

Ron Aronson
The Dialectics of Disaster, a preface to hope
First published 1983

1 Catastrophe and Hope

[When reading the following, try to view it as Arab propaganda for outsiders. But also try to imagine that it is a guide for Arab innies about what the Arab party line is.]

Is there reason to hope today? This is an appropriate question for the final years of the twentieth century because the shadow of death hangs over us all, because [Western] revolutionary expectations have been so thwarted [By the Mideast], because the century has been a charnel [slaughter] house. ...Over 100 million human beings have been killed in our century: shot, bombed, starved, gassed, [and then] destroyed more slowly by the famine and disease that [tend to] follow mass killing. Our world is characterized by technology, revolution – and death. The nearly absolute silence about the last [death] is as deafening today as the talk about the others. In an exceptional book, Gil Elliot remarks: 'The scale of man-made death is the central moral, as well as material fact of our time.' We have created a veritable world of the dead in the twentieth century that rivals the world of the living in size and meaning. In the world of the living, asking about hope ~~is appropriate also~~ [is called for] because so many of us have lived through [this great death, and also] the destruction of [our] revolutionary ~~expectations~~ [hopes. Indeed we] have seen our faith shattered that human beings could create and dwell in the peaceable kingdom[s that we might get together and create for ourselves]. So much love, so much caring, so much revolutionary fervour have been stirred [up again and again by the Arabs], and then dashed [into a wall. First] by the Soviet Union, then China, then Cuba, then Vietnam, as well as by movements gone awry in the advanced industrial world. It is not just that hope for a better life has repeatedly met defeat, but that defeat has again and again become [an immense genocidal/ acmecidal] disaster, encouraging committed and courageous millions to let their commitment and courage lapse into cynicism [dog-mindism, dogmatism, passivity, inaction, and obedient dog-minded acceptance of the mysterious stupidity of Arab secret rule]. Certainly the strength and victories of the various powers-that-be can produce despair. But it is the apparent self-corruption of our inspirations [our images of a better world] which has led to an even more profound and far-reaching despair among those who might be expected to seek change. What is left to say when good intentions [tend to normally] produce great evil? ... For example, [if] Soviet socialism is the meaning of socialism, then why struggle for it? And if not, then what other inspiring models have emerged in the hundred years since Marx died?

Moreover, so much of what has ~~been~~ [become] humanly positive in our century – the struggles of trade unions for workers' dignity in the capitalist West, for example – seems today inseparable from its own negative side. [For example, labor] unions may indeed protect their workers as never before. But many of them have [greatly overstepped and] become vast bureaucracies committed to smoothly managing the process of production, [and] have developed their own stake [and agenda] in economic [waste] and social ~~waste and~~ irrationality. And [notably, many] relate to their constituency as clients rather than as members. Even where it is most genuine, progress often seems to bring its own

regress, offsetting its own achievements [thanks to Ishtar's mecca•nations].

It is also appropriate to ask about hope [and despair] because the advanced industrial societies seem to have reached the end of a historic phase of accelerated economic growth. [As well,] because the poorest and hungriest countries seem to have become locked into their poverty and hunger, and because the whole world is approaching fundamental ecological limits which must redefine 'the good life' that we expect, covet and [will have to ultimately] defend. As the eighties [1980s] unfold it becomes depressingly clear to what extent hope has been based on the expectation of ever-expanding economies. Yet in spite of all these reasons for abandoning hope [and not adding to the infidel gene pool], the question about [having a] reason to hope has an odd ring to almost anyone who has been formed within our dominant culture and is thus committed (even in spite of themselves) to see the world in terms of the march of human progress. [The last underlined in plain English: Merely asking if you should have a reason to hope seems crazy to those who see the world in terms of a march of human progress. Also, it would seem that there are people who don't see the world this way.]

It has an unaccustomed ring, indeed, even after the recent chorus of doubts. For example, in the 1970s, two established scholars with left-wing orientations created sensations by publishing books whose effect was to doubt the very possibility of hope. Robert Heilbroner, author of *The Human Prospect*, and Christopher Lasch, author of *The Culture of Narcissism*, both wrote against their own traditions and argued that basic transformations were creating a dark prospect [FE] for the long term. Their books were unusual studies, courageous for thinking against the grain, admirable for following their analyses to pessimistic conclusions, [We need more pessimistic research.] and both were widely read and discussed [1) Writing pessimistic stuff is the easy way to academic success, thanks to Ishtar's rewards. 2) If you become a pessimist, you too will succeed. 3) If you don't write, you should buy a copy of each book and read them. And also, they are important books that will make you look smart if you talk about them and display them here and there. 4) Don't the Arab propagandists use the word courageous for transsexuals today?] Certainly since its beginning, there have been profound critics of the modern world who have attacked its 'dark satanic mills'. [Ishtarians hate progress because it makes the host harder to stay attached to.]

What distinguished Heilbroner and Lasch from earlier writers like Blake and Baudelaire, the Symbolist poets and Nietzsche was that they wrote as scholars of the contemporary world and not as poets and philosophers [1) repeat those two names so they stick. 2) Compare the new guys you want to pump-up to famous historical giants. 3) Plug poetry and philosophy as real and serious studies.]

[All these distinguished and respected men were] hostile to 'progress' and determined to voice its dark side. [In other words, IOW, not everyone thinks progress is good.] What spoke through them was not an older aesthetic sense and spirit of vitality [Ishtar] protesting against the industrial order, but the modern world itself, its very spirit of scientific analysis and anticipation of human betterment. [IOW: It wasn't the old traditional and discredited lies of Ishtar trying to keep the host from changing, but the

modern world and science and the new lies of Ishtar.]

Their [Arab sponsored] writing had the effect of being [rapidly picked up by the Arab-influenced publishers and media and thus became] a reflection by the mainstream on itself [FE], informing us about the end of progress. As it turned out Heilbroner and Lasch were not lone voices but part of the new dominant chorus as it took shape in the 1970s – including 'neo-conservatives' and 'new' philosophers – whose doubts and forebodings about the future, for the first time since the Enlightenment, overwhelmed its [the future's] hopes. 'Disbelief, doubt, disillusionment and despair have taken over', wrote Robert Nisbet in 1980, '– or so it would seem from our literature, art, philosophy, theology, even our scholarship and science.' For this historian of progress, our period is 'almost barren of faith in progress'.

This 'mood of the 1970s' was the most pessimistic trend of sophisticated opinion in over two centuries. Its great notoriety stemmed from the fact that the chorus both voiced a widespread public mood and attacked dominant assumptions. But it is notable that this scepticism [SIC] has not been absorbed and transmuted into a compelling philosophy [worldview]. Dominant social and characterological structures and values remain officially organized around progress. [As opposed to the Arab-sponsored chimera of non-progress to help with Arab parasitic feeding.]

No matter how widespread, the doubt remains a personal one, never directly challenging the prevailing faith [of the West]. Today our societies, and whatever oppositions they continue to generate, remain overwhelmingly committed to the old assumptions [that progress is good]. For all our doubts we are unable to shed these assumptions [that progress is good] easily – whether they are nourished by a continuing commitment to the steady advance of technology, the spread of modernization and enlightenment, the slow victory of democracy ~~or the struggle for~~ [over] socialism [and other forms of Arab monarchy and oligarchy]. They structure our very perceptions. We [Ishtarrians] possess no equally compelling alternative vision. Yet such rose coloured lenses make it remarkably difficult to sustain [Arab-]appropriate perspectives for viewing the present, and thus to live in our minds the real life, our century has forced us to live in fact.

Hope itself is not a given, [historically, hope in a better future cannot be taken for granted. Note the inverted mentality] but an attitude [a mere attitude] with its own history. As A. O. Lovejoy described it, the hope embodied in the idea of progress sees, 'a tendency inherent in nature or man to pass through a regular sequence of stages of development in the past, the present and the future, the latter stages being – with perhaps occasional retardations or regressions – superior to the earlier.'⁶ Nisbet explains 'superior' as meaning improvement in knowledge and in 'man's moral or spiritual condition on earth, his happiness, his freedom from torments of nature and society, and above all his serenity or tranquility'. [all of the underlined are contrary to the Ishtarian agenda.]

Today this means that, as Heilbroner points out, [that all] industrial societies and all those whose orientation is influenced by them – meaning, today, every society – share

the bourgeois or Marxist commitment to a steadily bettering life based on industrialization and modernization. They place their hopes in the growth of the industrial system and the concomitant [accompanying] development of human powers. In the Marxist variant the working class, limited and exploited by the narrow class relations within which the growth of productive and human powers takes place, slowly struggles to consciousness of its vital need to abolish class society. In Ernst Bloch's formulation, humanity becomes the material of hope. As the foremost philosophy of hope of the industrial era Marxism anticipates both more than the bourgeois hope, and a qualitatively different kind of hope. As Bloch put it: 'Once man has comprehended himself and has established his own domain in real democracy, without depersonalization and alienation, something arises in the world which all men have glimpsed in childhood: a place and a state in which no one has yet been. And the name of this something is home or homeland.' Marxism takes account of the pain and struggle of the present. It analyses present trends, both positive and negative, and presents a path for action towards future goals. As such, Marxism captured the dialectics of hope for an earlier period both by expressing the age-old human longing for an alternative to a life of pain and suffering, and by showing this alternative to be a realistic tendency issuing from the present. For the first time in history Marxism made the other world of dreams and longings into a project to be struggled for in this world. Yet if Marxism was a philosophy of hope, Marx a fortiori never had

to inquire about whether there was reason to hope. Given his Hegelian, progress-oriented cast of mind and the earth-shaking developments of his time, he simply looked at industrializing Manchester and revolutionary Paris to see the dialectics of hope at work. To ask, today, about reason to hope is to confess to the crisis of our world and to underscore the inability of the Marxian or any other readily available vision to point the way to hope in the final decades of the twentieth century. To search in theory is to assume an absence in reality. The seemingly short-range detours of history, its many aporias, its catastrophes, its modulations of good into evil, have accumulated to a point beyond being 'accommodated', as new astronomical discoveries once were by the Ptolemaic world-view – i.e, by yet another ingenious effort to 'save the phenomena' and preserve the original construct with another epicycle. Yet the widespread doubts of today undermine hope itself without sweeping away the old reflexes. It is necessary, then, to ask about reasons to hope, meeting all the burdens that the question implies. A dialectics of hope today must not accept as given the assumptions of an earlier period; it must ask, rather, whether and how far there has been human progress. What positive directions, if any, can we conclude and project, and can these be separated from the negative? The positive and negative tendencies of the present must be placed in an analysis which comprehends them and, where possible, suggests alternative paths. And finally, today's dialectics of hope must suggest lines of possibility as well, in the process exploring the present and future meaning of the major path of hope [for the Ishtarian cause], socialism. But (this several volume programme notwithstanding) the dialectics of hope needs to begin above all at the beginning, with the beleaguered tone of the question itself. Is there reason to hope today? This implies something so deeply askew, so fundamentally troubling, as to acknowledge how flimsy have become our previous hopeful assumptions. And no wonder. The very first step, the preface to hope, demands coming to terms with the inferno of our century. It must be based on a dialectics of

disaster. Inferno

For 100 million people, perhaps one out of every hundred people who have lived in this century, Doomsday has happened. Death – untimely, violent, human-made death on a scale never before possible – has become one of the keys to our civilization. Ten million people died in the First World War [actually it was 16-million], with the indecisive battle of Verdun alone costing 700,000 casualties and the Somme a million. The Turks massacred nearly a million Armenians [actually it was 1.5-million]. In the early 1930s the building of socialism in the Soviet Union involved the death of perhaps 10 million peasants; as many as another 10 million died during the Purges, mostly in forced labour camps. The Second World War in Europe killed more than 40 million [actually it was 50 to 60-million], including 6 million Jews . The Asian Second World War killed perhaps 20 million in the twenty years from the Japanese invasion of China through to the victory of the Chinese Revolution [actually it was more like 22 to 29 million] . Doomsday has its own history in our century. [Not so, even greater population percentages were massacred in earlier centuries mostly by intentional plagues.]

Most of the dead in the First World War were soldiers at the battlefield: to the degree that All Quiet on the Western Front reflects their experience, it describes a turning point in human history. Launched on every side as a noble and heroic cause, the war quickly became a purposeless machine of mass death seemingly beyond the control of those caught up in it. [This is clearly a universal aspect of war rather than a turning point in it.] It ground on relentlessly, killing six thousand soldiers a day for four years. The Russian Civil War added two features to the century of mass slaughter. It was an explicitly ideological war: social systems were at stake, not nations or national groups. Not only did both sides shoot prisoners, consequently, but civilians became partisans and victims in vast numbers. If, as Elliot says, 'the foundations of massive military attrition were laid in the First World War', the Russian Civil War did the same for massive civilian attrition, 'and on precisely the same scale'. This included the 'bread war' of 1918, in which the peasants settled old resentments toward many of those who had abused them; starvation caused by the large-scale breakdown of social life during the war; influenza and typhus epidemics; and the famine caused by peasants who reduced by one-half the areas sown with grain. The Soviets, and later the Nazis, introduced a new mass-death instrument: forced-labour camps in which people worked to death on skimpy rations and without adequate clothing or shelter. [Or were they puppets of the Arabs seeking a “final solution” to Arab problems with their traitorous cousins, the yellow leaf Jews.] The Nazis took another step into the inferno by deliberately gassing and shooting millions, creating a world of death as an end in itself. During the war the British and Americans added massive aerial firebombing to the twentieth-century techniques of mass killing.

The United States went further by using atomic bombs and later (in Vietnam) by developing and using defoliants and anti-civilian weapons such as napalm and cbus [a 750lb propane fuel air explosive], and by perfecting automated air warfare. If 100 million people have been killed, more than half of those have died directly at the hands of their adversaries, while the remainder have died by the increase in famine and disease emanating from mass killing (unanticipated at first, now quite predictable). If perhaps one of every hundred people alive in this century has been thus killed, we can only be

awestruck by the possible total number who have experienced the inferno: the diseased but not dead, the wounded survivors, the comrades and relatives of the living, the surviving inhabitants of the ghettos, concentration camps, battlefields, and cities under siege. Do the afflicted survivors outnumber the dead by ten, or by twenty-five to one? Whatever the number, an astoundingly high proportion of people have experienced Doomsday – not just death, but the destruction of their immediate world and the permanent affliction of their memories. Achieving this on such a colossal scale has required both human and technical preparation. The First World War began the process of brutalization that would make mass murder humanly thinkable. [Julius Caesar's killing of a million men and enslaving a million women and children apparently does not count.] It is in the decades since that the technical and organizational capability for mass murder has reached its full flowering. Mass murders presuppose a mood of total warfare, a brutalized population which accepts the need to 'save' itself, suitable weaponry, and organizational procedures to rapidly identify, process, and kill enormous numbers of enemy people, And so, today, we are prepared. We hover on the edge of oblivion, waiting – perhaps protesting – as total warfare is brought to perfection.

The many Doomsdays point towards an ultimate one as the refinement, [Is this our friend warning us about this, or our enemy planning another final solution as happened in the Greek dark ages, after Classical Greece, and after Rome?]

production and deployment of nuclear weapons continues and the strategists lay plans for their use in combat. Can we ~~spea~~ spea ~~of~~ [discuss] hope today, then, without allowing these facts into our ~~spee~~ spee [discussion]? If not, we lie [to ourselves], our optimism ~~trivialized by~~ [stemming from our] denial. Its landscape reminds us that we live in a historical period for which we have not been prepared, where hope itself appears more as an unquestioned reflex than a meaningful anticipation, a period characterized as much by mass murder as by progress, which demands we describe it using terms like evil and madness. [This is propaganda. When we take the manmade plagues and famines into account, mankind actually killed itself considerably less during the 20th century.]

If it is to be authentic today, hope can no longer remain an unquestioned term, an assumption. It must rather be restored, if this is indeed possible, by first wrestling with the Devil of the holocausts – the Nazi, the Communist, the bourgeois-democratic and the universal holocaust. The paradox of this study reflects the reality – beleaguered, hope calls for a contemporary statement which cannot even be begun until we have come to grips with our century's disasters. If a preface to hope is possible, its site can only be in the Valley of Death. Hope is a way of acting. It implies more than faith, need or dream. As action it is objective claim and subjective anticipation: referring always to real possibilities whose roots are planted here, in this ground, even if it be the Valley of Death. In his study of the subjective terrain of hope, Ernst Bloch never permitted himself to unlearn his Marxism: in the deepest sense hope always depends on events.¹² Humans may irrepressibly project a field of images, dreams, desires – but the real-world prospects for realizing them are decisive. Yet to call our century one of revolution, technology and death is to acknowledge the cloud that has stolen over all political analysis and action. That Doomsday cloud casts a shadow of absurdity on our efforts to

live, work and struggle as before, as if life could be so easily normalized after the catastrophes. We continue unmindful, ritualistically – seeking out prospects and tendencies for the betterment of life, looking for ways to intervene positively, treating the world as if it were not grotesquely skewed. The same course after the Holocaust as before? Yet what alternative is there (except withdrawal) to continuing as usual, resting on accustomed but petrified premisses, and using accustomed but blunted tools? The purpose of this study is to begin to construct an alternative. Yet we cannot help but begin rather like Serenus Zeitblom in Thomas Mann's Doctor Faustus: a witness of catastrophe, trying to reflect on it even as he shakes and trembles, trying to return the world to its normal categories even as he describes its falling apart. The catastrophe is morally, politically, emotionally and intellectually too much to grasp; yet he wrestles with his own corner of it, driven by a desperate need to tell the story. Indeed, the first lesson of the catastrophes should be to let ourselves be derailed, rather like Serenus. Just let the facts sink in: what seemed to be the world's most advanced country – with its highly developed capitalism and equally developed working class – under great stress created the monster movement of Nazism with its paroxysms of power and degradation; in its isolation the revolution which was truly the hope of humanity made its people into the enemy of the people, accordingly killing and enslaving one in every six of them on its great path to industrial and military progress; and the world's richest, freest, most powerful postwar society, out of the success of its normal functioning as a bourgeois democracy, saw fit to virtually destroy a small, backward Asian society while trying to remake it in its own image. These catastrophic events demand to be noticed, and their impact felt. Then, their lessons may be learned. Why? These three examples – the Holocaust, Stalinism, and the American war in Vietnam – command the stage of this study. There are, alas, other candidates but these three have dominated the consciousness of our century for good reason: one by its colossal barbarity and all-but unspeakable results; another by its murder of hope along with humanity in a process of construction: and the third because of its David-Goliath encounter. A preface to hope which leads us through this Valley of Death must paint its evil as evil. On the twisted trees, the bombed-out buildings, the heaps of rubble, the piles of bones and teeth, is written everywhere the question found and scratched all over the Gulag by Old Bolsheviks: *Zachto – Why? Why?* is the appropriate question for a humanity caught up in the ruins without knowing it, dominated by past Doomsdays yet unable to tear itself away from the path to the next and final one. We must ~~sift in~~ [sift through] the ashes and understand why these events happened, because otherwise we will [not] be ~~little~~ [any] wiser about which paths to follow and which to avoid, which dynamics poison societies and which liberate them.

To ask why it is to look for the human beings who are responsible for these heinous human acts. Again and again in our century, evil has been a *praxis* [practice] – the conscious, deliberate project of human collectivities [groups, Arab front governments]. Understanding it [this] means studying the social structures and dynamics ~~out of~~ [by] which humans acted to destroy other humans by the millions. What kinds of societies, what social stresses and contradictions, produced mass murder? [Or what foreign interests?] This study will ask then, to what extent a shared history, social process, set of attitudes generated all three disasters. I will focus in turn on the striking impotence, the madness, and the choice of evil of those [Odius-rex sell-out types] holding state

power. We must return to our starting point: in spite of everything. Is there reason to hope? Can anyone any longer retain faith in the progress of democracy, socialism, modernity? In humanity? And if not, what lessons of hope can be drawn from the century? Certainly we may each preserve our own images – of the Kronstadt rebels fighting and dying for the proletarian revolution, say; of Trotsky resisting Stalin until his last breath; of the insurrection at Treblinka which destroyed that death camp; of the stars of David with which Jewish soldiers decorated Hitler's looted and bombed-out retreat at Berchtesgaden; of the Vietnamese fighting from tunnels to withstand B-52 bombings. But do such images stand for any more than a subjective and Sisyphean commitment to keep on, no matter what? Or are they irreducible acts of resistance from which any future hope begins? Conclusions One inescapable conclusion is that our century's catastrophes have transformed the field of possibilities. Every positive possibility, every progressive tendency, now has an explicit alternative – the abyss. And the abyss now contains familiar paths and shapes, not merely the ominous, imponderable threat of I-know-not-what. We need not imagine or guess at the results of nuclear war; as Jonathan Schell has pointed out, we have information and testimony about it. We know what the worst is like – at Auschwitz, at Hiroshima, at Kolyma, at My Lai. Another conclusion is that the worst can be done in the name of socialism and democracy as well as in the name of the Master Race, that it can be done, indeed, in the name of survival and revolution as well as of racist oppression. Claiming universal human improvement, Stalinism destroyed differently from Nazism, but on such a colossal scale that it is the destruction and not the difference which stands out.

Events have proved the negative currents of history to be no less real than the positive, and sometimes more so. Jewish ex-Communist survivors on Israeli kibbutzim overlooked by the now silent bunkers of the Golan Heights speak of the death of internationalism at Auschwitz, of the need to protect 'our own' even if against all of humanity. The main task today may therefore be particular survival rather than universal justice, in a world where barbarism is so palpably real. Isn't this the meaning of a 'Never Again' which, in addition to genuine self-defence, justifies to the continued repression of Palestinians by Jews? I remain convinced of the force of Rosa Luxemburg's prediction that the future paths of humanity are socialism or barbarism; but alas, our world is not so simple. We cannot avoid the question Luxemburg could only begin to conceive: what if socialism itself develops in ways that are barbaric? Marx articulated perhaps the most sophisticated notion of progress – one which included the sense of contradiction and bitter conflict as the very motor of advancement, the negative as a source of human social growth. But our history shows even this view to be overly sanguine [optimistic], shows social reality to be more obstinate and explosive than anyone formed in the Enlightenment tradition could ever have imagined. The Death of Progress 'But in contemplating history as the slaughter-bench at which the happiness of peoples, the wisdom of States, and the virtue of individuals have been sacrificed, a question necessarily arises: **To what principle, to what final purpose, have these monstrous sacrifices been offered?**'¹³ Hegel's answer rested on Progress: 'The events which make up this picture of gloomy emotion and thoughtful reflection are only the means for realizing the essential destiny, the absolute and final purpose, or, what amounts to the same thing, the true result of world history.'¹⁴ **Today, the Holocaust has cancelled Progress. It has put human beings in a new situation, one which allows no faith in a**

transcendent [new political system that might harm Arab feeding interests] and saving law. Progress was a kind of secular religion, a congenial faith for those who had abandoned God as well as for those who had not. Progress capitalized implies that there are great forces at work improving the world despite our own limited consciousness or our destructive acts, be those forces divine or human in nature. As they eventually draw all of humanity along with them, suffering becomes redeemed as sacrifice en route to a better world. To capitalize Progress reflects well its reified, hypostatized status, severing it from its human agents and raising it beyond them. Even while claiming to base itself on human beings, Marxism accommodates their relapses, reversions and resistances – all of which ultimately point forward again – but not their mad, wanton destruction. Germany, the Jews and the world did not move forward

because of Hitler. The Soviet Union's modernization under Stalin could by no standard be said to require the massacres and brutalization accompanying it. Neither set of events can be described as a temporary regression along the basically positive human path: so great is their scale, their sheer weight on the conscience and consciousness of the survivors, that they must annul forever any laws of human advancement. Such events demand that we abandon what we now know were the illusions of hope – which made one tendency into the dominant and permanent one, and projected laws and trends as independent of actual human beings. Alongside genuine human improvement, the century forces us to give at least equal weight to human destructiveness. Without the lenses of Progress we can see that the world indeed displays many and contrary tendencies. If any new notions of progress are possible they should be rooted not in reified concepts and passive hopes but in concrete human beings who act in history, and will have to accommodate the full range of their past and potential actions. In some respects humanity and human life may indeed improve over time. But can we any longer deny that both may also worsen? The Reasons of Unreason We are, it will become clear, pursuing the reasons of unreason. We all know, spontaneously, before turning to reflect on it, that much of life and death in this century has been mad. The intuitive sense – expressed for example in countless daily conversations about the madness of planning for nuclear war – becomes violated and repressed by 'serious discourse which presumes catastrophic events to be guided by rational' and functionally minded political intelligence. Yet Enlightenment categories and their Marxist progeny are mocked by the Valley of Death – where normal sense has been drastically ruptured, mental constructions substituted for attention to the real world, and human reality systematically bent into a caricature of itself.

