

## C H A P T E R V I

### THE ENEMY AS JEW

---

The American agitator denounces communists, plutocrats, refugees without qualification, but he insists on distinguishing between "international" and "American," atheistic and religious, "good" and "bad" Jews. To believe him, his feelings towards the Jews are quite friendly and he is only attacking so-called organized Jewry. The functional characteristics of the enemy which he sometimes explains as consequences of racial characteristics, he at other times sees as the cause of racial characteristics. Communist or plutocrat lead to the Jew, but the Jew seemingly leads back to the communist or plutocrat.

The American agitator's failure to develop an explicit and complete anti-Semitic program may be due to the political immaturity of American agitation or to the opprobrium attached in this country to public expressions of anti-Semitism. Whatever the reason, indirect approaches to anti-Semitism actually help the agitator: he can pose as an objective student who is not obsessed by hatred and who should therefore not be denounced as a fanatic. Anti-Semitism, he says, is "one of the mysteries of the centuries"<sup>1</sup> and he merely wonders "if the entire matter of preservation of the Jewish community as a separate and peculiar community should not be given study?"<sup>2</sup>

He can build up a certain suspense: his listeners know the anti-Semitic themes will come but they are not always sure how the agitator will put them across. The agitator can also imply that his reserve in discussing such matters is due to the power of the forces opposing him. But since he always manages to put across his anti-Semitic bias, he suggests that he has succeeded in defying the power of the opposition.

In this chapter no attempt is made to develop a theory of anti-Semitism. We are here concerned only with the stereotypes of the Jew as they appear in agitational material and the way in which the agitator develops and transforms those stereotypes into a logically self-contradictory but psychologically consistent image of the Jew, who appears both as weak

and strong, victim of persecution and persecutor, endowed with unchangeable racial characteristics and irrepressible individualism.

### THEME 12: THE VICTIM

**THE JEW IS PERSECUTED.** The theme of the persecuted Jew appears in many variations: sometimes he is pictured as a tool or victim of providence; sometimes the severity or existence of persecution is denied; and sometimes the agitator even implies that the Jews stage pogroms against themselves. Whatever the variation, however, the agitator succeeds in keeping his audience constantly aware of the so-called Jewish problem. It matters little whether he denies being an anti-Semite or pretends to explain or even deplore it; in each case he manages to suggest that anti-Semitism is a fundamental and relevant category in the discussion of public issues.

The agitator characterizes persecution of Jews as a kind of natural phenomenon:

They were thrown out of every country that got a hold of them . . . Mussolini came in and they were thrown out . . . Mr. Hitler came along and he threw them out . . . they were thrown out of Poland . . . they were thrown out of Norway . . . France had to throw them out. France is throwing them out.<sup>3</sup>

The agitator is apparently aware of the public revulsion against the Nazi acts of violence. To counteract the possible effects of it, he absolves fascist leaders from all responsibility:

We cannot let ourselves be hoaxed into believing that these refugees have fled from the wrath of Franco in Spain, or from the wrath of Hitler when they left Moravia, or Slovakia, or now from Poland. No! *They fled from the wrath of the treacherously outraged peoples of those nations*, as they may one day flee as well from the wrath of a finally aroused populace in America.<sup>4</sup>

Before the spectacle of Jewish misery, the agitator eschews any display of emotion and instead urges his audience to study the question "objectively." He seems to refute the notion that he appeals primarily to passions, and presents the audience with a systematic survey of Jewish history preceded by the following remarks:

Recurring persecutions and expulsion of the Jews have marked the history of every age and country since the fall of Jerusalem. . . . As background for current reading about the Jews—particularly the war mongering of their

international financialists and political policymakers [we present the following survey] . . .<sup>5</sup>

Although the explanation is here purely secular, and the fall of Jerusalem is associated with the intrigues of international bankers, the overall purpose of this "background for current reading" is to impress upon the reader the permanent and inevitable character of Jewish persecutions. The personality and motives of the persecutor recede into the background: the Nazi attack on the Jews is a problem that concerns only the Jews, who, since they are destined to suffer, cannot be defended by any earthly power. By summoning them to seek refuge only in spirituality, the agitator drives home the idea of their absolute defenselessness, and he underscores the precariousness of this refuge by comparing it to a bomb shelter:

If there was ever an occasion for Jewry to abandon its materialism, now is the acceptable day. Until there is a deep spiritual reawakening in the hearts of Jewish leaders, there will be perpetuated the story of Egypt in America and every other nation—a story which will chronicle the worst sufferings of God's once chosen people. Perchance the rich can flee—for a time. But the poor, innocent, misled little Jew will remain, as he always does, to bear the plagues of persecution. . . . Have the Jews forgotten that the more they organize materially against their opponents, the more assaults will increase and the closer they are to persecution? There is no security for Jews except in the bomb shelter of spirituality.<sup>6</sup>

**THE JEW IS NOT PERSECUTED.** One of the major devices by which the agitator develops his theme of the Jew as victim is often to deny the very existence of persecution. "The persecutions of which the Jews in Germany complained were in reality no persecutions at all."<sup>7</sup> For even if there were one or two difficulties in Germany, nonetheless, "Synagogues are open on Saturday the same as usual and rabbis receive their pay without molestation."<sup>8</sup>

Towards such matters the agitator is eager to be as unimpassioned and cautious as possible. One must not be too hasty in accepting news reports: "No one in this country knows the exact truth about German treatment of the Jews except that its severity has been greatly exaggerated."<sup>9</sup> For the fact is that though "the wails of the rabbis about the persecuted Polish Jews clutter up the press . . . we can dry our sympathetic tears; the sob stories are not true!"<sup>10</sup> The agitator is not taken in by mere newspaper reports; he reasons dispassionately: "At present there

are three and a half million Jews in Poland and they would not be there if there had been any 'persecution.'"<sup>11</sup>

What does the agitator achieve psychologically by thus flouting the historical evidence of persecution of Jews? For one thing, since the Jewish complaints are branded as exaggerated, the Jews are established as professional complainers who take advantage of the gentiles' kind-heartedness. At the same time, the persecutions are reduced to something quite ordinary, normal, and legal, routine activities of a modern state. Here the agitator implies that the term "persecution" does not really apply to the Jews, for the Jews are not quite normal human beings anyway. One does not speak of a termite's or a parasite's rights when it is exterminated. Such creatures cannot be said to be persecuted; they are simply destroyed.

