

## Judge Dennis Davis and Professor David Peimer | The Trial of Adolf Hitler Legalities and Propaganda, Part 2

- Hi, Dennis. Hi, David. Thank you. So I'm going to hand over to the two of you to continue "The Trial of Hitler Legalities and Propaganda: Part Two." Thanks so much.

- Before we start, I had a series of questions that came to me overnight, as always on these programmes, and many of them are really particularly important so I just wanted to briefly, for two minutes, touch on one of them, which essentially followed from the question that I was asked about them by Carly, about the judiciary which came after Weimar, the German, the Nazi period. And just to clarify on that, what basically happened was that everything really changed after 1933.

And after 1933, when Hitler came to power, effectively as most analysts of German legal history would tell you, it was a parallel process between, on the one hand, the police, and on the other hand, the established courts. Now the police powers were independent of judicial control and effectively allowed them to do almost anything they wanted in an unfettered fashion. And I mentioned last night how Ernst Rohm himself, as much of a thug as he was, landed up by literally being assassinated and that was called a form of German justice. But there was a system of judicial control right through.

Right through! But by 1933, it had changed radically. In 1933, all professional legal associations were merged into the National Socialist League of German Jurists, and you can imagine what their affiliation was. In April of '33, there was a complete purging of Jewish and Socialist judges and indeed lawyers, led by a very interesting character who perhaps we can talk about at some later stage called Carl Schmidt, who's played a really important role in all sorts of ways. Simple point I'm making is that in a way those of you who come from South Africa will identify with this.

That as we moved into the more egregious parts of apartheid, all of them were egregious, but I suppose the more authoritarian in the 1980s, you had the tension without trial, you had emergencies, and you had a whole range of power which was unfettered by the judiciary. And then on the other hand, you had the judiciary. Although the South African judiciary at that time was a somewhat more complex, nuanced institution than was the German, even during the Weimar. Would you please, please bear this in mind when we come back to this a little later. Otto Kirchheimer, the great Jewish German theorist, who wrote a book called, "Political Justice," who I quoted last night, I want to quote again.

That, "Courts succumb to politics, particularly most frequently in fragmented political contexts like Weimar." And I want to come back to that because I think for many countries around the world, that is a very pertinent observation in the contemporary era. But so much for answering the question. So let's pick up where we were last night. Where we were was you'd seen a clip of an actor performing one of the Hitler speeches, and what we want to show you now is a little text of actual Hitler's real speech. Let me just make one final legal point, if I may.

Some people also asked about this. The German system at the time to this day is an inquisitorial system. They don't behave in the way judges do in, say, the Anglo-American world where we sit relatively passively, although some of us not so passively, and we listen to examination of evidence and process, and then we make our assessment. Here the judges basically run the show and they ask questions and, effectively, they take a lot of the role away from the prosecutors and the defence counsel. And in the Hitler Trial, the thing that was particularly important with regard to this was given the conservative nature of the judge, of the presiding judge, Hitler got away with murder.

No wonder the case went on for 24 days, but there were numerous speeches of which one of them is a text we're about to show you, or at least a part of the text.

*Text is displayed.*

Now, I'm just going to read a couple of passages to you and then I'm going to want David to comment on this because it's not a legal document such, it has much more to say. But let me just start off. "It may seem strange that a man who, as a soldier, was for six years accustomed to blind obedience, should suddenly come into conflict with the State and its Constitution.

The reasons for this stem from the days of my youth." And this recalls a question that was asked to us earlier. "When I was 17, I came to Vienna and there I learned to study and observe three important problems. The social question, the race problem, and the Marxist movement. I left Vienna a confirmed anti-Semite, a deadly foe of the whole Marxist world outlook, and pan-German in my political principles." Just observe there the fact of the confirmed anti-Semite and deadly foe of the whole Marxist world outlook were in many ways inextricably linked because as truly as he had been in pains to tell us, and rightly so, the Marxist world outlook, philosophy was ultimately dominated by many Jewish thinkers.

So the idea of Hitler talking about it as a Marxist Jewish conspiracy, there it is early on. "And since I knew that the German destiny of German Austria would not be fought out in the Austrian Army alone, but in the German-Austrian Armies, I enlisted in the German Army. Then in November at 1918, it was announced the revolution had broken out in Munich. At first, I could not believe it. Luxembourg issue at that time, there arose in me the determination to devote myself to politics, et cetera, et cetera. I was a seventh member." Then just let me carry on. "I attached myself to this party and not to one of the great political parties where my prospects would've been even better because none of the other parties understood or even recognised decisive and fundamental problem.

For us, it was a filthy crime against the German people, a stab in the back of the German nation. The middle class could not take up arms against it because the middle class did not understand the whole revolution. It was necessary to start a new struggle and to incite against the Marxist despoilers of the people who did not even belong to the German race, which is where the

Marxist problem is linked with the race problem, forming one of the most difficult and profound questions of our time." And then comes '23. "And as early as '22, we'd seen that the rule was about to be lost. France's aim was not merely to weaken Germany to keep her from obtaining supremacy, to break her up into small states, that truly France would be able to hold the Rhine frontier."

And if I could just go to the last paragraph. "Only burning, ruthless, brutal fanaticism could have saved the situation. The Reich Government should have let the hundreds of thousands of young men who were pouring out of the Ruhr into the Reich under the old colours of black, white, and red, flow together in a mighty national wave. Instead, these young people were sent back home. The resistance that was organised for wages rather than honour.

A national resistance was degraded to a paid general strike." I just want to make a couple observations and then turn it over to David because this is a fascinating passage from a very long speech. But here you have, number one, Hitler basically says, "I joined, I enlisted in the German Army." And I might add, he then goes on, 'cause you can see the three dots, to talk about his service to the German Army. He comes in, as I say, into the courtroom with his medals showing that he's a war hero. So the one aspect that he's telling everybody, the entire world, is that he's a dedicated German soldier who was sold out by a whole bunch of these people who committed a filthy crime against the German people and stabbed them in the back.

And the second thing he does, which I found really fascinating, is he's already telling you that what his project is is to make Germany great again, which is the threats from France and others to make Germany and to weaken it and to make it just small, break up into small states, so that France would dominate it. And we need something different, a burning, ruthless, brutal fanaticism. And so you can see that out of this is being developed a project, a political project. The hero and the visionary all coming together. But David, I mean, you yourself had referred me quite rightly to the really interesting work which I dug out from my own library of Laurence Rees on the question of charisma. And in a way, the way he describes that, seems to me you could almost tease us out of some of what this text says. So I'd be interested in your comments on that.

