

CHAPTER V

THE HELPLESS ENEMY

The agitator faces a problem: as he frightens his followers with the specter of a ruthless enemy, must he not reassure them that the enemy can actually be defeated?

Most social movements recognize that at the time of their formation they are weaker than their enemy, a situation that is presumably to be changed by the movement becoming stronger than its opponents. But in agitation there is no need to weaken him, but only to unmask his inherent weakness. His strength is based not on actual power or might, but on tricks and deception.

The agitator so constructs his enemy themes that the political attributes of the enemy lead directly and unobtrusively into psychological attributes. In the latter he continues the process of dehumanization already begun in the political portrait, and then twists this dehumanization into helplessness. A low animal, a parasite, a bug is inhuman and therefore undeserving of sympathy; it is helpless and therefore easy to destroy. By portraying the enemy as a criminal, a degenerate, a low animal, a bug, the agitator stirs deep layers of hatred and frustration in his listeners; their itch to violence becomes unbearable, and their hatred of this unspeakable enemy overflows. He steps into the muddy pool of the malaise in order to channelize it into a stream of hate.

THEME 10: CREATURES OF THE UNDERWORLD

CRIMINALS. The agitator speaks of his opponents as "down-right villains"¹ or as "hoodlums."² The President is "supported mainly by gangsters and racketeers"³ and is "the kind of stooge the Overseas Gang required to work their program of spoliation through the Congress."⁴ Referring to plans for unification of Allied efforts during the war, the agitator finds that "it smells like that page in history which gives account of the attempt on the part of Benedict Arnold to put our troops under

the command of a foreign power.”⁵ He is constantly discovering “widespread suspicion” created by “traitors of both alien and domestic breed” and learns that even Republican leaders are perhaps “only traitors in disguise.”⁶

But the enemy is more than a mere traitor, or villain or hoodlum; he is a murderer. Without naming names, the agitator makes it clear that he holds the enemy responsible for a good many unexplained deaths:

Christ warned all posterity that the Jews were then and to be “Satan’s Chosen People” and that compromise with them spells destruction. Because Christ’s warnings have not been heeded by those calling themselves Christians, wars alone, created by “Satan’s Chosen People,” just the past 25 years, have liquidated over 50,000,000 Christians! To bring this close to home, another recent opponent of NUDEAL, Colorado’s *Sen. Alva Adams*, died of a sudden attack, making 19 dead Congressmen so far this year—3 times the death rate of England in 1940 their year of worst blitzkriegs!⁷

Such remarks are not isolated: the agitator exploits the conspiracy device to suggest to his audience that accidents and natural events are diabolic plots of the enemy. He sees a sinister significance in the fact that Senator Lundeen was “killed in an airplane accident . . . on his way home to address a rally of people who were protesting any premature entrance into the war”;⁸ he suggests that this and other deaths reveal the enemy’s determination to achieve his ends by any means whatsoever—“if you hew to the line and let the chips fall where they may, anything can happen.”⁹

It is noteworthy that in playing up such stories the agitator makes no reference to law-enforcement agencies. The enemy is not only identified with the criminal underworld, but he is shown as operating with impunity—murder remains unpunished, even uninvestigated. The agitator’s harping on the enemy’s terrorism might suggest to the audience that political murder is a natural expedient. They get away with murder—but this works both ways: the potential victim of today can become the executioner of tomorrow.