True, the Jews groan and lament, but they are still alive: "On all sides we hear of the 'terrible German pogroms,' *but we have yet to hear of a single Jew killed in one under the Hitler regime.*"<sup>12</sup> In fact, hints the agitator, it is not unlikely that Jewish complaints are merely a stratagem to conceal aggressions against Christians: ". . . all this hue and cry about Hitler's persecution was smokescreen to hide the disappearance—mostly to USA is my guess—of millions of Jews in Europe."<sup>13</sup>

And so what appears to others as an attack on a defenseless group becomes a struggle between the forces of order and a cunning enemy whose demand for rights is merely a pretext for securing unfair advantages. Only the suckers can pity Jews—only those who allow their pity to make them the victims of the Jews. One must suppress one's altruistic impulse in relation to them as one suppresses it when witnessing the arrest of a criminal. The impunity with which actual persecution of the Jews is denied seems to imply that whoever joins the hunt of the Jews need not fear punishment or moral disapproval. For, says the agitator, the persecuted are really the persecutors.

**ANTI-SEMITISM DISAVOWED.** The agitator's repudiations of anti-Semitism, or even direct assertions of pro-Semitic feelings—"I am a friend of the Jews"<sup>14</sup>—are variations of the rhetorical figure of apophasis (mention of something while denying intention to mention it). The form, sometimes the mere tone, of such statements belies its presumed content. The audience always knows. For the agitator manages to insert an anti-Semitic insinuation in the very midst of his disclaimer. For example: "*Liberation* has never deliberately dealt in rancors. It has picked no quarrel with

the Jew as individual but strictly what his race represents in the mass."<sup>15</sup> Whether the individual is blamed for the group or the group for the individual, the effect is the same.

The existence of anti-Jewish animosity is justified by innuendo: the Jews are behind both capitalism and communism. The same ambiguity is developed in the guise of careful definitions:

. . . neither Father Coughlin nor *Social Justice* is anti-Semitic . . . in the sense that it is opposed to any individual Jew, to any religious Jew, to any group of Jews.

We are opposed, however, to having atheistic Jews *impose their code of life upon our political structure, our social structure, our economic structure and our national structure.*<sup>16</sup>

Such formulations actually define the anti-Semitic tactics: the Jew must always be attacked on some pretext; the fact that the Jew is persecuted must be exploited politically. If despite all the agitator's sincere efforts to the contrary anti-Semitism still flourishes, it is not his fault. He even promises to defend the Jews—and takes this opportunity to outline a program of action for the anti-Semitic extremists:

Will I ever assail Jewry in general? Ridiculous!

If and when the day should come when the anti-Semite radicals will grow strong enough as a result of the depression and Communist aggression to rise against the Jews, I will be in the front ranks of the Cohens, the Franklins, the Issermans, the Wises, the Bambergs and the other sons of Israel fighting in their defense.<sup>17</sup>

While these denials afford him an additional opportunity to keep the so-called Jewish problem alive in the minds of his audience, they are especially helpful in the dissociation of anti-Jewish action from anti-Jewish sentiment. Even those who do not harbor any anti-Semitic feelings must be mobilized for the hunt, or at least neutralized. It is as though the agitator were aware of the fundamental difference between the kind of "bona fide" suburban anti-Semitism, which is not usually associated with a conscious political purpose, and totalitarian anti-Semitism, in which the Jew is primarily an object of political manipulation. An anti-Semite of the traditional type may recognize that at least some Jews are good citizens, although he would not care to meet them socially. What the agitator aims at is to impress upon his audience the need to persecute all Jews, the "good" and the "bad"—a distinction he does not take very seriously in any case. And by developing the idea of collective responsibility of the Jews, he provides the rationalization for this attitude.

ALL ARE GUILTY. The agitator professes to be so opposed to anti-Semitism that he often gives the Jews advice on how to combat it. "Why don't the Jews who want peace and quiet repudiate such character assassins as Walter Winchell?"<sup>18</sup>

Or he addresses himself directly to Jewish religious leaders: "The evil doers in their own midst must be cried out against by the rabbis."<sup>19</sup>

By suggesting that the "bad" Jews are able to engage in their destructive activities because they enjoy the passive support of the "good" ones, he smuggles in the notion of collective responsibility.

I say to the good Jews of America, be not indulgent with the irreligious, atheistic Jews and Gentiles . . . be not lenient with your high financiers, and politicians who assisted at the birth of the only political social and economic system in all civilization that adopted atheism as its religion, internationalism as its patriotism and slavery as its liberty. . . .<sup>20</sup>

The agitator does not run any risk of being misunderstood in his time-worn distinction between the good and bad Jews. Jewish solidarity, and Jewish collective responsibility are treated as so self-evident that the very idea that some "good" Jews might escape the wrath of the aroused gentiles appears as ridiculous. As though to make this clear, the agitator playfully refers to a fictitious central Jewish organization which could correct any Jewish transgressors:

FOR THEIR OWN PROTECTION I sincerely wish that the General Jewish Council would take some of their incorrigible children to the woodshed. A few lightning flashes properly aimed and a few thunder claps efficaciously yelled would do much to rectify the barometer of class hatred. . . .<sup>21</sup>

The agitator's seemingly casual reference to racial tensions as "class hatred" serves to intimate that all Jews belong to the same social group, the well-to-do.

ANTI-SEMITISM EXPLAINED. The trouble with the Jews is that they don't listen to the agitator's advice; otherwise, he suggests, all might be well. For some inexplicable reason, they reject his sincere offers of friendship: "Why do these short-sighted Jews continue to goad us? Why don't they cultivate our friendship instead of inspiring our animosity?"<sup>22</sup> The agitator drives to an extreme the idea, still held by many Jews themselves, that Jewish behavior or character accounts for the hostility against them. He denounces the narrow-minded ethnocentrism of the Jews:

If you want to arouse an anti-Jewish sentiment in America that will sweep like influenza across the fields of our nation, break down these immigration

barriers . . . Be temperate and satisfy the needs of your people instead of the racketeers within your own midst who are raising money with which to build up straw men and knock them down again.<sup>28</sup>

The agitator is particularly indignant at the Jewish effort to combat anti-Semitism. Such an idea is denounced as outright madness: "National Committee to Combat Anti-Semitism . . . this crazy organization should be folded up by the Jews themselves."<sup>24</sup>

Anti-Semitism is nothing but a reaction to the Jewish persecution of anti-Semites: "These merciless programs of abuse which certain Jews and their satellites work upon people who are not in full agreement with them create terrible reactions."<sup>25</sup>