- Okay, thanks so much, Dennis. And great to see everyone again. Thanks for being here. And also, if I can just mention that thanks for the emails as well, and in particular the one from Barbara. What Dennis was saying at the beginning about this idea of what we were talking about yesterday, how Hitler turns himself from this ordinary failed artist, failed architect, goes into the army, he's a corporal, et cetera. He's at the bottom of the ladder, of the social ladder. You know, this tiny little nondescript, decaying beer hall in Munich. And with six people, you know? And the whole thing starts, which we all know the effect later.

But it only takes just more than a decade. So what's interesting is to see, and Barbara was kind enough to send me the ideas of the narcissistic personality and the cult of the personality. Now that as a notion is not new for any of us. It goes way back to ancient times, to the ancient

pharaohs and kings all over the world, not just Europe. The kings, the chiefs, everywhere. The cult of the personality and the narcissism that is linked to it. And because what Laurence Rees also does in the book, fascinatingly, and which is the link to theatricality, is he links it to the notion of charisma. And I want to just look at that briefly with some things to do with the texture, the speech that Hitler gives, and the whole notion of the importance of charisma in the cult of the personality and the narcissistic leader who will become the dictator or whether it's in a whenever we use the word dictator or the king and so on, but total authoritarian power. And to jump quickly post-war, Albert Speer gets out of Spandau Prison.

His sentence, as I'm sure everyone knows, was 20 years. And afterwards he wrote the book, "Inside the Third Reich," became a huge bestseller, made a fortune of money in Germany and the world, and he went on a tour of it in America of campuses. And the students asked him at one university, "What do you think is the most important quality for a leader today? Not just in the States, but anywhere in the world?" And Speer said, "This is a brilliant question." And he paused for quite a long time, and he said, "Develop your charisma." This is Albert Speer in the late 1960s giving talks, not only in America, but in Europe and everywhere. And that's the one quality he focuses on for a great leader in the 20th century in giving a speech, in giving a talk in the late '60s. It happens to be in the States, could be anywhere.

And out of that, Laurence Rees builds this idea of, "What is charisma?" What is it for a leader anywhere in the world today to have charisma? And why is it so essential? Why was it in the past? Why is it now? And how is it linked to, as some of you were asking really helpfully yesterday, how to use technology? Of the internet and of YouTube, you know? Et cetera, et cetera. How do we choreograph? How do we act and perform the narcissism of charisma today? Which is different, but users, ancient techniques of theatre and acting, which go way back. And then Speer would identify that as the most important quality.

The other idea was Goebbels' whose phrase was, and it's in "Goebbels' Diaries," where he says, "The most important insight that Hitler ever had was that everybody craves a strong leader." Whatever that means in different cultures, at different times of history, Goebbels had the insight to see, it's interesting to me that that's what he saw as Hitler's best quality for him. Linking it to the speech here is we can, look how many times the word I. I, I, I. I went through. I came into contact. I attached myself. What I did. I was the seventh member. It's irrelevant who else was the member. I left Vienna. I decided it was a deadly foe.

I decided I was a confirmed anti-Semite. It's all I. There's a zero empathy for anybody who might be other. So kill empathy. And once one does that, one can be the narcissistic personality cult. One can achieve it because then one can be the opportunist, one can create the vision. It's all dreams, it's all nonsense, this. This is all lies, you know? But the other idea that Rees brings up is that you need something fermenting in the culture. And the heroic leader with the vision simply articulates it, gives it words. And that is what is so powerful in this speech given by a young 20-something Hitler in 1923. The speech, you know?

He's got the stab in the back, got betrayal, and it's a huge thing. It's the war. He's linking the enemy, the enemy of the state, the enemy of the German people. He's bringing race and nationalism in. It's against anything else, whether it's the religion of Jews or whether it's Marxism, whatever. He's also bringing in his position. He was number seven. Everyone else in the party is irrelevant. I attached myself to the middle class, even didn't understand. They're not even German. Okay? He's also prepared to be outrageous. He's prepared to be audacious, which is necessary for the hero, the ex-victim to become hero and martyr. Audacity.

The profound questions of our time. He can pontificate and give wisdom together with his vision. In 1923 came the great and bitter scandal. I mean we can read it with melodrama at the moment, but we've got to see the passion of a young 20-something year old giving this in a Munich court and realising this is the stage and literally, not metaphorically, literally the stage for national and international fame, and from there he can only rise. And to see this, we see that. We saw that picture of him standing in the cells with the bars. He's gone from the lowly corporal to that as early as '22. And then finally, the burning. He reveals his true self.

Bocklef Hubbel used to say, when I was fortunate enough to work with the guy, a remarkable guy, "Characters reveal themselves on stage." And it's a brilliant insight. They're not only tested through conflict and through situation, but how do they reveal their true self? And towards the later part of the speech, Hitler reveals that burning, ruthless, brutal fanaticism could have saved the situation and only I could be the saviour. Which is the last quality of the charismatic hero, that, "I am your saviour."

The Reich Government could have let thousand, da, da, da, da, da, and he sums up the entire war and the flag, et cetera, for him. So all of this together gives not only a theatrical, but using political trial for theatrical and entertainment and for self-grandiose, self-expression of all these qualities of the narcissistic cult or personality hero to come. And at what feeds the vision. Okay, thanks. Back to you.

- Can I just make one point, David, about that before? I know you want to show how Hitler could manipulate audiences by another clip, but Rees makes an interesting point, just following on what you're saying. He talks about that combination between heroism and charisma, and then he makes a point that you've just made I want to emphasise. Where he says that, "You can't just have a mission. That's not good enough. You've got to have an overarching vision, which you've got to articulate in which you say, 'I know the world and I know how to change the world.'" And that's why we're going to come to it, why "Mein Kampf" becomes so important in this regard, because here's the rudiments of it, but it all develops out. I wanted to say, I'm not sure that's only true of right wing politicians.

- [David] Oh, no.

- I'm not suggesting that left-wing or progressive politicians should say, "I know the world." But what they've got to be able to do is to have a vision of saying, "This is our line of march. This is

where we want to take the society." I mean, if you take somebody on the entire opposite side, I would want to argue in terms of quality to either Trump or Biden, I think this is surely uncontroversial. Have a look at FDR, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, of whom I've said often, and I said that when we were talking with Adam Goodman, that when he died and somebody was crying and the person, the journalist, said, "Do you know Roosevelt?"

