

The Fascism of Environmentalism

By Bernard Switalski
switabern@juno.com

Preface

"The rule of the Party is forever. Make that the starting point of your thoughts."
O'Brien to Winston Smith, "1984"...

"Only a few prefer liberty - the majority seek nothing more than kind masters"
Sallust, "Histories"...

"We cannot prove that those are in error who tell us that society has reached a turning point, that we have seen our best days. But so said all before us, and with just as much apparent reason. On what principle is it that, when we see nothing but improvement behind us, we are to expect nothing but deterioration before us?"
Thomas Macaulay, 1830...

"It is a terrible thing when you think you got on a bandwagon and it turns out to be a garbage truck"
Ernst (Putzi) Hanfstaengl...

* * * *

Robert B., a boyhood acquaintance whom I'd seen only a few times in the past thirty-five years, back in the 1960s took a PhD in a scientific discipline at a first-rank American university, then moved to Canada, where, to protest the Vietnamese war, he gave up his U.S. citizenship for Canadian and subsequently spent his career teaching at a Canadian university.

Newly retired and with time suddenly on his hands, during the summer of 2000, Robert contacted me, to touch base with the old days, I suppose.

We exchanged a few emails, in one of which I mentioned that, based upon a decade of mucking through the theory, practice, and historical origins of environmentalism, I've concluded that contemporary environmentalists are a band of frauds and Third-Way-fascists bent on reversing the Industrial Revolution and wrecking capitalism, and that Al Gore was one of them.

Oops! Struck a nerve.

Robert fired back a tirade, accusing me of using "brutalized logic" and "dubious sources", and

furious at me for "slandering" Mr. Gore, in whom, it seems, Robert had found his eco-maharishi.

So I rummaged through my notes, from which I composed a lengthy second letter, this time touching on:

1. Environmentalism's scientific absurdities.
2. Environmentalism's intellectual dishonesty.
3. Environmentalism's anti-capitalism.
4. Fascism's anti-capitalism.
5. Environmentalism's century-old link to fascism.
6. Environmentalism's current association with the "Third Way", the latest incarnation of fascism.

All of which together compel any reasonable person to conclude that fascist-style anti-capitalism, environmentalism, and the Third Way have morphed into a single, indivisible thing.

Thus....

A Letter to Robert

Robert,

Didn't mean to gore your ox - pun intended.

However, your reaction confirms John Acton's point (emphasis mine):

"Few discoveries **ARE** more irritating than those which expose the pedigree of one's ideas".

Which is what this letter explores: the pedigree of ideas ... your ideas ... leftist ideas.

And, down to business.

First, to get a feel for where we're headed, a few reflections, beginning with Hayek, from his, "Road to Serfdom"...

There are few signs yet that we have the intellectual courage to admit to ourselves that we may have been wrong. Few are ready to recognize that the rise of fascism and nazism was not a reaction against the socialist trends of the preceding period but a necessary outcome of those tendencies. This is a truth which most people were unwilling to see even when the similarities of many of the repellent features of the internal regimes in communist Russia and National Socialist Germany were widely recognized. As a result, many who think themselves infinitely superior to the aberrations of nazism, and sincerely hate all its manifestations, work at the same time for ideals whose realization would lead straight to the abhorred tyranny.

...

To make a totalitarian system function efficiently, it is not enough that everybody should be forced to work for the same ends. It is essential that the people should come to regard [those ends] as their own...

[Therefore...] Facts and theories must become no less the object of official doctrine than views about values. And the whole apparatus for spreading knowledge - the schools and the press, radio and motion pictures - be used exclusively to spread the

views which, whether true or false, will strengthen the belief in the rightness of the decisions taken by the authority; and information that might cause doubt or hesitation be withheld.

.....

...The totalitarian leader may be guided by an instinctive dislike of the state of things he has found and a desire to create a new hierarchical order which conforms better to his conception of merit; he may merely know that he dislikes the Jews ... [so] he will readily embrace theories which seem to provide a rational justification for the prejudices which he shares with many of his fellows. Thus a pseudo-scientific theory becomes part of the official creed which to a greater or lesser degree directs everybody's action.

Or the widespread dislike of the industrial civilization and a romantic yearning for country life, ... provide the basis for another myth: "Blut und Boden" ("blood and soil"), expressing not merely ultimate values but a whole host of beliefs about cause and effect which, once they have become ideals directing the activity of the whole community, must not be questioned.

And a bit from Orwell's, "1984" ...

Here, O'Brien speaks to Winston Smith ...

"Reality exists in the human mind, and nowhere else. Not in the individual mind, which can make mistakes, and in any case soon perishes; only in the mind of the Party, which is collective and immortal.

...

We control matter because we control the mind. Reality is inside the skull. You will learn by degrees, Winston. There is nothing that we could not do. Invisibility, levitation - anything. I could float off this floor like a soap bubble if I wished to. I do not wish to, because the Party does not wish it. You must get rid of those nineteenth-century ideas about the laws of nature. We make the laws of nature."

* * * *

Germany, 1815, Moritz Arndt, a "fanatical German nationalist", a man in thrall of the near-primitive, close-to-nature life lived by the noble Teutonic peasant, opined that...

"When one sees nature in a necessary connectedness and interrelationship, then all things are equally important - shrub, worm, plant, human, stone, nothing first or last..." (1)

And Paul de Lagarde, a fellow whose, "distorted criticisms of modernity ... were characteristic of men with utopian inclinations ... an idealist, in the same way that Hitler was to be an idealist or another generation" ...

"Better to split wood than to continue this contemptible life of civilization and education; we must return to the sources, on lonely mountain peaks, where we are ancestors, not heirs." (2)

And from Fritz Stern's classic, "Politics of Cultural Despair - A Study in the Rise of German Ideology", 1963. Here Stern remarks upon the ideas of Julius Langbehn, circa 1890, an essential contributor to an embryonic National Socialist theology ...

Berlin epitomized the evil in German culture: "Spiritually and politically, the provinces should be maneuvered and marshaled against the capital." The poison of commerce and materialism, or, as he sometimes called it, the "Amerikanisierung" (Americanizing) of Germany, was corroding the ancient spirit of the Prussian garrison town... . Forty years later, millions of Germans were to echo the charge that, "the crude cult of money, a North American and at the same time a Jewish characteristic, predominates in Berlin more and more."

And Ludwig Klages, German ecologist and "venomous antisemite", "an intellectual pacemaker for the Third Reich", "[who] paved the way for fascist philosophy in many important respects", from his, "Man and Earth" - a speech given at the legendary Hohe Meissner gathering of the Wandervögel, 1913 (more on the Wandervögel, later)...

We understand completely the true symbiosis that embraces the entire animal kingdom, and which extends throughout the entire planet. However, as soon as the man of "progress" arrives on the scene, he announces his masterful presence by spreading death and the horror of death all around him.

.....

No intelligent person can have the slightest doubt that the dazzling achievements of Physics and Chemistry have been pressed into the exclusive service of "Capital."

...

Make no mistake: "progress" is the lust for power and nothing besides, and we must unmask its method as a sick, destructive joke. ... This destructive urge takes many forms: progress is devastating forests, exterminating animal species, extinguishing native cultures, masking and distorting the pristine landscape with the varnish of industrialism, and debasing the organic life that still survives.

...

Like an all-devouring conflagration, "progress" scours the earth, and the place that has fallen to its flames, will flourish nevermore, so long as man still survives.

And these days we have Arndt's and Lagarde's and Langbehn's and Klages' modern counterparts ... folks (Volk?) such as...

Jeremy Rifkin and Ted Howard, eco-hierophants...

"The traditional notion of ruthlessly exploiting and controlling nature in the name of progress is being challenged by an environmental creed that emphasizes a reintegration with the ecosystem.

... unbridled scientific and technological progress and creeping corporate hegemony call for a new spiritual awakening which would lead to a fundamental change in the values and institutional relationships of American society." (3)

Or David Brower, director of the Sierra Club and the Friends of Earth...

"[To save the planet from the horrors of Industrialism] We've got to reach search back to our last know safe landmark. I can't say where it is, but I think it's back there about a century, at the start of the Industrial Revolution." (4)

Or John Shuttlesworth, eco-theologian...

"[Technology is] taxation without representation imposed by an elitist species upon the rest of the natural world... .
The only good technology is no technology at all." (5)

Or David M. Graber, "biocentrist" biologist...

"...Somewhere along the line - at about a billion years ago, maybe half that - we quit the contract [with Nature] and became a cancer. We have become a plague upon ourselves and upon the Earth.
...Until such time as Homo sapiens should decide to rejoin nature, some of us can only hope for the right virus to come along." (6)

Or from the Earth First! newsletter, December, 1989...

"If radical environmentalists were to invent a disease to bring human populations back to sanity, it would probably be something like AIDS. It [AIDS] has the potential to end industrialism, which is the main force behind the environmental crises. "

Or Ernst Callenback, from his, "Ecotopia", 1975...

In Ecotopia, humans take their "modest place in a seamless, stable-state web of living organisms, disturbing the web as little as possible. Basic necessities are 'utterly standardized' and ecologically offensive consumer items are not produced. If a new device is invented, a law requires that pilot models be given to a panel of ten ordinary people. Only if everyone of them can repair anything that might go wrong with the invention, is manufacture permitted. Not surprisingly, life is strikingly egalitarian. The nuclear family is in the process of disappearance, being replaced by groups of up to twenty people. Population is in steady decline, although not rapidly enough for some of the "radical thinkers" of the ruling party, who believe the proper size would be "the number of Indians who inhabited the territory before the Spaniards and Americans came."

Or Dr. Theodore Kaczynski, from his manifesto, "Industrial Society And Its Future", 1995...

"The Industrial Revolution and its consequences have been a disaster for the human race.

...

For primitive societies the natural world provided a stable framework and therefore a sense of security"

Or Al Gore, from his, "Earth in the Balance"...

"Modern industrial civilization, as presently organized, is colliding violently with our planet's ecological system. The ferocity of its assault on the earth is breathtaking, and the horrific consequences are occurring so quickly as to defy our capacity to recognize them. [Therefore] We must make rescue of the environment the central organizing principle for civilization."

Which immediately brings to mind...

"Throughout the writings, not only of Hitler, but of most Nazi ideologues, one can discern a fundamental deprecation of humans vis-à-vis nature, and, as a logical corollary to this, an attack upon human efforts to master nature."

Robert Pois, from his, "National Socialism and the Religion of Nature", 1986.

Which, of course, shifts us back a few decades to...

"When people attempt to rebel against the iron logic of nature, they come into conflict with the very same principles to which they owe their existence as human beings. Their actions against nature must lead to their own downfall."

Adolf Hitler, "Mein Kampf".

And yet another voice from Hitler's National Socialist Third Reich: Dr. Ernst Lehmann, professor of botany, Munich, 1934...

"We recognize that separating humanity from nature, from the whole of life, leads to humankind's own destruction and to the death of nations. Only through a re-integration of humanity into the whole of nature can our people be made stronger. That is the fundamental point of the biological tasks of our age. Humankind alone is no longer the focus of thought, but rather life as a whole ... This striving toward connectedness with the totality of life, with nature itself, a nature into which we are born, this is the deepest meaning and the true essence of National Socialist thought."
(7)

And Hitler's most prominent National Socialist theologian, Alfred Rosenberg ...

"Today we see the steady stream from the countryside to the city, deadly for the 'Volk'. The cities swell ever larger, unnerving the 'Volk' and destroying the threads which bind humanity to nature ..." (8)

On February 22, 1940, in a letter to Alfred Rosenberg, Martin Bormann imparted Hitler's plans to destroy Germany's churches and replace them with a new faith, a "National Socialist Weltanschauung". After Hitler had won the war, Bormann assured Rosenberg, "every German boy and girl", would be taught to observe new "commandments", first among which would be, "the love of nature in all its forms." (9)

Or historian Raymond Dominick's remarks...

Professor Doktor Walther Schoenichen, director of the conservation office in Prussia during the twenties and thirties identified two chief causes for the ongoing degradation of Nature. First, he blasted the "unscrupulous thirst for profit, that holds nothing as holy or worthy of reverence except the welfare of the cash register." Second, he attacked the "alienation from Nature that is born on asphalt and that finds no joy in life without filth and jazz. Underscoring this opinion, Professor Doktor Hans Schwenkel, head of the government conservation office in Wurttemberg, observed that both Naturschutz and Heimatschutz sprang from disenchantment with "technology and industry, with the predominance of money, with the over-valuation of productivity" Schwenkel found the roots of the conservationist creed in the retreat from "rationalism and positivism," a retreat joined by all anti-modernists, including the Nazis.

....

The preservationists who advocated Volksgemeinschaft mouthed an anti-capitalist cant similar to the economic rhetoric of the Nazis. In accord with their anti-materialistic outlook, voelkisch conservationists denounced exploitative, destructive profit-taking, branding it "raubbau" (literally, "building on theft"). Most of them advocated limitations on property rights. As one wrote, "The mere material advantage of the individual should never win out over the rights of the general public.

....

... when the Nazis came to power most conservationists eagerly aligned with them. The magazine of the Bund Naturschutz in Bayern quickly proclaimed, "No time has been so favorable for our work as the present one under the swastika banner of the national government." (10)

And historian David Schoenbaum's peek into the "romantic soul" of Heinrich Himmler...

".... that the farmer was the ideological darling of official Germany ... was one of the few consistent premises of Nazi life. ... Blut und Boden, the East German homestead, the superior virtue of rural life, were ends in themselves and approximations - if not the realization - of a state of nature. They appealed like little else to a certain kind of Nazi imagination, and like little else they were maintained from the beginning of the Third Reich to the end.

....

Systematic dispersal of both bourgeoisie and working class - i.e., of urban society - the encouragement of illiteracy, and war on Christianity as well as Judaism, all had their places in a grand design that was to embrace the continent. Historical status was to yield to biological status, "the new peerage of blood and soil." this was a social revolutionary program, a cross between neo-feudalism and a kind of perverse jacobinism [Nazi agrarianism was] anti-money and anti-bourgeois, anti-aristocratic and anti-Western, ineradicably rooted in the conviction that the practicing German farmer was a superior individual and that the city with all it represented was a moral swamp. ...

If National Socialism had a program and a goal, this was it. Embedded in the romantic soul of Heinrich Himmler and carried by the irresistible institutional ascent of the SS,

this - if anything - was the National Socialist idea." (11)

And historian Alan Bullock's...

"Blut und Boden (Blood and Soil), for example, was an old dream of the German right, which expressed a longing to escape from the corruption and complexity of city life and turn back to a preindustrial age of peasant agriculture and rural simplicity."
(12)

All of which leads us finally to Spengler's famous...

"If you listen closely, you can already hear the tramp of the new Caesars coming to take over the world."

Doomsday...

"[The soil of Greece] keeps continually sliding away and disappearing into the sea ... What now remains, compared with what once existed, is like the skeleton of a sick man, all the fat and soft earth having wasted away and only the bare framework of the land being left ... the stony plains of the present day were once full of rich soil, the mountains were heavily wooded ... There are mountains in Attica which can now support nothing but bees [that is, are covered only with grass and scrub] but which were clothed, not so very long ago, with fine trees suitable for roofing the largest buildings - and roofs hewn from the timber are still in existence ... The country produced boundless pasturage for cattle.

Plato, from his, "Critias" ...

Doomsday peddlers have been around a long time, and they've never lacked for chumps to bamboozle.

Example....

One fine day in the year 156 A.D., in Phrygia (now part of Turkey), the prophet Montanus suddenly reeled round and round and keeled over into a trance in which he envisioned Christ's second coming and the end of the world. Thenceforward, Montanus roamed the dusty paths of Asia Minor, proclaiming to all who would listen that doomsday lay just round the bend. Montanus gathered many disciples, among whom was one Quintus Septimus Florens Tertullianus, Tertullian, who went on to become a champion of Monantism and a dynamic intellectual force and teacher in the early Christian church.

At the core of Tertullian's teachings lay his bitter admonition that life in the 2nd century had become "too extravagant, too wasteful", and that "population growth had run out of control". "Mankind was raping the Earth of its resources", Tertullian warned grimly...

"...we men have actually become a burden to the Earth ... the Earth can no longer support us..."

And, to escape total planetary destruction, mankind had to withdraw to the past and practice severe asceticism, living in a simpler more natural state. (13)

Fast forward 18 centuries...

Below, find a few snips from the "Heidelberg Appeal", an environmental policy statement originated in 1992 and signed to date by at least four thousand scientists - including 72 Nobel laureates. Note the way these guys have skipped past all the technical details and drilled right to the core of the matter...

"We are worried, at the dawn of the 21st century, at the emergence of an irrational ideology which is opposed to scientific and industrial progress and impedes economic and social development.

...

We contend that the Natural State, sometimes idealized by movements with a tendency to look toward the past, does not exist and probably never has existed...

...

We do, however, forewarn the authorities in charge of our planet's destiny against decisions which are supported by pseudoscientific arguments or false and nonrelevant data."

Before we unravel how it all fits together - "doomsday" and "the new peerage of blood and soil" and the "romantic soul of Heinrich Himmler" and the "stable-state web of living organisms" and the "iron logic of nature" and "the ancient spirit of the Prussian garrison town" and "the tramp of the new Caesars coming to take over the world" - we must first state briefly the case for Heidelberg's claim of: "pseudoscientific arguments or false and nonrelevant data."

"The global warmers ... predict that global warming is coming, and our emissions are to blame. They do that to keep us worried about our role in the whole thing. If we aren't worried and guilty, we might not pay their salaries. It's that simple."

Kary Mullis, Nobel, Chemistry, 1993... (14)

T'wer it that simple.

But, it ain't.

The global-warming hypothesis...

"A hypothesis is always more believable than the truth, for we tailor a hypothesis to resemble our opinion of the truth, whereas the truth is only its own awkward self. Ergo, never discover the truth when a hypothesis will do."

Machiavelli, "The Prince"...

"No one understood better than Stalin that the true object of propaganda is neither to convince or even to persuade, but to produce a uniform pattern of public utterance in which the first trace of unorthodox thought immediately reveals itself as a jarring dissonance".

Leonard Shapiro, from his, "The Communist Party of the Soviet Union", 1970.

"Truth they knew was a party matter, and therefore lies became true even if they contradicted the plain facts of experience. The condition of their living in two separate worlds at once was one of the most remarkable achievements of the Soviet

system.

Leszek Kolakowski, "Main Currents of Marxism", 1978.

"You are a slow learner, Winston", said O'Brien gently.

"How can I help it?" Winston blubbered. "How can I help seeing what is in front of my own eyes? Two an two are four."

"Sometimes, Winston. Sometimes they are five. Sometimes they are three. Sometimes they are all of them at once. You must try harder. It is not easy to become sane."

George Orwell, "1984".

* * * *

"As we explore the changes to the earth's temperature over the past century, we must remember that any observed warming (or cooling) is not necessarily caused by the increasing concentration of CO₂. A multitude of processes are at work on the climate system, and we know that these processes have warmed and cooled the earth repeatedly in the past. There is absolutely no guarantee that any CO₂-climate signal over the past century can be identified in [an atmospheric] system that has such a high degree of natural variability.

... [The temperature trend in the 20th century] ... is not statistically different from zero. We cannot say with confidence that there has been any trend in U.S. mean annual temperatures in this century!

... Though not statistically different from zero, the period from 1920 to 1987 has been dominated by a cooling of 0.13C (0.24F). Here we have possibly the best temperature data set for any area of the planet (the HCN, "U.S. Historical Climatology Network"), and during a time (1920-1987) when equivalent CO₂ increased by over 30 percent (from approximately 325 to 425 ppm), the temperature cooled slightly. If one accounts for the remaining heat-island effect and the effects of stratospheric dust, we may assume that any warming signal of the past century in the United States would be reduced even further."

Dr. Robert C. Balling, from his, "The Heated Debate: Greenhouse Predictions vs Climate Reality", 1992. (15)

The CO₂/global-warming hypothesis asserts that: If the CO₂ content of the atmosphere rises, then the global climate gets warmer. But a hypothesis is only as good as the next observation; that is, a single negative event refutes a hypothesis, and, bingo! there's the negative in Balling; that is, during the 67 years CO₂ levels rose by 30 percent, global temps fell, and that fact alone knocks the pins out from under the CO₂/global-warming hypothesis.

When delving into the arcana of global-warming, one repeatedly encounters obscure but legitimate data such as these: from, "1999 Illinois State Water Survey, Apr 19, 2000" ...

"Temperature and precipitation data of quality were then analyzed to assess fluctuations over the past 95 years. Annual maximum and minimum temperatures revealed that highest values occurred in the 1930s and the 1950s and the lowest values during the period 1960-1985. The linear 95-year trends of temperature at all stations showed slight decreases with time, from 0.001F to 0.0009F per year. The difference between the average maximum and minimum temperatures at the

benchmark stations has changed with time, becoming less during the last 25 years by 1.5F. This could be due to increased cloudiness during the last 30 years. Analysis of the seasonal temperature data revealed that the trends in spring were essentially unchanging from 1901-1995, but those for summer, fall, and winter indicated slight downward trends over the 95-year period."

Which compels one to conclude that: if Mother Earth has experienced a warming trend over the past century, then the State of Illinois uniquely has escaped that trend.

And this overview...

"[First]...the apparent warming may be nothing more than that, apparent; for the global land-surface temperature record is fraught with many problems, not the least of which is the considerable [localized] warming experienced at many of the measurement sites over the past century, due to intensification of the urban heat-island effect as cities have grown in size and population.

Secondly, much of the world was a degree or two warmer about 6,000 and 1,000 years ago ... when the CO₂ content of the atmosphere was fully 80 ppm less than it is today.

And finally, there are at least three solar-modulated cycles of climate known to operate on time scales of centuries to millennia; and all of them are presently in an ascending phase indicative of warming. As a result, nothing in the historical climate record can be construed to suggest the likelihood of an imminent CO₂-induced greenhouse catastrophe..."

Dr. Sherwood B. Idso, from his monograph, "Carbon Dioxide and Global Change" ... (16)

And one might pose this general question: Who decides which is the "correct" global temperature? That is: radical environmentalists claim that the CO₂ released into the atmosphere by our techno-industrial society has caused the global climate to warm, thereby portending catastrophic consequences for us all. Yet, over the eons, absent homo sapiens, the Globe has experienced wide swings in temperature. For example: except for a few short cold-spells, the period between about 600 and 40 million years ago found both poles ice-free. Then, about 40 million years ago, temperatures plunged into an unexplained cold-snap that has continued until today, culminating in the last couple of million years (the Pleistocene Epoch) in the regular advance and retreat of the great polar ice-sheets. And, historically closer to home, during the pre-industrial era, there have occurred: the "Medieval Warm Period", with temperatures much warmer than today, followed by the "Little Ice Age", with temperatures much cooler. Therefore, one might ask: what point on the global temperature curve is the "correct" point?