From the idea that the Jews promote anti-Semitism by their stupidity there is only one step to the idea that they promote it deliberately: "Kahn is one of those Jews who is devoting his life to the promoting of anti-Semitism. God save the race from such Jews."<sup>26</sup> Opposition to anti-Semitism is depicted as a method for escaping all criticism and for attacking innocent gentiles:

"Anti-Semitism" is a defense mechanism. Its origin is very ancient. It is a label used by Jewish scoundrels to protect themselves against *just* as well as *unjust* criticism. No other race claims any such general immunity from criticism. The label frightens many persons with weak spines.<sup>27</sup>

No wonder that the agitator in exasperation accepts the label: "Inspired press constantly calls me anti-British, as well as pro-Nazi, and anti-Semitic. If following Christ's footsteps makes me 'anti-Semitic'—so be it."<sup>28</sup>

The persistent denial of anti-Semitism thus becomes a proud admission of it, with the suggestion that such admission is an act of courage.

UNSERIOUSNESS. Obviously, the agitator has the time of his life in discussing anti-Semitism. One moment he may strike a pose as someone too frightened for words: "We cannot be specific in describing the race responsible for the hatred campaign because we Americans would lose our necks if we would dare to speak up."<sup>29</sup>

Or he gives a clownish display of bewilderment:

As my followers know, I am opposed to racism in all its varied forms, but for some reason, which I cannot figure out, there is a certain clique of Jews in every community who stop at nothing short of murder itself to prevent our people from assembling. I must continue to believe, until I am convinced otherwise, that these people are financed . . . by Josef Stalin. . . .<sup>30</sup>

Or he imitates the techniques of the money-back-guarantee advertisement:

*Lie Number 12:* Gerald Smith is anti-Semitic. He answers this by saying that if any person can find a written or public utterance he has ever made against any race or any creed, he will retire from public life.<sup>31</sup>

He may also throw in an ambiguous reference to how efficiently he would deal with the question if he were in power: "If we will put Christ first in America and the problems of America first in our hearts, these unhappy conditions involving racial groups will be ironed out in a hurry."<sup>32</sup>

Or he directly combines a protestation of tolerance with a transparent threat: "I am not religiously intolerant. I don't care if the Jew stays in the synagogue all day long. Then I would know where he was."<sup>33</sup>

It is noteworthy that the last utterance was answered from the audience with the remark: "They go in there to count their dough." In discussing the Jews the agitator knows that he can get away with anything. It does not matter whether he calls himself a friend of the Jews with reservations or an adversary without reservations; it does not matter what the Jews feel about it. The fact that Jewish helplessness can become an occasion for jokes shows how he can succeed in suppressing human feelings in the audience and in promising more substantial pleasures when the real hunting season opens. The Jew is the victim, and victims are there to be victimized. The Jew *should* be persecuted because he *is* persecuted—this is the core of the agitational theme of the Jew as victim.

It is now possible to trace the dynamics of the enemy themes. In portraying the enemy as ruthless, the agitator prepares the ground for neutralizing whatever predispositions for sympathy for the underdog his audience of underdogs may feel. If the enemy is ruthless, then there is no reason to feel sympathy for his simultaneous—if contradictory—helplessness. In this way the Jew as victim becomes legitimate prey.

Moreover, the agitator can play upon the ambivalent feelings toward the weak who even as they are objects of sympathy, are also the objects of suspicion and hatred. It is dangerous to become identified with the weak; one avoids the persecuted victim almost as a matter of course. From such distrust of the weak to joining a hunt against them is a step which implies the complete repression of altruistic motives. Such repression is not innately rooted in human character, but is determined by specific social conditions, one such condition being the mob appeal that rallies citizens to hunt down a criminal. But if a more convenient quarry

can be substituted for the criminal, the innocent will be persecuted as if he were a criminal, and the fact of his misfortune and weakness will be seen as proof of his guilt.

### THEME 13: THE OTHER

The theme that says the Jew should be a victim because he is a victim is developed into the notion that he would not and could not be singled out for persecution if he were like everyone else. The Jew must have done something to deserve the general hostility directed against him, and he has done this because he is by nature unassimilable.

The Jew is caught in a trap. When viewed as the Other, he is primarily accused of refusing to adjust himself; but if he shows the slightest sign of trying to be like the gentiles, he is told that he cannot change and is accused of malicious motives in wanting to change.

Native Americans have no lasting patience with a people that stresses its *differences*, when it dares to do so, and retreats to an imaginary haven of its *likenesses*, after its differences have become a source of acute and general annoyance.<sup>34</sup>

The agitator uses a number of devices to suggest that it is the Jews' otherness which is the cause of their persecution.

*The Jew as Anti-Christ.* The most ancient explanation of anti-Jewish feeling is that the Jews rejected Christ. This explanation implies that the Jew has not been singled out by his enemies but has rather singled himself out. As a result the status of the Jew is fixed for the entire Christian era:

Take history and go back. I could take you back 400 years ago, and the same little minority group were thrown out of Spain. Why? Because they deliberately refused to live like any other man in the country.<sup>35</sup>

Striving to exploit religious sentiment, the agitator consistently refers to the Jews as the "deadly enemies of Christianity itself"<sup>36</sup> and "the hidden anti-Christ power"<sup>37</sup> and as indulging in a "ghastly assault on the Christian religion."<sup>38</sup> But this kind of conscious religious "argumentation" offers, especially in modern times, rather limited possibilities for the agitator, if only because—theoretically at least—the Jews can escape hostility by conversion.

The agitator therefore strives to strike deeper psychological chords in his audience by perverting the universalistic nature of Christianity into

an endogamic religion that is equated with "Americanism." More important, he uses traditional religious language to stir certain ambivalent attitudes which arise from the Christian recognition that Jesus was a Jew. Images of blood and violence occur abundantly in his denunciations of Jews as anti-Christians. The Jews are absolutely ruthless, they "expect to show no mercy to Christians."<sup>39</sup> In fact, their persecution of Christ has never ceased: "Though He had many friends, there was no one to speak out in His defense: 'For fear of the Jews no one spoke out openly of Him.' It has always been so. It will always be thus."<sup>40</sup>

By vividly depicting this allegedly eternal hostility, the agitator is able to present his audience with sadistic images:

Why is there in this world such deadly animosity for the name of Christ? . . . Pilate ordered that he be scourged, whipped—but even the show of blood upon his back did not satisfy the sadistic mob of Hell. They could be satisfied with nothing but crucifixion, death on the cross.

