

CHAPTER VII

A HOME FOR THE HOMELESS

As a would-be leader of a popular movement, the agitator cannot content himself with articulations of malaise and denunciations of the enemy; he must offer some kind of statements about his goals and the means by which he proposes to reach them.

The "positive" statements of any advocate of social change may be discussed under four heads:

1. Descriptions of the values and ideals that are to replace the rejected values and ideals.

2. Formulations of goals which contain some assurance that the factors leading to present frustrations will be eliminated and that a situation will be created in which frustrated needs will be fully gratified.

3. Descriptions of the methods of realizing these goals—a practical program of action.

4. References to the character of the movement's adherent as contrasted with the character of the enemy. The adherent is not merely one who is exempt from the enemy's vices; he also has positive virtues. (A prohibitionist, for instance, is not merely a teetotaler, but also a man who, precisely because he does not succumb to the vice of drink, is an upright citizen, a faithful husband, a thrifty, far-sighted, self-controlled individual.)

This last group of statements will be discussed in the next chapter, while in this one we shall take up the first three, dealing respectively with the agitator's values, goals, and methods of achieving them. Of all agitational themes, those which might be described as programmatic are the least well-developed.

PLATFORMS AND PROGRAMS. As soon as we examine the platforms and programs of the agitator, we find that there is a considerable dearth of materials. When formulating a specific objective, he almost cynically aims to go one better than the government, his most dangerous competitor.

For instance, he proposes a "Serviceman's Reconstruction Plan" which provides that "each member of the United States Armed Forces, upon his honorable discharge, be paid \$7,800. . . ."¹

When the agitator does issue a "Statement of Principles" it is as vague as the following document of the "Committee of 1,000,000, a patriotic and dynamic crusade which began with nine constituents and now has more than 3,000,000":²

The foundation principles of this committee, which have been unchanged since its beginning in 1937, are as follows:

1. To rebuild the spirit of America.
2. To wipe out to the last vestige Communism, Nazism, and Fascism in all forms. (In view of the attempt now being made to join us in a political union with foreign countries, we express our bitter objection to all such schemes to compromise the sovereignty of America, such as "Union Now With Britain," "Federal Union, Inc." etc.)
3. To redefine the American national character.
4. To instill a new spirit in American youth, dedicated intellectually and physically to the maintenance of American institutions.
5. To issue a call to farmers and laborers to resist what is now known to be an international plot to make them part of a world revolution.
6. To rededicate the citizenry of America to the family altar and to the spirit of the Church.
7. To secure the maintenance of a well-defined standard of American living.

Some of the points in such platforms are restatements of the stereotyped images of the enemy (the communists must be wiped out); others are examples of shadowboxing and still others are merely glittering generalities. It would be easy enough to go through such platforms and show their internal inconsistencies as well as the contradictions between what they proclaim and what the agitator says on other occasions. But such exercises would have slight value.

REACTION PATTERNS. The agitator seems to steer clear of the area of material needs on which liberal and democratic movements concentrate; his main concern is a sphere of frustration that is usually ignored in traditional politics. The programs that concentrate on material needs seem to overlook that area of moral uncertainties and emotional frustrations that are the immediate manifestations of malaise. It may therefore be conjectured that his followers find the agitator's statements attractive not because he occasionally promises to "maintain the American standards of living" or to provide a job for everyone, but because he intimates that

he will give them the emotional satisfactions that are denied them in the contemporary social and economic set-up. He offers attitudes, not bread.

Actually he fails to touch upon the roots of emotional frustration in our society. He does not present his followers with a prospect of joy or happiness, but rather encourages a verbal discharge of emotion. Significantly, the whole meaning of the agitator's movement is represented as a reaction: "I assure you, we are aroused and your challenge is hereby met by a mightier challengé."³ The followers are invited to hit back at those who direct history against them. Rather than a movement expressing universal aims, the agitator's movement proposes itself as a kind of protection agency which will ward off the enemy.

All the while, the audience is not expected to act because of desires or motives of its own, but only out of exasperation, when it has been goaded beyond endurance by the enemy's depravity. "When enough Gentiles have been booted out of jobs, the Gentiles are reactively bound to arise and boot out Jews."⁴

THEME 15: EITHER-OR

THE AGITATOR'S VALUES. Agitation differs from both the reform and revolutionary types of social movements in that it attacks values not in open, explicit terms but surreptitiously, under the guise of a defense of existing ideals. In that way, the agitator can both reject current values while avoiding the task of formulating a new set of values. Nowhere does he explicitly indicate, even in the most rudimentary fashion, any adherence to universal standards or criteria that could take the place of discarded ideals and form the nucleus of a new moral, philosophical, religious, and political outlook (cf. 29-33).

