

The Presentation of “Self” and “Other” in Nazi Propaganda

DIANE KOHL

University of Stirling

Nazi propaganda was based on traditional German values and incorporated then contemporary psychological and biological theories. A first attempt to explain the role of the German population in the Holocaust was made by describing an authoritarian personality. Another theory, the psychology of the masses, explains group behaviour in terms of ingroup cohesion, feelings of superiority and a decreased sense of individuality. This paper analyses speeches by Adolf Hitler and Joseph Goebbels using critical discourse analysis. In concurrence with the psychology of the masses, Nazi propaganda used different strategies in its presentation of self and other, which aimed to increase ingroup cohesion and also create fear towards other. Furthermore, these strategies encouraged a non-human view of other and, from the perspective of the Nazi's, legitimized the treatment which the Jewish people endured. Alternative interpretations are also considered.

Nazi propaganda was based on traditional German values and provided a complete explanation of the past and present events happening in the world (Bytwerk, 2008; Herf, 2006). Nazi propaganda therefore had a close relationship with economic disturbances and also incorporated prominent theories and problems of the time (Billig, 1978; Welch, 2004). For example, the propaganda related to the Jewish people was based on the already existent anti-Semitism in Germany. This was coupled with the fact that the Jewish people were centered in the larger cities and in certain fields of employment, leading to high saliency and an overestimation of their actual numbers though they had actually always been a minority (Herf, 2006; Kershaw, 1980). Hence, propaganda is best understood if placed in its historical context and in consideration of its psychological background (Billig, 1978). Nazi propaganda relied heavily on rhetoric, keeping the main points simple, emotional and insistent (Bytwerk, 2008). The general tone of Nazi propaganda was that of a discourse of logical and rational cause and effect (Herf, 2006). Adolf Hitler assumed distinctive positions in relation to both the ingroup and the outgroup (Potter and Lloyd, 2005). Research on persuasion has shown the importance of credibility, appeals to emotions and the expectations of the audience, all of which will be considered in the analysis of this paper (Giles and Robinson, 1990; O'Keefe, 2002). The self/other distinction is of particular importance in propaganda, since it is a means of justification of action and identification of friend or foe. Further influential theories include: the authoritarian personality, the psychology of the masses and the realistic conflict theory (RCT), all of which will be outlined here.

A first attempt at looking at the Holocaust, in terms of psychological characteristics of the people involved, explained it in terms of a predisposition to obedience and a willingness to submit to an authority of the German population (Fest, 1973). Adorno

(1973) looked for a German authoritarian personality in order to explain obedience. This was characterized by a strong super-ego resulting from a conflicting relationship with the father and a submission to conventional beliefs and to an authority figure. The authoritarian craves authority in order to compensate for his or her weaknesses, which are projected onto the weak outgroup (Billig, 1978). However, others have pointed out that Nazi propaganda was vague when talking about the treatment of the Jewish people and hid the final solution (Fest, 1973). Since Adorno, other studies have suggested that, in other nations, the people might have acted similarly as has been shown in the Netherlands and the United Kingdom (e.g. Meeus and Raaijmakers, 1995; Reicher and Haslam, 2006).

Another theory used to explain the Holocaust is the psychology of the masses. McDougall (1920) stated that in a psychological group in which people have certain homogeneity and a common feeling about a common object, they tend to lose the sense of individuality. They become anonymous parts of a bigger cause, which they put above their own self-interest. There is an almost complete identification with the ingroup (Watson, 1974). Perceived differences of the outgroup are magnified and since the outgroup is avoided, stereotypes cannot be proven wrong (Watson, 1974). Socialization further reinforces out-group hostility as it is often rewarded within the in-group (Watson, 1974). In this group emotions spread quickly, as if contagious. The ingroup membership brings with it a feeling of superiority and security. A common goal focuses all of this energy, hence the irrationality and often aggression of such groups (McDougall, 1920). Within this framework, the Holocaust is explained in terms of the Nazis acting as one massive psychological group and the irrationality that comes with this complete identification with the ingroup.

RCT extends the theory of the psychology of the masses. Both ingroup and outgroup interaction increases hostility, especially when both are perceived to compete for the same resources. However, it also increases ingroup cohesion and positive self-image (Brief et al., 2005). In the 1930s the economy in Germany was stagnant, yet most Jewish people appeared to be in jobs that allowed them to be rather well off. This could have led to hostility as both German and Jewish people seemed to be in direct competition for scarce resources. Both these theories can account for some of the behaviour observed in the German people during World War II.

Nazism still has many followers and many still believe in some of the claims made by Nazi propaganda. Recent headlines corroborate this as British Bishop Richard Williamson publicly denied the Holocaust (O'Keefe, 2009). This paper is not aiming to show what the German people could have known or what they did actually know; instead, the paper will focus on what can be empirically studied, namely the way the Nazi government effectively used propaganda to influence the masses. It can be argued that Nazi propaganda was successful since the government was able to follow its plans until 1945. It is also possible to derive, from the rhetoric used, the goals propaganda producers wanted to achieve. In light of the previously mentioned theories, this paper is going to look at the presentation of self and other in Nazi propaganda. In order to do this, this paper will look at speeches made by Joseph Goebbels and Adolf Hitler and analyze how they presented the ingroup (Aryans, Hitler) and the main outgroup

(Jewish people) using critical discourse analysis. First, this paper will look at how Aryans and Jewish people were described. Then the presentation of Hitler will be explored, focusing on his presentation as human and as demigod. Finally, this paper will look at the presentation of the Jewish people; focusing on their alleged omnipresence, their dehumanization and their identification through actions. Alternative interpretations will also be considered.

METHODOLOGY

Many researchers have identified discourse as a social practice that is both constructed by, and constructs, social phenomena (Carvalho, 2008). Van Dijk (1993) and Hammersley (2003) note that dominant discursive practice shapes socially shared knowledge such as attitudes and ideology. Within Psychology, discourse is investigated using a qualitative methodology (Cronick, 2002). One of these approaches is critical discourse analysis (CDA). CDA is a method used to tease out the rhetoric of dominant discourse (Holsti, 1969). CDA is especially useful in investigating the relationship between dominance and ideology, and how discourse can manipulate reality (Carvalho, 2008). It is often employed if the original speaker of the message is not available for further elaboration and when looking at political documents such as propaganda (Holsti, 1969). CDA focuses on structures, strategies and figures of speech used rather than just content (Holsti, 1969; Van Dijk, 1993).