So, down through the centuries, the Satanic sons and heirs of Beelzebub have continued to cry, "Crucify! Crucify!" whenever the name of Christ is mentioned.<sup>41</sup>

Thus the ambivalent image of the Jew persisting from childhood religious training is transformed by the agitator into an image of an unchangeable group that consistently opposes every aspect of the western tradition. While pretending to preach Christian ideals, the agitator becomes the advocate of a radical anti-Christianity that denies the possibility of redemption to unbelievers.

For genuine believers, the condition of the unconverted can be the cause not only of disapproval but also of pity. But the agitator's "theological" explanation of the Jew's stubborn refusal to be converted cannot lead to pity; it leads, on the contrary, to the suspicion that the Jew's refusal to see the light of truth is based not on ignorance but on some secret superior knowledge. While the Christians chase the mirage of eternal salvation, the Jews grab all the material goods. The Jews do not have to worry about the restrictions imposed by Christian ethics—and as the pious Christian prays, they empty his pockets (cf. p. 13). The Jews thus enjoy all the fruit forbidden to the Christians.

As a result, the agitator's repeated charge that the Jew is a "businessman first, last and always"<sup>42</sup> and that "the only God whom he worships is the calf of gold"<sup>43</sup> has implications contradicting the agitator's occasional excursions into theology. The agitator is here simply appealing to a strictly secular feeling: envy of unfair advantages. The Jews are so

ruthless and money-mad that they exploit even their status as a persecuted minority to gain extra privileges:

They [the Jews] are unwilling to share the common fate of their fellowmen but they are demanding *special* consideration as a 'minority,' a 'stateless' class, a 'homeless' race, a 'helpless' people, a 'persecuted' religion.<sup>44</sup>

The Jew makes a racket even out of his role of anti-Christ.

**CLANNISHNESS.** The Jews refuse to conform—in making this traditional accusation the agitator speaks out as a serious educator who wants each fellow to mingle with the crowd. He is disturbed by snobbishness and pretension of superiority:

Let the Jews remember that too many Americans are conscious of some of the tenets of Judaism. Jews are so ultra-clannish that they frown upon a Jewish girl's marrying a Gentile boy because the Goyim is not good enough, either morally or intellectually, for the girl.<sup>45</sup>

Trying to make capital of the age-old fact of Jewish seclusion as though it were simply a manifestation of Jewish character, he intimates that he must be kept apart from the community, and then accuses the Jew of seclusiveness.

The charge of clannishness also helps suggest that Jews are primarily concerned with their own needs and indifferent to the welfare of the country in which they live:

No one should expect from an American Jew the same devotion to American traditions, or to the stability of American society or even to the perpetuity of our constitutional government, as from other racial and national elements of the population.<sup>46</sup>

**FERMENT.** The Jew refuses to change himself, but at the same time he constantly changes his environment. The epitome of restlessness for its own sake, he is never satisfied with his place in society.

The Jews, suggests the agitator, are troublemakers, if only because they try to improve their status. But the Jews are blamed for this very rebellion against the situation that produces their insecurity: their restlessness is attributed to an irrepressible will to power. The homelessness of the Jews is their own doing: "They have no country, never had one and never intend to have one. . . ."<sup>47</sup> In the countries where they find temporary rest, they plot to achieve dominance:

. . . Jews so far forget their kindly and just treatment in this Christian land as to take the lead in every subversive movement for its overthrow; when they

carry on continual agitation against our economic system and our form of government in their open forums and conclaves of their rabbis . . .<sup>48</sup>

When the Jews act as troublemakers they have come out of their seclusion. Hence, the agitator's denunciation of their subversion is an implicit call to drive them back to the ghetto. But the image of the Jew as the irrepressible agent of change, the "ferment of national decomposition" (Mommsen) seems to have a still deeper psychological impact on an audience that is itself restless and insecure. For in a turbulent world where others, including the agitator, are compelled to grope hesitantly and often blindly and to fall back upon such vague notions as imminent doom or conspiracy, the Jews seem to feel at home. Using their "age old tactics,"<sup>49</sup> they have somehow managed, suggests the agitator, to preserve their identity over the ages, evil though it is; their troublemaking enterprises, whether directed towards financial control of the world or revolutions against the world or both, always show that the Jews have a clear goal. In a world of shattered and atomized personalities, the image of such an enemy as it is unconsciously conjured up by the agitator seems both attractive and dangerous to his audience. By attributing these secretly desirable traits to the Jews, the agitator stirs his audience's envy—and to feel envy of the helpless, hunted foe is to increase the desire to use violence against him.

**SPOTTING THE JEW.** The image of the Jew as Anti-Christ and its secular derivations of the Jew as clannish and the Jew as social ferment are the more conceptualized symptoms of Jewish otherness. But the Jew can also be detected by other, more primitive characteristics that are sometimes so elusive as to defy description. While the conceptualized traits reflect the Jews' unwillingness to conform, these other traits reflect the Jews' inability to conform because of their idiosyncracies. The former may sometimes be concealed, but the latter show through every disguise, and are the best way to identify a Jew. The agitator plays the part of a bloodhound always hot on the scent of the Jew who cannot hide his true identity.

Among these alleged distinctive traits, there is first of all the Jew's undefinable foreignness. The word epitomizing this trait of foreignness is "oriental" or "Asiatic." The agitator speaks deprecatingly of "orientals who are American citizens,"<sup>50</sup> of oriental concepts of government, of oriental mobs that overrun the White House, of oriental aliens that invade our rich nation and rifle the cash register, etc., etc. Associations of

the forbidden, immoral, and luscious seem to play a role in the use of the term "oriental."