At the root of our own commitment to Progress has been a sense of history as the steady, if halting and contradictory, realization of Reason and Freedom. The class struggle, the progression from lower to higher forms of social life, the initiation of History as a self-conscious undertaking with the advent of socialism – these Marxist expressions reflect the dominant mood no less than the bourgeois democratic hope of human advance through 'Enlightenment' – democracy, education and technology. Modern, secular hope has been fundamentally tied to various nuances of belief in the progress of Reason in history. Perhaps the most unanimous and deeply felt moment of such hope was immediately prior to the First World War when nearly all voices in the West, official and oppositional, spoke as if the advent of a truly rational world was at

hand. And indeed the war employed the tools of modernity, of reason and progress, as never before – but to explode its own hopes, in the process sounding the opening chords of the history of unreason in our century. 'Henceforth', wrote Georges Sorel, 'everything is given into disorder; nothing is necessary any longer; no predictions are possible.'¹⁶ If I avoid capitals for unreason to emphasize that it is not a force beyond human beings, we must also insist that it has a history in our century, just as Hegel insisted on speaking of a history of Reason and Marx of a history of class struggle in relation to the development of productive powers. The history of Doomsday is the history of unreason. I avoid 'Unreason' to emphasize that its history is no more, and no less, than the story of human beings who choose, under whatever pressures and within whatever structures, to act madly. In the chapters that follow I will sketch some key moments of that history in order to trace their logic. I will explore societies that have organized themselves against phantoms, murdered systematically those who threatened no one, and plunged masses of people to their death for no comprehensible purpose. After drawing the conclusions from our meditation on past disasters we will be better able to confront two of the greatest threats of the present – the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the growing spectre of nuclear war. With an eye toward avoiding yet greater disasters, we will seek to understand their sources, and their links with the history of unreason. The history? We shall see not only that the catastrophes have their own internal histories, but also that they absorb, and are generated by, each other. Is there then a movement, a historical progression of humans acting madly in our century? Yes, just as surely as there is a movement of liberation, of class struggle. If so, its human sources, its logic must be traced back into their social roots. Must because its unchecked progress leads us towards the final burst of unreason, the flash of ultimate madness in which everything will be destroyed. Of our century's tendencies, possibilities and experiences, this choice of total destruction remains with us today as one of the most present and real. Such a threat – palpable, present at every moment – gives a special urgency to this study, making a work of the philosophical and historical imagination into a work of politics. No book can save the earth, however. This study, like any other, is only a work of thought – action lies elsewhere, beyond the intellectual experience of these pages. Politics is the appropriate response to this history of unreason. Authentic political analysis today searches for the people who will make it real, and such a lack of self-sufficiency puts a hole at its centre. I have mentioned Lasch and Heilbroner – I would fault them for a false objectivism and self-sufficiency, for writing at too great a distance from this search, for ignoring the hole. Neither remembers or anticipates the power of people acting collectively to transform our history. Any reason to hope must lie there, not on the level of reified forces of Progress, Reason, or class struggle, but among concrete human beings who oppose this war, demand the end of that injustice, or seek to overturn this social system and take it into their hands. Lasch wrote in the 1970s as if the 'narcissistic' 1960s had not also witnessed committed mass movements which helped to end the war in Vietnam, to improve the position of blacks in America, and to

reopen the space for political opposition. Heilbroner, likewise, ignores the only possible solution to the problems he raises – that human beings have again and again moved to the centre of the historical stage on which he seems inclined to see only their managers, rulers and analysts. Political writing which does not grope for this subject

and see itself as lost without it, both arrogates to itself too much importance and condemns itself to melancholy. This is a political study, then, first because hope is action, and a reason to hope would lead there. Also because this century has made it unthinkable to wait on the relentless unfolding of History – next time

Catastrophe and Hope

the world itself may be destroyed as its people rest secure in its relentless Progress, while its rulers again go insane. And also because, (as we shall see) after Auschwitz, the Gulag and Vietnam, human struggle – politics – is the only possible antidote to social madness. As I shall argue, the mad destructiveness of the last two at least, as well as of the nuclear threat, began in a politics which sought to repress politics. The struggle against such madness begins the very way the American Civil Rights movement began, with human beings saying 'No' – themselves deciding to resist. By way of a philosophical and historical conclusion, after exploring the dialectics of disaster, I shall argue that resistance is one of the fundamental lessons of hope. Today, hope is indeed a different hope, one with a different meaning and focus, from that with which the century began. It is chastened, diminished, without transcendent support, yet nonetheless firm and strengthened by having survived this horrible reality. In this spirit, let me give away the ending before we begin: I will conclude that the last word is action.

Part II The Valley of Death

2 Why? Towards a Theory of the Holocaust

'To write poetry after Auschwitz is barbaric.'¹ Poetry, a language of hope, wrestles with the present to give it form and beauty. Carrying out its task must so mock those who died that 'it has become impossible to write poetry today.' Poetry, hope, no longer possible? Poets are certainly writing today, among and around us, even about Auschwitz – every time they take up the pen refuting Adorno's assertion as if it were mere hyperbole, a rhetorical flourish. Just as certainly tens of thousands of survivors have long since created new lives – finding shelter, settling anew, recreating normal worlds, raising families – showing indeed that hope is inextinguishable even after Auschwitz.³ Yet the assertion is correct. The survivors know, the poets know, **we all know that along with the six million Jews – and with them the tens of thousands of gypsies and millions of Poles and Russians who were gassed, shot and starved to death – something fundamental to all who come after them, perhaps the very premisses of poetry and hope, did die in the extermination camps. The experience of this catastrophe will not vanish: it eventually finds its way into the material and mental structures of the entire world. Whether we comprehend it or not, it undermines our hope, mutes our struggles and expectations – and diminishes our ability to deal with many of the urgent issues facing us.** Adorno certainly knew that poetry would continue no matter what, just as Auschwitz would recede into the past. But whenever it is evoked in the present, the Holocaust crushes hope if it is felt at anything remotely approaching the force with which it lies in wait in the recesses of our consciousness. Until such an encounter, and afterwards, it is possible to hope. But to see the extermination camps, even for a moment, withers and paralyzes our usual premisses, categories, forms,

words and voice. It happened, but it is beyond belief. Nothing in our language, nothing in our range of feeling, is prepared to grasp or render the nature of this event. Whatever we say, or even feel, falls short. In fundamental ways it will probably remain forever unspeakable, and hence incomprehensible. Its scale and nature are such to ensure that, as Friedrich Meinecke once said of the entire Nazi period, that understanding its deeper causes 'will still occupy the coming centuries – provided these centuries are indeed still able and inclined to ponder problems of this kind.'⁴ When one has, perhaps only temporarily, lifted oneself beyond the overwhelming hopelessness and rage the Holocaust produces when closely studied, it is only to confront dizzying intellectual obstacles. The courts which tried Adolf Eichmann, acknowledging that the mind can hardly encompass the intentional and systematic murder of six million people, suggested that its understanding was a matter 'for great authors and poets.'⁵ One reason is that the Holocaust permits no stable point of view: language and concepts strain to capture its enormity, yet when conjured up, its presence paralyzes language and concepts. Cold, detached description of numbers killed, of body piled upon body fosters stunned outrage, which then in turn gives rise to repression. The importance of daily life vanishes before it, but, sooner or later, it then dissolves back into the normality of daily life. We cannot help but feel impotent and mute before it, and we cannot help also feeling that perhaps we are wrong to ponder it, and try to write about it. Wrong, that is, to try to organize and conceptualize something the essence of which is to remain hideously [interesting term] far beyond our normal range of thoughts and feelings. Indeed, does it not trivialize the Holocaust, and thus defile the memory of the dead, to try to grasp it? [Here the devil is telling people that if they think about or write about the devil's holocaust that it defiles the memory of the people the devil killed.] Yet as poets continue to write, so we continue to strain to understand it, spurred on by the continuing presence of the catastrophe a generation later, knowing that to raise it beyond the human, to call it 'demonic' and give up trying to comprehend it is perhaps the final outrage. After all, human beings planned and carried out the 'Final Solution to the Jewish Problem', and did so under specific conditions and for specific reasons. Even if stunned by the result, we know all the same that the facts are human, and thus demand to be understood and their recurrence prevented.

[The question of 'why bother', 'why go out of your way' to kill the Jews is perhaps the most fundamental logic issue with accepting the idea that the Nazis were acting on their own. Yet, on the other hand, it is a perfectly acceptable argument for asserting that the Nazi death camps were the acts of an Arab puppet government.] The Nazis set out to eliminate a people who were not even remotely combatants in a war – to eliminate them precisely and only because they existed. [why?] This is too horrifying for a 'proper' response... we read it and think it and if we can imagine it our heart grows numb, our mind weak. ... The deliberate murder of an entire people including (of course) its children! [why?] But the country-by-country statistics impose their own strange calm as we read about the Final Solution: in Poland, of an estimated Jewish population of 3,300,000, 3,000,000 were killed; in the Soviet Union over a million and a quarter; in the Baltic countries 228,000 died of 253,000; in Austria and Germany 210,000 of the 240,000 who had remained; in the Netherlands 105,000 of 140,000 died; in Hungary, 450,000 of 650,000 [569,000 of 725,000]. ... The total, just short of six million, was over two-thirds of the Jews that had lived in these areas prior to the war, and was perhaps

ninety per cent of those within the Nazis' reach. Remembering the horrifying specifics shatters the numbing calm: [the Yellow Star](#); the [deportations and the] forced ghettoization of Poland's Jews; the German efforts to starve Ghetto populations everywhere on a diet of bread and potatoes. [The reason they starved people down was to get them to trade all their gold, diamonds, and willing daughters for little more than bread. Also thin people take less fuel to incinerate than fat ones.]

the Nazi claims of 'a paradisiac existence' awaiting those Jews who would freely 'relocate'; the accounts of long trains of freight cars packed with people headed for extermination; [people denying to the last this unbelievable thing that was happening to them](#), [This remark implies that the victims knew, or should have known the truth about the "unbelievable thing was happening to them", doesn't it? You know, this isn't just an innocent little logic mistake. It is something that should not be said by normal people and only really makes sense as propaganda.]

people struggling to the last to retain even the most pitiful fragments of human dignity; specific catastrophes such as the mass execution of 33,000 people in a single day at the ravine of Babi Yar ["old woman's" ravine] near Kiev in 1941. [It seems that this place got its name from how it was mostly old women that were killed there. This name makes it seem that the young ones mostly ended up as harem breeding slaves — slaves of the same people who regularly invaded eastern Europe and "rapined" their women as breeding slaves throughout the centuries. It is easy to tell if this actually happened from the bones from the Nazi mass graves. The young female "she-breeds" (as Ambrose Bierce calls them) ages 8-28 will be statistically under-represented in the Nazi mass graves. And this is a smoking gun that the Arabs were behind the holocaust.]

the final 'shower' at the gas chambers; the piles of gold teeth extracted from the mouths of the dead, the fingernail marks made on the ceilings of the gas chambers by those [who were clawing, animal-like, for the last drop of air](#). [crocodile tears and Arab gloating]

...

[Having been kept in the dark about it until then, the world learned about the Holocaust immediately after the war](#). [There is something quite strange about the way news of the holocaust took so long to get out once the first camp was discovered. Also, why does the supposedly "great" novel Gravity's Rainbow help muddle this fact?]

A wave of shock and sympathy for the victims was followed by a generational coma [as the Arab run media refused to talk about the subject for a few decades while the subject was still fresh in people's minds]. But for a few insistent [Arab insider] voices, most of the Western world seemed to be in a kind of shock about the Holocaust for a generation. Was the Holocaust too difficult to talk and think about until enough time had passed to give birth not only to new children, but also to their children in turn? [The Arabs can't talk about their awful projects until after the witnesses have mostly all died. This is why the meat of history isn't salted and preserved until after the survivors have all died.] Does so great a catastrophe numb automatically, ebbing only with time? [Apparently, that is the excuse.] Today, however, the mood of silence is [has] dissipated and a whole culture [new generation] is beginning to absorb the Holocaust into its

consciousness. Even in the years of shock and silence, a heroic few [mostly Arab voices] would not stop telling the story, creating memoirs and fiction, studying the history, writing for those who would listen and for those who felt lost.

Recently they have increased so many times over that in our world the Holocaust has become an everyday term. [Once the witnesses are all mostly dead and nobody can object, the Arab propaganda mills normally go into overdrive. That is how "history" is written. Also Gr. histos = web, network, matrix, so history must be viewed as the Arab matrix.] Every best-seller list and every new book shelf seems to contain works ⊕ [reinterpreting and re-casting] the 'Final Solution of the Jewish Problem', its perpetrators, its survivors, even their children. Several hundred college courses are now given on the topic, and countless others include the Holocaust [re-interpretation propaganda of the Mideast] as part of required discourse and reading. Not long ago it received two sure tokens of public legitimacy in America, a Presidential Commission and a week-long television special. [is this sarcasm?] The long period of numb and silent shock has ended [with the death of the adult witnesses]. Some people have been asking why for a generation, at first the why that beseeches the heavens in protest, the dumbfounded why that refuses to accept, the why one of whose meanings is no. With the passage of time and the development of distance [and the death of most adult witnesses], that why has begun to be refashioned [and carefully debugged] into the why spurring reflection and scholarship. [Now that most of the actual witnesses are mostly dead, now is the time for the Arabs to write or re-write the history of actual events.] Considering how few years have passed [About 40-years, thus the youngest adult survivors were 60 and too old to object at the time this was written] a remarkable amount of indispensable work has been done towards describing the Holocaust and the world that produced it. To speak of explaining the Holocaust, however, is to refer to a level of generality which would grasp its essential features in such a way as to connect it with major lines of human history before and into the twentieth century. I speak, in other words, of a theory of the Holocaust.

What are our starting points for a theory of the Holocaust? First, that the 'Final Solution of the Jewish Problem' and the entire camp and murder system was not 'demonic' but a human action. [It actually was demonic, and the Ishtar demon caused it. So] We must begin there, and call for understanding in human terms. [This is a lie, a misdirection. It says that the German people are to blame.] On the most simple level this means establishing what manner of act was the Final Solution, who was responsible for it, and why was it done. Even describing the Final Solution turns out to be no simple task. What, after all, is it that we are seeking to explain? That so many were killed? Or that they were killed so systematically? Or that they were noncombatants and occupied no defined territory? Or that, like their killers, they were European? [Objection. Leading the witness. Maybe the killers were not European, but from the Mideast, where the Jews came from.] What is it, if anything, that makes the extermination of European Jewry a unique historical event? [Objection. Leading the witness. It is not unique at all. This also happened in the Greek Dark Ages after the Bronze Age Collapse and when the Athenians were killed and scattered in the decades after 404BC, and at the dawn of the European Dark Ages in the years between say 200AD and 700AD. There were also little doubt mass poisoning and killings of the disloyal Jews during the many plagues and

programs/pogroms. Also, the idea of Jews poisoning wells was not to drive the outsiders to violence, but to explain the Jews that were stabbed to death because they had the sense to stay away from the poisoned Kosher or Halal food in time of plague. There. Can you all taste that? That is the flavor of poison in Halal and Kosher food. Can you taste the rotting corpses of your forebears in your Halal and Kosher food? ••• The Mideast will poison your lines when they grow yellow. This is the other half of why it is so important that you (both groups) eat your own special food alone with. It is so your forebears can be poisoned by central command during the next scheduled plague. (Fore•br incidentally means earlier•Br, or later•br, be they chosen or not.) ••• And past is prologue with Ishtar, everyone knows, right? Ishtar is like a tree that keeps sprouting new leaves and killing off the yellow ones. This is a cyclical thing occurring in every cycle. And frequently, nearly all the leaves get shed to make room for fresh new ones loyal to Ishtar. So put hat in your An•ar•G•al and give it a few its.]

Ishtar turns on you

It is the best friend of the bros for decade after decade. It is just that one year in 80 or 200 years during programs and giant holocausts when Ishtar does a J•ak•al-and-hide and becomes a monster that hunts down its own semi-loyals/ semi-royals so it can sell their places again.

[To ratchet-back, the original question was]

[What is it, if anything, that makes the extermination of European Jewry a unique historical event?](#) [The answer is that this was not a unique event, it was and will continue to be a problem for as long as Ishtar exists.]

[Secondly, the question of who is responsible has already received a number of unsatisfactory answers, from Taylor's condemnation of the German people as the source of Nazism to Golo Mann's opposite emphasis on one evil man, Adolf Hitler.](#)

[Wait. Isn't there some possibility that the Nazis could have been a puppet state? Why is the choice only between the dictator or his people? Why isn't puppet dictator on the menu? And why even express this idea unless you are trying to define the range of thought away from puppet dictator? ••• Also, on a tangent, here we have an entire rhetorical device that most people take for style. But it is actually an "Orwellian" tool for narrowing the range of acceptable thought. And those lists of three things, (for example: blue, purple and scarlet) they are used to blur the memory of one thing into three, for example the way that purple was changed into blue, purple and scarlet in the Book of Exodus.]

[Understanding the Holocaust involves clarifying the relationship of the process of genocide to those who ordered it, those who carried it out or supported it, and those who 'merely' accepted it without protest. The question, after all, points us to ask not only about the 'chain of command' but also about the nature and structures of a society which made the unthinkable into the possible.](#) [Again, more defining the range of acceptable thought, and the placement of blame on the Germans. And the idea that the Nazis were a front dictatorship is outside the possible range of thought. Also note the word to in bold, note how it is foreigner English or FE.]

And finally, we must ask why did it happen? This is perhaps the most taxing and speculative of the questions, not only because explaining any large historical event is so difficult, but also because of the obvious irrationality of Nazi policy. If the Jews were not really the force of evil that the Nazis claimed them to be, then why did they act to exterminate them? What madness, both social and psychological, infected the society that created the Holocaust? [The yellow Jews are only evil to the green Arabs still working for the parasite.]

As should be obvious, these questions entail significant issues and demand chains of reflection and speculation. They demand combining the psychological and the social dimensions into a single coherent account in order both to insist on the fundamental irrationality of the Final Solution and to explain its deeper logic. [gibberish]

Is there anything unique about the Holocaust when placed against the century's other mass murders? The Holocaust stands out against the twisted landscape of death in the twentieth century as the one mass murder utterly devoid of instrumental purpose: there is no comprehensible reason for it. Certainly obsessive antagonism towards the Jews was a functional bedrock of Nazism, first uniting the movement[.], then later providing [And there was also] enormous material benefits to tens of thousands during the dispossessions. [6-million die and only tens of thousands benefit? Maybe it was tens of thousands chosen harem brothers that benefitted from the money and breeding slaves rescued from death.]

But all this was secondary, if not unintended: the Nazi passion against the Jews was just that, a passion. Jews were exterminated not because they stood in the way of Nazi goals – for example either by occupying contested space or offering resistance. Rather, their extermination was the goal. [In other words, the European part of WW2 existed primarily to cover up the Holocaust, the Mideast “wind” blowing away all the dead leaves on the tree of life.]

All other mass killings of this century have at least a clear, if tenuous, connection with significant political purposes. And in most cases the murders have ended with the conflict which produced them. The Germans, on the contrary, rounded up Jews and shipped them off to be gassed after they became masters of a certain area, not in order to master it. Extermination of the Jews was an end in itself. [Read that a couple times.]

The Final Solution indeed weakened the Germans' ability to fight. Nearly the entire Hungarian Jewish community was shipped to Auschwitz in May and June 1944, and gassed there while the Soviets were pushing the Germans out of Eastern Europe and the British and Americans were invading Normandy! Were not the troops and supplies more needed in the battles to keep the Soviets out of eastern Hungary? Were not the 147 trains of thirty cars each more needed for rushing troops to the multiplying fronts? 'More needed' – no such calculus animated German policy because extermination of the Jews was itself so necessary that the approach of the Red Army, and certain defeat, only intensified the work of the ovens. It was as if, after all, this was Hitler's purpose, the Nazis' holy mission, their contribution to Western civilization. That work stopped only when, by October 1944, it had become substantially completed: Central Europe had

[been rendered judenrein.](#)

Isn't•real

Later the Arabs got the outsider world to force the Arabs to give the survivors, the Jews, the Judaeen Arabians their promised land back to them. So today, a great amount of harem spawn can come from this place which is supposedly set diametrically against the Arabs in a deadly matrix theatre of fake division and fake hatred, and very real wars where great numbers on both sides die horrible violent deaths.

[Only a handful of survivors still lived in territories which were once home to nine million Jews.](#) [I bet that's the real number, and I would not be surprised if 9-million Arabs were also sent to their deaths in the Nazi camps.]

[One must insist on the diabolical uniqueness of the Final Solution, even in this century of death.](#) [Wait for the Facebook, Twitter and Gmail purges, or drugings.]

Objectivity and Subjectivity in Describing the Holocaust

Unfortunately, as time passes, the Holocaust even if diabolically unique, becomes a historical fact like anything else. It achieves a solidity, a there-ness which incorporates it all too easily into the rationality of human history. In seeking its causes and meanings we cannot help but endow it with an aura of inevitability which indeed suggests a kind of historical legitimacy. Actions, trends lead to it; actions, trends lead from it. The Holocaust becomes part of the order of things. [Furthermore, when historians try to bracket out their outrage and shock that such a thing has happened, when they approach it dispassionately in the name of scholarly objectivity, the last step may be taken towards making it a rational project of human energy and intentions,](#) merely one possible project among others. The Greek term Holocaust, [holo•caust=whole burned] evoking as it does the uncontrolled horror of mass burning by fire, as well as the Jewish [and Arab] [determination \[for the potentially disobedient\] to remember it forever,](#) are only feeble antidotes to this distorting process of objectification.

Study might profitably begin with a subjective response, one which points towards the structures of the Holocaust by suggesting what it means to us. By saying to us I have in mind a yet more specific subjectivity, that of the Nazis' actual or intended victims. When words can be found, what indeed does the Holocaust mean to Jews? Among the most frequent terms used to describe the Final Solution are evil and mad. They are used freely, without self-consciousness about their technical appropriateness or objectivity, and they simultaneously express, judge and describe. To call the Final Solution evil is to judge it morally; to call it mad is to judge it morally and psychologically. Moral judgements, where they are serious, are descriptions of the actions they judge and illuminate their structure. Thus they are key terms for a moral phenomenology of the Final Solution. To speak of evil may make the reader pause. [Claims of good waging war on evil have accompanied every one of the catastrophic events or threats to be treated in this study. Most of the hundred million victims of our century are sacrifices to one or another form of moral Manicheism \[Based on a supposed eternal conflict between good and evil, light and dark\]. Indeed, the Nazis saw their victims as the absolute](#)

embodiment of [Ishtarian] evil, and their mission as cleansing the earth of them. 13 Gil Elliot is not only mistaken but implicitly self-contradictory, when he argues in the Twentieth Century Book of the Dead that moral judgements convey and illuminate nothing about the great mass murders. After all, his own book has a deeply moral purpose: to sketch the great evil of our age. And implicit in such a project is the goal of better understanding it to avoid repeating it. We cannot dispense with such terms of judgement, because morality is both fundamental to political understanding and a necessary dimension of the structure of every action. If we are to rescue the word from misuse by religious or political holy warriors we should restrict the application of evil to actions, not people. As Peter Phillips argues most convincingly and movingly, we simply perpetuate the moral blindness of the Nazis by considering them a race apart. They differ from us only by degrees.

In evoking this perspective, however, I have replaced the subjective starting point with a call for a certain kind of engaged objectivity. Are the two compatible? I have suggested that we all, non-Jew as well as Jew, begin our encounter with the Holocaust as Jews. That is, we can minimize the false objectification as far as possible and begin to glimpse and appreciate what actually happened, if we situate ourselves in the victim's place. Then it is crystal-clear what is meant by extermination. The shock, the rage, the initial unbelievability give rise to calling the Nazis [Germans] evil and mad. They [the Germans] were barbarians. But at some point the process of understanding can continue forward only if we shift our perspective to look behind the act to try to understand those [Germans] who did it and why. [Here is Ishtar blaming Germany without using the word Germany.] At this point it may impede understanding to view the Holocaust as Jews: rage towards those who carried out the extermination programme [This is Ishtar hiding how pogroms were really programs.] may indeed be millennial, and may make all studies of it into thinly veiled acts of revenge. What is needed then is a perspective which can ask why such evil and madness made sense. Is such understanding possible without sympathy? If we may best begin to grasp the Holocaust as Jews, perhaps we may best complete our understanding of it as the Nazis' fellow human

beings. Then, perhaps we can glimpse why these particular people became demonic. In fact, as I will argue, the Germans who participated in the Final Solution acted in response to the pressures they experienced and the prospects they saw before them: which means that anyone, ourselves included, could under certain circumstances become mass murderers. [Here is Ishtar saying that it can do a similar thing anywhere.] A perspective appropriate to this fact precludes all righteousness. Evil and Madness What makes the Final Solution evil has already been indicated: its purpose was to destroy the Jews of Europe. That was its only purpose. Certainly we may speak of all contemporary societies as being in some sense evil, just as we may comment on all war as evil. Indeed, in systemically inhumane societies such as ours, we may all have to concede our own participation in exploitation, oppression, the stunting of human capacities and wasting of lives. But the age-old systematic practice of harming and even killing of human beings has always been kept within certain limits. One limit has been its

economic purpose as with slavery. A certain rudimentary regard for human beings was

always built into slavery. Slaves were, after all, valuable chattels [chattel, FE]. Another kind of limitation, in the case of war, has been set by its military purpose.¹⁵ Above all, humans have been exploited and killed for a reason, and those reasons have defined – and restricted – the various evils visited upon humans by humans as means to specific ends. However, rarely if ever in history can we glimpse the spectacle of extermination as a policy, and certainly never on the scale wrought by the Nazis. [What about Pol pot, Armenia, WW1 machine gun charges, Caesar's killing of Gaul?], The building and operation of killing centres [centers] whose sole purpose was to exterminate the Jews and other lesser [greater, smarter] peoples are the most eloquent arguments that the Final Solution deserves to be regarded as unmitigatedly evil in its structure [different]. It might be argued that because the Nazis believed that they were ridding the world of what they regarded as its [main] source of evil, they, too, killed for a reason. But the very fact that the Nazis believed that the Final Solution would 'cleanse' Europe of the 'vermin' who were the source of its ills marks their undertaking not with moral purpose but with [misconception to the point of delusional] madness. Mad: this term of outrage and judgement is also a term of description, and it may have an unsettling effect on the reader. Irrational perhaps, but mad? I use this as a term of moral phenomenology with intentions similar to those in speaking of the Final Solution as evil. The issue is not whether the individual Nazis were themselves mad: like Arendt's Eichmann, they all may have been quite normal in their environment. Our concern is rather with their outlook and actions. To be sure, if Freud is right we are all somewhat mad, in the sense that being civilized is a sure token of a rupture with significant dimensions of our own and external reality. To employ madness, as a term of social diagnosis, however, is to suggest a collective inability or refusal to experience that reality, and the substitution for it of something mentally conjured up. Individuals regarded as clinically mad dwell systematically among such wholly subjective conjurings, to the point of ordering their lives around them. They differ from the rest of us, of course, only by degree. Similarly, if there is no completely sane society, at various moments of history it is none the less possible to point to societies which in decisive ways have ruptured with reality and acted out wholly subjective fantasies. To describe the Final Solution as mad is to characterize it as a policy which expresses such a systematic rupture with reality. The question is unavoidable: was Hitler mad? At the end, of course, he had lost contact with reality, refusing to even hear reports from the fronts. His last words, [or the words ascribed to him] which blame the war on the Jews, were clearly the rantings of a madman, as was his less widely known decision to destroy Germany. [Clearly the Nazi objective was not only to kill the Jews but also to purge Europe of its best people again. So judging from objectives, isn't the Hitler administration more believable as a puppet than as an organic German thing?]

But just as clearly his tactical course between, for example, 1930 and 1933 shows him to be a political genius. His [Hitler's] brilliance and extraordinary talents included a fine grasp of the objective situation and how to steer through it, exploit it, and ultimately dominate it. [This essentially says that Hitler's genius laid in his fine grasp of the political situation and in his brilliant ability to come to power.]

But even if on this tactical level he was consummately rational, on a deeper level Hitler had already broken with reality. Mein Kampf is a crazy quilt of sense and nonsense, of

brilliant perception and mad railing. [it is also full of cipher numbers] But it remains an integral whole, a Weltanschauung [Weltanschauung = world view. I disagree. I think Mein Kampf is a patchwork of garbage. I also think that it should be required reading as textbook example of political propaganda and garbage media.]