Analysis will be conducted on documents coming from Hitler's (1925/1988) book *Mein Kampf*, Bytwerk's (2008) *Landmark Speeches of National Socialism* and the German Propaganda Archive (GPA). All the documents used for the analysis are in English. The speeches taken from Bytwerk's book and the GPA were translated by Professor Bytwerk himself. The translator of the English version of *Mein Kampf* used here is not named. *Mein Kampf* and the speeches collected by Bytwerk and the GPA constitute important documents that were produced with the intention of influencing the German people as well as other nations. Previous research has focused on post-1933 material (Billig, 1978). The GPA has a specific pre-1933 section, which enables this paper to include these speeches as well. Even though Nazism was not a considerable political force before 1933, attempts to persuade and attract were still made. This paper will refer to these documents using paragraph and line numbers and the author will be referred to by his initials. A list of the documents in chronological order can be found in the appendix. The first number following the initials will be the chronological number of the document, as taken from the list in the appendix. If the document is taken from a book, the number in brackets will be the page number. The paragraph number will be followed by a backslash and the line number.¹

CDA is subjective, as any interpretation will always be the author's interpretation. An obvious shortcoming of analyzing documents of deceased people is that the speaker cannot be prompted for clarification. However, an advantage of looking at historical documents is that the specific audience is known. Certain knowledge of the historical

1 For example, (AH-1 (25) 2/6) refers to text number 1 from the chronological list in the appendix (book), page number 25, paragraph 2, line 6. Similarly, (JG-4, 12/3) refers to text number 4 (online document), paragraph 12, line 3.

context of the documents enables the analyst to better understand the choice of words used. Hence, the findings will be put in their historical context. Also, translated documents could potentially bias the analysis, since the translation might change the meaning of words. To circumvent this to a certain extent, most documents used were translated by Professor Bytwerk, introducing some uniformity amongst them. However, no translator is named in the edition of *Mein Kampf* used. Another problem will be the generalization of the findings (Antaki, Billig, Edwards and Potter, 2002). These findings will be put in the historical context, but the historical context is obviously specific to that period of time and that area. On the other hand, some characteristics of Nazi propaganda have been noted in various conflicts since World War II (Power and Peterson, 2011, this edition); for example the war in Iraq (Rampton and Stauber, 2003). Even though elaborating on those is beyond the scope of this paper, this seems to point to a possible generalization of the findings. A certain bias from the analyst's side cannot be denied. The general aversion towards the atrocities that were committed is an obvious factor. However, since only one side is considered in the analysis this bias should not affect it notably, but it is embedded in the interpretation.

This paper will explore the presentation of self and other in Nazi propaganda. Due to the abundance of speeches, only speeches made by Hitler and Goebbels are included in the analysis. The presentation of other is restricted to the Jewish population, since they were the main focus of the propaganda. Previous research into Nazi propaganda has shown that one of the main features of the presentation of self was that Hitler was presented as omniscient and that the Aryans were synonymous with good (Fest, 1973). Another important aspect was the dehumanization of the Jewish people, which implied how to treat them (Kershaw, 1980). The documents chosen will thus be coded for two core ideas: presentation of self (Aryans, Hitler) and presentation of other (Jewish population). Since, in political discourse, words often have a particular meaning in a particular context, the unit of coding will be text fragments (Billig, 1978).

ANALYSIS

Distinction Between “Self” and “Other”

On a general level, the distinction between self and other appeared to be equal to the distinction between good and evil: Aryans were made synonymous with everything good and the Jewish people with everything bad. A considerable focus of propaganda was on strengthening the ingroup, which is essential, as group identification is believed to be the incentive to genocidal behaviour (Stanton, 1998). The dichotomy is binary; a person belongs to either the ingroup or outgroup.

Describing “self”: the Aryan

According to Hitler, it is God’s will for the Aryan to rule over all other beings, since:

“He [the Aryan] is the Prometheus of mankind, from whose shining brow the divine spark of genius has at all times flashed forth, always kindling anew that fire which, in the form of knowledge, illuminated the dark night by drawing aside the veil of mystery and thus

showing man how to rise and become master over all the other beings on earth.” (AH-2 (262) 3/10)

The phrase “illuminated the dark night by drawing aside the veil of mystery” also seems to associate the Aryan with industrialization and its positive consequences such as industrial growth and prosperity. Using the metaphor of the “Prometheus of mankind”, Hitler clearly illustrated his opinion of the place Aryans occupied: They were the link between God and the rest of humankind. Goebbels underlines this further: “These people are noble, brave, generous, willing, and full of devotion under the care of a strong hand, and it may rightly believe that it is spotless and pure, and that it has the blessing of God” (JG-4, 12/3) When saying “full of devotion”, Goebbels alludes to devotion to the ingroup. Devotion and loyalty were praised as the highest Aryan virtues. This could be used to enhance the ingroup bond (O’Keefe, 2002). The superiority of the ingroup is a source of power and authority for its members and a big part of its attraction (Adorno, 1973). This superiority in turn leads to jealousy amongst the other people as:

“They hate our people because it [our people] is decent, brave, industrious, hardworking and intelligent. They hate our views, our social policies, and our accomplishments. They hate us as a Reich and as a community. They have forced us into a struggle for life and death. We will defend ourselves accordingly.” (JG-8, 35/17)

Pointing out the superiority of the Aryan race and the jealousy it arouses in others served two functions. It was a means of distinguishing between the ingroup and the outgroup and strengthening the unity of the Aryans through stressing common characteristics and providing the common goal: to defend the ingroup (Billig, 1978). It further set up a frame for upcoming action: since they “forced” Germany into a struggle, Germany had to “defend” itself. The use of “accomplishments” is important. Many Germans believed that World War I was only lost because Germany was stabbed in the back by traitors on the inside (Fest, 1973). Speaking of Germany’s “accomplishments” restored pride. The fact that the Jewish people were said to “hate” the deserved German “accomplishments” was re-opening an old wound and restoring feelings of frustration and anger, which were then associated with the Jewish population.

Describing “other”: the Jewish people

Associating the Jewish people with negative events was a core feature of Nazi propaganda (Schreiber, 1984). From the beginning, the Jewish people were associated with Germany’s loss of World War I (see, for example, Kershaw, 1980). The Aryan people, on the contrary, were associated with beauty and good: “Everything beautiful that we see around us is the result of the Aryan of his spirit and industry. [sic] Only the bad is the gift of the Hebrews.” (AH-1 (25) 2/6) “Hebrews” is a term often used in the Bible and, for Christians, has the negative connotation of the murder of Jesus Christ. Jewish people were described using words that have negative connotations and Aryans were described in opposite terms.