The attribute of foreignness is supplemented by a wealth of more specific references to Jewish history. The agitator can dispense with using the word Jew when he speaks of Pharisees, money changers, the gold-mongers clan, the usurpers of Christian liberties. He can content himself with mentioning "those flagless citizens,"<sup>51</sup> or indulge in a kind of "guess who" test: "Every classification of decent citizens in this country—except perhaps one—has openly condemned Communism. . . ."<sup>52</sup> He can name the Jew without naming him: "If Churchill says it is O.K., then it is all right from Hyde Park all the way down to the East Side of New York, from which district some big names have come."<sup>53</sup>

He can also, just as in the case of anti-Semitism, take advantage of the official prohibition and resort to the rhetorical figure of apophasis (cf. p. 68): "There were certain over the radio unnamable naturalized persons living in America. . . ."<sup>54</sup>

Sometimes several attributes are merged, as in the following quotation where the traits of anti-Christianity, anti-Americanism, control of propaganda apparatus, psychopathic behavior, and sinister business machinations all point to the Jew:

I do not subscribe to the proposition that if we have prosperity we must have war. That is Satan's gospel. Peace is the gospel of Christ. The radio and the press are filled with the propaganda of war. Should we Americans engender an artificial hatred towards any nation to satisfy the merchandisers of murder and the owners of debt?<sup>55</sup>

Public censorship of broadcasts only partly accounts for the agitator's habit of designating the Jews by indirection; the device serves purposes other than mere circumvention of the law. It is a game, a rehearsal of the anticipated hunt and a verbal reproduction of the age-old hunt of the persecuted. But this game in addition to its entertainment value serves also to teach the audience to discover spontaneously what the agitator wants it to discover. The attention of the audience is concentrated on the Jews more effectively when they are not mentioned explicitly. Look into the rat holes, the agitator seems to say, I don't have to tell you whom you will find there.

At the same time, the agitator seems to match the enemy's tactics by entering into a conspiracy with his followers in which he speaks to them in the anti-Semitic in-group language: he summons his followers not to

reveal the esoteric knowledge he has imparted to them, thus strengthening the bonds between him and them.

The prohibition against uttering the enemy's name is an archaic heritage. By not naming the Jew, the agitator suggests that he is so powerful that the mere act of calling him "the Jew" might mean danger. But simultaneously he suggests another implication. The Jew is so despicable and wretched that even the mere mention of his name is repulsive. When the Jew is not mentioned in the same way decent people are, his character as outcast is stressed, and he seems to the audience a weak and helpless figure. In this way, again, the agitator develops the device mentioned in the previous chapter: the Jews' strength, a cause for hating him, is shown as merely a façade of his essential weakness, a reason for persecuting him.

Yet the Jew remains ubiquitous. Foreign while yet familiar, he can be encountered everywhere, hiding under every mask and always spotted by the agitator. The Jew is unable to cover up his tracks.

**JEWISH NAMES.** The climax in the process of spotting the Jew occurs when Jews, still without being called Jews, are referred to by Jewish-sounding names. Now at last the quarry has been trapped and is ready for the kill. The audience reacts with laughter (cf. p. 63); in the agitator's apocalyptic oratory, such moments of triumphant detection seem to provide one of the few bits of relief: "Sidney Hillman, or more correctly Schmuel Gilman . . ." <sup>56</sup> or, "Karfunkelstein, alias Leon Blum . . ." <sup>57</sup> or "Meyer Genoch Moisevitch Wallach, sometimes known as Maxim Litvinov, or Maximovitch, who had at various times adopted the other revolutionary aliases of Gustave Graf, Finkelstein, Buchmann, and Harrison was a Jew . . ." <sup>58</sup>

The agitator suggests that he for one cannot be cheated: he always discovers the essence behind the appearance. It is not true, he seems to say, that a name is just a name; if we look at it more closely, if we find its origin and pronounce it correctly, its true meaning is revealed. The Jewish name is a label that makes clearly visible the nature of its bearer; it is a stigma, it pins the Jew down, and he can no longer escape.

The strong emotional reaction that the mention of Jewish names always seems to produce suggests that they are not perceived as ordinary names, i.e., conventions, but that they are felt to be an integral part of Jewish personality. The fact that Jews can be recognized merely by their names seems to bear this out; and the fact that the Jews have preserved their names despite all historical vicissitudes (in the course of which they lost

every other conventional sign of national identity) makes their names an important symbol of their historical continuity. But the Jewish name is also a symbol of the continuity of the persecution to which the Jews have been exposed. By bringing out this latter aspect, by forcing the Jew who actually or allegedly uses an alias to show his real name, the agitator twists the badge of pride into a badge of disgrace.

The agitator's frequent recourse to cumulations of Jewish names suggests that the device reverses the symbolic significance of such names in still another way. The repetition of Jewish family names creates the impression that they are all more or less the same, consequently that their bearers are all the same, and can be dealt with simultaneously and equally. Instead of denoting an individual, the Jewish name is made to indicate a species, a race. The name becomes a stereotype of nonindividuality: if you know one Jew you know them all.

The Jewish name is transformed into a term of abuse and in hurling it at the enemy the agitator engages in name-calling in the literal sense of the term. As a mocking epithet, its sound is not only foreign but ridiculous. It strikes the audience as a joke: "Walter Lipshitz Winchell—I'm not joking—that's his name . . ." <sup>59</sup>

The agitator sometimes engages in painstaking heraldic research:

It is known, however, that Winchell's father used the name of Jacob Laino, and that Winchell assumed the name of "Lawrence" in his youth. "Our real name," he once wrote with a show of impatience, is "Schmaltz." *Our guess would be that Winchell's real name (if it ever comes out) is, or should be Vevele Weinschul, which is a good, honest, respectable name.* <sup>60</sup>

The family name, envied token of tradition and heritage for non-Jews, becomes a symbol of degradation for the Jews. What the gentiles are proud to display, the Jews seem eager to hide. Their history is made into their curse and disgrace. By evoking a past when the Jews were persecuted (or, as in the above quotation, reminding the audience that the Jew who enjoys American freedom was once a subject of an anti-Semitic country), the agitator verbally reenacts the injustice previously done to the Jews.

MIMICKING. We come here to what is perhaps one of the most crucial anti-Semitic stimuli—mimicking,\* which is not limited to the pronunciation of Jewish names. Striking examples are to be found in the agitator's way of describing Jewish complaints. He suggests that the Jews do not

\* Cf. Horkheimer, Max, and Adorno, Theodor W.: *Dialektik der Aufklärung*. Amsterdam, Querido, 1947, pp. 212 ff.

speak like human beings but make weird sounds: whenever they express emotions, they are loud, conspicuous, unbearable, and comical. The agitator refers to “. . . the wailing yelps and weird wails of subversive Jews and Communist gangs. . . .”<sup>61</sup> or imitates sounds supposedly made by Jews among themselves: “America’s Jewish Kommissars Screech, Squabble and Scrap.”<sup>62</sup> When the Jews want to protest against Hitler, these “alien-minded super-collectivists” indulge in “loud sneers and jeers and hymns of hate”;<sup>63</sup> on other occasions, they yell, howl, whine,<sup>64</sup> etc.

