous

for our folk” (6). Franz again connects the metaphor and says, “Like the poisonous mushrooms!” (6).

The mushroom theme offers a tool for differentiation between that which is good and that which is evil. The Jewish character begins to emerge as a loathsome fantasy type, who is “the cause of misery and distress, of sickness and death” (6). The German begins in turn to emerge as interested in grasping the Jewish question; thus, in the final lines, the narrative voice states, “The German youth must become acquainted with the Jewish poisonous mushroom. It must know what danger the Jew means for the German folk and the whole world. It must know that the Jewish question is the fate for all of us” (7). The fate of the world depends on exposing the “ depravity and baseness of the Jewish race…[the] devil in human form” (7).

The German mother teaches and protects her young against the unsuspecting dangers of the natural world, disciplining and redirecting his thoughts towards a German understanding. Stock character, scene, and action themes in the poisonous mushroom narrative set the tone for the entire book. With subtle discrepancies, the remaining narratives all follow and mimic the rhetoric of the poisonous mushroom tale.

**CH.2 HOW ONE RECOGNIZES JEWS**

The stage is set to expose “the truth about the Jewish poisonous mushroom”; therefore the narratives transition to describing the metaphorical Jewish mushroom in greater detail by taking the reader into the German child’s world (7). The narrative voice begins; the teacher has drawn pictures of Jews on the blackboard; “even the laziest among the pupils, ‘snoring Emil’, closely follows the matter and does not sleep, as is
The teacher, Mr. Birkmann, is a good teacher because all the children like him, and furthermore “are happiest, when the teacher talks about the Jew. And Mr. Birkmann can do that masterfully” (7). The teacher calls on Karl Scholz, “the little fellow in the front row”, to expound on what has been taught; the pupil explains, “Mostly, one recognize[s] the Jew by his nose. The Jew nose is bent at the end. It looks like the figure 6. Hence one calls it a ‘Jew six’” (7). Similar statements follow:

“His lips are usually thick. Often the lower lip hangs down somewhat. One calls them ‘danglers’” (8).

Furthermore, “the gaze of the Jew is lurking and stinging. One can…tell by his eyes that he is a false, deceitful person” (8). To all of this the teacher emphatically says, “Correct” (8).

Another pupil is called out to explain further: “Jews are usually small to medium in size…short legs…arms are also frequently very short…fleeing foreheads. Many criminals have such a forehead. The Jews are also criminals” (8). And don’t forget, “hair…like a Negro. [And] Their ears are very big and look like the handle of a tea cup” (8). Then the teacher exhorts, “Pay attention, children! Why does Fritz always say: ‘many Jews have bent legs’ – ‘often they have a fleeing forehead’ – ‘usually their hair is dark’?” Heinrich answers, “not every Jew has these traits. Many a Jew does not have a real ‘Jew six,’ but proper
Jew ears. Many a one does not have flat feet, but proper Jew eyes” (8). The narrative voice finalizes these thoughts: “Then the teacher goes to the pulpit and turns the board around. A saying is written on the reverse side. The children read it aloud:”

From a Jew’s countenance
The evil devil speaks to us,
The devil, who in every land,
Is known as evil plague.

If we want to be free of the Jew
And want to be happy again, and joyous,
Then the youth must struggle with us,
To vanquish the Jew devil (10).

The teacher awards those who engage the Jewish question and don’t “fall asleep.”

This narrative describes the mythic Jewish appearance while syllogistically attaching meaning to those descriptions. The Jewish character emerges dirty, awkward, and criminal; the Jew’s only redeeming quality is the fact that it is possible some Jews do not have the full battery of Jew traits.

The German characters are children and a teacher. The characters reveal their knowledge, which is then validated and furthered by the teacher. Few German physical attributes are discussed save adjectives such as “little,” “strong,” and “blond.” There is however an emphasis on the character’s knowledge of the Jewish question, where the narrative voice states, “The teacher is satisfied” (8).

CH.3 THIS IS HOW THE JEWS CAME TO US

This narrative voice tells the story of “How the Jews Came to Us” through the eyes of Fritz and Karl. It is a sunny day, school is out, “book pack on back or under arm, the children race homeward” when Fritz spots some Jews and says, “Karl, look over
there! For God’s sake, how do those men look!” Karl remarks, “Oh you mean the three eastern Jews over there? I already know them” (10). Fritz asks what Karl means by his use of the term “eastern Jews.” “Pay attention Fritz,” Karl says. For you see, says the narrator, “Karl is well informed. Not for no reason is he a year older than Fritz and the best pupil in the class” (10). “The Jews we see there come from Galicia or Poland. And because the homeland of these Jews lies east of Germany, one calls them Eastern Jews. Do you understand that?” (10). Naturally Fritz has immediately understood this. But he cannot get a grip on himself. He says, “Look at those fellows! Those ugly Jew noses! Those lice-ridden beards! Those dirty, protruding ears! Those bent legs! Those flat feet! And those smeared, greasy clothes! Just look how they fumble with their hands! How they talk with a Jew accent! And they, they also want to be humans?” (10-12).

This third narrative adds to the reader’s understanding of the Jew’s appearance; the fantasy Jew type should be becoming clearer with every descriptive narrative. There is a pattern in place connecting the narratives, where a recently introduced theme is brought back up in a different context. In the previous narrative there was the “fleeing forehead,” which means criminal behavior. Now here, based on appearances, Karl leaps to the further conclusion, based on the Jews’ ghastly appearance,
that “they are criminals of the worst sort. They lie and swindle, they steal and receive stolen goods, so one could (sic) become fearful in front of so much baseness” (12).

Criminal behavior and appearance are on thing, but deceptiveness is another. Fritz explains, “When they have enough money, they remove their dirty rags, cut off their beards, get de-loused, dress in modern suit-coats and move around as if they were non-Jews. In Germany they speak the German language and act as if they were Germans. In France they speak French and claim to be Frenchmen…They do that in the whole world” (12). The Jew is deceptive despite their appearance, even still, it “doesn’t help them at all. Their bent Jew noses, their Jew ears…one immediately recognizes them as Jews!” (12). Karl agrees with a nod whereby Fritz continues, “there are many people who still fall for the Jew swindle” leaving Karl to respond “But not me!...I know the Jews! And I also know a fine saying:’”

\[\begin{align*}
\text{From the east did they come one day,} \\
\text{Dirty, lice-ridden, purse empty.} \\
\text{But already after a few years} \\
\text{They had become rich.} \\
\text{Today they dress elegantly,} \\
\text{They no longer want to be Jews,} \\
\text{So keep your eyes open and note you well:} \\
\text{A Jew remains a Jew!} \quad (12).
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Von des Judens Anfecht} \\
\text{Der siehe Teufel zu uns spricht.} \\
\text{Der Teufel, der in jedem Land} \\
\text{Als böse Plege ist bekannt.}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Woll’n wir sein vom Jud befreit,} \\
\text{voll Frohsinn und Befriedigung,} \\
\text{Die Zeit, die durch das Haufen noch nicht} \\
\text{Und uns vom jüdischen Teufel befreien.}
\end{align*}\]
The Jew is a dirty, lice-ridden foreigner that does not deserve to be called a German. In the streets you can spot the Jew and it always looks bad. As in the last narrative, the Jew’s appearance is described in detail. The German inhabits two character types, a mature German and an ignorant one. The narrative voice directs the reader to simple details such as how to carry a book bag and how to be real men; the Jewish question occupies the conversation casually. And the poem is catchy; the English translation fails to capture the rhythm and/or rhyme scheme of the original German.

**CH.4 WHAT IS THE TALMUD?**

In the fourth chapter, the book takes us into the synagogue where presumably one learns what it means to think like a Jew. The Rabbi questions Sally, the thirteen-year-old Jewish boy, regarding what the Talmud says about non-Jews. It is briefly mentioned that Sally is always in controversy with his German counterparts at school, “And each time, Sally is at fault” (13). The Rabbi is an “old Jew…[with a] long beard…[and a] devil’s face” (13). And the Talmud “is the secret law book of the Jews” (13). This narrative also establishes that “the Rabbi is a Jewish Pastor” and the “Synagogue is a Jewish Church” (13).

The Rabbi asks a question about non-Jewish catchphrases. Sally reflects, then says: “one catchword of the non-Jews goes: Work does not shame.” [Rabbi:] “What do the non-Jews mean by that?” [Sally:] “They mean that it is no shame, if one must work.” [Rabbi:] “Do we Jews also believe that?” [Sally:] “No, we do not believe that! In our law book the Talmud it is written: ‘Work is very harmful and little profitable.’ “And that is why we Jews do not work, rather mostly engage in trade. The non-Jews were created to
work” (13). The Rabbi praises Sally, “You have learned that well…” and then continues with the lesson which, with each claim made, a supportive Talmudic passage follows (14). Sally goes on, “We may deceive and swindle the non-Jews”; “If we loan money to the non-Jew we must demand usurious interest for it”; “Regarding robbery it is taught: Non-Jews may not rob each other. The non-Jew may also not rob a Jew. However, the Jew may rob the non-Jew anytime” (14). The reasoning to follow is syllogistic, in which Sally enumerates, “Jews are alone human” and non-Jews are “classified to cattle”; therefore “the goyim (non-Jews)...are not Jews [therefore not human], hence they may be killed” (16). Sally begins to get excited but the Rabbi interrupts saying, “That’s enough...you will one day become a genuine Jew” (16).

This is one of two narratives where the Jewish ideology or thought is expressed through Jewish characters; the narrative is not through the eyes of a German character. Rather this narrative reveals to readers their youthful Jewish counterpart. The Jewish youth is 13, his name is Sally, he is the son of a livestock Jew, and he like all other Jewish boys his age goes to the Rabbi to learn what the Talmud says about the non-Jew.

This narrative depicts Jewish ideology, provides various behavioral concepts, and also exposes a Jew’s contempt for non-Jews. The fantasy type at play here is the deceptive Jew in his natural habitat, learning his beloved and sacred books. The fantasy theme exposes the ways in which the Jew is allowed and attempts to swindle the German
and the world. As one witnesses more of the same in the forthcoming narratives, the Jewish ideology fantasy theme becomes a concrete idea that assists further elaboration. This fantasy theme explains the reasoning behind how the Jew infiltrated and bankrupted Germany; while Germany was working hard, the Jew was planning a takeover. The above statements illustrate the ideology of a Jew, therefore, when the reader reads more narratives that compliment this sentiment, he/she will not doubt why the Jew swindles, etc. rather they now possess the answer, which is reflected in the poem that completes the chapter:

Murder, theft and lie
Robbery, perjury, swindle
Are permitted for Jewry!
Every Jew child knows that.

It is after all, written in the Talmud,
What Jews hate, Jews love.
And how the Jew thinks and lives,
Is set down in the Talmud (17).

CH.5 WHY DO JEWS HAVE THEMSELVES BAPTIZED?

As established in previous narratives, by definition a Jew cannot have his/her ears or nose “cut off; so one immediately recognizes them as Jews!” (12). Along that line of thinking, the following narrative drives home that point (that Jews are essentially different from other people) by asking if the Jew can become a non-Jew.

The “Why Jews Baptize Themselves” narrative places the Jew characters (husband and wife) exiting a Christian Church, which is clearly out of the ordinary to the onlookers in the illustration. The narrative voice declares that two BDM (League of German Girls) girls, Anni and Grete, usually have “duty” on Fridays which are thus “the
most beautiful days in the week for them” (17). Unfortunately their “duty” was cancelled due to their leader being sick, and now “Their whole day has been ruined” (17). Not speaking a word, they walk on until they reach “the Church of the Savior” (17). They spot a Jew outside.

The girls notice the Jew carrying a New Testament with the Cross on the front. This Jew is with his wife, the only Jewish woman mentioned in the whole book. This Jew possesses the quintessential “Jew-six,” and his mannerisms are like those described in previous narratives: “bent legs, flat feet! That nose, that mouth. Those ears, that hair! And he wants to be baptized” (17). The girls decide they will wait to see if baptism changes the Jew.

When the Jews emerged from the Church Anni turns to Grete “Did you notice anything...?” (18). “Not the slightest thing!” Grete whispers. “They still have the same noses and ears, the same legs, the same lips, the same Negro hair! And she [the wife] waddles just like before” (18). The girls drop some names of leaders who support their statements, like Streicher, Martin Luther, and “popes.” As the Jews leave the church, the Jew spits on the ground in front of the girls. They are disgusted by such “baseness” and leave the church while thinking about the baptism. Anni remembers something her BDM leader said, “Just as little as one can turn a Negro
into a German through baptism, can one turn a Jew into a non-Jew!” Grete angrily stomps her foot to the ground. “I do not understand the clergy who today still baptize Jews. They take nothing but criminal scum into the church, after all” (18). The narrative voice tells the reader that Anni then stops to announce something “serious and meaningful: “I believe a time will come one day when the Christians will curse those pastors who once let Jews into the Christian churches…And they will destroy them, if our clergy continues to admit Jews into the churches. There is a saying:

*If a Jew one day comes running*  
*And wants the pastor to baptize him,*  
*Don’t trust him and hold back,*  
*A Jew will always be a Jew!*  

*Even baptismal water does not help there,*  
*And through it the Jews does not become better!*  
*He is a devil in the time*  
*And remains it into eternity!* (18-20).