And he said, "No, but he knows me. He knew me." The idea of the leader who can actually show a vision. Now Hitler was able to do that in a quite remarkable fashion and in a way, I think the speech shows you the beginnings, the commencement of precisely the way in which he orchestrated this. And we'll see a little bit more of this when he moves into Landsberg Prison and starts compiling "Mein Kampf." But I think we should. I was fascinated by that clip that you dug up, David, because it shows a different side to him, which just shows what an actor he really was.

- Thank you. And if I can just add, just before we show the next clip, just to add a couple of things from the trial, which we can see comes out, or is actually shown through the speech as well. The sense of blaming, which we spoke about. And also I think it's so important that he says, as the hero, the ex-victim turned hero and martyr, he says he's guilty.

- Yeah, he does that. Yeah.

- Erich Ludendorff, he's the great well-known General. Ludendorff, as Dennis was saying yesterday, Ludendorff and Hindenburg were two of the great Generals of the German Army in the First World War, well-known internationally, who's appearing there, who can barely mumble a few things. But Hitler chooses to say, "I'm guilty." Now he knows it could lead to a death sentence, but he also knows with audacity, he's got to take a leap. And that's part of the archetype. And I agree totally with you, Dennis. Whether it's right wing or left wing is irrelevant. This is the psychology of the personality cult and the charismatic hero and visionary leader, whether it's left or right.

- One thing I just wanted to say, David, you just prompted me. I'm sorry, I'm going. You give a bottle in English senile. Is Rees makes a really interesting point as well, that it's not that, for example, people like Hitler tell people that which they don't know.

- Yeah.

- He tells them things where they listen to that and they say, "There was nothing with which I disagreed. I agreed with him entirely." In other words, he's able, as it were, to quarry out of the speech those thoughts that people are thinking and aren't able to articulate as eloquently as he does. And Rees gives an example of the relationship, the initial relationship, between Hermann Goring and Hitler. Hermann Goring was a very significant war hero.

He wasn't a little Corporal in the First World War, and he was an aristocratic personality. And he

meets Hitler and you'd think, "Well, why would he be attracted to Hitler when he's so much more prestigious?" And he says, "I listened to him and everything he said I agreed with." It was immediate to Goring that Hitler was articulating that which Goring thought, but couldn't in fact fashion in the same way. I found that very interesting insight from Laurence Rees' book.

- Yeah, and just to add to that. If we consider the notion of perhaps at times civilization is form and we lift the thin veneer of the form, and you find a leader arises who articulates the feelings underneath the form and the thin veneer of civilization and all the emotions, appeal to the emotions, not facts, all the emotions of what's happening in the society, and in this case of hate of the Jews, of anti-Semitism, the Marxism, the hate of the Marxists, the stab in the back, the blame, the enemy of the State, everything in the speech, and is required as a ruthless rejection of all, follow me as a saviour, lift the veneer of civilization's form and the charismatic leader gives the vision, which is actually articulating everything bubbling under the surface. And that's the intelligent quickness of the mind that can do that and then stay visionary. In a totally different context, in a totally different way, as you mentioned FDR, Churchill does the same.

- Yeah, he does.

- A totally different way. He has the ability to understand, unlike Halifax, what is lingering in the minds of most people in the society and articulate it, lift the veneer or form in civilization and feel it, know it, and find the words. And a totally different context, totally different way. Churchill, all these others, which is why they loom so large in the historical imagination for all of us.

- Yeah. Okay, thank you. You want to show the clip?

- [David] Yeah.

- Okay.

- Okay.

*Video clip plays.*

- We know that in his relationship with Ava Braun, as in so many other areas of his life, Hitler resorted to drugs. He was injected with testosterone, cocaine eyedrops, everything.

- [Narrator] As his health worsened, Hitler's leg was shaking uncontrollably. His personal physician, Dr. Theodor Morell, noted in his diary it was probably stress related. The treatment was an injection believed to contain methamphetamine.

- He was on a cocktail of something like 74 drugs, and so this clearly clouds the mind. It'll keep you up, it'll keep you going, but it really robs you of a great deal of perspective. He's an addicted leader.

- So the long lie-in, the late breakfast, the medical treatments, the injections, the pills. Before lunch. And then he will walk down to the tea house, eat cake, and he gets driven back uphill because he never likes to physically exert himself. Supper, another vegetarian meal, and then it's a very strong expectation that everyone gathers around the fire and he starts talking. And he talks and talks and talks about art, about race, music, vegetarianism, history.

- He spent hours talking to people. They'll have to sit there and listen to it. And we have many memoir accounts where people say, "My God, I was ready to shoot myself. I thought he would never stop."

- [Narrator] The extent of Hitler's self-delusion was captured on a secret audio tape.

- [Narrator] Made without his knowledge by a sound engineer, it's the only known recording of him speaking in private and off the record.

- [Narrator] Hitler can be heard explaining to Finnish Marshall, Carl Gustaf Mannerheim, why the assault on Russia wasn't going to plan.

- Hitler admits he was not properly prepared. He underestimated Russia, but he can't admit he's wrong. So the way for him to kind of justify or rationalise his mistake, he says, "I would've done it anyway."

- When Hitler says, "The Russians had 35,000 tanks."

- It's clearly an exaggeration.

- [Narrator] In truth, at maximum strength, the Soviet Army only had around 23,000 tanks. Even in trusted private company, Hitler was manipulating the facts.

- These are baldfaced lies. He states them with such confidence that people in the background are going, "Yes, 35,000. Yes, 35,000."

- What he does then is he has the audacity to say, "Nonetheless, we knocked out 34,000 of those 35,000 tanks."

- When in fact, that's fantasy. He's in a fantasy world.

*Video clip ends.*

- Okay, thank you so much Shawna, for showing that. And just to pick up on that, you know, as we see in the clip, it's the only time Hitler has ever been recorded in a private way, speaking just ordinarily and privately. Besides the relative banality of the absolute ordinariness of all this, what



it's actually talking about is huge. But what I find fascinating is the lies and the combination between when he knows it's fantasy and when he knows it's lie and truth. And as they say, the ability to speak with the confidence even in this way, which is just with a couple of people, the Finnish leaders, couple of Generals and so on. You know, not necessarily in front of thousands and thousands of fanatical Nazis. But the ability to speak with confidence about everything that's just lies. If the world does not fit me, I will force it to see itself the way I want it to see it.