That is, which is the "correct" global temperature?

And who decides these things?

Sidebar:

To get a feel for the blizzard of direct and inferential evidence existing out there re the post-ice-age climate (ranging from about 11,000 years ago to the present), google for "Holocene climate". Pay special attention to the "Pre-Boreal" period, when the climate, at least in the British Isles, might have warmed by as much as 7 degrees Celsius in as little as seven years.

And, while you're at it, check out the "Climatic Optimum", also referred to as the

"Holocene Maximum", the time period between 4,000 and 7,000 years ago when global temperatures reached as high as 2.0°C warmer than present.

In the mid-1990s, the idea that the climate sometimes changes suddenly and dramatically generated a new field of study: "RCCEs" ("Rapid Climate Change Events"). Both the beginning and the end of the "Younger Dryas" are RCCEs. For many more RCCEs, find the "Greenland Ice Sheet Project Two" (GISP2) and the "Greenland Ice Core Project" (GRIP).

Or, for starters, you might hit: "Abrupt increase in Greenland snow accumulation at the end of the Younger Dryas event", published in, "Nature", 1993 - (362: 527-529), by Alley, Meese, Shuman, Gow, Taylor, Grootes, White, Ram, Waddington, Mayewski, and Zielinski.

Moving right along...

Mean sea level has not changed in the past century, which puts a lie to the ecologists argument that global warming is melting the polar ice caps; atmospheric temperatures, though having up-and-down cycles, have not established a trend in either direction.

... and the gasses in the atmosphere caused by human activities are insignificant."

Dr. R.E. Stevenson, Secretary General of the International Association for Physical Science in the Ocean. (17)

Got to love Stevenson; he flat out calls environmentalists liars.

Which they are.

Also...

1.

For years NASA has claimed that the South Polar ice cap was melting. However, recently, NASA issued a newsletter suggesting that they might have misinterpreted the data and, perhaps, there has been little or no melting at all. (18)

2.

Water vapor accounts for 93 percent of the greenhouse effect, and CO₂ is only one of several other gasses that account for the remaining 7 percent. To investigate how variations in the levels of atmospheric gasses effect climate change, it would seem reasonable to begin with the most important gas - water vapor. Instead, environmentalists have locked on CO₂.

True, in the past century, the CO₂ content of the atmosphere rose from about .03 percent to about 0.045percent - an 0.015 percent increase.

However, at the absolute most, only half that 0.015 percent increase in atmospheric CO₂ can be traced to human sources, the rest being part of the natural variation in atmospheric CO₂ of which we have little or no understanding.

Half of 0.015 percent is 0.0075 percent - that is, seven and one half *thousandths* of 1.0 percent.

Thus, environmentalists ignore the gas that accounts for 93.0 percent of the greenhouse effect to focus on the gas that accounts for seven and one half *thousandths* of 1.0 percent, and they claim the seven and one half *thousandths* of 1.0 percent as sufficient cause to trigger the wide-sweeping structural changes to the global economy that the Kyoto Treaty demands, and the consequences of which cannot be foreseen.

To a rational person, the environmentalist view seems misguided, if not outright stupid. But it

ain't misguided, and it ain't stupid; they know exactly what they're doing. Environmentalists have powerful reasons for attacking anthropogenic CO₂, powerful reasons which will become clear later in this letter. So, pay attention!

"There is almost universal agreement among atmospheric scientists that little, if any, of the observed warming of the past century can be attributed to the man-induced increases in greenhouse gasses."

Dr. Hugh Ellsaesser, Participating Guest Scientist, Lawrence Livermore Labs.
(19)

Ellsaesser, one of the most respected atmospheric scientists around, says that his crowd almost universally dismisses the anthropogenic-CO₂/global-warming hypothesis as false. On the other hand, Al Gore, self-proclaimed inventor of the Internet, claims the opposite to be true.

Let's see whom shall I believe... ?

"[The] 70-90 year oscillations in global mean temperatures [correlate] with corresponding oscillations in solar activity. Whereas the solar influence is obvious in the data from the last four centuries, signatures of human [influence] are not distinguishable in the observations."

Dr. K. Lassen, Danish Meteorological Institute, Solar-Terrestrial Physics Division. (20)

Lassen's and similar studies deliver compelling evidence that variations in solar radiation effect the global climate in detectable ways - and you can throw in oscillations in the Earth's orbit, tilt, and wobble, not to mention volcanic activity and its detectable effects. But ask environmentalists to identify the anthropogenic CO₂ signal in the data, and they go mute. Which demands an immediate response to the request: In what way does the effect of anthropogenic CO₂ on the climate differ from no effect at all on the climate?

Sidebar: The Milankovitch Cycle Theory...

In the early 20th century, Serbian astrophysicist Milutin Milankovitch (1879-1958) developed a theory that tied climate change to the cyclic variations in Earth's orbital eccentricity, obliquity, and precession. Milankovitch's theory collected dust for fifty years until 1976 when Hayes et. al. published in "Science" a study of deep-sea sediment cores going back 450,000 years that revealed a close correlation between the Milankovitch Cycles and what the cores said about the paleo-climate.

By 1982 the Milankovitch Cycle model had gained enough weight to cause the National Research Council of the U.S. National Sciences to conclude...

"...orbital variations remain the most thoroughly examined mechanism of climatic change on time scales of tens of thousands of years and are by far the clearest case of a direct effect of changing insolation on the lower atmosphere of Earth." (21)

*

"Besides the general prevalence of fudge factors, the latest [computer] models have other defects that make them unreliable. ... We must continue to warn the politicians and the public: don't believe the numbers just because they come out of a super computer."

Dr. Freeman J. Dyson, professor emeritus of physics at Princeton's Institute for Advanced Studies. (22)

The Kyoto Treaty - formally entitled, "Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change" - imposes upon technologically advanced nations a host of restrictions on the generation of CO₂ (and other gases) as the cause of global climate change. Yet, in its text, the Kyoto Protocol...

1. Never claims that the climate is changing.
2. Never claims that anthropogenic CO₂ (or any other anthropogenic gas) has in any way affected the climate.

Kyoto omits making either claim because its authors must avoid the embarrassment of having to produce scientifically rigorous data to support such claims, and no such data exist.

Therefore, to create the illusion of a scientific rationale for Kyoto, its authors have conjured up computer models that purport to prophesy the global climate in the year 2100.

Which is the propagandist's classic ruse: make a prediction about the future that can't be proved or disproved, but so dire as to demand immediate preventive action, and never mind collateral damage.

Sidebar:

For a comprehensive discussion of the severe faults inherent *in* and the proven failures *of* the computer models environmentalists use to justify Kyoto, see, "The Satanic Gasses, Clearing the Air about Global Warming", By Patrick J. Michaels and Robert C. Balling, Jr., 2000.

Sidebar:

You've got to read it to believe it. (It's available on the web.)

The Kyoto Protocol is 8,500 words of the most vague and incomprehensible gobbledygook ever contrived by the mind of man. I've had lots of experience writing and interpreting contracts (which is what treaties are), and if someone dropped this thing on my desk to sign, I'd fling him and his treaty out the door.

And "The Protocol" itself is the muscle for the "United Framework Convention on Climate Control" (UNFCCC), 1992, (also available on the web) a separate document which purportedly reveals that we have recklessly sailed the planet onto climatic rocks, and, to save ourselves, we've got to DO SOMETHING! However, if read closely, the UNFCCC, like The Protocol, never flat-out states that the climate is changing.

(You've got to read it closely. Closely. It doesn't say what it seems to say.)

Computer models and politics...

Scientists prone to political activism sometimes produce computer models that generate results

amazingly synchronous with the scientists' political beliefs. For example, Dr. Carl Sagan, deeply involved in the peace movement, in the early 1980s produced the TTAPS (Turco-Toon-Ackerman-Pollack-Sagan) model which predicted that a nuclear war would raise enough dust to blot out the sun and bring on a "nuclear winter".

Nuclear Winter! Wow! The media ran with it, and you still hear the phrase used today. However, the media somehow failed to report on the many critics of the TTAPS model. For example, Russell Seitz, Harvard Center for International Affairs, viewed the TTAPS as worthless, revealing that, to achieve the results Sagan wanted, TTAPS had ignored factors such as the effects of day and night, clouds, rain, the continents, and the oceans. (23) And George Rathjens of MIT dismissed TTAPS as, "... the worst example of the misrepresentation of science in my memory." (24)

Later, when the Soviet Union collapsed, looking for a new home, Sagan threw in with the eco-cult, where, during Desert Storm, he raced from TV network to network, predicting that smoke from the oil well fires would alter the climate enough to cause famine in India or worse. Gee! I wonder how that prophesy panned out. (25)

More eco-quackery...

Besides Sagan, we have fellows like the oft-quoted Dr. Steven Schneider, a doomsday drum-thumper for decades, expressed this 'environmentalist' approach to scientific integrity...

"... scientists should consider stretching the truth to get some broad-based support, to capture the public's imagination. That, of course, entails getting loads of media coverage. So we have to offer up scary scenarios, make simplified, dramatic statements, and make little mention of any doubts we might have. ... Each of us has to decide what the right balance is between being effective and being honest." (26)

Or one might cite Dr. Paul Ehrlich, the Grand Old Man of Eco-quackery, for forty years a most venerated doomsday campaigner, who has battled ferociously against global warming, making an alarming case for the immanent incineration of planet Earth.

However, since the early Sixties, with equal conviction, scattered among his many, many, many writings, Ehrlich has also prophesied...

1. A new ice age.
2. The start of World War III on October 13, 1979.
3. Massive starvation in India by the early 70s.
4. Massive worldwide starvation by the 80s.
5. Massive shortages of fuel and industrial raw materials by the 90s.
6. The reduction of the population of the United States to 22.5 million by 1999 because of famine and global warming.

Which prompts one to inquire of his disciples: In what ways does your Dr. Ehrlich differ from The Celestial Messenger from Planet Crackpot?

The case against the anthropogenic-CO₂/global-warming hypothesis has grown so powerful that even a militant warmer like Hansen at NASA's Goddard Institute has begun to pull in his horns; "The forcings that drive long-term climate change are not known with an accuracy sufficient to

define future climate change", Hansen admitted in 1998. (27)

But a decade earlier, on a blistering hot day in July of 1988, Dr. James Hansen testified before a Congressional committee that his computer model had revealed that global warming had arrived, and that 1988 would be the hottest year on record. The media, right on cue, per the script, proclaimed:

GLOBAL WARMING HAS ARRIVED!

However, turned out that 1988 was not the hottest year on record. In fact, the lower 48 experienced record cold snaps, and Alaska had its coldest winter ever measured.

Hansen had been dead-bang wrong - a fact which, per the script, never made the headlines. (28)

Sidebar:

For a look at whence leads the collusion between politically-motivated media and politically-motivated science, see below, "Appendix D, The Soviet media and T.D. Lysenko - a lesson in science as politics", which answers the timeless questions posed by Milovan Djilas in his classic, "The New Class", 1957: "What can the unfortunate physicists do, if atoms do not behave according to the Hegelian-Marxist struggle or according to the uniformity of opposites and their development into higher forms? What of the astronomers, if the cosmos is apathetic to Communist dialectics? What of the biologists, if plants do not behave according to the Lysenko-Stalinist theory on harmony and cooperation of classes in a "socialist" society?"

And, unless one understands a least a little about...

- the Medieval Warm Period,
- the Little Ice Age,
- the heat-island effect,
- the utter corruption and unreliability of the surface temperature record,
- what NASA's temperature-sensing satellite has found (the only uncorrupted data-set extant),
- what the USDA's "Plant Hardiness Zone Maps" tell us about North America's flora's opinion of global warming, (29)
- how El Nino and La Nina affect the climate,
- how Pinatubo affected the data record after 1992,
- how the North Atlantic Oscillation affects the climate,
- how the Pacific Decadal Oscillation affects the climate,
- how variations in solar radiation affect the climate,
- that, using the EPA's own numbers and simple arithmetic, one can calculate that it would take the internal combustion engine 5,000 years to double the current level of atmospheric CO₂,
- and that North America, the Great CO₂ Satan, is in fact a CO₂ sink, (30)

then one ought not form opinions about global warming.

Then there's the ozone hole...

First of all, it ain't a "hole".

It is a thinning of the "normal" concentration of ozone above the Antarctic that begins round the

end of the South Polar winter and disappears during the South Polar spring and was discovered first in the mid-1950s, well before the common use of CFCs.

The annual thinning of the ozone layer above the Antarctic has nothing to do with CFCs, but is instead a natural phenomenon whose arrival, size, density, location, and disappearance vary from year to year. In 1983, it seemed not to arrive at all, but appeared finally out over the ocean, at a tenth its predicted size.

G.M.B. Dobson, the Brit from Oxford who fathered atmospheric ozone measurement, in the late 50s wrote...

"... the values in September and October 1956 were about 150 [Dobson] units [50%] lower than expected. In November [South Polar springtime] the ozone values suddenly jumped to those expected... .

It was not until a year later, when the same type of annual variation was repeated, that we realized that the early results were indeed correct and that Halley Bay showed a most interesting difference from other parts of the world." (31)

In 1990, re-corroborating Dobson, two French observers, Rigaud/Leroy, (who, by the way, coined the term, "hole"), republished their 1958 paper that showed Dobson units at 120 at the tail-end of the 1958 South Polar winter.

They remarked...

"... the thinning [is] related to the Polar Vortex.
... and the recovery was sharp and complete." (32)

Both Dobson and Rigaud/Leroy concluded that they'd detected a natural phenomenon, almost certainly related to the South Polar Vortex. And, if one doesn't know what the South Polar Vortex is, then one ought not form opinions on ozone depletion.

Sidebar:

Poke round the NASA website and you'll find the, "Glossary of Ozone Related Terms". Among these terms, you'll find, "polar vortex", under which NASA defines the term. However, NASA's definition fails to mention the annual and temporary nature of the vortex phenomenon or that the ozone "hole" comes and goes as the vortex comes and goes.

To illustrate how these eco-sharks deal from the bottom of the deck...

In 1991, Senator Gore chaired Senate hearings on ozone depletion at which Susan Weiler, a marine biologist by training but a environmental activist by profession, testified that, because of ozone depletion, "The ecosystem of the Southern Hemisphere is on the verge of collapse."

By some inexplicable oversight, Senator Gore neglected to invite anyone from the other side to testify - for example, Dr. Osmond Holm-Hansen, a marine ecologist who had studied the South Polar ecosystem for twenty years, and who considers Susan Weiler to be "more a politician than a scientist". Holm-Hansen would have testified...

"Unlike the scare stories you hear some scientists spreading, the Antarctic ecosystem is absolutely not on the verge of collapse due to increased ultraviolet." (33) (34)

Or there's Dr. Alan Teramura, U of Maryland, who for quarter century has studied the effects of UV on plant life and is considered the world's leading expert on the topic. In his studies, Teramura found a single variety of soy bean that suffered from increased UV. The eco-zealots took that unique result and repeated it endlessly as proof that increased UV will destroy our food supply.

However, eco-zealots fail to mention that Teramura's studies also revealed that increased UV has little measurable effect on most food plants, and some varieties actually flourish under increased UV.

And, summing up his years of study, Teramura said...

"There is no question that terrestrial life is adapted to UV ... Even at a 20 percent decline in ozone we are not going to burn up all the plants on the surface of the Earth and kill all the people."

Teramura goes on to say that the impact of the 5 percent decline in ozone over the next 100 years as predicted by the CFC/ozone hypothesis would be "imperceptible, masked by other effects like drought, pests, and frosts, whose impacts are much greater". (35)

Bulletin! Bulletin!

Because of unavoidable technical difficulties, the arrival of The Great Mother Wheel in the Sky, original ETA, 2000, has been rescheduled for 2100!

The little I've mentioned here against the CFC\ozone hypothesis barely scratches the surface; there's a hell of a lot more where that came from. The upshot of which is: there exists NO! evidence that CFCs or chlorine molecules freed by the break-down of CFCs released in the Northern Hemisphere migrate to the South Pole and destroy ozone there. The evidence against it is enormous, and among serious scientist familiar with the data, the CFC/ozone hypothesis is dead as a dodo, defunct! kaput!

Dr. Melvyn Shapiro, Chief, Meteorological Research, NOAA, Boulder, a bitter critic of the ozone hoax, has remarked...

"What you have to understand is that this is about money... If there were no dollars attached to this game, you'd see it played on intellect and integrity. When you say that the ozone threat is a scam, you're not only attacking people's scientific integrity, you're going after their pocketbooks as well. It's money, purely money." (36)

Dr. Fred Singer, a battle-scarred vet of the war against eco-zealotry, takes a similar cynical view...

"It's not difficult to understand some of the motivations behind the drive to regulate CFCs out of existence. For scientists: prestige, more grants for research, press conferences, and newspaper stories. Also the feeling that maybe they are saving the world for future generations. For bureaucrats the rewards are obvious. For diplomats there are negotiations, initializing of agreements made, and - the ultimate - ratification of treaties. It doesn't really matter what the treaty is about, but it helps if it supports 'good things'. For all those involved there is, of course, travel to pleasant places, good hotels, international fellowship..." (37)

Shapiro and Singer got it part right; that is: only *some* persons do it for money and/or glory.
But other persons do it for other reasons.
What might those other reasons be?

What, indeed...

Duck!! Ice age coming!!

Beginning in the late 1930s, what passes for the global temperature record took a slight (statistically insignificant) downward trend. Based on that minute apparent dip, in the early 1970s the prophets of doom rang the alarm! A NEW ICE AGE IS COMING! A NEW ICE AGE IS COMING! And the culprit? Industrialism! and its noxious effluents, dust and smoke, blocking out the sun, threatening to throw the planet into the deep freeze.
At the time, frights like these appeared in print...

"The continued rapid cooling of the earth since World War II is also in accord with increased global air pollution associated with industrialism, urbanization, and exploding population..."

Reid Bryson, longtime eco-deep-thinker, 1971. (38)

"There are ominous signs that the earth's weather patterns have begun to change dramatically and that these changes may portend a drastic decline in food production - with serious political implications for just about every nation on earth.

... The evidence in support of these predictions has now begun to accumulate so massively that meteorologists are hard-pressed to keep up with it.

... But they [meteorologists] are almost unanimous in the view that the trend will reduce agricultural productivity."

Peter Gynne, Newsweek, April 28, 1975.

"The facts have emerged, in recent years and months, from research into past ice ages. They imply that the threat of a new ice age must now stand alongside nuclear war as the likely source of wholesale death and misery for mankind"

Nigel Calder, former editor of the New Scientist, 1975. (39)

But then, smack in the middle of the campaign to stampede the proles into ice age hysteria, the global temperature trend took a slight (statistically insignificant) upward slope.

Uh-oh!

Problem?!

No problem.

On a dime, without so much as an, "Excuse my elbow!", the prophets of doom spun a one-eighty. By George! it isn't global COOLING that threatens life as we know it!

By golly! it's global WARMING!

And the culprit?

What else!?

Industrialism!

And its noxious effluent, CO2.

To illustrate how these characters did the eco-flip....

Today, Dr. Steven Schneider (mentioned above) speaks with a stentorian voice among the global warming apocalyptics, and, like Tertullian, threatens us with fiery annihilation, lest we change our profligate ways. However, thirty years ago, Schneider was busy at flogging the anthropogenic-aerosols/ice-age line of doom. At the time, a few scientists speculated that the theoretical warming caused by increasing CO₂ levels might tend to offset the cooling effects of anthropogenic aerosols. In furious defense of his ice age, Schneider lashed back (note the categorical certainty of his tone.)...

"Temperatures do not increase in proportion to an increase in atmospheric CO₂... Even an eight-fold increase over present levels might warm the Earth's surface less than 2 degrees Centigrade, and this is unlikely in the next several thousand years."
(40)

Point: When global temperatures seemed to be falling, Schneider blamed the fall on industrialism, and he understood clearly that CO₂ was an insignificant greenhouse gas. But when temps began to rise, Schneider whirled round and scrambled aboard the CO₂/global-warming bandwagon, this time blaming the rise on, what?

Right!

Industrialism!

So, you see, it ain't about warming or cooling.

It's about industrialism.

These guys don't like it.

They wanna kill it.

Which leads to a most interesting question re eco-zealotry: Why do environmentalists want to kill industrialism?

They argue that: through its noxious effluents, industrialism threatens the survival of Planet Earth. But, they continue, industrialism is only a symptom of a much more fundamental flaw in human affairs. And that flaw is capitalism. Capitalism promotes industrialism. Thus, to save ourselves ... CAPITALISM! ... THERE'S! the demon we must exorcize! And, if you don't do what we tell you, THE WORLD WILL END! Not my words. Theirs. A few examples (of many out there)...

"... the immediate source of the ecological crisis is capitalism, a cancer on the biosphere. I believe that the color of radicalism today is not red but green."

Murray Bookchin, founder of the Institute of Social Ecology. (41)

[The environmental movement should regard attacks on pollution as] ... "different ways for attacking concentrated corporate power, thereby opening up the possibility of revolutionary change, and for reorganizing society and communities on different principles..."

James Ridgeway, long-time fellow of The Institute of Public Policy. (42)

"... environmental pollution is a sign of major incompatibility between our system of production and the environmental system that supports it. [The socialist way is better because] ... the theory of socialist economics does not appear to require that growth should continue indefinitely."

Barry Commoner, long-time seminal thinker among the eco-ministry. (43)

"Scientists who work for nuclear power or nuclear energy have sold their soul to the devil. They are either dumb, stupid, or highly compromised ... Free enterprise really means rich people get richer. And they have the freedom to exploit and psychologically rape their fellow human beings in the process Capitalism is destroying the earth. Cuba is a wonderful country. What Castro's done is superb. "

Helen Caldicott, Australian physician, speaking for the Union of Concerned Scientists. (44)

"We must make this an insecure and uninhabitable place for capitalists and their projects. This is the best contribution we can make towards protecting the earth and struggling for a liberating society."

From, "Ecodefense: A Field Guide to Monkeywrenching", 1987.

"...if we don't overthrow capitalism, we don't have a chance of saving the world ecologically."

Judi Bari, of Earth First!. (45)

Sidebar:

The real world has a nasty way of jumping up and slamming these suckers in the face. For those who think that only socialism can save the planet, check out, "Toxic Nightmare: Ecocide in the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe" (1993), and, "Ecocide in the U.S.S.R.", (1992) by Murray Feshbach and Alfred Friendly, who begin Chapter 1 with...

"When historians finally conduct an autopsy on the Soviet Union and Soviet Communism, they may reach the verdict of death by ecocide. ... No other great industrial civilization so systematically and so long poisoned its land, air, water and people. None so loudly proclaiming its efforts to improve public health and protect nature so degraded both. And no advanced society faced such a bleak political and economic reckoning with so few resources to invest toward recovery."