The Jewish people were characterized as completely different to the Aryans. The reason that was given for people not noticing this difference before was that the main Jewish qualities were mimicry and deception: "Today they are simply practicing mimicry, the art of appearance and disguise, an art at which the Jews are extraordinarily good, since they have always had to use it to maintain their precarious existence." (JG-12, 4/9) Focus on the mimicry of the Jewish population was necessary because it was impossible to distinguish between Jewish and non-Jewish people, later leading to the introduction of the yellow star (a yellow star-shaped patch Jewish people had to wear to identify them as Jewish) (Bytwerk, 2004). Perceived differences between the ingroup and outgroup were magnified to create and justify the distinction between self and other (Watson, 1974). Mimicry is a concept from biology that describes an insect's ability to copy another organism. This also hints at the dehumanization of the Jewish people, which will be expanded upon later. This quote also notes mimicry as strength of the Jewish people or "an art at which the Jews are extraordinarily good", but at the same time mentions the Jewish people's "precarious existence" which is obviously a weakness, therefore identifying them as a beatable foe for the German people. Other apparent Jewish strengths sometimes mentioned included their "cunning" and "being manipulative". It is noteworthy that Jewish people were only granted abilities with negative connotations that could potentially be used to exploit the German people, especially since the latter were described as "generous" and "decent". The overall distinction of self as absolutely good and other as absolutely bad seems somewhat blurred; however, the distinction was still clear in as much as the two sides had opposing abilities which identified them as adversaries.

Hitler admits to a similarity between the Nazi government and the Jewish people saying: ". . . his [the Jew] first care was to preserve the racial integrity of his own people" (AH-2 (286) 3/2). Here the characteristics of self and other seem to overlap, but Nazi propaganda always branded Jewish blood as inferior. On the other hand, Aryan blood was seen as pure and strong. The distinction is again enhanced through this paradox, which shows the opposing "qualities" on both sides. However, this paradox was not identified as such, but was instead taken as a justification for the Nazi's own racial policy. After all, if the people who are disadvantaged through the racial policies acknowledge the importance of a pure race, then it cannot just be propaganda. Messages are often perceived as more persuasive if the source does not seem to speak out of self-interest (O'Keefe, 2002). Burgoon and Miller's (1985, cited in Giles and Robinson, 1990) language expectancy theory provides a possible explanation for this. It states that people have certain expectations about the linguistic properties of language and the speaker's behaviour. In this case, Hitler violated the expectations through behaving in an unexpected way by admitting to the paradox. Burgoon and Miller's theory would suggest that this could have enhanced his credibility and perceived sincerity.

Nazi propaganda tried hard to make all the Jewish people homogeneous. Hitler stated: "If the Jews were the only people in the world they would be wallowing in filth and mire and would exploit one another and try to exterminate one another in a bitter struggle." (AH-2 (273) 5/1) Again, "exterminate" is usually used when speaking of killing insects not humans and this whole quote describes the Jewish population in animalistic terms.

This could be a further justification for the treatment the Jewish people endured, since they would, allegedly, kill one another and so did not deserve any better. This fits in with the just world belief that people get what they deserve (Kirkpatrick, 1999).

Alternatively, the distinction between the Jewish people and the Aryan could be seen as a way to categorize people into two distinct groups: Jewish and Aryan. Describing and praising the Aryan could then be seen as a way to encourage the German population to see themselves as part of the Aryan group. Social identity theory (SIT) posits that when people assume a shared group identity, they also take on shared attitudes towards the outgroup and want their group identity to be positive compared to the outgroup's identity (Hogg and Vaughan, 2008). This new group identity also sets the gauge for future behaviour, as people conform to their new self-identification as a group member (Hogg and Vaughan, 2008). This could result in hostility as the two groups are pushed apart, since the German people wanted to distinguish themselves from the Jewish people, who were described as inferior, to maintain their positive group identification.

Presentation of “Self”: Adolf Hitler

Goebbels and Hitler tried hard to make Hitler appear human as well as almost godlike. The Hitler image was also created by the economic situation in Germany at that time. Germany still had not recovered from World War I; the economy and the morale were in decline. People wanted someone to lift Germany out of its desperation and found that hope in Hitler. They projected all their expectations and desires onto him and his first successes seemed to prove them right (Fest, 1973).

Adolf Hitler's presentation as human

Hitler was presented as very knowledgeable: “He [Hitler], is, one might say, a specialist in every area, but the wonderful thing is that while most specialists never go beyond their knowledge, his knowledge is the raw material for understanding and action” (JG-7 (83) 4). Hitler is not just knowledgeable, he can also use that knowledge in “action”; he is a man of action and work. This focus on action could be used to circumvent the aversion people had to politicians and it also kept Hitler in line with the working class (Adorno, 1973).

Goebbels points to the unity of the German population supporting Hitler saying: “May he remain what he is to us and always was: Our Hitler!” (JG-9, 17/2) He was “their” Hitler, he was part of the people, a man who cared deeply about them and who worried a lot about important decisions (Bytwerk, 2008). Hitler’s human side was important for the propaganda, otherwise his followers would not have been able to identify with him. It was also important for the feeling of superiority within the ingroup. If Hitler was not human, the German people would merely have been inferior followers, entirely led by him. Hitler’s human side shows that the weak could become strong, if they adhered to the movement (Adorno, 1973). Goebbels further stated: “We Germans do all agree on one thing, though: There is nothing that can separate us from the love, obedience and confidence we have in and for the Führer” (JG-9, 4/9). The first part of the sentence clearly unites the German people. Using the word “though” Goebbels showed that no

matter what other differences there were between them they all agreed on their love for Hitler. The use of “we” and “us” implies that Goebbels spoke on behalf of all the German people. This way it appeared that the whole people made this statement, which again created pressure to conform and not speak up (McDougall, 1920). This pressure was mostly passed on through socialization. New members learned what they were allowed to verbalize by the reactions they got from older members. The feelings of superiority and security provided by the ingroup membership were shared through contagion and mass suggestion (McDougall, 1920). Considering that ingroup membership came with many advantages and non-members were left-out and disadvantaged, a strong need to conform was created. This forced conformity leads to discomfort, which is then avoided through changing the negative attitudes and beliefs (Giles and Robinson, 1990; Kershaw, 1980).

Adolf Hitler's presentation as demigod

Goebbels also presented Hitler as a demigod: “I believe it is time to portray to the entire nation the man Hitler, with all the magic of his personality, all the mysterious genius and irresistible power of his personality.” (JG-5, 1/10) First of all, this quote again circumvented the aversion many people had towards politicians by avoiding mentioning leadership skills (Adorno, 1973). By focusing on such indistinct abilities as “magic”, “mysterious genius” and “power” of personality, Goebbels left everything open to the audience’s imagination and so satisfied the diversity of people in it. Together the ambiguity of his personality and of the political aims ensures that Hitler could be whoever each individual wanted him to be (Adorno, 1973).