Lies and lie and lie again. Goebbels said, "The most important thing with propaganda is the greater than lie, and the more often you repeat it, at least 2/3 of the population will start to believe you." It's an amazing insight in "Goebbels' Diaries." And with contemporary technology, it just explodes globally everywhere in the world, a sense, to relate it to one of the questions from yesterday. It has an echo chamber today. And what's fascinating here for me, it shows quite a banal, fairly rational, but this link between delusional self-quality of the narcissist, and the ability to fantasise, the ability to convince, and proceed with sheer confidence in tone, attitude and thought, himself and others. But when that line gets blurred, maybe through the drugs he's taking, all the other stuff, we don't know, that's when I think the real danger starts to kick in. The ancient Greek idea of hubris, of arrogant pride, when too much of that self-belief kicks in, the delusional becomes the ordinary normal for the person.

We see it in characters on the stage from Richard the Third to Macbeth with all his doubts, and many others, even King Lear. And the lesson they have to learn, of course, is to come off their high horse, literally, in Richard the Third's case. But this guy doesn't. And what we're trying to show is how the propaganda, the charisma, fantasy, reality, all of these come together when there's zero empathy. All of these come together in how to appeal as the visionary and present oneself in a performance of charisma, which is necessary for any leader, I think today. Left, right, centre, doesn't matter. Business, whatever the field, you know? I think it's a fascinating insight of our times and so-called reality TV tries to use so much of it. And I'm not just talking about in America, but you know, South Africa, globally, how reality TV really works, you know? Because those people are trying to perform with charisma and they're taught that before they go into "Big Brother's" room and all the rest of it. Okay, over to you, Dennis.

- So yeah. So thanks David and I wanted to shift gears slightly because we now get to the end of 24 days of the trial, and one could analyse so much of that great deal of detail. But we get to the end of the trial and we come to the summing up, and this fits in very much with David's point and I think what we've been pushing. Is the way in which Hitler not only commands the stage, commands the court, but does more than that. By the end of it, he almost compelled, you know? Almost? He does compel the prosecutor to make a series of what are really quite astounding comments, which therefore means that there's not much of a surprise when you get to sentence. Let me share with you just two things that the prosecutor says.

This is the prosecutor! I mean, frankly, in my many years on the bench, I've never heard a prosecutor say this sort of thing about the accused. "Arising from humble origins, Hitler proved his German cost of mind as a brave soldier in the Great War." He's not talking about sentence

here, by the way, this is before guilt. "He was filled with a genuine blazing enthusiasm for a great German Fatherland." Well, look at the effect of the speech we showed you on the prosecutor. "After the war, with painstaking work, he created from the smallest beginnings a great party! A great party, the National Socialist Workers Party." And then he says, realising what he said, Stenglein, who was hardly an impressive prosecutor, "I have no judgement to render on his party's politics." This is after he called it great. And then he concludes, he says, "As a human being, we cannot withhold our respect from Hitler."

Yet as grave as his crime is, so great too is his guilt." So, you know, the confusion, as it were, of a prosecutor acknowledging the charisma of the man, the role of the man, the heroic status of the man, all of which he's saying before saying, "Well, treason's a serious business." I assure you that if we discuss the Rivonia Trial, you will not hear Percy Yutar say a word of that kind about truly great people like Nelson Mandela and Walter Sisulu. But here it is and it's not a surprise, therefore, that, and as David said, Hitler of course pleads guilty because he takes all of the responsibility on his own shoulders. So whilst Ludendorff is acquitted on all charges, and five of the other defendants, including two who I spent some time talking about last night, Ernst Rohm and Frick, are guilty of a technical charge of aiding and abetting and actually never spent any time in prison. Hitler is convicted of treason.

And observe this. Article 81 of the then German Penal Code required lifelong imprisonment in a penitentiary or fortress prison. The Munich Court invoked extenuating circumstances. It permitted the sentencing of between 5 to 15 years. The minimum was five. They gave Hitler five, which meant he'd be eligible for parole after only six months. And of course, you know, then Neithardt gives a whole lot of reasons for this. I'll just make one point. He says, "I'll tell you why we are only giving him five of which he can be out after six months. Why? Because he acted in purely patriotic spirit with the noblest unselfish of motives." Well, that exactly parodied what the prosecutor had said. And so Hitler goes to Landsberg Prison and he spends, as it were, no more than six months there.

Before we get onto "Mein Kampf," I wanted to just say when he goes to prison, and this again echoes something that David observed yesterday, when he's looking through the prison bars and you realise you're dealing no longer with this strange little travelling salesman, which is what the "Chicago Tribune" called him at the beginning, but a really formidable character. It is interesting that Hitler was receiving upwards of five visitors a day, from all over Germany, throughout the six months. And I'll merely quote you one person, Elsa Brookman, she was a Romanian princess and it was her husband who published the work of Houston Stewart Chamberlain, of whom we've encountered through Trudy's lectures.

And Brookman was a real kind of socialite in Munich, and she had a thing called Salon Brookman, which was supposed to be some right-wing intellectual circle. And she writes about the first time she goes to see Hitler and boy, does this support what David's just said. "Finally, someone came and got me. I was led through a number of long corridors and approached Hitler, who was dressed in Bavarian lederhosen and a yellow linen jacket. He looked simple and

chivalrous and his eyes were bright. The moment of our encounter was so important for me because I perceived the same simple greatness, the same mature and genuine nature, and flowing from the roots in the person who stood across from me as I had previously experienced at a distance in the great Fuhrer, an orator within the total spectacle of mass events, including in the courtroom.

I brought him best regards from a great man who was still alive then and who had foreseen the Fuhrer's destiny, Houston Stewart Chamberlain, who was also our friend." And that really, in a way, personifies exactly what David is talking about. How he had managed, as it were, to carve this out. I want, because we've got a little bit of time left, just to tee up and then I wanted to ask David to talk a little bit about how he saw it. But it does appear that in July, 1924, these were the first indications that the public got that Hitler was writing a book. And he himself told Siegfried Wagner, of course relative of Wagner, that he was writing to comprehensively settle accounts with those gentlemen who enthusiastically cried, "Hoorah," when he'd been sentenced to imprisonment.

