

# WHAT WAS IT THAT MADE NAZISM SO ATTRACTIVE TO ORDINARY GERMANS FROM THE OUTSET

*National Socialism (German: Nationalsozialismus), more commonly known as Nazism is the .. He believed that communism was invented by the Jews to weaken nations by Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union to form a common anti-liberal front so . Gobineau's theories, which attracted a strong following in Germany.*

In other words, Kershaw combines his "structuralist" approach to the Nazi state with an equally forthright view of Hitler's personal power. The political dynamics of the collapse of Weimar will always be fascinating, as will the biographies of leading Nazis and their opponents. The Need for a New General History The profusion of new research drawn upon by Kershaw makes the need for a new general history of the Third Reich abundantly clear, and two other new books begin to fill that gap. The earlier three chapters on Weimar, the machinery of repression, and Nazi values contain much of importance but lack the strong narrative thrust of the chapters dealing specifically with race and the putative European New Order. Historians and biographers have long debated the question of when Hitler became an anti-Semite; many question his own account in *Mein Kampf*, preferring an earlier or later date. Why everyone went mad. From them, the term spread into other languages and it was eventually brought back into Germany after World War II. By political religion, Burleigh means the "sacralization of politics" or "the politics of faith," and with this idea he counterposes an ideal of critical reasoning against the calamitous results of a politics based on "belief. This aspect grew ever more pronounced during the war years, as he relapsed into silence and seclusion outside the daily briefings and councils and associated routines of lunches, dinners, and tea parties. On the one hand, the "polycratic" view is reduced to a caricature, which bears scant resemblance to the sophisticated institutional analyses it has actually inspired. Even during the war, when militarist expansion and the racialist frenzy of genocide overwhelmed everything else, the integrity of the "social context," however battered and reduced, could still be analytically upheld. On the Eastern front, in the Caucasus and in the Crimea, the Germans ordered the rebuilding of mosques and madrasas previously dismantled by Moscow, and the re-establishment of religious rituals and celebrations, with the intention of undermining Soviet rule. Kressel, ed. One of the few to publicly criticize these deportations was, in fact, George Orwell, who was working as a war correspondent on the continent. His book has an introduction and ten chapters, arranged topically in rough chronological sequence. He continues with a ninety-one page analysis of the "racial war against the Jews," picking up threads from the earlier chapters on the German Jews and euthanasia. He was not hanged. The chapters on the reactions of the elites and of ordinary people to the establishment of the regime are good, although the treatment of women is far more tenuously connected to available literatures than the sections on workers and the young. How well do these two books discharge the tasks of a general history? Once the explanatory sufficiency of Nazi ideology and Nazi totalitarianism had been questioned, in other words, it was possible to have a very different discussion of Nazism's relationship to German society, one less beholden to models of coercion and far more open to arguments about consent.