So much for socialism saving the planet.

At this point, one must set aside the scientific journals and pick up the history books, because we're not talking about science anymore; we're talking about ideas and the "pedigree" of those ideas. Specifically...

The pedigree of the environmentalist idea

In 1815, Prussian painter Heinrich Oliver fashioned his, "Holy Alliance", an heroic image of

Fredrick of Prussia, Francis of Austria, and Alexander of Russia celebrating their victory over Napoleon. But, more than just depicting the military defeat of an enemy, Oliver paid homage to the defeat of ideas. His monarchs came clad in knights' armor, brandishing long-swords, Gothic; thus, they represented the glorious victory of the Middle Ages and feudalism over the modern and alien concepts of capitalism and democracy that had taken shape in the West and rumbled east across the Rhine along with Napoleon's caissons. (46)

"[The French Revolution] based society on the institution of private property, but also on the human rights of the average man. It declared all peoples to be alike, at the same time, by a process first noticeable in Germany in the time of Napoleon, persuaded many peoples that their interests were opposed to the "West", and that their particular national character forbade assimilation into a uniform world civilization."

R.R. Palmer, Princeton, 1947, from his preface to "The Coming of the French Revolution", by George Lefebvre. (47)

"[During World War I] ... enmities gradually focused upon ... England as the home of rapacious 'Manchester' capitalism, or of France as the embodiment of ideas represented by the date 1789. ... Among German intellectuals of an already illiberal cast of mind, such writers as the Russian novelist Fyodor Dostoevsky, who were rabidly anti-Western, became modish. [The Germans hailed World War I] as a revolution and a liberation, a rebellion against stultifying conditions and the domination of Western culture by France and Britain, providing the chance for the full affirmation of Germany and German culture for the first time."

From, "The Third Reich - A New History" by Michael Burleigh, 2000. (48)

Here we have introduced the ideas of "capitalism", "liberal", and there did exist in German-Europe this century-old anger and resentment at "Western culture".

Therein lie the origins of modern socialism, socialism's "fascist" variant, and environmentalism ... the very same environmentalism which Dr. Stanley Payne, in his, "A History of Fascism, 1914-1945", (1995), observed that, "... the first major expressions of modern environmentalism", occurred in pre-WWI Germany around the turn of the last century and, "would later be adopted by the fascists".

"Certainly the Marxist movement cannot, at this time or at any other, be identified simply with the ideology of the socialist parties that belonged to the International. The many sources of European socialism had by no means dried up, though they seemed of little importance compared with the apparently self-consistent, universally applicable theories of Marx. Only in Germany was it possible, despite the strong tradition of Lassalleanism, to frame and maintain for a considerable time a uniform ideology based on Marxist premises, or what were generally regarded as such."

From Kolakowski's, "Main Currents of Marxism".

"Augustus won over the soldiers with gifts, the populace with cheap corn, and all men with the sweets of repose, and so grew greater by degrees, while he concentrated in himself the functions of the Senate, the magistrates, and the laws.

....

Meanwhile at Rome people plunged into slavery - consuls, senators, knights. The

higher a man's rank, the more eager his hypocrisy, and his looks the more carefully studied, so as neither to betray joy at the decease of one emperor nor sorrow at the rise of another, while he mingled delight and lamentations with his flattery.

Tacitus, "The Annals".

Of both its Marxist and fascist varieties, socialism - as we know it today - has its roots (for the most part) in 19th century Prussia, where a gaggle of cranks, crackpots, misfits, soreheads, and other deep-thinkers - all those Dead White European Males such as: Marx, Weitling, (Moses) Hess, Stirner, Mannheim, Herder, Kautsky, Plenge, Mehring, Arndt, Jahn, Stahl, Menzel, Fichte, Sombart, Lassalle, Liebknecht, Lagarde, Hegel, Langbehn, List, Schmoller, Feuerbach, Rodbertus, Haeckel, Nietzsche, Riehl, and von Treitschke - established the theological foundations for every belief held so dear by today's left.

Whatever social injustice today's leftist detects, these guys detected first.

Whatever solutions to social injustice today's leftist demands, these guys demanded first.

And for all their spiritual radiance, the theologies generated by these 19th century Prussian evangels in practice produced for us in the 20th century: Lenin, Stalin, Hitler, Mao, Pol Pot, Castro, and Mussolini.

Fascism as Marxist heresy...

"As late as 1932, Mussolini acknowledged Fascism's affinities with Communism: 'In the whole negative part, we are alike. We and the Russians are against the liberals, against democrats, against parliament'."

Richard Pipes, "Russia Under the Bolshevik Regime", 1993.

"The mainspring of the socialist ideas that arose under the combined influence of the Industrial and the French Revolution was the conviction that the uncontrolled concentration of wealth and unbridled competition were bound to lead to increasing misery and crises, and that the system must be replaced by one in which the organization of production and exchange would do away with poverty and oppression and bring about a redistribution of the world's goods on a basis of equality. Beyond the general conception of equality, socialist programmes and ideas differed in every respect. Not all of them even proposed to abolish private ownership of the means of production."

Leszek Kolakowski, "Main Currents of Marxism".

"It is a common mistake to regard National Socialism as a mere revolt against reason, an irrational movement without intellectual background. If that were so, the movement would be much less dangerous than it is. But nothing could be further from the truth or more misleading. The doctrines of National Socialism are the culmination of a long evolution of thought, a process in which thinkers who have had great influence far beyond the confines of Germany have taken part. Whatever one may think of the premises from which they started, it cannot be denied that the men who produced the new doctrines were powerful writers who left the impress of their ideas on the whole of European thought. Their system was developed with ruthless consistency. Once one accepts the premises from which it starts, there is no escape from its logic. It is simply collectivism freed from all traces of an individualist

tradition which might hamper its realization.

.....

What, then, caused these views held by a reactionary minority finally to gain the support of the great majority of Germans and practically the whole of Germany's youth? It was not merely the defeat, the suffering, and the wave of nationalism which led to their success. Still less was the cause, as so many people wish to believe, a capitalist reaction against the advance of socialism. On the contrary, the support which brought these ideas to power came precisely from the socialist camp. It was certainly not through the bourgeoisie, but rather through the absence of a strong bourgeoisie, that they were helped to power.

..... the socialists of the Left approached more and more to those of the Right. It was the union of the anticapitalist forces of the Right and of the Left, the fusion of radical and conservative socialism, which drove out from Germany everything that was liberal.

The connection between socialism and nationalism in Germany was close from the beginning. It is significant that the most important ancestors of National Socialism - Fichte, Rodbertus, and Lassalle - are at the same time acknowledged fathers of socialism. From 1914 onward there arose from the ranks of Marxist socialism one teacher after another who led, not the conservatives and reactionaries, but the hard-working laborer and idealist youth into the National Socialist fold. It was only thereafter that the tide of nationalist socialism attained major importance and rapidly grew into the Hitlerian doctrine."

Hayek, "Road to Serfdom".

"I am a Socialist, and a very different kind of Socialist from your rich friend, Count Reventlow. ... What you understand by Socialism is nothing more than Marxism."

Adolf Hitler, spoken to Otto Strasser, Berlin, May 21, 1930. (49)

"[In Mussolini] Socialists should be delighted to find at last a socialist who speaks and thinks as responsible rulers do".

George Bernard Shaw, 1927. (50)

" ... better go down with Bolshevism than live in eternal capitalist servitude."

Joseph Goebbels, "Diaries".

"We National Socialists are enemies, deadly enemies, of the present capitalist system with its exploitation of the economically weak ... and we are resolved under all circumstances to destroy this system".

Gregor Strasser, National Socialist theologian. (51)

Fascists are socialists.

First clue: the Nazis called themselves,

"The National Socialist German Workers Party",

not,

"The National Capitalist German Plutocrats Party".

And the National Socialists boasted that Hitler had created in Germany, "the most modern socialist state in the world." (52)

When reading fascist theologians, one quickly realizes that fascists are as obsessively anti-capitalist as any Bolshevik or Social Democrat, and, during the 1920s and 30s, everybody knew it. For example, in the late 1930s, while in Spain during the civil war, George Orwell lamented at the fighting between fascists and socialists because, after all, "Aren't we all socialists?" (53)

In Mussolini's early days, before his rise to power, many of his Marxist critics viewed his fascism as a curiosity and recognized it as "more of a heresy from, rather than a mortal challenge to revolutionary Marxism." (54)

In the first few paragraphs of "Capital", Marx decreed private property to be the root cause of capitalism and, thereby, the root cause of evil, and no self-respecting Marxist-socialist will ever let go that cardinal article of faith. And therein resides the critical difference between Marxist-socialism and fascist-socialism: Marxism prohibits the private ownership of property, and fascism does not - which is the ultimate heresy to Marxists and thereby inspired the unbridgeable and often violent schism between Marxism and fascism which has lasted until this day. (Later, more on how this schism came about.)

During the 1920s and 30s, because such little practical difference existed between fascists and Bolsheviks, critics of Hitler's National Socialism routinely called it, "National Bolshevism". The Bolsheviks, stung by being throw on the same theological pile with fascists, at the Third International, 1934, contrived the "agent theory" of fascism, (55) and decreed through the Comintern that the international Marxist propaganda machine should immediately associate fascism with capitalism, and, thereby, per formal Stalinist/Leninist dogma, fascism became, "the open terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinist, and most imperialist elements of finance capital." The machine acted with such vigor and lasting effect that even today people wrongly perceive fascism as a necessary attribute of capitalism, and critics of the socialist gospel get tagged as fascists.

Other sectarian differences existed between Marxists-socialists and fascists-socialists. For example, Marxist-socialists were "internationalist"; that is, Marxists-socialists dismissed national frontiers as the obsolete vestiges of capitalism, and, to destroy capitalism, all the world's proletariat must rise up and act as a single, unified entity without regard for geography or nationality or ethnicity - as Marx proclaimed in his "Manifesto", "The working men have no country." (A canon still fundamental to today's left, latched on to especially hard by environmentalists. See the first few citations in Appendix F, below.)

On the other hand, fascists-socialists tended to be "nationalist"; that is, the socialism of most fascist parties was specific to a specific nation, appealing to prejudices and petty hatreds of a specific nationality.

Or one might have a variety such as Hitler's National Socialism, a flavor of fascist-socialism meant specifically for the "Volk", whom National Socialist theology portrayed as a kind of mystical Germanic "Nation", bounded not by geography but by blood - and non-Aryans need not apply.

Because so many variations existed, scholars disagree over a precise definition of fascism. In the "Enciclopedia Italiana" (1992), Emilio Gentile, in an article on "Fascismo", takes a shot at a comprehensive definition by listing a series of ten generally-accepted sets of characteristics common to all fascism's varieties.

Two excerpts from Gentile's list...

...From #2 "[Fascism is] anti-materialist, anti-individualist, anti-liberal, anti-democratic, anti-Marxist, and anti-capitalist."

...From #9 "[Fascism is] ... an organization of the economy that ... broadens the sphere of state intervention, and seeks, by principles of technocracy and solidarity, the collaboration of the 'productive sectors' under control of the regime, to achieve its goals of power, yet preserving private property and class divisions."

(More on this, "organization of the economy", later, when we'll talk about Mussolini. And if you think he's not important to this tale, think again.)

Ernst Roehm, a dedicated socialist, leader of the SA, second only to Hitler in power in the National Socialist Party, in a letter to a friend, observed how often his street thugs switched back and forth between Roehm's National Socialist gangs and the Communist gangs, uncertain on whose side they rightly belonged. **

In his, "Road to Serfdom", Hayek remarks upon how, during the 1930s, the propagandists of both parties recognized the "relative ease with which a young communist could be converted into a Nazi or vice versa" and how university professors in the U.S. and Britain noticed that students returning from study in Germany could not decide whether they were Marxists or fascists, but were certain only that they hated, "Western Civilization".

Down with Western Civilization!

".... in the sphere of ideas Germany was the most convinced exponent of all socialist dreams, and in the sphere of reality she was the most powerful architect of the most highly organized economic system. In us [Germans] is the twentieth century. However the war may end, we are the exemplary people. Our ideas will determine the aims of the life of humanity. World History experiences at present the colossal spectacle that with us a new great ideal of life penetrates to final victory, while at the same time in England one of the World-Historical principles finally collapses."

Professor Johann Plenge, "as great an authority on Marx as Sombart"... (56)

"...the decisive question not only for Germany, but for the world, which must be solved by Germany for the world is: Is in the future trade to govern the state, or the state to govern trade? In the face of this question Prussianism and Socialism are the same ... Prussianism and Socialism combat the England in our midst.

...

... both of the parties which one may describe as specifically Prussian, the conservative and the socialist, have never lost an illiberal and antiparliamentary tendency. They are both socialist in a higher sense. ... [both] assign to the whole the unconditional authority to regulate the conduct of the life of the individual in the general interest."

Oswald Spengler ... (57)

"It is true that the impertinence and the presumption of the French was and is, in spite of all their misfortunes, unbearable; but after all, France has given the modern world its freedom and its civilization. ... Let our litterateurs and our politicians vaunt the science and even, God forgive them, the arts of these [Prussian] conquerors; but if they would only look a little below the surface they would see that in their veins still runs the old blood of the Goths, that their pride is beyond measure, they are hard, intolerant, despisers of everything that is not German".

Guiseppe Verdi, from a letter to a friend on the eve of the Franco-Prussian War, 1870... (58)

To all those 19th century Prussian divines, the mortal threats to life as they knew it were "liberalism" or "modernity" or "Western Civilization" - the terms are interchangeable - and were the fetid manifestations of the wicked ideas spawned by the warped minds of such "liberal" thinkers as: Adam Smith, James Madison, John Locke, Jeremy Bentham, Jean Jacques Rousseau, Alexander Hamilton, Edmund Burke, Thomas Jefferson, John Stewart Mill, Thomas Macaulay, John Acton, and Alexis de Tocqueville - some of the 18th and 19th century liberals who held that:

Because material prosperity and political freedom derive from the free exchange of goods and services, the state ought promote commerce and defend property rights. In Federalist 1 Hamilton cites as one of the half dozen most pressing reasons for adopting the Constitution to be...

"The additional security which its adoption will afford ... to liberty and to property."

And in Federalist 12, Hamilton actually begins with...

"The prosperity of commerce is now perceived and acknowledged by all enlightened statesmen to be the most useful as well as the most productive source of national wealth... ."

Because, "all men are created equal", the state must not legislate class-privileges, that is, grant special rights or benefits to a class or otherwise identifiable group of persons: that is, the law must treat all equally, as individuals.

Because individuals hold rights superior to the rights of the state, and, as Jefferson warned, because, "The natural progress of things is for government to gain and liberty to lose", the state's powers must be severely limited.

(For more, see the U.S. Declaration of Independence and the original version of the U.S. Constitution, two classic, 18th century liberal documents.)

Sidebar:

Hamilton's and Jefferson's ideas about property and trade and freedom and legislating privileges are not new; they'd been round a long time. In his, "Politics", Aristotle went so far as to argue that:

"For the well-nigh essential activities of all states is the buying and selling of

goods to meet their mutual basic needs; this is the quickest way to self-sufficiency, which seems to be what moves men to combine under a single constitution."

And in, "The Annals", Tacitus cites the legislating of privileges as the hallmark of the corrupt state:

"And now bills were passed, not only for national objects but for individual cases, and laws were most numerous when the commonwealth was most corrupt."

Sidebar: Early German liberalism...

Post Napoleon, the German princes went to great lengths to stamp out the "liberal" ideas that had arrived along with Napoleon's legions and taken root in German Europe, especially Prussia. In his, "German History, 1770-1866", Oxford, 1989, James J. Sheehan gives an account of the liberal movement in the early 19th century in German Europe and the unresolved conflicts building between liberalism and reaction which led finally to the great liberal explosions of 1848.... (Note how well this dove-tails with: "He has erected a multitude of New Offices, and sent hither swarms of Officers to harrass our people, and eat out their substance.")

"The primary target of political protest during these years was the bureaucracy, whose growing influence over German life was examined in Chapter 7. For many people, bureaucratic institutions were a persistent source of frustration and resentment: censors limited the spread of enlightened opinions and necessary knowledge, policemen harassed innocent travelers, officials inhibited trade or restrained enterprise `Excessive government or the interference of the administration in too many affairs has become the rule,' David Hansemann complained in 1840, Unconsciously, officials have taken upon themselves the most varied matters that could be left to private individuals or organizations.' A few years later Robert von Mohl wrote that `we can no longer see reality amid the floods of paper, and if someone promises to simplify administrative business, the result is merely a dozen more unnecessary reports and decrees'. Otto Camphausen noted with alarm what he regarded as a `fanatical' hostility to the bureaucracy. ...

Throughout German Europe the political opposition sought to curb excessive bureaucratic power and subject governments to the rule of law. `It is a fundamental truth', declared a liberal member of the Baden parliament in 1831, `that the government should not be allowed unilateral authority over private legal conditions, and has no right to limit the free use of its citizens' physical and intellectual resources'. Liberals regarded constitutions not merely as a way to regulate the distribution of power but also as a means to define the proper uses of power and to prevent its abuse. Similarly, the liberal concept of the Rechtsstaat, which was of great importance to theorists like Mohl, was an effort to protect persons and property from unreasonable regulations and arbitrary interference."

To the Prussians, "Western Civilization", meant west of the Rhine; that is, French and British notions of democracy and capitalism and commercialism and urbanization and industrialism and technology and individualism and parliaments ... all of which the Prussians perceived as socially destructive and contrary to the Prussian way of doing things... inimical to the Prussian sense of order... all very, "un-German".
As Sheehan put it... (59)

"Nineteenth-century [German] writers often contrasted the stability of traditional society with the turbulence they saw in the world around them. ... Armies, cities, factories, universities, and governmental agencies all grew so much in the course of the nineteenth century that they became qualitatively different from their pre-modern predecessors. At the same time, these institutions, and the ideas and habits that sustained them, changed more quickly than at any time in history. The implications of these changes left no corner of life untouched. Traditional Europeans lived in a world of immediate uncertainty but long-term continuity; if they survived, they could assume that tomorrow would be much like today. For moderns the opposite seemed to be true ... they had to live in a world where basic change was permanent and inescapable."

Sidebar:

For a good introduction to nuts and bolts of 19th-century German ideas, see, "The Politics of Cultural Despair - A Study in the Rise of German Ideology", Fritz Stern, 1963.

In Appendix A, below, see Stern's remarks on Paul Lagarde and Julius Langbehn, two 19th-century Prussian prophets whose ideas exerted enormous influence on the formation of National Socialism and environmentalism and their common hatred of liberalism and capitalism and industrialism and Jews and cities and technology all bound up in a "melancholy yearning for the past".

Today, though the leftists don't know it, in most leftist circles, Lagarde's and Langbehn's ideas are cutting-edge theology.

So, to deliver the Volk from the "chaos of the soul" imposed by Western Civilization and its liberalism and capitalism, the Prussians concocted forms of salvation, which split into two general categories, which were - as Spengler named them - "socialist" and "conservative".

The socialist utopia - in its broadest sense - would be industrial, filled with great factories and mills, owned in common by proletarians who joyfully tended their machines, safe and content in the knowledge that the all-powerful Party would see to all their needs.

On the other hand, the conservative utopia - in its broadest sense - would be a return to Medieval times, bucolic, few factories or towns, peopled by small landholders living close to Nature, noble yeomen tending their fields with crude tools, happy in the knowledge that an all-powerful prince would protect them and see to all their needs.

So they disagreed over how Utopia should look.

The socialists would retain the cities and the factories, but hold all property under communal ownership.

The conservatives would retain the notion of private property, but do away with the cities and

factories.

Despite their theological differences, with crystal clarity all those early Prussian prophets understood that they could not achieve what Czech writer Milan Kundera characterized as the "totalitarian temptation", "the age-old dream of a world where everybody would live in harmony, united by a single common will and faith, without secrets from one another", if Comte's, "Western malady, the revolt of the individual against the species", was allowed to exist. Therefore, to create Utopia, the utopians had to eradicate this "individualism", this ugly "Western malady".

No need for individual "rights" in these utopias; the state has rights, citizens have duties. None of this "individualism" crap allowed here; we will not tolerate any revolt against the species; we are all "one"; one proletariat, one Volk, and the Party will care for us, the Prince will care for us, and we shall never suffer want or fear again. As Tom Joad mused, "We are all part of one big soul". That's powerful stuff to the empty-headed.

Students, professors, and socialist Utopia...

"Every one of Comrade Stalin's utterances is a mighty search-light up the path of the revolutionary youth movement ... The young workers and toilers of the capitalist countries who are groaning under the yoke of capitalism look with great love and hope to Comrade Stalin ... They see and know that the people of the Soviet Union, whose happy life is for them a bright beacon, are indebted the Bolshevik Party and its great leader, Comrade Stalin, for the flourishing of their youth and their happiness. Stalin rears the young generation like a careful, experienced gardener."

From, "Clarity", journal of the American Communist Youth League, 1940. (60)

For a while in his twenties, Hitler had been a starving artist, a homeless hunter of libraries, pouring over political tracts, writing poems, scraping out a meager living by hawking his artwork. (61) Early in his career, Joseph Goebbels, the scholar, won a PhD in Romantic literature from Heidelberg U.. As a youth, Himmler grew herbs and became fascinated with "natural" foods and diets, and began a life-long crusade against refined sugar, canned foods, and white bread to the point where, once in power under the non-smoking, vegetarian, teetotaling Hitler, he promised the German people that, "after the war we shall take energetic steps to prevent the ruin of our people by the food industries." (62)

In 1920 Hitler was 31, Gregor Strasser 28, Goering 27, Hess 26, Goebbels 23, Bormann and Himmler 21. They were just a bunch of cockeyed young dreamers and poets and artists and writers and students and teachers, out to make a better, socialist world.

In the German elections of Sept 14, 1930, Hitler's National Socialists drew 68.2 percent of their support from persons under age 40. (Half of whom, by the way, were women - the ladies luvved that Adolf.) **

Then...

"Revolutionaries often claim to be representatives of youth... . But Hitler put much more of his cult of youth into practice than Mussolini did. ... [Hitler's National

Socialists] were youthful: In 1931, in Berlin 70 percent of the SA were men under thirty, and in the Reichstag in 1930, 60 percent of the National Socialist deputies were under forty ... The German exile Karl Otten wrote an incisive paragraph about Hitler's appeal to German youth: 'The young truly love Hitler, in almost limitless ecstatic admiration. Not only because he understands their childish impulses and even encourages them.' Hitler seems to have been the creator of a free country of the young. Before them he plays not the role of a severe father but of a mother, a source of many pleasures and of love. He allows them pseudo-revolutionary freedom for their biological and sexual impulses, adding to his appeal."