And what is particularly interesting about this is apparently he seemed to have typed the manuscript himself. It appears that Hess's role was to discuss it with him, but that it was essentially almost all Hitler's own writing, obviously burnished by the conversations he had with Hess. And what is interesting is that there was a veritable library to which he had access. And let me just tell you a few of the books that clearly he was able to access, and then we can talk a little bit about the role of "Mein Kampf." He said he clearly had some of the works of Houston Stewart Chamberlain. He also had Hans Gunther's "Racial Ethnology of the German People." He had the racist pamphlet by American car maker Henry Ford, "The International Jew: The World's Foremost Problem." And he then said, "I told an American reporter," who'd come to see him, I regard Ford as one of my great inspirations."

He also apparently used American Eugenicist, Madison Grant's "The Passing of the Great Race." And he also had access to Arthur de Gobineau's teachings on "The Inequality of Human Races." It is extraordinary that there he was in prison with this veritable library, which he was accessing to weld together what was not a unique biological racial theory, not at all, but was one which ultimately was the core of his interpretation of history, and it emerges. It emerges. And just one aspect of it. He says this. In late July, when asked by one of his visitors at Landsberg whether his attitude towards the Jews had changed subsequently his time of imprisonment.

He said, "Yes indeed! I've realised that I was far too mild. In the course of working on my book, I've come to see that in future we'll have to employ the most severe means if we are to triumph. I'm convinced that this is a question of survival, not just for our people but for all peoples. The Jew is a global plague." That's what he said and that was percolated through the book. So David, the interesting thing, he himself admits it, that he would never have written the book had he not had those six months to reflect, have the access to the library of the prison, and then sit there and discuss this with Hess. And to go back to Rees.

Rees's argument is the "Mein Kampf" was a crucial part of this entire progress of Hitler because now you did have that vision which was published. And apparently Hitler's very proud of the book. He used to give away a lot of copies and became very rich as a result of the publication royalties from the book. But it seems to me that that book is the quintessential form of propaganda which piloted him into the kind of leadership role. But I'd be interested in your comment.

- Yeah, Dennis, great. And also, you know, what you were saying about such the importance of the book with the saviour, the hero, the ex-victim, you know? In that clip, the film clip, we see him in the prison first, in the cell, and then going into the courtroom, et cetera. From that to the man at the bars who writes this book, of course he's dictating to Hess who's sleeping in Landsberg Prison, by the way, in the room next to him.

- Yes. Yes, he is.

- And he dictates it and Hess is typing it all up. You know, he's the useful idiot.

- Well, Ullrich actually says that Hitler typed it all, but it doesn't matter.

- No.

- [Dennis] There's some cooperation between the two of them. Yeah.

- Exactly. So he's already got his secretary. In other words, he's planning and organising what is necessary to serve him as the visionary leader and saviour and hero now of the German people. And is starting to either through self-delusion or cynical belief, believe that he is that. To perform it, he has to show it, you know? Compared to the private moments of his life. But even there he has to keep up the lies and the illusions. Just one or two things before we come to the book. At the end of the trial, Hitler actually concluded his final speech and claimed that he said, "Even if he is found guilty, the eternal court of history would acquit him." He's now positioning himself finally as the saviour.

- [Dennis] Yeah.

- Of the German race, of the German people, the eternal court of history. I mean, to align yourself with that kind of perception, with no ironic self-awareness or humour, is an extraordinary leap of fantastical proportions for any narcissistic personality even. And as Dennis was saying, the attitude towards the Jews hardens, becomes more extreme. It's all there. The attitude towards the Marxists or anybody who is going to oppose the ruthless necessity of what will come. In the writing of the book, he realises that the great saviour needs to have something written, whether it's whatever. It could be articles, chapter, you know?

But a book of some kind. And starting to see himself in this position, he also said that the Jews,

that he would rid the world of what the Jews had bequeathed, which was morality and conscience. And it's such an important phrase, written early on. And that all put together, you start to see how this, on the one hand, insane, on the other hand, sensing what's already in German and European, I would argue myself, history of nationalism and anti-Semitism, which has been bubbling for centuries, and how to articulate it in his own times, how to give it words.

And in the book finally, which the book, by the end of the war, it had sold over 20 million copies. It had been translated into 18 languages internationally. And this is way before, you know, many of contemporary approaches to publishing. And as Dennis said, he had made a fortune of money through this whole thing. One or two other quick ideas is that how much he held Ford and General Motors to such high esteem. And Speer, as I'm sure everybody knows, had modelled when he became Minister of Armaments, he'd modelled so many of the factories approach on the assembly line of, you know, Ford.

But interestingly, that Ford and General Motors had companies, had plants in Germany before the war and during the war. And then afterwards, claimed money back as compensation from the American Government for bombing the Ford and General Motors plants, and they got \$30 million each. It's just an interesting little twist to the whole thing. But Hitler is in touch internationally now with what is happening with Ford and many others, and obviously in England and elsewhere. He's not only in touch with Germany, but globally, how to voice a certain vision and be the saviour, and through the workings of the book. I guess what I wanted to say was that Hitler also realises in these these six to eight months in Landsberg Prison to change tact politically. So not only is he developing the personality, but his political savviness in a way. I hate to use that word with this guy, but I feel we have to.

And he's not going to go along the violent path anymore and try and foment a violent revolution of the streets, classic style, he's going to go with democracy and use it. He's going to go with the vote and that's his huge difference with Rohm, as Dennis was saying, 'cause these are the great friends at the beginning. Rohm is in charge of the storm troopers and Hitler and he, et cetera, in the beginning set up really the whole party and the ethos. He's going to go with democracy and the vote and getting to power, and then establish a total authoritarian dictatorship. Huge split in the party with Rohm and others, which I'm sure Truly will deal with far better than I will, you know, in terms of this. But he realises all this. So his political thinking is evolving, as well as the charisma, as well as the cult of personality. He's putting it all together and it's all shown in "Mein Kampf." In the beginning, it has a much longer title, which is ridiculous.

- [Dennis] Yeah.

- And the publisher says, "Just change it to, 'Mein Kampf,' 'My Struggle.' Full stop." And I think this is part. And that phrase resonates everywhere. The little guy struggling against all the big institutions and isms of society. Come and join me, you know? Et cetera. Follow me. And the idea of the Fuhrer begins to develop here properly in his mind. So the great irony of being in prison is it gives him time, as he said, to think, to write, to read, and formulate and articulate the

vision and the approach to achieving that vision in prison. Irony of the irony. What would've happened if not only the art academy in Vienna had taken him in, what would've happened if there had never been a trial in 1923? What would have happened if he'd been sentenced to prison much longer or hung or whatever? Or anything. The ironic use all the time of these events to his own personal benefit.

- And I might say he himself recognised that.