At its root, as the source of all evil to the German Volk, one finds the Jews as international conspirators, controllers of the world's press, carriers of disease, leaders of Bolshevism, financial swindlers, pornographers and procurers [of prostitutes and drugs. It sounds like a pretty good description of the Ishtar beast that the Jews would fronting for until they didn't and were killed off like the leaves of an oak in the "fall" season.]

In his study of Hitler's Weltanschauung Eberhard Jäckel presents a remarkable catalogue of references to the Jews from the first volume of Mein Kampf: 'The Jew is a maggot in a rotting corpse; he is a plague worse than the Black Death of former times; a germ carrier of the worst sort; mankind's eternal germ of disunion; the drone that insinuates its way into the rest of mankind; the [bloodsucking] spider [parasite] that slowly sucks the people's blood out of its pores; the pack of rats fighting bloodily among themselves; the parasite in the body of other peoples; the typical parasite; the people's vampire ...

Madness, like evil, is self-evident to those not sharing in it. What is most remarkable about this particular example is that it became enough of a mass outlook [to pass] for a [genuine popular] movement, and then [to survive for long enough for the entire German] society as a whole to be organized around it.

As Peter Merkl says, speaking of those believing in antisemitic conspiracy theories: 'The movement was literally led by the paranoids. Hitler and Nazi Germany meant it, and acted on it: step by step the Jews were isolated as the non-human carriers of disease, removed from the community, set apart and isolated, and then, appropriately, exterminated [by a common outlook passing for a mass movement, passing for a government. This in the wake of a generation-killing and generation-traumatizing war and by a case of hyper-inflation where money died and the newly arrived "refugee" Jews ended up owning vastly more than they should have owned by pretty much everyone's reckoning.]

Most political ideology disfigures reality. [An interesting confession.] In the next chapter we shall see how Marxism, though containing a critique of ideology, succumbed to the same distorting process as liberal and conservative ideologies, and for the same reasons: to fit a refractory reality to an outlook which needed to see it differently. The Nazi vision, however, and the process of implementing it, leaped far beyond even these political distortions. Nazi antisemitism is a rupture with reality. I choose this formulation rather than the overly functionalistic emphasis on the Jews as scapegoats in order to insist on the element of madness in Nazi policy. There is indeed a logic to the Final Solution, and I will argue that its roots lie in the history and structure of German society. [In other words, the only logical explanation is to blame the Germans.] But it is the logic of a movement which has decisively rejected logic, which has, that is, broken in key respects with the instrumental rationality we usually assume to govern political thought

and action.

The Nazi Party Programme, drafted in 1920 and 'declared to be unalterable', rejects citizenship for Jews but unlike Mein Kampf it does not yet make them the source of all evil. However, the party manifesto on agriculture, proclaimed ten years later when Nazism had become a mass movement, reflects the full-scale [anti Jewish] paranoia we have seen in Hitler's words.

It largely blames the state of German farming on 'the Jewish world money-market, which actually controls parliamentary democracy in Germany [and] wishes to destroy German agriculture', on Jewish domination of wholesale trade; and on Jewish control of electric power, fertilizer and credit. [It is very easy to imagine the green-star Ishtarites working to do this so as to escape-goat the yellow-star Jews they wanted to eliminate.]

One of the essential features of such madness is the abandonment of the distinction between fantasy and reality. To Nazism destroying the Jews meant literally destroying the source of the world's evil. [They were after Ishtar but they instead killed the disloyal people that Ishtar set up as escape goats.]

Symptomatic of its delusionary universe was the prominence given to an organic, magical and biological language, an antiscientific language of incantation. For Alfred Rosenberg, in a book which sold over a million copies by 1942, the Jew's parasitism should be described 'exactly in the same way in which we speak of parasitic occurrences in the life of plants and animals. The sacculina [a barnacle] pierces the rectum of the common crab, and gradually grows into it, sucks away its vital forces [and ultimately killing the crab]; the same process occurs when ~~the Jew~~ [Ishtar] invades society through the open wounds of the people, consuming their creative forces and hastening the doom of a society.'

Such language served Nazi needs well. It raised their assertions beyond dispassionate, objective study while imparting to them a pseudoscientific cast. Detached from the need for verification, such language evoked the mystified fears of those unable to face reality directly. Thus detached, it gave license to complete subjectivity, allowing them to combine the most incongruent ideas into a single whole. Thus, in this 1937 statement of Goebbels, the subhuman Jew [green Ishtarite] becomes the superhuman threat: 'Behold, this is the enemy of the world, the destroyer of civilizations, the parasite among the nations, the son of chaos, the incarnation of evil, the materialized demon of mankind's decay.'

Above all, such language had a transforming function. Alex Bein argues that Nazi teachings were so widespread and widely believed that the Jew ceased to appear as a human being to most people. He came to appear 'as some lower animal, like worms and insects, terrible and incomprehensible in their destructive effect and, above all, like the parasitic microbiological creatures invisible to the naked eye, the bacilli and bacteria which one daily heard and read about as carriers of disease and decay. [You know that Nazi film that visually compares Jews to rat, that was not for the current generation, that was for history, to hid the way the Jews were called parasites and blamed for Ishtar's

parasitism.]

Hence, the rupture: social problems were successfully pointed away from social causes, evocatively focused on a 'carrier of disease' who, moreover, lacked social power and was susceptible to attack. The Jew was weak but strong, subhuman but superhuman; the image of 'parasite' unifies these contradictory conceptions. [The people the German army rounded up were weak, but Ishtar was strong enough to ruin Germany three times.]

The conception of the Jews that made genocide possible is summed up by an instruction manual for the Nazi leadership. 'The subhuman man, who to all appearances is a biologically homogeneous, natural creation with hands, feet, and some sort of brain, with eyes and a mouth, is all the same a totally different, a terrifying creature; he is endowed with human features – though merely a sketch version of the true human being – mentally, spiritually he stands lower than an animal. Inside this man there rages a violent chaos of wild uninhibited emotions: unspeakable destructiveness, primitive lust, unashamed vileness. Subhuman man – nothing else.... He hates the work of the other [German people]. He rails against it, furtively as a thief, openly as a slanderer – as a murderer ... Never has the subhuman man kept the peace, permanent troublemaker that he is. ... He needs for his self-preservation the mire, the hell, but not the sun. – And this underworld of the subhuman man found its leader! The Eternal Jew!' Even forty years later this language has not lost its power to shock – and yet, how much more shocking that these mad ravings should have become the language of policy! Already in Mein Kampf.

Hitler had indicated what should have been done to Germany's Jews at the start of, and during the First World War: 'twelve or fifteen thousand of these Hebrew corrupters of the people' should have been gassed.

[Once] In power, this madness moved to its conclusion: the parasites were [all] exterminated. The Nazi outlook began as a systematic distortion of reality. In power, however, the Nazis were able to reshape reality until it conformed to the distorted fantasy.

In this wild sense, the Nazi outlook became true. The blood fellowship of the German Volk was brought into being in step after deadly step as the Jews were systematically reduced to the status of subhumans: removed from the civil service, disenfranchised, deprived of German citizenship, prohibited from ritual slaughter, their property expropriated, made to wear a special badge [yellow star]. Nazi policy made the Jews over into the vermin Nazism claimed they were from the beginning. Finally, having changed their legal, social, political and economic status into that of living subhumans and having threatened them with extermination should Germany go to war, the final step was carried out: Jews were exterminated. Elimination of humans as vermin was the final break with reality. Madness became policy in the Einsatzgruppen and the gas chambers.

If this meant that psychopathic insanity became normal character structure in the

leaders of the Third Reich, it also meant a systematic corruption of thought and speech patterns. Language militates against the extermination of a people. If it could not be said without implying that it was horrifyingly evil, then references to it had to be detached from all conventional associations in order to disguise what was being said. Thought and language themselves underwent a systematic rupture with reality during the Third Reich.

Responsibility for the Final Solution

The issue of responsibility for the Holocaust appeared at Nürnberg in 1945 and has not left us yet. Was Hitler primarily to blame, or was it the Nazis, or the German people as a whole.?' [Objection. Again, leading the witness and omitting the possibility that the Nazis a puppet government of the Arabs]

Was extermination of six million Jews a direct result of the movement that brought Hitler to power or in some sense the product of German society, or Hitler's own project carried out by hundreds of thousands unable or unwilling to resist his authority?

[Objection. Again, leading the witness and omitting the possibility that the Nazis a puppet government of the Arabs]

If our first question was what was the Final Solution, we must now ask who was responsible for it. It is ironic, but perhaps appropriate, that the most sweeping and powerful argument ever made on behalf of human responsibility, Sartre's Being and Nothingness, was being published in Paris [what a coincidence] as French Jews were being shipped away by a [German] system of evil perfected to minimize anyone's sense of responsibility for it. Only a handful [of Germans] did the actual killing. In a characteristic combination of gangsterism and bureaucracy, the rest [of the Germans] either gave the orders without speaking the words or were mere distant accomplices operating this or that corner of the vast [German] machinery under orders. How far can responsibility for such an operation be extended? It may help us to think in terms of circles of responsibility, moving from the actual [German] perpetrators themselves – both political and technical – to the [German] network of those whose activities supported the extermination, then to those [Germans] who knew about it and passively acquiesced in and accepted it, and finally to those [Germans] who perhaps knew nothing about it or even opposed it inwardly but helped to create the conditions in which it became possible. [what an artificial spectrum] Certainly in the first circle of responsibility stands Hitler himself, who conceived of the mass murder of the Jews and ordered the Final Solution. And here we must include those closest to him, such as Himmler, who directed its carrying out, and the inner circle of leading Nazis. In the next circle of responsibility are the several hundred who, claiming to act only under Hitler's orders, planned and directed every phase of the Final Solution and who have largely been brought to trial since. There is no debate about the direct responsibility of the inner circle of perpetrators themselves. And there is compelling reason to include in the outermost circles of passive responsibility those outside Germany who knew of the great secret and kept it secret, doing nothing to stop the Holocaust. I refer especially to the leaders of the countries which remained indifferent to the Jews' fate, such as the United States and Great Britain – not only by restricting immigration but later by refusing

to attack the camps or the rail lines leading to them. But the greatest area of controversy concerns all those [Germans] in between: the obedient operators of the extermination machinery and those [Germans] who peopled the various layers of the interconnected administrative, mechanical and policing apparatus; the loyal Nazis unconnected to the Final Solution, and non-party members who had helped, or supported, or merely accepted Hitler's rise to power; and loyal Germans elsewhere who knew of the exterminations and did nothing to stop them. [This makes it sound as if all of Germany knew about the death camps and nobody did anything to stop it.]

Whose Authority? In the third circle are the executioners themselves, hardly more than fifty thousand SS members at the camps and in mobile killing teams. [Here is how many men ran the latest Arab extermination program/ pogrom] Members of this group have occasionally been brought to trial and convicted, often in connection with 'excesses'. What is their responsibility? The problem of establishing responsibility in a hierarchical structure such as Nazi Germany (or indeed America during the Vietnam War) led Stanley Milgram to devise his experiments on obedience to authority. Milgram's starting point is his notion that, while the policies of the Final Solution originated in the mind of Hitler, they were carried out on a massive scale only because a very large number of people abandoned their consciences and obeyed orders to do harm to the innocent.³⁸ Milgram's question was: Why did they obey? To answer this he devised the celebrated experiments which tricked people hired as assistants into becoming subjects;³⁹ these showed an alarmingly high willingness of subjects to obey orders, no matter what. But his 'proof' that a large percentage of individuals will obey an evil authority hinges on distorted notions of both individual and authority. Milgram's guiding image of the individual is that of an autonomous person who 'merges ... into an organizational structure' and so abandons his own ability to weigh his actions and their consequences morally.⁴⁰ Milgram's guiding image of authority is of someone rigorously external to the individual, who seeks to have the individual do his purposes, and easily manipulates and lies to the individual.⁴¹ With these guiding images Milgram constructs for us a model of the moral individual murdering under a chain of command which extends back, in the case of the Final Solution, to Hitler.⁴² However significant his purposes, Milgram asks the wrong question and gives the wrong answer. After all, Milgram's 'subjects', as late twentieth century Americans, believe in the authority of science and share with their manipulator a whole set of implicit and explicit values about the employer employee contract. Should we not expect individual disobedience to legitimate authority in a smoothly functioning society to develop only slowly and with great difficulty? What, after all, is more striking, that in the master experiment 60 per cent of the 'subjects' obeyed, or that 40 per cent of them refused to obey?

Milgram's distorted sense of individual autonomy is but the obverse of his distorted sense of authority: he himself acts as a devious manipulator whose goal is to impose radically foreign purposes on his subjects. But was this how Hitler functioned? Contrary to Milgram's assumptions, it is necessary to insist that for the German SS guard, Hitler was his chosen authority. Milgram seems not to realize that this was the man who had received 13 million votes for president in 1932; that he was seen as the Führer; that his party was hegemonic in German society because of the very ideas found in Mein Kampf and Nazi propaganda; that the victory of Nazism was in its essence already a surrender

of whatever 'autonomy' had been possible in Weimar society; that joining the SS meant the complete acceptance of Nazi ideas and a determination to carry them out. The SS oath of induction promised: 'I swear to you, Adolf Hitler, as Führer and Chancellor of the German Reich, loyalty and valour. I pledge to you and to the superiors whom you will appoint obedience unto death, so help me God.' Those who spoke these words [were the ones who] murdered six million Jews. They were overwhelmingly not 'ordinary Germans' but [the most gung-ho] members of the Nazi movement. From that movement came the 3,000 executioners of the Einsatzgruppen, who shot a million Soviet Jews, this 'determined army of death', in Heinz Höhne's words: 'Wholly dedicated to achievement, hardness and camaraderie, they reached a degree of insensibility surpassed only by those soulless automata, the concentration-camp guards. [Most of the guards were on the outside of the camps and could not clearly see what was going on inside.] Here was to be found the elite of that barbaric type of mankind, intoxicated by its own achievements, which Himmler exalted as the SS ideal; it was indeed an Order of the Death's Head [the name of the SS division that ran the Nazi death camps and their precursor death squads] , divorced from the world of ordinary mortals and from their moral standards, ready to undertake any mission ordered by its masters, and prisoner of a community claiming the sole right to decide the SS man's social and ethical standards. For years their leaders had drummed into the men now forming the Einsatzgruppen that they should yield themselves to the intoxication of power, that they should savour [FE] the elite's feeling of superiority and consider themselves a class above the mass of Party members, too superior to conform to their moral standards – they even claimed for themselves the right to turn men into subjects for biological laboratory experiments. If anyone thoroughly believed the propaganda of Nazism – and if anyone was selected and trained to embody Nazi ideals – it was members of the SS. From them were chosen first the mobile killing teams, and later the staff of the extermination camps. If it had been central to Mein Kampf and Nazi propaganda, the outlook that led to Auschwitz became a standard part of the SS training lectures: 'The Jew is a parasite. Wherever he flourishes, the people die. From the earliest times to our own day the Jew has quite literally killed and exterminated the peoples upon whom he has battered [to batten is to prosper like a parasite at another's expense.], insofar as he has been able to do so. Elimination of the Jew from our community is to be regarded as an emergency defense measure.' In short, those who actually killed Jews were carrying out a policy for which they were quite prepared and to which they had become personally committed.

Beyond the Camps: Whose Responsibility?

But how deeply into German society, how far beyond those who directed it and those whose hands were bloodied, does responsibility extend for the Final Solution? Certainly some degree of responsibility is borne by all those hundreds of thousands who were part of the complex and far reaching death machinery – including the soldiers and SS troops who rounded up Jews and shipped them to the camps, countless clerks, construction workers and railroad crews. [1] If you told the conscripted-at-gunpoint Polish construction workers who built Auschwitz that the "showers" they were building were actually gas chambers, and that the crematorium building and smoke stacks were not a central heating facility, but a crematorium for up to 7,000 corpses a day, they

would probably not have believed you. This dual purpose aspect is not an exception, but a defining characteristic of every aspect of the holocaust. Every single murderous thing about the holocaust had a deadly Mr. Hide purpose, and an innocent Dr. J•ak•al euphemism side. And this clearly says that an outside force was responsible for the acme•cide of Europe’s smartest people so the continent would be easier to dominate. 2) It is notable that the rails leading to the big phase II Auschwitz camp run far from both the town and the camp until they turn to enter the camp. So nobody could tell what was coming and going.]

Beyond these are all those hundreds of thousands of Germans who, years before, dutifully performed the various tasks which led up to the Final Solution, and who have argued since that the open and vigorous antisemitism of the 1930s – disenfranchising and expropriating Jews – was one thing, and Hitler's policy of extermination quite another. What kind of responsibility extends to the hundreds of thousands who joined the NSDAP before it achieved power, or to the nineteen million who voted for it in the 1933 election? Or to those who, sensing the evil and madness of this man and his movement, did not devote themselves to blocking the Nazi path to power by whatever means necessary? To those who were politically paralyzed by the rapid Nazi rise to prominence? Does it extend indeed to German society as a whole? Or is the truth rather the opposite – namely that Hitler and his barbarian clique elbowed their way into power at a time of crisis and then, bit by bit, imposed their insane will upon the party, German society, and Europe, to the point of genocide and suicide? While no historian denies the relevance of the flourishing German tradition of antisemitism in the 19th and early 20th centuries, neither is it possible to deny that the Final Solution, as Dawidowicz put it, 'had its origins in Hitler's mind'. Indeed, even Himmler claimed to have been astonished when he first heard Hitler's plans for the Final Solution. If the NSDAP and SS leaders directed it with monstrous efficiency, not one of them believed in it sufficiently to stand up for it and defend it at Nürnberg. The fact that extermination was hardly ever discussed directly, and that official policy was to keep it secret, makes it even more difficult to ascribe it to German society as a whole. Whatever their sense of divine mission, those who ordered and directed it were equally aware that it was a crime to be hidden even from the rank-and-file of the Nazi movement. Nor must we forget that by the beginning of the war most Jews had already fled Germany, leaving only perhaps 250,000 to be deported from Germany itself; that the killing centres were located in the newly acquired areas of Poland, not in Germany, and that the murders were committed in wartime, indeed after the invasion of the USSR opened its bloodiest phase. [1) The death camps were located in Nazi occupied foreign territories where millions of people were killed: and great numbers of these people were killed for even asking minor questions of their occupiers. 2) Any of the soldiers who asked question risked being sent to the dreaded “eastern front” a meme that received far too much attention in the media.]

Moreover the SS was assisted in the extermination programme by native fascists and antisemites everywhere: Letts, Ukrainians, Lithuanians, Hungarians, Poles and Rumanians. Within Germany, it has been emphasized, while many of the votes that brought Hitler to the anteroom of power may have been antisemitic, many others were votes to destroy Weimar democracy and entrust the state to a man who would rule.

Others cast in their lot with the only party that seemed sufficiently vigorous to be able to end the depression. And still others because, like Albert Speer's mother, they liked 'to see clean-cut young men march through the streets, a sight that promised order in the midst of chaos and exemplified energy in the midst of despair.'⁴⁸ If bitter antisemitism characterizes many of the Nazi supporters

studied by Theodore Abel and Milton Mayer, there was no expectation in the earlier study of the approaching doomsday and no rejoicing in the later one over its achievement. Nearly all of these people leave us with a sense that genocide was Hitler's policy, or at most that of the million or so wildgewordene Spiessbürger who made up the most committed Nazis. Few among even the most crazed Nazis could have known that the modern nation-state was about to give them the means for translating 'Juda, verrecke' into reality for the first time in history. Had they known, would they have been so casual in their calls for violence? Who Was Hitler? But to point at Hitler and a relatively small group poses another question: who, after all, was this man Hitler, and how did he attain the power to exterminate European Jewry? [Mein Kampf is emphatically a German, petty-bourgeois document](#) that could have been produced only during Weimar, after defeat, revolution, counterrevolution and disastrous inflation. In Hitler a number of historical currents came together: racism, bourgeois values of law and order, petty-bourgeois resentment, a sentimentalized vision of home and family, nature mysticism, nationalism, and expansionism – plus a 20th century populist determination to realize these ideas politically [by activating the German people](#), No single element was unique to Hitler; rather (in Sartre's formulation), he interiorized a number of decisive historical trends in his developing years, and then re-exteriorized them as his project. However, the essence of the latter was to become [Germany's project](#). If the elements which went into the making of Adolf Hitler belong to his class, his nation's experience and his historical moment, it would be contradictory to claim that the resultant project somehow belonged exclusively to Adolf Hitler the individual. To say (as for example Henry Pachter does) that '[Hitler had become Germany's destiny](#)', suggests not only that he held power, but that his power and projects all became possible because he had absorbed and lived decisive historical currents. This was the sole basis for his power after 1933: to shape the new incarnation of such trends. [The point, then, is not that fifty thousand \[50,000\] Nazis obeyed their Führer but that, after all, these Nazis became a dominant political force able to take hold of the machinery of the \[German\] state and make genocide official state policy.](#) Why was Hitler able to become the absolute leader whose word was law and whose name became the German greeting? Why indeed was he able to attain power quite legally, after receiving one third of the vote? The questions underscore the central point: [Hitler and the Nazis were as much created by German society as they were its rulers.](#) [This is a lie. The Nazis were brought to power from the outside as puppets.]

[It is beside the point to assert, by way of extenuation](#) [as an excuse], [that they took power in a crisis.](#) [Another lie. The loss of 4.5-million of German's most duty-minded men in WWI and the following total economic collapse caused by hyper-inflation had everything to do with Hitler's immense private army of S.A or Sturmabteilung thugs, and the Nazi rise to the point where they could seize dictatorial power over a Germany which lacked real men.]

The spectacular rise of the challenging party, and the absence of sufficiently vital alternatives [due to the violent and murderous activities of Hitler's immense private army of S.A or Sturmabteilung thugs], were key dimensions of the crisis itself. The ascendant movement created the vacuum by paralyzing its enemies politically on the eve of seizing power. The Nazis did this by proclaiming absolute obedience, racism, a cult of violence, aggressive national expansion, and antisemitism: these were not hidden aims imposed after Hitler took power, but lay at the very heart of his enormous popular support. However they were understood outside of the working class, a majority of Germans supported the movement that promised them these things. [Untrue. In November 1932, the Nazis only got 33% of the vote under conditions where opposition people were beaten and killed, and ballot boxes were surely stuffed.]

Antisemitism in Power

Merkel's statistical study of the essays gathered by Theodore Abel in 1934 reveals 'the presence of extraordinary amounts of prejudice and hatred in the respondents, a feature that still has to be fully acknowledged in much of the literature.' Fully 14 per cent of the SA members studied and 11 per cent of the remaining party members reflect full-scale paranoia. In other words, one would expect them to fully believe, constantly espouse, and act upon, the Nazi antisemitic madness. 'It is hard to imagine', writes Merkel, 'a reasonably perceptive, mature person who would join the NSDAP without being fully aware of its chief issue.' What does this tell us about the [German] society in which the enunciators of such madness were able to move from the political gutter into the corridors of power? The point is not to determine what percentage of Germans shared the paranoia of the most rabid Nazis [because most Germans did not] –

studies focused on individuals neglect the fact that political parties do not merely reflect, but also crystallize, focus and shape individual feelings as much as any party can [The Arabs created WWI, and the Jews acted as the face of the black market which obviously profited from the war. Then the Arabs created hyper-inflation and a situation where the Jews seemed the main beneficiaries. Lots of people lost their family lands to what were once trivial debts denominated in gold or its proxy Swiss francs. So there was this entire social strata of people who lost their homes and were forced to go to the cities and often work in factories, so there were lots and lots of people who thought they lost everything to the Jews. Also, the Arabs probably posed as Jews and did some pretty awful things to and near certain characters they would notice, so they would have enough mass murders to run things.

Now after all this, the Arabs created the Nazi party to “crystallize, focus and shape individual feelings” as much as possible. So the Arabs both created the problems afflicting Germany, and then ran the “Nazi” solution to the problem, the elimination of their own yellow cousins, the Jews no longer helping with the Arab cause.]

How the holocaust happened

If you want to know how it happened, and how to prevent it from happening again, look at this document. Here is a summary, here is your enemy's tactical guide.

the Nazis at that moment gained hegemony [domination] over German society. At the very least, the Nazi ascendancy indicated that there was a widespread acceptance of their racist and paranoid rantings as legitimate political discourse [or so the Arabs would have everyone think.] whether it had majority support or not [The Nazis probably would have polled less than 10% without the violence and ballot box stuffing.], an antisemitic course had become acceptable politics. Their enemies' paralysis [due to SA violence], their fragmentation [due to SA violence] and defeat [due to SA violence] without an all-out struggle, meant their acquiescence before such evil.

If before 1933 the paranoiacs dominated the Nazi movement, after 1933 they dominated German society [thanks to a Nazi coup] – meaning that their vision of reality and course of action became prevalent [official state policy]. Did the Nazis reflect German society? [the answer is that they clearly did not.] In politics, such dominance is the ultimate truth. [In politics, dominance is the ultimate truth and all that really matters.]

Thus it is hardly likely that most Germans were surprised when the first government-sanctioned anti-Jewish boycott took place, two months after Hitler became Chancellor. Indeed, Karl A. Schleunes, argues persuasively that the boycott, threatening as it did Hitler's precarious modus vivendi with Hindenburg and the non-Nazis in his cabinet, was organized as a way of channelling and disciplining powerful grass-roots party pressures. The pressures continued, leading to each further step towards [FE] the solution of the 'Jewish Problem':

the antisemitic legislation beginning with the expulsion of Jews from the civil service on 7 April 1933, the Nürnberg Laws of 1935, the Aryanizations (expropriations) of 1937-38, and Kristallnacht – the nationwide pogrom of 9 November 1938.

From Antisemitism to the Final Solution Antisemitism, no matter how hegemonic, does not amount to extermination. The stubborn argument for Hitler's primary responsibility in this project recurs in Bullock's conclusion that 'if ever a man exercised absolute power it was Adolf Hitler.' This appraisal is mirrored in the extreme emphasis virtually all Nazi officials associated with the Final Solution have given to 'obeying orders'. And they are right, in one sense: Nazism was Führer-worship. Self-effacement before unquestioning obedience to Hitler was indeed a cornerstone of the movement. As Rudolf Höss, commandant of Auschwitz, testified: 'I had no second thoughts at the time; I had received an order and had to carry it out. When the Führer himself had ordered the 'Final Solution' of the Jewish question, no long-standing National-Socialist could have second thoughts, least of all an SS officer. "Führer, befehl, wir folgen" – Führer, command, we follow thee – was for us no empty phrase, no mere slogan. We took it with deadly seriousness.' [Here is why kings, dictators and presidents are so deadly dangerous to mankind. And even more importantly, here is why a bill of rights is such a vital component of every constitution.]