John Lukacs, from his, "The Hitler of History", 1997.

In his, "Before the Deluge, A Portrait of Berlin in the 1920s", 1972, Otto Friedrich recorded this exchange between himself and Professor Richard Lowenthal, a former leader in the communist youth movement in Germany during the 1920s...

Friedrich:

"How is it that the Nazis could appeal so strongly to young students, when one usually thinks of young people as idealistic?"

Lowenthal:

"Because the Nazis were idealists too. They promised national unity and national resurrection. And there was that basic German romanticism - you know - you know the difference between 'Gemeinschaft' and 'Gesellschaft'? The first is a medieval concept, a society in which everyone works for the common good; the other is the modern, materialistic idea, a society in which everyone competes against others for his own good. There was widespread feeling that this was un-German, that it had been imposed by foreigners. There was some truth to this too. Capitalism did come from outside because Germany was so backward, and democracy was brought in by the armies of Napoleon. The whole of the German Romantic movement was a criticism of that, and it is still true for young radicals today. So the Nazis promised an alternative to what they called a corrupt plutocratic system. And everyone wanted to believe."

Friedrich records another conversation, this one with Dr. Heinz Pachter, a professor of history then teaching in New York, but who grew up in Germany during the 1920s and 30s...

Friedrich:

"Was the Youth Movement really serious? Was it comparable to the radicalism of American students?"

Pachter:

"Frighteningly comparable."

Friedrich:

"But the students are mostly left-wing nowadays, whereas they seem to have been right-wing in the twenties."

Pachter:

"Right-wing, left-wing, it doesn't make that much difference. The Nazi youth talked of 'liberation.' They were also in rebellion against their parents, and against 'the system.' The left today - they just want power, and the worship of power is Fascist."

A bit more, from G.L. Fosse's, "The Genesis of Fascism", as found in, "Fascism, An Anthology",

Nathanael Green editor, 1968....

"Fascism was a movement of youth, not only in the sense that it covered a short span of time, but also in its membership. The revolt of the fin de siècle had been a revolt of the young against society, but also against parents and school. They longed for a new sense of community, not for a 'chaos of the soul'. They were of bourgeois background, ...

Such were the young who streamed not only into the German youth movement, but also into the fasci and the SA, and made up the cadres of the Iron Guard as well as the Belgian Rexists.

...

The fascist leaders too were young: Mussolini was 39 when he became Prime Minister, Hitler 44 on attaining the Chancellorship, Leon Degrelle was in his early thirties, and Primo de Rivera as well as Codreanu were in their late twenties.

Youth symbolized vigour and action: ideology was joined to fact. Fascist heroes and martyrs died at an early age in order to enter the pantheon..."

All those early revolutionaries venerated and appealed to youth in a kind of early 20th century version of, "Don't trust anyone over thirty".

And they had lots of success recruiting the young. Hitler's bloodiest henchmen - Himmler, Roehm, Eichmann, "Gestapo" Mueller - all joined the National Socialists in their twenties, and Lenin's head executioner, Felix Dzerzhinski, organizer of the Cheka, barely out of his teens joined with the Bolsheviks, and later came Mao's Red Guards, many from China's 'elite' universities, who, by the tens of thousands marched arm-in-arm to the chant:

"If you're a revolutionary, step forward and join us.
If you're not, get lost!

...

Get lost!
We're gonna chase you out of your fucking job!
Kill! Kill! Kill!" (63)

Or, from Courtois', "The Black Book of Communism" ...

"In Pol Pot's day it really was the children who were in charge. All witnesses agree that the majority of soldiers were extraordinarily young. ... Ly Heng remembers the last recruitment campaign immediately before the arrival of the Vietnamese, which was extended to include the New People and was aimed at boys and girls from thirteen to eighteen. ... New recruits immediately lost touch with their family and usually also with their village. Living in camps and relatively isolated from a population that feared them, yet well treated by the government, they knew that they were all-powerful Beyond the revolutionary verbiage, the motivation of many, sometimes on their own admission, was that they "didn't have to work and could, kill people." Those under fifteen were the most feared: "They were taken very young, and the only thing they were taught was discipline. They learned to obey orders, without

asking for any justification. They didn't have any belief in religion or in tradition, only in the orders of the Khmer Rouge. That's why they killed their own people, including babies, the way you kill a mosquito."

Or Whittaker Chambers, recounting his first-hand experiences as a member of the CPUSA beginning in the 1920's, from his "Witness", 1952...

"... Every year the Communist National Students League was graduating its hundreds from the colleges. These were the first quotas of the great drift from Columbia, Harvard and elsewhere. These were the years that floated Alger Hiss into the party and made possible the big undergrounds, the infiltration of the Government, science, education and all branches of communications, but especially radio, motion pictures, book, magazine and newspaper publishing. An entirely new type of Communist made his appearance, not singly, but in clusters, whose members often already knew one another, influenced one another and shared the same Communist or leftist views. A surprising number came of excellent native American families. Nearly all were college trained from the top per cent of their classes. Those who lacked the hardihood or clarity to follow the logic of their position and become Communists [instead] clumped around the edges of the party, self-consciously hesitant, apologetic, easing their social consciences by doing whatever the party asked them to do so long as they did not have to know exactly what it was. From 1930 onward, a small intellectual army passed over to the Communist Party with scarcely any effort on its part. Within a decade, simply by pursuing the careers that ordinarily lay open to them, these newcomers would carry the weak and stumbling American Communist Party directly into the highest councils of the nation....

And then, the professors...

"Give a professor a false thesis in early life, and he will teach it till he dies."
John Jay Chapman, 1900...

"Nazi penetration of the universities was not confined to the students. The years 1933 and 1934 saw a purge that led to the dismissal or resignation of 15 percent of the 7,700 tenured university teachers, 18 percent in the natural sciences. The majority of German professors, however, gave their support to the regime: 700 signed a declaration to this effect in November 1933, and Martin Heidegger, one of the most influential philosophers of the century, declared in his rector's inaugural address to Freiburg University, "No dogmas and ideas will any longer be the laws of your being. The Fuhrer himself, and he alone, is the present and future reality for Germany and its law."

From Alan Bullock's, "Hitler and Stalin", 1991...

"In addition to their belief that nationalist considerations transcended politics and to their practice of quiet anti-Semitism in professional appointments, the vast majority of Weimar academicians also subscribed to the rejection of a vaguely conceived "materialism." The academicians used this term as an ambiguous catchword to represent the source of all the ills of German society. Materialism meant too much

commercialism, concern for money, industry, and technology. ... Materialism fed the vulgar tastes of the masses It stood for the evils of Zivilisation enthroned above the virtues of Kultur.

From, "Scientists under Hitler, Politics and the Physics Community in the Third Reich", Alan D. Beyerchen, 1977...

In his, "Inside the Third Reich", Albert Speer related his youthful experiences while a university teaching-assistant in Berlin, witnessing a beer-hall speech at which Hitler mesmerized the professors...

In 1930 we sailed from Donaueschingen, which is in Swabia, down the Danube to Vienna. By the time we returned, there had been a Reichstag election on September 14 which remains in my memory only because my father was greatly perturbed about it. The NSDAP (National Socialist Party [Nazi]) had won 107 seats and was suddenly the chief topic of political discussion.

My father had the darkest forebodings, chiefly in view of the NSDAP's socialist tendencies. He was already disturbed enough by the strength of the Social Democrats and the Communists.

Our Institute of Technology had in the meanwhile become a center of National Socialist endeavors. The small group of Communist architecture students gravitated to Professor Poelzig's seminar, while the National Socialists gathered around Tessenow, even though he was and remained a forthright opponent of the Hitler movement, for there were parallels, unexpressed and unintended, between his doctrine and the ideology of the National Socialists. Tessenow was not aware of these parallels. He would surely have been horrified by the thought of any kinship between his ideas and National Socialist views.

Among other things, Tessenow taught: "Style comes from the people. It is in our nature to love our native land. ... True culture comes only from the maternal womb of a nation." ... The National Socialist creed [too] held that the roots of renewal were to be found in the native soil of Germany.

Tessenow decried the metropolis and extolled the peasant virtues: "The metropolis is a dreadful thing. The metropolis is a confusion of old and new. The metropolis is conflict, brutal conflict. Everything good should be left outside of big cities Where urbanism meets the peasantry, the spirit of the peasantry is ruined. A pity that people can no longer think in peasant terms." In a similar vein, Hitler cried out against the erosion of morals in the big cities. He warned against the ill effects of civilization which, he said, damaged the biological substance of the people. And he emphasized the importance of a healthy peasantry as a mainstay for the state.

Hitler was able to sense these and other currents which were in the air of the times, though many of them were still diffuse and intangible. He was able to articulate them and to exploit them for his own ends.

...

The students were chiefly turning to the extremists for their beliefs, and Hitler's party appealed directly to the idealism of this generation. And after all, was not a man like Tessenow also fanning these flames? About 1931 he had declared: "Someone will have to come along who thinks very simply. Thinking today has become too complicated. An uncultured man, a peasant as it were, would solve everything much more easily merely because he would still be unspoiled. He would also have the strength to carry out his simple ideas." To us this oracular remark seemed to herald Hitler.

Hitler was delivering an address to the students of Berlin University and the Institute of Technology. My students urged me to attend. Not yet convinced, but already uncertain of my ground, I went along. The site of the meeting was a beer hall called the Hasenheide. ... The room was overcrowded. It seemed as if nearly all the students in Berlin wanted to see and hear this man whom his adherents so much admired and his opponents so much detested. A large number of professors sat in favored places in the middle of a bare platform. Their presence gave the meeting an importance and a social acceptability that it would not otherwise have had. ... Hitler entered and was tempestuously hailed by his numerous followers among the students. This enthusiasm in itself made a great impression upon me. But his appearance also surprised me. On posters and in caricatures I had seen him in military tunic, with shoulder straps, swastika armband, and hair flapping over his forehead. But here he was wearing a well-fitted blue suit and looking markedly respectable. Everything about him bore out the note of reasonable modesty. Later I learned that he had a great gift for adjusting - consciously or intuitively - to his surroundings.

As the ovation went on for minutes he tried, as if slightly pained, to check it. Then, in a low voice, hesitantly and somewhat shyly, he began a kind of historical lecture rather than a speech. To me there was something engaging about it - all the more so since it ran counter to everything the propaganda of his opponents had led me to expect: a hysterical demagogue, a shrieking and gesticulating fanatic in uniform. ... It seemed as if he were candidly presenting his anxieties about the future. His irony was softened by a somewhat self-conscious humor; his South German charm reminded me agreeably of my native region. A cool Prussian could never have captivated me that way. Hitler's initial shyness soon disappeared; at times now his pitch rose. He spoke urgently and with hypnotic persuasiveness. The mood he cast was much deeper than the speech itself, most of which I did not remember for long. Moreover, I was carried on the wave of the enthusiasm which, one could almost feel this physically, bore the speaker along from sentence to sentence. It swept away any skepticism, any reservations. Opponents were given no chance to speak. This furthered the illusion, at least momentarily, of unanimity. Finally, Hitler no longer seemed to be speaking to convince; rather, he seemed to feel that he was expressing what the audience, by now transformed into a single mass, expected of him. It was as if it were the most natural thing in the world to lead students and part of the faculty of the two greatest academies in Germany submissively by a leash.

...

Here, it seemed to me, was hope. Here were new ideals, a new understanding, new tasks. Even Spengler's dark predictions seemed to me refuted, and his prophecy of the

coming of a new Roman emperor simultaneously fulfilled.

Within ten years, Hitler's "new ideals", his "new understanding", his "new tasks" bore their inevitable fruit in the form of the SS Einsatzgruppen, special "operations units" charged with organizing the systematic murder of "untermenschen" in the conquered territories on the eastern front.

Who were these Einsatzgruppen fellows?

Who else!?

Burleigh's description... (64)

"Historians have routinely made much of the fact that many of the Einsatzgruppen were educated - two-thirds of whom held university degrees, and a third doctorates. Predictably, less is made of the truth that a doctorate merely betokens an assiduous mindlessness, signifying nothing about the wider personality. For, ironically, the universities were precisely the places in Germany which fostered an elite for of antisemitism, whose radicality was ill disguised with a carapace of 'scientific objectivity' towards the 'Jewish Question'. Now these former student radicals had the chance to implement what they so often talked of in their exclusive circles."

Point: No socialist tyrant ever lacked for hot-eyed young zealots and professors chomping at the bit for the chance to lop off the head of anyone who dared challenge the revolution.

Environmentalism and the German Youth Movement...

(The "Wandervögel", roughly, "wandering free spirits".)

Circa 1900, the ideas expressed in the quote below would have fit perfectly within the theologies espoused by the Wandervögel and the likes of Langbehn and Lagarde. Ideas like these inspired the German Youth Movement...

"We are, all of us, exploring a world that none of us understands and attempting to create within that uncertainty. But there are some things we feel, feelings that our prevailing, acquisitive, and competitive corporate life, including tragically the universities, is not the way of life for us. We're searching for more immediate, ecstatic and penetrating modes of living. And so our questions, our questions about our institutions, about our colleges, about our churches, about our government continue. The questions about those institutions are familiar to all of us."

Hillary Rodham, Commencement Speech, Wellesley College, 1969.

.... For the youth movement in its way was a microcosm of modern Germany. Few are the political leaders, and even fewer the intellectual leaders among the generations born between 1890 and 1920, who were not at one time or another members of the youth movement, or influenced by it in their most impressionable years. And perhaps even more important than this personal element is the fact that all the great issues of the time are reflected in the history of the movement.

....

The tragedy of the Youth Movement was precisely its 'freedom.' Refusing to tie itself to any practical adult education, it floated, directionless, on the waves of public

emotion. Despising liberalism and suspicious of intellectual analysis, its leaders were inevitably swept up in the gigantic mass movement of National Socialism.

....

Everyone knows the devastating effect on German democracy of the aggressive nationalism current among professors, schoolteachers and leaders of public opinion.

.... Middle-class boys and girls, in their period of adolescent rebellion, might have been expected to react against the older generation by espousing the cause of democracy. That they failed to do so was largely due to the fact that their emotions and enthusiasms were captured by a movement which smothered any intelligent doubts

...

... Reading Mr. Laqueur's account of the Wandervögel ..., with their Wagnerian nostalgia for death, I can't help feeling that, in the case of German youth, crass materialism is a good deal less dangerous than the nostalgic longings for a hero's death which, in two generations, brought the Free Youth Movement to disaster.

From R.H.S. Crossman's introduction to, "Young Germany - A History of the German Youth Movement", by Walter Z. Laqueur, 1962.

The angry young men of 1900 were found among the more articulate sections of the younger generation throughout Europe. Some developed a new cult of youth in an attempt to bring fresh air into the stale and musty atmosphere surrounding their elders. The writings of 'Agathon' in France, and of the early Italian Futurists, are evidence of this trend. The Wandervögel was one of the specific German forms of protest. It was and remained unique in many respects, since Germany's situation in Europe was different from that of other countries. The triumph of liberalism in France, Britain, and the United States had never extended to Germany... . Capitalism had indeed prevailed in Germany and industrialization had made rapid strides, but in many sections of the population a medieval, anti-liberal, and anti-capitalist mentality survived

The official ideology of this society and its declared values were not those of individual freedom and the pursuit of happiness, but consisted of aristocratic Prussian ideas about loyalty and service to Kaiser and Reich. If the middle classes had been the leading force in German society, dissatisfaction would have taken very different forms from those it eventually did; it would have been a protest from inside or a post-liberal critique of society. In Germany, because of the weakness of the liberal movement itself, the movement was pre-liberal, romantic, in some respects medieval.

.....

... [The Wandervögel] return to nature was romantic, as were their attempts to get away from a materialistic civilization, their stress on the simple life, their rediscovery of old folk songs and folklore their adoption of medieval names and customs. Romanticism probably has a closer hold on Germany than on any other country. There have been classical schools in every culture, but nowhere has romanticism been so deeply rooted as in German literature, music, art, and the general Zeitgeist.

... The political philosophy of the romantic school had a fatal impact on German thinking throughout the nineteenth century and beyond. Not every Romantic was a

reactionary, but reactionary the mainstream of romantic opinion certainly was; having rediscovered the Fatherland and national history, they proceeded to reject alien influences and to hate the foreigner. A religious revival degenerated into religious intolerance and obscurantism. The Middle Ages became the great ideal: the manly virtues and poetic love, true faith and loyalty had disappeared with the age of chivalry. The only way to reestablish a harmonious society was to model it as closely as possible on the medieval pattern with its knights and vassals, its guilds and estates. The romantics glorified the peasantry in its bondage and were opposed to the growth of industry and trade. The whole development of the German youth movement was shaped by the impact of romantic philosophy, by a glorification of the past fraught with misgivings for the future. It was a repetition, on a smaller scale, of the general German misfortune: The German national consciousness was first awakened under reactionary auspices, in a war of liberation that put an end not only to Napoleon's rule but to the achievements of the French Revolution.

Walter Laqueur, from his, "Young Germany - A History of the German Youth Movement", 1962.

The fight against liberalism in all its forms ... was the common idea which united socialists and conservatives in one common front. At first it was mainly in the German Youth Movement, almost entirely socialist in inspiration and outlook, where these ideas were most readily accepted and the fusion of socialism and nationalism completed. In the later twenties and until the advent to power of Hitler a circle of young men gathered round the journal "Die Tat" and, led by Ferdinand Fried, became the chief exponent of this tradition in the intellectual sphere. Fried's "Ende des Kapitalismus" is perhaps the most characteristic product of this group of "Edelnazis", as they were known in Germany, and is particularly disquieting because of its resemblance to so much of the literature which we see in England and the United States today, where we can watch the same drawing-together of the socialists of the Left and the Right and nearly the same contempt of all that is liberal in the old sense.

F.A. Hayek, "Road to Serfdom".

The environmentalist sentiments of 19th century Prussian conservatives manifested themselves most concretely beginning around 1890 in the form of the charismatic Karl Fischer's "German Youth Movement", the "Wandervögel", where, at any one time, thousands of young Germans trekked the forests arm-in-arm, singing songs of praise to their oneness with Nature, vilifying cities and factories and technology and Jews and liberalism and capitalism - greeting each other with "Heil!", and addressing Fischer as, "Fuehrer".

In his, "1918 - War and Peace", 2000, Gregor Dallas equates the nature-loving Wandervögel with the brutal, violent Frei Corps...

The idea of forming voluntary corps out of elite front-line troops came to [General Wilhelm] Groener in Spa, during the last weeks of the Western war. It was first put into practice when Supreme Command sent in the 'innoculators' to preserve order in the retreating army, and had its ancestry in Ludendorff's 'storm troopers', so effective in his spring offensive. But the guiding spirit of the Free Corps was born earlier, in the generation that grew up in Germany at the turn of the century - the war generation.

Throughout Europe there had been an explosion of new art forms during this period, but nothing was so radical, so militant in its rejection of liberal bourgeois society - its 'sham' of religion, its 'triviality' of politics, the 'lifelessness' of education, the 'sentimentality' of commercialized literature, the 'trashy' art, the 'mechanical' drama, the 'repressed' relationship between the sexes in and outside marriage - as the German youth movements of the 1890s and early 1900s. The historian Modris Ekstein has even argued that at the heart of the Great War was their war of liberation, their 'Befreiungskrieg', against the Victorian hypocrisy and conservatism of England: that England was Germany's main enemy, not Russia, or France.

The link between Nordic nudes singing songs and making love in the forest and the furious volunteers of the Free Corps is not self-evident - many members of the Wandervögel and Mount Cenis were pacifists, jailed for their activities. And yet they had the same mystic fellowship of the 'Volk', the same corporative spirit. They called in the same irrational, fervent manner for a leader, 'der Führer'. They sang the same song of the freebooters, 'Das Landsknechtslied'. The youth movements despised the convenient, mechanical habits of the bourgeoisie, 'das Bürgertum'; the volunteers hated the rear, 'die Etappe': "Yes, and then we have the Rear!! The Rear lies far, far behind the Front and there is plenty of everything there: plenty of comfort, food, conveniences, peace - all the enjoyments of life combined in that one little enticing word: The Rear! . . . We called them 'Chair-bound goldbricks' [Etappenhengste] and the word was never spoken without an undertone of contempt."

The youth of the forest said the same of the townsfolk. These were not the bitter words of England's war poets, raised on Hardy and Kipling; or the French 'normalien' who went to war and returned home disillusioned. They were more radical. More violent. And, if one responds that the pacifist antidote in Germany was Erich Maria Remarque's 'All Quiet on the Western Front', one might read that book again and see in it the very same cult of youth, the cult of the soldier, the cult of death... .

Or, as John Toland described the Wandervögel in his, "Adolf Hitler", 1976...

These youngsters tramped around the land, often wearing colorful costumes, in their search for a new way of life. For the most part from the well-to-do middle class, they despised the liberal bourgeois society they sprang from and were convinced that "parental' religion was largely sham, politics boastful and trivial, economics unscrupulous and deceitful, education stereotyped and lifeless, art trashy and sentimental, literature spurious and commercialized, drama tawdry and mechanical." They regarded family life as repressive and insincere. They also were concerned that the relations between the sexes, in and out of marriage, were "shot through with hypocrisy." Their goal was to establish a youth culture for fighting the bourgeois trinity of school, home and church.

They would sit around campfires, under the direction of a Führer, and sing "The Song of the Freebooters," while silently gazing into a campfire in quest of "messages from the forest," or listening to someone read hortatory passages from Nietzsche or Stefan

George, who wrote: "The people and supreme wisdom yearn for the Man! -The Deed! ... Perhaps someone who sat for years among your murderers and slept in your prisons will stand up and *do the deed*." These young people, thriving on mysticism and impelled by idealism, yearned for action - any kind of action.

They found it in the Great War. Perhaps that is why they were as convinced as Hitler of the righteousness of the Fatherland's cause. Life in the trenches brought officers and men closer together in a brotherhood of suffering and blood. The men worshiped the one who led them into desperate hand-to-hand combat. "To them he was not their commanding officer; he was their Fuehrer And they were his comrades! They trusted him blindly and would have followed him into hell itself if it were necessary." Together they formed a front-line relationship of democracy hitherto unknown in Germany. The miles of trenches were isolated from the rest of the world and became, in effect, a "monastery with walls of flame."

And from Peter Staudenmaier's essay, "Fascist Ecology: The 'Green Wing' of the Nazi Party and Its Historical Antecedents" (emphasis mine)...

The philosopher Ludwig Klages profoundly influenced the youth movement and particularly shaped their ecological consciousness. He authored a tremendously important essay titled "Man and Earth" for the legendary [Hohe] Meissner gathering of the Wandervögel in 1913. An extraordinarily poignant text and the best known of all Klages' work, it is not only "one of the very greatest manifestoes of the radical ecopacifist movement in Germany," but also a classic example of the seductive terminology of reactionary ecology.