The Jewish fantasy types maintain consistency while adding small elements like the Jewess that waddles and a face “I believe she stole from the devil!” (17). The German fantasy type shows two strong German girls, unhappy about not being able to do their duty, modeling good German behavior by spending their free time elaborating on the Jewish question, scrutinizing Jewish identity, appearance, and ideology.

The saying that accompanies the narrative furthers the comparison between the Jew and the devil, thus aligning Nazi ideology with the purity of religion. If the reader is a Christian, this should concern them and thus draw them into involvement with in the Jewish question.
CH.6 HOW A GERMAN PEASANT WAS DRIVEN FROM HOUSE AND FARM

Father is working in the field and his son fetches him some water. The narrative voice describes a hot day where the sun “pitilessly…burns down from the sky…Even the little birds that sang so happily earlier, are silent and seek protection in the treetops of the cool forest. Only for the peasant there is no rest and relaxation” (20). The son brings his father water and then sees a Jew. Amazed, he asks what the Jew is doing there with his “fat stomach,” bent legs, and crooked nose (20). The father warns the son about the Jews’ deceptive ways, and that the neighbors are losing their farm because of the Jew. Father had explained to the neighbors many times that the Jew was bad, but they did not listen. “Boy! That is a terrible misfortune. How often did I warn [him]!” (20). Father continues, “…his wife and seven children will be driven from house and farm!” (20). The narrative voice relates that the son is “visibly shaken [and] his eyes darken with rage.” He vows that when he has his farm he will never allow the Jew in (22). Then he finishes by telling his father “a saying that the teacher told us yesterday in school:

The peasant prays to the lord:  
Oh, keep hail far away from us,  
Spare us lightning and flood,  
Then the harvest will be good again.

But even worse than these plagues  
Is the Jew, let yourself be told!  
Let yourself be warned: Guard yourself  
Against the Jew bloodthirsty villain (22).

The father is the mature character, educating the ignorant as well as the
unfortunate who did not heed his advice. The farm is a symbol for hardy German life and livelihood. The Jew, as usual, has a specific descriptive appearance that connects him to his crimes.

THE END (OF THE FIRST NARRATIVE SET)

That ends the initial set of narratives. The fantasy themes and types are now evident and well-articulated. The Jewish fantasy type is a swindling creep with devilish motives and appearance. The good German type is one who contemplates, identifies, and stands up against the evil Jews. The scenes have mostly taken place outside, save two instances, and no character has interacted with a Jew face-to-face yet. Characters have thus far only interacted with the Jew at a distance. Each account has presented an indirect account of the Jew save the one narrative that did not have a German character and was all Jewish ideology.

The next seven chapters take the reader on a journey through various “first hand” experiences with the Jew. These narratives elaborate on behavioral characteristics of both the German and the Jew. In the following narratives, the reader will see German characters making mistakes, regretting them and rectifying them.

These narratives bring first hand experiential reports instead of indirect accounts. These narratives differ from the introductory set because they provide stages where the concepts that have been introduced can play themselves out; the reader will see the effects of the previous conclusions. The reader has learned how to identify a Jew through fundamental traits. In addition to this the reader also has been shown something of the
Jews’ supposed history and ideology, which always proves dangerous to the “folk.” The following narratives spell out these dangers in the enactment of direct encounters.

**CH.7 THIS IS HOW JEWISH MERCHANTS SWINDLE**

The seventh narrative changes tactics and puts Jewish appearance and ideology to work. After a day of work is done, the narrative voice tells the reader, the peasant woman sweeps the peasant room “spotlessly clean” (22). “While the children happily scamper outside, the young peasant woman prepares supper. The door opens. A man steps in. It’s a Jew!” (22). His name is Samuel Levy, a peddler who “badly swindled” the peasant lady in the past; the excellent wares he was peddling were “just rubbish and trash…but the Jew does not let up” (24). The narration reads, “The farm mistress knows this flattery. She knows that everything the Jew says is a stinking lie. She knows that the dress fabric the Jew wants to sell is poor rubbish. She knows the Jew does not pay the difference, rather makes much money in the process. And because she knows all that, she does not fall for Levy’s lies” (24). The peasant woman is suspicious and once the logic is revealed the statements make sense. In addition, for the reader, the appearance of Levy the Jew as portrayed in the illustration is exactly as the previous ideology narratives said it would be: “Jews are usually small to
medium in size…short legs…arms are also frequently very short…fleeing foreheads. Many criminals have such a forehead. The Jews are also criminals” (8). In addition the Jew’s hair is “…like a Negro. Their ears are very big and look like the handle of a tea cup” (8).

The Jew has been caught by the proper thoughts of the peasant woman and she shouts “I will buy nothing from you!” (24). The Jew leaves cursing and then his thought process is revealed. The narrative voice states, “he first looks to the left, then to the right. When he is totally alone, he talks aloud: “The farm mistress has noticed something! Has noticed that I just want to cheat her! That’s a shame…” (24). Relentless, the Jew goes to another peasant house and does the same, but this time the story stops and the narration reads “But woe, if the peasant woman lets herself be taken in by the Jew’s flattery” (24).

The symbolic world here accentuates the behavior of the Jew. It has given voice to the otherwise dormant ideology. The peasant woman did the “right” thing thus exemplifying the response of the informed and proper-thinking German. There is an element of warning that accompanies these narratives, as unsuspecting characters blinded to the truth are shown being therefore deceived by the Jew. It is reminiscent of the warning the farmer gave to his neighbors before they got involved with the Jew. The theme of obedience to “right-thinking” is beginning to emerge.

*The Jewish peddler*
*Is a swindler and seducer.*
*He lies through and through,*
*And you-you suffer the harm.*

*Many have also experienced this.*
*If you want to protect yourself against harm,*
*Then don’t let the Jew in*
*And buy from the German merchant* (25).
The German characters inhabit two camps: the ignorant and vulnerable, and the strong and knowledgeable – the latter are not afraid to act on the Jewish question. A normal scene, a typical Jew, a wise German and an ignorant one, is just another day in the neighborhood.

**CH.8 WHAT HANS AND ELSE EXPERIENCED WITH A STRANGE MAN**

The title is elusive and vague by not mentioning the word “Jew”; rather the author leaves the reader to infer that this is what is meant by “strange.” Suggestiveness here builds suspense, and in that suspense the reader has already made the leap that the Jew and his tricks are behind all that is bad.

The narrative describes Hans playing soccer in the street and Else playing with dolls. Hans “rides on a real horse!” (25). They are shown in a common, domestic scene; Hans is a real boy and Else his sister is a real girl. Hans’ friend Michel tells him that he should stop hanging out with his sister so much, “you’re not a proper boy, rather a kid who likes girls” (25). The narrative relates that Hans was angry, but then realized that “Michel is actually right. Yes! Boys belong together.” And his sister, as a girl, “can’t play soccer and ride on a genuine white horse” (25). The narrative continues, “For a whole week Hans no longer looked at his sister” but then she began to bring home an extra amount of candy (25). When Hans questioned her she said that she gets it “from a strange man. But say nothing to mother! The man strictly forbade me!” (26). Hans naturally wanted his sister to let him in on the secret, which led them down Ufer Alley, “where the strange man walks about” (26).
As they approached the man Hans “became distrustful and stopped” (26). But he gave in because he wanted the candy. Before Hans identified the man as a Jew, he thinks to himself, “What a funny speech the man has, he talks through his nose! Through his big, crooked nose! Perhaps he’s even a Jew!” Hans hesitated. Else wanted to reach for the bonbon. Hans held her back. He thought: “What does the man want from us? Why should we go with him?” The narrative voice asserts, “suddenly, a terrible fear came over the boy… ‘You are a Jew!’ he screamed. (26).

The symbolic world created by the fantasies in previous chapters helps the reader see that Hans was able to deduce from basic clues that this was a Jew and therefore a bad person. Shooting from disbelief to full-on fear, the boy runs to the policeman and quickly relates his experience. “Soon he [the policeman] had caught up with the foreign man, he handcuffed him and took him to prison” (26). The reward for Hans’ efforts does not go unrealized: the officer visits the boy’s house the next day to say, “Dear Hans! You are a capable, good boy! If it hadn’t been for you, we wouldn’t have caught the Jew for whom we have been searching for so long” (28).
The saying that “the mother spoke” was:

_A devil walks through the land,_  
_It’s the Jew, well-known to us_  
_As folk murderer, race defiler,_  
_As children’s terror for all lands!_  

_He wants to ruin the youth,_  
_He wants all folks to die._  
_Don’t get involved with any Jew,_  
_Then you will be happy and joyful!_ (28).

The informing nature of Der Giftpilz ideology begins to emerge; the mature German must be willing to act on the Jewish question. The Jew looks just as he should, shady and criminal. Great meaning should be attached to these symbols: in every situation, do not trust a Jew, rather inform upon him. Not doing so is dangerous.

**CH.9 WHAT HAPPENED TO INGE AT THE JEW DOCTOR**

This narrative takes the youth vision of responsibility to the next level by cementing the fact that even parents can be wrong and should listen to their children. When Inge was sick her mother commanded, “March! Now you go over to doctor Bernstein and have yourself examined!” (28). Inge replied, “But why to doctor Bernstein? He’s a Jew! And no German girl goes to a Jew” (28). “The mother laughed. “Don’t talk such nonsense! The Jew doctors are alright. But you girls in your BDM babble such naïve stuff! What do you girls know about it!” (30). Then the narrative voice relates mother’s anger when Inge tried to refute her claims, finally after Inge persistently claimed “the Jews are our mortal enemies!” Mother insisted that Inge go to see Dr. Bernstein, “And if you refuse, then you’ll see me really angry” (30). The narrative relates
that Inge “didn’t want to be disobedient and went” (30). The disbeliever/heretic character emerges as a fantasy type.

The following event occurs in the Jew doctor’s house. Inge continued to contemplate her conversation with her mother and “she remembers the warnings from the unit leader: “A German mustn’t go to a Jew doctor! And especially not a German girl! Many a girl who sought healing from a Jew doctor only found disease and shame there” (30). This theme builds into the narratives a fear of Jewish doctors all the while illustrating obedience. While waiting Inge heard crying coming from the doctors office and then, “Doctor, sir, doctor, sir, leave me alone!” this statement was followed by “mocking laughter” (30).

Inge waits about an hour after the shrills heard from the doctor’s office. When Dr. Bernstein appears, the Jewish character theme reemerges as the ideological basis for Inge’s future fantasy type action: “Horrified, she jumps up. Her eyes stare into the face of the Jewish doctor. And this face is the face of the devil. In the middle of this devil face sits a huge, crooked nose. Behind the classes spark two criminal eyes…the thick lips [with] a grin that means: “Now I finally have you, little German girl!”” (31). Inge runs breathless out of the Jews house straight for home.

The reunion with her mother is most compassionate and forgiving. The mother understood her mistake and tells Inge, “I already reproached myself” (31). Furthermore
mother says, “I already know what you want to say. I promise you. Gradually I am seeing that one can even learn something from you children.” Inge nods. “You’re right, mother. We BDM girls, we already know what we want, even though you don’t always fully understand us” (31). Then Inge teaches her mother a saying degrading the Jewish doctor and forever, proclaiming faith only in German doctors.

Reproach is relegated to anyone who does not possess proper ideology or act on it; i.e. the disbeliever, who will feel the cold hand of reality soon enough. A mature German carrying out the fantasy theme of thwarting the Jewish devil complements this Jewish fantasy type. Through attention to detail and personal determination, the German will prevail. In this narrative, the theme of a strong German resolve is evident in both German characters. The mother realized her mistake, and the daughter obeyed her mother despite her better judgment. Although everything turned out well, the reproach and return to proper thinking is highlighted. The paradigm of parents being the bearers of knowledge has shifted in this narrative; the mother concedes to her daughter’s knowledge, which makes her realize that the youth are right. Then “slowly and with meaning.” Inge tells her mother, “in the past you have taught me many a saying. Today I want to tell you a saying that you must note…” (31).

**The Jew doctor in German land**

The devil has sent us.
And like the devil he defiles
The German woman, German honor.

The German folk will not heal,
If it does not soon find the path
To German medicine, German meaning,
Henceforth to the German doctor (32).
The German characters’ themes emerge more fully in this narrative, but not without an added element. This narrative assumes that the ideology rests with the youth, putting the responsibility in the hands of children.