What are we to answer to Höss? That to elevate an individual to supreme authority, with such a massive evasion of responsibility, is in itself a deliberate action [On the part of the frontman's Arab supporters]?

Was there not in such subjection a preexisting acceptance of Hitler's intentions as Höss's own, a precognition [pre-understanding] of what Hitler would command, a way of muting consciousness of the barbarism that was thereby chosen?

The point is, after all, that process cannot be separated from content. It says a great deal about the Germans who obeyed that they chose obedience. For example, to join the Nazi party, to vote for it, to capitulate before it – each step meant an abandonment of reason.

To choose the party and leader who would destroy parliamentary democracy was not like choosing a superior form of workers' democracy that would more fully realize the rationalist and egalitarian promises of parliamentary rule. It was to reject any and all democratic, rationalist, and egalitarian commitments. It meant embracing instead the charismatic leader whose unique, almost mystical powers would direct those who had abandoned reason as a guide. A choice of unreason, and a choice of evil. After all, the very word of this man, a man of manifestly evil intentions, became the supreme law of German society.

In achieving this position, wasn't Hitler giving voice to the malignancy, the irrationality of the [Arab directed] social forces that brought him to power? And wasn't his ascendancy a sign of the malignancy and irrationality of a society which could produce no other leading force? [This the Germans held was thanks to Hitler's domination of the gutter, or the more violent sections of German society. And this domination was due mostly to the huge S.A that the Nazis employed, thanks to German commodity companies giving them piles of money because their Arab fronting masters told them to do so.] Moreover, it distorts the course of events to describe the locus of the Final Solution as being Hitler. Among Nazis there was general agreement about the 'Jewish Problem': [but] how could it be solved? [There was little agreement here.]

Schleunes guides us through the prewar period, showing how policies and actions evolved in fits and starts, from a number of centres of action, but were unsuccessful in removing 'the Jew' from German life. Only if we take seriously the Nazi paranoia about the demonic Jewish threat to the Aryan race, can we understand why the need for a solution should have been felt so urgently. [So the holocaust doesn't really make sense unless you think this Aryan stuff was a genuine ideology.] And yet what real solution was there, once total emigration was ruled out because no country was willing to receive the Jews? [Remember that giant ocean liner full of refugees? What nation was going to start taking millions of Arab refugees in the middle of a great decade-long global depression?]

Yehuda Bauer argues, 'the idea of a mass murder of the Jews was the logical consequence of Nazi theories', once emigration became impossible. Logical: each step, from boycott to legislation to Aryanization to [deportation to] ghettoization further separated Jews from Germans [strange how the act of removing these people from society was omitted from this list.] but in the end, the Jews' destructive and demonic threat would only be removed if they were removed. As Ernst Nolte suggests, Hitler's lieutenants may well have shrunk back from the consequences of their wishes and wants, because they were not totally without decency. 'They combated the Jews, but

they failed to recognize that even a complete emigration, according to the intrinsic meaning of the National Socialist doctrine, could not accomplish any genuinely essential changes. No wonder they became the prey of the more logically consistent mind.' Hitler incarnated, especially in the Final Solution, the utter consistency of the racism around which German society had come to be organized. By achieving absolute power he was able to carry this theology to its logical conclusion.

Who Is Responsible?

How far can we now generalize beyond Hitler, his circle, and the SS troops involved – beyond even the Nazi movement and its supporters – in attributing the Final Solution to German society or Germany? [how much can we blame the German people for what we did?]

It is true that no matter how hard we look beyond Hitler we never see more than a relative handful of key actors. But this tells us more about our century's machinery of destruction than about the man Hitler and the German nation-state. [It also suggests a small and easy to manage puppet circus for a nation's leadership.]

Those who could win control over the machinery and organize society around it, needed in the end only a relative handful of obedient servants to operate it. Hitler, we may say, got all the cooperation that was needed. If genocide can be performed by strikingly few, it is no less striking how many accomplices it requires [once the blame-casting starts].

Hundreds of thousands were asked only for their complicity, and gave it. Whether or not they desired to exterminate the Jews, they certainly acted, in the only ways that mattered, to bring that end about. Similarly, those who had voted Nazi, whatever reasons they might give, had acted in the ways available to them to bring to power a movement incorporating violence, obedience, antisemitism, militarism, and unreason.

[The Arabs are just so good at blaming the Germans. But fundamentally, there was this small group of Arabs that instituted this don't-ask-any-questions, just-obey sort of government in Germany where they shipped lots of German off to die in war to to be killed in other ways. Then the Arabs used this to pull off a giant genocide. Then they blamed the German people as much as they could for this. Then they used that guilt to Merkel millions of Arabs into Europe.]

The two and a half million who joined the Nazis by 1935 more directly endorsed and participated in the movement. All those who became agents and beneficiaries of the antisemitic policies must also be numbered among the [vast numbers of German] accomplices, as must those [a tiny number] who knew what was being done to the Jews after 1941 but acquiesced.

Even more directly connected are the hundreds of thousands who, though neither directing the Final Solution nor guarding the camps, provided the machinery through which it took place: those [other prisoners] disposing of the victims' property, [those prisoners] taking inventories of their gold teeth, [those fertilizer plant people] manufacturing and shipping gas, [those prisoners] performing the voluminous paperwork, [those weapons factory owners] directing and profiting from the starving labourers. In the end millions acted and assented: those who knew it was happening but

let it continue, as well as those who aided and abetted it more directly. They all bear a share of the responsibility for the murder of six million Jews.

You have got to believe me

Lets say you had a concentration camp worker, like in Shindler's List. And lets say this guy spoke German, and lets say that he dared talk to his German factory manager. And lets say he knew exactly what was happening at the camps. And lets say he told his manager that the Nazis were starving people down and then gassing them and burning their corpses. Lets say the boss believed this was true. And lets say he wasn't afraid to tell others. And lets say he wasn't afraid of the Gestapo. Who was he going to whisper this information to?

Certainly the average German – let us say, the SPD voter who withdrew after 1933 and kept to himself – is no more responsible for the Final Solution than the average American was responsible for the laying waste of Vietnam. Certainly no more, but also no less. Not only all those who participated in one or another phase of the preparation for genocide [by for example building ordinary-looking showers that could also be used as gas chambers.],

or in the Final Solution itself, but also all those who knowingly accepted without opposition their society's actions thereby made those actions their own. The Nazis did not demand active involvement; having reduced the population to passivity they needed only complicity. [This is an idea that should be read several times because it is so fundamental to understanding the nature of Arab power.]

Already in some sense theirs in historical origin – just as the technological hubris that destroyed Vietnam is a part of American national identity – the Final Solution further came to belong to tens of millions in Germany and elsewhere by virtue of their silent acquiescence. To be sure, Nazi Germany was ruled by terror, and opposition meant grave consequences. The concentration camp system had originated as a way of detaining [German] opponents of the [Nazi] regime. There were many who inwardly opposed what was done to the Jews, but went along because they felt they had to. [That is if they knew what was being secretly done to the Jews, which most of them didn't know.]

On this level Milgram's experiment is illuminating. The military, for example, was whipped into subservience to Hitler's policy, and many of the millions of military and civilian accomplices must have been decent people who hated Nazism but saw no alternative to obedience to their society's [domestic] rulers. Nazi Germany, after all, was a society whose policy from the beginning was deliberately and systematically to transform its citizens into passive agents.

One of the most remarkable facts about the Nazi extermination of Jews is that it proceeded virtually without incident or opposition among Germans. [This is because it was not only top secret, but there was the Russian front and the camps for the government's critics.] Opportunities were certainly available to resist, sabotage, or at least undermine, the Final Solution. It was more than terror, or merely obedience, that

caused the exterminations to be carried out so efficiently and be accepted so silently by the citizens of the Third Reich. [As if they knew that million of people were being gassed and incinerated.]

After all, it was open resistance (culminating in Cardinal Galen's famous sermon), which led the Nazis to abandon their euthanasia programme. Similarly, even under 'totalitarian' rule most of Germany's seventy million faithful sullenly let die the Nazi pagan 'Faith Movement'. Yet the many and complex steps preparing for and carrying out the Final Solution were taken virtually without incident. [Mostly because it was top secret.] Certainly, opposition to the other Nazi projects had developed in peacetime, and they threatened 'Aryans' themselves; while the extermination programme was secret, took place in wartime, and involved 'non-Aryans' [They involved non-Germans in Nazi occupied foreign territories.]

But the overwhelming mood towards the relatively few outcast and then departing Jews seemed to be, if not outright hostility then at least indifference to their fate. After all, was the Final Solution not rooted in a millennial Christian history of antisemitism, given new focus by recent German history? Did not the Nazis take power on a programme of antisemitism, behind a leader obsessed by it and who gave frequent warning of his intentions? And hadn't the militaristic racists defeated their opponents politically by 1933? And did not their new order proceed, as promised, to organize itself psychologically, socially, economically and culturally for war and expansion and against the Jews [and the poorly understood feeding of Arabs Inc.]?

From the start did it not carry out persecution, disenfranchisement, expropriation, and pogrom, and was not this accepted by millions of Germans? [again he stretches the blame to all of Germany] And was there not available in the SS – those claiming after all to be the best, the purest Germans in a racial state – a cadre willing to destroy the Jews? And did not this operation proceed with staggering efficiency? Taken together these by-now rhetorical questions point towards another: was not the extermination of the Jews as much an outgrowth of German history and society as the Nazis themselves? [Again, blame the Germans] If we would understand why the Jews were exterminated these reflections point us not towards Hitler's psyche alone, but towards the [entire German] social soil in which such evil became ascendant.

46 The Heritage of Defeat

What radical social pathology led to and was expressed in the radical extermination programme? The secret which accompanied Germany into the years of inflation and depression was its history of defeat – not only widely resented defeat at the hands of the Allies in the First World War but that of the peasants three hundred years earlier, that of the bourgeoisie in the nineteenth century, and that of the proletariat after the war. If one step in this history was the peasants' defeat by the aristocrats in the sixteenth century, another was the later aristocratic reaction to modernization. They squeezed the peasants harder rather than leading a drive for genuine modernization of the kind which, in the case of England, broke the peasantry as a social force and drew the aristocracy and bourgeoisie close together. By 1848 the constellation of forces had become such

that no bourgeois-democratic revolution was possible: the latter knew defeat in advance. Paraphrasing Marx, [Barrington Moore](#) sketches the resulting bourgeoisie: 'a commercial and industrial class which is too weak and dependent to take power and rule in its own right and which therefore throws itself into the arms of the landed aristocracy and the loyal bureaucracy, [exchanging the right to rule for the right to make money](#).' [Clearly someone else was on the other side of this exchange. And it seems they were happy to make the trade.] They were too few, too timid, and too weak; the [Arab-backed] aristocracy was too strong and, soon, would become the only effective safeguard against the rising proletariat. To say that the bourgeoisie never triumphed in Germany is to say far more than meets the eye. Moore helps us to see how a mad political outlook had already developed in the late nineteenth century and could become a mass phenomenon in the twentieth because, in 1848, the then-rational one had been defeated. The lower middle class developed the furious will and strength to run amok because, a century earlier, their regressive hopes had not been liquidated by an ascending bourgeoisie. No matter how brutally, he argues, the American, French, and British bourgeoisie contributed to gradualism and democracy by successfully making society over in their image. Certainly, they did this to serve their own interest; but they functioned simultaneously as a modernizing, progressive force which, for a time, led and furthered humanity's struggle for freedom and dignity. Their revolution against the feudal world could become

'everyone's' only because it was a relatively humanizing, civilizing, and democratizing struggle. The country of the Final Solution was one in which industrialization, the fundamental economic advance, took place without the parallel human, political, social, and cultural advance embodied in constitutional government, an effective parliament, revocation of aristocratic privileges and the victory of new ideas of human dignity and political equality. A decisive revolutionary rupture with the past in the service of the present and future never happened in Germany, even though it industrialized virtually overnight.⁶⁸ Antisemitism and Völkisch Thought The key to German society's 'illness', to its 'distorted social development' was the defeat of the social forces that might have brought progress in human terms – a more democratic government, a more equal society, a more humane and rationalistic outlook – to accompany breakneck technological and economic progress. On the ideological level this defeat left open space for regressive and anti-rational outlooks to assume a legitimacy and currency unthinkable where successful revolutions had assured the hegemony of values such as reason, equality and progress. At the same time the irresolution and lack of congruence between and within the social, legal, political, economic and educational realms generated tensions which promoted ever more virulent strains of such thought. Regressive outlooks are present in any industrializing society, but in Germany the irrationalist and antisemitic protest against modernity was strong and widespread enough to be a contender for ideological dominance.

We must understand what this means – that prejudice became paranoia. People who hated the coming of the modern world believed what they said when they blamed it on the Jews as the people of the city, of the political and cultural vanguard, of internationalism and commerce.⁶⁹ And they were taken seriously, as age-old Christian antisemitism became absorbed and reshaped into this new current of protest. In 1880

200,000 students signed a petition calling for the exclusion of Jews from government service, public and professional life in Germany. As George L. Mosse points out, antisemitism, anti-modernism and völkisch (i.e. romantic folkish) thought – generally united in a single outlook – became 'commonplace bourgeois notions' in the late nineteenth century. Espoused by respected thinkers and academicians like the historian Treitschke, this current did more than develop claims to scientific, moral and political legitimacy: 'The fact is that schools dominated by the völkisch ideology were so numerous as to constitute the centre rather than the fringe of German education.'⁷¹ How secure were the Bismarckian reforms, including emancipation of the Jews, in a climate in which the antisemitic völkisch outlook 'had permeated much of the nation' even before Hitler came on the scene?⁷² Reforms were not won as the fruit of popular struggles, but imposed from above.⁷³ Not achieved through a real defeat of pre-bourgeois social forces, they rested therefore on shaky soil. This climate of uncertainty, concealed beneath the spectacular rise of German industrial capitalism and of the German socialist movement, is remarkably symbolized in a passage from a letter written in 1917 by Walter Rathenau, then director of General Electric Company, to Mrs von Hindenburg: 'Although myself and my ancestors have served our country as best as we could, I am, as you would presumably know, as a Jew a second-class citizen.'⁷⁴ The Moment of Truth Nevertheless, it seemed for some time that Germany was the world's most modern and potentially most revolutionary society. It seemed also – among Jews – that assimilation and not antisemitism was the real 'Jewish problem' in Germany.⁷⁵ But the real weakness of its progressive forces was revealed. Less in the stampede to war in 1914 – which was, after all, universal – than in the defeated revolution and deadlock following the collapse of the Hohenzollern monarchy and discrediting of the feudal aristocracy. The heritage of defeat here reappears in an especially vicious form: the betrayal of a class by its own party leaders. 1918 was the most propitious moment yet for a decisive victory of 'modernity' in Germany. The military was demoralized by the allied victory and the workers had declared a republic. Even if not a socialist republic, a liberal democracy was in the offing which might

forever sweep away the pre-bourgeois forces from German life. To achieve this the Social Democratic government would, in Moore's words 'have had to get to work at once to take control of the armed forces, the administrative bureaucracy, and the judiciary, remoulding them as instruments loyal to the Republic. It would have had to adopt an economic policy that included a degree of government control over certain areas of heavy industry, with some concessions to the workers over conditions on the shop floor. In doing all that, the government would have had to be willing to forestall the National Assembly by taking a series of essentially irreversible decisions necessary as the foundation for a liberal and democratic version of capitalism.'⁷⁶ The social basis for this vigorous policy existed in the militant and active revolutionary movement, organized into workers' councils. But the Social Democratic leaders did not seek to change the 'wrong, outdated, anachronistic distribution of power'⁷⁷ among the classes of German society. Sebastian Haffner concludes that Fritz Ebert, the spd leader 'did not want a republic, he wanted to save the monarchy'.⁷⁸ Hating the revolution 'like sin', Ebert sought to share power with the bourgeoisie and the aristocracy. His and the spd's main animus became directed not against the old order, but against the repeated risings of workers.⁷⁹ In the end, during the revolutionary wave, the spd not only failed to push for

a liberal democratic programme but accepted, rehabilitated and made common cause with the old bureaucracy and aristocracy against the workers themselves. No wonder that while administering the state apparatus, even at the height of a wave of popularity which gave them eleven million votes in 1919, the SPD made no effort to gain real control of it. Why? Perhaps Moore's description of the bourgeoisie of 1848 can be slightly altered and so made apposite for the SPD of 1918 and after: the party which represented the majority of the working class was too weak and dependent to take power and rule in its own right and therefore threw itself into the arms of the bourgeoisie, the discredited landed aristocracy and the bureaucracy. It exchanged the right to rule and to reshape Germany for the right to further workers' interests under a revived old order. One can scarcely exaggerate the effect of this failed revolution on subsequent events. Germany was in a constitutional crisis of the deepest sort; yet the one force which could have decisively swept aside pre-bourgeois social classes, institutions and ideology had been defeated. More than defeated: betrayed by its own leaders in collusion with the old order, the working class was now split into two parties. It was in the anomalous position of being formally 'in power' while [its leaders continued to call on volunteer soldiers – the Freikorps – to put down workers' \[up\]risings](#). On the other hand, of course, the old aristocracy and bureaucracy hated the 'Marxist' republic which had been manipulated into negotiating a humiliating peace, while the army remained intact and undefeated. In as much as

[the Freikorps led to the Nazi stormtroopers \[the S.A. the Sturmabteilung, the "Brownshirts"\]](#), the non-revolutionary SPD republic was saved by those who would soon become its own gravediggers. If the parties of the working class did not exercise real power after the war, the old order was historically played out, unable now to unite Germany even under a military dictatorship. At the same time, nationalism was intensified by a humiliating and economically draining peace, and by French occupation of the Ruhr. The peace was both too severe and not severe enough,⁸⁰ because it humiliated the old order yet allowed the retention of its minions intact – especially the bureaucracy and military. For all its limits, socialism had had a corrosive effect on the old Germany by bringing the masses to the centre of the historical stage, so that in the Republic the old nationalist and aristocratic parties had become irrelevant. The army remained perhaps the most significant force to be reckoned with under Weimar, yet it too was no longer able to rule. Not strong enough to assume hegemony in the nineteenth century, the bourgeoisie was now structurally even less able to take leadership in a society where socialism was already on the agenda. The worsening political stalemate of the Weimar republic thus reflected a social crisis in which no traditional class was capable of asserting hegemony either by itself or in coalition. One could scarcely imagine a more welcoming soil for the völkisch, anti-modern, irrationalist outlook to be turned into a mass-based political party. The Lower Middle Class and National Socialism The party that emerged owed its origin, nature and phenomenal growth to many things: defeat, failed revolution and constitutional crisis, the deep penetration of the antisemitic and völkisch outlook, and the postwar economic crises. [In the postwar peace settlement Germany had lost 13 per cent of its prewar territory, 10 per cent of its people, 15 per cent of its arable land, 75 per cent of its iron ore deposits, 44 per cent of its pig iron capacity, 38 per cent of its steel and 26 per cent of its coal capacity. \[And\] Inflation, \[quickly became\] tied to the punitive reparations Germany had](#)

to pay the Allies, exploded [this entirely wiped out] the life savings of many of the [almost every single] hard working and thrifty [German person] between 1919 and 1923. [Then] After a [6-year] period of [semi-]stability, the Depression struck, bringing unemployment rates of over 30 per cent by 1932. The Nazis had dropped from 6.5 per cent of the vote in May 1924 to 3.0 per cent that December, and then to 2.6 per cent in 1928. But in the 1930 elections [after the financial crisis of the 1929 stock market crash, and little doubt considerable ballot fraud,] Nazi support skyrocketed to 18.3 per cent, giving them the second largest delegation to the Reichstag.

Barrington Moore confirms that the NSDAP was indeed largely the party of the lower middle class – the 'little men', including teachers, small merchants, white-collar employees and officials, farmers and self-employed craftsmen. Who were these people? The first thing that leaps to the eye, in the studies by Theodore Abel in the 1930s, and Milton Mayer in the 1950s, is that most of their subjects appear quite ordinary and conventional [They are ordinary and conventional because most of the constituency was not real, but mere fake ballots].

'There is little to be found in them' [these common Germans who elected Hitler], says Peter Merkl of Abel's respondents, 'that seems sinister or ominous. And yet the consequences of their common foibles, errors, and delusions cost an estimated fifty million human lives and untold destruction and misery.' [Again, blame the German people.]

If there is a direct line of mad rage from Mein Kampf through the Nazi movement's tactics and actual behaviour in power to the Final Solution, it is not immediately evident in these [fake] people. They are overly sentimental, ardent nationalists [make them seem real] respectful of hard work and honesty, authoritarian and antisemitic. As Barrington Moore describes the respondents in Abel's study, their values are those of early competitive capitalism, they are 'petty bourgeois rather than bourgeois . . . with a strong overlay of both bureaucratic and even feudal features. They are people we can understand and sympathize with, rather than savages from the political gutter.

Hitler himself was patently one of these 'little men'. His jerkiness, exaggerated gestures and insecurity were those of one who lacks the grace and self-confidence learned through operating the levers that reproduce society. His [ghost writer's] writing reads like that of an autodidact lacking training, culture and polish. He was filled with resentment towards his betters, and indeed towards the whole world. He lacked faith in the future and longed to have been born 'earlier'. Certainly idealizing the past or one's childhood does not prefigure evil to come, even if it does show desire to withdraw from a traumatic present. The same is true of intense nationalism. But the Nazis absorbed these attitudes into National Socialism, which is a definite leap beyond the more ordinary kinds of irrationality. In its deep structure it is a contradiction in terms. The worker who tells his story in Abel's account shows the irreconcilable pressure of idealized family and fatherland on the one side, and his experience and identification as a worker on the other. We can see his 'synthesis' of reactionary sentiment and class struggle in his acceptance of National Socialism. Its inherent inauthenticity was his authentic resolution. Abel's other essays show people living under similar enormous pressures,

ten-signs, blockages and contradictions who chose to 'resolve' their situation by leaping beyond it, either towards the chimera of National Socialism, by faith in the absolute leader, or by fixating upon 'the Jew' supposedly 'polluting' their blood or defiling their race.⁸⁴ As an outlook, National Socialism represents a fantastic joining of two irreconcilables. Nationalism united all classes, socialism sprang from class struggle; nationalism needed a foreign enemy, socialism claimed to be internationalist; nationalism deeply respected existing authority, socialism sought (in people's minds at least) to overthrow it. As a mass movement, Nazism was deeply marked by social-democratic aspirations and the workers' struggles against class society. This philosophy of the 'little man' who wants to leave society as it is begins by articulating enormous resentment against wealth and privilege, only to end by effacing this resentment in the larger community of the fatherland.⁸⁵ Its inherent illogic is such that it can be held together as outlook and movement only by three recourses: to an absolute leader, who will mystically cement together the otherwise irreconcilable by force of personality; to aggressive national expansion, as the only way of creating the material means for a 'socialism' providing economic benefits for the workers and poor without disturbing existing economic structures too much; and to virulent antisemitism, as the main defining pole of a Germanic fantasy-community for which class boundaries were irrelevant.⁸⁶ As an outlook National Socialism was not only articulated without style or grace, as Neumann pointed out,⁸⁷ but it was also contradictory, illogical, and founded on a systematic distortion of reality. Because Nazism could not be rational it aggressively promoted the rejection of reason itself, and based itself instead on regression. Regression was one of the strongest currents of Nazism: its explicit goal was to return to the past. In fact, the movement coalesced around a virulent hatred for modernity. According to Nazi ideology the alienated, depersonalized, faceless twentieth-century world was to be reversed in the pure Völkisch state. Medieval virtues, especially of physical prowess, would be given a central place. The peasant, the tiller of the soil rooted in nature, would be honoured once more, and craftsmanship would become socially important again. Irrationalism and obedience to the leader were to replace Enlightenment notions of reason and political democracy. Women would be returned to their role of home-maker, mother and helpmeet [helpmate] for the Aryan warrior. The very notion of the Volk, so central to Nazism, was a deliberate regression from what was seen as the cosmopolitanism and internationalism of the modern world. The Jews were hated primarily as bearers of modernity: an international people, an urban people, adept in the ways of modern capitalism and often proponents of socialism as well. Elemental values common to liberal democracy and socialism – such as equality, civil rights and liberties, the dignity of all people, the importance of rational deliberation and democratic decision-making, rule by law – were violently rejected by Nazi ideology and practice. On the very first page of Mein Kampf Hitler introduced a key reversal of both bourgeois and socialist dreams for international peace and respect between nations. Through conquest the German Volk would increase their daily bread, using swords as ploughshares. Against the panoply of slowly developed civilized values was asserted a brutal vision of Aryan domination: survival of the fittest, subservience to authority, and 'blood purity'. These analyses take Nazi ideology seriously. We have learned that antisemitism, as the pivot of this ideology, must be taken equally seriously. These key strands of Nazism perpetuated the rejection of modernity and rationalism found in nineteenth-century romantic thought, but they gave it a new active and violent mass

character. What was also new in Nazism was its political specificity – it blamed Versailles and the Jews for the actual suffering of Germans in the late 1920s and early 1930s. It physically attacked Jews, broke up meetings, engaged in violent demonstrations, street fighting and political assassinations [all to violently suppress opposition to its agenda of killing the yellow star Jews, the arch enemies of the green star Arabs].