"Man and Earth" anticipated just about all of the themes of the contemporary ecology movement. It decried the accelerating extinction of species, disturbance of global ecosystemic balance, deforestation, destruction of aboriginal peoples and of wild habitats, urban sprawl, and the increasing alienation of people from nature. In emphatic terms it disparaged Christianity, capitalism, economic utilitarianism, hyper-consumption and the ideology of 'progress.' It even condemned the environmental destructiveness of rampant tourism and the slaughter of whales, and displayed a clear recognition of the planet as an ecological totality. All of this in 1913!

It may come as a surprise, then, to learn that Klages was throughout his life politically archconservative and a venomous antisemite. One historian labels him a "Volkish fanatic" and another considers him simply "an intellectual pacemaker for the Third Reich" who "paved the way for fascist philosophy in many important respects." In "Man and Earth" a genuine outrage at the devastation of the natural environment is coupled with a political subtext of cultural despair. Klages' diagnosis of the ills of modern society, for all its declamations about capitalism, returns always to a single culprit: "Geist." His idiosyncratic use of this term, which means mind or intellect, was meant to denounce not only hyper-rationalism or instrumental reason, but rational thought itself. Such a wholesale indictment of reason cannot help but have savage political implications. It forecloses any chance of rationally reconstructing society's relationship with nature and justifies the most brutal authoritarianism. But the lessons

of Klages' life and work have been hard for ecologists to learn. **In 1980, "Man and Earth" was republished as an esteemed and seminal treatise to accompany the birth of the German Greens.**

Sidebar:

Klages', "Man and Earth", is on the Web, and it does read like an operations manual for today's environmentalists.

Sidebar:

In 1913 Klages railed against "the destruction of aboriginal peoples" and, thirty years later, Hitler's National Socialists, speaking through voices such as Walther Schoenichen, Hitler's Minister of the German Forests and the Reich Agency for Nature Protection, would take up the cause of "original" people against the evil white man. As Luc Ferry, in his, "The New Ecological Order", University of Chicago Press, 1995, remarked...

We have to be ignorant or prejudiced not to see it: Nazism contains within it, for reasons that are in no way accidental, the beginnings of an authentic concern for preserving 'natural,' which is to say, here again, 'original' peoples. In the chapter devoted to this subject in his book, Walther Schoenichen cannot find words harsh enough to condemn the attitude of 'the white man, the great destroyer of creation': in the paradise he himself is responsible for losing, he has paved only a path of 'epidemics, thievery, fires, blood and tears!' "Indeed, the enslavement of primitive peoples in the 'cultural' history of the white race constitutes one of its most shameful chapters, which is not only streaked with rivers of blood, but of cruelty and torture of the worst kind. And its final pages were not written in the distant past, but at the beginning of the twentieth century." Schoenichen proceeds to trace, with great precision, the list of the various genocides that have occurred throughout the history of colonialization, from the massacre of the South American Indians to that of the Sioux - who "were pushed back in unthinkable conditions of cruelty and infamy" - and the South African bushmen. The case of the latter is particularly symbolic of the misdeeds of liberal capitalism: they were killed because they had no notion of ownership. Game having disappeared from their region, this hunting people was forced to "steal" goats belonging to the colonists - the word "steal" must be placed in quotes, since bushmen had no concept of private property. And as they were thrown into prison without any idea of what was happening to them, they allowed themselves to die of starvation: "Thus an interesting people was exterminated before our very eyes, simply because an exogenous policy imposed on the indigenous population refused to understand that these men could not abandon their hunting lives to become farmers from one day to the next . . ."

This indictment, written in 1942 by a Nazi biologist who saw the Naturschutzgesetz as a means to remedy these misdeeds does it not protect all forms of wild life, is not without interest. Its designated target is [classic] liberalism and, more specifically, French-style republicanism. But it also has a

positive goal: to defend the rights of nature in all its forms, human and nonhuman, so long as they are representative of an *original state* (Ursprünglichkeit). On the first point, Schoenichen's attacks are clear. They throw in question capitalism's greed. For in the context of a different world vision, it "would have been entirely possible to find a reasonable compromise between the claims of the conquerors and the basic needs of the primitive peoples. It is primarily the [classic] liberal vision of the world that is responsible for having stood in the way of such a solution. For it recognizes no motivation other than economic profitability, which raises to the level of a moral principle the exploitation of the colonies for the sole benefit of the mother country." This naturally provides an occasion to assail the French theory of assimilation, which is, according to Schoenichen, "drawn directly from the principles of the Declaration of the Rights of Man of 1789." Thus "the old [classic] liberal theory of exploitation always constituted the backdrop for French colonial policy, so that there was no room for a treatment of primitive peoples that tended in the direction of the protection of nature."

In opposition to this "assimilationist" vision of the primitive state, Nazi policy advocates an authentic recognition of differences: "The natural policy for National Socialism to follow is clear. The policy of repression and extermination, the models for which are furnished by the early days of America or Australia, are just as unthinkable as the French theory of assimilation. Rather it is appropriate for the natives to flourish in conformity with their own racial stock." It is necessary then, in all cases, to leave the natives to their own development.

....

Like the aesthetics of sentiment and deep ecology, which also place new value on primitive peoples, mountain folk, or Amerindians, the National Socialist conception of ecology encompasses the notion that the *Naturvolker*, the "natural peoples," achieve a perfect harmony between their surroundings and their customs. This is even the most certain sign of the superiority of their ways over the [classic] liberal world of uprootedness and perpetual mobility. Their culture, similar to animal ways of life, is a prolongation of nature; it is this ideal conciliation that the modernity issued from the French Revolution has destroyed and which it is now a matter of restoring.

Sidebar:

Peter Staudenmaier is an anarchist. Anarchists hate fascists - remember the Spanish Civil War - and they hate Bolsheviks too. This anarchist hatred of Bolshevism is as healthy today as it ever was and goes all the way back to a mid-nineteenth-century theological squabble between Marx and the ever-popular Mikhail Alexandrovich Bakunin. Later came Lenin, during the Red Terror, killing off Russian anarchists left and right. Despite their mutual hatred, anarchists and Bolsheviks temporarily joined forces to fight alongside each other in Spain, but, during the last days of the war, those old, bottled-up antagonisms burst into the open when anarchists fell out with and fought pitched battles against Stalin's legions in the streets of Madrid. (65)

Fact is: anarchists pretty much hate everybody. Nevertheless, here, Staudenmaier got his facts right.

Over the decades, the German Youth Movement eventually splintered into competing factions, flickered, then, with the coming of World War I, sputtered out.

But the ideas were there! firmly planted in millions of young minds, primed and ready for action: down with capitalism! down with the Jews! down with the cities! down with the factories! down with technology! lacking only a new Fuehrer to come guide them, whom they found finally when Hitler emerged to gather them all up into the National Socialist German Workers Party.

Sidebar:

Do a Google-search for, "Wandervögel", and you'll find them alive and well, still living in German Europe, and still reminiscing fondly about Karl Fischer. But they've dropped the "Fuehrer" and "Heil!" bits ... I believe.

And you stumble upon the damndest things. For example, not only does one find modern environmentalism among the Wandervögel, one finds modern feminism there too.

See Appendix E, below - excerpts from Marion de Ras' essay, "The Domain of the Wandervögel Girls: Pedagogical Eros and the Utopia of a Holy Island", where de Ras argues that, "Roughly between 1918 and 1928, the female branch of the German youth movement was dominated by the ideals of "women's culture," of a return to nature and the physical" - and things gets pretty racy from there.

So the environmental sentiments of 19th century back-to-Nature Prussian conservatism did well. They survived World War I in tact and soon found a home inside the National Socialist Party.

But Prussian socialism hit a snag.

There was a flaw in the socialist promise.

That "private property" thing.

Except for the most rigidly dogmatic cranks, people wanted to preserve the capitalist notion of private property; that is, they wanted to keep their stuff.

On the other hand, people wanted all that free stuff the socialists promised.

What to do? What to do?

The birth of fascism...

"You have everything I lack. You create the spiritual framework for Germany's reconstruction. I am but a drummer and an assembler. Let us work together."

Adolf Hitler speaking to Arthur Moeller van den Bruck. (66)

During the German election campaign in 1932, Hitler's National Socialists ran against both Marxism and, "the American system, or high capitalism", promising to take the best from each and create, "a new socialist man". (67)

"The Fascist conception of life stresses the importance of the State and accepts the

individual only in so far as his interests coincide with the State. It is opposed to classical liberalism [which] denied the State in the name of the individual; Fascism reasserts the rights of the State as expressing the real essence of the individual.

....

The maxim that society exists only for the well-being and freedom of the individuals composing it does not seem to be in conformity with nature's plans."

...

If classical liberalism spells individualism, Fascism spells government."

Benito Mussolini, "The Doctrine of Fascism", 1932...

In his, "The Coming American Fascism", Harper, 1936, Lawrence Dennis - noted American economist and anti-Semite - boasted that classic liberalism - that is, "18th-century Americanism" - would soon become a "laughing stock", and that, "liberal norms of law or constitutional guarantees of private rights", would be replaced by fascism, that is, "the enterprises of public welfare and social control."

"The Kapp Putsch [March, 1920] was not just against the government. It was against capitalism. [General] Ludendorff was behind Kapp. He wanted that the military and the workers to make a new government, a worker government. That would have been the first uniting of nationalism and socialism - and youth."

Dr. Hans Staudinger, socialist, one-time leader in the German Youth Movement, and an official in Germany's Economics Ministry in the late Teens and early 20s.

**

"I am proposing the integrated State, which will bring economic justice, and which will say with due authority: no more strikes, no more lock-outs, no more usury, no more starvation wages, no more criminal conspiracies against full production, no more capitalist abuses.

... if this be the Fascist State, then I proudly declare myself a Fascist!" (68)

Calvo Sotelo, from a speech made to the Cortes, Madrid, 1936. (69)

"Fascism, which is the very antithesis of Individualism, stands as the nemesis of all economic doctrines and all economic practice of both the capitalist and communistic systems."

"The Philosophy of Fascism", 1936, by Mario Palmieri, Italy's foremost fascist theologian.

Round the turn of the century, into the breach stepped a new view of Utopia - an idea that had been percolating for a generation, a "synthesis of socialism and capitalism", a "middle way", a "third way".

George Sorel, circa 1900, an advocate for violence to bring about socialism - but no Marxist - distrusted the "decadence" inherent in the Marxist variety of socialism and preached that socialism could work only by, "incorporating into it free-market competition". (Some argue that Mussolini abandoned Marxism because of Sorel's ideas. For more on Sorel, see his, "Reflections on Violence".)

In 1913 Hilaire Belloc published, "The Servile State", a criticism of this 'third way' idea, in which Belloc argued, "the effect of Socialist doctrine on Capitalist society is to produce a third thing different from either of its two begetters - to wit, the Servile State".

Sidebar:

Belloc defined the Servile State as...

"That arrangement of society in which so considerable a number of families and individuals are constrained by law to labor for the advantage of other families and individuals as to stamp the whole community with the mark of such labor we call the servile state."

But hardly anyone listened to Belloc's alert to the dangers to freedom lurking in this "third thing". Instead, they listened to fellows like Arthur Moeller van den Bruck, the "patron saint of National Socialism", who in 1922 published, "Das Dritte Reich" (The Third Reich), an "enormously influential book among German intellectuals" (and Prussian generals), in which Moeller proclaimed that socialists and conservatives must join forces to combat their common enemy, liberalism, and create a "new thing", a "German socialism", led by one strong man on a horse, acting through a loyal and youthful elite - ruthless, dedicated, unfettered by squabbling parliaments and laws.

Moeller's were not new ideas, but instead had roots buried deep in Germany's past. As Stern remarked in his, "Politics of Cultural Despair"...

"Arthur Moeller-Bruck came of age in the 1890's, in the decade of Langbehn's success. An esthete and an outsider, Moeller felt repelled by the culture of Wilhelmine Germany and early joined the "inner opposition" to imperial Germany. ... Whether litterateur or Landsturmmann, poet or publicist, he longed for a new faith, a new community, a new Reich. After 1918, he became the leading figure of the conservative revolution; in 1922, he wrote "Das Dritte Reich", generally regarded as the prophecy of Hitler's regime, actually the final political projection of his prewar cultural criticism. He was the last and in some ways the most admirable of the Germanic critics, and in him we can understand that the conservative revolution was not a spontaneous or reactionary opposition to Versailles or to the Weimar Republic, but was the reformulation under more favorable historical conditions of a nineteenth-century ideology."

Or as R. D. Butler observed similarly in his classic, "The Roots of National Socialism, 1783-1933", 1942...

"[Moeller's "Das Dritte Reich"] was not only the culmination of advanced political thought in postwar Germany. In a very real sense it was the climax of 150 years of persistent theory. In exploring the ideas of Moeller van den Bruck one threads a maze of romance and realism, prejudice and pessimism, bitterness and bravado, shrewdness and sentimentality, of an idealism which scales the heights of mysticism and plumbs the recesses of narcissism. And that maze leads one back past the new romantics, through the nineteenth century, ... back to the romantic origins [of German thought]. ... Moeller was thus at one with the other romantics in rejecting rationalism along

with materialism; and like them he identified rationalism with the west, holding that 'the Age of Reason was an affair of the West.' "

By the early 1920s, after 150 years of hand-wringing, most of Germany's intellectually anointed had outright rejected the West's Age of Reason with its materialism and liberalism, advancing rather a romantic world-view, one filled with idealism and mysticism ... still ubiquitous and powerful today - as the spirit of Obi-Wan Kenobi whispers, "Luke! Don't think! Trust your feelings, Luke!"

A few bits from Moeller's, "Das Dritte Reich"...

"All antiliberal forces are combining against everything that is liberal. We are living in the time of this transition. The change is taking place most logically from below and attacking the enemy where his power began. There is a revolt against the age of reason."

"Reason turned thinking into calculating man. It corrupted Europe. The World War was the shipwreck of the age of reason. ... The fight against the age of reason which we are entering on, is a fight against liberalism all along the line. In the course of this fight we shall realize how brief an epoch the Age of Reason has been; how circumscribed, unimportant and feeble its creation; how ephemeral its legacy. In England it has produced some practical things, in France some witty ones. But all great achievements on our side of the border were produced in the teeth of the age of reason. All eminent men with us, whether we think of Goethe or Bismarck, were un-liberal men. Every decisive event, the rise of Napoleon's power, the foundation of the German Empire, were un-liberal events."

"Liberalism has undermined civilization, has destroyed religions, has ruined nations. Primitive peoples know no liberalism".

"There are no young liberals in Germany today; there are young revolutionaries"

"Liberalism is a philosophy of life from which German youth now turns with nausea, with wrath, with a quite peculiar scorn, for there is none more foreign, more repugnant, more opposed to its own philosophy. German youth today recognizes the liberal as the enemy."

"... German socialism has a new national mission ... to place itself at the head of the oppressed nations and show them what are the conditions under which they alone can live. When we talk now of German Socialism, we do not of course mean the socialism of the social democrat . . . ; neither do we mean the logical Marxist socialism which refuses to abandon the class war and the internationals. We mean rather a corporative conception of state and economics, which must have a revolutionary foundation..."

But Moeller had competition south of the Alps, because, about the same time in Italy, Benito Mussolini, who, like the Prussians, perceived liberalism as the mortal enemy of mankind, had

broken with the Italian Socialist Party.

Il Duce!...

"When, in the now distant March of 1919, I summoned a meeting at Milan through the columns of the Popolo d'Italia of the surviving members of the Interventionist Party who had themselves been in action, and who had followed me since the creation of the Fascist Revolutionary Party (which took place in the January of 1915), I had no specific doctrinal attitude in my mind. I had a living experience of one doctrine only - that of Socialism, from 1903-4 to the winter of 1914 - that is to say, about a decade: and from Socialism itself, even though I had taken part in the movement first as a member of the rank and file and then later as a leader..."

Benito Mussolini... (70)

As had almost every leading fascist of the era, (71) Mussolini started out as a true-believing Marxist, your classic "red-diaper", his father a fire-breathing Marxist-activist who preached violent revolution and who named his son after Mexico's Benito Juarez, a hero of Marxist revolutionaries. (72)

By 1920, Il Duce had moved well along toward forming his own version of what Moeller called a, "corporative conception of state and economics" - fleshing out an "Italian model" of the synthesis of capitalism and socialism.

In Il Duce's utopia the capitalist exploiters of the industrial proletariat could retain nominal ownership of their dismal factories and shops, but the state would dictate prices, wages, working conditions, allocation of resources, profits, and disbursement of class privileges according to social goals dreamt up by a ruling priesthood who, through a system of state-run "Corporations", would, "control the market in the interests of the people". (73)

"Fasci Italiana di combattimento", Mussolini called it - Fascism.

And Mussolini-style fascism proved enormously popular round the world.

In 1928, in the preface to Mussolini's autobiography, U.S. Ambassador to Italy Richard Washburn Child wrote...

"...it may be shrewdly forecast that no man will exhibit dimensions of permanent greatness equal to Mussolini... The Duce is now the greatest figure of this sphere and time."

In 1926, Sol Bloom, Chairman of the House Foreign Relations Committee, said of Mussolini...

"It is his inspiration, his determination, his constant toil that has literally rejuvenated Italy..." (74)

Mussolini was a miracle worker! They all said it. Thomas Edison called him, "The greatest genius of the modern age"; Gandhi rued his own limitations because he was, "no superman like Mussolini"; in 1927 Winston Churchill called him, "...the greatest figure of this sphere and time" and added, "If I had been an Italian I am sure I would have been entirely with you" and "don the Fascist black shirt." (75)

And Cole Porter, writing, "You're the Top", expressed a popular idea with...

You're the top!

You're the great Houdini!

You're the top!
You are Mussolini! (76)

To top it all off, in the early 1930s, when Mussolini predicted that, "In ten years all Europe will be fascist", no one of importance thought to contradict him, and few noticed (or cared to notice) that Mussolini had turned Italy into a police state in which you had better watch your mouth lest you lose your job - or worse. Instead, they all marveled at how fascism solved all social problems. Fascism avoided the excesses of the Bolshevik "Red Terror" that had risen in Lenin's Russia, it pulled the fangs of the capitalist exploiters of the industrial proletariat, and it promised a cradle to grave welfare state. In short, fascism resolved all conflict between - as Il Duce used the phrase - "the haves and have nots". (For more on Mussolini-style fascist theology, and how well Mussolini predicted the future, see Appendix C, below.)

Sidebar:

In matters economic, Hitler's National Socialists pretty much mirrored Mussolini's "Italian model". As Schoenbaum puts it...

"... The Third Reich was notable for the far-reaching transfer of managerial decisions [away] from the managers. Wages, prices, working conditions, allocation of materials: none of these was left to managerial decision, let alone to the market. ... Investment was controlled, occupational freedom was dead, prices were fixed, every major sector of the economy was, at worst, a victim, at best, an accomplice of the regime.

A generation of Marxist and neo-Marxist mythology notwithstanding, probably never in peacetime has an ostensibly capitalist economy been directed as non- and even anti-capitalistically as the German economy between 1933 and 1939." (77)

Or, in more detail, from Bullock's, "Hitler and Stalin", 1991...

Between 1936 and 1939 the controls to which German business was subject were extended to include imports and foreign exchange, allocation of raw materials, allocation of labor, prices, wages, profits, and investment. Their impact varied between one sector and another but extended to agriculture as well as industry, the plan being responsible for producing and distributing the tractors and fertilizers. Business still remained in private or corporate hands, but to a large extent the government through the Four-Year Plan dictated what companies should produce, how much new investment they should be allowed to make, where any new plants should be sited, what raw materials they could obtain, what prices to charge, what wages to pay, how much profit they could make and how they should use it (after paying increased taxes) for compulsory reinvestment in their business or the purchase of government bonds.

...

In the summer of 1937 Goring announced plans approved by Hitler for an industrial complex (to be named the Hermann Goring Reichswerke) for extracting and smelting iron from the low-grade Salzgitter ore fields in

Brunswick. When the iron and steel industrialists produced a paper rejecting Goring's autarkic policy, he threatened them with arrest as saboteurs and compelled the private firms to invest some of their own funds in the state-owned competitor with which he now confronted them.

Or from Time Magazine, January 02, 1939...

The Nazi credo that the individual belongs to the state also applies to business. Some businesses have been confiscated outright, on other what amounts to a capital tax has been levied. Profits have been strictly controlled. Some idea of the increasing Governmental control and interference in business could be deduced from the fact that 80% of all building and 50% of all industrial orders in Germany originated last year with the Government. Hard-pressed for food-stuffs as well as funds, the Nazi regime has taken over large estates and in many instances collectivized agriculture, a procedure fundamentally similar to Russian Communism.

They nearly pulled it off here too....

FDR's "National Industrial Recovery Act" - the famous "NRA", passed by the 73rd Congress, June, 1933 (and soon knocked down by the Supreme court) - handed FDR much the same dictatorial economic power enjoyed by both Mussolini and Hitler, containing language such as:

"[The President] may investigate the labor practices, policies, wages, hours of labor, and conditions of employment in such trade or industry or subdivision thereof; and upon the basis of such investigations, and after such hearings as the President finds advisable, he is authorized to prescribe a limited code of fair competition fixing such maximum hours of labor, minimum rates of pay, and other conditions of employment in the trade or industry or subdivision thereof investigated as he finds to be necessary to effectuate the policy of this title..."

And in 1934 Roosevelt's National Planning Board was looking to Germany, Russia, Italy, and Japan for models of how a government ought best organize and control its nation's economy. (78) (79)

John Toland too noticed the similarities, when, in his "Adolf Hitler", 1976, he remarked...

[By January 1937] Hitler's achievements in the first four years had truly been considerable and impressive. Like Roosevelt, he had paved the way to social security and old-age benefits. And, like Roosevelt, he had intuitively divined that the professional economists, whose thinking was hobbled by accepted theory, had little understanding of the depression. Both leaders, consequently, had defied tradition to expand production and curb unemployment.

"Hitler also anticipated modern economic policy," commented economist J. Kenneth Galbraith in 1973, "... by recognizing that a rapid approach to full

employment was only possible if it was combined with wage and price controls. That a nation oppressed by economic fear would respond to Hitler as Americans did to F.D.R. is not surprising." Perhaps he understood economics too little to know what he was doing. "But in economics it is a great thing not to understand what causes you to insist on the right course."

Sidebar:

"Three-quarters of the Italian economic system has been subsidized by government."

Benito Mussolini, 1934... (80)

"In Fascist Italy the state pays for the blunders of private enterprise."