And so murder and persecution are in the air, ubiquitous, unrelenting, ever threatening. The enemy is dragged down from the remote realm of power politics, revolutionary theory and stock exchange manipulations to the vulgar level of the underworld. But these very denunciations of the agitator imply that his audience, until today the victim of this criminal horde, will tomorrow participate in a collective hunt of revenge. The enemy is offered as legitimate quarry. Since he commits such criminal

deeds with impunity, can the agitator's followers feel any squeamishness about the methods to be used in retaliation? There is nothing left but for the followers to take the law into their own hands, and the agitator himself will

. . . treat personally with John L. Lewis, Robert M. LaFollette, and Samuel Dickstein, as three treasonable and surreptitious disrupters . . . to arrest them as soon as possible with Silvershirt backing, and after presenting due evidence of their traitorous activities to a Silvershirt jury, to confine them upon conviction in a Federal penitentiary for the remainder of their lives.¹⁰

DEGENERATES. The enemy is not only a ruthless criminal, he is also constitutionally inferior. Because he is abnormal, he must be isolated and removed. He is foreign not only because he belongs to another nation or race, but also because he is organically incapable of behaving according to norm: "We want neither your physical nor your mental diseases which cause your peoples to engage, incessantly, in mass murder and devilish destruction."¹¹

In his description, perversion and hysteria are closely connected with destructiveness.

Why are Winchell's reactions pathological? Why does he rant and rave and become hysterical? Why is he fanatically determined to destroy the reputations of others? . . . [He] is an ego-maniac. . . . He is abnormally sex-conscious . . . a confirmed neurotic . . . and definitely psychopathic.¹²

The enemy, those "Socialists, Communists or psychopathic radicals," is "howling about Fascism in America."¹³ "In all his career, Adolph Hitler did not approach the insolence of this minority in the number and grossness of their lies, in the perverse and stubborn nature of their wickedness."¹⁴

That such epithets of degeneracy are vague does not at all impair their usefulness. For one thing they arouse distrust of everything the enemy says or does, but, more important, they suggest the conclusion that the insane enemy must be isolated. Nor can there be any pity for the insane once their sickness has been designated as socially poisonous.

Here again the agitator's appeal is based on an ambivalent approach to the alleged characteristics of the enemy: the very piling up of the enemy's horrible characteristics implies to his followers the possibility that, in such a situation of extreme social dangers, they too will be able to be released from their inhibitions. By diagnosing the enemy in terms of a syndrome of hysteria, perversion and insatiable hatred, the agitator stigmatizes him with the disease he is encouraging among his followers.

LOW ANIMALS. A criminal or psychopath, however dangerous, may still retain human features, and law and custom provide procedures for handling them. But the agitator breaks this last tenuous link between the enemy and mankind by transforming him into a low animal. Likening the enemy to a vicious animal is more than a metaphor of abuse because the agitator's use of this metaphor is so persistent, so overwhelming, that in effect it usurps the place of its object in the perception of the audience.

As a poet whose inspiration is controlled by his ultimate purpose, the agitator confines himself in his imagery to animals of the "unrespectable" kind, rodents, reptiles, insects, and germs. He speaks of "criminal alien rats, and other forms of rodents,"¹⁵ of the "Bolshevik rat's nest."¹⁶ He states expressly that whatever other form the enemies may take is a disguise; in reality they are "poisonous, subversive vipers, regardless of the name they take on."¹⁷ He calls for energetic, ruthless action against the enemy on the ground that "we dare not play with the poisonous venom of a reptile."¹⁸ But it is when evoking insects or bacteria that he is most eloquent.

. . . Like a cloud of grasshoppers, like vermin in the closet, like white ants in the cellar, like termites in the furniture, a million propagandists have moved in upon us.¹⁹

He develops a metaphor in great detail:

These alien enemies of America are like the parasitic insect which lays his egg inside the cocoon of a butterfly, devours the larva and, when the cocoon opens, instead of a butterfly we find a pest, a parasite.²⁰

In these foregoing examples the human connotations of terms like "propagandists" or "alien enemies" are literally buried under the mass of insects.