**CH.10 THIS IS HOW THE JEW TREATS HIS SERVANT GIRL**

Twenty three year old Rosa left Germany to seek a position as a servant girl in Vienna. Her worried parents had expected a postcard but nothing came, until one day they received notice. The letter read, “When I arrived in Vienna, a man awaited me at the train station, He took off his hat and was very friendly to me. But I noticed immediately that he was Jew” (34). Rosa proceeds to tell the unfortunate events that were orchestrated by the Jew that landed her destitute and desperate; in summation “Don’t go away! Remain in Germany!” Rosa’s adventure was miserable from the Jewess yelling obscenities at her and the Jewess’ sons wanting “to break open my locked bedroom door” (34). “In desperation,” Rosa confessed, “I wanted to poison myself with gas” (34). In all of the misfortune caused by the Jew, Rosa somehow came to be in the company of “the wife of a German businessman who had come to London with
her husband. And these dear people helped me…the freed me from slavery. They even purchased me a return ticket” (34).

The German woman, whether little, whether large,
The Jew just calls her ‘Goja’.
He hates her, and he defiles her
And torments her worse than cattle.

If a girl wants to keep herself pure,
The she mustn’t keep the house among Jews!
If she wants to survive the life struggle,
Then she must not go to the Jew! (35).

Worried parents become the conduit for exposing the international Jewish question. Loathsome Jewish behavior is accentuated, while the mentality of the German folk is depicted as savior-like, taking care of their own. The fortunate outcome for Rosa was due to Germans, who returned sanity to an otherwise out of control situation.

CH.11 HOW TWO WOMEN WERE SWINDLED BY JEW LAWYERS

A long friendship ends between Mrs. Eckert and Mrs. Kraus when their children got into a scuffle and one hit the other giving him a bloody nose. The narrator says, “both boys had immediately reconciled…German boys can take it. They are not plaintive” but this did not stop the adults from arguing further (36). In time they would go to court, both hiring Jewish lawyers with a “50 mark advance” (36). Both Jews promise that the women will get their money back and that the opponent would “pay that and much more” (36). After six weeks the day of court occurs. The Judge rules, “Both women are Guilty! Both must pay a fine” (36).
Ignorance in this case is not bliss. Both German women learned that by considering the Jewish question they “could have spared [themselves] that” (38). Again the Jew’s behavior is accentuated, causing the ignorant to stand out. The German characters are two ignorant German adults who quarrel in vain. The Jewish lawyers are revealed as colleagues, further exposing their corrupt ways by stating “Now we have relieved both Gojas of their money, and we can put it in our pocket!” (38).

The Jew lawyer is left Completely cold by feeling of right. He only goes before the court, Because he expects to make a lot of money there.

Whether or not the honest and good Rip each other apart and bleed to death, That leaves the Jew completely cold. Never go to a Jew attorney! (38).

CH.12 THIS IS HOW THE JEWS TORTURE ANIMALS

Kurt and Otto had gotten into a quarrel with each other. “You lie!” Otto had said, “I don’t believe you that the Jews are such terrible animal torturers, like you say. I don’t believe it that the Jews simply slit the animals’ necks and let them slowly bleed to death while fully conscious. That can’t be so. You lie, Kurt!” That is what Otto had said, and that made Kurt terribly angry. But he didn’t let it show. He just said: “Fine, Otto, I will prove it to you that I am no liar!” (38-40).

These initial claims set the didactic stage and ready the reader for the revelation. At this point the reader knows the outcome, but is left waiting for Otto to figure out his
mistake. The reader knows that Otto’s only hope is to figure out his mistake before getting hurt by the Jew. In the illustration above you can see the Jews slaughtering the animal while Kurt and Otto look on in the window behind. The revelation is complete and the prophecy realized even to the heretics.

The blood and the soulless Jews are too much for Otto to handle and he calls out “Almighty God!” (40). His sentiments are backed up by the graphic image of blood and barbarism. They run away and Otto turns to Kurt with the punch line, “…now I believe you! You didn’t lie to me. The Jews are the most vile people in the world” (41). After reading the graphic images in the narrative, the reader can only appreciate the recognition that the Jew is bad. Doubt is essentially quenched for the reader in the same way that it is for the character.

*It lies in the Jew’s blood*
*Rage, envy, hatred, anger*
*Against every folk of the world,*
*That isn’t among the ‘chosen’.*

*He slaughters animals, slaughters people.*
*His thirst for blood knows no bounds!*
*The world will only heal,*
*If we save it from the Jew* (41).

Two German boys, one a disbeliever and the other a knowledgeable young man, together engage the Jewish question and rectify their German identities. Both boys are
surprised by the Jewish behavior, witnessed in the second Jewish place that is illustrated in the narratives. The narrator shows strength and resolve in the mature German character, thus adding to this character type. The theme here is that of rectifying disbelief and freeing one from Jewish rage.

**CH.13 WHAT CHRIST SAID ABOUT THE JEWS**

This narrative provides a divine explanation for the reason the Jews “always had enemies,” which was because “the Jews murdered him [Jesus]” (41). The narrative begins, “The mother had been on the field with her three children. She had mown fresh grass for the goats that waited for fodder back home in the stall. Her little daughter Gertrud had watched her little brother in the toy wagon while Georg look for berries in the small forest nearby. Now they’re done. Slowly, they return home” (41). Gertrud asks about something mother said earlier, specifically “that not only today are there many people who hate the Jews, rather there had already been opponents of the Jews thousands of years ago” (41). Mother backs up her ideology with concepts mentioned in previous narratives, such as Jews being rogues and criminals.

However misguided Gertrud might be, she read somewhere that the Jews were persecuted, that their oppressors “locked them up or even killed them. But one shouldn’t
have done that…” (42). Georg now offers his refutation to his sister’s ignorant claims. He says, “Naturally one had to do that…whoever is a murderer, deserves to himself be killed!” (42). Of course Georg is praised for his observations. Then the religious symbol, the Cross, emerges before them, a spontaneous and brilliant example to illustrate this exact conversation, but from a religious point of view. Mother states, “The man hanging on the cross was one of the greatest opponents of the Jew of all time. He recognized the Jews in their depravity and baseness…He also said, ‘Your father is the devil!’ Do you know, children, what that means? That means that the Jews are descended from the devil, hence they can only live like devils as well. And that is why they commit crime after crime” (42).

The mother then puts the finishing touches on this ideological narrative. She states, “Because this man knew the Jews, and because he proclaimed the truth to the world, that is why he had to die. *That is why the Jews murdered him. That is why they crucified him…*Remember that the Jews are the children of the devil and murderers of men. And remember the saying:

\[
\text{As long as Jews live on earth,} \\
\text{There have been opponents of the Jews.} \\
\text{They warned against the Jew brood} \\
\text{And even sacrificed their blood,} \\
\text{So that the world would know the devil} \\
\text{And not rush to its ruination,} \\
\text{So that the world would soon free itself} \\
\text{From this Jew slavery! (43).} \]

The German characters constructed here show the mother as wise, the young boy as smart and knowledgeable, Gertrud as ignorant but learning, and the Jew as the devil
and murderer of Jesus. This farm scene is the same as in narrative six, which provided a symbol for German sovereignty.

**CH.14 THE GOD OF JEWS IS MONEY**

Mother and Lilolette are conversing the in front window of their home. Lilolette “reflectively…gazes out the window.” When questioned by mother as to what she was thinking about, she says, “Mother, I often think how hard father must work for us every day…It’s so hard to earn money!” (44). Mother relates that it was worse before Hitler came along, and that he has restored to the German people “work and bread…Today it is a joy again to be able to work. To be able to work for our folk, for our fatherland” (44).

Lilolette has childish aspirations to amass a lot of money and provide for people, thus making them happy. But Mother corrects her, saying “believe me, money alone does not bring happiness. I know many people who, despite their wealth, are the poorest people” (46). Essentially they are “sick from – laziness” (sic) (46).

The theme is then explained which is a reasonable deduction on Lisolette’s part. She asks, “Tell me, mother, how is it that precisely the Jews have become so rich? Our teacher told us in school that there are today thousands of Jews in the world who are millionaires. But the Jews don’t work at all. Only we non-Jews must work” (46). The
reader learned this idea back in the fourth narrative, with Sally and the Talmud. But the theme is furthered, “The Jew only trades. But one can’t become a millionaire through trade with rags, paper, bones, old clothes, and furniture!” (46).

Mother quickly corrects young Lisolette, by explaining that it is precisely because of such swindling that the Jew is able to exploit the non-Jews, because “Jews know no pity...child you must note one thing: The Jew is not a person like us. The Jew is a devil. And a devil knows no honesty.” As the Bible saying goes, “you should devour the folks of the earth...o you know what that means? It means that the Jews should destroy all the folks of the earth! You should exploit and suck them dry until they finally die off. That is what this saying is supposed to mean” (46). “He [the Jew] does not rest until he can sit on a big sack of money” (47).

\[
\text{The Jew’s purpose in this world} \\
\text{Strives only for one thing: money money money!} \\
\text{Through lie and deceit and other things} \\
\text{To make himself immeasurably rich.}
\]

\[
\text{What does he care about disgrace, mockery!} \\
\text{Money, that is and remains his god!} \\
\text{With money he hopes to vanquish us,} \\
\text{To achieve world master (47).}
\]

This narrative explains why the Jews are rich, but more importantly who their G-d is. Similar to previous narratives, this narrative furthers the biblical tone with biblical quotes. Liselotte is an unseeing disbeliever, who learns from her mother the right approach to the Jewish question. The home is another repeated scene, but this time it is not under direct threat from the Jew: the home is represented as a safe spot where mother and child can be safe while looking out their window on a cruel world.
THE END (OF THE SECOND NARRATIVE SET)

Until now, the Jew has been largely an observed character, rather than an active character speaking in his/her own voice within the narratives. For the German characters the Jew is an observable character who is always the subject of disbelief. The reader watches how German youth observe and comment on the Jew. Save the brief appearance of Sally and the Rabbi, the Jew is given no real voice.

The final narratives and rhetorical vision are constructed to accentuate the Jews’ public desecration of Germany and her values. Their unabashed contempt for Germany will now be exposed for the reader to see. The narratives here are secondhand accounts of adult Jews blaspheming the folk.

CH.15 HOW THE WORKER HARTMAN BECAME A NATIONAL SOCIALIST

The first narrative comes from the eyes of Mr. Hartman, a reformed “Red” who is now a Nazi German worker. The narrative begins with some Hitler Youth boys on a two-hour march, singing and rambling on. Reaching the construction site vista, “they totally forget the singing. ‘It is something wonderful, the autobahn,’ they say among themselves, ‘a mighty work that the Fuhrer creates here!’” (47). When they meet Mr. Hartman, he relates a dramatic story about a workers’ meeting where a
Jew became angry when his motives were questioned. Mr. Hartman wanted clarity and he called out for answers; the Jew eventually screamed, “We don’t give a hoot about Germany…The main thing is that we are very well off…” (48). Mr. Hartman recounts, “Now I knew enough…We were supposed to work with the Jews so that Germany would perish. But I didn’t want to become a traitor. No! Never and never again! I turned my back to the Jew who continued to scream and left the assembly without saying a word.

Three other comrades followed …Later I found the path to Adolf Hitler. And I tell you: I will remain with Adolf Hitler as long as I live. Today I know the Jew. I will always remember the song that we sing in the works unit:

If a folk wants to develop its power,
It must stand together tight.
For strike and rebellion, class warfare
Destroy a folk.

The world has often experienced that
since many, many centuries.
Only then will the be eternal peace,
If we free ourselves from the Jew (50).

Throughout the narratives we see the Jewish antagonist who assists the creation of relationships and moral values. Although hating the Jew is the topic of the über-narrative and thus the overarching rhetorical vision, the bulk of the narratives use the theme of Jewish antagonism as the common thread that weaves the canvas of Nazi ideology. The Hartman narrative depicts a born-again Nazi figure: a man who can be trusted because he saw the light. The stock Jewish antagonist is a theme that compliments the rhetorical vision of rebirth. These people, like Hartman, are mature in their ideological framework and will “stand together tight” no matter what (50). The scene is a place the Fuhrer is constructing; this metaphor works for this narrative because the main
character Hartman is one of Hitler’s workers. This is not merely industrial construction but rather ideological construction: The construction of a war mind, disciplined and ready for battle with the lying Jew. This story of Mr. Hartman’s re-birth as a sensitive German identifies the reader with a mature understanding of the “Jewish question” through the eyes of adult characters, pure role models. “Today I know the Jew. I will always remember the song that we sing in the works unit…” (50).

CH.16 ARE THERE DECENT JEWS?

The narrative begins with four men sitting around a table at a restaurant. The narrative voice describes, “The Jew’s name is Salomon. He has paid for the beer for the others. And now he thinks he has the sole right to speak. Incessantly, he addresses the others.” Solomon relates that all the things people say about the Jews are lies. “People always say that we Jews cheat other people, that we lie and swindle. Not a word of it is true. We Jews are the most decent people there are” (50). The carpenter “shakes his head. And then he says: “No, my dear Salomon! You can’t make me believe that. For I know enough Jews who are the biggest rogues who walk the earth” (51). Then he proceeds to list various Jews who outright swindle good Germans.