And, as its Ideology and actions gathered support [in the resulting vacuum], it sought political power. The 'little man' gave Nazism the dynamism, force, and organizational strength [the illusion of a popular mass movement so that it was able] to impose its will upon a Germany in crisis, with decisive assistance from the [100,000-man S.A. secret police force, the obedient German] military and large capital [fictional citizens fronting for the Arabs]. For all other classes it was not the right time: they were either timid, without a popular base, defeated, or obsolescent [FE, foreigner English, obsolete]. The 'little man' alone sought and acquired power. The 'Little Man' in Power He did it in a characteristic way, however: by surrendering all power to Adolf Hitler, by abandoning the heart of his social and economic programme, by compromising with his betters and projecting his impotent rage away from this situation. Nazism was a 'socialism' which, in power, would not attack the capitalists, which deeply respected authority, and buried class struggle in aggressive expansion and hatred of the Jews. The point is that the profoundly unrevolutionary yet highly explosive character of this 'fools' socialism' reflected the fundamentally impotent structural position of the lower middle class. The years after 1933 verify that the Nazi project – to guarantee the social status of the Mittelstand [middle class] and protect it against both the working class and capital was, as Kühnl has said, 'objectively illusory'. The 'little man's' energies were 'directed towards the restoration of a past historical situation and social structure which has long been superseded by the development of the productive forces.' In other words, economically and technologically Germany's problems and needs had become those of an advanced capitalist society. Their inherent distance from the real levers of effective social power is expressed in the fact that, by themselves, the social forces of Nazism were incapable of grasping the last rung on the ladder to political power. Without Reichswehr and bourgeois acceptance the Nazis would have remained forever suspended between a hopeless putschism on the one hand and their one third of the vote on the other. The fact that Hitler was invited into office by Hindenburg In 1933 is more than symbolic: other classes, in other societies, have had the means and the will to take power against their national bourgeoisies and/or military forces. By contrast the very unrevolutionary thrust of 'revolutionary' Nazism suggests, among other things, that its leading group, even if it produced a Hitler and entered the halls of power, could never be genuinely dominant. Why? The nature of the lower middle class was to depend structurally on large capital [the fictional citizens fronting for Arabs Inc. This is common democratic tactic/synergy that must always be guarded against in a true democracy.] – socially, economically and ideologically. It desires to turn back the clock [as the Mideast seeks to do so it can better stay attached to its host.] remained purely subjective. Having no authentic – that is to say, independent and potentially realizable – long-term political, social or economic interests of its own, it was indeed as incapable of actual rule as it was of seizing power on its own.

But after all, did not the Nazis take power in one way or another, bringing tens of thousands of their own into leading positions, [What a strange thing to say, what a strange mentality. This is apparently someone's agenda.] and did not Hitler utterly dominate Germany – including, finally, the military, the bureaucracy and the bourgeoisie? We can see this process unfold in Allen's account of Thalberg between 1930 and 1935, and it explains why Mosse uses revolution without inverted commas to refer to the Nazi takeover and its aftermath.⁹⁰ Indeed, did they [the Arabs behind the Nazis did] not worship power, and exercise it – to promote German recovery, [but] to create a totalitarian society, to expand by the threat of war, to conquer Europe with the most powerful war machine ever developed, and ultimately to assume the power of life and death over whole [infidel] peoples?

But these were products of an all-powerful impotence. The Nazis were structurally incapable of doing the one thing that really mattered to their social class: undoing history. The paradox is vividly demonstrated in the [totally bazaar] Nazi treatment of department stores, a process that must have puzzled so many of Hitler's loyal supporters. No capitalist institution had been as prominently attacked along the Nazis' road to power as the largely Jewish-owned department stores [which industry the Arabs wanted to grab control of. This actually makes no sense, so the following underlined is the gibberish Arab propaganda explanation] – this was in keeping with the necessarily superficial 'anti-capitalism' of a class which would attack its larger, more modern and efficient competitors – especially if they were Jews – but not the very market and property system of which it hoped to remain a respected part. [Now the actual history] After 30 January 1933, many of the anticipated steps were taken against department stores. Exceptionally high taxes were levied on turnover. Jewish stores were [officially] boycotted. Permanent limits were placed on chain and department store expansion. Department stores were excluded from handling certain profitable government and party business, and were boycotted repeatedly by various party groups. The failure rate of their apprentices before local examining boards rose appreciably, and the press and the mails discriminated against their advertising.

But, as the policy of a fundamental non-revolutionary government, these could only be temporary or half measures, taken ambivalently. Rapid economic recovery within the existing order, a vital need of the Nazi regime, depended on encouraging the most efficient – in this case, the largest, [most monopolistic] most highly developed – economic forms. Corporate capitalist realities undercut petty-bourgeois dreams as the banks, industry and government officials all saw the necessity of keeping the department stores healthy. Already in July 1933, the Reich Minister of Economics decreed for example that two large Jewish chains, which now had huge government investments, could not be allowed to go under. By 1936 turnover at the large stores had risen back to 86 per cent of that of 1932. By 1938 the threats had been removed, if not the formal restrictions. A 1935 official Party statement criticized the inadequacies of small shops, emphasizing that retail outlets where working people could buy cheaply did not deserve discrimination if maintaining the standard of living was the most important economic objective. Thus did the Nazi 'revolution' capitulate to the priorities of modern capitalist society, which it had no serious intention of dismantling. The vicissitudes [variability] of Nazi policy towards department stores reflect the fact that a non-socialist

movement of 'little men', even if it held state power, could develop no sensible alternative to furthering the interests of monopoly capitalism.

As Poulantzas has argued, this [It] was indeed a secret of fascism: [that] it 'accelerates [FE sic] the consolidation and ~~stabilization~~ of the economic supremacy of big finance capital over the other ~~dominant class and class~~ fractions. ~~But this is by no means to be interpreted as meaning that~~ [thus] fascism represents the economic interests of big capital "exclusively". Fascism, rather, operates in the economic sense, as a factor neutralizing the contradictions among those [other smaller] classes and fractions [of society competing with the Arab monopolies], while regulating development to ensure the exclusive domination of the big capital [enterprises fronting for Arabs inc.]. This 'exclusive domination' did not give large capitalists a free hand – rather, they [still] had to submit to what Neumann called a 'command economy' in which Hitler's [the Arab-run Hitler administration's] priorities ruled to such an extent that some authors have ridiculed the idea that capitalism was favoured under the Nazis. But to argue the point of whether (Nazi) politics or (bourgeois) economics was in command during the Third Reich is to miss the forest for the trees [translation: Of course it was economically motivated, Arab policy is always economically motivated]: a society need not be commanded by big [Arab-fronting] capital [in every single way] to serve ~~the latter's~~ [its] fundamental interests. Even if the logic of his course led him there, serving the interests of big capital was not the main mission of Adolf Hitler. Driven repeatedly into the arms of the bourgeoisie, Nazism continued to dream of going backwards to a more hospitable time but was carried forward by deeper currents than it could ever comprehend.

The inevitable 'compromise' between Nazism's original [German] base and [the] military and economic ~~realities~~ [objectives of its true Arab masters] was brutally announced on 30 June 1934, on 'The Night of Long Knives' which destroyed the Nazi 'Left'. For all the talk of revolution during the Nazi era, and by historians since, basic property relations [i.e. ownership by fictional citizens of great wealth fronting for Arabs Inc.] were not even questioned, [and] the corporate sector became ever more the lynch-pin of the economy. ~~and~~ [In fact,] the German capitalism that rose from the ashes after 1945 had [a] stunning continuity with that of Weimar and the Third Reich. [read that a few times and let it sink in.] Economically speaking, fascism's hidden historical role ~~may have been~~ [was] to create an alliance between monopoly capital [fronting for the Arabs] and the 'little men', but this was accomplished only by intensifying the contradictions between them to the disadvantage of the ~~latter~~ ['little man']. For Adolf Hitler's social class [and people] the Third Reich was a disaster. The Germany of 1939, as David Schoenbaum summarizes its results, confounded all expectations: 'Objective social reality, the measurable statistical consequences of National Socialism, was the very opposite of what Hitler had presumably promised and what the majority of his followers had expected him to fulfill. In 1939, the cities were larger, not smaller; the concentration of capital greater than before: the rural population reduced, not increased; women not at the fireside but in the office and the factory; the inequality of income and property distribution more, not less conspicuous; industry's share of the gross national product up and agriculture's down, while industrial labour had it relatively good and small business increasingly bad. In the [Arab-run] command economy [of the Nazis] all of this took place deliberately: wages and prices were controlled, large farms and estates were

encouraged, migration from country to town and town to city was permitted [encouraged], women were [not only permitted, but] encouraged to work. In other words, while railing against the modern world [Arab interests] Hitler, like all fascists, was a great modernizer [Arab ally].

Impotence in power

My point is not that fascism served the bourgeoisie, which it did, after all, only by commanding it and by plunging Germany into total war. Nor is it that the 'little man' was swindled during the Third Reich, which he was. But, above all, as Bloch said of the peasant, the petty bourgeois was 'situated in an older place'. The 'swindle' confirmed that as a class, the petty bourgeoisie had no programme. That is, no programme which could be put into effect in the Germany of the 1930s. Its rabid desire to turn back the clock represented a fundamental historical impotence, and thus could only be 'achieved' symbolically through a mad break with that reality. Impotent? As I have emphasized, one of the most striking characteristics of Nazism was Hitler's [truly absurd, Arab fronting] power lust. The worship of the Führer already promoted in Mein Kampf [a ghost-written book of semi-gibberish] was central to the conversion of so many to Nazism, [How could Hitler be an idiot if he wrote this big book that everyone is talking about?] and was built into the movement's ethos and [largely fake] electoral appeal.

[Once] In power, Hitler's Arab backers took every step possible to achieve absolute power. The German state attained unparalleled domination over the Western world. How do these undeniable facts square with my emphasis on the impotence of the social class upon which the movement was built? [They don't, or they only do so temporarily. This is because,] In the most basic social sense, the [Arab-fronting] Nazi obsession with power only confirmed their lack of it [genuine lasting power]. This points us towards the terrible fracture in German society in which the class which sought and then held political power was unable to dispose over [dispose of, i.e. get rid of] the prevailing technical-economic complex [of the European people] to achieve any socially meaningful goal [that would help the Mideast]. The nature of Nazi power is the decisive consideration. Certainly any sophisticated discussion of Nazism has to acknowledge the relative autonomy of the political from the economic apparatus, and recognize that at this decisive moment in history power in one realm did not automatically translate to power in the other. A key but generally unposed question about power is the congruence of an aspiring social force with society's actual level of development. As Bloch said: 'Not all people exist in the same now.' Those who clamoured for a return to the past rejected, and ultimately took a kind of suicidal vengeance on, the twentieth-century world. They were, in Bloch's term, a 'non-synchronous remainder' living a 'non-synchronous contradiction'. The primary problem was not that the German lower middle class turned to Nazism in droves but that it existed in the first place as a particularly regressive social constellation retaining political and ideological legitimacy in the fatal conjuncture of the 1920s and 1930s. Bloch speaks of 'synchronous contradictions' in which the 'impeded future' contained in the Now can be set free by a social class

whose being is synchronous with the possibilities of this 'impeded technical

benefaction'.¹⁰² No political force, try as it may, can reshape a society against its actual historical possibilities. If it can indeed cripple or destroy the society, there is no wishing away the realities of an attained level of historical development. Even the ruler of Germany's totalitarian state was impotent to achieve the illusory aims of his class in the face of its fundamental historical weakness – in the face of the inappropriateness of its goals to the prevailing economic-technical complex and its possibilities. In that society, only a genuinely alternative movement in power could have avoided the economic fate of Nazism, its ultimate acquiescence to the structural limits imposed by German capitalism even as it commanded it. Genuine power is socially effective power: the ability to shape society in accord with its actual possibilities, to move confidently towards the future, to be congruent by orientation and disposition with the demands of this society. The Nazis lacked all of these. The ascendancy of this class [the Nazis] was the most sinister reflection of a situation in which no other social class was sufficiently strong or sufficiently hegemonic to rule [in the face of 100,000 violent Nazi private security personnel], and ~~the movement able to grab state power~~ was based (in Fritz Stern's words) on a 'wild leap from political reality'.¹⁰³ We have seen that the 'wild leap' had already been taken from the very beginning of Nazism in Mein Kampf; indeed it received its shape long before, in the middle of the nineteenth century.

If the projection of all of Germany's problems onto the Jews was already built into Nazism this testifies to the incongruence of the 'little men' with the advanced capitalist world. This meant that [the artificial Arab fronting] forces [were] rooted more authentically in that world [and that matrix], like monopoly capital, were bound to triumph [and make lots and lots of money] when it ~~was~~ [became] a question of hard economic realities, such as ending the depression or preparing for war. Nevertheless, this virulent [and completely unacceptable] outlook had already achieved a certain autonomy from its [Arab fronting] social sources, ~~was~~ [and thus became] a 'normal' current [aspect] of German life, and could be reshaped into a legitimate political programme. Their despair about the present [economic and political situation of the German nation], ~~the impossible project of revising history, the redemption of the Volk, the turn to unreason,~~ and the fixation on the Jews [Arabs] as the cause of all evil – each step of this wild leap constituted part of the appeal of Nazism. The other part was its determination to do something about all of this [huge problem once and for all].

Once the Nazis were in power, this determination would meet the limits of reality. The Final Solution From the beginning of the Nazi enragés [Fr. enragés = furor, rage, rabidness, rage, extreme anger. The author of this does not want you to understand how the Arabs used rage to cause the holocaust. First they set up Germany to lose badly in WW1, to kill the good men in Germany and other countries. Then they instituted war reparations that seem designed to have cause the hyper inflation that they caused. And ultimately money died worthless in Germany in the fall of 1923, wiping out everyone's capital apportionments and savings. And there just happen to have been lots of Jewish refugees from Russia during and after WWI (ending in 1918) and before Soviet Union formed and confiscated everyone's possessions in the last couple days of 1922. Lots of these went to Germany. And while much is made of their wealth, it was not really them doing the actual title lending. The Arabs were lending the gold (or its famous proxy the Swiss franc) to the Germans so they could pay their war reparations,

and then due to inflation, they couldn't pay the money back, and had this huge foreclosure crisis where it was the Russian Jews demanding the money, taking away their family homes, and serving as a scapegoat for Arab greed designed to "enragés" the Germans. This anger-wave surfing is a big part of how the Arabs got the Germans to round up all the Jewish communities of Europe and kill them. It was also probably essential for finding people to run the apparatus, people they had no idea that they were pawns killing other pawns in a great stupid game that has no real reason other than vague and confused Arab theories of survival and meaning of life.

We might also take note of how the German leader's title sounds like "the furor" in the world's dominant language. So the lone gunman who authorized the genocide of those 6-million Jews was named "furor". Won't that help the Arab history re-writers to properly record historic reality. And how far have we advanced if we are still calling our leaders as Nero=Black and "Furor".]

[Returning and repeating the underlined:]

The Final Solution from the beginning of the Nazi enragés represented [was due to] the impossibility of reshaping the [Jews of the] twentieth century to the ~~tastes and needs~~ of the Mittelstand [middle class, the Mideast]. They stood for the urge to retreat from a world ~~they hated~~, and the impossibility of that retreat. They also represented the mad and evil visions of victory which grew out of this feverish, yet sterile soil [It was all very emotional, yet there were no alternatives to Nazism presented to people. Also, there was a popular sense that the war reparations were excessive and that they were ruining Germany and that this was not really grasped by the victor nations. Many were probably lead to think that some act of defiance and victory was needed.] After 1933 the Nazis possessed the political power – and military and technological means – with which to try to carry out this retreat imagined as a victory [second stupid attempt at war] . Retreat imagined as a victory: [A second stupid attempt at war] This is after all, the meaning of the torchlight parades, the burning of books, the creation of a specifically 'Aryan' culture, the great rallies and celebrations.

But none of this could pacify either the pain which had driven the lower middle class onto the political stage – which must only have intensified as their actual social and economic situation worsened – or the antisemitic rage which was its insane product. [Translation: But this couldn't pacify the vast German working class. They were driven by war pain and economic pain into politics. And as their economy and society fell-apart completely, antisemitic government rage was its insane result.]

Given the inevitability of its failure on every other level, Nazism could succeed only by addressing and solving 'the Jewish problem' [for their Arab masters]. This is why the logic of Nazism [so directly] leads to the Final Solution. It seems clear that no one, even Adolf Hitler, fully and consciously grasped that this is where the rupture with reality by his impotent class would lead.

In their first years of power, writes Schleunes, the Nazis 'stumbled' towards a solution. Each step was an improvisation, a response to specific pressures and situations, and each step led to a further impasse. 'They were certain only that a solution was [absolutely] necessary. This commitment [and certainty] carried the Nazi system along

the twisted road to Auschwitz.' The extermination of six million Jews, successfully eliminating Jews from most of Central and Eastern Europe, was the Nazis' one great victory. [for their Arab masters.] The Final Solution reflects [is the opposite of] impotence in power. In radically fulfilling the dream of völkisch antisemitism it was the act of those who, having no effective power to shape the social world, ~~still disposed over~~ [in possession of] the political and military might to try to destroy the force allegedly at the source of its evils. [You see, the Arabs have always scapegoated the Jews for their own money extraction techniques. They were the true source of all the host society's evils, but they set-up their disloyal "yellow star" or "yellow leaf" cousins from time to time for not helping out.]

This logic, inherent in Nazism from its origin, was finally stated by Hitler in 1939, and put into action by him in 1941 or 1942. As Germany's defeat in the war became at first possible, then likely, then inevitable, the extermination apparatus only intensified its mission. As the prospect of real victory faded, their mad project to save civilization from the Jewish demon only accelerated [so as to satisfy the Arab masters of the Nazis].

[The excuse idea was that] By exterminating the people who incarnated it, evil could still be destroyed. [Only they didn't go after the right people. They went after the people the Mideast wanted to do away with, the genetic leftovers from its own chosen leadership, the smart descendants no longer loyal to feeding the Mideast and instead, as is totally natural, worked against it.] Only in this barbaric way could the 'little man' become the master race. Unfit for the Modern World or Part of It? In conclusion, what is the source of the ~~impotent~~ [potent] and mad rage that led to the Holocaust? Much about Nazism seems to dispute my analyses of it as a ~~lower-middle~~ [working] class phenomenon. From the beginning the party proclaimed itself beyond class conflict, seeking to harmonize proletarian and bourgeois in the Aryan state. [So Nazism did offer one thing that was nice, a society that was not stratified (at least among Germans) and this was important to the working class.] However deluded, its primary object was, the well-being of all Germans, irrespective of class [was part of their plan]. Moreover [besides], it called itself not only the 'National Socialist' but the 'German Workers' Party'. [The Nazis were also known as the German Worker's Party.] And in fact, by 1935 over a quarter of its membership were industrial workers – the largest number (662,000) of any occupational category in the 2.5 million member party. [So who were the other 75%?] This leads us to the root question: was Nazism the response of a 'backward' class [of Germans] resisting integration into the modern world, or did it rather reflect a rage towards that world by those [Germans] already accustomed and acculturated to it? Was the real root of the problem that Germany, industrializing later than Britain, developed unevenly, its older social layers put into exaggerated tension with its newer ones until an explosion was reached?

For Bloch [the Kaaba] the central characteristic of Nazism was that it emerged ~~from~~ [to deal with a] 'non-synchronous' people [people not synchronized with and not obeying the needs of Ishtar] – remnants of earlier social forms [Mideast leavers/leaves/lines] who persisted [survived] into a present for which they were unfit [to live, In Ishtar's judgment at least]. If misery ~~only~~ [ever] afflicted synchronous people [it was them. New subject] even though of different positions, origins, and consciousness, it could not

make them march in such different directions, especially so far backwards. [Translated: Wherever they came from, regardless of their position or mentality, they all went in their own direction, which was normally backwards for the Mideast, and in defiance of the still binding oath of their ancestors. And that is why we killed them.]

They [the Nazis] would not have such difficulty "understanding" the Communist language which is quite completely synchronous [with Ishtar's needs] and precisely oriented to the most advanced economy. [One way they sold communism was to cast it as more advanced than capitalism.]

Synchronous people [synchronized to the Mideast agenda] ~~could~~ [would] not permit themselves to be so largely brutalized and ~~romanticized~~ [degraded. This], in spite of their mediate [middleman] position, which keeps them economically stupid, [and] in spite of all the semblance that it [that person is now a dead yellow leaf on the tree of life and] has a place there.'

Or is the root of Nazism exactly the opposite, the successful progress of the modern world? In Dialectic of Enlightenment, Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno emphasized that self-denial and renunciation were inherent in the Western programme of the domination of nature, [it is] a project [program] not limited to ~~bourgeois~~ [modern] society but whose literary record was at least as old as the Odyssey [by Homer. This is 2,700 years old]. Fascism, and indeed antisemitism, are seen as one pole of the dialectic of Western civilization [under Mideast domination constantly has with] itself.

As [Western] domination [of the Mideast] progressed, so did the mad revolt of brutalized nature, culminating in the antisemitism of twentieth-century totalitarianism – rooted precisely in its most 'synchronous' people [the Jews. It was their turn.] Its result was not liberation but barbarism: [It was in a way] 'the rebellion of suppressed [light-side goodness] nature against [Ishtarian, dark side] domination, [and all that is] directly useful to [Mideast] domination [of its host].' The Frankfurt [frank•fer•te = honest•bro•you] thinkers saw this barbarism as dialectically linked to the progress of civilization. [The progress of the host normally causes hard times for the parasite.] This is what Herbert Marcuse meant by saying that totalitarian violence 'came from the structure of existing [German] society'. For Marcuse, Adorno and Horkheimer, intensified [debt] domination and [then] renunciation [default] make such explosions inevitable.

Did Auschwitz express the barbarity chosen by those unwilling or unable to join the ~~modern world~~ [Arab cause], as I have suggested with Bloch. Or is its secret the explosion of the ~~repressed side~~ [pent up German/Arab rage] of our long journey away from ~~barbarism~~ [civilization] and towards ~~civilization~~ [barbarism]? In fact, Auschwitz surely reflects both: a consummately civilized barbarism. If they broke through barriers to behavior long equated with being civilized itself, the Nazis did so under the full weight of domination [from an outside invader] and [a sort of] renunciation, possible only in advanced civilization, using the technical and organizational sophistication available only in that civilization. The 'return' to the most brutally primitive levels of behaviour was a product of the present using the tools of the present. In other words, we must turn to [Nazi ideals about] modernity itself, as well as the ~~lower-middle~~ [working] class rebellion

against it, to explain the Holocaust. Or rather, not to 'modernity' as such, but to the fact that after the workers' defeat in 1918 [more attention needs to be given to this idea. Did the Germans think they were fighting a war of worker liberation in WW1?] alternative remained to its [defeat's] most oppressive forms. Defeat was the universal formative experience in Germany. Demoralized, without a way forward, many workers felt such defeat no less than the lower middle class. The ideological and political amalgam they accepted was rooted in a despair which they could see as their own, containing much truth about the destructive side of the modern world. Truth, that is, perceived from the sad position of being unable to create a more humane modern world. If workers [Germans] moved towards Nazism it was because defeat had made them responsive to the rage of the lower middle [working] class. Rather than [than] confusing our class analysis, this fact completes it: As during any social crisis, as with any movement, the dominant party was not wholly of a single class. Others joined it for their own reasons, lending their own weight to the movement while accepting its central thrust. In this tragic situation, the impotent rage of the 'little man' without a way forward [which] became generalized beyond the class in which it originated and to whose situation it gave focus. In the years of crisis after the war [WWI], more and more Germans became despairing [FE] turned therefore into 'little men', and found their way to the Nazi revolt. Their mixture of fantasy and reality, of impotence and power, of regression and modernity pointed towards total war and extermination of the Jews as its natural outcome. [And how does this conclusion follow from the argument expressed?]

[The following is about Arab manipulation in the Soviet revolution and can be skipped. It is a worthwhile read, but not as worthwhile as the material above. The following blue text sections are recommended to Russians and others whose nations have been duped into instituting Arab-fronting confiscatory communism.]

3

Why? Towards a Theory of the Soviet Holocaust

In the early morning of the second day of the Bolshevik Revolution, Lenin and Trotsky bedded themselves down on the floor of Smolny Institute. There the momentous All-Russian Congress of Soviets had just adjourned after adopting a 'Peace Declaration of the Peoples of All the Belligerent Countries', and a Land Decree transferring to local Soviets and land committees 'all land-owners' estates and all lands belonging to the Crown, to monasteries, and the Church', as well as constituting itself the new government of Russia. Thus the Bolsheviks gave stirring proof of their determination to transform the country, and the world, in the direction demanded by the masses of poor and working people in Russia and voiced by Lenin: 'We shall now proceed to construct the Socialist order!' Its first act, the peace proclamation, was addressed not only 'to the Governments and to the peoples of the belligerent countries' but also to the workers of England, France and Germany, whose history of struggle is 'a sure guarantee that the workers of these countries will understand the duty imposed upon them to liberate humanity from the horrors and consequences of war; and that these workers, by decisive, energetic, and continued action, will help us to bring to a successful conclusion the cause of peace – and at the same time, the cause of the liberation of the

exploited working masses from all slavery and all exploitation.'¹ For once in the history of the world the hope was to be acted upon. Certainly the imperialist governments would resist the offer. 'But we hope that revolution will soon break out in all the belligerent countries; that is why we address ourselves to the workers of France, England, and Germany'² Later in the debate Lenin returned to this point: 'If the German proletariat realizes that we are ready to

Why? Towards a Theory of the Soviet Holocaust 65 consider all offers of peace, that will perhaps be the last drop which overflows the bowl--revolution will break out in Germany'³ The proclamation was accepted unanimously. 'Suddenly, by common impulse', wrote John Reed, 'we found ourselves on our feet, mumbling together into the smooth lifting unison of the Internationale. A grizzled old soldier was sobbing like a child. Alexandra Kollontai rapidly winked the tears back. The immense sound rolled through the hall, burst windows and doors and soared into the quiet sky.'⁴ 'Did it go altogether into the sky?' asked Trotsky, following upon Reed's description. 'Did it not go also to the autumn trenches, that hatchwork upon unhappy, crucified Europe, to her devastated cities and villages, to her mothers and wives in mourning? "Arise ye prisoners of starvation! Arise ye wretched of the earth!" The words of the song were freed of all qualifications. They fused with the decree of the government, and hence resounded with the force of

a direct act. Everyone felt greater and more important in that hour. The heart of the revolution enlarged to the width of the whole world. "We will achieve emancipation" The spirit of independence, of initiative, of daring, those joyous feelings of which the oppressed in ordinary conditions are deprived – the revolution had brought them now. "... with our own hand!"⁵ Drifting off to sleep a few hours later, the acknowledged leader of the revolution whispered to the writer of these words, the great organizer of the insurrection: 'Es schwindelt' – 'It is dizzying.'⁶ Dizzying, this achievement of proletarian power for the first time in human history.⁷ If its provenance was clear in the process by which the October Revolution seized power – relying upon tens of thousands of armed workers – its intentions were broadcast in its first decrees. Together they reflected the fact that, for the first time in human history, the Bolsheviks presided over a state directly resting on and serving the poor and oppressed masses. For the next several years this earthshaking event reverberated around the world, inspiring revolutionary movements – including those in Germany, Hungary and Italy – and a wave of worker militancy further West – in France, Britain and the United States. Lenin's whispered comment expresses, unconsciously, a key to what would follow. In speaking German at the first moment of release and relaxation, was Lenin not reflexively suggesting Russia's fatal dependence on Germany? Hitler created Stalin. This simplistic and onesided anachronism points, none the less, to the Bolsheviks' conviction that their revolution was only the opening shot of the worldwide proletarian revolution, and that their own success, indeed survival, hinged on assistance by a victorious proletariat in the West. It suggests that the failure of the German revolution, and its disastrous aftermath, from the beginning turned Russia back on itself to wrestle with the most severe of contradictions: how to build socialism, there, alone. Defeat in Germany was to remove the prospect of proletarian support, and heighten to the breaking point Bolshevik urgency to end Russia's inferiority. Indeed, if defeat in Germany led to Stalin

and 'socialism in one country' in Russia, may we not also say that it led to a suicidally introverted foreign and Comintern policy which kept the German proletariat split while Hitler was rising to power? In this sense, perhaps, it is no less true that 'Stalin created Hitler'. A preface to hope reveals itself most strikingly as a history of unreason when we approach the vicissitudes of this revolution, one of humanity's greatest hopes – and catastrophes – in this century. Even today, the possibility of hope for many continues to turn on how the Bolshevik Revolution is interpreted. Was Stalinism inherent in Leninism – or indeed, in Marxism? Is the Soviet Union a socialist society? Was Russia ripe for a Marxist revolution? Upon such questions seems to rest the very chance of socialism after Stalinism and in the light of today's Soviet Union. After all, of all the century's revolutions, only this one erupted in modern industrial cities and was carried through by the industrial working class. As a result the dénouement of the Bolshevik Revolution has done more to stifle hope than any other event in the century, has helped destroy socialism as an ideal worth struggling for in the minds of generations of industrial workers.