It would be false, however, to imagine that his work of disintegration results in a complete vacuum. In order to destroy loyalties to universal beliefs, the agitator always insists that all ideals and ideas cannot be taken at face value, but are rather mere camouflage for the enemy's will to survive. This will to survive now becomes the agitator's implicit frame of reference. As a result, his picture of the world and of the problem of man's conduct in that world are tremendously simplified. Instead of a variety of more or less complex situations that are judged in terms of a set of differentiated ideas, the agitator proposes to view the world as split between two irreconcilable camps. There is no possibility of working out a solution acceptable to all, or even a solution in which everyone will

find a satisfying place for himself. The adversary can never be won to the agitator's cause, even if and when the desired condition for which the agitator works were achieved; the only way to deal with the enemy is to exterminate him. The agitator assimilates opposing human groups to hostile biological species, and ultimately, in his view, the march of history relapses into the processes of nature.

In such a world people are neither guided nor inhibited by moral standards. All ethical problems are reduced to the single problem of choosing between the stronger and weaker camp, that is, of discovering which camp will ensure one's survival. The enemy, by his very nature, is unable to choose, but those who have the privilege of choice must adhere to the most powerful camp if they are to avoid destruction. Here, then, is a world in which values may in fact interfere with the crucial choice even if they do not already serve as tricky means of insuring the enemy's victory. It is an Either-Or world—survive, by no matter what means, or perish, with no matter what good intentions. Either or—for or against—this fundamental dichotomy is basic to the agitator's world outlook.

In the Either-Or world constructed by the agitator, the essence of human life is violent conflict, a conflict that is unavoidable and present on all levels of human existence.

The great masses of humanity are divided by a deep and wide chasm. On the one side of this chasm are the real producers of wealth—the underpaid farmers producing the food and fiber for all and the underpaid laborer processing the food, the fiber, the homes and all the material things of a civilization.

On the other side of a deep wide chasm is a little group of wealthy men. Every capitalistic system under the sun is perfectly satisfied with things as they are within the state and yet not satisfied that their economic domination is enough.⁵

This economic dichotomy is transposed to the sphere of international politics. "It is a war between the 'Haves' and the 'Have-nots.' . . . In plainer language: because Jewish international bankers own or control the gold of the world, *it is their war.*"⁶

According to the agitator the same division will continue after the war: ". . . The Jewish Agency is the *united front* of Jewry (a kind of Jewish League of Nations impenetrable to Gentiles) against the non-Jewish world, regardless of any internal dissension in their own midst."⁷

In the field of domestic politics the motif of self-preservation is invoked directly:

As far as I am concerned, we have been reduced to that one simple elementary problem of self-preservation. . . . Head-choppers in Washington might become so ambitious as to create an unhealable disunity by their extreme practices.⁸

More often the appeal to self-preservation is clothed in ideological garb, as in the following:

We are coming to the crossroads where we must decide whether we are going to preserve law and order and decency or whether we are going to be sold down the river to the Red traitors who are undermining America.⁹

or

. . . the Talmudic philosophy of Europe-Asia-Africa and Nudeal is directly opposite that of Christian. . . .¹⁰

The conflict, whether conceived in biological or dressed in ideological terms, is pictured as all-embracing and omnipresent; no situation or issue is outside of its fatal orbit. The profoundest causalities in history—"Every serious student of world affairs today knows that the mighty conflict of the centuries is under way and must move on to its final, inevitable and devastating climax"¹¹—as well as such trivial matters as the shape of the traffic lights in New York City (cf. p. 10) are alike experienced as consequences of the same Manichean struggle.