What the Jews are here implicitly blamed for is that they seem to challenge both the discipline of civilization, which prescribes restraint, and the suppression of the urge to display one’s own emotion. They appear free to act out their passions and desires, their demands and fears, their sympathies and above all their antipathies. Once again, the Jews refuse to conform, this time on a deeper emotional level. They are portrayed as despicable and dangerous for they insist on the right to be individuals. The agitator discredits such expressions of individualistic rebellion.

This condemnation of Jewish expressiveness is accompanied by its caricaturing imitation. The followers are forbidden to indulge in such expressiveness for themselves, but they are permitted to imitate manifestations of it in their alleged enemies.

The fact that the audience enjoys such caricatures and imitations of allegedly weird Jewish behavior shows that this Jewish foreignness is not as external to them as it might seem. They feel it in their own flesh, it is latent in them; the Jew is not the abstract “other,” he is the other who dwells in themselves. Into him they can conveniently project everything within themselves to which they deny recognition, everything they must repress. But this projection can be effected only on condition that they hate the Jews and are permitted to realize the repressed impulse in the form of a caricature of the enemy. They find an outlet for their repressed aspirations only by simultaneously condemning them.

#### THEME 14: THE MENACE

According to the agitator, Jewish influence is behind every threat to society and every frustration of his followers’ hopes. From the idea that the Jews are persecuted to the idea that they are persecutors, the transition is not too difficult; it has been made often enough in the past to become a kind of stereotype. But this stereotype is not merely the product of anti-Jewish agitation; it would seem that the history of the Jews and

interpretations of this history have contributed to the creation of an idea of the Jew in which persecuted and persecutor are inextricably blended.

The fate of the Jew has always been an object of theological speculation; his survival has struck many thinkers as a mystery that could not be explained by natural causes. A well-known religious philosopher who was by no means hostile to the Jews refers to them as a "pre-eminently historical people"\* which

according to the materialistic and positivist criterion ought long ago to have perished. . . . The survival of the Jews, their resistance to destruction, their endurance under absolutely peculiar conditions and the fateful role played by them in history; all these point to the particular and mysterious foundations of their destiny. . . . The Jewish destiny is characterized by a particular dramatic intensity which makes the purely Aryan spirit seem dull by comparison. . . . The Jewish spirit constitutes a distinct racial type. . . . It is still animated by the aspiration towards the future, by the stubborn and persistent demand that the future, should bring with it an all-resolving truth and justice on earth, in the name of which the Jewish people is prepared to declare war on all historical traditions, sacraments, and associations.

The above passage is based on an explicit rejection of a "materialist" or "naturalist" approach to history, but even on the level of the "ideal" or the "transcendent" the image of the Jews as persecuted leads almost irresistibly to the idea that they are essentially different from and opposed to the world as it is.

In the agitator's language the idea of the sacred mission of the Jew acquires a negative sign. The theologian's "mysterious foundations" are transformed into a deliberate Jewish conspiracy; the "particular dramatic intensity" of "the Jewish spirit" into Jewish ruthlessness and cunning; and the "war on all historical traditions, sacraments, and associations" into vicious aggression against the Gentile world. Awe and admiration can be sublimated forms of fear and envy; and when the agitator reduces the emotions inspired by the "idealist" theological interpretation to those of his own level, he transforms the awe and admiration into fear, envy and hatred. The sheer fact that the Jews have managed to survive through so much suffering seems to him and his followers evidence that they must have certain secret and menacing powers. Because they are and have been persecuted they can be plausibly charged with having the vindictive and cunning mentality of slaves; because they have survived all persecutions, they can be plausibly assumed to command extraordinary resources, and to be endowed with an extraordinary vitality. They alone seem to be

\* Berdyaev, Nicolas: *The Meaning of History*, New York, 1936, pp. 86 ff.

self-sufficient, and able to preserve their individuality in a world that suppresses individuality.

**VINDICTIVENESS.** During the prewar and war years one of the persistent themes of agitation in America was that the Jews had instigated a crusade against Hitler to revenge themselves for his persecutions:

Day after day, and far into all these pregnant nights, we hear the ceaseless, senseless din of propaganda, all of which is for the purpose of making us war-minded enough to go to war to save World Jewry's financial, political, economic and social fortunes.

Ever since the Armistice of November, 1918, Jewry's International High Command has been making plans for the next World War—which is now beginning in Europe.<sup>65</sup>

To drive home his point more effectively, the agitator may characterize Jewish machinations as a well-established and understandable reaction, only then to accuse the Jews of cowardice and selfishness:

. . . We would not condemn the Jews so much for their culpability in declaring and prolonging this war if they would manifest sufficient intestinal fortitude to say that the war now being waged is to protect their vast international business interest.<sup>66</sup>

However, the audience is not allowed for one moment to think that Jewish hostility to Hitler is justified. The Jews are vindictive by nature: "It is a matter of record that Jews over the world, particularly the United States, long ago 'declared war' on Germany," created "a distorted impression of events in Central Europe," and generated "antagonisms and retaliations, until finally the flame ignited."<sup>67</sup> They

bristle with hate because their pride has been hurt by Adolf Hitler. They have a persecution complex and they want America to go to war . . . even if it costs the lives of ten million Americans, as long as they can have their revenge.<sup>68</sup>

Jewish lust for revenge is depicted as unrestrained, as directly pathological. As the war approached its climax, the agitator's line was that "Jewish leadership insists on annihilating and enslaving all people of German blood, regardless of their innocence or their guilt," and he prophesied that "they [the Jews] will likely bring down on their heads a reaction even worse than that through which they have just passed."<sup>69</sup>

The notion that Hitler's treatment of the Jews was a "reaction" to their vindictiveness follows a sentence in which the Jewish interest in this war is described as "understandable." The agitator speaks as though there

were no distinction between the idea that the Jews are vindictive because they were wronged and the idea that he is wronged because they are vindictive. He seems to have no difficulty in blaming the persecuted for the worst actions of the persecutors. Alluding to a report that the Gestapo forced some Jews into its service, he concludes:

In view of savagery displayed in Russia, by Jewish OGPU, wherein torture carried to unmentionable extremes helped liquidate during past 25 years some 50,000,000 persons; and in view of *Rabbi Alstat's* admissions, can it be that the gruesome liquidations now attributed to the Gestapo were carried out by some kind of beasts?<sup>70</sup>

No matter how lurid the colors with which alleged Jewish power is painted, the agitator always suggests that this power is ultimately imaginary. The idea that the Jews are helpless is perhaps nowhere stressed more strongly than when the agitator refers to their power. The unserious and sometimes directly grotesque connotations in such references do not seem to weaken the basic implication that there is an identity between the persecutor and persecuted. Like sadist and masochist, the two are not distinguished in the unconscious.