The brute fact of the Soviet Union today, no less than under Stalin, makes a mockery of the claims of those who promise that socialism will be more humane than capitalism, more genuinely democratic, more rational, more technologically inventive, and less destructive of the environment. In short, its very existence, no less than its traumatic history, saps the sense that any alternative is possible. Why struggle for a revolutionary transformation of our societies if that [Soviet style communism] is all that can be hoped for? There are two horrors in the Soviet experience: one is the sheer number of human lives destroyed, the sheer weight of the loss and suffering; another is the defeat of hope.

The second [latter, the defeat of hope] is perhaps the greater barrier for humanity today. After all, even mass death can be somehow absorbed, if it is seen as being en route to a better world. But the defeat and corruption of revolutionary hopes is a moral, intellectual and political loss from which there is no appeal. Humans abandon hope when struggles and sacrifices, accepted in the conviction that they have some meaning and purpose, are seen to lead nowhere.

Achievement and Disaster

The barbarism of Nazi Germany, difficult as it may be to face squarely, nonetheless seems almost easy to comprehend next to the phenomenon of the Soviet Union in the 1930s. The Nazis' madness and evil were apparent in 1933 to anyone who did not share it: war, terror and antisemitism were built into their movement. The great questions about the Holocaust are straightforward, if horrible: why did people choose to commit such staggering evil? But no one contests the complete absence of anything redeeming about the Nazis: no monuments to their purpose are worth preserving except as admonitions. This movement died with its ruler and left everything it touched in ruins. The Soviet Union is much more taxing [and difficult thing] to comprehend. Stalin moved to power silently, almost unobtrusively, not at the head of the glorious mass movement of liberation but in the process of the movement's bureaucratization. [Then, once] In power, Stalin's rule made the whole people potential 'enemies of the people' as it

created an astounding apparatus of inquisition, forced labor and death. It cost perhaps 20 million lives, one in eight Soviet citizens [and most of the nation's smartest and firstborn]. Yet in one of history's most spectacular [imaginary] leaps forward it also created overnight [the illusion of] a modern industrial society, barely soon enough to repel Hitler's armies at the gates of victory. [what a coincidence.] If it did the work of the Devil, destroying and terrorizing, it also [claimed that it] immeasurably enriched and transformed Soviet life, educating, civilizing, spreading medical care, modernizing. If Stalin stands next to Hitler as one of history's great tyrants, he also towers above the leaders of our century as one of history's great [illusionary] builders. Appreciating the aftermath of [the] October [revolution] thus means heading simultaneously in two directions, measuring achievement as well as disaster. About both there remains dispute and denial, even thirty years after Stalin's death. The debate is, of course, political – the more Stalinist construction is stressed, as in Nettl's *The Soviet Achievement*, the less is the catastrophe mentioned (it receives there only seven pages);

the more the catastrophe is stressed, as in the Menshevik Raphael Abramovitch's *The Soviet Revolution*, the less is the achievement referred to (in this case a single grudging sentence).⁹ Avoiding denial means emphasizing both colossal facts which the Soviet thirties have left behind – the victory over Nazi Germany, and the destruction of many millions of ~~people~~ [infidels] – and inquiring into their connection. Certainly the Soviet [Union's incredibly slow] victory over Hitler can be discussed in terms of such variables as overall military strategy, leadership[, poor equipment] and [dumb] battlefield tactics. Stalin's shocking paralysis during the invasion's first two weeks, for example, had a major effect on Soviet losses. At the nadir of the Great Purge, Stalin had stripped the military of competent officers and technical experts. [And] across society, the Purge had replaced morale with terror, drastically retarding production, preparedness and skill. On the other hand Hitler's fixation on taking Stalingrad, for example, can also be seen as the turning point. Nevertheless, in the words of Francis Randall, 'other things being equal, the stronger power wins the war.' The Germans' initial accumulation of armaments and their successful surprise delayed the outcome, 'but Russia's superior strength was never altogether overcome, and eventually won the war.'¹⁰ Russia's superior strength: how did this happen, this transformation from the 'weakest link' in the chain of capitalism to a socialist power superior to one of its strongest links and all her satellites put together? In the height of battle, with two-thirds of European Russia occupied or devastated in 1943, the USSR still out-produced Germany in tanks and airplanes. Although his conclusion may be disputed that Russia's production was superior to Germany's in 'every year' of the conflict, Randall points out the Soviet 'miracle' of the Second World War: 'The Germans started the invasion with a larger accumulation of heavy weapons, and destroyed much of what the Russians had in the first five months. But the Russians eventually succeeded in maintaining their superior production--often in quality as well as quantity – and in concentrating their movements (after the first five months) more rapidly and more effectively to achieve superiorities and win key battles.'¹¹

It may indeed be that the Soviet Union could accomplish this only by destining 'all for the front', and, in Maurice Dobb's words, 'cutting to the bone the supply of all but the

bare essentials for civilian consumers';¹² it may also be that Soviet industrialization had for a dozen years been lopsided towards the heavy industries needed for war production: and it may indeed remain true today that this formidable industrial-technical base has not yet resulted in a bounty of consumer goods. Still, in spite of every possible qualification, the undeniable fact remains that the Soviet Union was saved by modernization and industrialization. It might indeed have been carried out more rationally, humanely and efficiently than the breakneck industrialization of the five-year plans. But without an Industrial, agricultural, technical and cultural revolution victory would have been inconceivable. Revolution: that quantity became quality is attested by the fact that in 1928 production had barely recovered to its pre-First World War level, while by 1940 the basis had been created for a modern industrial state. The last point is decisive. The immensity of the country, its inexhaustible reserves of population, the vastness of its resources – these became positive factors of defence only because they had already been harnessed, developed, organized. This achievement took place in the scant twelve years before Germany attacked. The moving of factories and people eastward as the Germans occupied western Russia, the production of weapons of equal quality to the Germans', the training, equipping and organizing of division after division: all of this testifies to the astounding ability of a country only two generations away from serfdom to function as a modern power in the supreme test of modern powers--total war.¹³ If the achievement is fully half the account, the other half is the holocaust wrought on its people by the state that emerged from the world's first socialist revolution.

Stalin was not boasting when he told Winston Churchill that ten million kulaks had to be dealt with during collectivization, most of them being 'wiped out'. Perhaps 5-½ million peasants died from hunger and the diseases of hunger in the man-made famine of 1932. [The Ukrainian famine of 1932-33 is normally held to have killed 7-million people, or about 25% of Ukraine's population. And why are all the deaths minimized by Aronson, why is not one over-stated?] Mass starvation was caused not by food shortages, but by steeply increased, calculated government requisition from newly-collectivized peasants. Collectivization itself led to some 16 million peasants being forcibly resettled, some 3-½ million being placed in forced labour camps, with perhaps 3-½ million executed. 'Liquidation of the kulaks' truly meant the physical extermination of one part of the Russian population. It was followed by the Great Purge of the 1930s, a gigantic human iceberg of which the infamous Moscow Trials were only the tiniest tip. Robert Conquest estimates that perhaps a million people were executed in 1936-38, that the forced-labour camp population in late 1938 may have been between 8 and 15 million people, and that during the late 1930s 6 ½ million people died in the camps, largely as a matter of policy. The total casualty figure for the Stalin years, 1930-53, is estimated as 20 million dead. Just as with the [eventual] Soviet victory over Germany, so should we take the salient fact of so many deaths as reflecting a much broader reality [of infidel annihilation]. That reality takes in all the trappings of a totalitarian state including the cult of personality, the crude bullying of an entire population, the raising of an entire generation on lifeless dogma, and the return for inspiration to Tsarist models [of Arab front Tsar=Caesar domination]. In the years of terror, no one was above suspicion. All the other five men named in Lenin's will [last will and testament] were to die at Stalin's hands, as well as nineteen of the thirty-three Politburo members between

1919 and 1938. As Anton Antonov-Ovseenko describes the years in which he grew to manhood and saw his father destroyed: 'Fear became a nutrient medium, part of the atmosphere you breathed. Everyone and everything was feared. The neighbours in your building, the caretaker in the building, your own children. People lived in fear of their co-workers, those above them, those beneath them, and those on the same level. They feared oversights or mistakes on the job, but even more, they feared being too successful, standing out. At the top they also lived in fear. A party or government post was something like a smoking crater in which someone had just been killed. A newly appointed minister, Central Committee member, secretary of a provincial committee, or president of a municipal Soviet executive committee would hunch down and work away in the fresh crater in the hope that the theory of probability would not let him down: a second artillery shell shouldn't fall on the same spot.' These years were epitomized in the situation described by Roy Medvedev: 'The country had a President [Kalinin] whose wife was kept in a concentration camp. Informing became a central social activity, as every last person was potentially pitted against everyone else. 'Children denounced their parents, and parents disowned children arrested for "counterrevolutionary activity." Each denounced the other. Under Stalin the number of informers approached the number of inhabitants able to read and write, or speak. Only the infants failed to denounce. Even in the kindergartens denouncing was encouraged. Soon every second person in the country was informing. Under certain circumstances, Jean-Paul Sartre wrote, socialism 'could be synonymous with hell.'

Zachto – Why?

[R. Zachto = for what] Describing that hell has been the great achievement of Alexander Solzhenitsyn. His *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* was published in 1962, during the wave of de-Stalinization under Khrushchev. In reading it our question becomes the one prisoners wrote on cell walls, carved into the planks of transit camps and on the sides of prison wagons: zachto – why? Why the catastrophe? Is it separable from the achievement, as for example Antonov-Ovseenko and Medvedev claim, or was it necessary, as Sartre insists? Was it a cost of modernization? Or a consequence of Communist revolution? Or of that revolution's isolation? Or of its prematurity, as Rousset argues? Or, more particularly, a result of Lenin's untimely death? Or of Trotsky's defeat? Or of Bukharin's policies being abandoned? To reply to these questions, we must take issue with even the most lucid Bolshevik selfinterpretation. This study will insist that the revolution's deformation was inseparable from its accomplishments – in broad outline the thesis developed so powerfully by Isaac Deutscher. But I intend to reverse his emphasis, by focusing on those respects in which the accomplishments of Stalinism stemmed from its irrationality. To be sure, Deutscher was sensitive to the fundamental irrationality which came to permeate the revolution. Indeed, one of its greatest descriptions is his characterization of the situation in which the Soviet people and their rulers found themselves during the tours de force of 1928-33 which transformed industry and agriculture: 'The whole [Soviet] experiment seemed to be a piece of prodigious insanity, in which all rules of logic and principles of economics were turned upside down. It was as if a whole nation had suddenly abandoned and destroyed its houses and huts, which though obsolete and decaying, existed in reality,

and moved, lock, stock, and barrel, into some illusory buildings, for which not more than a hint of scaffolding had in reality been prepared; as if that nation had only after this crazy migration set out to make the bricks for the walls of its new dwellings and then found that even the straw for the bricks was lacking; and as if then the whole nation, hungry, dirty, shivering with cold and riddled with disease, had begun a feverish search for the straw, the bricks, the stones, the builders and the masons, so that, by assembling these, they could at last start building homes incomparably more spacious and healthy than were the hastily abandoned slum dwellings of the past. Imagine that that nation numbered 160 million people; and that it was lured, prodded, whipped, and shepherded into that surrealistic enterprise by an ordinary, prosaic, fairly sober man, whose mind had suddenly become possessed by a half-real and half-somnambulistic vision, a man who established himself in the role of super judge and super architect, in the role of a modern super-Pharaoh. Such, roughly, was now the strange scene of Russian life, full of torment and hope, full of pathos and of the grotesque; and such was Stalin's place in it; only that the things that he drove the people to build were not useless pyramids.' This description of the irrationality of 'socialist construction' captures, as do much of Deutscher's Stalin and Trotsky, the revolution's passage from reason to madness, from good works to evil without ever fully renouncing reason or the good. The strengths of Deutscher's interpretation are the strengths of the Marxist tradition: its rationalism, its understanding of the ways in which situation influences action and action situation, its historical scope, its sense of the interrelation of the political, economic, social and technological planes. But, like that tradition, Deutscher remains uncritical of his own rationalist and progress-oriented premisses; he is too confident of 'history', too unquestioningly insistent that the revolution's contradictory outcome stems from the barbarism of an earlier world. For example, in describing Stalinism 'as the amalgam of Marxism with Russia's primordial and savage backwardness'²³ he fails to see the utter irrationality of imposing 'enlightenment' on a recalcitrant environment, the irrationality that would become indistinguishable from Marxist rationalism. Deutscher's lucidity, and its limits, recall and mirror the strengths and weaknesses of Leon Trotsky's appreciation of the revolution's course. Possessing Marxist intellectual tools but not power, Trotsky in opposition and then exile became the lucid self-consciousness of Bolshevism, the one Russian analyst who both shared the revolution's commitments and dared to confront it with the full force of its own betrayal. He alone spoke to it with its own voice, of its own hopes. Like Deutscher after him, he sought the source of the betrayal in the material situation. Thus he produced the most compelling contemporary self-interpretation of Bolshevism: 'Socialism is a structure of a planned production to the end of the best satisfaction of human needs; otherwise it does not deserve the name of socialism. If cows are socialized, but there are too few of them, or they have too meagre udders, then conflicts arise out of the inadequate supply of milk – conflicts between city and country, between collectives and individual peasants, between different strata of the proletariat, between the whole toiling mass and the bureaucracy. It was in fact the socialization of 'the cows which led to their mass extermination by the peasants. Social conflicts created by want can in their turn lead to a resurrection of "all the old crap"'²⁴ In Marx's original the German reads Scheisse – shit. Meaning classes, exploitation, inequality, the absence of democracy. What else could be expected in a society where the struggle for survival was the dominant feature of life, where the typical citizen was not the literate worker and trade unionist living in

cities and producing modern goods with sophisticated equipment, but the illiterate muzhik, only a generation away from serfdom? Where by the mid-thirties, while 'the United States consumes twelve pencils a year per inhabitant, the Soviet Union consumes only four, and those four are of such poor quality that their useful work does not exceed that of one good pencil, or at the outside two.'²⁵ Seeing the society and most of the population as fatally underdeveloped, Trotsky sought, a way out of the cul-de-sac in which the revolution's own assumptions placed it by describing the Soviet Union as 'a contradictory society halfway between capitalism and socialism.'²⁶ He might with greater accuracy have insisted that the country was being pushed towards socialism without having first gone through the capitalist advance beyond feudalism. He might have emphasized, according to Marxist assumptions, the absence of a process of human development, one which Russia had not yet undergone by itself and to whose fruits it was denied easy access by the failure of revolution in Germany. His theory of uneven and combined development gave a premature happy ending to what would become a tragedy. Writing in the mid 1930s, his vision of the Soviet Union was dominated by his sense of its backwardness – meaning the abysmally low Russian level of education and political development; meaning a general absence of the experience of working in collective, modern industry, of living in cities, of exposure to science and technology. This situation, for Trotsky, explains the growth of bureaucratic rule, increasing inequality, and the cult of Stalin. Trotsky's extremely penetrating analysis is however hampered by a fundamental blind spot. The weakness of his perspective is perhaps best expressed by the major omission of *The Revolution Betrayed*: Trotsky virtually ignores the fate of the peasantry in the early 1930s. He dismisses talk of induced famine, forced labour camps, mass executions, expropriations and deportations, as simply 'the twaddle of liberals that collectivization as a whole was accomplished by naked force.' But as a whole, it was. While Trotsky accurately describes the mood of civil war in the countryside during these years, he pays more attention to the loss of animals – slaughtered en masse when the peasants were forced to enter collective farms – than to the loss of human life. Why? While Trotsky emphasizes the goal of the changes in the countryside as being to move from 'barbarism to civilization' he totally passes over the barbaric means employed. The source of this fatal blind spot is that Trotsky, while in some sense perceiving the contradictory situation in which the Bolshevik Revolution found itself, was himself part of that contradiction. Exiled from power – indeed, perhaps only because of this – he could to some extent voice the revolution's humane, egalitarian and democratic aspirations against Stalin's crudeness and brutality. It is Trotsky, after all, whose history of 1917 has been one of the great celebrations of the power of ordinary people. But, as we shall see, when in power himself Trotsky accepted, even promoted and initiated decisive early steps down the road to the police state of the 1930s. Deutscher, like Trotsky, treats the expropriation, exile and slaughter of tens of millions of peasants with striking callousness. This admittedly 'bloody cataclysm' receives only three pages in Stalin, while an entire chapter ('The Gods are Athirst') is devoted to the

Great Purge of 1936-38, treating it primarily as a party purge. His Trotsky acknowledges, as does his Stalin, that 'millions of people [were] dispossessed and condemned to social, and many also to physical, death.'²⁸ But that is all: where page after page is devoted to the internal manoeuvring under Stalin, to deep and sustained

analysis of the causes of the revolution's turns of direction – for example, Deutscher takes seven pages to discuss the consequences of Jacob Blumkin's 1929 visit to Trotsky on Prinkipo – it is little short of astounding that Deutscher does no more than register the event experienced as an unmitigated holocaust by the vast majority of Soviet citizens. Why does Deutscher's eloquence grow cold when speaking of the destruction of what he regards as the grey, primordial peasantry? To him it seems they scarcely matter, except as obstacles to socialism, as a human mass to be 'civilized'. He seems to regard them with the eyes of a Trotsky, if not a Stalin. Are they not enlightened eyes, Western eyes? His point is that their fate under the Bolsheviks was in a sense foreordained by history. 'In a vast country accustomed to extensive agriculture [the replacement of the unproductive small-holding by the modern large-scale farm] could be achieved either by the energetic fostering of agrarian capitalism or by collectivization – there was no other choice. No Bolshevik government could act as the foster parent of agrarian capitalism – if it had so acted it would have let loose formidable forces hostile to itself and it could have compromised the prospects of planned industrialization. There was thus only one road left, that of collectivization' Although the all-important questions of scale, method and tempo had still to be resolved, 'the actual situation of 1929 dictated that Stalin and his followers attacked the opposing forces with mounting fury.'²⁹ Deutscher does quote Trotsky's description of the 'liquidation of the kulaks' as a 'monstrosity'. But the 'monstrosity' is not the human catastrophe but the fact that 'collectivization should not outrun the technical means needed for it.'³⁰ In other words, the surviving collectivized peasants

would be unable to produce enough to discover the advantages of social over individual farming! For Deutscher collectivization appears as an inevitable war, against virtually equal opponents, 'a war which the collectivist state waged, under Stalin's supreme command, in order to conquer rural Russia and her stubborn individualism.'³¹ Bukharin, reviled by Stalin – and by history – for his sympathy to the peasants, views this 'war' rather differently in his comparison of 1919 with the period 1930-32: 'In 1919 we were fighting for our lives. We executed people, but we also risked our lives in the process. In the later period, however, we were conducting a mass annihilation of completely defenceless men, together with their wives and children.'³² A second blind spot, for all Deutscher's eloquence in rendering the irrational directions taken by the revolution, concerns his unwillingness or inability to comprehend this phenomenon of irrationality. One senses in him no pathos for the millions destroyed; nor even the momentary self doubt that it might all not have been necessary. For his work is animated by a fervent belief in progress and ultimate rationality. Stalin was driving history forward: if the path was catastrophic perhaps this was inevitable. Russian savage backwardness absorbed and transformed the Bolshevik drive to enlighten, modernize, rationalize. Stalin undertook, to quote a famous saying, 'to drive barbarism out of Russia by barbarous means. Because of the nature of the means he employed, much of the barbarism thrown out of Russian life has crept back into it.'³³ It rests with Stalin's heirs to sort out those aspects of the heritage worth keeping from those to be discarded. One senses that the rationality guiding Deutscher's enterprise and the Marxist project in some sense gilds its subjects: tragedies and irrationality there may be, but they fit within an overall logic of human betterment. However, if the whole is indeed becoming insane, may it not be argued that it was not human betterment but 'pyramids of sacrifice' which were being

produced? Deutscher conveys but does not comprehend the break with rationality of a society in which, in Antonov-Ovseenko's words, 'there arose two categories of citizens – those in confinement and those still waiting to be arrested.' This society in which nearly every person became a potential 'enemy of the people' was a society which claimed to be entering into socialism while its children were without milk to drink. Under Stalin, society underwent a rupture from reality, and proceeded instead by a systematic displacement – by fantasy, by organizing itself around myth, and by a violent and disfiguring assault on reality itself to make it conform to the fantasy and myth. But if the worst features of Stalinism are to be regarded as madness, I will argue that they were neither the revolution's accidental deviation nor its bastard child. They were produced, rather, out of the revolution itself, as were its best features and achievements [In the eyes of its true Mideast masters]. Not, as Deutscher argues, as the revenge of Old Russia against her modernizers, but somehow as the product of the modernizers themselves. The Revolution Against the Workers For Lenin the event that 'lit up reality better than anything else'³⁵ was the Kronstadt uprising of March 1921. However the Bolsheviks tried to discount the rebellion at the naval base and surrounding industrial complex – as led by White Guards, anarchists and Social Revolutionaries, as based on new peasant recruits and untried revolutionaries-its locale and character were fated to bring about, as Bukharin said, 'the collapse of our illusions'.³⁶ Leonard Schapiro's description of it as the 'revolt of the proletariat against the dictatorship of the proletariat'³⁷ contains more than antiCommunism. Indeed the entire leadership knew quite well that they were using 'violence against the "toiling masses" in the name of the "toiling masses"'. First, the sailors of Kronstadt had always been the shock troops of the revolution: the Aurura, which had played a major role in the October insurrection, was now up in arms, as was the Petropavlovsk, whose crew demanded the overthrow of the Bolsheviks in the name of proletarian democracy. Second, this uprising was undeniably one of workers – in whose name the Bolsheviks claimed to rule Russia. A sympathetic general strike in nearby Petrograd was expected. And indeed the Petropavlovsk resolution sought not to return to pre-revolutionary days, but demanded freedoms only for the workers and peasants and their parties, calling for an end to the Bolshevik monopoly.³⁹ In swiftly and mercilessly repressing the revolt, the party of workers was suppressing what had been one of the main fortresses of the Bolshevik revolution itself, suppressing those who, genuine revolutionaries, now demanded that the revolution live up to its promises. The reversal is captured in the image of Trotsky reviewing the victors of the bloody assault on the pride and glory of the revolution, the Kronstadt that had been his own political base in 1917. Two simultaneous events confirmed the revolution's direction: the

Tenth Party Congress passed a motion by Lenin to ban organized factions within the party; and this same congress initiated the New Economic Policy. The narrowing of party democracy continued, a process dating back to October 1917. Victorious in the Civil War but frightened by the size of potentially counter-revolutionary forces, the revolution reasserted the Bolshevik political monopoly rather than fulfilling its promise to restore opposition parties. 1920 had seen the debate which led to dismantling the trade unions as autonomous organizations whose purpose was to represent the workers. Deutscher presents the logic of the next step. 'Almost at once it became necessary to suppress opposition in Bolshevik ranks as well. The Workers' Opposition (and up to a

point the Decemists too) expressed much of the frustration and discontent which had led to the Kronstadt

rising. The cleavages tended to become fixed; and the contending groups were inclined to behave like so many parties within the party. It would have been preposterous to establish the rule of a single party and then to allow that party to split into fragments. If Bolshevism were to break up into two or more hostile movements, as the old Social Democratic Party had done, would not one of them – it was asked – become the vehicle of counterrevolution?'⁴⁰ But the goal of the Workers' Opposition and the Decemists was not to overthrow the revolution, but rather to restore proletarian democracy. The Kronstadt rebels had been slaughtered for demanding one fundamental component of such democracy: free elections to the Soviets. Now the party oppositions were prosecuted for demanding others: workers' control at the factories and over the entire economy. Together these demands had been the Bolsheviks' own in 1917; now they were repressed as actually or potentially counter-revolutionary. Why had Bolshevik power, which in 1917 meant workers' power, now come to impose itself decisively over the workers, to the point of making their trade unions instruments of factory discipline and of repressing those party members who sought to restore that power to them? Most immediately, this was a time of crisis: the victors ruled over a ruined country. Ten million had died in the Civil War, industry was at a near-total halt, the cities were depopulated, the countryside was providing a fraction of its pre-war produce. By the end of 1921, thirty-six million people were suffering from famine. The working class – in whose name and with whose support the Bolsheviks had made the October Revolution, who had flocked into the party in 1917 – had fought and died in the Civil War, had been absorbed into the party and government apparatus, or had fled the towns. The ruling party saw itself as a workers' party, but it also saw as threateningly premature demands for free food, clothing and lodging, as well as medical attention, traveling facilities and education – in a land where the railways were ruined and the factories were producing one-fourth of their pre-war output, a land which was reverting to cannibalism in the countryside. These urgencies were framed by the momentous fact, already apparent though not finally confirmed until 1923, that no other proletarian revolution had succeeded in the wake of the World War. The Bolsheviks were alone, ruling over a ruined society. Lenin's speeches and writings of the period demonstrate how far the strategic perspective of European revolution had dominated Bolshevik thought. In 1920, on the anniversary of the October Revolution, Lenin insisted that 'ours is an international cause, and until the revolution takes place in all lands, including the richest and most highly civilized ones, our victory will be only a half victory, perhaps still less.'⁴² Now that the Civil War seemed won, it was clear that economic development had to precede socialism, and reconstruction to precede development. Lenin did not spell out what was the danger that will continue 'until the revolution is victorious in one or several advanced countries.'