Each German around the table corroborates the previous while adding their own twists to the devil Jew theme. At the
end even the inn-mistress says to the worker, “You told him...too bad he’s gone.

Otherwise I’d have told him something as well. I would have told him a saying. And the saying goes:

\begin{quote}
One frequently hears the fairy-tale,  
How good a Jew is,  
He gladly gives his money to the poor  
And is an angel on earth
\end{quote}

A Jew, pure like an angel?  
That can only be a fairy-tale!  
Who thought up this fairy-tale?  
The Jew himself created it! (53)

The formula regarding how mature Germans handle the Jew is clear: there is no good Jew anywhere, no exceptions. But possibly more important, these narratives are no longer “investigating” the Jewish question, but rather proclaiming “I know the Jew,” which implies a completed understanding of the espoused ideology. The characters are all German, no names, just professions. As adults they verbally pin the Jew to the facts. Even the servant lady illustrates confidence and understanding of proper conduct towards the Jew.

CH.17 WITHOUT SOLVING THE JEWISH PROBLEM: NO SALVATION FOR MANKIND

There may be no salvation without solution; however, first the boys must become men. This is the purpose of the next narrative: it creates men. “The Jungvolk boys are proud of their black uniforms,” the narrative voice relates (53). “We’re real Hitler men!” the boys say” (53). The narrative voice chimes in, “Even if the “men part isn’t completely true, they are right about one thing: the Jungvolk boys are loyal to the Fuhrer to the death...[they] are often also a little cheeky (sic)” (53). Konrad and Anton are best friends
with an older, more experienced boy named Erich because “Hitler youth Erich has already seen a lot during his life. Twice already he was present at the Reich Party Day in Nuremberg” (53). The relationship is primarily based on Erich’s familiarity with the political landscape, his affiliations, and his ability to “relate his experiences so nicely” (53). This ultimately means he is able to answer the Jewish question.

Erich inhabits a superior/mature role relative to the other characters in the narrative and is taking the boys on a walk through the city streets. He tells the younger Jungvolk boys about his experience at an assembly “last year in Munich on November 9th” (53). He describes how the top ranking offices of the Nazi party walked out; first the Führer, then Göring, Goebbels, Frick, Rust, Rosenberg, Amann Schwartz, their youth leader Schirach, “and many other old fighters” (54). Lastly Erich mentions Streicher, a man whom the boys already know as “the enemy of the Jews,” which is why the Jews hate him. The boys want to hear more. Erich tells another story:

The assembly was overflowing. Many thousands of people were there. At first Streicher talked about his experiences during the years of struggle and about the mighty accomplishments of the Hitler Reich. Then he started to talk about the Jewish question. What he said was so clear and simple that even we boys could understand it. Again and again, he presented examples from life. One time he was very funny and cracked jokes so that all of us had to laugh. But then he was dead serious again, and it was so quite in the hall that one could have heard a pin drop.
He talked about the Jews and their horrid crimes. He talked about the great danger that Jewry poses to the world” (54).

A captioned section then reads in italics “Without solution of the Jewish question, no salvation for mankind!” (56). Erich continues, “That is what he called to us. All of us understood him” (56). The story concludes with Streicher leading the crowd in a Sieg Heil. Everyone “cheered him with huge enthusiasm” (56). Erich’s words are complicated. He claims that Streicher talks about the Jewish question, but does not explicitly answer the question. What is the message that the crowd is supposed to have received after “He talked about the Jews and their horrid crimes”? Rather it seems that the mention of “Jew and their horrid crimes” is a strong enough statement to summon the suggested vision. Of course everyone understood, as Erich relates, but what did they understand?

The chant from the assembly, Erich “will also not forget”:

From the Germany that Hitler created  
Goes into the whole world the cry:  
Free yourselves from the Jew’s hand  
And save folk and fatherland!

The world awakens in Judah’s chains,  
It knows only Germany can save it  
German purpose and German essence  
Will yet heal the whole world! (56).

It was Streicher’s words that took Erich by surprise, for Streicher describes a healing. Through identification and therefore knowledge of the Jews’ “horrid crimes,” the world will be brought to its ultimate rectification. The thousands of people and the scene of the assembly provide the symbolic German world which delivers this vision. Erich’s description of events was vivid, well thought out, contemplative, and utterly serious; for him, being a Nazi is no joke, acceptable as jokes may be. The children looking up at
Streicher become young Nazi men, with their black uniforms; they are to be the ones who “stand together tight” and identify Jewish poison for the world.

The boys in their gear standing “together tight” solidifies the vision for the reader, the one that will accentuate the espoused ideology and provide a canvas for future action. In the illustration of Julius Streicher, the caption underneath reads, “‘Whoever fights against the Jew, wrestles with the devil.’–Julius Streicher” (sic) (55). He is not one shown as violent towards the Jews, rather he is known as the enemy of the Jews, which is why Jews do not like him. He informs on their evil ways but more importantly he informs on the reason the world lacks salvation from its evils.

One might not think of Streicher as the most fitting figure for the end of the book; perhaps the Führer would have been a better fit. However, the narrative voice draws attention to Streicher’s ego as well as his skill with the spoken word, described as being on level with none other than Der Führer. The only difference is that Streicher is relatable: he as another German commoner who saw the light and has been hitting the streets publicly to expose Jewish schemes since 1923. The rhetorical vision here creates a space that allows for a free flow of hate to be expressed openly; a sort of path of “transcendence” is offered, claiming that one must hate the Jews in order to maintain a good life.

THE END AND SUMMATION

Der Giftpilz provides 17 mini narratives, 40 German characters, 9 Jewish characters (one a Jewish woman), and 25+ ways to identify the Jewish person. The settings/scene inhabit all normal locations of German life: doctor, home, school,
outdoors, church, farm, etc. There are only two exceptions, the Jewish slaughterhouse and the synagogue. The difference between these two is that the boys are looking into the slaughterhouse, but in the Synagogue there are no German characters at all. The action/purpose intrinsic to all of the narratives is the recognition of the Jewish devil, his appearance, ideology, and behavior, which is depicted from several angles.

I have categorized the narratives into three thematic categories, which separate the chapters as well. The first set encompasses Jewish appearance and ideology; the second focuses on Jewish behavior; and the third is the reformed German. The fantasy types in the 17 mini narratives correspond to these themes. For example, the dominant fantasy theme exposed in the first seven chapters is the Jewish identification, employing scenarios where characters have contemplative experiences that help them articulate the Jewish identity and appearance. This theme establishes the parameters of what is acceptable and unacceptable. The corresponding fantasy type is the poisonous, dirty, swindling Jew.

Essentially, by splitting into three dominant fantasy themes (Jewish appearance by attribute and/or trait, and appearance by behavior) one can see that chapters one through six present a predominance of dialogue describing Jewish traits: their eyes, nose, ears, lips, forehead, hair, hands, legs, bodies, feet, accent, clothes, beard, and grin. When the Jew is mentioned in the first seven narratives, a description follows; these descriptions, similar to the poisonous mushroom narrative, come with syllogistic reasoning. Namely, poison is bad, poison is identifiable, Jews are poison, therefore, and Jews are bad and identifiable. Narratives two through seven play off similar logic; for example, a fleeing forehead is a sign of a criminal; Jews have fleeing foreheads;
therefore, Jews are criminals. This logic helps make generalizable claims regarding the Jew’s attributes/traits.

The next set of narratives (chapters 7-14) articulates the theme of Jewish behavior. This is where the characters experience the supposed result of Jewish behavior associated with Jewish appearance, and are introduced to guidelines for appropriate German behavior in response to Jews. The corresponding fantasy types include but are not limited to: the German heretic/disbeliever, the German believer, and the Jewish devil. The second set of narratives build upon the first set through correcting symbolic experiences with Jewish people and their behavior.

This middle section thus shifts focus, leaves behind the attribute dialogue and progresses to behavior. The first half of the book dealt with behavior only to the extent that it syllogistically accompanied the attribute; an example would be the forehead as a sign for criminal behavior. In the middle section of the book, the behavior is highlighted and the attribute is assumed based on their behavior. Of course the visual component aids the trait component, and further describes what the dialogue is not saying; however, the syllogistic foundation laid down in prior narratives leaves conclusions to be made enthymematically rather than explicitly.

The classic definition of an enthymeme is a deductive argument with premises and/or conclusion unstated. The reader or listener completes the argument by providing the missing piece. For example, in the narrative where Hans and Else go to get Bonbons from the Jew in Ufer Alley, Hans does not say that the Jew is dangerous or even a criminal. Rather, the rhetoric describes the Jew with “funny speech…his nose…his big crooked nose! Perhaps he’s a Jew” (26). A few lines later Hans screams, “You are a
Jew!” (26). He then “grabbed his sister and ran away with her as fast as he could run” (26). The Jew needn’t be “exposed” as criminal; that was already done in previous chapters. The Jew has already been defined as criminal; here, it is simply inferred.

The Jew has become synonymous with criminal, therefore the natural place to turn is the police. The Jew is now an enthymematic term leading one to fill in the definition and/or “conclusion unstated.” It is not that the Jew is a criminal; rather, it is criminal to be a Jew. The Nazis tried to redefine what the Jew inherently was. *Der Giftpilz* has the whole definition of what they decided the Jew as a concept to be, right down to whom the Jews worship. As much as *Der Giftpilz* promotes an ideology, it is promoting a vision of a new world where creations return to concepts.

The Jew is a peddler, rogue, villain, criminal, livestock Jew, department store Jew, butcher, doctor, lawyer, and swindler. The main theme is that the Jew, no matter his appearance, swindles and exploits the way the devil does. He permeates German life (I say “he” because there are only two other mentions of a Jewess in the narratives). From the inner sanctum of home to the courthouse the Jew is the threat and the criminal. From here to the end of the text the term for Jew is simply “the Jew.” Occasionally there is a mention of “the Devil face” but the mention of other traits/attributes is negligible. The term “Jew” in the middle section, operates on its own without aid of descriptive elements; he has become the sole enemy of the German.

The attributes have all along been connected with a criminal behavior. When Hans informed on the Jewish candy man, he described his criminal behavior through his appearance; the Jew did not do anything wrong except look Jewish. Not only this but the Jews killed Jesus and therefore they will have inevitable enemies forever. Couple this
narrative with the Jewish slaughterhouse, and the Jews’ murderous ways are exposed, leaving the reader to make the inevitable connection between appearance and behavior, which therefore creates a vivid enemy. This enemy has a well-defined thought process and behaviors to match. This gives the enemy a sophistication that seemingly must be matched and outsmarted; the enemy becomes anyone who disputes this ideology. In the face of such an enemy, the reader is left to make the connection between this ultimatum and his or her own commitment to the Jewish question.

Lastly, the final set of narratives paint the picture of a reformed German. This last set consists of three narratives that solidify all the newfound knowledge and understanding provided in the book regarding the Jewish question. One must ask; what does a conscious German do now? The theme is rectification, and correcting previously misguided attempts at proper German life.

In the narratives Germans account for most of the characters and are mostly children, save the few parents and adults. In addition, their appearance is scarcely described, leaving most of the descriptive work for the illustrations. The reader is able to tell which German is which based on the picture. Nevertheless, the German appearance is not emphasized. Rather, the role they play is emphasized greatly. With the Jewish character type appearance equals behavior. For the German, however, appearance has nothing to do with behavior.

The three German character types emerge: the heretic/disbeliever, the mature German, and the reformed German. Each German embodies one of these three, and either engages the narrative through disbelief and education, or through belief and rectification. German characters can be identified with in a positive way no matter the character’s type,
because in all instances learning happens, meaning is created, and rectification takes over.

There are three more common features to the narratives: the narrator, the poems that accompany the end of each chapter, and the Jew as Devil. In addition to these, there is a consistent use of argumentative function that employs syllogistic logic and argument by analogy, which effectively function as a template for normalizing and generalizing all that is acceptable and unacceptable. All the above themes, types, and visions of Der Giftpilz will be further discussed in the following chapter.
CONCLUSION

RHETORICAL IDENTITY

The main feature of the analysis chapter examined the narrative elements of *Der Giftpilz* to uncover its fantasy and symbolic world. What emerged was a canvas depicting two paralleling ideas: first, the progression from German ignorance to German maturity regarding the Jewish question; second, the progression from the Jew as a creation to the Jew as a concept (*Der Giftpilz* essentially redefines Jewish essence). While highlighting relationships, identities, and ideology, this propaganda rectified wrong thinking and disobedience from the perspective of Nazi ideology. *Der Giftpilz* depicts young Nazi men, women, boys, and girls actively engaging and acting upon the Jewish question. This engagement fosters something Bormann calls a rhetorical vision. Arguing that *Der Giftpilz* is a source for correcting a young German’s mind, body, and spirit, these mini-narratives paint a vivid symbolic world that promotes a superstitious ideology, which then gives way to the über-narrative.