- [David] Yeah.

- Because in 1942, this is what he said. "Without Landsberg, there would've been no 'Mein Kampf.'" He said, "It was only there that I achieved conceptual clarity about things which I'd largely intuited beforehand. It'd been very stupid of the government to imprison me. They would've been better off letting me speak and speak again and never found my peace of mind." So it's fascinating to me that he says that. And just, you know, I hate to quote "Mein Kampf," but to give you some sense of just this point about how, you know, the Jews had become centre of everything, of this incredible pathological hatred.

You know, he confirms the fact that the Jew is a global plague, and he writes in "Mein Kampf," "If at the beginning and over the course of the First World War, we had subjected 12 to 15,000 of these Hebraic corruptors of the people to the same poison gas that hundreds of thousands of our best productive Germans had to endure in the field, then the sacrifice of millions of lives at the front would not have been in vain." And you know, what troubles me about this is we sort of come to the end of this two-part series, subject of course to what David has to say, here's my last couple of thoughts. It is remarkable, and it's always been remarkable to me, that both at the trial and at "Mein Kampf," Hitler did not disguise his intentions.

He told the world exactly what he was going to do, and, by God, he did it. And the point about it is that it really is incredibly troubling that this sort of notion of history where somebody could do this and everybody poo-poops him, and the rest of the world said, "It's never going to happen again," really needs to be a lesson that we have to learn throughout history. Because this is perhaps the- No perhaps! This was the quintessential example of a complete homicidal maniac with all of the shrewd, clever, cunning leadership qualities of which David has spoken. And look what he did, having told without disguising anything.

And then just finally from my side, of course David's right, you know? What if? What if? What if the bullets had hit him rather than somebody else during the uprising? What if, in 1939, he hadn't left on the train? What if they had imprisoned him? But what is absolutely clear is that the German judiciary of the 1920s, of what Neustadt was in fact a good example, were very much complicit in the erosion of any constitutional project which the Weimar Republic had intended to develop in Germany post the First World War. And that too is a, what if? But that's a what if that we should all bear in mind. Constitutionalism and constitutional democracy is fragile. The guardrails can be destroyed in a nanosecond. And if you don't have judges who are desperately

committed to protecting those guardrails, which is exactly what the German judges didn't do, and which is why I keep on quoting Kirchheimer, is, you know, can the judiciary in a fragmented society like Weimar do it? That's the question we need to ask as our world becomes more fragmented. We need to ask ourselves to what extent do we, as citizens of our societies do we in a sense promote a discourse which promotes that constitutional democracy, which in turn means the dignity of everyone in that society and safeguarding the rights thereof?

That's a serious question that for me, having done all this research for these two lectures on the trial, that's what comes out for me. Because I think, you know, you do these things and they're horrific. And as I started my part of the lecture yesterday by quoting Volker Ullrich, who basically said, "I needed a bath after I had written about this reptilian character for so long." I feel the same. But I've got to ask myself, as I'm sure David does as well, as we've both been pressing, "What does it tell us about now? What does it tell us about our own condition? And what does it tell us about lessons that we have to learn if we preserve a constitutionally democratic society?" Not just for ourselves, but for our children and our grandchildren. David, over to you.

- Dennis, thank you so much. And I would echo every word you've said. And just to add to that, what I think we've tried to do in the lecture and yesterday and today in these series, which has been a revisiting and reimagining of many thoughts for which Dennis has wonderfully articulated, and what I would just add is parallel to the notion of the fragility of constitutionalism and the law, parallel to that is when we lift the form or the veneer of norms of civilization, or forms, whatever is bubbling underneath at any culture at any time, certainly the example of Germany here we see, can be grabbed by a group, by a leader, Hitler, who can articulate, who can achieve charisma, who can achieve the lack of empathy, who can achieve the sufficient dose of narcissism, who can achieve the ability of political intelligence.

And to articulate the things that are, as Dennis mentioned, as Rohm said and Goring, "He articulated what I was feeling." And that is an uncanny ability, and one has to be very aware of individuals who can do that and how they can then use all these qualities with great charisma to not necessarily persuade, but merely by articulating it, gain an extraordinary following who will believe anything, like they did with Hitler, ridiculously insane things, the Jews are this, the Socialists are that, whatever, et cetera, that Hitler is doing. They will believe it and follow it blindly to the end, including their own death, as of course the Germans themselves did in the war. So together parallel with fragility of constitutionalism, I would say there's a fragility of the stuff that bubbles underneath the fragile form that helps keep relative civilised morays and values that the Constitution is designed to protect.

And in that, I would just want to add one final thought to echo it, to add onto what Dennis was saying about now. I just, I'm haunted in a way by this whole thing and it's been haunting to go back into it. But there's one thought of Mark Twain's that keeps coming back. "History doesn't repeat itself, but it often rhymes." So I just want to thank Dennis and Wendy and Carly and Shawna, everybody, Judy, and everybody listening to Dennis and myself. Much appreciated.

- And we're happy to take questions.

Q&A and Comments:

Q: Thank you both very much. So I think this one could be answered by either of you. But how important is it for charismatic leaders to be seen to martyr themselves for their causes, such as in this case going to prison?

A: Well, I think from my perspective, I would say that if it happens, they'll seize it as an opportunity. And because the irony always of prison is martyrdom and how that can be used later at a certain point. And I think that Hitler realised it pretty early on, and that's why we purposely showed that clip. I mean, that's a film clip obviously with actors, but he realises the second he walks in of how I can turn this from the martyr, the victim, into the heroic leader and saviour. It doesn't have to involve prison. In the ancient Greek times, ancient Greek theatre, it was often banishment and exile. But it's the same effect psychologically, and in a society, I think.

- Well, it depends I would say. Because I mean, if they put him away for 15 years, which they could have under Article 81, he would've only come out in 1940, you know? And one wonders what kind of Germany there would've been. We probably wouldn't have had a war, et cetera. The fact that he was there for six months was unbelievably convenient for him. It was. I mean, he was right. It was a gift that he got from the government. He became a hero, he used the six months. I mean, if we take a contemporary example as some of us have, where Mandela was put away for 20 odd years, that's a totally different story because, you know, many of us my age never, ever thought we'd live in a Democratic South Africa, you know?

And when you wait for that length of time, Lord alone knows what's going to happen. The fact that he was able to come out of prison the way he did, I mean, speaks more volumes that could ever be written about him, about his own greatness. But that's a different matter. I suspect he would've probably been a great man irrespective of if he'd gone to prison. In fact, to be perfectly frank, I think South Africa would've been a far better society. In fact, think would've obviously been a far better society if democratic processes had taken place 30 years earlier and he had been the President.