Hitler was also presented as the messenger between God and the people: “That [Hitler speech] was religion in the deepest and most mysterious sense. A nation affirmed God through its advocate, and put its fate and its life confidently in his hands” (JG-6, 17). An advocate is someone who speaks on behalf of another person, especially in a situation where the latter might not have enough skill to present his or her case. Hitler spoke on behalf of the German people, because only he had the ability to speak to God. He represented what the German people wanted and defended their rights. Hitler also commonly talked of himself as a prophet (Herf, 2006). Furthermore, Goebbels seemed to imply here that the Nazi party itself was “religion in the deepest and most mysterious sense”.

Goebbels often used a religious discourse to describe Hitler: “He will show the peoples that way, but we look to him full of hope and with a deep, unshakable faith” (JG-16, 23/3). In relation to this the notion of “Führer”, German for “leader”, is interesting. It implied that he would lead people and that they should follow, without doubt. As Goebbels put it, people only needed to have faith in him and not think too much. However, Hitler and Goebbels also claimed that Hitler did have a rational reason to be the “Führer” since he had all the necessary qualities. Adorno (1973) shows the paradox this creates: The “Führer” wants irrational loyalty based on faith, but then claims a rational reason for being the “Führer”. The concept of “Führer” also appeals to the idea, described by Adorno (1973), that the fact that something exists is taken as proof that it is good and viable and so justifies its very existence. The fact that someone has become

the “Führer” is enough proof that he is capable and competent enough to lead the people. On the other hand, describing Hitler and the party in religious terms could again have been used to attract people of like mind that adored him. In line with SIT, people could have included this in their shared group identity and come together at public events for the purpose of celebrating or even worshipping Hitler.

Literature on the use of religious speech in propaganda is scarce, so this paper can only give possible reasons for its use in Nazi propaganda. Kershaw (1980) posits that one reason for the pseudo-religious proportions of the Hitler image was the fact that the admiration for him compensated for the decreasing belief in actual Christianity, which took place at the time. Kirkpatrick (1999) notes a certain predisposition to belief in the supernatural in order to make sense of the world. Furthermore, the Germans that died during the failed coup by Hitler in 1923, as well as the imprisoned Hitler were seen as martyrs afterwards and treated accordingly (Kershaw, 1980). According to Labeling Theory, a label distorts perception and creates the attributes related to the label itself. Thus, once labeled, this bias explains all behaviour as consistent with the label (Kidder and Stewart, 1975). After a while Hitler internalized the religious feelings projected onto him, especially after having his first political successes, which in turn could have influenced the presentation of self. Propaganda then incorporated this idea. Other reasons why Goebbels and Hitler might have wanted to make Hitler appear as a demigod, or Nazism as a pseudo-religion, include the fact that religions have a few common characteristics that cross cultures, which the Nazi government could have wanted from the German population. First of all, a god is the highest power (Kirkpatrick, 1999). It does not need to justify its actions and its actions cannot be wrong, since it is infallible. Bytwerk (2008) also points out that people turn to religion for guidance and answers. It seems that Goebbels wanted the Germans to turn to Nazism for absolute truths. Kirkpatrick (1999) also notes that laws seem to carry extra weight if sanctioned by a divine being. The Nazi government could have wanted to transfer all these characteristics onto Hitler (Yourman, 1939). Secondly, God rewards certain behaviours and punishes others, which is closely related to the just world belief that people get what they deserve (Hunsberger and Jackson, 2005; Kirkpatrick, 1999). This view would encourage people to see the treatment the Jewish people received as the treatment they deserved. Finally, a religion favours social cohesion and in-group membership by encouraging its members to put the group's interest over their personal interests (Argyle and Beit-Hallahmi, 1975; Hunsberger and Jackson, 2005).

Interestingly, some religions even promote prejudices. Research has suggested a strong relationship between Christian beliefs and anti-Semitism, which cannot be accounted for by other factors (Hunsberger and Jackson, 2005). In Christianity, which was the main religion in Germany at that time, Jewish people were always seen as the people that killed the Son of God. This might have made it easier for the Nazi government to use the Jewish population as scapegoats and dehumanize them. Kirkpatrick (1999) also notes that the “do good to others” dogma possessed by most religions, only counts for the ingroup. The outgroup is often dehumanized and harming or killing its members is not punished. Lastly, the belief that one's religion is the right one, the absolute truth, increases the superiority felt by its adherents and hence the ingroup membership feeling (Hunsberger and Jackson, 2005).

Presentation of “Other”: the Jewish People

The supposed omnipresence of the Jewish people together with their dehumanization and identification through their alleged actions all worked to create suspicion and fear towards the Jewish population, thus serving as reason and justification from the perspective of the Nazi's for the treatment they received. As some research has shown, providing reasons can make a difference even if they are not very good ones. In one study participants had to break into a queue at a photocopy machine. Sixty percent who did not give a reason were successful, compared to ninety-four percent with a good reason and ninety-three percent with a poor reason. Having any reason for behaviour seems to be enough (Langer, Blank and Chanowitz, 1978, cited in Bytwerk, 2004). Adorno (1973) also noted that, during priming studies, when prejudiced participants are presented with a list of alleged negative characteristics of Jewish people, they tend to agree with them all. The fact that an authority figure made the list seems to make it legitimate and scientific. The fact that the authority in Germany made claims about the omnipresence, dehumanization and the identification through actions, may have made these accusations legitimate in the eyes of the German people.