To cope with such a situation requires the most drastic measures: "*We do not want the Franco way for America,*" is the common theme of these editorial critiques. To be sure we don't; *neither did Spain!* But the alternative is Islam, or, in our day, Red godless Communism."¹²

The dilemma is absolute:

. . . God pity you blind business men who think that there is any cure for a situation thus poisoned. Unless you stand up and fight you will wake up some night and face the knife of a revolutionist at your throat just as they did in Russia, Spain, Mexico, and elsewhere.¹³

Those who choose wrongly will suffer the consequences:

The "bloodless revolution" phase is about over. Time will soon be, when you and others like you, will have to decide what leadership you will follow. The wrong choice means terror, rape, murder, starvation and destruction—besides which what occurred in Europe and Asia will be tame.¹⁴

The Either-Or dilemma seems to cut deeper than even the most fundamental political or social conflicts; it seems to be a universal characteristic of existence, a kind of predestination of human, sub-human, and super-human conflicts.

The agitator presents his vision of this Either-Or world not as the logical outcome of his deprecation of values but as a given and unquestionable existential insight. Actually the Either-Or situation is an unavoidable corollary of a world without universal values—without the hope of a final redemption which is an integral part of Western religious and philosophical thought. The agitator offers no vision of a better world, no hope that men will ever be able to live as brothers. All that is possible, he implies, is to survive in a dog's world, to band together as an *élite* in order to take from others what we want for ourselves. Moral values yield to a sober estimation of the problem of self-survival:

May I say this to you, ladies and gentlemen: There are five hundred million people starving in the world today. There are five hundred million people that are paupers of the war. We face the same problem you have to face when you go down a poverty-stricken street; you have got your little payday check and you make \$60 a week; you have got the boy in school, you want to be generous, you want to be a Christian, you want to do all you can, but just the moment you stop and dissipate all you have upon these people of the street, you have deserted your own, you have violated nature and you have struck suicide to your own household.¹⁵

Inherent in this whole attitude is the agitator's tendency to shift the emphasis of discussion from a defense of ethical values to biological self-defense. This shift involves a far-reaching change in the structure of human belief. In a liberal society the concept of loyalty involves capacity for judgment, feeling and exercise of will; ideally speaking, a man's choice of belief is determined by his rational insight. In the agitator's world, the ideational components of belief are largely eliminated, and one's acceptance or rejection of a creed is summoned, so to speak, to function independently. All the agitator's listeners are supposed to raise their hands when the agitator asks them to accept an attitude, and to shake their fists in fury when the agitator bids them to reject it. This simple acquiescence is the end-result of the Either-Or choice.

THEME 16: ENDOGAMIC COMMUNITY

THE AGITATOR'S GOAL. In his role as a social therapist, the agitator is a strong believer in the exogenic theory of disease: every pathological symptom is traced to a foreign agent. But if the agitator's ideas about pathology are definite, his concept of what is normal is remarkably vague. All he can offer is a rededication to the established institutional and

ideological framework of the American republic as it has persisted since the founding fathers. "I challenge Americans to reconsecrate themselves . . . to America . . ." ¹⁶ he exclaims. If anything has gone wrong, it can be only because we Americans have bothered with concerns that are not American or have strayed from American ways.

Offhand, it might seem that just as on other occasions the agitator tries to don the mantle of populism, he is here trying to identify himself with the conservative tradition. Unlike his European counterparts he is always eager to tie up his cause with respectable ideas and names; in his speeches he frequently mentions Washington, the Founding Fathers, Lincoln, and congressmen known for their conservative views.

Another conservative implication of the agitator's nationalism is his insistence that every social issue involves a conflict between the in-group and the out-group; he consistently refrains from analyzing social problems in terms of internal conflicts. Unemployment, for example, he sees as due to an influx of undesirable aliens; likewise, the problem of food distribution has nothing to do with variations of purchasing power within the nation, but is caused by the insatiable appetites of other countries. In the name of "Americanism" the agitator expressly denies class and social differences; ". . . Americanism is like pure water which tastes just as good to a ditch digger in Chicago as to a Supreme Court judge in Washington." ¹⁷

The image of "pure water" is perhaps not accidental; except for purity the agitator seems to have great difficulty in assigning any specific content to his nationalism. In the agitator's eyes, nationalism means first of all negation of its opposite—internationalism. He sometimes justifies this negation by debunking the liberalistic doctrines of world peace, by exposing the power politics that goes on behind the scenes of international bodies, and by sneering at the "advocates of world peace" who "don't agree among themselves." ¹⁸ But his main argument is: "We can't solve internal problems, so how can we claim to solve international problems?" ¹⁹ On the other hand, the only internal problem he stresses is the presence of foreign reds and Jews.