A favorite animal of the agitator's is the termite. In ridiculing one of his pet targets, former Foreign Commissar Litvinov, the agitator refers to him as "The Termite Lit-Val-Hin-Max-Graf-Buch-Har-Stein."²¹ The "enemies of America" are seen as "working like termites right here in America on the pillars of our social, economic, religious, and political life."²² These "termites have overrun the subway, the theatres, Coney Island, the Lower East Side, Flatbush, the Bronx, Newark. . ."²³

The micro-organism seems to combine all the vicious enemy qualities in the highest degree. It is ubiquitous, close, deadly, insidious, it invites the idea of extermination, and, most important, it is invisible to the naked eye—the agitator expert is required to detect its presence: "The propa-

ganda of the alienisms is seeping through the bloodstream of our national life like a deadly germ."²⁴

The danger of contamination is too great to leave anyone time to discuss this diagnosis:

. . . It only takes one venereal germ to destroy the body of a clean young man. It only requires one communist, well placed, to destroy a home, a mill, a factory, a school, or a section of the government.²⁵

The terrifying implications of a threat of epidemic are so vivid that the mere accumulation of appropriate terms may suffice to produce the desired associations:

Disease: Since B#243 quoted THE JEWISH PRESS 9-27-40 that *Polish Jews are typhus carriers*, predicting that such brought into Germany would spread that disease and help destroy Hitler . . .

The Jewish NY TIMES 11-20-39 quoted special cable from Berlin that Warsaw's ghetto was put under armed guards, segregation due to "*Jews were making profits from the need of the Polish population; furthermore, they were dangerous carriers of sickness and pestilence.*" This is borne out by Board of Health WPA project in 1934-35 in New York City to determine the relation between rats and *typhus fever cases*. . . .

Since hundreds of thousands of such "refugee" Jews have flooded our large cities during NUDEAL (aided and abetted thereby regardless of immigration laws), and since THE JEWISH PRESS boasts that such Jews taken into Germany will cause typhus epidemics, what a danger exists in our midst!²⁶

Since the enemy is a terrifyingly dangerous insect or germ, he must be exterminated ruthlessly: "What the average Gentile means to say is: 'It's going to take violence to rid the nation of the Locust Swarm, and the sooner we get it over with, the happier for the nation.'"²⁷

Indeed, people "are tired of the millions of alien Jews flocking like locusts to our country de-housing and de-jobbing native Americans."²⁸

Lest this agitational emphasis on low animals seem a mere fantastic aberration, it should be pointed out that European agitation indulged—and with all too evident effectiveness—in similar characterizations of its enemy. According to an eyewitness account, peasants recruited from the native population of Nazi-occupied countries to help in mass murders were given an intensive training course which lasted only a few hours, and which consisted in the study of pictures representing Jews as repulsive small beasts.* Similarly, in posters that were widely used by the Nazis to disseminate anti-Semitism (*two such posters are reproduced facing page 62*) Jews are pictorially distorted to such an extent that

* Cf. Hirsfeld, Ludwig: *Historja Jednego Zycia*, Warsaw, 1947, chap. XVIII.

the spectator must actually make an effort of the imagination to rediscover the human form in what appears to be some strange sort of bug*

How is this extraordinary content of agitation to be accounted for?

The agitator dehumanizes the enemy on several levels: the enemy seems to him a foreigner who comes from suspect geographical regions; he is a criminal who inhabits reprehensible moral regions; and he is a degenerate who derives from disgusting biological regions. To these evocations of the enemy image, the audience responds by experiencing a threat to its livelihood from the invading strangers; a threat to its emotional balance by the specter of the ubiquitous criminal whose crime it finds simultaneously repulsive and seductive; and a threat to its human status from the feared and filthy subhuman creature.

Various degrees of aversion to small animals are well known in psychiatric and everyday observations. Clinical experience indicates that there is a certain connection between extreme detestation of small animals and feelings of unconscious ambivalence towards childhood sexual development. Psychoanalysts have tried to show this ambivalence projected through parasitophobia in two ways: (1) the victim of parasitophobia longs for that phase in infancy in which the child, like a parasite, clings to and desires the mother; while (2) through his rejection of the parasite he expresses his subsequent revulsion from this attachment by means of his sadism into which his longing receded after being subjected to serious genital shocks and disappointments. In the parasitophobia the longing is still present but has been repressed by sadism; the longing continues its subterranean existence while the sadism is manifestly dominant.