Q: So to touch on that, how important is the environment that a charismatic leader finds themselves in? You know, did Germany have to be ready for a Hitler figure?

A: I think, just to come in here if I can. A very interesting idea is that after he came out of prison and changed his opinion to instead of to go to foment revolutionary violence on the streets, to go for the democratic option of votes and being elected, is that in the late 1920s, the Nazi Party only got about 3% of the vote. After the Great Depression of 1929, that's when they were catapulted and to become, to get massive amounts of the votes and seats in the Reichstag. So the event of the Great Depression and what happened with unemployed in Germany of the times, and the ability particularly in the Nazis to seize on it and use it, without that event, I'm not



sure if the Nazis or Hitler would've achieved anything really. Without the great division.

- That's a good point. Laurence Rees says about that, that, "You know, people said Hitler was like a hypnotist." Well, in 1929 they only got 2.4% of the vote. So 97%, 97-odd percent of the German electorate rejected him. But the point that I think was being made, by Rees and both of us, is that the charismatic personality has to be one which is able somehow to articulate that which is being thought by sufficient people. And clearly after the crash and the collapse of the Weimar Republic, Hitler was in fact articulating that which ultimately was thought by people, and people would've said, "That's right!" I mean, Rees makes the point, and it's true about this lecture, in fact all the lectures I give, you know? I know they're going to be people who think I talk complete rubbish. "What a terrible lecturer he is."

But there will be other people who say, "Oh, you know." Partly because they say, "Everything he said, I agreed with. What a wonderful lecture!" And by the way, I'm sure every Rabbi says that about his own congregants. And the point being, if you can kind of articulate that which people really think is the world as it is, then you're home and dry. And if you've got the ability to put it all together, and Hitler did. So it's true, you know? As Rees says, you know? People were interviewed about the speeches of Hitler and some said, "They were the most extraordinary speeches. They changed my life." And other people said, "What a complete lunatic!" But the truth is, there were too many of them who said, "It changed my life." And in sense, it's context that matters always.

Q: So one of the things often discussed around Hitler was his ability to appeal across the age range. You know, the Hitler Youth was a big feature of his power, shall we say. What do you ascribe his ability to really appeal, you know, across the age range in this way?

A: Well, I think I've answered that in part, Carly. I think for my part, I think he was able, as Germany got into more and more trouble, he was able to articulate a vision of a world. And in which he said, "I understand this world." Everybody said, "Yes, that's the world. You know, he's now made it clear to me why we're in the trouble we are. He has basically said what I've been thinking for a long time, and he says it better than I do. And, in fact, my goodness, thank God we've got somebody who's actually articulating that which I've thought." And the reality was that increasingly that was the case.

Otherwise, how do you explain, and you can read many of the books about Hitler, that right up till towards the end, I mean, literally late '44, there was still a significant support for Hitler and the German population? I mean, you know? They're bombing the German cities to smithereens and people still believe in him. I mean, it's the most extraordinary thing. I'm not going to say more, but I mean, it is amazing to me that even in moments of complete catastrophe, chaos or negligence, people still say, "Well, he knows what he's doing." Somewhere along the line, he was able to do that because he was able to speak across boundaries to the way in which people felt that their conditions could be explained.

- And to add to that, is the charismatic savior/leader in terms of the cross-generational appeal, from the very title of the book, "Mein Kampf," "My Struggle."

- [Dennis] Yeah.

- You can speak to the times of losing the war, the Germans, the massive millions and millions of unemployed, the middle class, nothing, the working class, nothing. Even the industrial class, anxious. What's going to happen? The weakness of the Weimar and the judge, the example of the judge in this trial, which is why I think it's so important historically, this trial, is you get a sense of the judiciary in the whole country or a much broader sense. So the ability to tap into, "This is my struggle from ordinary nothingness and the war, from everything, I can articulate why what happened happened, and I can articulate how we can get out of it.

And it's a struggle. And you know it as kids 'cause your parents struggled, or your grandparents. Your father may have died in the war, or may be maimed and injured. Your mother may be a widow, et cetera. Your grandmothers, your own family. So kids, I speak to you not only to the 20, 30, 40-somethings and the elderly as well. We all share the experience." The classic trope of the charismatic saviour. "This is what we all share. I'll show you the way out through a struggle."

Q: So you commented, I think, David, earlier on, about the kind of the difference between fantasy and truth and had he kind of entered his own narrative? Or do you think these were just propaganda tools?

A: I think that's a fantastic question. I think that's an extraordinary quality in human nature, the ability to move from fantasy and reality and how to blur the boundaries between the two. I think... I think with Hitler, we're just speculating here, but I would speculate that he, because I also see him as the cunning opportunist, you know? Dennis used the word cunning earlier and I agree entirely. The cunning and ability to manipulate all these things, which are conscious. We see him in ordinary talk doing it. In ordinary little talk, doing it, and we see him on the big stage doing it. I think that he was aware, certainly in the beginning, but I also think that he had passionate belief of the hatred of the Jews, the hatred of the Socialist, the hatred of, you know, all these other areas.

But where his cunning and political intelligence, if you like, and manipulation comes in is that he dumps National Socialist Party. He dumps the socialism. He keeps the nationalism. He ensures that Krupp and the other industrialists come on board. He's pragmatic in the end. He's not only an ideologue, he ensures he's got the money from the industrialist class and ensures that he can establish that. He's willing to get rid of Rohm and the storm troopers, his friend, because they're proving too rowdy and too difficult and they want to become the new army, they want to lead the new German Army, Rohm and the storm troopers.

But they can never be disciplined, he realises, so he has to get rid of them, kill Rohm, which he does, and bring in the SS and bring in the traditional army. He's got to get the Generals on his

side, the industrialists, the leaders of captains of industry on his side as well. There's a pragmatic cunning together with this insane hatred of certain peoples.

- Can I just make one point about that? I don't know the inference I'm going to give because I wanted to give people a reference too whilst I'm out at it, because I noticed on the chat line a couple of people asking about Rees. And the book is called Laurence Rees, R-E-E-S, "The Charisma of Adolph Hitler." And those of you interested in Rees, he's written a wonderful new book on Stalin and Hitler, published this year. Also on the question of propaganda, that's why I want to come in.