Although *Der Giftpilz* is grotesque in its content, it is rhetorically interesting on many levels. The analysis of *Der Giftpilz* presents an ideology that develops and exploits an irrational fear of “the Jew.” That fear then functions like a superstition that irrationally empowers something to impact one’s life. The irrational empowerment given to things informs one’s actions, similar to the way someone would return home to restart his/her day if a black cat walks across their path, as the irrational empowerment dictates. That person has given more meaning and power to a basic symbol than it warrants. Nonetheless, for the believer, the black cat’s meaning, if not acted upon, would lead to
certain consequences. In the creation of its ideology Der Giftpilz essentially creates a fanciful, superstitious world. Thus, when a German character in Der Giftpilz sees “the Jew 6” and informs upon him, he is acting superstitiously and giving meaning to that which is only meaningful because of the consequences illustrated in Der Giftpilz’s narratives. Der Giftpilz on all accounts creates meaning behind that which has none. Mere appearance does not mean you are a criminal or even behave criminally, but Der Giftpilz disagrees. It uses argument functions such as syllogism and analogy to explain its own symbolic world, which connects meaning directly to its symbol. Inspiring Germans to place faith in superstitious generalities is arguably the goal of Der Giftpilz; it gives more meaning to events than the event warrants, thus creating a compelling though irrational argument as to why one should believe it. One who is sensitive to language even in the slightest will be able to tell that Der Giftpilz is built around a filthy ideological framework, and when given to a child is like candy on an empty stomach; it is easy to swallow but hardly satisfying or fully nourishing in the end. No rhetorical work has been done on this artifact; therefore it seems appropriate to expose the rhetorical nature of this superstitious fantasy and its espoused ideology.

This discussion is separated into 4 sections that highlight the total ideology of Der Giftpilz, they are: structural, characterological, relational, and the rhetorical vision. These concepts best portray the über-narrative. Der Giftpilz possesses specific elements that assist the creation of the symbolic world and rhetorical vision. In many ways these attributes provide a background for the content; however, they are full of content themselves.
STRUCTURAL

Structural elements influence the formation of the über-narrative, while connecting one narrative to the other. First, the organization of the work directs the reader’s attention, which influences the subsequent judgment of the material. The narratives offer a simple collection of short stories with morals. They are Grimm fairy tale type stories; just replace ogre with “Jew.” One could pick up any particular chapter in Der Giftpilz and get a moral lesson, as with Grimm stories. However, there is a narrative coherence to Der Giftpilz’s structure, unlike the Grimm stories, which do not have a narrative thread behind their order. These narratives relate themes across individual narratives that allow groupings of chapters to be noticed and analyzed for their fantasy-building content. Upon analysis, these groupings reveal a logical progression of reasoning that begins in the mind but could ultimately cause the body to act, which draws the participant closer to the ideological spirit.

The first seven chapters relate the message of Jewish appearance. The reason that appearance is dealt with first is because it provides easily identifiable physiognomies and their explanations, upon which future narratives are supported. The Jew’s physical features enable generalization of “the Jew” as a type, which becomes easy enough to label as the devil, whom we know does not have the most agreeable appearance. These traits are easily identifiable because they are the “face of things” and once one can identify the problem, illustration of the problem follows.

Chapters seven through fourteen barely mention the appearance of a Jew, but rather discuss and relate Jewish behavior. With appearance, according to Der Giftpilz’s logic, comes behavior, which is reflective of Nazi racial theory: the way one looks
determines or directly indicates their worth (Blackburn 70). Once the explanation and identification of traits/attributes is out of the way, Der Giftpilz is able to show the reader the “real” experience with the enemy. The reader sees the characters act upon their newfound knowledge and “answer” the Jewish question. These middle chapters expose casual behaviors which prove detrimental to the German lifestyle. When one views these narratives not as separate entities but as groupings, an ideological progression emerges.

The last three chapters depict a rectification of events, the imminent realization of the Jewish question, and that the Führer is the savior. These narratives do not lambast the Jew as much as the initial chapters; rather they tell a story of how a German character realized, rectified, and found the Führer in the process. The reader is offered the most fitting conclusion to all the evidence presented prior, connecting these narratives into a symbolic world that subsequently helps to fashion a vision for the future.

Der Giftpilz’s overall organization helps foster that rectification vision because it mimics a rectification narrative. t first describes “the immature,” as represented by Franz in the first narrative; then it tells of how that immaturity can damage, as it does with Hans and Else when they accept the Jew’s bonbons. Finally a revelation that makes a young German chant: “Free yourselves from the Jew’s hand” (Der Giftpilz 56). Simply put, this book is about rectifying the mind, body, and spirit of German youth and is not simply a book full of morals: it is a book that fosters a superstitious ideology. This is partly achieved by its structure.

Therefore, as Bormann would hold, these groupings are evidence of themes that are consistent across “time,” allowing for the construction of an über-narrative and for a rhetorical vision to be realized. One would think that the über-narrative is that there are
no decent Jews, because that theme runs through each narrative; however, that is not the complete story. The über-narrative is rather that of the German obligation to engage the Jewish question and come to solid conclusions about it, thus rectifying history. The mini-narratives are structured in such a way that the character, scene and action get more complex as the reader progresses through the work. The individual narratives are combined into a means for engaging the Jewish question. By indirectly exposing the reader to the Jew’s ways and appearance, the mini-narratives provide a reader with enough evidence to construct a symbolic reality, one building block at a time. Jew hatred is a strong theme, but the goal of Der Giftpilz is to engage that theme in order to build a rhetorical vision of history-rectifying Nazi ideology.

Aside from what the characters do and the themes they engage, another aspect of structure is the scenes and settings that reinforce the ideological work of the organization. The settings become important for creating the ambiance, and attach meaning to the symbolic world of Der Giftpilz. All the narratives relate to common experience and settings, e.g. cleaning at home, hiking, talking, people watching, etc. These activities do not mean anything; however, for the propagandist they mean everything, because he/she does not create anything new, rather he/she pulls the strings of what already exists (Ellul 33). The propagandist wants to imbue common life experience with the espoused ideology; imparting meaning to common activities aligned with the rhetorical vision gives ideological weight to every aspect of life. Total propaganda helps redefine all aspects of life through the use of any and all available techniques (Ellul 9). When the reader watches other German children hike, talk, play with friends, and watch mother clean, those activates become attached to the Jewish question, thus making that the
prominent topic of conversation in every aspect of life. All activities become imbued with the Jewish question.

*Der Giftpilz*, however, inserts the imperative to adhere to the moral ideology, and makes cleaning, hiking, etc. into an anti-Jewish affair. The meaning associated with the symbolic world is revealed as a vital component to a life one thought he/she knew well. Exposing the Jew becomes essential to proper ideological life, indeed a commandment for the ideology, because avoiding the Jew is now exposed as vital to one’s joy and existence. This need for avoidance is irrational superstition. Nevertheless, action taken to combat these contrived consequences is inevitable once the superstition has become an enveloping paradigm. These meaning-laden symbols really hold no inherent meanings of their own. Without the meaning and explanation, the figure 6 is just a 6; a big lip is just that, a big lip. *Der Giftpilz* provides both meaning and explanation in its structure, giving unnecessary meaning to events and creating a highly superstitious ideology and moral code. Under the lens of FTA, imbuing meaning into basic and relatable things rhetorically creates a fantasy world full of superstitious agents, consequences and remedies for those consequences.

The last noteworthy aspect of structure is the individual nature of the narratives. Until now I have been talking about a grouping of narratives and an über-narrative. *Der Giftpilz* is, however, built from individual stories, and no single character is followed throughout. This compilation covers a large imaginative territory, fleshing out encounters one might have with a Jew in many possible forms: the peddler, the lawyer, the stranger, the banker, etc. In addition to that, making each narrative unique helps the rhetoric encapsulate specific archetypal scenarios. Therefore, the characters, scenes, and actions
must change in order for a consistent archetypal character to emerge. With each scenario, the characters learn from reputable sources exactly what it means to engage the Jewish question, and furthermore, what the explanation for the superstition is. In Der Giftpilz’s “collection” of stories, the archetypal scenario with the archetypal Jew can be seen. The narratives build on each other, one independent brick of ideology at a time. What fuses the context together is the presence of the different German characters, in different situations identifying the archetypal Jew as bad. In other words, every mini-narrative has a consistent lesson that builds toward the über-narrative, preparing the ground for the rhetorical vision to root itself.

**CHARACTEROLOGICAL**

The characters in Der Giftpilz can be categorized into four groups: the Jew devil, the ignorant/unseeing German, the reformed German, and the mature German. These characters tell the reader who not to be, and thus by default who to be. In all cases one does not want to be a Jew or a heretic/disbeliever, because it is especially detrimental to happiness, safety, and world salvation. The words of *Der Giftpilz* are explicit regarding this life-lesson for the good German. The poems, nuggets of pure ideology that appear in each narrative, emphasize the lesson by pointing directly to the four character types.

The poems do not expose the character types in their appearance, for that is negligible when considering this document as a moral ideology; rather the poems reveal the reformed and mature character’s internal thoughts. In all but four instances, the poems come not from the narrative voice, but from a character’s voice, giving insight into that characters’ prior statements. The poem comes out of the characters’ own mind (at
least in the fictitious world of Der Giftpilz), and is not something taught but rather a product of reflection and recollection, which helps the reader infer the characters’ understanding of things. When the character can recall a poem that fits the situation, the character is exposing prior engagement and competency with the Jewish question. Chapters one, two, four, and seven provide poems from the narrative voice, the rest are “sayings” that are remembered. These “sayings,” when recalled from memory, reflect a cultural recognition of “the Jew’s” evil, memorialized. It is a fictitious tie to a spurious, “fantastic” past. The reader is provided a way to relate and then express his/her engagement with the Jewish question, coincidentally in the same way the characters do. This is not the only element that forms the characters, but it is one that is very fruitful.

Another important tool for the construction of the characters is the narrative voice. Besides describing the actions and scenes the characters are involved with, the narrative voice further assists in archetypal character development. With each narrative, the narrative voice paints the background and drops the characters into a scene unaware of what will happen; the narrative will unfold through them and around them. Upon further analysis it seems that this method, much like the poems, effectively constructs the characters’ persona. For example, if the narrative voice expressed outright that Anni and Grete were two girls who saw two Jews get baptized, the characters would then only act out what had already been stated by the narrator. But this narrative voice provides just enough information at the outset to spark the narrative, and then the characters are able to come to their “own” conclusion. The narrator assists the characters, as well as the reader, in their exploration of the Jewish question by setting the scene and sometimes describing characters’ reactions. The narrative voice begins the narrative, “Anni and Grete are two
enthusiastic BDM girls. Each Wednesday and Friday they have ‘duty’ (sic). Those are the most beautiful days in the week for them. But today duty has been cancelled. The leader is namely ill. Anni is displeased…When they reach the Church of the Savior, Grete suddenly stops. ‘Anni look over there! The department store Jew….’” Anni responds that those are certainly “odd baptism candidates” (*Der Giftpilz* 17). The characters then carry the action forward, usually distilling the moral of the narrative with the poem: Anni seriously addresses the problem of the Jews attempting to integrate with a saying that concludes: “A Jew will always be a Jew!” (*Der Giftpilz* 18). When the characters are led to “realize” the meaning of the symbolic world on their own, their fictitious credibility deepens. The reader follows the pattern of this exploration. Because the narrative voice spans the book, this repetitive structure builds a thought pattern of realizing meaning, uncovering the moral.

I would argue that these types of characters are more relatable to the reader, thus giving the reader more reason to identify with and think about them. In these narratives the visual element is minimized. What must be done then is to provide a narrative voice that navigates motive and expression in the absence of visual space. When a thorough visual element is present, less needs to be explained, giving the characters a stage on which to appear unencumbered by the audience’s potentially limited understanding of the context. Thus this narrative voice becomes the eyes of the reader, showing him/her what he/she *should* see; a “god’s eye-view” in setting scene, and describing reactions.

The narrator directs the reader’s eyes towards the characters and their experience within the narrative. Although the narrative voice mentions other details of the story, they merely highlight what is experienced by the character. For example, in chapter six when
the reader learns “How a German Peasant was Driven from House and Farm,” the narrative voice states it was “A hot August day. Pitilessly, the sun burns down from the sky….Only for the peasant there is no rest and relaxation” (Der Giftpilz 20). The description of the day merely highlights the characters’ experience within the narrative. The German character, despite the elements against him, will be validated in his hard, honest work; very different from the Jew, as the narrative explains.