Gaetano Salvemini, 1936... (81)

There are plenty of books out there recounting how fascist economics had in fact wrecked Italy. Through a variety of accounting tricks and outright lies, Mussolini made Italy appear solvent and prosperous, which led everyone to believe that his fascist "Corporative State" ran like a well-oiled economic machine.

But it was all a charade - all bluff, bluster, and bull.

After 15 years of fascist economics, Italians were paying the highest taxes ever, and their standard of living had fallen below pre-WWI levels. By the late 1930s, the chickens had roosted, and no amount of cooking-the-books could hide the truth any longer: Italy was bankrupt, on the verge of collapse, and Mussolini welcomed war in desperate hope to pull his chestnuts from the fire.

Not to mention official corruption, which had risen in Italy to a scale that would make your average Cook County Democrat party-hack weep with envy and admiration.

Corruption seems to come naturally to socialist states. Former KGB Major General Oleg Kalugin, in his, "The First Directorate", 1994, gives this first-hand account of the ethics common among the ruling elite at the end-days of the Soviet Empire:

"During my years in Foreign Counterintelligence, I was constantly running up against the nepotism, cronyism, and corruption that increasingly plagued our Communist system. By 1980, only the most doddering Party bosses still believed the rubbish about the Soviet Union building a true, egalitarian system. Our Communism had degenerated over decades into a farce, a system in which the Party elite divided up the spoils and the plum jobs while the masses were left with cheap vodka, fatty sausage, and the chance to go once a year to a third-rate resort on the Black Sea."

In her, "The Coming Soviet Crash", 1989, Judy Shelton relates the chaotic state of the Soviet economy just prior to the collapse of the Soviet Union and Gorbachev's frenzied but futile attempts to inject capitalist market forces into the Soviet system

to save his Marxist butt.

And the bureaucracies...

Many historians point to the explosive growth of government planners and regulators in Germany and Italy and the Soviet Union as a significant contributor to the apparent reduction of unemployment under socialist rule in those countries. By sheer weight of numbers, armies of bureaucrats inevitably become a formidable inertial force in a society, obstructing change for fear of losing their sinecures and privileges and pensions. Gorbachev viewed the Soviet bureaucracy as an enormous, insatiable maw which the state could no longer afford to feed, and he openly planned to clean house - until the roof fell on his head.

* * * * *

Not all fascists subscribed to the "return to Nature", pre-industrial doctrines of the environmentalists.

Mussolini's Fascisti certainly did not.

But the Hitler's National Socialists did.

So the environmentalists stayed tucked away among the Nazis, biding their time, and most other socialists - excepting die-hard Marxists - had moved in with the fascists, and, by the late 1930s, fascism seemed to be doing well.

Sidebar:

On January 30, 1933, Hitler became Chancellor of Germany. On August 09, 1934, the German people voted whether or not to grant Hitler full, dictatorial powers. 43.5 million of a potential 45.5 million voters voted. Of those 43.5 million voters, 38.4 million (89%) voted "yes", make Hitler dictator. Thus, within a matter of months after Hitler entered the government, the German people voluntarily rejected democracy for dictatorship. That's how quick it can happen. (82)

For an account of how readily most German socialists (especially Social Democrats) threw in with Hitler's National Socialists, see, "Germany - 1866-1945", by Gordon A. Craig, Oxford University Press, 1978, part XV, 'The End of Weimar'.

And this Social Democrat side-switching worked both ways: Felix Dzerzhinsky, a Pole and Lenin's "Iron fist of the dictatorship of the Proletariat", along with many other Poles came out from the Polish Social Democrat Party to lock arms with Lenin's Bolsheviks. (83)

Social justice ... economic justice ... and, "How can you make a revolution without firing squads?"

"The greatest opportunity ever given to the world was thrown away because the passion for equality make vain the hope for freedom."

John Acton...

"Such legislation [abolishing private property] might well on first hearing sound attractive and humane; it would seem to promise exceptionally warm affection of everyone, and to have a particular attraction for those who blame the prevalent evils of constitutions entirely on the absence of communal ownership of possessions. ... But none of these [evil] things is due to the absence of communal ownership; they arise out of the depravity of human character."

Aristotle, "Politics"....

The whole of society will have become a single office and a single factory with equality of work and equality of pay.

Lenin, 1917 ...

"Democracy and socialism have nothing in common but one word: equality. But notice the difference: while democracy seeks equality in liberty, socialism seeks equality in restraint and servitude."

Alexis de Tocqueville, 1848 ...

Arise, ye prisoners of starvation,
Arise, ye wretched of the earth,
For justice thunders condemnation,
A better world's the birth.

From the, "Internationale" ...

"Where is Bukharin?" Bykov asked with a sly grin.

"Dead," I answered, rudely.

"You are right," said Bykov, "you are right. You can be absolutely sure that our Bukharin is dead. Bukharin, Rykov, Kamenev, Zinoviev, Piatakov, Rakovsky, Krylenko, Latsis, Tukhachevsky, Muralov, Smirnov, Karakhan, Mrachkovsky ... they are all dead ... the men who made the Revolution ... Stalin murdered them all."

From Chambers', "Witness" ...

The old principle: who does not work shall not eat, has been replaced by a new one: who does not obey shall not eat.

Trotsky ...

Scary phrases ... social justice ... economic justice ... phrases used to justify every brutal impulse of the most murderous regimes ever to appear on the face of the earth.

But, through the clever use of words, you can make it all seem right.

In his, "The New Class", Milovan Djilas reveals the trick...

"According to Marxist theory, there will be no classes and no class struggles; there will be no one to oppress and to exploit others; and there will be no need for the state. Until that time, then, the "most democratic" state is the "dictatorship of the proletariat", for the reason that it "abolishes" classes, and by so doing, ostensibly makes itself gradually unnecessary. Therefore, everything that strengthens that dictatorship, or leads to the "abolishing" of classes, is justified.... ."

Which made it perfectly reasonable for Gorge Bernard Shaw to state...

"We cannot afford to give ourselves moral airs when our most enterprising neighbor [the Soviet Union] humanely and judiciously liquidates a handful of exploiters and speculators to make the world safe for honest men." (84)

* * * *

"Soviet authority is organized civil war."
Trotsky ...

Bolshevist-style Marxist-socialism in the Soviet Union had problems.

In a general election held shortly after the October Revolution, the Bolsheviks drew only 25 percent of the vote, causing Lenin, in early 1918, to dissolve Russia's democratically elected Constituent Assembly, thereby obliterating the last semblance of democracy in Russia. (85)

Opposition to Bolshevism was so general and vehement and persistent that, to hold power, Lenin and later Stalin had to resort to a more-or-less permanent killing rampage in the Peoples Paradise - a necessary killing rampage; Lenin demanded a "war to the death against the rich, the idlers and the parasites", "cleansing the Russian land of all vermin, of scoundrel fleas, the bedbug rich and so on", and, "How can you make a revolution without firing squads?"

Thus, as Gregor Dallas observed... (86)

"The Bolsheviks made war on the country, on the peasantry, on trade, on the shops and markets, on transport, on the material foundations of urban civilization; they made war on the house, on the home, on the individual, on privacy, on decency - on human 'property' in the full sense of the term."

And from Pipes', "A Concise History of the Russian Revolution" ...

"The Bolsheviks did not acknowledge national boundaries, and in the usage of time, 'civil war' referred, first and foremost, to the political and social struggle between the Bolshevik regime and its own citizenry. In this broader sense of the term, the imposition of a one-party dictatorship and the incitement to class war in the villages, lay at the very heart of the Russian Civil War. So did the 'Red Terror'.

....

A political party that in free elections received less than a quarter of the vote, that treated as foe any individual or group that refused to acknowledge its right to rule and carry out the most extraordinary social and economic experiments, that regarded a priori nine-tenths of the population - peasants and 'bourgeoisie' - as class enemies, such a party could not rule by consent but had to make permanent use of terror. ... Terror was built into the very procedures and objectives of the Bolshevik regime, and for this reason - unlike its Jacobin prototype, which lasted only a year - it extended throughout its existence. And terror meant not only summary executions but a pervasive atmosphere of lawlessness in which the ruling minority had all the rights and the majority none, which impressed on ordinary citizens a sense of utter powerlessness. In the words of Isaac Steinberg, a Left SR [Socialist Revolutionary

Party] who served for a while as Lenin's Commissar of Justice, it was a 'heavy, suffocating cloak thrown from above over the country's entire population, a cloak woven of mistrust, lurking vigilance, and lust for revenge'. I affected and deformed everybody's life, day in and day out."

On the topic of socialist killing rampages, one must read, "The Black Book of Communism", by Stefane Courtois, a French historian - and one-time Maoist - who, in the 1990s, with several collaborators, researched the number of killings it took to keep Marxism alive across the planet, documenting events such as...

"From the end of the 1920s, the State Political Directorate (GPU, the new name for the Cheka) introduced a quota method - each region and district had to arrest, deport, or shoot a certain percentage of people who were members of several 'enemy' social classes. ... with victims selected according to precise criteria on the basis of a compulsory questionnaire. These quotas were centrally defined under the supervision of the Party.

...

This genocidal impulse, which aims at 'the total or partial destruction of a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group, or a group that has been determined on the basis of any other arbitrary criterion,' was applied by Communist rulers against groups branded as enemies ... "

Courtois came up with an estimate of 85 to 110 million total state-sponsored murders. A rough tally...

USSR 20 million;
China 65 million;
Vietnam 1 million,
North Korea 2 million;
Cambodia 2 million;
Eastern Europe ... 1 million;
Latin America 150,000 (about 17,000 murdered by Castro);
Africa 1.7 million;
Afghanistan 1.5 million.

These folks did not die in wars. No. They resisted their Party masters, and for it, died as "enemies of the people" - killed off like "noxious insects", as Lenin called them.

Sidebar:

Martin Malia, in his forward to, "The Black Book", remarks that, "Throughout the former Communist world ... virtually none of its responsible officials has been put on trial or punished. Indeed, everywhere Communist parties, though usually under new names, compete in politics."

And others wonder why Pinochet is hunted while Castro is feted?

In his review of, "The Black Book", Marc A. Thiessen observed, "The same week that Pinochet was arrested in London, Cuban dictator Fidel Castro was in Portugal, clinking glasses with heads of state at the Ibero-American summit."

Why do you suppose Castro gets a pass?

One reason might be the corking great support Castro enjoys among Hollywood's illuminati. Here's a partial list of Castro's disciples who have made at least one hadj to venerate up close the Great Man and his works: Robert Redford, John Sayles, Sean Penn, Danny Glover, Oliver Stone, Harry Belafonte, Saul Landau, Steven Spielberg, Jack Nicholson, Alan Arkin, Chevy Chase, Spike Lee, Sidney Pollack, Woody Harrelson, Ed Asner, Shirley MacLaine, Kevin Costner, and Leonardo DiCaprio. (87)

They worship him. Landau's reaction is typical. "They broke a lot of eggs", Landau has said, surely referring to the thousands of Cubans Castro murdered outright or who died in his tropical dungeons. And, stepping across the line into 'Koresch' territory, Landau went on, "When he comes into room, a wind follows him. He intimidates people by his very presence, he emanates, he vibrates power." (Imagine ... had Landau met Stalin, he'd have wet himself.)

Kevin Costner, describing his visit with Castro: "It was an experience of a lifetime to sit only a few feet away from him and watch him relive an experience he lived as a very young man."

Chevy Chase, at Earth Day 2000, proclaimed, "socialism works", "Cuba might prove that." And, "I think it's conclusive that there have been areas where socialism has helped to keep people at least stabilized at a certain level."

In 1998, following a three-hour visit with Castro, Jack Nicholson gushed, "He is a genius. We spoke about everything."

Steven Spielberg, after a long pilgrimage to Cuba, proclaimed that the time spent with Castro was, "... the eight most important hours of my life."

On the other hand...

In his, "Commies - A Journey Through the Old Left, the New Left, and the Leftover Left", a tale of growing up and living 'Red' in America, Ronald Radosh recounts his trip to Cuba in the early Seventies, his face-to-face encounter with the Marxist Shangri-la ... and the onset of disillusionment.

I finally got my chance to travel to Cuba. Sandra Levinson, who had come to New York City as a radical superstar, put the trip together. Sandy was part of the Ramparts editorial group associated with Bob Scheer and Warren Hinckle, and was also regarded as a hot number, known as much for her miniskirts and boots as for her radical ideology. A new group that Sandy created with Cuban help, called the "Center for Cuban Studies", sponsored this trip. Its neutral-sounding name hid the reality that the center functioned as the semi-official propaganda agency for Castro in the United States. In later years, the group would help Robert Redford gain access to Cuba for his film Havana and would negotiate with 60 Minutes to get them to hire Castrophile

Saul Landau as a consultant and commentator, as the price for giving the program access to Cuba and an interview with Castro himself.

Our group comprised a diverse body of New York radicals aside from myself, it included an honest but naive left liberal academic who taught Latin American studies at the City University; a radical psychologist who taught in the New Jersey college system; a man named Robert Cole, husband of the black Marxist Johnetta Cole, who would later become president of Spelman College and a director of the Clinton transition team for education in 1992; an activist named Suzanne Ross, a member of the Indochina Peace Campaign organized by Tom Hayden, who would found CISPES, the Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador; and the highly regarded black novelist, the late Toni Cade Bambara.

.....
It was quickly apparent, though, that however serious one's intention, traveling to Cuba with Sandy Levinson inevitably made one into a revolutionary tourist, one of those starry-eyed Western intellectuals who had traveled abroad to "socialist" countries since 1917 where they saw the future, as Lincoln Steffens famously said, and saw that it worked. The classic example was given by the German New Left author Hans Magnus Enzensberger, who later wrote that while he lived in Cuba among people who were in the direst poverty, most of the "radical tourists" knew nothing of the real situation existing in paradise. "I kept meeting Communists in the hotels for foreigners," he wrote, "who had no idea that the energy and water supply in the working quarters had broken down during the afternoon, that bread was rationed, and that the population had to stand in line two hours for a slice of pizza; meanwhile the tourists in their hotel rooms were arguing about Lukacs."

And so, while the Cubans were trying to squeeze into overcrowded buses in the August heat to get to jobs where they had to work an average twelve-hour day, my comrades and I enjoyed a lobster and shrimp luncheon in the best hotel in Cuba, the Havana Libre, formally the Havana Hilton, built the year before Castro's victory. There I drank wine and chatted with Regis Debray, then the leading French supporter of Castro, who had written a book called, "Revolution Within the Revolution", extolling Castro's guerrilla tactics as the single path for Third World revolt, and I sat in the sacred presence of Che Guevara's widow and other members of his family. They were engaging in the usual talk about the prospects for success of the worldwide revolution, and at the time were deeply concerned - as they were correct to have been - over the fate of Salvador Allende, their asset in Chile.

.....
The next morning, we began to experience some Cuban reality. Some of the women in our own group suggested we start the day by convening after breakfast to sing the Communist anthem "The Internationale" and then make the day's plans. Unfortunately, the plan didn't work, since we found it almost impossible to get breakfast served to us. To get anything to eat, we had to come into the coffee shop no more than two at a time, since a large group would be completely ignored. The government, by instructing its workers that their revolutionary duty prohibited accepting tips, took away all incentive to

serve, since their salary got them virtually nothing. I was reminded of the old New Yorker cartoon where a sign in a coffee shop says, "Tipping is considered an insult," while a box stands on the counter with the label, "Deposit insults here."

Over and over throughout the junket, we saw workers accepting dreadful working conditions without any perceptible complaints. One day our group went to the refrigerator factory at Santa Clara, which we were told produced four hundred units a day. The air in the plant was fetid, stinking of fumes and chemicals. The appliances were built with fiberglass insulation, and the workers wore no masks or protective devices to prevent them from inhaling the noxious fumes and fibers, which we knew could potentially cause cancer. The fiberglass residue was so heavy that it came down like snowfall. When we told the manager of our concern over the lack of protection afforded the workers, he told us, "If it were dangerous, Fidel would have informed us. Masks would cut down production, and we are certain that what we are doing is safe."

In Havana, we were taken to the famous Partagas cigar factory, originally built in 1905. Cigars were still rolled and manufactured by hand in the old manner; only one room was mechanized. The quality of the cigar, we were told, was dependent upon the old techniques of curing and treating the tobacco. The union representative said that the central economic board set quotas for production, and these goals had to be met. Here I received my education in the reality of socialist economics. What if workers felt that the quota was far too high and they could not produce the amount of cigars required? I asked. The union rep's answer was that the party's economists knew what was needed, and it was the workers' responsibility to meet the revolution's goals. If they could not fulfill their task working Monday through Friday, they would have to come in on weekends.

.....

We stayed in Cuba for more than a month, and ... , we saw and learned a lot. Yet although I had trouble admitting it to myself, the net effect was to make me start to rethink my most fervently held assumptions. It was an accumulation of small things that began to push doubts into the forefront of my thinking.

But those were the early days of the Revolution, one might argue. Give the Revolution a chance to mature, one might contend. O.K., let's give the *el triunfo de la revolucion* a chance; let's give el Lider Maximo another twenty-five years to pull off his socialist miracle.

In her, "Cuba Diaries - An American Housewife in Havana", Isadora Tattlin, the American wife of a European businessman, gives a matter-of-fact account of the four years she spent with her husband on assignment in Cuba during the mid- to late-1990s. A few excerpts...

"*Mira como a ellos les para tambien*" (Look how it also happens to them"), Lety says "First, the government announces to us we can never

have any eggs again, and we say, 'No eggs! How will we get along?' Then after that, the government says, 'OK, you can have eggs, but only four eggs a month,' and everyone says, 'How wonderful! We can have four eggs a month!'

.....
A group of women and children are standing in the square when we return. Their eyes fixed on us. It is noon and very hot, and there is no one in the middle of the shadeless square but them. They put their hands on the sides of the carriage, "Soap, soap," they plead. I open my mouth, but only a strangled "No" comes out. We get out of the carriage and push through them. More of them come out from the shadows at the sides of the square. "Soap, soap." They are almost moaning it. They put their hands on us.

Muna and I grab the children and run to a half-opened door in which a priest stands, motioning to us. He opens the door wide, and in we shoot, the women and children at our heels. He pushes the women and children back and closes the door in their faces. Nick is behind him, looking worried.

"When your husband told us you had gone off in the carriage," the priest says, "I knew this would happen to you on the way back. I was watching you."

"What should I have done?"

"You can't do anything," the priest says.

"Do they really think tourists carry bars of soap around in their handbags?"

"They believe tourists have everything," the priest replies.

.....
Farther down the street, a long line is forming in front of one of the few peso stores still open. The shelves in the window are bare but for a travel poster of Krakow. The line goes through the empty store to a barely lit counter in the back of the store.

"What's going on?" Nick asks one of the people waiting in line.

"They just got a shipment of talcum powder."

.....
Muna [Tattlin's Bangladeshi nanny] went to Bangladesh for a visit. She decided to stay there. It was too hard in Cuba. "The climate is like Bangladesh," she would say, "but we don't have such broken down houses", or, "in Bangladesh, people work."

.....
Sam, a Canadian friend of mine, Marianne, and I go to the airport to fly to Santiago. The plane is a Russian Tupolev, with wires dangling inside the cabin, seats and armrests missing, and steam emerging from under the seats and fogging the cabin.

.....
"Why are there always so many women standing by the side of the road, Mommy?" Thea and Jimmie ask me on the way home from school.

We see them on Quinta Avenida, which is the main artery of Miramar, a former upper-class neighborhood, and on the Malecon, which is a boulevard running along the sea, flanked by wide sidewalks and, on one side, a low seawall. We see them lingering on the curbs in latex spandex hot pants, halter tops, bike shorts, tube dresses, and sometimes decollete, full-length evening

dresses, the jineteras. Jinete means "jockey" in Spanish. Jinetera is a word invented in Cuba to mean "female jockey" because she rides the tourists.

It is said that they are not out-and-out prostitutes because they do not talk about price right away and say no if they do not like the man's face; if police stop, they tell them they are hitchhiking, for Cuban women tend to dress revealingly anyway and hitchhiking has become a common means of transportation since the beginning of the *periodo especial*, when bus service was drastically curtailed.

A jinetera will start out as a date, for the most part, going to a bar, to a nightclub, or to a paladar with the sexual tourist who has picked her up. Usually she will stay with the same sexual tourist for the entire length of his stay.

.....

Some visiting friends of ours - a married couple and their fourteen-year-old daughter - go to the beach. A slender young girl approaches them in the water. Our friends think she could not have been more than eleven years old. "Can I swim between your legs?" the girl asks the wife.

The wife thinks the girl is a forward child, but she spreads her legs in the water, and the girl swims between them.

She asks to swim through the husband's legs. He spreads his legs as well, but they are both feeling uncomfortable about it.

"Do your wife or daughter speak Spanish?" the young girl asks the husband after she has swum through his legs. "No," he says. She then asks the husband if he wants to have sex with her. "We don't need anything," the husband says. She excuses herself and moves to the next foreign couple.

.....

"Food, we have," Flora says. "It's a bit boring because it's always the same thing - rice, beans, rice, beans, sometimes chicken or meat - but there are practically no clothes or shoes."

Flora is wearing a shirtwaist of flowered cloth. It looks brand-new.

"That's a nice dress."

"This cloth was given to me by a friend who traveled to Spain. It's the only way."

.....

Natalia Bolivar's cat has disappeared. She searches the neighborhood, she goes door-to-door, she goes to her local CDR. Finally, it is discovered: some neighbors ate her cat.

[Note on CDRs: "In September 1960 Castro formed the Committees for Defense of the Revolution (CDRs), small neighborhood committees based around the cuadra (block). The leader is charged with surveillance of "counterrevolutionary" activities. The resulting social control is extremely tight. Members of the committees attend all CDR meetings and patrol constantly to root out "enemy infiltration." The surveillance and denunciation system is so rigorous that family intimacy is almost nonexistent." From, "The Black Book of Communism".]

.....

"Pretty run down," "It's in bad shape:" You hear that a lot, but no one prepares you for Berlin, 1945. Berlin, 1945, but routine, with tourists walking through it, taking photographs of the baroque and neoclassical and art nouveau and art deco remains, and people trying to sell you cigars, and kids and mothers and grandmothers living in the ruins, acting like it's a perfectly normal day, descending the stairs with water buckets to fill from tank trucks in the street because while there may be bathrooms in their apartments, there's no running water, and there hasn't been any for years. Sometimes a street is blocked off because a building has collapsed, its insides reduced to rubble by a fire brigade and shoveled into a big mound on the street to await pickup, which often, because of gas shortages, does not come for several days. The rubble heap attracts other garbage: corncoobs, carrot tops, blood-soaked rags, uncrumpling issues of Granma that have been used as toilet paper.