The agitator's tirades against vermin provide a rationalization for the release of sadistic impulses against the dirty enemies. The gesture with which a person violently eradicates vermin and the mixture of repulsion and pleasure he may draw from this act, can serve as a vicarious rehearsal for the lust to annihilate more substantial enemies.

The frustrated person (and we must always bear in mind that agitation is aimed at the frustrated) cannot tolerate the lack of frustration that he sees or imagines he sees in other people. Hence he yearns for ceaseless acts of destruction against the vermin as foreigners and against the foreigners as vermin. What agitation tries ultimately to achieve here is to distort and corrupt the very process of the audience's vision and audi-

* Cf. Polonski, Jacques: *La Presse, la propagande et l'opinion publique sous l'occupation*, Paris, 1946, p. 108.

tion. The audience must be conditioned to see the enemy as an animal and to hear the enemy making animal sounds.

There is another aspect of response which the agitator's stress on low animals finds in his audience. Swarms of insects, vermin, and rats seem to be a particularly appropriate vehicle for projection by the masses of their unconscious realization that they are nothing, in many instances, but a mere mass. In violently eradicating the hated vermin, the sado-masochistic person tries symbolically to separate himself from the crowd and confirm his individuality.

THEME 11: CALL TO THE HUNT

The agitator has shown that the wolf in sheep's clothing is actually a sheep in wolf's clothing. But an enemy overtly designated as helpless would cease to be an urgent menace and would not be a satisfactory object for the projection of resentments and fears. The agitator therefore simultaneously dangles both notions before his audience: his enemy is both strong and weak. He reconciles the apparent contradiction by indirectly suggesting that the enemy disguises his weakness by daring to be dangerous: weakness and strength blend in arrogance.

Weakness is inherent in the notion of the enemy as a stranger, an outlaw, a psychopath, and a low animal. None of these images suggests genuine danger. As for the enemy conceived as a germ or scourge, he can be dangerous only if moral taboos or humane considerations hamper efficient antiseptis.

Lacking any solid social support, despised and hated by the people, the enemy has never been able to seize and hold power, has never dared emerge undisguised into daylight. In fact, the enemy is aware of his weakness. He hides like a rat "in alley ways and other dark holes";²⁹ he lurks "in the shadows of anonymity"³⁰ and even cultivates "a passion for anonymity."³¹ He hatches his plots while traveling "in a special train with the shades drawn."³²

When he dares come into the open somewhat, the enemy's weapon is manipulation of public opinion. He controls the media of mass communication and operates "among the so-called intellectuals, professional people, school teachers, preachers, student groups."³³ As a trickster, a shady character, an impostor without real strength, the enemy is thus the antithesis of the hard-working, puritanical, and self-restrained entrepreneur who adheres to social convention and rules of moderation

and has nothing to hide from the public. But the enemy, nowhere nearly as solid a character, has nothing but his wits at his disposal; he is a dealer in words, in mere ideas, in articles, in speeches. Shut his mouth by force, and he collapses.

The agitator buttresses his suggestion that the enemy is fundamentally weak by linking the various kinds of enemies together in such a way that those which are merely targets of contempt take the edge off, so to speak, those which might symbolize danger. This amalgam of enemies is effected by a verbal device: cumulative enumerations of various enemies. The agitator speaks of "aliens, Communists, crackpots, refugees, renegades, Socialists, termites and traitors."³⁴ All the doctrines he attacks hardly differ in substance: "Bolshevism . . . regardless of whether it is called New Dealism, Communism, Liberalism, Rooseveltism, Social Democracy or Judaism."³⁵