Omnipresence of the Jewish people

The fact that the Nazi government presumably knew about the omnipresence of the Jewish people and their shady undertakings increased the superiority of the ingroup, since they had knowledge others were unable to have or understand (Adorno, 1973). Goebbels stated “Wherever you look, you see Jews.” (JG-15, 7/18) This implied that anyone could have been Jewish. It left people alert and seemed to condone denunciations. Goebbels expanded this further, saying:

“When one further considers the alienation of German intellectual life by International Jewry, its corruption of German justice that finally led to the fact that only one out of every five judges was German, the takeover of the medical profession, their predominance among university professors, in short, the fact that nearly all intellectual professions were dominated by the Jews, one has to grant that no people with any self-esteem could tolerate that for long.” (JG-3, 17/2)

Mentioning the justice system and the medical system plays with the reality that people feel a certain helplessness and suspicion towards some processes and professions that they do not fully understand; for example, the justice and the medical system or reasons for wars (Adorno, 1973). The use of “alienation” right before “German” associated the Jewish people with something “alien” to the German people. Speaking of an “International Jewry” also implied a world-wide conspiracy and made the Jewish people a powerful enemy. Yet Goebbels stated: “It may seem surprising that such a small minority possesses such great power and is such a deadly danger. But it is so” (JG-13, 3/8). This quote admits to the paradox of a “small minority” having “such great power” to the point of being omnipresent. Again, the paradox is not identified as such, but used as a further justification. The fact that Goebbels did not even give an explanation for why “it is so” could be taken as showing great certainty, which paired with a highly

credible speaker, could further enhance the persuasive effect of the message (Giles and Robinson, 1990). In a similar manner, both Hitler and Goebbels often claimed that the reasons for something were so clear that they did not need any clarification or further justification. This also displayed great certainty and may have confused the audience as to whether they might just have missed or misunderstood the supposed previous clarifications. The omnipresence strategy could also have been started by the German people, much like the religious discourse used to describe Hitler. Anti-Semitism was already present before the Nazi party came to power, so the German people might have readily accepted the Jewish people as scapegoats (Kershaw, 1980).

Dehumanization of the Jewish people

Dehumanization is another way to distinguish between ingroups and outgroups (Volkan, 2007). Adorno (1973) points out that dehumanization is often due to the lack of real evidence for the accusations and also a direct consequence of the perceived inferiority of the audience by the speaker. If the audience is perceived not to understand argumentation anyway, then it is better to just use images that appeal to the irrational and emotional.

Goebbels used a medical discourse to describe the Jewish people: "The Jews are a parasitic race that feeds like a foul fungus on the cultures of healthy but ignorant peoples. There is only one effective measure: cut them out" (JG-10, 9/4). Jewish people were described as "parasitic" and a "fungus", like a disease. People should not care about them, nor should they feel guilt for killing them (Adorno, 1973; Volkan, 2007). This strategy was also used in recent conflicts, for example in Iraq (Rampton and Stauber, 2003). The images used to describe the Jewish people also implied the solutions: a fungus has to be "cut out" (Watson, 1974). This medical discourse had various implications. First of all, it was used to put the German people into a state of exigency, since it was under attack by an apparent biological threat (Savage, 2007). This pushed them to take immediate action in which there is no time for rational argumentation. Secondly, dehumanizing the Jewish population and talking about them as a disease stressed their homogeneity and their otherness from the German people (Savage, 2007). Since they were identified as a threat, it was clear that they needed to be dealt with and the scientific medical discourse gave the necessary scientific proof that it was acceptable to kill them (Savage, 2007).

The medical discourse is not the only way propaganda can dehumanise the Jewish people. Another approach of achieving this is by using a religious discourse: "Jewry once again reveals itself as the incarnation of evil, as the plastic demon of decay, and as the bearer of international culture-destroying chaos" (JG-11 (121) 2/7). Goebbels and Hitler often referred to "the Jew" or "Jewry" rather than any specific people. In relation to Nazism being looked at as a pseudo-religion, the Jewish people became their monstrous, satanic counterpart: the incarnation or personification of evil and Satan (Bytwerk, 2004). Both Hitler and Goebbels, also often referred to the Bible, stating that the Jewish people had killed before and so would certainly do "once again", since it was in their nature and blood, again in reference to the death of Jesus.

Identification through actions

This section will look at how Nazi propaganda identified and distinguished the Jewish people as other by referring to their alleged past, present or future actions. This was not only used to scare the German population, but also to justify the treatment the Jewish people received (Adorno, 1973). As Herf (2006) explains, in order to justify their actions the Nazi government had to make a causal link between the Jewish population's actions and the Nazi's responses: "The Jews are our destruction. They started this war and direct it. They want to destroy the German Reich and our people. This plan must be blocked" (JG-10, 15). The fact that all the verb forms in this quote are in the present, seemed to point to an imminent danger and Goebbels attempted to force the German people to a hurried decision in his favour (Adorno, 1973). It is notable that the negative event is mentioned first, immediately followed by the action self needs to take, as a logical conclusion (Leudar, Marsland and Nekvapil, 2004). The fact that "destroying" rather than killing was used even in relation to the people implies that it was not just people that were being killed, but in fact the essence of being German was being destroyed. Hitler expanded this saying:

"In the course of a few years he endeavours to exterminate all those who represent the national intelligence. And by thus depriving the people of their natural intellectual leaders he fits them for their fate as slaves under a lasting despotism." (AH-2 (297) 2/4.

Since the Jewish people want to "exterminate", it is justified for the Nazis to use "the most total and radical measures" (JG-12 (121) 3/9). It is also noteworthy that Nazi propaganda used the same terms to speak for both sides: the Jewish people are said to want to "exterminate" and the Nazis in return "exterminate" them (Bytwerk, 2005). Herf (2006) also points out how this seemingly causal link between action and reaction, puts the obvious threat by Goebbels in a normal, logical and rational discourse rather than a one of war and injustice.

This strategy also strongly uses fear appeals. Describing atrocities arouses fear in the audience. At the same time, stating the measures taken to avoid these atrocities reduces the discomfort and is so reinforced (O'Keefe, 2002). Various factors influence the efficacy of fear appeals. First of all, too much fear paralyses rather than leads to attitude change (Giles and Robinson, 1990). To circumvent this, Nazi propaganda focused on Germany's strength. As Cronick (2002) points out, self is both victim and attacker at the same time. It is the victim because it is only defending itself, but also the attacker, as it has to protect the people. Secondly, having some evidence for the fear appeal enhances its effectiveness (Giles and Robinson, 1990). Evidence was provided by the Nazi propaganda, which explained everything in terms of a Jewish world conspiracy. The fear appeal again put the audience in an "every man for himself" state of mind in which nothing mattered except saving the ingroup (Adorno, 1973).

Projection: Accusing "other" of what "self" wants to do

Nazi propaganda tended to accuse the Jewish population of what the Nazis wanted to do to them, a defense mechanism that Freud termed projection (Adorno, 1973). It seems paradoxical at first that, after trying so hard to distinguish between the in- and

out-group, the ingroup projects their cognitive schemas onto the outgroup (Adorno, 1973) as can be seen here:

"They despise our culture and learning, which they perceive as towering over their nomadic world-view. They fear our economic and social standards, which leave no room for their parasitic drives. They are the enemy of our domestic order, which has excluded their anarchistic tendencies." (JG-15, 5/5)

This and the previous quote show examples of projection. The Jewish people are shown to want to "exterminate" people and "fit them for their fate as slaves". In reality, the Nazi government wanted to exterminate the Jewish population while the Slavic people were seen as an inferior and hence slave race to the Aryans (Hitler, 1925/1988).

