

Albert speer and the nazi party



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

'History is about winners' how accurate is this statement in the relation to the personality you have studied. Historians are divided on the extent to which Albert Speers contributed to Nazi Germany during World War 2 and prior to it as Hitler's architect. Speers was a winner as he became Reich minister of armaments and war production, becoming second in command (inside the Third Reich). His success extended further in numerous ways as he escaped with his life. However personalities are remembered as winners in history and Speers is now remembered as a deceitful Nazi who attempted to put his name down in history as a great historical figure.

Speers won the role of armaments minister as it was given to him, and he is known in history for his effective skills as he increased production by 300% with an increase of 30% labor hence increasing the war by 2 years. General Anderson states "if I knew what this man was achieving I would have sent the entire American eighth air force to put him underground". However this success was short lived as he was tried for the poor living standard of the laborers. Furthermore he was judged at Nuremberg for the reasons in improving the life style as he stated that he did it to improve the work yield and not for humanitarian reason.

In 1944 Speers openly opposed the scorched earth policy even though he was risking his life. In his memoirs he states that he did it for the sake of the German people to re-establish a country after the war, but historians such as Serene and Schmidt have judged the reliability of this information. Speers motive for opposing the policy could be seen as he was "second in command" and was likely to maintain a high position in the post-war

government ND to further be remembered in history as a great historical figure.

Schmidt believes that Speers was “ a narrow minded idealist, who offered his services to any superior force”. According to Schmidt he was giving his services to the superior allies in order to save his life. His reliance on the allies is reinforced as “ his confession of guilt at Nuremberg were calculating, opportunistic, a result of intelligence and planning rather than of morality or repentance” (Serene), she claims that Speers was deceptive and knew what he was doing at the trials, in order to further distance himself from the Nazi elite and the atrocities which were committed by Hitler.

Justice Jackson prosecuted Speers at the trials and instead of prosecuting him; he was actually appearing to emerge Speers as innocent, as his manipulation is shown over him. Speers was later deemed the good Nazi as his confession of guilt gave the Americans what they wanted from the trials. Speers states that “ history calls for such a trial” which he must accept the blame in order for the German people to have retribution, as a high Nazi official accepting blame for the atrocities was what the Americans wanted in these trials.

Speers and Hitler had a very strong relationship, as psychologist Montheistic states that it was ‘ homoerotic’ indicating that they were very close. If someone had such a close relationship with Hitler then they should have known about the atrocities committed against the Jewish people. However it is known for Hitler to sugar-coat words in order to protect those around him. Bullock further reinforces this idea by claiming that “ Speers

was a apolitical technocrat who detached himself from the decisions of the third Reich", which shows that Speers didn't involve himself in anything other than armaments.

Speers depiction however is clearly seen in the affidavit sent to the Jewish South African board concerning the holocaust. Speers accepted knowledge claiming that he attended a speech held by Hitler on the 30th of January in 1939. Hitler stated in the speech that " in the case of war the Germans would not be eliminated but the Jews would be annihilated from Europe", whereby Speers knew of his intention to deal with the Jews during a war. The refusal of knowledge about the final solution was questioned by historians as Speers held a speech in Posen earlier that day.

Hammier however mentioned his name twice and every high figure in Nazi Germany attended the meeting and later relaxed in the site. Speers agreed that he returned to Posen in the evening; however he claims in the interview held with Serene that he didn't speak to any of the ministers or Glitters. This is very contradictory to Speers personality as he was known as a man who enjoys socializing. Hammier even mentioned his name twice, and hence it is proclaimed by Van Deer Vat that someone must have told him that his name was mentioned twice about the final solution.

Schmidt argues that " Speers is a man of any abilities but little qualities" and that he was cold in the sense that he didn't care about anyone or show much emotion. He further argues that Speers was a propagandist who knew how to deal with people's emotions. This is clearly shown as he rejected his friend Rudolf Walters and distanced himself from his children. Speers claims that

he was “ thinking as a specialist and not as a human being”, ignoring the Jewish extermination in order to allow himself to “ exercise economic dictatorship over the whole of Europe’ Bradley Smith, as his aims were to politically motivate and intro a large empire.

Speers success was derived after he left Spanned “ coming out blinking in the public spot light, becoming a familiar face on television” Stein(2003) as he extended his power and reputation becoming a millionaire due to his memoir. However “ If the Judges at Numerous had known what we know now, Speers would have certainly been hanged” Lurch, (2002). Speers won his way out of the hangman’s noose, but lost his dignity and pride, as he would be remembered in history as a deceitful individual, definitely not a winner. Overall, Speers could be urged to be the most significant winner from the Numerous trials and during World War 2.

His success in gaining power did not end in prison, by expanding his empire after his 20 year sentence becoming a millionaire. His memoirs, however have been since deemed unreliable, “ the words of a propagandist” attempting to put his name down in history as a significant personality. His deceitfulness at the trials regarding his role of Reich minister resulted in him losing his dignity, and reputation after his death and hence put his name down in history as one of the most unreliable figure of the third Reich.