No group has any genuine independent existence, and all are pretty much alike. The very fact that the agitator can speak in one breath of "this radicalism, this racketeering, this sabotage . . . nazi spies, communist agents"³⁶ or of "these dictators, these czars, these fascists, these Nazis, these communists, these gangs,"³⁷ may suggest that there is no need to be cautious in attacking any of them. In these enumerations the underlying motive becomes apparent when refugees are linked with crackpots, termites, and traitors. Such combinations deserve not only moral indignation, but also contempt. Such an enemy is morally and mentally debased, an "unspeakable gang of alien scalawags, Communist fellow travelers, revolutionary Jews, third generation frustrates, mongrel misfits, and hypocritical humbugs. . . ."³⁸

The agitator seems occasionally to express surprise at finding such characters together: "an amazing conglomeration of cunning Communists, befuddled fellow-travelers, Utopian dreamers, and revolutionary visionaries, in most every key post of consequence."³⁹

By this amalgamation of the various stereotypes of the enemy, the nature of the audience's hostile emotion is transformed. The agitator supplants individual prejudice by mass prejudice. Individual prejudice is an attitude charged with emotional valuations and embodying idiosyncracies. Stubborn, even irrational clinging to idiosyncracies or prejudices is popularly interpreted as a kind of individualism. But when the agitator amalgamates the various hostile stereotypes of the enemy, the individualistic kind of prejudice gives way to a cold, abstract, standardized fury that is closer to the paranoiac's destructive rage than to the passion

of hatred. The enemy is hated with an emotional intensity that can be aroused only by a human being, and treated with a cold pitilessness that can be mobilized only against an inanimate object: "The Jewish Menace has now reached a stage that it can only be dealt with INTERNATIONALLY in the same way that Cancer, Malaria and Leprosy are dealt with and quite calmly at that and without any bloodshed."⁴⁰

While the international financiers, the House of Morgan, Stalin, the Jewish refugees, the Communist, and the fellow traveler are equated and are the objects of the same fury, its immediate target is in this case the weakest group, the Jews. We need not assume that the agitator's followers are completely deceived by the demagoguery which attributes dangerous traits to the helpless victim. They may be dimly aware that the object of their fury is really innocent of the charge used as a pretext for attacking it; but precisely because a weak target is singled out they may remember their own deep-rooted fears of themselves meeting the same fate as the victim-enemy.* The enemy's weaknesses come to symbolize the audience's own futile and abortive protest against oppression. In offering them a quarry to be hunted, the agitator provides them with an effective method of relief: they are to vent their resentment on some helpless victim. Once the various hostile impulses against different enemies have been amalgamated by the agitator, reduced as it were to a uniform gaseous state, they exert equal pressure on all points and tend to break through at the weakest point. Where that is everyone knows.

The act of the frustrated little man who impotently vents his fury on his child or wife is reproduced on a social scale. The individual perpetrator of such an act may realize its irrationality, and may feel consciously guilty. But on the social level, the concentration of fury on stereotypes of weakness acquires a new connotation. By identifying the victim of persecution with the dangerous persecutor, the agitator sanctions and rationalizes an act of cowardice and impotence and makes it appear as an act of courage and wisdom. At the same time he relieves his followers from one of their basic fears—the fear of being pushed to the

* The French historian Mathiez quotes the following excerpt from an official police report written after the execution of twelve persons at the beginning of the Terror: "I must tell you that such executions have the greatest political effects, but the most considerable of them is the appeasement of popular resentment. The wife who lost her husband, the father who lost his son, the merchant who has no trade, the worker who pays everything so dearly that his wages amount to almost nothing, perhaps resign themselves to their own sufferings only when they see people more unfortunate than themselves and when they think these people are their enemies." (Mathiez, A.: *La révolution française, Paris, 1928.*)

bottom of the social ladder. They are offered a group that deserves a fate worse than their own—a group of underprivileged people that they, the manipulated, can manipulate and humiliate with impunity. This transformation of the enemy from a dangerous persecutor into the persecuted quarry is the essence of the enemy theme in agitation.