Projection refers to seeing traits of self in other and has recently been found to defend self-esteem (Baumeister, Dale and Sommer, 2002). It has been suggested that people attempt to not think about undesirable traits, which tends to make them more easily accessible and so they are accidentally ascribed to others (Baumeister et al, 2002). A recent account of projection is provided by Maner et al. (2005) who showed that, in evolutionary terms, it is useful for people to assume emotions in others that are linked to their own emotions. Maner et al. (2005) have shown that people in a fearful state of mind perceived anger in faces of minority groups.

This section suggests that projection is merely a failed attempt at perspective taking between the ingroup and outgroup. Research has shown that without shared context successful perspective taking is low (Sillars, Koerner and Fitzpatrick, 2005). In the case of Nazi Germany, the government tried hard to prevent German people from having contact with Jewish people, through moving the Jewish people into ghettos (Herf, 2006). Gillespie (2006), in his study on tourists in Ladakh, has shown that when tourists have no shared context and cannot readily rely on stereotypes, they end up ascribing their own views to the Ladakhi. Unable to rely on stereotypes and not knowing those whose perspectives are taken, people tend to anchor their own perspective and then adjust it gradually until they deem it appropriate enough (Epley, Morewedge and Keysar, 2004). However, at the same time, the government's propaganda reinforced Jewish stereotypes using the media. The involvement of stereotypes in perspective taking has been implied by Galinsky, Ku and Wang (2008). Subjects taking a cheerleader's perspective performed worse on an analytical test and rated themselves more beautiful, hence incorporating the negative and positive stereotypes of cheerleaders (Galinsky et al, 2008). Projection, it could be argued, is a blend of both phenomena. Not having a shared context with the Jewish population and only having stereotypes of the Jewish population as a homogeneous group, the German people used both. For example, Goebbels incorporated the stereotype of the Jewish desire to subjugate and ascribed his own wish to exterminate them to the Jewish population when he said that the Jewish people want to "exterminate" people and fit "them for their fate as slaves". Trying to take the Jewish people's perspective the Nazi government, and maybe also the German population, projected their own views onto them. Projection has a similar effect to the previously mentioned strategies: it justifies the actions taken against the Jewish people.

Again, SIT can also account for these strategies. Goebbels seems to play with the fact that the ingroup wants a positive group identity in comparison to the outgroup, by claiming that the Jewish people have taken over “nearly all intellectual professions” (Hogg and Vaughan, 2008). A positive group identity can now only be achieved at the expense of the Jewish people, since they seem to be better off than most German people. At the same time, dehumanizing them and identifying them through their alleged actions increases the need of the ingroup to distinguish themselves from the Jewish people in order to protect their positive group identity, and further increases hostility. Considering anti-Semitism already existed in Germany before the Nazi party took power, all the aforementioned strategies might again have been used to group like-minded anti-Semites in the German population together. Expanding upon this insight, emergent-norm theory posits that in a group some people become leaders and, through their behaviour, set the rules for the whole group (Hogg and Vaughan, 2008). According to this, Nazi propaganda grouped together prejudiced people. The older and prominent Nazi party members then became seen as leaders and their behaviours as the norm for the whole group. If they considered the treatment the Jewish people received as acceptable, then it was also acceptable for the rest of the group and became part of the shared group identity (Hogg and Vaughan, 2008).

DISCUSSION

The way Hitler and Goebbels chose to present the Aryans versus the Jewish people provided the Germans with all they needed to have an enhanced ingroup feeling: a degree of homogeneity, a common mental object (Jewish people) and a common way of feeling towards it (McDougall, 1920; Schreiber, 1984). Hitler was presented as a highly competent person. Through giving the “simple” people an apparent view behind the scenes and providing them with knowledge, the Nazi party made people feel less helpless in relation to the economic crisis and uncertain future (Adorno, 1973). The presentation of Hitler was partially created by propaganda and partially by the German people themselves, who projected their belief in the supernatural onto Hitler and the party. Presenting Hitler as a demigod could have been another way to put him above justifications and to make him appear infallible. Religion is also a deeply emotional experience, so this might be another attempt to reduce the audience to a barbaric, instinctive state in which they are very suggestible (Adorno, 1973; Argyle and Beit-Hallahmi, 1975). Presenting Hitler as a demigod had another convenient effect: it explained why he knew things no one else knew, for example the existence of the Jewish world conspiracy (Herf, 2006).

The presentation of other was complementary to the presentation of self apart from small paradoxes used to increase the speaker's credibility. The omnipresence strategy is very likely to end up being a self-fulfilling prophecy, as a label can distort perception, and all input is then perceived as consistent with that label (Kidder and Stewart, 1975). Suddenly everything is seen as proof of the Jewish world conspiracy (Herf, 2006). Dehumanization was used to provide a pseudoscientific reason for the treatment of the Jewish population and to legitimize it (Savage, 2007). Identifying the Jewish people through their alleged actions aroused fear in the German population and justified the

treatment they received. Projection seems an unconscious result of trying to "see" into the outgroup's mind. It probably has a similar motivation as omnipresence and dehumanization: by projecting their own plans onto the Jewish people, the Nazi government immediately provided a solution and the justification for their actions.

The findings of this paper are in line with the psychology of the masses theory, RCT and previous research on Nazi propaganda. Nazi propaganda mainly aimed to strengthen the ingroup cohesion and the feeling of superiority of the ingroup. This kind of ingroup experience is often accompanied by a sense of decreased individuality and increased anonymity (Billig, 1978). The group is now highly susceptible to emotional appeals, as emotions spread easily throughout the group (McDougall, 1920). A skilled orator such as Hitler can now use this to appeal to the emotions of the people rather than their rational thinking and so converting them to an unreasonable state of mind (Adorno, 1973). Furthermore, increased ingroup cohesion mobilizes people if they believe that the ingroup is threatened. It would go too far to conclude that all of the German population was part of the psychological crowd, but the pressure to conform was enormous. The images used by Nazi propaganda encouraged an irrational, emotional response rather than rational argumentation. The authority in Germany provided reasons and justifications for what happened, thus legitimizing it. In line with RCT, the economic situation in Germany in the 1930's was bleak and there was a perceived competition for economic and symbolic resources such as pride. Germany wanted to regain its prestige, but this had to happen at the loss of the Jewish population. The authoritarian personality cannot account for the complexity of Nazi propaganda. In fact, if the German people had been so eager to submit to an authority figure, there would not have been any need for propaganda. Therefore, this paper points to a mixed dispositional and situational approach. The situational influences such as perceived overestimation of the percentage of the Jewish population and the declining economy led the way for a society that needed someone on which to project its hopes. Therefore, in extension to the findings of previous research on the topic, this paper has shown how some of the strategies worked together and how some were merely mirroring the feelings of the German population. Hitler assumed different roles in relation to self and other: protector and advocate to the Aryans, enemy to the Jewish people. The different presentation of self and other enabled him to assume all these different roles. Alternative interpretations exist, but do not provide a full account of the strategies presented here. For example, SIT and emergent-norm theory can account for some of the strategies identified. Describing self and other distinguished and strengthened the in- and out-group, while the government's behaviour was conveniently explained as self-defense. The presentation of Hitler was partially based on the German population's expectations of him and partially used to demand obedience and create pressure to conform. The alleged omnipresence and dehumanization of the Jewish people, as well as their alleged activities were used to legitimize and justify the treatment they received.