Even when he tries to anticipate the charge that he is always negative, and proposes a positive goal, the best he can do is to restate his essential negativism:

If Christians are determined to establish a Christian front, let not their motives be misinterpreted. Certainly it is not an anti-Semitic front. It is a front for Christ and for His principles. It is a militant front which is not content

to let the enemies of Christ, be they Gentile or Jew, dis-establish Christ in our government, our commerce, our industry, our factories, our fields or our institutions of education. Our militancy, however, may not be negative; may not be anti-Semitic. It must be positive and for Christ.²⁰

At the point where the agitator gets to his fundamental notions about Americanism, he parts company from the conservative by interpreting the imperative of patriotism as a call for endogamic seclusion. All of the arguments or pseudoarguments by which he tries to buttress his extreme nationalism are overshadowed by an absolute, almost instinctive rejection of everything foreign. For the agitator, the act of joining an international body is not only equivalent to the surrender of national sovereignty, but also involves the distasteful prospect of having to mingle with other people in a gathering "made up of a few Orientals and a few Russians and a few Europeans . . . and a few South Americans . . ."—²¹a prospect he does not find pleasing.

The ancient distrust and fear of the stranger seems to be at the base of the agitator's nationalism. For when he does try occasionally to give political concreteness to his nationalism, all he can produce is a few threadbare phrases: free enterprise, individualism, protective tariffs, and simple flagwaving. "The spirit of the founding fathers is still in our midst."²² Or: "Let American individualism function—let free enterprise produce."²³

Can a present-day audience, no matter how low its intellectual level, be satisfied with such an arid collection of clichés? Can it be satisfied with the distinctly unpleasurable note of denial that reverberates beneath the agitator's nationalism? For instead of material and moral security the agitator offers his listeners nothing but a refurbishment of slogans that have clearly not sufficed for protection from the foreign evils against which he warns them. Only when taken against the background of the world the agitator conjures up, the Either-Or world hopelessly divided into incompatible camps, does the affirmation of endogamic exclusiveness seem to hold primitive attractions that might compensate for its apparent aridity as the goal of a movement.

To disappointed and disoriented listeners, the affirmation of exclusiveness may mean the assurance that their identity will be preserved. Their sense of alienation may thereby be somewhat relieved, and replaced by a sense of belonging to something, no matter how vague. As the opponent of "the scourge of internationalism"²⁴ the agitator plays the role of the head of a family who is worried about the hardships his children suffer far from home and summons them to come back.

He is less concerned with complex international political problems than with such humble questions as money, material comfort, health:

I swear to my God that not a single dime of any money I may ever get my hands on will ever be sent to Europe's afflicted as long as one single American citizen remains destitute, jobless, paralyzed and suffering from neglect.²⁵

In these humble concerns food occupies a prominent place. Before giving to others, Americans must be sure that they eat their fill and eat what they want:

We assume that treaties and agreements and understandings shall be reached with other nations, but we want no League of Nations, we want no world court and no world congress . . . any more than we want our neighbor, three houses down the street, telling us whether we're going to have coffee or milk for breakfast.²⁶

As late as March, 1947, the agitator, in the name of food, denounces the Truman doctrine:

Giving our food and supplies to foreign nations or even selling them to them in credit which we will never get paid for, keeps prices high because of "shortages" and that is exactly what the New Deal International money changers have been and are imposing upon us.²⁷

His solicitude goes as far as the pettiest detail. Like a stingy housewife who frowns upon her children's extravagant habit of inviting guests for dinner, and who wants at least to save the best morsels for her own family, he advises his listeners: "I believe absolutely, when you have got one shipload of oleomargarine and one of butter, send the oleomargarine . . . and keep the butter at home!"²⁸

If the agitator refrains from outlining a detailed program for abundant living, he is at least vocal in assuring his listeners that whatever is available will fall into the right hands. For—and here we find another possible element of gratification in his arid appeals to preserve what exists—his listeners are promised to play a privileged role in the nation as he conceives it. Just as the material goods, so the spiritual benefits of Americanism are to be enjoyed only by an endogamic élite of Christian Americans.