Another example of the narrative voice highlighting the character and his/her experience can be found in chapter seven. When the Jewish peddler tries to swindle the peasant lady with no success, the narrative voice comments, “The Jew packs his things up. Cursing, he leaves the farmstead. Outside, he first looks to the left, then to the right. When he is totally alone, he talks aloud…A few minutes later the Jew Levy stands in the living room of another peasant. And again he lies like crazy” (24). The narrative voice is the reader’s eyes and ears, providing evidence and clues for further extrapolation of future narratives and events, perhaps even real life experience. This quote is especially important not only because it occurs in the first set of narratives, which means the narratives elaborate on appearance and explanation of that appearance, but also because it effectively builds a character type; the Jew is thus created by the narrative voice as a persistent menace.

Unlike the Jewish character, which is easy to identify, the German characters are a bit more subtle. I have identified three German characters: (1) the heretic/disbeliever, (2) the reformed German, and an extension of number two, (3) the mature German.

The heretic character simply disbelieves the necessity for the Jewish question. He/she is in denial. When Inge does not want to go to the Jewish doctor, her mother
insists, and gets angry when she spouts anti-Jewish “nonsense.” The mother character joins the ranks of those the reader should not be like, which I will explore more later on.

The reformed and mature German character types are distinct from one another. The reformed character is one who goes through the experience of reform that is described in *Der Giftpilz*. The mature character, in contrast, is already “there,” meaning they possess the ideology at their fingertips. The mature character may show that maturity by relating an experience of realization about the Jewish question to another character. The way that the mature youth are personified as keepers of the knowledge and the rightful bearers of it proves that Nazi propagandists were explicitly targeting children because of their willingness to accept the ideology. The adult characters often praise the children for their ingenuity in identifying the Jew, as well as admitting to the child’s superior knowledge regarding the Jewish question. This praise of German youth gives the reader something to strive for, by showing their parents that they are wrong about the Jew.

The mature German type becomes necessary to differentiate between those characters who already possess the message and those who come to it from a clean slate. The reformed characters are therefore those Germans that have been proven wrong or shown the light from the darkness; the mature character simply abides in the light.

Both the reformed and mature character types act as construction workers for the symbolic world. These characters also take a special place in the creation of the rhetorical vision of engagement with the Jewish question, because they are proof of those who may have thought they were immune to the Jewish question but found out contrary. These characters illustrate strength while showing how detrimental the Jewish threat is. In this
way, these character types operate as a cycle, where the character initially inhabits one of the types and then progresses from either heretic to reformed to mature, or from reformed to mature. In all cases the heretic type comes to inhabit the other types after being proven wrong regarding the Jewish question. *Der Giftpilz*, through the characters, models a teaching method. Through teaching the “wrong perspective” through the heretic type, these characters become mechanisms for the reformed or mature German to emerge which is consequently more useful for the ideology. The villain is still the Jew, but the heretic is an internal villain that the German characters must convert. When Kurt and Otto go to the Jewish slaughterhouse the heretic (Otto) is proven wrong and scared breathless, all because of his disbelief. Through the characters’ realization, the proper progression from heretic to true believer is achieved.

Through character development, *Der Giftpilz* dragged the reader through basic Nazi concepts and thought, although not illustrated as such, that define the enemy and juxtapose the evil Jew to the righteous German. Unlike the German, the Jewish characters seldom carry a name, which allows *Der Giftpilz* to label them by their appearance like “such dirty and filthy ones” (10). This rhetorical ploy reduces uncertainty regarding the behavior of any individual Jew by reinforcing stereotypes about Jews as a group. Those stereotypes are specific enough to emphasize the espoused ideology. The Jew’s face looks like a number 6; the Jew swindles the Germans; the Jew is a doctor, banker, shop owner, peddler, or thief, and of course, he smells. With the help of these illustrations a broader imaginative field is accessed, leaving little question to the Jewish problem. Through the dominant features of the Jewish character, appearance and behavior, each
German character is able to stand out in one of the three character types, thereby furthering the vision latent in the construction of these characters.

**RELATIONAL**

The structural and characterological elements build a vivid symbolic world that solidifies character themes and types, thus promoting a rhetorical vision and creating an über-narrative. In doing so, these elements further create a foundation for cultivating relationships and dispelling doubt. Through the dispelling of doubt, relationships are cultivated, illustrating whom to trust and whom to hate. The characters in the narratives, when their doubt disappears, form a more trusting relationship with the other character or the bearer of knowledge. I call this relational element “didactic narrative.” Several of *Der Giftpilz*’s narratives follow the didactic model, beginning at chapter eight, which starts the behavioral set of narratives. The didactic chapters are: eight, nine, eleven, twelve, fourteen, and fifteen. Each one of the didactic narratives fosters specific relationships. Furthermore, the relationships build upon each other from one narrative to the next.

The didactic narrative looks as follows: one character makes a claim that the other character opposes based on suspicion of the claim. Both characters then navigate the narrative until arriving at corroboration of the original claim, thus exposing it as truth. For Bormann, this is fertile ground for the for a rhetorical vision whereas the didactic model blends “discursive material, here and now events, and fantasy themes which are woven together to form a drama that is credible and compelling (Cragan 5). The didactic narrative presents a situation regarding Jewish tendency or behavior that is held suspect by one of the characters. That character then experiences the folly in his/her reasoning.
These narratives always confirm the Jews’ deceptive ways while correcting the non-believer until he/she reforms their thinking.

The non-believer is present in the behavioral set of narratives. In every narrative, suspicion of the key claim has a unique consequence for the reader’s interpretation and elaboration of the narrative. The reader watches a character turn suspicious. If the reader feels the same, they will be more likely to inhabit that mind set. Within the narrative, suspicion is dealt with through a character’s experience, knowledge and good sense. By following role models and figureheads, the reader will follow the good sense and have their own condemnation of Jews validated. Through proposing a preposterous claim, then showing how that claim is grounded in “proof,” the authors achieve two things. First, the initial dialogue creates a story/claim/situation where the disbeliever mindset is validated; second, the reader is then shown the folly in the disbelief and the disbeliever. The reader, if he/she doubts like the character in the story does, will soon understand the folly of his/her ways/thoughts via indirect experience of the characters’ transformation. This indirect experience allows doubt to exist only to be corrected. And for the reader, it only takes one real-life Jew with a big forehead to validate the entire ideology. Every story will end at the same conclusion, that there is no decent Jew; if you thought otherwise, you will be proven wrong like the characters in the book: they all thought the Jew was alright, but were then proven very wrong.

Social relationships are fostered through the didactic narrative. The didactic narrative fosters in the disbelievers, whether in the narrative or real life, trust towards six German relational gestalts. First, in chapter eight, when Hans saves his younger sister Else from a Bonbon-giving Jew, he runs to the police, thus illustrating his trust in the
German system as well as his protection of family. Second, in chapter nine, Inge goes to the Jewish doctor because her mother forces her to, despite her repeated protests. Inge’s mother learns that the youth are smarter than generally given credit, thus illustrating trust in the German youth. Third, in chapter eleven, Mrs. Eckert and Mrs. Kraus hire two Jewish lawyers to resolve a neighborly dispute that has left animosity between them. The Jewish lawyers swindle both Germans. Cultural loyalty is restored and the rectification of their relationship illustrates trust in German neighbors. Fourth, in chapter twelve, outside the slaughterhouse with Kurt and Otto, Otto realizes he was terribly mistaken about the humanity of the Jews. Immediately he trusts his much wiser friend Kurt. Fifth, in chapter fourteen, young Liselotte defends the Jews, which prompts a litany of proofs by her mother as to why the Jew is unpardonable. Through fostering a relationship with mother, Liselotte learns the right ideology. In the sixth, and final didactic relationship, in chapter fifteen, worker Hartman’s unpleasant experience with Jewish communists fosters a relationship with the National Socialist German Workers’ Party and the mature/reformed German character. During his meeting with the Jew, he saw the light and then was guided to Nazism. The above relationships cover a spectrum of presumably trustable character types.

In addition, the narratives also build responsibility within the reader to act nobly, like the characters in the narrative. The “older brother reader” will identify with the “older brother character,” thereby fostering responsibility within himself to be “a real boy” (Der Giftpilz 25). Furthermore, the same boy reader will develop trust in the wise mother, because she saved him from his lack of knowledge and education when he thought the Jew was OK. The danger the characters put themselves in because of their
disbelief or curiosity is enough to cure whatever Jewish sympathies one may have. The didactic narrative in chapter twelve, “This is How The Jew Tortures Animals” (38), provides a specific illustration of this dynamic:

Kurt and Otto had gotten into a quarrel with each other. “You lie!” Otto had said, “I don’t believe you that the Jews are such terrible animal torturers, like you say. I don’t believe it that the Jews simply slit the animals’ necks and let them slowly bleed to death while fully conscious. That can’t be so. You lie, Kurt!” That is what Otto had said, and that made Kurt terribly angry. But he didn’t let it show. He just said: “Fine, Otto, I will prove it to you that I am no liar!” (38-40).

These initial claims set the didactic stage and ready the reader for the revelation. At this point the reader knows the outcome, given the pattern already set in the work, but is still left waiting for Otto to figure out his mistake. The reader must hope that young Otto will figure out his mistake before getting hurt by the Jew. The illustration shows the Jews slaughtering the animal while Kurt and Otto look on in the window behind. The revelation is complete.

The blood and the soulless Jews are too much for Otto to handle, and he calls out “Almighty God!” (40). His sentiments are backed up by the graphic image of blood and barbarism. They run away and Otto turns to Kurt with the punch line, “…now I believe you! You didn’t lie to me. The Jews are the most vile people in the world” (41). After seeing the graphic images in the narrative, the reader can only appreciate the recognition that the Jew is bad. It is important to note that when Der Giftpilz was published in 1938, there was little chance for any child to witness shechita as depicted in the book. Food laws banning the practice were passed shortly after Hitler’s rise to power in 1933. This narrative is thus compelled to implant the experience, to explain and justify to the young reader why Jewish slaughter was outlawed. More important, the narrative expresses, if only for a moment, the possibility that some Germans could think the Jew could be ok. If
the reader had any nice experience with a Jew, he/she would understand why a character would be contesting the claim that all Jews are evil. It is normal to question things. But this didactic narrative presents the danger of a skeptical attitude when it comes to racial ideology, to nullify any sympathies a reader might have with the disbelievers in the story.

Furthermore, this form of rhetoric makes the reader draw the conclusions before the outcome has been confirmed. This mechanism “fulfills...[the reader’s] psychological or rhetorical need to make sense of its experience and to anticipate its future” (Hirokowa et al. 41). The narrative displays the controversy, only to leave the reader in suspense as to the fate of the disbeliever. Suspense begs for answers, otherwise it would not be suspenseful. The only answer that will quench that thirst and “make sense” of the experience was provided to the reader in the beginning of the book: the claim that the Jew is the devil in human form. That claim becomes the premise for all enthymematic messages created here. The didactic narrative technique also validates the belief of the believer, giving them the feeling of superiority in knowing they already possess the knowledge that the Jews are bad and should not be trusted under any circumstance.

**INTERCULTURAL**

The rules/systems approach in intercultural communication states that “relationships are said to ‘develop’ along with changes in the types of data used to predict others’ behavior” (Collier and Thomas 100). Norms emerge through symbols and their meanings to become interculturally gratifying either as alienating or identifying. That process forms relationships, identity, and clarity regarding the Jewish question. Coincidentally, a feature of intercultural communication is its ability to support identity
formation based on these cultural cues; through intercultural interaction “one person…may act on and thematize cultural differences” (Collier and Thomas, 100). The thematized cultural differences uncovered in the analysis of Der Giftpilz push the reader and the characters to accept the “right” cultural cue and act accordingly.

The Jews in the narratives, save Salomon in chapter sixteen, do not deny their devilish ways; rather they revel in them. In that way, the Jewish characters affirm and “testify” to the way German characters ascribe them. The description of the Jew peddler illustrates the point. When the Jew tries to swindle the peasant woman, “he first looks to the left, then to the right. When he is totally alone, he talks aloud: “The farm mistress has noticed something! Has noticed that I just want to cheat her! That’s a shame…” (Der Giftpilz 24). This narrative makes it clear that the Jew is aware of his own evil ways, which means he is avowing the same as the German ascription. The projected ascription and avowal depicted in the narratives match, and as predicted, the outcome is cultural identity, competence, and relationships. Obviously this discussion must protest the idea that Der Giftpilz actually promotes intercultural competence, because it seeks to alienate and prove negative stereotypes (as suggested by Collier), but from a Nazi point of view, this grotesqueness is competence. Competence of this nature, through the projective matching of German ascription and Jewish avowal, creates a competence via alienation that simultaneously drew Germans to Germany and distanced a long-time resident of that same motherland, the Jew.

The German characters in Der Giftpilz continuously avow their identities through the contrast between the ideologically weak/naïve and the ideologically mature German. This defines the espoused moral ideology of cultural continuum. The young German
reader avows herself or himself as a learning, rectifying being that thinks hard about the Jewish question and repairs his/her cultural relationships with other Germans. This is explicit in the didactic narrative of Kurt and Otto mentioned above, where one German questions the avowed ideological identity, until the other German proves that the avowed identity is in fact correct.