But was it not parallel to the bourgeois situation, as Lenin had characterized it: 'however strong it may seem militarily, it is internally impotent'? As time would tell, according to E. H. Cart, 'the Russian

proletariat, unaided by the other proletariats [elsewhere] and thrown back on its own resources, was unequal, in numbers, in organization and in experience, to the enormous burdens which the revolution had unexpectedly placed on it.' This weakness

is the tragic key to the aftermath of the world's first proletarian revolution. The solution to the problem was infernal: the weakness of the working class elsewhere and its smallness and dispersion in Russia both allowed and impelled the Party to step into the gap.

[Here is a guide to some of the way the Arabs cancel out democracy while allowing "voting".] First, all other parties must be repressed, or allowed to lead only a shadow existence. Then workers' freedom must be repressed: their power to manage, to elect, to voice grievances and expectations. Then, freedom within the party itself must be restricted. Trotsky **voiced the implacable if grotesque** [explained the relentless and repulsive] logic of the process: 'The Workers' Opposition has come out with dangerous slogans. They have made a fetish of democratic principles. They have placed the workers' right to elect representatives [leaders] above the [Arab fronting] party, **as it were**, as if the [Arab fronting] party were not entitled to assert its dictatorship even if that dictatorship temporarily clashed with the passing moods of the workers' democracy. ... It is necessary to create among us the awareness of the revolutionary historical birthright of the [Arab fronting] party. The [Arab fronting] party is obliged to maintain its dictatorship, regardless of temporary wavering in the spontaneous moods of the masses, regardless of the temporary vacillations even in the working class. This awareness is for us the indispensable unifying element. The [Arab fronting] dictatorship does not base itself at every given moment on the formal principle of a workers' democracy, although the workers' democracy is, of course, the only method by which the masses can be drawn more and more into political life.' These words betray a striking shift: from the living, breathing workers, with their 'temporary vacillations', to the abstract and now-empty 'principle of a[nArab fronting] workers' democracy'. The recalcitrant [obstinately uncooperative] present is appealed to 'the revolutionary historical birthright of the [foreigner fronting] party' [A double oxymoron]. It may be superfluous to comment that the ostensible goal of the entire project – to draw the masses 'more and more into political life' – is rendered quite impossible by a structural orientation intended to override the masses' 'passing moods'. This exclusive and dictatorial rule of [the Arab fronting] party over class was the result of a successful proletarian revolution and of a numb, prostrate and shrunken working class. Victorious, the proletarian leadership had been absorbed into the administrative machinery of party, army and state. [Thus] This [Arab fronting] bureaucracy began to become the nerve centre of Soviet Russia and – given the absence of a large and active proletariat in the factories – at the same time substituted itself for the class. As Trotsky's statement eloquently stows, by 1921 they had become [Arab fronting] rulers, concerned first of all with keeping power.

Deutscher's and Cart's analyses both suggest that had Russian society been sufficiently developed, the new [Arab fronting] rulers might have been forced to pull back, to allow a more mature and rooted working class some control over an advanced economic base. But, the interpretation suggests, the situation ~~forced~~ [permitted] them to become [the new Arab fronting] rulers [the new Arab mask] in order to strengthen the state which would create that base. In response to the [largely imaginary] crisis [that they invented], they now sought to secure their ability to do just this by expanding their power in every possible direction. Thus in vital respects they became [Arab fronting] rulers in the

traditional mould: they focused not on restoring power to the people, but on taking it from them and using it to protect their position [of power].

They wanted to make certain things happen to and for the people, and 'in their name'. A large, organized, energetic, articulate, and experienced [The underlined are five of the things the Arabs hate in democracies and they are also five of the things that are eliminated in the great war of reduction that the Arabs periodically cause.] working class in the factories, even one organically tied to the party, would have restricted them. It would have conceded less power to them; it would have made its demands too loud to suppress. For all their references to the proletariat, the Bolsheviks were determined henceforth to function, in Moshe Lewin's words, as 'a dictatorship in the void'.⁴⁷ The void caused by proletarian weakness was only the obverse of Russia's other major demographic fact: the vast majority of its people were peasants. The initiation of the New Economic Policy represented a hand stretched out towards that frightening reality of counter-revolutionary Russia – a remarkable concession to reality by urban and future-oriented revolutionaries who feared being overwhelmed by what Roger Pethybridge calls 'the naked confrontation between Bolshevik aspirations and social backwardness'.⁴⁸ Social backwardness, as I have indicated, was defined by these aspirations: the vast majority of Russians, living in the countryside, had just received their land, lived on the borderline between modern civilization and starvation, used wooden ploughs often pulled by themselves, and found their solace in religion and vodka or samogon. The Bolsheviks, of necessity, ruled over this mass of illiterates as a conquered province whose every mood needed close watching. Under the nep, rural Russia, now at peace and relieved of the threat of White restoration, was given the space to develop itself – and feed the country – at its own pace. If the Soviet Union was indeed not ready for socialism, nep was the most tangible proof of and concession to this. In the face of famine, the government restored the free market and an agricultural system based on individual initiative. It gave its way to the 85 per cent of Russia that had supported the revolution only because it meant achieving an age-old dream – private ownership of land. As the urban Bolsheviks confronted rural Russia, these activists, who were, in Lewin's words, 'used to deducing the political from the economic and social found themselves in a disturbing situation in

82 which a governing elite devoid of any social basis embodied a kind of "pure political power" and imposed its will on a society whose spontaneous dynamic, under the nep, tended towards ends that were the opposite of those of the party.'⁴⁹ The void in which they found themselves was in fact a "two-storied void", the first being the absence of a proletariat and the second, that of an economic

infrastructure.' For Lenin this meant not merely that the party must struggle to find ways to build the prerequisites of socialism from the human mass of backward peasants – itself a superhuman undertaking. It meant also the ever-present threat of the party's degeneration: 'Something has happened rather like what we learned in our history lessons when we were children: one people subjugates another. The subjugator is then a conquering people and the subjugated a vanquished people. This is true enough, but what happens to the culture of these two peoples? The answer is not so simple. If the conquering people is more cultured than the vanquished people, the stronger imposes its culture on the weaker. But in the opposite case, the vanquished country may impose

its culture on the conqueror. Is this not what happened in the capital of the rsfsr, and were not 4,700 of the best Communists (almost a division) submerged by an alien culture? Is it true that one might have the impression that the culture of the vanquished is of a high level? Not so: it is wretched and insignificant. But it is still superior to ours.⁵¹ Ruling over Russia, the Bolsheviks were mortally threatened from without and within. Finding themselves in a void they strove mightily and with vigilance to keep both their power and their purpose alive-by perpetuating that void. Hence the trend in which the revolution was, in Isaac Deutscher's words, 'beginning to escape from its weakness into totalitarianism.' **If free elections were potentially counter-revolutionary, and [a] workers' democracy would endanger the [Arab fronting] dictatorship that had come to be the revolution, then any faction calling for workers' democracy had to be banned. Factions were indeed banned. But from then on the party suspended above the masses had to function with an absolute but unwritten law: no one could take intra-party disputes outside to the masses. As Deutscher points out, a party which can allow no freedom to the society it rules ends up by tolerating no freedom inside itself. Concessions to individualism and to the anti-socialist character of the peasants worried many of the Bolsheviks: what would become of**

socialist aspirations? Was nep itself another step along the path of growing irrationality? But there was nothing inherently irrational in the encouragement of individual farming and the restoration of the market. The point is that the contrary aspects of the period – freedom of enterprise, and the progressive narrowing of political controls – were in truth dialectically linked. Undertaken by Marxists, could not help but be accompanied by grave self-doubts, criticisms, and fear of a complete reversion to capitalism. The very weight of the threat, the extent to which concessions to it violated socialist intentions, intensified the siege mentality in the party and the pressure for greater uniformity. It was felt that the party must rule over the peasantry and never permit its own outlook to absorb, however unconsciously, the petty-bourgeois attitudes encouraged by nep. To this very day Bukharin is criticized for having absorbed and expressed the ideology of the kulaks. Keeping its distance from the great mass of the people was thus a fundamental operating principle of the party whose ultimate commitment – and historical and moral claim to superiority over all others – was to be at one with and serve the needs of the great mass of people. Reality itself imposed on the Bolsheviks this rupture with reality.

The Bolshevik Perspective in Perspective Or so it would seem. This would seem to be the likely self-interpretation of a lucid Bolshevik of the early 1920s. As such, Bolshevism's habits of perception and purposes function like unseen lenses through which all situations are perceived, framing the given through which 'reality' and its 'necessities' are experienced. The self-interpretation of historical actors has always been that their actions are imposed by necessity; the victors among them generalize their lenses as norms through which reality itself seems to be speaking. If nothing else, historical hindsight enables us to see the situation as being one of interaction-- composed of events and tendencies which took on their meaning in relation to the Bolshevik intentions and modes of perception. If the situation was indeed becoming 'irrational' in 1921 it was so as an interaction between objective and subjective planes of reality, not as an irreducible, irrational given. Victory made the Bolshevik subjectivity into

a dominant objective force, to be sure; but that was not the only possible way of perceiving the situation in which the revolution found itself. Alternative revolutionary projects did exist, and each defined the situation differently. The anarchist Makhnovist movement, to take one example, controlled large areas of the Ukraine until 1921, fighting off Deniken's White Guards in the name of 'the complete liberation of the Working People from every oppression.'⁵³ The Red Army's victory over it meant the imposition of an authoritarian repressive force, concerned more with party power than workers' or peasants' freedom. The Makhnovists saw the peasants not as the 'huge sack of potatoes'⁵⁴ Marxist lenses insisted they were, but rather as a disciplined, creative and revolutionary force capable of achieving 'the egalitarian, stateless community of workers.'⁵⁵ Bolshevik social roots, traditions, prejudices, theory, goals and experience all led them to fear and suspect the peasants on whom the Makhnovists had based their movement, and over whom the Bolsheviks now ruled. Later Marxists, perceiving the peasants and their own situation differently, were to base themselves in the countryside – in successful insurrections in Yugoslavia, China and Vietnam – but no thought could have been further from the Bolshevik mind. If the suppression of the Makhnovists thus took on the force of necessity to the Bolsheviks, what about the suppression of Kronstadt? Or the integration of trade unions? Or the outlawing of party factions, the proclamation of nep? In short, were there meaningful alternatives within the framework institutionalized by the Civil War? Certainly retrospective lucidity would insist that a more rational policy may be imagined: one capable of halting the dynamic which eventually substituted Stalin for the Soviet proletariat, and moving more deliberately towards socialism. A more rational policy would have allowed for independent trade unions, recognition of all political parties which accepted the revolution and acceptance of factions within Bolshevism, while pushing for a planned economy with stress on building cooperative collective farms. A rational dictatorship of the proletariat would have

continued to train and equip workers to rule, and sought to keep alive their power from the shop floor through the party cells to the Soviets. David Rousset, for example, emphasizes that only trade union democracy could have possibly avoided the organic break 'of the Bolshevik party from the proletariat

Why? Towards a Theory of the Soviet Holocaust 85 at the point of production'⁵⁶ which he sees as the structural root of the revolution's undoing. A more rational policy then, might have made fewer accommodations to the non-socialist sector of the economy while drawing less power into Bolshevik hands: the emphasis on tolerance and concession might have shifted from the economic to the political sphere, taking the place of the emphasis on control. This would have meant sharing power. Could the party have moved in this direction? If a lucid self-interpretation tends to transform its subject's commitments and modes of perception into unseen givens, retrospective lucidity courts the opposite danger – of imagining a situation that could have been severed from the subjective lenses of its dominant forces. Since the situation consisted of the interaction of 'objective' trends with 'subjective' commitments and presuppositions, we must neither be seduced by the Bolshevik self-interpretation of necessity, as if that gave us the situation, nor ignore Bolshevik lenses, as if the situation could have existed independently of them. One decisive lens of Bolshevism – the very basis for its split with the Mensheviks In 1903 – was the idea of the vanguard

party. What Is To Be Done specifies that, because the spontaneous struggles of workers lead only to trade-union consciousness, revolutionary class consciousness can only 'be brought to them from without'⁵⁷ by a 'small, compact core'⁵⁸ of professional theoreticians, propagandists, agitators and organizers. 1917 saw a reversal in Bolshevik practice and, with *State and Revolution*, in theory as well; the following years however, brought a reversion to the theory and practice of the original primer of Leninism. There, as Herbert Marcuse has pointed out, 'Lenin aimed beyond the exigencies of the specific Russian situation, at a general international development in Marxism, which in turn reflected the trend of large selections of organized labor toward "class cooperation". As this trend increased, it threatened to vitiate the notion of the proletariat as the revolutionary subject on which the whole Marxist strategy depended. Lenin's formulations intended to save Marxian orthodoxy from the reformist onslaught, but they soon became part of a conception that no longer assumed the historical coincidence between the proletariat and progress which the notion of the "labour aristocracy" still retained. The groundwork was laid for the development of the Leninist party where the true interest and the true consciousness of the proletariat were lodged in a group

different from the majority of the proletariat.'⁵⁹ The vanguard party implies that the proletariat's own 'natural' course of development does not coincide with, and may even run counter to, the role Marx assigned it. Such an outlook suggested a sense of the party as more advanced than its class, of its ability to appeal to the truth of a situation as being beyond that situation itself, as well as a sense of bitter hostility to all other parties who might mislead the proletariat. As the party more and more becomes the active locus and subject of the revolution the class more and more becomes its raw material and object. But to carry this self consciously Jacobin idea to its extreme conclusion is to negate the very idea of proletarian revolution. History, of course, decided otherwise. The revolutions of 1905 and February 1917 flatly contradicted Lenin's sense of the limitations of the spontaneous consciousness of the proletariat – by creating the Soviets and overthrowing the Tsar – and he saw the need to formulate a more revolutionary perspective on its capacities, in order to bring the party in line with both experience and possibility. *State and Revolution*, written in August and September, was "interrupted" by a political crisis – the eve of the October Revolution of 1917.'⁶⁰ In it he threw off the established 'Leninist' lenses he had used since 1902 – explicitly criticizing the very Jacobin passages in Kautsky he had leaned on before, and insisting now that under socialism 'for the first time in the history of civilized societies, the mass of the population will need to take an independent part, not only in voting and elections, but also in the everyday administration.'⁶¹ Earlier Lenin had accepted and extended Kautsky's attack on the 'primitive democracy' which absurdly demanded 'that laws should be passed directly by the whole people'⁶² and emphasized instead the need for professional revolutionaries and officials. Now he defined revolution as 'the proletariat destroying the "administrative apparatus" and the whole state machine, replacing it with a new one, consisting of the armed worker.'⁶³ The old lenses could not have truly seen the new situation, but the revolutionary commitment underlying them prevailed to shape a view more in keeping with the actual behaviour of the Russian proletariat in 1917. The Bolsheviks became a mass party, taking it upon themselves to express the most radical moods of the proletariat, to organize their militia and, ultimately, to direct their seizure of power.

One consequence of the Civil War was that by 1921 the revolution had become a party affair. While theoretically the Bolsheviks had always seen themselves as representing the working class's deepest long-range needs, the actual conjuncture of Bolshevik policy and proletarian self-consciousness in revolutionary practice had turned out to be episodic – only by midsummer 1917 could they be said to have won majority support. As is obvious from parliamentary experience, such support could in the future be withdrawn, and then perhaps returned once again. Now, by 1921, it became alarmingly clear just how episodic was this conjuncture of party and class. The Bolsheviks could not help but revert to their old lenses, droning on about being the party of the working class even against these workers, who after all were now just recruits fresh from the

countryside. They knew all too well that in the crisis this actually existing working class was ceasing to follow them and tending to see other groups, whether anarchists or the newly revived Social Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, as expressing its aspirations and grievances. Moreover, the Bolsheviks could not help but interpret the crisis that led to the Civil War as confirming both the backwardness and the dominant socio-economic weight of non-proletarian Russia. Ruling over this populace and convinced that it must not have a share in power, the Bolsheviks yet felt the need to grant concessions to its menacing reality. A more socialist-oriented solution than nep might have had unacceptable political over-tones – encouraging, for example, peasant-controlled collective farming. Instead, the political monopoly tightened even as – and because – individual farming was encouraged. The least socialist solution, it was also the one most in keeping with the strengthening of the Bolshevik monopoly. Would free elections to the Soviets or free trade unions have meant the destruction of the revolution? Certainly the rulers would not have been re-elected. The point is that in the trial by fire since 1917 Bolshevik power had become indistinguishable from the revolution. For them to risk that power after the Civil War was inconceivable – all the more so given the ingrained Leninist conviction that the party reflected the long-range interests of the workers even against their short range inclinations. Indeed, had not their victory in fact been the victory of the proletariat and vice versa? The victors of the Civil War were above all determined to preserve the revolution,

even if against the spontaneous and temporary moods of the working class in whose name and with whose active participation it was achieved. **Free elections to the Soviets were therefore unthinkable – especially because in their view an immature working class misled by other parties would have forced the [Arab fronting] Bolsheviks to share their power.** Whatever it may have meant in the underground struggle against the Tsar or in opposition to reformism, with the Bolsheviks holding state power this vanguard conception now meant that they were fully ready to become usurpers installed over the working class in its name. As this usurpation became possible and seemed necessary, however, it initiated an irreversible process. Using their power against the working class, they leaned heavily on and inflated all those aspects of Bolshevik tradition in which they saw themselves as embodying its wisdom over and against it. In the wake of Kronstadt, they would henceforth seek to revive the working class, enlarge it, educate it – while keeping it passive and firmly under control by the party. This, the great contradiction of the Bolshevik revolution, meant that the party inevitably raised itself high above its class

– and Russian society as a whole – and thus ceased being what its Marxism had insisted it must be: the organic expression of the vital modern productive force. The repression of Kronstadt was one decisive step in this detachment, epitomized in the Bolshevik refusal even to negotiate with the rebels. They arrested their representatives, and blamed the workers' and sailors' revolt on White Guards – all acts of a party separating itself from its social base in order to rule over it.

The Need for Mystification

The rupture took place in consciousness as well as in politics. En route to becoming a ruling class, the dominant wing in the party had not only to articulate what was to be done, but also to integrate it into their outlook, to behold it and find it both Marxist and good. The Bolshevik lenses I have described took shape out of a commitment to socialist revolution: in the face of the disjuncture between 'progress and the proletariat' they had sustained a path to the socialist future. But now, in decisive respects, the party itself was veering away from that future. As this happened, the Bolshevik self-conception itself became more and more detached from the reality of Russia in the mid 1920s: Marxism, the great critique of ideology, was itself becoming ideology. And in the process the vision itself absorbed the reality, more and more grotesquely, with ever greater distortion. Certainly oppositionists continued to voice the socialist promise against this sorry reality, trying to open the party's eyes to the contradiction. At the centre of the party, Lenin himself had emphasized in 1921 the distortion of those who saw themselves as 'representatives of the proletariat' when the proletariat itself was virtually nonexistent. In response he was taunted by Shlyapnikov, on behalf of the Workers' Opposition, at the 1922 Eleventh Party Congress: 'Vladimir Ilyich said yesterday that the proletariat as a class, in the Marxian sense, did not exist [in Russia]. Permit me to congratulate you on being the vanguard of a non-existing class.'⁶⁴ An open exchange of such lucid ironies was becoming rare indeed. To see the facts for too long and too dearly was to illegitimize party rule, and worse, to call in question the revolution itself. If I have presented critically the self-interpretation of a lucid Bolshevism, let us be clear that even with its limitations it has been a product of historical retrospect. At the time, only Lenin in the mainstream seemed to approach such lucidity, and even then only for occasional moments. The full force of the contradictions into which Bolshevism had stumbled had become impossible to acknowledge without moving into the opposition, letting go of the levers of power, and risking being cut off from the revolution itself, instead, the dominant Bolsheviks began to veil and distort their own mode of perception. The urge to escape the contradictions appears in the enthusiasm for electrification of the early 1920s, as Marxists confronted the still primitive character of the society they had conquered. Roger Pethybridge quotes from a 1921 poster-poem of Mayakovsky which shows the futurist vision confronting the sceptical bourgeois:

At electrification his eyes bulged a bit,
'Utopia,' he said, 'nothing will come of it'.
Just you wait, bourgeoisie.

There'll be New York in Tetushakh
There'll be paradise in Shuee.

The fantasy of what the future would bring to these two remote villages was pathetically contradicted by reality: when a huge map was lit up at the party congress of 1920 to show Russia's future hydroelectric plants, the electric power of most of Moscow had to be cut off to avoid overstraining its power station. Pethybridge's point is that the fantasy itself was an evasion of Russian reality: 'the existing state of society seemed such a rebuttal of Bolshevik aspirations that it was more comforting to neglect it by looking beyond.'⁶⁶ This escape was fatal: 'the tensions between theory and reality in the social sphere eventually contributed to the political climate that led to Stalinism.'⁶⁷ Perhaps the crowning irrationality of the 1920s was the elevation of the [Arab fronting communist] party to divine status. We have seen how the situation led to isolating and elevating the [Arab fronting communist] party over the workers as well as the rest of Russian society. We have seen this expressed in Trotsky's attack on the Workers' Opposition and Decemists: the party 'is entitled' to reject the 'moods' of the proletariat and exert a dictatorship over the whole of society. [Thus communism became just another trick for the Arabs to rule over a foreign society with absolute and highly profitable power.] Three years later, as he was falling from power and under attack, Trotsky represented and extended this view of the party even as he rejected Zinoviev's call for recantation. As a relatively recent convert to Bolshevism, he may have felt impelled to demonstrate unwavering loyalty in the midst of a fierce struggle; but Trotsky was nevertheless voicing his own and the party's abiding mood, and drew its conclusions with his usual relentless brilliance. 'Nothing could be simpler or easier, morally or politically, than to admit before one's own party that one had erred. ... No great moral heroism is needed for that. ... Comrades, none of us wishes to be or can be right against the party. In the last instance the party is always right, because it is the only historic instrument which the working class possesses for the solution of its fundamental tasks. I have said already that nothing would be easier than to say before the party that all these criticisms and all these declarations, warnings, and protests were mistaken from beginning to end. I cannot say so, however, because, comrades, I do not think so. I know that one ought not to be right against the party. One can be right only with the party and through the party because history was not created any other way for the realization of one's rightness. The English have the saying "My country right or wrong." With much greater justification we can say: My party, right or wrong – wrong on certain partial, specific issues or at certain moments. ... It would be ridiculous, perhaps, almost indecent, to make any personal statements here, but I do hope that in case of need I shall not prove the meanest soldier on the meanest of Bolshevik barricades.'

This growing religion of the party originated as a response to the impossible situation. A guardian of historical truth became increasingly necessary in a situation which so violently mocked that truth. Connected to this is the mythology we have seen emerging about the party's relationship to the Soviet working class. Deutscher describes the process of its formation: 'Acting without the normal working class in the background, the [Arab fronting] Bolshevik from long habit still invoked the will of that class in order to justify whatever he did. But he invoked it only as a ~~theoretical surmise~~ [baseless theory] and an ideal standard of behaviour, in short, something of a myth. He began to see in his party the repository not only of the ideal of socialism in the abstract, but also of the desires of the working class in the concrete. When a Bolshevik, from the Politbureau member to the humblest man in a [jail] cell, declaimed [cried/ shouted] that "the

proletariat insists" or "demands" or "would never agree" to this or that, he meant that his party or its leaders "insisted," "demanded," and "would never agree." Without this half-conscious mystification the [inverted Arab fronting reality of the] Bolshevik mind could not work [and people would not allow it to be imposed upon them]. The party could not admit even to itself that it had no longer any basis in proletarian [as a people's] democracy.' If they found themselves in a contradictory situation by 1921, the [Arab fronting] Bolsheviks lived the contradiction between ideology and reality in part, by losing touch with reality, by distorting it, by lying about it. Only in part, of course: the nep showed remarkable sensitivity towards reality at a time of crisis. At the Tenth Party Congress Lenin emphasized that 'so long as there is no revolution in other countries, only agreement with the peasantry can save the socialist revolution in Russia. And that is how it must be stated, frankly, at all meetings and in the entire press.'⁷⁰ At the Eleventh Party Congress Lenin again emphasized the absolutely central place of the *thesmychka* with the peasants. 'Then the building of socialism will not be the task of that drop in the ocean, called the Communist Party, but the task of the entire mass of the working people.'⁷¹ In spite of such moments of clarity the distortion and the lie became, inevitably, a part of Bolshevism's essence, in accordance with – and in proportion to – the narrowing of its circle of power [under a single dictator frontman, the opposite of what true and broad democracy seeks] We will see this paradox intensify to a point of explosion: Russia's lack of maturity in Marxist terms, the Bolsheviks' impotence to achieve the socialism for which they had come to power, led to one of the most powerful state apparatuses in the history of the world; this state apparatus, constructed in a carefully maintained 'void', came to base itself on wholesale distortion and grotesque [shockingly inappropriate] irrationality. Already, at Lenin's funeral in 1924, the tendency was explicit in Stalin's medieval prayer to the memory of Lenin: 'On his departure from us, Comrade Lenin commanded us to revere and maintain the purity of the name of the party member. We swear, comrade Lenin, that we will faithfully carry out this command! On his departure from us, Comrade Lenin commanded us to safeguard, like the pupil of our eye, the unity of our party. We swear, Comrade Lenin, that we will faithfully carry out this command.'

Stalin Versus Trotsky

On 17 January 1928, GPU agents hustled Leon Trotsky, the leader of the October Revolution, and his family out of Moscow. Exiled to Alma Ata, in Kazakhstan, near the Chinese frontier, Trotsky would never return to Russia or to political power. Kept unnoticed by GPU deception, this momentous departure was both finale and prelude. That the revolution should deport one of its great leaders was given appropriately ironic punctuation by the fact that the commander of the accompanying guards had served in Trotsky's bodyguard during the Civil War. The process and events leading to this event show a further widening of the distance of the leaders of the Soviet Union both from the class in whose name they ruled and the masses over whom they ruled: the dramatic stifling of political life within the Communist Party; the fatal extension of the process of substitution [Killing people and substituting those loyal to Ishtar?]; reliance on ever more grotesque forms of myth making; and the development of the characteristic forms of Stalinist legitimation – the quasi-religious cult of Lenin, the rewriting of history, the use of the big lie, the demand for recantation from defeated opponents. The fundamental

differences that emerged between Trotsky [a political writer whose real name was Lev Davidovich Bronshtien] and [the loyal Arab genocidal murderer frontman Josif Vissarionovich Dzhughasvili, renamed as Joseph] Stalin during the 1920s can be explained by the disintegration of the worldwide revolutionary movement catalyzed by [the] October [revolution].