The basic implication of the agitator's "defense" of American principles is that the human rights they proclaim should be transformed into a privilege. Even this doubtful privilege is nowhere defined clearly, except in contexts where its meaning comes down to the right to persecute minorities (cf. pp. 66-67). The agitator speaks in grandiose terms of "the

final judge-and-jury of what's what in America . . . the American people." But when this final judge-and-jury which "has yet to render its decision" finally does it, the only result "will be a decline of the Jewish population in both Washington and Hollywood. No, we do not mean a pogrom! We refer to migrations."²⁹

The privilege here offered to the endogamic *élite* includes the essential promise to implement their rights as Americans by a vague permission (made more thrilling because it is accompanied by an apparent denial—"no we do not mean a pogrom") to participate in the coercive functions of society. The promise of beneficent dependence in a nation that will be like a family is supplemented by the promise to the obedient followers that they will enjoy power over their prodigal and wicked brothers.

THEME 17: HOUSECLEANING

THE AGITATOR'S METHODS. Even more vague than the agitator's statement of his goals is his definition of the means by which he tends to achieve power. By virtue of his almost total silence on this matter, the agitator implicitly suggests that in this respect at least his movement is like a traditional political movement that intends to use orderly and democratic methods to change the government. At the same time, the agitator seems to promise his audience a more active role in the liberation.

"This meeting," he reminds his audience, "is not a lecture course, it is not an open forum. . . . We are making history here today."³⁰ For though he has no wish other than to take power by the most peaceful and orderly means, the enemy may force him to use force; and if so, "we will fight you in Franco's way."³¹ Similar threats of a general uprising are to be found in his vague references to "Thirty Thousand 'Minute Men'" who are reported training at Lexington and Concord³² and in his prophecies that the enemies' "days are numbered."³³ In a bolder mood, he declares that "there will be no stopping the blood running in our city streets"³⁴ and that "the country's due for civil war, anyway."³⁵

Yet it must be emphasized that the agitator's calls to direct action are at least as vague as his definitions of his goal. It would be erroneous to believe that his programmatic silence is merely a cover for preparations for an armed uprising. In fact, the agitator takes care to make clear that his proposed uprising is not really a revolution. Throughout his remarks there runs a strong current of respect for institutionalized force. It is not accidental that the agitator who attacks the executive, legislative, and

even judiciary branches of the government with indiscriminate virulence (cf. pp. 46-48), will invariably identify himself with the forces of law and order, especially the police, and occasionally discover quite imaginative arguments to persuade them to take his side: "The Police of USA well know that the first to be liquidated in the event of a 'takeover' by the Synagogue of Satan (Organized Jewry-Intl. Finance) thru 'revolutionary' tactics, are the Police men."³⁶

The agitator becomes quite lyrical when he speaks of armed forces. In 1943, while the nation was engaged in an unprecedented war effort, he demanded, as though no one else had thought of it before him,

. . . a line of fortifications built on land and water and in the air around the United States, that can be pierced by no alien force. It will be made up of cruisers, destroyers, gunboats, mosquito fleets, anti-aircraft guns, and airplanes, both bombers and fighters, troop transports, merchant vessels and a perfectly trained army, navy and marine force.³⁷

The spontaneous rebelliousness the agitator wants to set in motion is to remain unstructured and unorganized; it is to be confined to an immediate emotional reaction. To describe this reaction the agitator falls back upon familiar clichés: there is going to be trouble, "hell is going to pop."³⁸ But seldom does he suggest anything more specific or far-reaching than a march on Washington.

Even as a demagogue he never goes so far as to call upon the masses to take power into their own hands and establish their own governmental authority. Such a proposal would contradict his whole approach to his followers. As he describes it, the influence of the masses on the government must always be, at most, an indirect one; their aroused fury is to be kept in a kind of indefinite suspension, a perpetual and never fulfilled threat against the legislators and officials who might act against their wishes. The agitator never lets himself be carried away by his revolutionary élan; he knows when to stop and transform it into its opposite. This is one point at which he seems always to have himself most completely under control. Even when he does offer his followers a picture of a successful upheaval, it hardly involves any fundamental change in government:

. . . With a determined *MARCH* on *WASHINGTON* you could expect the guilty cowards in both House & Senate to run away, leaving the patriots, who could then go thru with the impeachment proceedings. That patriotic remnant of the Congress then could enact a law declaring who would serve as Pres., V-P, etc., until next election. That is the law!³⁹