But it is not a replacement of the persecutor by the quarry; in the image of the enemy the two coexist. Hostility against the quarry can be effectively aroused only when the audience half believes it to be dangerous; the hunt is always conceived of as an act of self-defense. In this way the followers are reminded that although they are an *élite* today, they are in constant danger, and can retain their privileged status only by faithfully following the leader in the constant hunt of the enemy. Not even extermination of the enemy removes the danger he represents: he has to be killed again and again, killed only to be revived once more so that he may fulfill his function indefinitely.

LUMPING-TOGETHER DEVICE. It is this image of an organically weak and unassimilable enemy that emerges as the end result of the lumping together of the various enemy types. In the very process that blurs the distinctions between all the enemy groups, the Jew alone becomes more sharply delineated. From the outset he is present in all the versions of the enemy as their invisible essence, and when the agitator enumerates his various "vicious foes" it is always the Jew who stands out as the most conspicuous, tangible, and accessible target. Consider, for example, the following list:

. . . the Judaeo-Marxists, Anglophiles, International bankers, radio commentators, Hollywood, Anti-Defamation League, Anti-Nazi League, Friends of Democracy, Rhodes scholars, *PM*, *Daily Worker*, *Chicago Sun*, *The New Masses*, *The Nation* and *The New Republic* . . .⁴¹

Aside from the fact that communism, liberalism, and anti-nazism are elsewhere represented as Jewish activities, the only group that emerges as clearly identified here is "the Judaeo-Marxists," the Jews. The implication apparently is that an Anglophile, communist, or liberal is recognized through his being a Jew or being associated with Jews; and that to *be* a Jew is equivalent to belonging to a group or organization that the agitator considers pernicious.

Likewise in the list, "HIDDEN HAND agencies—Communist Party, CIO, AFL, Federal Council of Churches, Jews, et al.,"⁴² the apparently non-Jewish terms only help to throw a more glaring light on the Jews.

A member of any of the enumerated organizations is not recognizable as such and may leave it any time; but a Jew must always remain a Jew whether he wishes to or not.

As Lindbergh said in Des Moines this week, sooner or later the American people are going to be looking for a few flocks of scapegoats. And it's not going to be the Irish, the Spaniards, the Egyptians, or the Hottentots who'll be called to that accounting.⁴³

Indeed, the very idea that any other group could be a scapegoat is almost comical. The agitator knows very well that he need not be more explicit. But he does not merely rely on existing anti-Jewish stereotypes; he also helps to refurbish them and develop new ones. Reduction of the formidable persecutor to a helpless creature is supplemented by a converse process, to be discussed in the following chapter, in which this helpless creature is endowed with the qualities he must have if he is to serve the agitator's political and psychological purposes.

In singling out the Jews, the agitator need not necessarily resort to explicit "lumping together." He speaks as though he knew that the tendency to single out the Jew as the source of all their troubles is latent in his listeners, and that the very mention of a Jewish name suffices to push all other "enemies" into the background. The procedure is illustrated in a speech⁴⁴ made by an agitator who begins by depicting himself as the target of persecution by the powers that be and the communists. It seems that as a result of an insulting remark he made about President Roosevelt

. . . orders came down from Washington—I was nineteen years old at that time—orders came down from Washington calling for my arrest. I was imprisoned and indicted by a Federal Grand Jury on charges of threatening the life of the President.

This incident was followed by various tribulations, involving communist activities in the army and the "New-Deal-dominated War Department." His opposition to Communism, he went on, made him appear suspect, and he was not allowed to go to the front:

I immediately volunteered for the D-Day invasion of Europe saying that I wanted to do anything and everything that any other soldier had to do in this war to demonstrate that I was a true American and a loyal soldier—and a loyal soldier saying that I had volunteered for overseas service; that I loved America and I was a Christian and if I was guilty of anything wrong, I told them to call me up before an investigating board and examine my record and my life.



In this poster, a Low Animal is attached to the Jew.



In this poster, the Low Animal and the Jew are merged.

See page 56.