Persecution of the Jews even comes to be conceived of as a prerequisite of Jewish power. The idea is presented with a touch of irony.

Space is too limited to comment on why Jews hired gangsters to stage pogroms against other Jews. But it IS necessary that Jews be persecuted. If they were not, their whole international system would collapse. That is why it was necessary that Hitler be made to kill so many before the United States would destroy Germany. By Jewish reports, Hitler killed every Jew in Germany about six times. It is hard to believe that a Jew could be killed that many times, have all his property confiscated, and then show up at a refugee camp with a fur coat and suitcases full of money, clamoring about his sacred right to come to the United States.<sup>71</sup>

The identity of the persecutor and the persecuted is explicitly stated by an English street orator who, referring to the refugees of the *Exodus 1947*, complained that "now Britain was a fifth-rate nation, dictated to by four thousand Jews afloat in British ships."\* It is difficult to believe that even a pro-fascist audience fails to perceive such a charge as a joke—but it is a startling joke, a proof of the agitator's impudence or prowess and his determination to resort to any means to attain his end. It is proof that against the Jew everything goes—just because he is helpless he can be hit below the belt. But the charge also sets associational trains in motion—

\* Quoted by Woodrow Wyatt; *The New Statesman and Nation*, August 30, 1947.

the refugees, after all, *are* a stubborn and troublesome lot, and if they do not dictate to the British Empire, they certainly tried to, and they do force the Government to waste a great deal of time on them. The idea of their power is a good joke, but it is not "dismissed" as other jokes are—quite on the contrary.

CUNNING. The Jews do not satisfy their lust for revenge openly. They always act behind the scenes and it is they who are "the power behind *all* dictators."<sup>72</sup> The agitational texts suggest that the most important Jewish instrument of domination is, next to money, the manipulation of public opinion.

The agitator exploits certain actual occupational facts. The relatively high percentage of Jewish participation in the motion picture and radio industries and in the press is used in two ways. First, the Jews are depicted as the absolute masters of the media of mass communication. ". . . We recognize the tremendous influence which the sons of Jewry wield in the press, the cinema and on the radio, the three chief sources which control public opinion."<sup>73</sup>

In fact, all "movies . . . are run by Jews";<sup>74</sup> the Jews "control the press . . . control the motion picture industry a hundred per cent,"<sup>75</sup> and "press and radio in the United States is definitely under Semitic domination. . . ."<sup>76</sup>

Secondly, this alleged position of the Jews is depicted as a consequence of their innate intellectuality. This may be stated in the form of a compliment:

My fellow citizens, I am not ignorant of Jewish history. I know its glories. I am acquainted with its glorious sons. I am aware of the keen intellectuality which has characterized its progress in commerce, in finance and particularly in the field of communications.<sup>77</sup>

Resentment against the Jews as wielders of intellectual power is fed by the obscure realization that such power is basically precarious (cf. p. 58); the agitator has a way of suggesting that success spells danger for the Jews: "In the fields of publicity, finance, commerce, communications, amusement and industry, the Jews have risen to perilous heights."<sup>78</sup>

The Jews seem to have succeeded in using standardized products of mass culture for the pursuit of their own exploitive ends: "The Jew combines owning and controlling the movies and radio have a cheap trick in their method of Hollywood clowns using radio programs to advertise and glorify each other."<sup>79</sup>

The followers' own ambivalent attitude toward mass culture, the feeling that in the last analysis they are somehow betrayed by what they read and hear and see, is exploited for agitational purposes. While manipulating the others—so the agitator tells his audience—the Jews protect their own interests. Mass culture is a product of intellectuality, and intellectuality is above all seen as a means of exploitation. The Jews are conceived of as living by their wits and avoiding physical work. They achieve their goals by means of intellectual machinations, Stock Exchange manipulations, or revolutionary propaganda, but they never seem to toil in the sweat of their brows. This is a trait common to the banker and communist, and is one of the elements of the paradoxical image of the communist banker.

Significantly enough, the agitator rarely accuses the Jews of violent crimes. The Jews are depicted as crooks, conspirators, warmongers, revolutionists, but they never seem to do things with their hands. As compared to them, a common murderer or burglar is a laborer with tools and skills, who must engage in physical work to achieve his ends. The Jews are not even such hard-working criminals. Work without hardship is identified with exploitation, and to the followers the vision of a people who enjoy life without paying for it is intolerable. Hence the accusation that the Jews aim at compelling the gentiles to perform all the "dirty" work:

I speak of the International Organized Jewry who seeks a One World government, mongrelizing of the races (of all except their own) a world police force, world court, (again Jew-dominated) and a one world government with once free and independent Christian Americans as the slaves to till the soil, sweat in the industries, fight the wars and be the slaves.<sup>80</sup>

These old motives of resentment may be intensified by an obscure suspicion that the intellectual no longer fulfills his traditional function of serving the spiritual needs of the community. He is identified with the best-selling author, the movie script writer and the successful newspaperman. He seems to make a good living by producing a content that serves merely to divert those engaged in less gratifying tasks.

Domination by intellect is experienced as usurpation because it is not backed by actual physical power and ultimately it depends on the consent of the dominated or on deception. Consistently depicted as over-sophisticated, practicing debauch, enjoying forbidden things, tempting the suckers by futile entertainment and pursuing destructive aims, the modern intellectual, as the agitator sees him, is a secular variation of the devil.

But the agitator is not in the least against the principle of manipulating people by means of the entertainment industry; he merely objects to the fact that it cannot be used for his own "righteous" purposes: "The moving picture business today is largely in the hands of Satan and his emissaries. . . . Satan has things pretty much his own way in a sphere that ought to be a powerful factor for righteousness. . . ."<sup>81</sup>

**SELF-SUFFICIENCY.** Our list of traits that the agitator ascribes to the Jews includes several that supposedly define the Jews' character—for instance their freedom from the shackles of Christian morality, their readiness to help each other, their irrepressible dynamism, their expressiveness, their cunning. All these traits are denounced as despicable and hateful; yet they also lend themselves to another interpretation, for they can be viewed as desirable assets in the individual's struggle for existence. On some occasions the agitator almost explicitly indicates that he conceives of the Jews as people who somehow manage to get more out of life than the gentiles:

I am not an anti-Jew. The Jew has his place but he has it no more than you or I. He has a place where we will put him in time, and when he gets there he won't be able to spend much money, not more than we have now.<sup>82</sup>

But the strain of envy present in such an accusation is not confined to the stereotype notion that the Jews possess inexhaustible financial resources. The other traits referred to above also seem worldly assets that have been appropriated by the Jews, while the non-Jews have lost or are losing them.