The agitator takes it for granted that after the purge the populace will withdraw to their homes and leave the government in the hands of the "patriotic remnant." In his eyes the masses remain essentially passive. The agitator's quarrel with the government is not at all basic, it merely involves a desire to see it manned by satisfactory personnel: "Place the Nation's affairs—every department—every agency—every job—in the hands of capable, experienced, honest experts whose loyalty to American principles of government has never been questioned."⁴⁰

In fact, it would seem that one of the objections which the agitator has to the government is that it doesn't govern: "The chaotic results of the bad government which has been inflicted upon us . . . point to the conclusion that some reorganization is necessary for a system of government which fails to govern."⁴¹

Behind the apparent contradictions between the agitator's call for rebellion and his desire merely to effect changes in the personnel of the government, is his reliance on the old European device of a *putsch*, in which there is a realignment of ruling circles without the intervention of the masses of people. It may therefore be asked why this proposal should be found attractive by the agitator's listeners. If the agitator were desirous of offering an opportunity for social action to an audience which suffers from a sense of nonparticipation in public life, the results of his *putsch* would necessarily be extremely disappointing: a brief, sensational flareup after which nothing of consequence had been changed. The movement, on the face of it, has no goals nor does it seem to offer an appreciable field of action for its followers—it seems merely a movement for the sake of movement, a futile excitement for nothing at all.

We may find a clue to a possible answer to our question if we examine the content of the practical steps that the agitator advocates to end existing abuses, and the imagery he employs in such contexts. These steps consist almost uniformly of metaphors of discarding, throwing out, eliminating, as preparatory to extermination. "All refugees . . . should be returned to the lands from which they came";⁴² "All aliens and former aliens should be deported."⁴³ America will "throw the Reds out"⁴⁴ and "kick out" the Jews.⁴⁵ Sometimes the orderliness and police character of the procedure is indicated by references to the need for "so called Refugees" to "be cataloged"⁴⁶ or for compiling lists of names⁴⁷ of the undesirables to be deported. The accompanying imagery is consistently drawn from the realm of hygiene. The word purge occurs directly: "We must purge America of every un-American organization and activity which

might menace our national defense in the hour of a great crisis,"⁴⁸ and in innumerable variations. Thus the agitator talks about "cleansing America."⁴⁹ He advocates a "cleansing bath . . . of violence,"⁵⁰ a purge "of every 'ism,'"⁵¹ the "political sterilization of the Jewish internationalists,"⁵² and "an internal fumigation to rid ourselves of European germs before we succumb to their diseases."⁵³

The agitator's output is full of references to the present condition of the country as an ill-kept house. He complains that the enemies "have littered our fair land,"⁵⁴ that "ideological and intellectual disease germs"⁵⁵ are contaminating America, and that it is "time to clean house."⁵⁶ He denounces "this whole smelly mess" with which this nation has become afflicted⁵⁷ and speaks of the necessity of "yanking this country from its devil of a mess!"⁵⁸

Like the Low Animal metaphor this hygienic metaphor occurs too consistently and too profusely to be dismissed as accidental. It seems on the contrary to perform significant functions in the agitator's speeches and writings, one of which may be to make respectable his proposed political operation by presenting it in the guise of a harmless and familiar house-cleaning. By comparing his rebellion with an act of elementary hygiene, he suggests that essentially everything is all right and that all we need is some more "order" or "orderliness."

The idea of a "housecleaning" seems to have a reassuring effect on both listeners and potential backers: nothing too extreme is contemplated. At the same time it serves as a substitute for genuine political activity. The great decisions are made by the heads of the family, while the rest of the family (that is, the audience) can busy itself with keeping the place clean, picking up the "mess," and protecting the house from foreign burglars. Consequently the gruesome or bloody consequences of the agitator's purge become a mere unavoidable by-product of the community's renewed health and well-being. The agitator uses as his emblem the oversized American housewife with a fly swatter in one hand and a broom in the other: an image of the harmless and aggressive follower, of harmlessness transformed into aggression. For all his ruminations about apocalypse, for all his warnings about threatening catastrophe and for all his insistence on the Either-Or nature of the impending showdown, the agitator can summon no more glorious picture of his great act of liberation than this simultaneously ridiculous and threatening picture of a housewife doing her chores.