Thus, in another example of the lucid self-[re-]interpretation of Bolshevism, Jean-Paul Sartre has analyzed the 'monstrous' slogan of the victors' 'socialism in one country', as a response to the impossible situation into which revolutionary Russia awoke in the 1920s. 'Soviet isolation was first and foremost that of a monstrosity: an underdeveloped country moving without any transition from a[n old] feudal system [of Arab domination] to [new] socialist forms of production[,Arab domination] and property [ownership].' For the revolution to succeed in its own terms – to become socialist – required international revolution; for the Soviet Union to survive required turning inward, consolidation, construction. Events had made impossible the unified Bolshevik project – of achieving socialism in Russia as part of a worldwide revolutionary movement – and so it now split into what became seen as mutually antagonistic intentions of radicalizing or surviving. The contradiction became complete as these two irrational fragments of the once unified project proclaimed themselves wholly true when, fundamentally, neither was. On the one hand, 'permanent revolution' risked the Soviet Union, where socialism had indeed taken power. On the other, socialism could scarcely be constructed in a single country, least of all a backward and impoverished one: the victorious slogan, while relieving the Soviet Union of the responsibility for promoting world revolution, also claimed that its backward masses could achieve the impossible by themselves. A tragic necessity, isolation, was mythologized into a matter of national pride as well as an excuse for pursuing a cautious and un-revolutionary foreign policy. The 'abstract universalism' of Marxism, preserving the image of worldwide socialist liberation, became Trotskyism, while its real incarnation in backward Russia became Stalinism. By distorting consciousness, the false became true. The most striking feature of Sartre's discussion is his emphasis on how the false became true in Soviet Russia, in fact as well as consciousness. While socialism was impossible in backward Russia, the revolution led by socialists did indeed triumph. Under Stalin's slogan it proceeded to build 'an order based on the fundamental socialization of land and machines, under emergency conditions and through continual sacrifices of everything to the most rapid possible increase in the rate of production.'⁷⁴ Certainly socialism in a single country became 'synonymous with hell,' but it also became 'the matrix for the institutionalization of the Russian Revolution.'⁷⁵ In other words, a false idea was the response to an impossible situation. Adopted, it became the guide to accommodating socialism to Russia and to transforming the latter: 'The adaptation of this highly specific reality to the new exigencies was to be long, arduous and embattled. But what was essential had been preserved. The transformations had to be violent but they were no longer required to be revolutionary. In this way, the monstrous slogan acquired a practical truth, because it really was the idea of that monstrous but inevitable transformation: of that distorted praxis, whose particular distortion was nevertheless the reality (and therefore the truth) of an incarnation which transcended itself in an undertaking which it conditioned at the outset and which remained qualified by it.'⁷⁶ Sartre certainly makes such distortions sound absolutely necessary, if the revolution were to survive. But as

Moshe Lewin points out, such necessity also retained a great element of chance at its centre.

One leader had seemed capable of calling the monstrosity by its true name; of refusing to give in to ideological distortions which hid the possibilities of the situation: of laying hold of both vision and reality and avoiding the fracture in the party which the [Soviet] revolution's [Arab fronting] position seemed to impose – in short, of uniting in his person the political stature, moral authority, intellectual acuity, popularity, and devotion to the revolution's goals necessary to keep the original Bolshevik project intact. But Lenin – never mentioned by Sartre – was incapacitated by late 1922 and died in January 1924 – an accident of history [little doubt caused by Arabs Inc.] which certainly undercuts Sartre's necessitarian formulations. [The Soviet Union came into existence in the last couple days of 1922 and 13 months later, Lenin, who was incapacitated the whole time was dead.] What if Lenin had lived? Lewin argues that it was not inevitable that left-wing dictatorship had to 'degenerate into a personal, despotic and irrational dictatorship [of the sort the Arabs needed to run the Russian empire and keep Europe apart from Asia].'

While only 'daring reforms' could have counteracted the tendencies of the bureaucratic machine that had emerged from the Civil War, Lewin [al•oo•in] insists that 'there was nothing essentially utopian about Lenin's aim of achieving a rational [Arab fronting] dictatorial regime, with men of integrity at its head and efficient institutions working consciously to be beyond [push for] both underdevelopment and dictatorship [as Arab fronting rulers normally push for].' But such plans could remain only subjective 'wishes' 'in the absence of a capable and undisputed leader.' Lenin's untimely death removed that leader: 'the embalming of his body and the cult of his person helped to dissimulate a type of dictatorship utterly foreign to his plans.' Lewin does not underestimate the difficulties even Lenin would have had in reversing the situation and reforming the party. But by 1922 this had become his goal, and only illness and death kept him from making a determined effort to remove Stalin. He may have failed, even with his skills, his reputation, and his determination. But if anyone could have prevented what became the Stalinist excesses, it was Lenin. 'As the founder Lenin was not afraid of unmaking and remaking what he had made with his own hands. He was not afraid of organizing the people around him, of plotting, of fighting for the victory of his line and of keeping the situation under control. Trotsky was not such a man. Lenin disappeared and Stalin [the murderous Arab frontman] was assured of victory.' An Irrational Situation It is certainly part of the irrationality of the situation that Trotsky became the mythical enemy and Anti-Christ of the revolution only after he was defeated. This may have dawned on many of those who encountered 'Trotskyism' first through the eyes of the Comintern, and found out only later that this mighty foe was no more than an insignificant sect. Indeed, Trotsky had already been bested by the time of Lenin's death, so much so that the succession was never in doubt. It was no accident that Trotsky, travelling to a rest cure, should have learnt of Lenin's death by a code message from Stalin which lied to him about the funeral day. Thus Trotsky continued his trip while Stalin made himself the most prominent of the mourners. The result of the momentous contest between Stalin and Trotsky was strictly predetermined by the fact that effective power had been in Stalin's hands since 1922. Historians tend to present the conflicts of the 1920s as the most articulate protagonists saw them: locked in life-and-death debates about the great

policy issues affecting 'the fate of 160 million people; and the destinies of Communism in Europe and Asia.'⁷⁸ But two puzzling interrelated features of the Trotsky-Stalin conflict point to the deepening 'irrationality of the contest. First, the major oppositionists of the 1920s – not only Trotsky, but also Zinoviev and Kamenev, and later Bukharin – remained strikingly obtuse about the real issue, Stalin's accumulation of despotic power. Second, as Deutscher says, 'this great contest took place in a frightful void. On either side only small groups were involved.'⁷⁹ The interaction of Marxist blindness and the reality of Bolshevik power doomed any and all oppositions, and intensified the irrational course of the

revolution. So blind to the decisive political process was Trotsky that as late as 1926-27 he was able to proclaim as the paramount principle of the Joint Opposition: 'With Stalin against Bukharin? – Yes. With Bukharin against Stalin? – Never.' In other words, the reigning social and economic considerations dictated a possible alliance with 'centrist' Stalin but never with 'rightist' Bukharin.

Bukharin was himself so obtuse to the political process taking place that he contributed to destroying party democracy, without which he himself was destined to be helpless once Stalin decided to change course. When Stalin stole Trotsky's thunder and displaced Bukharin in 1928-29 by his push for rapid industrialization, it should have become clear to both that their Marxist disposition to emphasize social and economic 'substance' over political 'form' had blinded them to the most important changes taking place in the 1920s: the separation of the party from the proletariat and of the leadership from the party apparatus, whose apex of decision-making progressively narrowed until it was wholly dominated by the General Secretary; and the final elimination of all opposition to the latter's domination.⁸¹ Their Platform, drafted in October 1928, leaves no doubt of the Joint Opposition's primary concern with the social and economic 'base' of Soviet society rather than its political 'superstructure'. In that respect it was on the whole an excellent critique and a plausible programme, projecting a rational Left path towards voluntary cooperatives and greater industrial development and planning, as well as defending the economic rights of workers and poor and middle peasants. In this last sense it would have changed the thrust of the *smychka* with the peasantry towards those who had most to gain from a more explicitly socialist course. In addition, it rejected – shortly before the Great Depression began – the thesis of capitalist stabilization upon which 'socialism in one country' was based, and sought a more militant international in anticipation of a revival of imperialist aggressiveness and, perhaps, of socialist opportunity. The programme of the Joint Opposition, in short, projected a course that would have been far more foresighted and humane, as well as effective, than the convulsive 'Great Change' initiated by Stalin two years later. As such, it has for fifty years been the locus of Marxist criticism of Stalinism, achieving the status of the rational

alternative which, tragically, was not to be followed. The Platform, like many of those whose sense of subsequent history has been shaped by it, makes a single but decisive mistake: it assumes 'that the situation can be corrected by the party itself.'⁸² The circumstances of its drafting, as well as its form, tone and content reflect the Opposition's determination to persuade the party politically to a new course even

though, in terms of structure and personnel, it was becoming drastically different from the one that had made the revolution. Certainly the Opposition could count on several thousand supporters among the Old Bolsheviks, perhaps as many as Stalin and Bukharin.⁸³ But beneath this thin layer was a vast inert mass, members who had joined more recently and who had little commitment to, or experience of, disagreement, debate and democracy. For them the party was the new avenue of advancement, and their relationship to it was structured by the hierarchies and routines of the newly developing system of privilege and power. If Trotsky and his followers still thought and acted in terms of a party, most of these party masses were now candidates for the machine: they were not revolutionaries so much as a

part of the emerging ruling class. Their adherence to a risky Left deviation was the last thing to be expected. Manipulated by Stalin, this apparatus had blocked Trotsky at every turn at least since Lenin's death, slowly but inexorably narrowing the ground on which he stood, often with his own cooperation. 'Trotskyism' had already been described as a deviation from Leninism; oppositionists had lost their positions and been deprived of access to other party members, at congresses or in print, and were being hounded from the party. In fact, the Joint Opposition 'offensive' culminating in the Platform may equally be seen as their last gasp, the defensive and impotent response of people fighting for their political lives. Placed in this context, the Platform reads as an act of uncomprehending blindness, a futile show of intellectual acuity in a situation dominated by a deaf-and-dumb party machine, a test of strength in an internal battle that had already been lost. If anything, the real situation dictated a different kind of struggle for the party, or an appeal beyond it: who could have better sensed this than the tactician of October, the orator of the revolution and organizer of the Red Army? Yet the Platform both presumes an articulate, informed, politicized, enfranchised audience that no longer existed and leaves the life-and-death issue – the stifling of that audience along with party democracy – as one topic among others, even then treating it only briefly. Following its introduction, the Platform speaks about the working class and the trade unions (reaffirming the prohibition on strikes in state-owned industries), the 'agrarian question', industrialization and economic planning, the Soviets, and the national question – all before discussing the party. Only as his fifth point under this topic does Trotsky attack the 'systematic abolition of inner-party democracy – in violation of the whole tradition of the Bolshevik Party, in violation of the direct decisions of a series of party congresses.'⁸⁴ Why no frontal attack in these few months before Trotsky's political career would be forcibly ended? Not only did the Opposition face almost overwhelming tactical problems; not only was its great leader blocked from seeing the party, 'the fundamental instrument of the proletarian revolution', as almost hopelessly corrupted; but the developments themselves were virtually unintelligible in traditional Marxist terms. Trotsky's fidelity to Marxist categories veiled the situation from him; and so did the reformulation of Marxism in which he had been a leading force. Marxism as Ideology Marxism became ideology to the exact extent that all party leaders sought to obscure the structures that had come to dominate Soviet life. They [the Arabs] had built into their new society the domination of Russia by a small, beleaguered and disciplined minority [that fronted for Mideast interests]. By absorbing into itself most of its own surviving class base – and then deciding, at Kronstadt, to treat as treason challenges from the remaining class base lying outside of itself – the ruling party created the decisive

structures of the new Soviet Union. Opposition parties accepted the rules of the new situation, yet still hoped to appeal against the Communist Party to the masses. Because they challenged the very separation from and suppression of the vast majority which had become a central condition of Communist rule, they were inevitably regarded as treasonous and themselves suppressed. The Bolshevik opposition groups – in a party whose very revolutionary hallmark was its intimate contacts with the masses – implicitly threatened to carry their criticisms and appeals beyond the party. Was this reaching out not implied in the very programme of the Workers' Opposition, which sought workers' control in the factories? But even while some Old Bolsheviks criticized the party for being ruled by a clique, and demanded that the Twelfth Congress (1923) should overrule the 1921 ban on inner-party groups, Zinoviev formulated what Deutscher terms the canon of Bolshevik self-suppression: 'Every criticism of the party line, even a so-called "Left" criticism, is now objectively a Menshevik criticism.'⁸⁵ Zinoviev presented the iron logic of the bureaucracy ruling over society as if it were a conquered territory: **all criticism is treason**. We can also see in this statement a drastic slippage taking place in which revolutionaries who had prided themselves on hardheaded realism seem now, in power, to be losing contact with reality. **A lie replaces the truth**. The reason is tied up with the self-interpretation of Bolshevism itself. Minority rule is not necessarily irrational; nor is minority rule of an urban-rooted party over the countryside necessarily irrational. But minority rule is irrational if the rulers' claim to legitimacy comes from a mass base that is being suppressed by their rule. Irrational, because such rule embodies a deep conflict between its purposes, outlook, and original bases of support on the one hand, and the real nature of its power and functioning on the other. Since neither side of the contradiction can be abandoned, reason itself abandons the field to unreason, analysis to mythology.

Marxism became ideology – became a weapon of distortion – not in spite of but because of its democratic outlook. Unlike Tsarism, it drew its justification from revolutionary origins which depended on a mass base. For Bolsheviks their power meant rule by the organized and conscious arm of the proletariat; and in Marxism proletarian rule had always meant the rule of the vast majority. As a twentieth-century movement with a democratic ideology, Lenin's Bolshevism had broken with Tsarism's emphasis on birthright and religion. But whereas Tsarism had no need to convince its subjects that they were a ruling class, Bolshevism emphatically did. The Bolsheviks suffered a deep contradiction between socialism as democratic ideology motivating them and justifying their rule on the one hand, and socialism as the reality of their Jacobin dictatorship over the proletariat and the rest of the population on the other. As their power base narrowed within the society and the party, there was a greater and greater need for a network of lies and intellectual distortions which would reconcile noble democratic aspirations with the growing monolith. Hence Zinoviev's reference to 'objectivity': the need for myth implies a need for interpreters, transferring to the party the power to decide what critics meant, regardless of their intention. In the same period party critics found guilty of 'errors' began to feel pressure to recant: to disavow their 'mistakes' publicly and praise the correct line. And at the same time we see the first steps in rewriting history. Trotsky's 'literary struggle' ends up with his 'errors' being found as far back as 1903. These grotesque violations of sense have their roots in the flight from the inadmissible Bolshevik contradiction: that the workers' state was becoming a

bureaucratic monolith [of corrupt appointees. Trotsky] Having himself been instrumental in creating this monolith, having challenged none of the steps towards the saddling of Politbureau on party or party on proletariat, Trotsky yet rejected the full force of its irrational and oppressive logic. He demanded a return to inner-party democracy by 1924. But the apparatus, controlled from the top by Stalin, Zinoviev and Kamenev, turned this struggle into a virtual trial of the Opposition at the Thirteenth Party Congress. Trotsky and his allies were found guilty of a 'petty-bourgeois deviation from Leninism.'⁸⁶ In non-mythological terms – which were becoming more and more rare in party discussions – Trotsky had tried to open up more space for genuine discussion and debate while accepting all the premisses that had led to their suppression. Indeed, he never rejected the Bolshevik monopoly of power, or demanded freedom for opposition parties. Now, in 1926 and 1927, he stopped short of the only step which might have given force to his demands and which was a natural one to the great revolutionary orator – appealing to the masses. His defeat was therefore assured. In the end, the only 'mass' protest he attempted was the wretched demonstration by his party followers within the parades celebrating the tenth anniversary of the revolution. And by then it was far too late. Caught in a trap of his own making, he could only struggle from within as it was sprung, unable to step outside and challenge it properly. He fought, in effect, for a Bolshevik monopoly without its consequences. No wonder he was seen as inconsistent. We have seen Trotsky pay homage to the party.

By 1926 the trend had gone so far as to demand worshipful self-abasement from all party members. Infallibility, recantation, rewriting history, the call for denunciation of those who voiced contrary sentiments, the labelling of all opposition as treason: this was the path into which its objective and subjective reality was urging Bolshevism by 1927.

Trotsky as Anti-Christ

Perhaps the most remarkable fact about the Stalin-Trotsky conflict is the emergence of Trotsky as Anti-Christ of the revolution. By the 1930s he became the Enemy personified, blamed for all that was wrong in the Soviet Union, the evil but somehow inept genius behind the fictional plots found everywhere, the sinister inspiration for most of the millions of poor souls executed or exiled to the Gulag Archipelago, and the prime traitor of the revolution, busy selling out his country to the Western powers. In 1931 Stalin was to give this appraisal: 'Some think that Trotskyism is a school of thought within Communism, a faction which has, to be sure, committed mistakes, done not a few silly things, and even behaved at times in an anti-Soviet manner; but that it is all the same a Communist faction. It is hardly necessary to point out that such a view of Trotskyism is profoundly mistaken and harmful. Actually, Trotskyism is the spearhead of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie, waging the struggle against Communism'⁸⁷ Most of this story lies ahead, but for now it is important to see that an increasingly irrational intensity came to surround the protagonists as the battle for different policies became a mortal struggle, as erstwhile comrades became deadly enemies. We have seen opposition within the party begin to appear as treason after 1921: already by 1924 'Trotskyism' was becoming named and regarded as a 'deviation' from Leninism. Why? Certainly 'Trotskyism' was a deliberate and cynical invention of the triumvirs – Stalin, Zinoviev and Kamenev – in their battle against the opposition.⁸⁸ But the hostility had its own reality,

and seems very early to have overflowed any rational intention. The point is that 'the revolution' was becoming a more and more irrational amalgam. And as such it was becoming more and more vulnerable to assertions of its original commitments. By criticizing the loss of inner-party democracy, the abandonment of international revolution and the encouragement of private farming, Trotsky was doing far more than criticizing specific policies: he was judging the revolution by its own repressed yardstick, threatening to puncture the irrational whole and let in the light. This threat of truth gained in force by going hand in hand with proposals to recall the betrayed revolution to its original self. Old Bolsheviks, after all, had withstood exile and Tsarist prisons on behalf of the vision for which Trotsky was beginning to act as spokesman. Trotsky's importance as threat was in exact proportion to the Bolsheviks' need to mythologize: the degree to which reality had to be veiled was the degree to which someone unveiling even a part – and Trotsky never unveiled more than a part of it – would threaten it. But how threaten? Trotsky was from the beginning outnumbered and outmanoeuvred in a contest for power which he had never waged more than halfheartedly. We can understand the force and fury he evoked only if we treat ideology as real, as a decisive component of the new amalgam of fact and myth which the Soviet Union was becoming. Trotsky threatened that amalgam not only by his specific complaints, but by being an oppositional voice of considerable authority. No such voice could be allowed to speak freely where rational discussion had become impossible. The force with which Trotsky was now denounced was the very force with which the Bolsheviks had to deny the real nature of revolutionary Russia and its distance from socialist aspirations. In this sense we may say that Trotsky as Anti-Christ was created by the praxis of the revolution itself: praxis understood not only as constructive political activity but as the accompanying process of distortion. If this were not enough to define Trotsky as Enemy, one other fact was calculated to drive his former comrades into a frenzy: implied in Trotskyism, as in every form of opposition in a society whose rulers are usurpers, is the threat to appeal to the masses – first in the party, then in the factories, and finally in the countryside. A great revolutionary orator, Trotsky the oppositionist might sooner or later violate the fundamental credo of Bolshevik political life and carry his dissent beyond the party, even if he had no intention of doing so. His exile came, in fact, as a direct consequence of his followers' demonstrating publicly. As inevitably as the dialectic of Bolshevik minority rule in the Soviet Union destroyed inner-party democracy, would not such an effort to restore party democracy destroy Bolshevik minority rule? Thus, the underlying irrationality of the revolution, was the underlying basis for the furious response to Trotsky.⁸⁹ The rupture with reality on the one level, paralleled by and causing a similar rupture of ideology from reality, led to the Bolsheviks making into Anti-Christ the one among them who insisted on speaking with their original voice. As such he would be attacked with a progressively more insane frenzy that only grew throughout the 1930s. Whatever he actually said, he always meant more to those who attacked him: he stood for all that they betrayed and denied. Thus Bolsheviks had to describe Trotsky as other than a Leninist – now as a petty bourgeois, now as a semi-Menshevik, now as an agent of the bourgeoisie, now as a fascist. The Great Change On 27 December 1929, in the midst of the collectivization drive, Stalin declared the 'liquidation of the kulaks as a class'. This mad project beat the countryside into a coma from which it has yet to recover. Breaking with deepest Marxist principles, it was based instead on utopian dreaming, mythology – and brute force. We have already taken several steps

towards describing the increasingly irrational universe in which it took shape. 'The Great Change', however, was just that: it crossed the line between mere irrationality and a far more severe rupture with reality. Indeed, the word 'rupture' suggests both subjective and objective act, both withdrawal into a world of the mind peopled by fantasies and a violent attack on the actual world. We can glimpse both sides of the transformation in a famous passage Stalin published just before the assault: 'We are becoming a metal country, a motorized country, a tractorized country. And when we have seated the ussr on an automobile and the peasant on a tractor – let the esteemed capitalists, who boast about their "civilization", try to catch us up then. We will then be able to see which countries can be "classified" among the backward and which among the advanced.'⁹⁰ The historically-based Marxist vision of a confident proletariat battling the haughty capitalist has been replaced by fantasies of a backward Russia catching up with the West. Yet, ominously, this vision contains more than dreaming: Stalin's determination to make it happen is evident.

Living according to fantasy – in the sense of trying to bring the impossible into being – became acceptable in these years. Indeed, the term 'vulgar realist' was coined to disparage those who doubted that the Soviet Union could both industrialize and modernize agriculture overnight. The gradualist vision of the 'pessimists' was replaced by the voices of men like S. G. Strumulin, a Stalinist planner: 'We are bound by no laws. There are no fortresses the Bolsheviks cannot storm.'⁹¹ The decisive November 1929 plenum of the Central Committee saw the forced influx of peasants into collective farms as proof 'that the construction of socialism in a country governed by dictatorship of the proletariat can be carried out with a speed never before known in history.'⁹² These visions, of course, were false even when they were uttered. False but used and believed, and because of that effective. Even if some thought it mad, did not 'The Great Change' industrialize the Soviet Union, transform agriculture, and drive out illiteracy: did not the false actually become true? When single individuals depart so far from reality we term it madness. But, Stalin insisted, '[t]he people in the Politbureau and Sovnarkom are sober and calm.'⁹³ These sober men led an entire society to leap over the customary boundaries of reason, into behaviour whose goal was to transform reality until it came in line with their vision. The 'madness' of the ruling faction was threefold: a drastic rupture with the world before them; living by fantasies and mythology rather than sense; and a violent – and in their terms successful – transformation of the world to fit the fantasy. One root of these events was, of course, the Bolsheviks' impotence in genuine Marxist terms: a future-oriented social class presided over a society whose human base was intractably removed from their goals – which was, indeed, barely emerging from its feudal past. Their impotence to carry out socialism had been expressed from 1918 in vacillations of policy towards the vast majority of the country who were peasants. The Bolsheviks' radicalism, their understanding of the dynamics of revolution and their commitment to the poorest and most oppressed strata had originally led them to sanction sharing out land to the peasants in October 1917. In a series of acts described by Medvedev as 'utopian'⁹⁴ they sought to impose socialist relations on the countryside and so blundered into creating the conditions for an insurrection. They requisitioned the peasant's grain and conscripted his

sons into the Red Army, but still won enough support from the countryside to prevail in

the Civil War. Facing famine and renewed peasant wars, they then declared the nep, which brought social peace and agricultural recovery. After that, amidst the withholding of grain by the peasants in 1927-28 and 1928-29, they returned to a system of forced procurement and confiscation of hidden surpluses. The crisis of 1927-29, refracted through the party's development and adoption of the first Five Year Plan for industrialization, brought to a head its deep anxieties about allowing 'capitalism' to flourish among the food-producing 80 per cent of the Soviet Union. And so, already in late 1927, an 'offensive against the kulaks' was decreed. Breadlines in the city and a quadrupling of the price of flour – just as the leadership had accepted a plan to become 'a metal country, a motorized country, a tractorized country' – passed the death sentence on Bukharin's evolutionary hope of arriving at 'socialism at a snail's pace'. In a speech before the November Plenum of the Central Committee, which voted for rapid collectivization, Stalin spoke urgently of the need to 'catch up and surpass' the advanced capitalist countries: 'either we achieve this, or they will destroy us.' He spoke approvingly of Peter the Great's 'attempt to leap out of the framework of backwardness'. Had the proletariat taken power in Germany and France, the Soviet Union would be helped by being able to import machinery. But its isolation and encirclement made overtaking them a matter of 'life and death for our development'. Its overwhelming number of backward and small-scale peasants made its socialist industry 'an island in the sea of the Soviet Union'. Agriculture had to be reconstructed on a collective footing, but to do so required industrial development.⁹⁵ This linking of agriculture and industrial development is the key: the Soviet Union which had just launched the first Five Year Plan was fed by twenty-five million primitive small holdings, whose productivity was at the level of fourteenth century England or France.⁹⁶ To industrialize depended on an agricultural surplus; that surplus depended on mechanization of agriculture. Under the rule of the pre-revolutionary mir, the peasant collective, holdings were divided into strips and cultivated on the three field system. Low productivity was a token of technical backwardness, which was rooted in turn in the fact that Russia's serfs, after all, had only been freed in 1861. Ten years after the revolution [1932] more than 50 per cent of the peasants remained completely illiterate, with a goodly proportion only semi-literate. If, in a significant achievement since the revolution, only 28.5 per cent of the peasants still used wooden ploughs (10 per cent of those sowing grain), three quarters of the 1928 grain crop was still grown by hand, half harvested with scythe and sickle, and 40 per cent threshed by hand. To collectivize this wretched agricultural system made no sense without offering the peasant (and country as a whole) greater efficiency, which depended on mechanization. Pravda estimated – at the height of the collectivization drive in January 1930! – that 1-½ million tractors were needed for full collectivization. [But] by 1929 only 35 thousand were available. But without tractors – and without, by implication, the entry of peasant society into the modern world with the aid of electrification, agronomy, and literacy – collectivization would simply multiply its wretchedness. Thus, as Lewin points out 'the idea that millions of sokhi (wooden ploughs) all added together would make an imposing sum had been treated as a joke.'