So I was turned over to one Major Goldstein [laughter] in the psychoneuro-pathic ward of the station hospital for observation [laughter]. . . .

During the speaker's recital of the sufferings inflicted upon him as a result of insulting remarks, the audience kept quiet as though impressed by this tale of persecuted innocence. Mention of a Jewish name produced laughter—a relief of tension.

The discovery of the Jew among the conspirators has subconsciously been expected all the time; the preceding list of enemies is revealed as a joke, and the Jew is its point. This point is enhanced by the association of the Jew with mental disease, for the suggestion is that not the persecuted hero but the Jew is the real psychopath.

The relief expressed by the laughter is also caused by the realization that there is a simple method of "cleaning up" this "whole bad, smelly mess of persecution."⁴⁵ All that is needed is to crush those psychopathic Jews. Behind these horrors there is a man whose name has been made so comical that pronouncing it dispels all fears. The humiliated followers thus become the humiliators, and act out their sense of superiority over their enemy.

The laughter seems to foreshadow the pleasure of the anticipated hunt. The suggestion is that the followers are laughing only because they are generous—they should hit, and hit hard, instead of laughing. Like the cat, they play with the mouse.

PATTERN OF OBSESSION. The persistence with which the agitator builds his fantasy image of the enemy stems from a paranoiac conception of his relationship to the world. In any event, the agitator is the least restrained of all figures in public political life. Without inhibition or even the suggestion that he is in any way exaggerating, he can assert that "I read a pamphlet not long ago that said that 67 per cent of the House of Representatives were Jewish. I read a pamphlet that said it and it guaranteed the truth of it, put out by a publisher here in New York. And the Senate is somewhat the same, only a little less, about 59 per cent."⁴⁶ Or he can ask with regard to the wartime evacuation of London: "Did you read about the wholesale evacuation of London, ostensibly to get women and children away from the terrible Nazi bombers—that haven't arrived at this writing? *Are Jewish refugees in the evacuated homes now, we wonder?*"⁴⁷ And when the agitator is asked by the Library of Congress for copies of his publications, he is again on his guard; he suspects that it is one of the "tricks . . . used to trap Christian Americans. . . ."⁴⁸ To

complete our citations of the paranoiac character of agitational material, we find the agitator discoursing on "why Mussolini turned against the Jews": "One factor compelling immediate action was the question of hygiene. Syphilis in a virulent form is highly prevalent among the natives of Abyssinia. Mussolini resolved to combat both miscegenation and disease. Much to his surprise, he encountered considerable opposition in Italy. He discovered that it came primarily from Jewish sources."⁴⁹

Such paranoiac delusions as are found in the above statements are in reality the projections of hatred. The persecutor always represents some of the features of the person who suffers from the paranoiac delusion. As Freud puts it, the man who thinks "I hate him" twists the thought into a defensive projection: "He hates me."* By indulging in this projection, the paranoiac relieves himself of part of his fear of self-destruction. The agitator, by directing his audience's fears on the image of the enemy, similarly relieves it of some of its fears. But just as the paranoiac finds only temporary relief by fixating the blame on a particular target, so the most the agitator can offer to his audience is a palliative for rather than a cure of its fears.

And so he, together with his followers, continues to search. It is this search, rather than any actual object of the search, which seems to characterize the relationship between agitator and audience. Behind one enemy there always lurks another. Suffering from a kind of eternal restlessness, the agitator never seems able to find a terminal and perfect image of the enemy; each version leads to another, each destruction of the enemy's disguise to the renewed discovery that he has still another disguise. It is like a strip tease without end.

They seem, however, to find a temporary resting place in their hunt for a target of their accumulated resentment. Here at last the "real" enemy seems to have been found—the Jew, who confirms the fantastic fusion of ruthlessness and helplessness.

* Cf. Freud, Sigmund: *Psychoanalytic Notes upon an Autobiographical Account of a Case of Paranoia*, Collected Papers, Vol. III.