These remarks on the political content of the "housecleaning" theme may be supplemented by others based on psychoanalytical theory. According to this theory, education for cleanliness is one of the most difficult experiences a small child ever encounters. The child offers tremendous resistance to it, and even after he has been habituated to follow the social codes of cleanliness, the traumatic experience of cleanliness training exerts far-reaching consequences on both the conscious and unconscious layers of his personality. One of the major devices used to coerce children into cleanliness habits is threats that they will become sick and be punished for their sickness if they violate the rigid hygienic codes. As a result, they develop feelings of repulsion to the more obvious manifestations of uncleanness. The theory that there are significant and dynamic connections between the reorganized anal drives (as psychoanalysis describes the socially formed attitudes towards cleanliness) and such character traits as order, exactness, and pedantry is well known. So also is the notion that suppressed infantile instincts reassert themselves in later life through neurotic symptoms—among other ways, as delectations in the forbidden sphere of dirt.

The agitator is a virtuoso in manipulating such susceptibilities. In stigmatizing the enemies as people who live in the midst of the most offensive rubbish and refuse he permits his audience to toy with verbal equivalents of the outlawed infantile pleasures. By insulting the enemy—that is, by attributing to the enemy familiarity with dirt and filth—it is possible to come into contact with forbidden materials and to perform forbidden acts. The same person who would be consciously ashamed to display even the slightest inclinations towards such infantilism, grasps this occasion to indict the enemy for his own lust—and thereby finds an involuted method for expressing that lust. But simultaneously the projection of repressed desires onto the enemy reminds the audience that there is something shameful and disgusting about such desires. Projection makes possible simultaneous enjoyment and rejection.

Stereotypes utilizing the symbols of dirt, filth, and odor are used to impress the audience with the fact that all speeches and literature put out by the enemy should be discarded at once. Since the agitator counts upon the willingness of people to listen and to read, he must make the reaction of refusing to hear the views of his competitors quasi-automatic. This automatism cannot be achieved merely by discrediting the competitor's wares as fraudulent. It requires an immediate negative emo-

tional reaction, which is obtained by the warning that the enemy's material should not be touched because it is filthy.

Perhaps the deepest layer of personality that can be psychologically organized or manipulated is the complex human reaction towards odors. When people smell a bad odor, they quite often do not turn away from it; instead they eagerly breathe the polluted air, pretending to identify it while complaining of its repulsiveness. One does not have to be a psychoanalyst to suspect that in such instances the bad smell is unconsciously enjoyed in a way somewhat similar to that in which scandal stories are enjoyed. We probably here touch upon phenomena quite successfully repressed in the collective unconscious of mankind, a last faint reminder of animal prehistory, of the way animals walk face downwards while using their nose as a means of orienting themselves. The idiosyncratic violence with which various disgusting odors are rejected, and on which the agitator speculates, points to a repressed and forgotten origin. What the agitator does here, as in so many other instances, is to encourage these atavistic predispositions. The dark and forbidden things the listener enjoys with such insistent indignation are the very same things he would like to indulge in. Whether the agitator is conscious of his manipulation of these susceptibilities or is subject to them himself, is a moot point; what is important is that he does manipulate them in a sustained and patterned way.

It is no accident that metaphors of stench and slime are prominently represented among the agitator's hygienic metaphors. He speaks of the "cesspools of Europe,"⁵⁹ he likens capitalism to "a stinking corpse,"⁶⁰ and he refers to enemy propaganda as "malodorous." He does not hesitate to compare himself to a sniffing dog: "Well, I didn't have to sniffle him very long to find out he had the Willkie smell all over him."⁶¹ but this evil smell is combated by a pleasant smell: "I resolved in 1940 when I got nipped by that financial smell that came down from Wall Street and rolled on to the flats of Indiana to get the smell of horse and cow—I vowed never again would I fall for such a trick."⁶²

The audience, it is interesting to note, applauded the reference to the good smell, while laughing at the reference to the bad one.

In the agitator's view of the world, the atmosphere is permeated with foulness. When the audience reacts to his portrait of this world in terms of its socially conditioned response and prejudices, the image of the dirty and evil-smelling enemy solicits reactions that range from moral indignation to outright fury against those who create such an atmosphere. The

prevalence of moral and material rubbish demands the most thorough sanitary measures. Such legitimate catharsis purifies the enjoyment that accompanies the delight of fantasies about forbidden dirt.

Those of his followers who expected to move into a new home are given only the same old shack—thoroughly housecleaned.