This paper has investigated the presentation of self and other in Nazi propaganda in an attempt to add a more complete account to previous literature. A weakness of this paper is its restrictiveness. Other media channels, such as films or posters were not considered. Speakers other than Goebbels and Hitler were not considered either and

most documents came from the same source. Also, by looking at the topic in a broad manner, many findings could not be fully explored. For example, the similarity between strategies used by the Nazi government and governments in other more recent conflicts could only be noted but not elaborated upon (see, Power and Peterson, 2010, this edition for elaboration). Future research should focus on identifying and comparing these similarities, thus improving the generalization of this paper's findings.

REFERENCES

- Adorno, T. W. (1973). *Studien zum Autoritären Charakter*. Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Suhrkamp Taschenbuch Wissenschaft.
- Antaki, C., Billig, M., Edwards, D. and Potter, J. (2002). Discourse analysis means doing analysis: A critique of six analytic shortcomings. *Discourse Analysis Online*. Retrieved January 13, 2009, from <http://extra.shu.ac.uk/daol/articles/open/2002/002/antaki2002002-paper.html>
- Argyle, M. and Beit-Hallahmi, B. (Eds.). (1975). *The Social Psychology of Religion*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Baumeister, R. F., Dale, K. and Sommer, K. L. (2002). Freudian Defense Mechanisms and Empirical Findings in Modern Social Psychology: Reaction Formation, Projection, Displacement, Undoing, Isolation, Sublimation, and Denial [Abstract]. *Journal of Personality*, 66, 1081-124.
- Billig, M. (1978). *Fascists: A Social Psychological View of the National Front*. London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Brief, A. P., Umphress, E. E., Dietz, J., Burrows, J. W., Butz, R. M. and Scholten, L. (2005). Community Matters: Realistic Group Conflict Theory and the Impact of Diversity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48, 830-44.
- Bytwerk, R. L. (2004). *Bending Spines: The Propagandas of Nazi Germany and the German Democratic Republic*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.
- Bytwerk, R. L. (2005). The Argument for Genocide in Nazi Propaganda. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 91, 37-62.
- Bytwerk, R. L. (Ed.). (2008). *Landmark Speeches of National Socialism*. College Station: Texas A & M University Press.
- Carvalho, A. (2008). Media(Ted) Discourse and Society. *Journalism Studies*, 9, 161-77.
- Cronick, K. (2002). The Discourse of President George W. Bush and Osama bin Laden: A Rhetorical Analysis and Hermeneutic Interpretation. *Forum Qualitative Social Research*, 3. Retrieved January 22, 2009, from <http://www.qualitativeresearch.net/index.php/fqs/article/viewArticle/836/1816>
- Epley, N., Morewedge, C. K. and Keysar, B. (2004). Perspective Taking in Children and Adults: Equivalent Egocentrism but Differential Correction. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 40, 760-68.
- Fest, J.C. (1973). *Hitler*. Frankfurt/Main, Germany: Verlag Ullstein.
- Galinsky, A. D., Ku, G. and Wang, C. S. (2008). Perspective-Takers Behave More Stereotypically. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95, 404 -19.

- German Propaganda Archive. <http://www.calvin.edu/academic/cas/gpa/>
- Giles, H. and Robinson, W. P. (Eds.). (1990). *Handbook of Language And Social Psychology*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Gillespie, A. (2006). Tourist Photography and the Reverse Gaze. *Ethos*, 34, 343-66.
- Goebbels, J. (1933). The Racial Question and World Propaganda. *German Propaganda Archive* (n.d.).
- Goebbels, J. (1933) The New Year 1934. *German Propaganda Archive*. (December 31). Available at <http://www.calvin.edu/academic/cas/gpa/goeb23.htm>
- Goebbels, J. (1935). Our Hitler. *German Propaganda Archive*. (April 20). Available at <http://www.calvin.edu/academic/cas/gpa/unser35.htm>
- Goebbels, J. (1936). Our Hitler. *German Propaganda Archive*. (April 20). Available at <http://www.calvin.edu/academic/cas/gpa/unser36.htm>
- Goebbels, J. (1937). Our Hitler. (April 19). (pp. 80-85). In R. L., Bytwerk (Ed.). (2008). *Landmark Speeches of National Socialism*. College Station: Texas A & M University Press.
- Goebbels, J. (1939). The New Year 1939/40, *German Propaganda Archive*. (December 31). Available at <http://www.calvin.edu/academic/cas/gpa/goeb21.htm>
- Goebbels, J. (1940). Our Hitler. *German Propaganda Archive*. (April 20). Available at <http://www.calvin.edu/academic/cas/gpa/unser40.htm>
- Goebbels, J. (1941). The Jews are Guilty! *German Propaganda Archive*. (November 16). Available at <http://www.calvin.edu/academic/cas/gpa/goeb1.htm>
- Goebbels, J. (1943). Total War. (February 18). (pp. 114-139). In R. L., Bytwerk (Ed.). (2008). *Landmark Speeches of National Socialism*. College Station: Texas A & M University Press.
- Goebbels, J. (1943). The European Crisis. *German Propaganda Archive*. (February 28). Available at <http://www.calvin.edu/academic/cas/gpa/goeb72.htm>
- Goebbels, J. (1943). The War and the Jews. *German Propaganda Archive*. (May 9). Available at <http://www.calvin.edu/academic/cas/gpa/goeb37.htm>
- Goebbels, J. (1943). Goebbels on New Year's Eve. *German Propaganda Archive*. (December 31). Available at <http://www.calvin.edu/academic/cas/gpa/goeb63.htm>
- Goebbels, J. (1945). The Creators of the World's Misfortunes. *German Propaganda Archive*. (January 21). Available at <http://www.calvin.edu/academic/cas/gpa/goeb64.htm>
- Goebbels, J. (1945). Our Hitler. *German Propaganda Archive*. (April 20). Available at <http://www.calvin.edu/academic/cas/gpa/unser45.htm>
- Hammersley, M. (2003). Conversation Analysis and Discourse Analysis: Methods or Paradigms? *Discourse and Society*, 14, 751-81.
- Herf, J. (2006). *The Jewish Enemy*. London: Harvard University Press.
- Hitler, A. (1925). Reestablishing the National Socialist German Workers Party. (February 27). In R. L., Bytwerk. (Ed.). (2008). *Landmark Speeches of National Socialism*. College Station: Texas A & M University Press.
- Hitler, A. (1988). *Mein Kampf*. (Trans.). Mumbai, India: Jaico. (Original work published 1925).
- Hogg, M. A. and Vaughan, G. M. (2008). *Social Psychology* (5th ed.). Harlow: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Holsti, O. R. (1969). *Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities*. London:

- Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Hunsberger, B. and Jackson, L. M. (2005). Religion, Meaning and Prejudice. *Journal of Social Issues*, 61, 807-26.
- Kershaw, I. (1980). *Der Hitler-Mythos: Volksmeinungen und Propaganda im Dritten Reich*. Stuttgart, Germany: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt.
- Kidder, L. H. and Stewart, V. M. (1975). *The Psychology of Intergroup Relationships: Conflict and Consciousness*. London: McGraw-Hill.
- Kirkpatrick, L. A. (1999). Toward an Evolutionary Psychology of Religion and Personality. *Journal of Personality*, 67, 921-52.
- Leudar, I., Marsland, V. and Nekvapil, J. (2004). On Membership Categorization: "Us", "Them" and "Doing Violence" in Political Discourse. *Discourse and Society*, 15, 243-66.
- Maner, J. K., Kenrick, D. T., Becker, D. V., Robertson, T. E., Hofer, B., Neuberg, S. L., Delton, A. W.,
- Butner, J. and Schaller, M. (2005). Functional Projection: How Fundamental Social Motives Can Bias Interpersonal Perception. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 63-78.
- McDougall, W. (1920). *The Group Mind*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Meeus, W. H. J. and Raaijmakers, Q. A. W. (1995). Obedience in Modern Society: The Utrecht Studies. *Journal of Social Issues*, 51, 155-175.
- O'Keefe, D. J. (2002). *Persuasion: Theory and Research*. London, UK: Sage Publications.
- "Pope Didn't Know Bishop Denied Holocaust, Vatican says". (2009, February 4). The Canadian Press. Retrieved February 9, 2009, from <http://www.cbc.ca/world/story/2009/02/04/pope-williams.html>
- Potter, S. and Lloyd, J. (2005). With War in Mind: A Dialogical Analysis of the Mindset Underlying Blair's Case for War with Iraq in 2003. *Medicine, Conflict and Survival*, 21, 283-98.
- Power, S.A. and Peterson, L. (2011). Theorizing Propaganda: Extending Kohl (2011). *Psychology & Society*, Vol. 4 (1), 27-30.
- Rampton, S., and Stauber, J. (2003). *Weapons of Mass Deception: The Uses of Propaganda in Bush's War on Iraq*. London, UK: Robinson.
- Reicher, S. D. and Haslam, S. A. (2006). Rethinking the Psychology of Tyranny: The BBC Prison Study. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 45, 1-40.
- Savage, R. (2007). "Disease Incarnate": Biopolitical Discourse and Genocidal Dehumanisation in the Age of Modernity. *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 20, 404-40.
- Schreiber, G. (1984). *Hitler Interpretationen 1923-1983*. Darmstadt Germany: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Sillars, A., Koerner, A. and Fitzpatrick, M. A. (2005). Communication and Understanding in Parent-Adolescent Relationships. *Human Communication Research*, 31, 102-28.
- Stanton, G. H. (1998). The 8 Stages of Genocide. *Genocide Watch*. Retrieved February 10, 2009, from <http://www.genocidewatch.org/aboutgenocide/8stagesofgenocide.html>
- Van Dijk, T. (1993). Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Discourse Society*, 4, 249-83.
- Volkman, V. D. (2007). Ethnicity and Nationalism: A Psychoanalytic Perspective.

- [Abstract]. *Applied Psychology*, 47, 45-57.
- Watson, P. (Ed.). (1974). *Psychology and Race*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing.
- Welch, D. (2004). Nazi Propaganda and the Volksgemeinschaft: Constructing a People's Community. *Journal of Contemporary History*, 39, 213-38. Retrieved February 16, 2009, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3180722>
- Yourman, J. (1939). Propaganda Techniques Within Nazi Germany. *Journal of Educational Sociology*, 13, 148-63. Retrieved February 16, 2009, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2262307>

APPENDIX

I. Chronological list of speeches used:

1. Adolf Hitler "Reestablishing the National Socialist German Workers Party" (27 Feb. 1925)
2. Adolf Hitler "Mein Kampf" (1925)
3. Joseph Goebbels "The Racial Question and World Propaganda" (1933)
4. Joseph Goebbels "The New Year 1934" (31 Dec. 1933)
5. Joseph Goebbels "Our Hitler" (19 April 1935)
6. Joseph Goebbels "Our Hitler" (19 April 1936)
7. Joseph Goebbels "Our Hitler" (19 April 1937)
8. Joseph Goebbels "The New Year 1939/40" (31 Dec. 1939)
9. Joseph Goebbels "Our Hitler" (19 April 1940)
10. Joseph Goebbels "The Jews are Guilty!" (16 Nov. 1941)
11. Joseph Goebbels "Total War" (18 Feb. 1943)
12. Joseph Goebbels "The European Crisis" (28 Feb. 1943)
13. Joseph Goebbels "The War and the Jews" (9 May 1943)
14. Joseph Goebbels "Goebbels on New Year's Eve" (31 Dec. 1943)
15. Joseph Goebbels "The Creators of the World's Misfortunes" (21 Jan. 1945)
16. Joseph Goebbels "Our Hitler" (19 April 1945)

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHY

Diane Kohl is a graduate from the University of Stirling and currently taking a sabbatical due to internship commitments. She starts a Masters at LSE next year. Her main research interests are personality, perspective taking, persuasion and possible relations between them. Email: dkohl_2@hotmail.com