The ideologically mature characters always disagree with the ideologically weak or naïve, and ascribe them as extremely misguided and dangerous for the Volk. In contrast the Jew ascribes the ideologically weak as perfect targets, which is ultimately how the ideologically weak German reader is led to relate to the danger. The connection between the weak and the Jew is accentuated by the Jew’s own avowal as a criminal, because it effectively acts to validate the negative threat brought on by those ideologically weak Germans who have contact with the Jew.

Conversely the Jew’s ascription of the ideologically mature German differs from the German’s avowal because one is positive, the other is negative, which causes a chasm and magnification of intercultural difference that ultimately causes friction. The ideologically mature German is dangerous, not for the Volk but for the Jew, and thus it becomes necessary for the Jew to steal and swindle the German; the ideologically mature is just harder to manipulate. Therefore, the book illustrates that if everyone were ideologically mature, the Jew would not be a problem. The contrast created here fertilizes the rhetorical vision of the narratives, because it identities with the ideological mature by creating narratives that support that character type.

Viewed from the rules/systems approach, the friction of intercultural interaction couples with the collision of the characters’ projected ascription and avowal to help the
reader experience symbols while congruently learning the cultural rules surrounding those symbols. Thus *Der Giftpilz* creates a fantasy world with an intercultural chasm that widens the gap between the ideologically pure and grotesque, which leads to even greater intercultural friction with more cultural identification, as well as intercultural knowledge. The intent of this document is to disassociate from a Jewish culture that had long been resident in Germany. To achieve this, the propagandists promote intercultural friction to a moral ideology. The espoused ideology, in connection with the patterns of ascription and avowal depicts identities formed through conflict.

**RHETORICAL VISION**

The fantasy types and themes here cultivate the rhetorical vision of a reformed German learning to live by a mature ideological code, where the positive commandment is to think about and recognize his/her preferred identity and engage “the Jewish question.” The negative commandment is stay away from the Jew. Fostering a strong German identity, the fantasies show a relatable, trustworthy, memorable, scary, and joyful world; they give to the reader a vision of an ideal world getting straightened out and saved from its enemy.

The rhetorical visions are three: the visions build from a series of narrative themes and types, which translate to expressions of ideology, rectification, and identity. Arguably these are fantasy themes. I label them as rhetorical visions because each set of narratives creates one of three distinct aspects of German identity: the mind, body, and spirit. Three different visions for each aspect of German life; the visions define how the mind should think, where the legs should march, and to whom the spirit should yearn.
The first narrative set inhabits the ideological set, which describes the Jew and how to identify his evil ways. It answers basic questions like: Where did the Jew come from? How do you notice a Jew? What are some things to be aware of? These questions effectively expose the ideology and history of Nazi thought and the narrative’s rhetorical vision because they aid the creation of the projected intercultural chasm. The part of the identity emphasized is the mind. Being uneducated in regard to Jewish appearance is dangerous, therefore it must be rectified; the rhetorical vision is a sharp mind that becomes the rectifying agent for German culture.

The next rhetorical vision aids the reader in his or her ability to be aware of the danger that lurks around every corner. The body must be strong to follow the dictates of the mind, which ultimately lead one to awareness and discipline. This vision wrestles with how German characters (ideologically mature or not) interact with the Jew; essentially this is the ideology realized in intercultural interaction. The experiences develop normal German scenes and behavior while juxtaposing those images with the Jew being caught in his evil doings. This rhetorical vision encapsulates everything bad about the Jew and provides a warning for the reader against the adopting wrong identity.

The last rhetorical vision combines the ideological work and the behavioral element as a foundation for the National Socialist German Workers’ Party. It depicts a full rectification of thoughts and events. It leads to the only logical conclusion: German identity is strong, anti-Jewish, and willing to expose that as a normal part of life. The ideology is clear, the identity is clear, now the rhetorical vision calls upon the reader/participant to activate his/her spirit and inhabit the rectified cultural identity through participation. The ideology, when validated, brings one to the rhetorical vision
latent within the dramas and draws the German close to the preferred identity. Through
the ideology described in the first and second rhetorical visions, this vision becomes an
acceptable way heal the world; ideologically organized and mature Germans must unite
and act as stewards.

In the method chapter I quoted Cragan, saying, “A rhetorical vision is a blend of
discursive material, here and now events, and fantasy themes which are woven together
to form a drama that is credible and compelling” (Cragan 5). The interpretation of reality,
by a body of discourse, can be driven so deep into the social strata that the choice of
one’s own identity becomes a false dichotomy. Bormann perceived this in his research:
individuals or groups, who do not participate in the fantasy initially, are eventually
compelled to because the drama is so vivid. Bormann states that “typical plot lines”
become the connection between all “communication contexts” inspiring “a response
reminiscent of the original emotional chain” (Bormann, Fantasy 398). Bormann’s
findings are congruent with Der Giftpilz’s rhetorical strategies. What I call the “didactic
narrative” functions as a means to target those individuals “who do not participate in the
fantasy initially,” which eventually compels them to accept the message, identity, and
vision. Every aspect of German life is dealt with and of course it all adds up: from mother
to the classroom, Talmud studies with the Rabbi to Hans and Else, the reader begins
building, by contrast, a dramatic German identity that seeks to widen the intercultural
chasm.

Nazi propaganda created a superstitious fantasy that was more compelling than
psychologists and doctors are able to explain. On the streets the Nazis created an
alternative reality that citizenry were not accustomed to, be it through scarcity of
automobiles, or *Stürmer* street posters. With time, the Nazis witnessed their citizens fall into rank. In *Der Giftpilz*, one set of narratives prepares the ideological foundation, the second set takes the reader into the world of experience, and the third set solidifies the ideology fusing the avowed Germanic identity with truth and sanctity. These rhetorical visions effectively satisfy the Germanic mind, body, and spirit, by rectifying all that is German and anti-German.

*Der Giftpilz* is no more than a collection of stiff-boot narratives imprinting itself on impressionable soil. There are 17 mini-narratives that contrast a potential reader’s real experience with an imagined identity that is proven true by the projected reality of stock characters, scenes, and actions; this provides the reader with the ideological and moral tools to create a reality that ultimately exploits the normalcy of life’s innocence. The rhetorical technique of *Der Giftpilz*, and the narratives therein, construct a forum for providing lessons, dispelling doubts, and through layers of abstraction, quarantining the youth-imagination to a compelling identity and fantasy more compelling and relatable than the present. This cultural identity matures and solidifies itself within the characters through layers of abstraction that make *Der Giftpilz* repeat the monotonous ideological Nazi identity of hate.

**DISCUSSION**

It is the opinion of this paper that the distilled version of Nazi propaganda can act as a template for analyzing other, more modern, child-specific propagandas. *Der Giftpilz* has it all; hate, deceit, love, remorse, courage, many common feelings and relationships are dealt with in a mere fifty-seven pages. This piece of propaganda creates a scene
where two worlds, starkly juxtaposed, lead the reader to the natural conclusion; Nazism rectifies all that is evil.

Further work should be done on Der Giftpilz to show the propagandistic power untapped in this study. For instance, could there be an even greater reality and persuasion built from the propaganda poetry? Other methods could and should be used to analyze this and similar documents for the purpose of revealing the persuasive elements of propaganda. Fantasy theme analysis should also be applied to modern day propagandas to expose the seeds that are being planted within modern generations. FTA, as I use it here, would be useful for looking at current propagandas, because it could act as a revealing mechanism for the hateful ideologies that pervade the modern world. Although most ideologies are not as totalizing as Nazi ideology, propagandas of this type exist and perpetuate a rhetorical vision. Through comparative analysis, between Der Giftpilz and modern propagandas, one might be able to draw parallels that help illuminate the broader vision and fantasy world hidden beneath the surface and shared between different propagandas. Comparative studies could then be catalogued by their rhetorical vision. Since a rhetorical vision is a coping mechanism and/or projection of future action, cataloging the rhetorical visions of propaganda aimed at children could effectively predict the actions of a propagandized citizenry.

Der Giftpilz espouses a superstitious ideology that attempts rectification of Germany; not in violent action, but violent thought to push the reader in the direction of correcting his/her mind and realizing Germany’s savior, Nazism. By studying the material of a youth population, one can begin to project the future, and if savvy, greet the youth at a crossroads before the ideology has completed its mission. By 1938, after five
years of Hitler’s rule, Germany was synonymous with Nazi. The Nazis effectively met their youth at a susceptible age for crafting their identity, ideologically or otherwise. By 1938 most of the Jews were ghettoized and/or on their way to a concentration camp. If the youth had seen a Jew, he/she most definitely would have looked like most of the characters in *Der Giftpilz*. The propaganda in this book is a reflection of what the Nazis had created prior to 1938.

Although many human rights efforts exist, frightening is the reality that high-population nations are currently preparing a prejudiced war-mind with child propaganda. Child propaganda does not hurt the child as much as it hurts every subsequent generation. It instills within children conspiracy, delusion, fantasy, superstition, and supremacy, which robs children of childhood and creates frightened and possibly violent adults. *Der Giftpilz* is persuasive because it provides a template for potential action. In that way it is enthymematic; however, if it were enthymematic, Hans for example would have turned the Jew into the police because he enthymematically understood the Jew to be a criminal. Rather, he turned the Jew into the police because he understood the ideology and its proper response, namely that Jew is not a criminal, rather it is criminal to be Jewish. The Nazis attempted to mythologically and ideologically recreate the world, and in doing so recreated evil. In its conceptual habitat they placed the Jew. This is exactly why *Der Giftpilz* and its publishers got front row seats at the Nuremberg trials: their job was the redefinition of “the Jew” as evil incarnate, and its consequences were unforgivable. It was and still is dangerous because there is no return; an estimated six million perished without a trace because of an ideology that refashioned their inherent existence.
The most elementary propagandist touches the most elementary mind. The child is that mind. It is supple, moldable, and prepared to lap up any careless message spilt. Streicher was explicitly dangerous because of his simplicity. Streicher was a regular guy who made it his mission to espouse Nazism and Jew hatred on every corner. This is the increasing danger in our technological society; any regular guy/girl can have potential access to millions of people instantly. Yesterday’s mediocre journalist receives worldwide press because of a “tweet.”8 Yesterday’s mediocre journalist receives worldwide coverage because she was in the right place at the right time. That “fifteen minutes of fame” can have a profound propagandistic effect. School shooters become famous because of inescapable media coverage, which subsequently prompts more shooters who know their message will be heard, if only for fifteen minutes. Suicide bombers fall into this category, because they also receive their attention on earth when they kill thirty people on a bus. Their video plays loud, and then silent. Hamas is an organization that showers Palestinian youth with Nazi-like hate towards Jews and the garden-variety infidel.9 The television shows, books, songs, videos etc. teach their children to kill anyone not like them, especially Jews.

Scholars have long known the persuasive power of narratives. Every religion has a narrative which expresses the depths of its holiness. This thesis does not attempt to claim the power of narrative, rather it is to show how basic narrative and rhetorical elements form a cohesive reality entirely independent of the real world. This “fantasy world” is often times more real than not, in the case of the Nazis, that was unfortunately the case. Der Giftpilz and its utter simplicity serve as a template to understand Nazi

8 A message sent via the Twitter messaging service.
9 Pioneers of Tomorrow. Hamas Children’s Show. Al-Aqsa TV (HAMAS/PA). MEMRI TV, Film. Youtube.
propaganda and the other propagandas like it. *Der Giftpilz* shows all who read it how simple literary narrative elements can have definitive persuasive power.
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APPENDIX

CHAPTERS TITLES SEPERATED BY SECTIONS

1. Identifying the Poison: The Jew
   Ch.1 Poisonous mushroom
   Ch.2 How One Recognizes Jews
   Ch.3 This is How the Jews Came to Us
   Ch.4 What is the Talmud?
   Ch.5 Why Do Jews Have Themselves baptized?
   Ch.6 How a German Peasant was Driven from House and Farm

2. Experiential Paradigm
   Ch.7 This is How Jewish Merchants Swindle
   Ch.8 What Hans and Else Experienced with a Strange Man
   Ch.9 What Happened to Inge at The Jew Doctor
   Ch.10 This is How the Jew Treats His Servant Girl
   Ch.11 How Two Women were Swindled by Jew Lawyers
   Ch.12 This is How the Jews Torture Animals
   Ch.13 What Christ said About the Jews
   Ch.14 The God of Jews is Money

3. Aryan Rectification
   Ch.15 How the Worker Hartman Became a National Socialist
   Ch.16 Are There Decent Jews?
   Ch.17 Without Solving the Jewish Problem: No Salvation for Mankind
**BY CHAPTER: CHARACTER, SCENE, ACTION**

### 1. Jewish Appearance

Ch.1 Poisonous mushroom  
- Action: mushroom picking/searching for good mushrooms  
- Scene: forest, walk  
- Characters: Franz, mother, Jew  
- Outcome: Jew is poison to the world  