The very multiplicity of Jewish attributes is significant. The Jew appears as a colorful figure: he is interesting, he attracts attention. He does not have to stress his originality, he is allegedly recognized by innumerable obvious signs, by his language, manners, ideas. The very fact that he is a Jew distinguishes him from the anonymous crowd. It is true that his characteristics are contradictory. He is persecuted and privileged, strong and weak, rich and poor, religious and atheistic, clannish and promiscuous, modern and archaic. But the Jew somehow synthesizes all contradictions; despite his multiplicity he remains one, easily and clearly identifiable. A remarkably integrated personality, he gives free expression to individualistic impulses that others must repress; at the same time he has a highly developed rational faculty, and has not lost the sense of collective solidarity.

The Jew's capacity for enjoying life creates the illusion that in an era

when the individual is under tremendous pressure, the Jew, by defying the trends of the day, remains an individual and profits from it. To an audience obsessed by feelings of insecurity, the agitator suggests that the Jews are a people who have succeeded in weaving a continuous historical texture of their own since the beginnings of time and who know at any given moment how to cut this material to meet any new situation. He often refers to Jews by epithets or images taken from the Bible or from their ancient and medieval history; even their most modern techniques of propaganda are nothing but a repetition of age-old devices: "Technique and its [propaganda] terminology from the Sanhedrin and from the Sanhedrin's progeny. . . ." <sup>83</sup>

The Jew, the agitator intimates, is at home in every country, he is not fettered by linguistic, geographic, ethnographic frontiers. He is ubiquitous—everywhere on the earth and everywhere in history. He has solved the problem of belonging and although he is an individual, he is never isolated. And he shapes his own fate; while the other peoples are never held responsible for their misery, the Jew is responsible for both his own and the other nations' fate.

His fate as an individual is also the fate of his people. The Jews always help each other, sacrifice themselves for each other, and as we have been told, even stage pogroms against themselves when this can serve their purposes. Although unique individuals, they act like a swarm of insects and invade other countries like epidemics.

The image of the Jew who escapes the heavy demands of self-discipline, whose morals are easy, who does secret and forbidden things and enjoys life without paying for it is all the more provoking because the Jew seems able to do all this even while his power is so precarious. For Jewish power, the agitator implies, has no solid foundations in reality; it is based solely on manipulations and machinations. It cannot withstand the exercise of brute force; and brute force is something that the Jews never have at their disposal. The very survival of the Jews can thus be felt as a challenge, since it seems to refute the idea that ultimately everything in life is based on physical power, and that those deprived of it must submit to those who wield it. The Jews symbolize the utopia of harmony that has come to be regarded as a deception. This almost automatically suggests that they can enjoy happiness only by deceiving others.

At a time when bare survival comes increasingly to be felt as the sole value, and conformism as the sole method of assuring one's survival, Jewish survival seems an intolerable challenge. If the world has borne up

with the Jews for centuries, it cannot bear up with them any longer; they must be liquidated because they are doomed: there is no place for the individual in the world today. In the last analysis, elimination of the Jew does not seem to be motivated by expectation of material gain, but by the fact that in modern life individual happiness seems to become so exceptional that the presence of a group which seemingly continues to pursue it is felt as an affront and a menace.

It would be erroneous to represent the Jew as the ultimate enemy of the agitator. While his invectives converge on the Jew, his attack is aimed at all forces in society that he finds reprehensible. The Jew becomes the symbol on which he centers the projections of his own impotent rage against the restraints of civilization.

Such sentiments are not unique to American agitation:

. . . I also want to talk to you, quite frankly, on a very grave matter . . . I mean the clearing out of the Jews, the extermination of the Jewish race. It's one of those things it is easy to talk about—"The Jewish race is being exterminated," says one Party member, "that's quite clear, it's in our program—elimination of the Jews, and we're doing it, exterminating them." And then they come, 80 million worthy Germans and each one has his decent Jew. Not one of all those who talk this way has witnessed it, not one of them has been through it. Most of *you* must know what it means when 100 corpses are lying side by side, or 500 or 1,000. To have stuck it out and at the same time—apart from exceptions caused by human weakness—to have remained decent fellows, that is what has made us hard. This is a page of glory in our history which has never been written and is never to be written, for we know how difficult we should have made it for ourselves, if—with bombing raids, the burdens and the deprivations of war—we still had Jews today in every town as secret saboteurs, agitators and troublemongers. We should now probably have reached the 1916-17 stage when the Jews were still in the German national body.

We have taken from them what wealth they had. I have issued a strict order, which SS Obergruppenführer Pohl has carried out, that this wealth should as a matter of course be handed over to the Reich without reserve. We have taken none of it for ourselves. Individual men who have lapsed will be punished in accordance with an order issued at the beginning which gave this warning: Whoever takes so much as a mark of it is a dead man. A number of S.S. men—there are not very many of them—have fallen short, and they will die without mercy. We had the moral right, we had the duty to our people, to destroy this people which wanted to destroy us. But we have not the right to enrich ourselves with so much as a fur, a watch, a mark, or a cigarette or anything else. Because we have exterminated a bacterium we do not want, in the end, to be infected by the bacterium and die of it. I will not see so much as a small area of sepsis appear here or gain a hold. Wherever it may form, we will cauterize it. Altogether, however, we can say that we have fulfilled

this most difficult duty for the love of our people. And our spirit, our soul, our character has not suffered injury from it.\*

The use of the stereotypes of Jewish greed and sabotage, and the metaphor of the bacteria (cf. pp. 55-58) cannot obscure the fact that something more than wealth and hygiene is involved. Although the speaker uses terms such as "spirit," "soul," and "love of our people," the essential point he wants to impress upon his listeners is this: that under no circumstances must they succumb to human impulses. The dehumanization and killing of the Jew cannot be carried out effectively unless the killer too is dehumanized, unless he extirpates in himself every claim to human existence as an individual.

\* Speech of the Reichführer-SS Heinrich Himmler at the meeting of S.S. Major-Generals at Posen, October 4, 1943, quoted in *Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression*, Washington, 1946, p. 558.