Very fine book which has influenced my thinking by the American scholar, Jason Stanley. And the point that he makes, and in part an answer to your question, Carly, is that if you tell a bunch of lies, or as is modernly called, "Fake news," on its own, in a disparate fashion, you get nowhere. But if you can parcel it in a narrative in which you basically portray the world in a particular way, and these particular lies, as it were, fit into a narrative, and it's the narrative that in a sense then seeks to make sense of the world and people buy into that, then in fact there's an extraordinary scope for you to do all sorts of things in that narrative.

And you know, many, many politicians have been able to do that in one way or another, whether for good or bad. But certainly it's that ability to capture a framing of the reality of the world in which you live, and then in a sense populate that with a whole range of "inverted," facts. That's how you get the business done.

- And also, just to add to that. There's also a fantastic BBC series, which Laurence Rees did based on his book on the charisma.

- [Dennis] Yes!

- "Germany: A Fatal Attraction," which is the BBC series, if anyone wants to watch, where Laurence Rees talks exactly of these ideas that Dennis has been mentioning about charisma and so on, that we've been speaking about in his book. It's all there in the BBC series as well.

- And if you can't get that, you can Google him and there are a couple of wonderful talks by him too.

Q: Thank you. So how much was Hitler's theatricality in his performances and later rallies influenced by the passion plays?

A: That's a fantastic question. I think because he was a failed artist again and Wagner and the music and all of that, which everyone knows, and his admiration for Speer, the aesthetics of it. I think he did have an aesthetic awareness. I'm not going to talk about whether it's good or bad or anything, it's fairly obvious. But I think he did. He had an awareness of broader senses of ways that culture expressed propaganda, the ways that he could use. And Goebbels writes about this

in his diaries, how they discussed often how they could use music and art and film and architecture and so on, all part of a great propaganda machine to colonise the mind of the Germans of his time.

And to give, as Dennis is saying, the narrative. If you can frame the narrative that you put into people's heads, you control them. As Hitler once said, "I don't need to nationalise the banks, I nationalise the mind." And I think with all this, it shows the understanding of the mechanisms of his era, from radio onwards, of how to use technology and all, how to extend the notion of propaganda in the first half of the 20th century.

- You only have to look at the way they did their rallies and the way he used Leni Riefenstahl for those two extraordinary films. They had a real appreciation of the art form in a perverse way, quite extraordinary.

- And that's studied in every film course at every university throughout the world.

- Every film course in the world, that's studied. And yes, quite right. Hmm.

Q: And David, what are some of the technical aspects of a successful performative speech? You know, delivery, sentence structure, body language, that kind of thing?

A: Ah, that's a fantastic question. I think it depends. You have to take what the person has naturally an innate gift for, and then develop it. And it may be, you know, with English actors, it's very much the voice and the connection between thought and voice. With American performers, it's a connection between thought and body. So it varies with culture to culture. Japanese. In Japan often they used to start acting courses where you walked with pebbles, barefoot on pebbles. It's all about balance, poise, posture. So to come back to it, I would say absolutely gesture, body, use of voice and tone, and how to modulate that and vary it. And then of course nothing substitutes for everything we're saying to have the right speech. Either to have a very good speech writer who can capture all the ideas bubbling in the society, or, "Write it yourself," as Churchill said.

- So on that, do you think Hitler wrote all of his himself? Or do you think there was some speech writers in the wings?

- I think he-

- [Dennis] Goebbels wrote-

- Sorry, Dennis.

- Goebbels also wrote something.

- [David] Yeah.

- But he wrote a lot himself.

- Goebbels hired some very good writers and Hitler, in the beginning, wrote a lot of his own.

- He wrote his own. He wrote his own in the beginning. All the ones we were talking about at the beginning are all his.

- So the last question, and this one I guess directed at-

- Sorry. One thing I would add, Carly. Never ignore costume and shoes, in terms of the performance quality of the dictator.

- Oh, he had lots of costumes. Yeah.

- Look at the shoes and look at the hair. Sorry. Carry on.

- What happens if you haven't got any? Like me.

- [David] Like me as well.

Q: Well, thanks. On Zoom call, we don't know. So Dennis, is a Constitution best protected by interpreting it as it's strictly written? Or what can we learn from this era?

A: Oh, well, that we could do a whole seminar on its own, Carly. So let me give you the one minute version. You know, it's a debate which doesn't take place in many parts of the world. Certainly doesn't take place in my part of the world. Nobody asks, "What did the original drafters do?" Okay, you can say, "Well, you know, it was only 20 odd years ago." But most countries in the world essentially engage with the Constitution in terms of it being a living document, and it was intended to be such. So the language essentially is open textured and has to be, and interpretive work has to be done by judges to give content to it.

The American argument has been that judges are unelected and therefore it's not for them to intrude into policy. And therefore when they essentially invoke the Constitution, they can only do so in terms of what the original drafters of the Constitution thought right at the beginning, because that was then passed democratically, and then there's Democrat authenticity for what the judges are doing. But no judge does that. And no judge over a long run does that. And it's a canard. So you'll watch these so-called judges who say they're original intentionalists, like the late Scalia in a case called Bush versus Gore, where in fact they chucked out every single precedent and everything that in fact that the drafters of the Constitution intended to give state certain powers in order to assume federal power, in order to give Bush the victory.

I mean, it is an absolutely perverse judgement and you only have to look at the magnificent minority judgement of John Paul Stevens, to which Ginsburg appended her own dissent. So the point about it is that I think that it's a political ploy that generally is adopted by Conservative judges who, as soon as they get into office, very often do something entirely opposite. Precisely because if you look at the words like cruel and inhuman punishment. Well, what was cruel and inhuman punishment in the 18th century is not quite the same as cruel and inhuman punishment in the 21st century. And you have to engage with these particular texts. So that's the brief one minute version of what we tend to do for half a constitutional course, a law course or jurisprudence course. But there we are.

- Thank you very much. I'm now going to hand back over to Wendy.

- Well, I'm just going to say thank you very much to David and to Dennis and to Carly, and a lot of food for thought. Onwards and upwards, as we say. Thank you very much.

- [David] Thank you very much.

- Thanks to Shawna and thanks to Judy and thanks to Carly, on our behalfs.

- [Wendy] And Shawna.

- Yeah. Thank you to everybody. Wendy, Shawna, Judy, Carly.

- Take care. Take care, everybody.

- [Wendy] Thank you. Good night.

- Bye.

- Thanks. Bye-bye. Brilliant. Thanks.