Putti, caryatids, Corinthian columns, sphinxes, fasciae, garlands, meanders, centurions, blare past elegance. Sidewalk mosaics announce the stores that were: JOYERIA (Jewelry Store), PELETERIA (Shoe Store), WESTINGHOUSE Y HOTPOINT. Wooden braces hold some facades in place. Yagruma trees grow out of second-story balconies - not out of pots, but out of the balconies themselves - their roots finding enough nutrients in the interstices between blocks to grow several stories, sometimes higher than the roofs.

.....

There is no flour in the Diplo, no sugar, and no salt. Lowering her voice and looking around, Lorena says she is sure she can conseguir some flour for us.

Resolver (to resolve) and *conseguir* (to get, obtain, attain, find) are two of the most frequently used verbs in Cuba and are used more often than the word comprar (to buy), for more often than not, it is not mere buying that you have to do in order to acquire material things.

.....

An encounter with Fidel, I say to Alex, brings to mind Asian theater: Kabuki, No, Chinese opera, Bunraku, with their carefully contrived movements, stock facial expressions, masks. He speaks for twenty-five minutes, listens for three, speaks for twenty-five, listens for three. Thai dancing, too: reenactments of scenes from the Ramayanda, flights over water, the powerful monkey general (Hanuman) of the North. This goes on in daily life, too, as if daily life in Cuba were one long rehearsal for an encounter with Fidel, in the formulaic responses, in the limited movements of *conseguiring* and *resolvering*, in the dissolving and re-forming line of the permissible, which one must locate, agilely, on a daily basis. Encounters with Fidel are full-dress performances: porcelain masks, pointed golden headdresses, false fingernails, dog-faced devils, mice. The room becomes electrified, as if stage lights have gone on, when he enters, and norms of human interaction are dispensed with. The beard and uniform are his masks. He performs and we watch, responding within defined limits, with our own less-splendid masks and stock facial expressions.

There is also the element of religious adoration. He arrives in mysterious,

roaring procession, is extracted from a black Mercedes, unfolds, performs his timeless rite. His time is up, he is carried, an animate reliquary, by phalanxes of devotees to another location, to perform again. He is the ark of the covenant, a moving holy Kaaba, the virgin goddess of Katmandu.

.....
Among the younger ones, whose circumstances are somehow harder to define, there's an affable lady from New Jersey (I don't yet know her name) who is the wife of Miguel Alfonso, an irascible Cuban bureaucrat with a slim gray ponytail who specializes in virulent anti-U.S. cocktail party remarks. They travel to the United States every summer for vacation on the Jersey Shore.

.....
Lola's brother's Neighbor's father-in-law has been kicked to death for his car. He was a man in his sixties, a retired orthopedic surgeon, who drove his car as a taxi in the evenings to make money. He waited for customers in the evenings just off the Plaza de la Revolucion.

[Soon after...]

They caught the boys who kicked Lola's brother's neighbor's father-in-law to death - two seventeen-year-olds....

"Take my car!", the boys said the old man said to them. "You don't have to kill me."

The boys told the police that they killed him because "the dead don't talk."
[Soon after...]

The seventeen-year-olds who kicked Lola's brother's neighbor's father-in-law to death have been executed by firing squad.

.....
There is a school at the end of our block. Every morning you can hear the children reciting:

Pioneros del comunismo, Seremos como el Che!
(Pioneers of communism. We will be like Che!)

The director of the school and an assistant come to our door this morning. The director tells us they need detergent, rags for cleaning the floor, disinfectant, a broom. There are little children in the school. She and the teachers are afraid for their health. They have had nothing to clean the school with for months.

Concha says to just give them a little bit because no matter how much you give them, they will always ask for more. I send Concha to the school with some detergent, rags, and disinfectant. Concha says we can't send them a broom, though, because we only have one and won't have any if ours breaks.

The director says she doesn't know how she can thank us - then asks us if we have any light-bulbs.

.....
The workers set up a board on sawhorses in the garage for a dining table. We serve lamb for the first meal. One worker says he has not eaten lamb since Easter of 1958.

.....
An American woman whose husband works at the Interest Section has

three little boys who play baseball with the Cuban boys at a baseball field off the Malecon. The field is ringed by houses with small porches that face the field. The other day, the American woman tells me, one of her little boys had to do something more than just pee. She was standing with him at the edge of the field, wondering what to do, when an elderly couple, sitting on their porch, seemed to understand the problem and beckoned to them that they could use their bathroom.

The bathroom, as usual, was barely functioning, but the people were so kind to let them use it that the American woman wanted to give them something. She thought to offering money would be too crass, so she offered them some homemade chocolate-chip cookies that she had in her bag.

The old man took one, bit into it, and started to cry. "I remember this taste," he said.

.....
Two women, more friends of friends, arrived here yesterday from the United States. They will not be staying with us, but they will be coming for lunch. They faxed us from the United States before they left, asking if they could bring us anything.

I faxed them back, asking them for three things. I faxed them to bring me the smallest Ziploc bags available in the supermarket (outside measurements 5 1/2 inches by 3 1/2 inches, officially called "snack bags"), clear plastic pages (available from photography supply stores) to hold 3 1/2-by-5-inch photos, and some tennis balls.

The women arrive at the house at 2 P.m. For two weeks I have been pleasantly anticipating the arrival of those Ziploc snack bags in particular. They are the perfect size for the children's school snacks. There are no pre-wrapped kid-portion snacks to speak of in Cuba. Everything they take to school is either homemade or bought in bulk in the United States or in Europe and brought in kilos of nuts, industrial quantities of raisins. That's where the little bags come in. They hold just the right amount of raisins, nuts, cookies, and so forth for school. The children enjoy opening the Ziplocs; it makes them feel they are getting something closer to store-bought pre-wrapped snacks. Lately we have had to improvise with plastic wrap and rubber bands. The children have no patience for the rubber band packages: they tear at the wrapping, spill the contents, eat less, and come home in bad moods. We find flattened raisins and smeared chocolate in the bottoms of the lunch boxes. Ziploc snack bags will make everything better.

Sandwiches, we put in pint-sized Ziploc bags, but we have plenty of those. I have been thinking happily, too, about how, when the right-sized photo pages arrive, I will be able to continue organizing the boxes and boxes of loose family photos (going back to the births of our children) that I have vowed to myself I will organize, a little every day. It is something that it's possible to do only in Cuba, because in Cuba there is often nothing - absolutely nothing - going on, and there is time, time like people had a hundred years ago, when they quilted or tatted or carved, a little bit every day, and who knows how much longer we will be here.

The women extract what they have brought me from a carrying bag. They

bring out four containers of tennis balls, a box of pint-sized Ziploc sandwich bags and a large box of Ziploc quart-sized freezer bags. They also bring out two packages of photo pages to hold 4-by-6-inch photos. I have plenty of 4-by-6-inch photo pages.

"Are the sizes all right?" they ask.

"Oh fine, these are great. Thank you," I say, but inside I want to cry. And this is not the first time this has happened.

Not receiving something you need is bad, but receiving something you don't need is somehow worse. Why do people think I go through the trouble of writing specific sizes in my faxes to them? Doesn't it occur to people that I go to the trouble of writing specific sizes of things because I actually need those sizes and not other sizes? Is it not possible for people to imagine that I have spent two whole weeks thinking of all the progress I would be able to make once those things arrived?

I go into the powder room, wash my face, say "Shit!" to the mirror as loudly as I can without other people hearing me. I grip the edge of the sink. "*I am a privileged foreigner,*" I repeat to myself. "*I am a privileged foreigner and I will be out of here someday.*" I take a deep breath and move back, smiling a smile that only I know the meaning of, onto the veranda.

The next time friends of friends come, I tell myself, I will write them the reasons for needing one size of a particular thing and not another size, all the reasons for needing a particular size, in long, obsessive, run-on sentences, not caring what they think, sentences that end with the ultimate reason, that of the well-being of the entire family, so that they, especially people from the United States, with stuff up to their eyeballs, will understand the reality here.

It's amazing what people think people need here.

People need anything made of rubber here. People need anything made of plastic. People need Tupperware boxes and Ziploc bags and coated rubber bands for hair. People need Rubbermaid dish drainers - the metal kind, coated with rubber, and the rubber trays that go underneath them - so that the wooden counters on which dishes drain don't stay perpetually humid and rot. They need solid Rubbermaid garbage cans, with snap-on lids to keep rats away. People need things to stack, conserve, preserve, classify, label, repair. People need ties for plants. People need tomato stakes. People need gaskets. They need gaskets very badly. They need the thick gaskets that go around refrigerator doors and insulated gaskets for oven doors, and they need the rubber rings for espresso pots and canning jars. People need coated wire that bends. People need golf tees to pound into worn screw holes so that they can insert screws again, and the springs and tiny screws that go inside locks and door handles and window locks so that the rain doesn't come in more than it already does. People need sheets of expanded metal to repair the seats of broken outdoor furniture so they can sit and play dominoes and wait for things to change, and they need Rust-Oleum so that the outdoor furniture doesn't rust through again. People need Thompson's Water Seal. People need burner parts for gas stoves, and new burners for electric stoves, so that they don't have to cook over fires in their backyards and cut down more trees and make their asthma worse than it already is. People need asthma medicine. Cuba has the

highest rate of asthma in the world, from the dust and the mold and the humidity, which they can't get rid of or escape from, for lack of parts.

OK, so they don't have lots of material goods in Cuba. But Castro has provided the Cuban people with the finest education and health systems on the planet.

Has he?

Let's see...

In his, "The Poverty of Communism", 1988, Nick Eberstadt, Harvard demographer/statistician, casts grievous doubt upon Castro's claims...

Irrespective of their political inclinations, it seems, the consensus of virtually all informed observers is that Cuba has made model progress against disease and ignorance, those two basic scourges of low-income countries.

This opinion is fundamentally unsound. It is not based on an examination of Cuban data, or of statistics from countries with which Cuba might most reasonably be compared. If Cuba's social progress is accurately reflected in its statistics, it has fared not better in improving health and reducing illiteracy than most other affluent Caribbean and Latin American societies. There is reason, moreover, to wonder whether Cuba has done even this well. Since the early 1970s, substantial inconsistencies have emerged in Cuban social statistics - inconsistencies that would be readily explainable only if Cuba's records were being deliberately falsified.

.....
In 1977, a U.S. Congressional delegation visiting Havana was told that Cuba's literacy rate had risen to 99 percent from 25 percent during the Castro years. This claim is directly contradicted by Cuba's own statistics.

Cuba's literacy rate, as measured by its censuses, passed the 25 percent mark long before 1900. By 1953, the date of the last prerevolutionary census, the literacy rate for those 15 and older was put at 76 percent - over three times what modern Cuban authorities claim it was. Despite the misrule of the dictator Fulgencio Batista and the disruption attendant to the revolutionary struggle for power, Cuba's literacy rate appears to have risen, albeit slowly, through the 1950s. Professor Carmelo Mesa-Lago of the University of Pittsburgh, an expert on the Cuban economy, has suggested that Cuba's literacy rate might have been about 79 percent when Castro gained control of the government. This would have been one of the very highest rates of literacy for a non-industrial country in that era.

.....
Instead of "starting practically from zero," as Mr. Castro has sometimes claimed, pre-revolutionary Cuba was [in fact] one of the hemisphere's more developed and literate tropical societies.

A check of the historical record is instructive. In the late 1940s or in the 1950s nine other Caribbean or Latin American societies had literacy rates roughly comparable to Cuba's. Of these, three seem to have reduced illiteracy much more rapidly than Cuba did. Dominica, Grenada, and Trinidad-Tobago all began the 1950s with illiteracy rates equal to Cuba's, or higher. By 1970

they had reduced their measured rates of illiteracy to 6 percent, 3 percent, and 8 percent, respectively - rates that Cuba not only had failed to attain then, but may not have attained yet.

.....

As best as can be told from these numbers, revolutionary Cuba's performance in dealing with illiteracy has been no better than that of its peers in the Western hemisphere.

.....

When the Castro forces came to power in 1959, Cuba was perhaps the healthiest Latin nation in tropical America; its statistical system was one of the Caribbean's best. In the years since the consolidation of Communist power, Cuba has gained the reputation of an exemplar of health progress. The notion that Cuba's performance has been exceptional is by no means limited to sympathizers with or publicists for Havana. Under these circumstances, it might be assumed that a solid body of statistical evidence can be found by which to document a broad-based and unambiguous improvement in health conditions in Cuba since the Castro revolution. Surprisingly, this does not seem to be the case. While Cuba does appear to have experienced advances in health since the late 1950s, its pace of progress does not seem extraordinary in comparison with those nations and areas against which it might most fairly be judged. Moreover, since the early 1970s Cuba's health statistics have been beset by peculiar and puzzling inconsistencies. While no foreign observer can pronounce on these inconsistencies with absolute confidence, the simplest explanation for these paradoxes would be that certain key health figures had been deliberately falsified.

.....

Many of the Castro government's proudest claims concern the transformation of health conditions in Cuba. Thanks to radical social reforms and people-oriented health care, it is argued, Cuba's infant mortality has been cut by more than 75 percent since 1959, and its life expectancy has come up to European and North American levels. Such reports have convinced many foreign observers that Cuba is a "socialist showcase," as a chief of staff of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee once described it.

The Cuban health record should be examined with greater care. As with education, the Cuban government did not have to start from scratch. Pre-revolutionary Cuba's last smallpox epidemic was in 1897; its last outbreak of yellow fever was in 1905. On the basis of its 1953 census, Cuba's life expectancy in the early 1950s has been calculated at 59 years. This may sound low today, but in the early 1950s it placed Cuba above most Latin American nations. It also placed Cuba above such nations as Spain, Portugal, Greece and Japan. Far from being an especially stricken nation, pre-revolutionary Cuba was in fact one of the developing regions' healthiest societies.

.....

By 1982, Cuba's officially reported infant mortality rate was 17.3 per thousand births. While this would represent a comparatively advanced level of infant health in the context of today's developing regions, it is not dissimilar from the infant mortality rates of a number of islands and societies in Central

America and the Caribbean, including Costa Rica (1981 infant mortality rate: 18.0 per thousand), Dominica (1978: 19.6), Grenada (1979: 15.4). Guadeloupe (1982: 15.5), Puerto Rico (1983: 16.0), St. Lucia (1977: 19.2), Martinique (1977-81: 16), the Cayman Islands (1981: 14), and Bermuda (1979: 15). (These are all places which the World Health Organization designates as having essentially complete registration of births and deaths.) And while a 60 percent reduction in infant mortality in a decade would incontestably represent an impressive accomplishment, such feats are, apparently, not unknown in the rest of Latin America. According to data from vital registration systems, the Latin American nation with the fastest pace of infant mortality decline since 1970 has not been Cuba. Instead, it appears to have been Chile. In 1973, Chile's registered rate of infant mortality was 66 per thousand births. In 1982, Chile's infant mortality rate was recorded as 24 per thousand - a 64 percent drop in nine years. Although Chileans may have lost political liberty under the Pinochet dictatorship, the junta which installed itself was apparently not insensitive to the political significance of appearing to "meet the basic human needs" of the population beneath it.

.....

According to Cuba's own life tables, infant mortality fell by about 32 percent between 1960 and 1974. Over roughly that same period, according to their [own] life tables, infant mortality fell 40 percent in Panama, 46 percent in Puerto Rico, 47 percent in Chile, 47 percent in Barbados, and 55 percent in Costa Rica. If Mr. Hill's National Academy of Sciences reconstructions are correct, infant mortality in Cuba would have fallen by only 25 percent between 1960 and 1978. If his estimates are reliable, the revolutionary Cuban experience would represent not the most rapid, but instead virtually the slowest, measured rate of progress against infant mortality in Latin America and the Caribbean for that period.

*

Compared to Lenin, when it came to killing people, the tsars were pikers. In the first few months of the Bolshevik Revolution, Lenin had more people executed than had the tsars in the previous hundred years of Russian history.

Here's a typical Lenin telegram found by Courtois in the Soviet archives:

"You must make an example of these people.

Hang (I mean hang publicly, so that people see it) at least 100 kulaks, rich bastards, and known bloodsuckers ...

Yours,

Lenin.

P.S. Find tougher people."

Lenin's word was law. So if Lenin ordered a hundred "bloodsuckers" hanged, a hundred "bloodsuckers" got hanged. And if you had trouble getting people to do the hanging, you just found, "tougher people". Even during his last days before his death - wasted to bones and half incoherent - Lenin was still firing out orders for the execution of recalcitrants. 'Arrest three

thousand in Minsk, and send a thousand to the archives!' And his death squads dashed out and did it. It is not a stretch to imagine this sociopath's last, mad, dying whisper ... "Kill 'em! Kill 'em all!" (88)

No telling where it all might have ended had not Hitler triggered World War II and thus tossed a monkey wrench into the works. The disaster of World War II knocked the fascists - and, thereby, the environmentalists too - off their feet.

Down.

But not out.

Time to reorganize.

First order of business: change the shingle on the front door; we can't go round calling ourselves fascist anymore.

Enter: The Greens.

The ideas that animate today's environmental movement reach back through the German Greens, back through Hitler's National Socialists, back through the Wandervögel, and back to 19th-century Prussian conservatives, to fellows like Langbehn and Lagarde, those haters of classic liberalism and capitalism and Jews and industrialism and technology and cities and Western Civilization in general.

But industrialism is a necessary condition for the Marxist-socialist dialectic to work; that is: Marxist logic depends upon conflict between the bourgeoisie and 'industrial' workers. Which means: no industrialism, no industrial workers; no industrial workers, no conflict; no conflict, no Marxism. Therefore, when today's environmentalists argue that only socialism can save us from the ravages of industrialism and capitalism, they cannot mean the Marxist variety of socialism. Then what variety of socialism might they mean?

Enter: "The Third Way"...

"[Fascism] does not accept the liberal dogmas as to the sovereignty of the consumer or trader in the free market.... Least of all does it consider that market freedom, and the opportunity to make competitive profits, are rights of the individual. Such decisions should be made by a 'dominant class', an 'elite'."

Lawrence Dennis, "The Coming American Fascism", 1936.

"... in New Orleans 10 years ago, we set out to outline what we believed ought to be done. Our approach came to be known as the Third Way."

William Jefferson Clinton, from remarks made at the Democratic Leadership Council's Hyde Park Retreat, April, 2000. (89)

"The free market, regulated in the public interest, is the best engine of general prosperity".

From, "The New Orleans Declaration", Democratic Leadership Conference, New Orleans, March, 1990. (90)

"... the State must regulate the market in the interests of the people..."

From Article #64 of the Socialist International's, "Declaration of Principles".

"Economic initiatives cannot be left to the arbitrary decisions of private, individual interests."

Mario Palmieri, "The Philosophy of Fascism", 1936.

" ... production cannot be left to the play of economic liberalism but must be planned systematically for human needs."

The, "Frankfurt Declaration", adopted by the Socialist International, Frankfurt-am-Main, Germany, 1951.

"We believe government should harness the forces of choice and competition to achieve public goals."

From, "The Hyde Park Declaration: A Statement of Principles and a Policy Agenda for the 21st Century", Democratic Leadership Council, August, 2000. (91)

[The state must] "...regulate markets in the public interest...".

From Anthony Giddens', "The Third Way - The Renewal of Social Democracy", 1998.

"We have moved past the sterile debate between those who say Government is the enemy and those who say Government is the answer. My fellow Americans, we have found a Third Way."

William Jefferson Clinton... (92)

"The Third Way is a unified theory of life which will marry capitalism and statism, and tie together practically everything: the way we are, the way we were, the faults of man and the word of God."

Hillary Rodham Clinton... (93)

"The Third Way is an alternative to both Capitalism and State Socialism."

Andrew Gamble and Gavin Kelly, theologians for Tony Blair's, "New Labor Party". (94)

"Fascism can be regarded as a compromise between pure individualistic Capitalism and Socialism, but is decidedly nearer to the latter than to the former."

Paul Einzig, from his, "The Economic Foundations of Fascism", 1933 - a British apologist for Mussolini, just one of many many many of the era.

* * * *

In April of 1999, while visiting the United States, in an appearance on, "Jim Lehr's Newshour", Tony Blair stated that his world-view included goals such as...

- a world with no borders
- a globalization of the world economy
- relief of Third World debt

During the same visit, while in the Midwest to speak to the Economic Club of Chicago, in an interview on local TV, Blair stated that: "forgiveness of Third World debt" and a "Marshall Plan for Africa" were goals of: "a new doctrine of international community", that is, "The Third Way".

Sidebar:

Mr. Blair failed to mention that, since 1980, sub-Saharan Africa has enjoyed the equivalent of four-plus, "Marshall Plans". (95)

I happened to see both Blair interviews, and, though I'd never heard the term, "Third Way", before, I did recognize the agenda. Tony Blair's Third Way agenda comes directly from the "Declaration of Principles" as published by the Socialist International. No surprise here; turns out the Socialist International lists Tony Blair (and Ehud Barak) among its current roster of vice presidents. Lots of international heavyweights in this Socialist International gang.

I'd already encountered the Socialist International while researching the "Earth Summit", 1992 (a.k.a. "United Nations Conference on Environment and Development", a.k.a. "UNCED"; a.k.a., the "Rio Conference") the great environmental hootenanny at which Mrs. Gro Harlem Brundtland, an organizer of the Summit, "freely acknowledged to reporters in Rio that the Earth Summit's agenda was based upon the Socialist International's Declaration of Principles". (96)

Sidebar:

Brundtland dwells among the loftiest aeries of contemporary leftism. Besides having served as a vice president of the Socialist International, and besides having held the Presidency of Norway, Brundtland currently heads the U.N.'s World Heath Organization, and no less a leftist luminary than the Clintons' own Donna Shalala has described Brundtland as possessing, "a large heart, a clear vision, and a strong voice", ... "a natural born leader", ... "my distinguished friend and colleague".

My, how they do flock together.... (97)

Sidebar:

When Brundtland said that the Earth Summit based its own agenda upon the Socialist International's Declaration of Principles", she was referring to the U.N.'s "Agenda 21", a 300-page document adopted at Rio and which defines itself as:

"... a comprehensive plan of action to be taken globally, nationally and locally by organizations of the United Nations System, Governments, and Major Groups in every area in which human impacts on the environment."

Agenda 21 establishes the "environmental" foundation for the Socialist International's brand of socialism.

At the time I read Brundtland's statement, curious as to who was this Socialist International, I found them on the Web and downloaded their Declaration (about 7,000 words). Based upon what their Declaration states, the Socialist International seems to be a kind-of-sort-of-internationalist-environmentalist-neo-Social-Democrat-or-whatever-bunch; they've crammed lots of stuff in their bag.

However, sifting through it all...

... because Socialist International theology allows for the private ownership of the means of production,
... and because, per Article #64, "... the State must regulate the market in the interests of the people...",
... the Socialist International therefore falls squarely among the fascist varieties of socialism - Articles #63 and #64 are pure Mussolini.