Ch.2 How One Recognizes Jews  
- Action: students articulating how to spot a Jew  
- Scene: classroom  
- Characters: Teacher Mr. Brikman, Emil, Karl, Fritz Moller, Heinrich Schmidt, Richard Krause  
- Outcome: Jewish identification  

Ch.3 This is How the Jews Came to Us  
- Action: cold water swimming “German boys aren’t sissies”  
- Scene: classroom  
- Characters: Fritz and Karl, dirty ugly eastern Jew  
- Outcome: How Jew came to us  

Ch.4 What is the Talmud?  
- Action: Learning from Talmud  
- Scene: Synagogue/Jewish Church  
- Characters: Sally, Rabbi  
- Outcome: Treatment of non-Jews based on Talmud, the law of the Jews  

Ch.5 Why Do Jews Have Themselves baptized?  
- Action: day ruined by “duty officer” being sick, talking  
- Scene: Outside a Church on a sunny day  
- Characters: Anni and Grete, Jewess Rebecka and Jew Veilchenblau  
- Outcome: Jews don’t actually change after baptism  

Ch.6 How a German Peasant was Driven from House and Farm  
- Action: Son looking on as German farmer gets swindled, asking father questions  
- Scene: on the Farm working  
- Characters: Father Angerbauer, Son, and Jew Rosenfeld, Peasants Flurbauer  
- Outcome: Why Jew is talking with German neighbors, never do business with a Jew  

### 2. Jewish Behavior

Ch.7 How Jewish merchant swindles  
- Action: Jew selling wares to peasant woman who declines offer  
- Scene: Evening after work at the Peasant room  
- Characters: Peasant woman, Shmuel Levy the Jew  
- Outcome: Jews leaves mad because she didn’t buy  

Ch.8 What Hans and Else Experienced with a Strange Man  
- Action: informing on the Jew who gave candy to sister  
- Scene: Streets  
- Characters: Brother and Sister Hans and Else, Michael Hans friend, Police, the Jew  
- Outcome: Jew taken to prison, Hans congratulated  

Ch.9 What Happened to Inge at The Jew Doctor  
- Action: visit to the doctor after mother insisted  
- Scene: Doctor’s office  
- Characters: Inge, mother, and Dr. Bernstein, plus unknown patient  
- Outcome: mother reconciles: “one can learn from their children”
Ch.10 This is How the Jew Treats His Servant Girl
Action: Letter from Rosa the daughter
Scene: mother and father reading the letter
Characters: Rosa and her travels to a Jewish employment agency, Mother and father
Outcome: “stay in Germany”

Ch.11 How Two Women were Swindled by Jew Lawyers
Action: Mrs. Kraus and Eckart fight and take each other to court
Scene: courtroom
Characters: Mrs. Kraus and son Willi, Mrs. Eckart and son Willi, Lawyer Silberstein and Morgenthau
Outcome: they realize they could have saved themselves trouble if they didn’t fight

Ch.12 This is How the Jews Torture Animals
Action: sneaking to Jewish slaughter
Scene: Slaughter house
Characters: Kurt and Otto, and three Jewish men
Outcome: “do they murder humans too?”

Ch.13 What Christ said About the Jews
Action: conversation about Christ
Scene: field with a cross
Characters: Mother, Gertrud, Georg
Outcome: “who ever is a murder, himself must be killed” and “Jew killed Christ, the cross is a reminder”

Ch.14 The God of Jews is Money
Action: conversation between Liselotte and Mother
Scene: Home looking out window
Characters: Liselotte and Mother, talking about father and the Jew
Outcome: The rich, like Jews, are sick with laziness. Fathers work is good.

3. Rectification

Ch.15 How the Worker Hartman Became a National Socialist
Action: March and convo with construction site worker
Scene: construction site
Characters: HJ boys (Richard, no name for others), HJ leader, George Hartman
Outcome: Rebirth of Hartman and first hand experience the Jew was bad

Ch.16 Are There Decent Jews?
Action: Jew pays for the others beer, praises Jews. Others fight back
Scene: around a table at Zum Schwarzen Adler Inn
Characters: Jew Solomon, worker, peasant, Carpenter
Outcome: Jew is the only people who created themselves with a fairy tale

Ch.17 Without Solving the Jewish Problem: No Salvation for Mankind
Action: conversation, on their way to a Nazi rally
Scene: in front of a Streicher poster outside on route to Nazi rally
Characters: Konrad, Anton, Erich (experienced of the 3).
Outcome: Awe of the spoken word and Nazi accomplishments, “without solving the Jewish problem: no salvation for mankind”
SUMMATION: CHARACTER, SCENE, AND ACTION

CHARACTERS

The German:
1. Franz
2. Mother/father
3. Non-Jew
4. Teacher
5. Boys
   a. Emil
   b. Karl
   c. Fritz
   d. Heinrich
   e. Richard
   f. Kurt and Otto
   g. Hans
   h. Georg
   i. Willi
   j. Konrad, Anton, Erich
6. School children
7. Girls
   a. Anni
   b. Grete
   c. Inge
   d. Liselotte
   e. Rosa
   f. Else
   g. Gertrud
   h. Enthusiastic BDM girls
8. Farmers
9. Workers
10. Peasant Women
11. Mrs. Eckert
12. Mrs. Kraus
13. Son/daughter
14. Friends
15. HJ boys
16. HJ leader
17. George Hartman
18. Worker
19. Peasant
20. German police
21. Carpenter

The Jew:
1. 13 yrs. Sally Blumenstock (boy)
2. Rabbi
3. Jewess Rebbecka
4. Jew Veilchenblau
5. Jew Rosenfeld
6. Solomon
7. Dr. Bernstein
8. Shmuel Levy
9. Silberstein and Morgenthau

Jew Appearance:
1. Dirty/Greasy clothes
2. Big
   a. Eyes
   b. Nose
   c. Ears
   d. Lips
   e. Forehead
   f. Hair
   g. Beard
3. Short
   a. Hands
   b. Legs
   c. Bodies
   d. Flat feet
4. Fat
5. Eastern Jew
6. Thieves/Robbers/Criminal
7. Devil face
8. Swindler
9. Criminal
10. Poisonous mushroom
11. Peddler
12. Rogue
13. Villain
14. Livestock Jew
15. Department store
16. Butcher
17. Doctor
18. Lawyer
SCENE
1. Forest
2. Classroom
3. Little old German city
4. 4pm schools out
5. Sunny day
6. Church
7. Farm
8. Bank
9. The peasant room
10. Streets
11. Home
12. Apartment building
13. Doctors office
14. Courtroom
15. Slaughter house
16. At the window at home
17. On a march
18. Construction site of Fuhrer
19. Workers meeting
20. Zum schwarzen adler Inn

ACTION
1. Action: mushroom picking/searching for good mushrooms
   a. Outcome: Jew is poison to the world
2. Action: students articulating how to spot a Jew
   a. Outcome: Jewish identification
3. Action: cold water swimming “German boys aren’t sissies”
   a. Outcome: How Jew came to us
4. Action: Learning from Talmud
   a. Outcome: Treatment of non-Jews based on Talmud, the law of the jews
5. Action: day ruined by “duty officer” being sick, talking
   a. Outcome: Jews don’t actually change after baptism
6. Action: Son looking on as German farmer gets swindled, asking father questions
   a. Outcome: Never do business with a Jew
7. Action: Jew selling wares to peasant woman who declines offer
   a. Outcome: Jews leaves mad because she didn’t buy
8. Action: informing on the Jew who gave candy to sister
   a. Outcome: Jew taken to prison, Hans congratulated
9. Action: visit to the doctor after mother insisted
   a. Outcome: mother reconciles: “one can learn from their children”
10. Action: Letter from Rosa the daughter
    a. Outcome: “stay in Germany”
11. Action: Mrs. Kraus and Eckert fight and take each other to court
    a. Outcome: they realize they could have saved themselves trouble
12. Action: sneaking to Jewish slaughter
    a. Outcome: “do they murder humans too?”
13. Action: conversation about Christ
    a. Outcome: “who ever is a murder, himself must be killed”
14. Action: conversation between Liselotte and Mother
    a. Outcome: The rich, like Jews, are sick with laziness. Fathers work is good.
15. Action: March and convo with construction site worker
    a. Outcome: Rebirth of Hartman and first hand experience the Jew was bad
16. Action: Jew pays for the others beer, praises Jews. Others fight back
    a. Outcome: Jew is the only people who created themselves with a fairy tale
17. Action: conversation, on their way to a Nazi rally
    Outcome: Awe of the spoken word and Nazi accomplishments
POEMS BY CHAPTER

1. Devil in human form.
   And you—you suffer the harm.
   Many have also experienced this.
   If you want to protect yourself against harm,
   Then don’t let the Jew in
   And buy from the German merchant (25).

2. From a Jew’s countenance
   The evil devil speaks to us,
   The devil, who in every land,
   Is known as evil plague.
   If we want to be free of the Jew
   And want to be happy again, and joyous,
   Then the youth must struggle with us,
   To vanquish the Jew devil (10).

3. From the east did they come one day,
   Dirty, lice ridden, purse empty.
   But already after a few years
   They had become rich.
   Today they dress elegantly,
   They no longer want to be Jews,
   So keep your eyes open and note you well:
   A Jew remains a Jew! (12).

4. Murder, theft and lie
   Robbery, perjury, swindle
   Are permitted for Jewry!
   Every Jew child knows that.
   It is after all, written in the Talmud,
   What Jews hate, Jews love.
   And how the Jew thinks and lives,
   Is set down in the Talmud (17).

5. If a Jew one day comes running
   And wants the pastor to baptize him,
   Don’t trust him and hold back,
   A Jew will always be a Jew!
   Even baptismal water does not help there,
   And through it the Jews do not become better!
   He is a devil in the time
   And remains it into eternity! (18-20).

6. The peasant prays to the lord:
   Oh, keep hail far away from us,
   Spare us lightning and flood,
   Then the harvest will be good again.
   But even worse than these plagues
   Is the Jew, let yourself be told!
   Let yourself be warned: Guard yourself
   Against the Jew bloodthirsty villain (22).

7. The Jewish peddler
   Is a swindler and seducer.
   He lies through and through,
   And like the devil he defiles
   The German woman, German honor.
   The German folk will not heal,
   If it does not soon find the path
   To German medicine, German meaning,
   Henceforth to the German doctor (32).

8. A devil walks through the land,
   It’s the Jew, well-known to us
   As folk murderer, race defiler,
   As children’s terror for all lands!
   He wants to ruin the youth,
   He wants all folks to die.
   Don’t get involved with any Jew,
   Then you will be happy and joyful! (28).

9. The Jew doctor in German land
   The devil has sent us.
   And like the devil he defiles
   The German woman, German honor.
   The German folk will not heal,
   If it does not soon find the path
   To German medicine, German meaning,
   Henceforth to the German doctor (32).

10. The German woman, whether little,
    whether large,
    The Jew just calls her ‘Goja’.
    He hates her, and he defiles her
    And torments her worse than cattle.
    If a girl wants to keep herself pure,
    She mustn’t keep the house among Jews!
    If she wants to survive the life struggle,
    Then she must not go to the Jew! (35).

11. The Jew lawyer is left
    Completely cold by feeling of right.
    He only goes before the court,
    Because he expects to make a lot of money there.
    Whether or not the honest and good
    Rip each other apart and bleed to death,
    That leaves the Jew completely cold.
    Never go to a Jew attorney! (38).

12. It lies in the Jew’s blood
    Rage, envy, hatred, anger
    Against every folk of the world,
That isn’t among the ‘chosen’.
He slaughters animals, slaughters people.
His thirst for blood knows no bounds!
The world will only heal,
If we save it from the Jew (41).

13. As long as Jews live on earth,
There have been opponents of the Jews.
They warned against the Jew brood
And even sacrificed their blood,
So that the world would know the devil
And not rush to its ruination,
So that the world would soon free itself
From this Jew slavery! (44).

14. The Jew’s purpose in this world
Strives only for one thing: money money money!
Through lie and deceit and other things
To make himself immeasurably rich.
What does he care about disgrace, mockery!
Money, that is and remains his god!
With money he hopes to vanquish us,
To achieve world master (47).

15. If a folk wants to develop its power,
It must stand together tight.
For strike and rebellion, class warfare
Destroy a folk.
The world has often experienced that
Since many, many centuries.
Only then will the be eternal peace,
If we free ourselves from the Jew (50).

16. One frequently hears the fairy-tale,
How good a Jew is,
He gladly gives his money to the poor
And is an angel on earth
A Jew, pure like an angel?
That can only be a fairy-tale!
Who thought up this fairy-tale?
The Jew himself created it! (53)

17. From the Germany that Hitler created
Goes into the whole world the cry:
Free yourselves from the Jew’s hand
And save folk and fatherland!
The world awakens in Judah’s chains,
It knows only Germany can save it
German purpose and German essence
Will yet heal the whole world! (56).