Sidebar:

When reading "The Declaration", one enters a fantasyland in which the past never happened and history starts today, at this very moment in time, and only a shiny-bright future lies ahead - provided we follow the Socialist International agenda.

In the real world: the Declaration point-by-point echoes all those 19th century Prussian utopians. They've said it all before. They've tried it all before. Hitler tried it, Mussolini tried it, Lenin tried it, Mao tried it, Castro tried it, and here comes the Socialist International, hot to give it another shot.

These guys never quit.

For example, do these words sound familiar...?

"We ask that the government undertake the obligation of providing citizens with adequate opportunity for employment...

We demand a broad extension of care for the aged... an all-around enlargement of our entire system of public education ... education at government expense of gifted children of poor parents ... the improvement of public health..." (98)

Of course these words sound familiar. One hears them or variations on them spoken during every election campaign in the United States. And they've been around a long time. In 1920, these specific words were written into the National Socialist German Workers Party platform. But they might just as well have come from a speech given by Lenin or Mussolini or Dick Gephardt.

And, somewhere along the line, the speeches always appeal to envy and contain elements of intimidation. Note these comments written by an anti-Nazi German in 1937...

"Hitler's speeches are all demagogic and laced with sharp attacks on the entire upper class. ... [With] The mounting hatred against the upper class, at the same time there is a growing aversion to all independent-minded people.

Whoever does not crawl in the dust is regarded as treacherous." **

There it is. Down with the rich! And if you disagree, you are treacherous - and it is a short step from "treacherous" to "enemy of the people", to be dealt with accordingly.

The Socialist International and Social Democrats...

"We have said that there could not have been social-democratic consciousness among the workers. It would have had to be brought to them from without. The history of all countries shows that the working class, exclusively by its own effort, is able to develop only trade-union consciousness, i.e. the conviction that it is necessary to

combine in unions, fight the employers, and strive to compel the government to pass necessary labour legislation etc. The theory of socialism, however, grew out of the philosophic, historical and economic theories elaborated by educated representatives of the propertied classes, by intellectuals."

Lenin, "Collected Works", Vol. 5.

The Socialist International started out Marxist, founded over a hundred years ago as a clearing-house through which the world's various Marxist-socialist parties could meet to match notes and form a common international agenda to advance.

In the early days, the Socialist International was composed mostly of the "Social Democrat" variety of Marxist-socialists, and Lenin perceived the Social Democrats as a greater threat to Bolshevism than were liberals or fascists. As a serious political force in continental Europe, classic liberalism was already dead as a dodo, and fascism consisted mostly of barely-organized roving gangs of head-busting thugs in Italy. But the Social Democrats were everywhere, in force, organized, respectable, and the only serious theological threat to Bolshevism.

Sidebar: On the death of classic liberalism in Europe ...

"The decline of liberalism was expressed above all in the abandonment of two principles that had been fundamental to [classic] liberal social philosophy. The first of these laid down that the main function of state institutions was to protect the safety, freedom, and property of the individual: questions of production and exchange lay outside their competence and should be left to private initiative, which gave the best assurance of prosperity. The second, more specific principle was that the relationship between the employer and the wage-earner was a particular kind of free contract between free individuals and must be left subject to the laws of such contracts: it was an infringement of freedom for the law to interfere in labour agreements or for trade unions to exert collective pressure on employers to improve conditions. These two principles, expressing what may be called the 'pure' doctrine of capitalism and free competition, were scarcely defended by anyone in the closing years of the nineteenth century."

From Kolakowski's, "Main Currents of Marxism".

By the early 20th century even prominent European "capitalists" had abandoned capitalism. For example, Walter Rathenau, a pivotal organizer of Germany's war effort and a committed German nationalist, who was also the CEO and son of the founder of AEG (Germany's 'General Electric'), in two best-selling books, "Days to Come" (1917) and "The New Economy" (1918), would argue: (99)

"In days to come, people will find it difficult to understand that the will of a dead man could bind the living; that any individual was empowered to enclose for his private gratification mile upon mile of land; that without requiring any authorization from the state he could leave cultivable land untilled, could demolish buildings or erect them, ruin beautiful landscapes, secrete or disfigure works of art; that he conceived himself justified, by appropriate

business methods, in bringing whatever portion he could of the communal property under his own private control; justified, provided he could pay his taxes, in using this property as he pleased, in taking any number of men into his own service, and setting them to whatever work seemed good to him, so long as there was no technical violation of the law; justified in engaging in any kind of business, so long as he did not infringe a state monopoly or promote any enterprise legally defined as a swindle; justified in any practice, however absurd or however harmful to the community, provided always he remained able to pay his way."

Thus, Rathenau rejected the profit motive and denounced wealth and the wealthy. He advocated heavy taxation upon luxuries, such as: tobacco and liquor and "large private parks ... horses: carriages ... costly furniture." And there must be: "sharp restrictions on competition, the merging of firms within the same industry, the participation of both government and labor unions in the management of large corporations, and the redistribution of political power according to economic functions rather than according to regional population." All of which made Rathenau a classic Mussolini-style fascist-socialist.

In 1922, while he was serving as Weimar's Foreign Minister, nationalist fanatics assassinated Rathenau, not because of his socialism, but because they perceived him as a "Versailles traitor", a "November criminal", and he was a Jew.

Lenin (as had Stalin) began his political career as a Russian Social Democrat. During the Second Congress (summer, 1903), over a doctrinal squabble, Lenin led a (narrow) majority faction out from the Russian Social Democrat party to form his own party, the Bolsheviks (meaning "majority", in Russian).

The fundamental theological conflict between Lenin's Bolsheviks and Russia's Social Democrats (often called, "Mensheviks", Russian for, 'minority') revolved round by what means the Marxist utopia should come about.

Both the Bolsheviks and Social Democrats agreed that the dictatorship of the proletariat - as Marx ordained - "cannot be effected except by means of despotic inroads on the rights of property". However, led by a priesthood composed of an intellectually and morally elite - "the vanguard of the proletariat", "the true keepers of the proletariat's consciousness" - Lenin and his Bolsheviks advocated violent revolution, convinced that the proletariat itself was by nature inert and stupid, and, if push came to shove, would always side with the existing regime.

Sidebar: Re the peasant class...

The Marxist argument places the peasantry in the class of "petty bourgeois", and, by definition, all bourgeoisie are mortal enemies of the proletariat. Therefore, at the time of the Russian Revolution, the 80 percent of the Russian population who owned a cow or a patch of land, by definition, became enemies of the Revolution, and, thereby, they must be destroyed. "They are so ignorant that they have no idea what is really in their own interest", wrote Felix Dzerzhinsky, and could be tamed only with Trotsky's "iron broom". (100)

On the other hand - also led by a priesthood composed of the intellectual elite - Social Democrats preached evolution, working within the existing system, but constantly pressuring it for change, disrupting its institutions, undermining its mores, battering its traditions, sowing doubt and confusion, confident they could - bit by bit, slow but sure - persuade the proletariat to legislate the Marxist state into existence. (101)

In 1905, Stalin railed at workers in Batum...

"Lenin is outraged that God sent him such comrades as the Mensheviks [Social Democrats]! Who are these people anyway! Martov, Dan and Axelrod are circumcised Yids. And that old woman, Vera Zasulich! Try and work with them. You can't go into a fight with them, or have a feast with them. Cowards and peddlers!" (102)

Lenin came truly to HATE! Social Democrats - ostensibly for their imperfect grasp of Marxist theology, but more likely because they challenged his global control of the Marxist revolution by offering a potent alternative to his Bolshevism; not all Marxists went for that "violent" bit. And there must have been a personal element in Lenin's hatred. First, he had Rosa Luxemburg demeaning Bolshevik theological purity by describing, not Bolshevism, but German Social Democracy as, "the purest embodiment of Marxist socialism", (103) and then came Friedrich Ebert, a German Social Democrat and the first President of Weimar, leading a Reichstag dominated by Social Democrats and other varieties of socialists, joining with Prussian generals to suppress the "Spartakist Uprising" (1919), thus foiling Lenin's bid to take Germany by coup.

In March of 1919, Lenin founded the "Third Communist International", or "Comintern" ("Communist International" as opposed to "Socialist International") specifically to combat the influence of the Socialist International and to advance his own Bolshevik vision of Marxist perfection. And Lenin's tactic worked pretty well; many Marxist parties jumped to the Comintern, while others split, some members joining the Comintern and others remaining with the Socialist International.

Sidebar:

A major event in the international socialist saga, this schism between the Bolsheviks and Social Democrats. For a close-up look at the running-battle between Lenin/Stalin and the Social Democrats, see Borkenau's, "World Communism, A History of the Third Communist International", 1939.

Sidebar:

In July-August of 1920, during the Second Congress of Third International, Lenin set the ground-rules for membership in the Comintern, the crucial requirement being: complete and unquestioned obedience to the leadership. Though ostensibly an international conglomeration of Communist parties from round the world, each of whom had an equal voice in its operation, in fact the Comintern was a department of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and, because Lenin ran the Central Committee, Lenin (and later Stalin) ran the Comintern.

A lot has been written about the Third International and the Second Congress of same. Google for "Second Congress Comintern" and you can even get a full set of minutes, a must-read for those guileless out there who still believe that Lenin and his gang had in mind anything less than total world domination.

Sidebar:

In point of fact, the Social Democrats' ideas conformed better with Marxist theology than did Lenin's ideas.

But it didn't matter.

Lenin had Iron Felix.

Inside the USSR, Lenin had little trouble with Social Democrats; those who failed to throw in with his Bolsheviki, he either had shot or shipped to the gulag.

Later, in Germany, Hitler dealt with Social Democrats similarly.

Despite the pounding they took from Lenin's Bolsheviks and Hitler's National Socialists, the Socialist International and the Social Democrats both survived, and, sometime after World War II, for reasons not clear (to me, at least), both the Socialist International and the Social Democrats abruptly deserted Marxist-socialism for fascist-socialism, now accepting the notion of private property.

Sidebar:

See the "Frankfurt Declaration" (it's on the Web), adopted by the Socialist International's First Congress, Frankfurt-am-Main, 1951. In it you find the profound shift away from the Marxist model of social justice to the fascist model. Also note the complete absence of environmentalism in Frankfurt. Only years later did it dawn on them to use the environment to attack capitalism (capitalism's industrial effluents are destroying the planet), and today you find the Socialist International's "Declaration of Principles" awash with eco-mumbo-jumbo, and environmentalism has emerged as the principal vehicle by which to advance the international socialist agenda.

In 1959, led by Willy Brandt at the famous Party Congress at Bad Godesburg, Germany's Social Democrats renounced Marx for Mussolini. (104)

Thenceforward (not much here for Il Duce to argue with)...

1. German Social Democrats would form coalitions with "bourgeois parties".
2. The "New Party Program" would omit all references to Marx. (Much as Blair's "New Labor Party" today omits all refs to "socialism".)
3. Key industries need not be nationalized.
4. The "means of production" might remain in private hands.
5. German Social Democrats accept a "social market economy".
6. The new Party slogan would be: "as much market economy as possible; as much planning as required"

(They say that that loud hum heard round Bad Godesburg in 1959 was Rosa Luxemburg, spinning in her grave.)

Later, with the collapse of the Soviet Union, the Socialist International has risen again as the dominant voice for the international socialist revolution, listing among its member parties the likes of the British Labor Party, the Sandinistas, lots of "Social Democrat" parties, a smattering of "Socialist" parties, and the odd "Revolutionary Front".

When I heard the Blair interview (above), I searched the Web for the "Third Way".

Found zip.

But today, you find a lot.

Some of it comes from the "New Democrats Online" and "The Progressive Policy Institute", two websites promoting the "Democratic Leadership Council" and the "New Democrat Party".

The "Democratic Leadership Council" defines itself as:

"...a nonprofit corporation exempt from tax under Section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code. It is not a political committee and is not organized to influence elections"

which is a neat trick, because its primary function is to crank out relentless propaganda for the Third-Way/German-style-Social-Democracy - which seems to have emerged as the unifying model for socialist-perfection among the leftist-sanctified in both North America and Europe - and heaping breathless adulation upon Bill Clinton, Tony Blair, and Gerhard Shroeder as champions of it all.

For example...

"Starting with Bill Clinton's Presidential campaign in 1992, Third Way thinking is reshaping progressive politics throughout the world. Inspired by the example of Clinton and the New Democrats, Tony Blair in Britain led a revitalized New Labour party back to power in 1997. The victory of Gerhard Shroeder and the Social Democrats in Germany the next year confirmed the revival of center-left parties which either control or are part of the governing coalition forming throughout the European Union. From Latin America to Australia and New Zealand, Third Way ideas also are taking hold." (105)

Sidebar:

On the ndol.org website, about two dozen U.S. Senators and seventy U.S. House Members, all traditional Democrats, also list themselves as "New Democrats".

Which compels one to wonder if these people have subordinated the interests of the United States to what they perceive as a greater good, that is, an international authority based upon Third Way theology.

On the other hand, others see the Third Way as nothing more than fascism with a paint job. Which it is.

So, what's all this got to do with environmentalism?

Well...

By making the Socialist International agenda the environmentalist agenda, Brundtland herself placed the world's environmental priesthood inside the Socialist International.

And the Socialist International is fascist.

Ergo, environmentalism has found its familiar old home, wed to fascism.
But there's a hitch in this marriage; these ain't the same fascists from the old days.
The Socialist International is Mussolini-style fascist, not National-Socialist-style.
For example, Rudolf Bahro, a founder of the German Green movement, viewed his Brave New Green World as one where we shall live in socialist communities of no more than 3,000, consuming only what we produce, and there shall be banned: trade among communities, mechanized transportation, computers, telephones, and all other modern technology. (106)
Therefore, Bahro's utopia - the Green's utopia - is not Mussolini's utopia, which accepts technology and industrialism - provided the state controls the market in the "interests of the people". (107)
Instead, Bahro's is that old National Socialist utopia, the utopia those 19th century Prussian conservatives had in mind; that is, the return to a pre-industrial, pre-urbanized, medieval society.

So the marriage of Mussolini-style fascism and Bahro-style fascism is a marriage of convenience only, one partner using the other, which will last only until both have achieved their common goal: that is, the destruction of those last few tatters of classic liberalism and its capitalism still extant.

After which?... your guess is as good as mine. Perhaps, to sort things out once and for all, we'll see another, "Night of the Long Knives".

Sidebar:

Interesting fellow, this Bahro. He began his political career as a Marxist (what else?), and, besides holding a professorship (what else?) at Berlin's Humboldt University where he taught "social ecology", he founded the, "Lernwerkstatt", an "ecological academy for one world", dedicated to promoting such New Age themes as: "deep ecology, eco-feminism, Zen Buddhism, holistic nutrition, Sufism, and the like" (reads like Harvard's undergrad course list).

In his, "The Logic of Salvation", 1987, as a (final?) solution for Mother Earth's eco-woes, Bahro called for a, "Green Adolf", asking,

"Is there really no thought more reprehensible than a new 1933?", and remarking, "But that is precisely what can save us! The ecology and peace movement is the first popular German movement since the Nazi movement. It must co-redeem Hitler", and, "The Nazi movement [was] among other things an early reading of the ecology movement."

Among Bahro's associates at the Lernwerkstatt, we find Jochen Kirchhoff, who has declared:

"National Socialism was a botched attempt at healing the world . . . and to ground politics in the spiritual."

And there is Rainer Langhans, "a former anarchistic 'wild man' of the 1960s German student organization SDS" who has written:

"spirituality in Germany is named Hitler", and, "We have to be, so to speak, the better fascists." (108)

Sidebar:

There actually exists, "The Libertarian National Socialist Green Party", found at,

"www.nazi.org", who, in-your-face, combines good old fashioned National Socialism with environmentalism.

Why...

What puzzles me most about these people is not how they do what they do, but why? The 'how' is easy - the propaganda, the lies, distortions, misrepresentation of facts, the appeal to the greed, sloth, envy, and gullibility of the proles - Hitler and Lenin had it down pat; the techniques have not changed since, and they work. But we now have a grisly, meticulously documented, 80-year record of where it all leads. So WHY do they persist? In the face of the record, what motivates these people to hang on to the terrible past so passionately and to believe the things they believe?

Persons much more knowledgeable than I have suggested possibilities. For example, in his "1984", Orwell, who understood the socialist mind as well as anyone has ever understood it, has O'Brien say to Winston Smith...

"You could grasp the mechanics of the society you live in, but not its underlying motives. Do you remember writing in your diary, 'I understand *how*, I do not understand *why*'? It was when you thought about 'why' that you doubted your own sanity.

.....

Now I will tell you the answer to your question. The Party seeks power entirely for its own sake. We are not interested in the good of others; we are interested solely in power. Not wealth or luxury or long life or happiness; only power, pure power.

...

One does not establish a dictatorship in order to safeguard a revolution; one makes a revolution in order to establish a dictatorship. The object of persecution is persecution. The object of torture is torture. The object of power is power. Now do you begin to understand me?"

For Orwell, then, the motive lies in a blind lust after pure power, advanced and preserved by terror. As O'Brien tells Winston, "If you want a picture of the future, imagine a boot stamping on a human face - forever."

But David Horowitz, who grew up with and spent half a lifetime among socialists, proposes a different motive...

"The effort to produce a super race of socialist men and women created monstrosities instead

... For behind the revolutionary pursuit of the impossible ideal lies a deep hatred for the human norm, an unquenchable desire for its annihilation.

... Self-hatred is the dark side of the ambition to exceed all previous human possibility, and the ultimate root of the revolutionary ideal. ...

Totalitarian terror is the necessary means for an agenda whose aim is to erase the past and remake the human soul. The totalitarian state is not an aberration of the

progressive spirit, but its consummation." (109)

So for Horowitz, the motive lies in self-hatred.

But the results are the same as for Orwell ... totalitarian terror.

Perhaps they're both right, or perhaps they're both wrong; I don't know. But whatever the motive is, it is something sick, encouraging and sanctioning as moral mankind's most brutal instincts, and, once set loose, the "progressive spirit" feeds on its own momentum to a point of depravity where it can survive only through the ruthless, bloody suppression of dissent.

It always has. It always will.

Appendix A.

In his, "The Politics of Cultural Despair - A Study in the Rise of German Ideology", 1963, Fritz Stern singled out Paul de Lagarde (1827-1891) and Julius Langbehn (1851-1907) as best representing the ideas that comprised the latest in 19th and early-20th century German thought. Below, find a few excerpts from Stern, from which you get a real feel for the essence of National Socialism and its hatred of liberalism and capitalism and industrialism and technology and Jews. If you fancy yourself as holding the very latest twenty-first-century-progressive ideas, then too late; Lagarde and Langbehn beat you to the punch.

Paul de Lagarde...

Lagarde was a voracious reader, and the romantic writers were his favorites. He read and reread Karl Lachmann's famous edition of Wolfram von Eschenbach, as well as Achim von Arnim, Barthold Georg Niebuhr, and Savigny. He was deeply impressed by Jakob Grimm's German mythology, which was published in 1855. Lagarde's romantic strain was strong and never died.

The "annus mirabilis" of German liberalism, 1848, passed Lagarde by; his sole political act had been to don the black and white cockade of Prussian conservatism. "Consonant with my education and my family ties, I was entirely on the side of the king, whose distaste for a constitution seemed to us fully justified by the consequences which had attended the French constitutional regime."

"The nation, like the individual, has a soul, and in the last analysis, for nations as well as individuals, the soul alone possesses value." Therefore all the material triumphs of imperial Germany counted for nothing, indeed were an evil, because they endangered the German soul. Lagarde's criticism was quickened by his nostalgic recollection of an earlier, uncorrupted Germany, where the heroic essence of Germanism, of "Deutschtum", had prevailed, and had been embodied in a unique race of German heroes.

Scattered throughout the "Deutsche Schriften" were the distorted criticisms of modernity that were characteristic of men with utopian inclinations, and that could have been composed by Carlyle or Tennyson as easily as by Lagarde. The evils of the

industrial society, particularly in its infancy, were great; they were made more unbearable still by those writers who tortured the minds of men by nostalgic dreams of a past that never was and prophesied a future that could never be, all the while vilifying, but not explaining, the present.

Lagarde assumed that most Germans were unhappy and that the new commercial society bred nothing but this discontent and resentment. He assumed, in short, that everybody would sooner or later be afflicted by the same despair that oppressed him. Already in 1853, in his first essay, he wrote: "We are all thoroughly discontented." Thirty-five years later, after Germany had been successfully unified, he complained: "Our life is more joyless than anyone can imagine." This was the insistent theme of his cultural criticism. No work was done that pleased, no art produced which was creative, no faith existed which ennobled and inspired. The typical "Burger" chased after comfort and success, with no sense for the world beyond. Nothing but dissatisfied and disgruntled hedonism. Nothing but mediocrity, dull, drab middleclass life, materialism and cultural sterility. ... His charges against the emptiness of urban existence and against the corruptive impact of commercial life rounded out the usual picture of the conservative-esthetic protests. "Better to split wood than to continue this contemptible life of civilization and education; we must return to the sources [of our existence], on lonely mountain peaks, where we are ancestors, not heirs."

To many Germans, then, Lagarde was an idealist, in the same way that Hitler was to be an idealist for another generation, and in a way that Marx and Bismarck never were. He helped to establish the idealism of antimodernity, and, as we shall presently see, he incorporated into his program of reform radical provisions for violence and tyranny. But these, as Lagarde's reputation was to prove, could be sanctioned without depriving the resentment against modernity of its idealistic respectability.

... he thought of himself, and was hailed, as the prophet of Germanism, of the Vorkstum that was still unspoiled.

Lagarde believed man to be a creature of will and energy and sentiment, for whom reason was of secondary importance: "The core of man is not his reason, but his will . . . For like everything that is good, knowledge also enters through the will, whose wings are sensibility and imagination, and whose driving force is love."

In the 1850's, philosophers and publicists tried to define a conservative creed, and all of them, most notably Friedrich Julius Stahl and Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl, condemned the nascent capitalistic and commercial order and hoped to restore in some form the idyllic life of the small town, of the self-sufficient farmer and artisan. ... In all these matters Lagarde was less specific and systematic than his contemporaries, but he breathed the same nostalgia as they did for a Germany that was free of all the social evils of a liberal, commercial society. The nostalgia of the right had as its counterpart the utopias of the left; the 1850's were critical years in the history of socialist theory, especially Marxism, and Lagarde's passionate concern for the unity of the German people reflected his fear that the working classes would become alienated from the existing order.

The focus of Lagarde's attack on Bismarck's Germany was the continuing divisiveness of the new Reich. The political act of unification had not created unity, indeed, the institutions of the empire were breeding new conflicts. He fulminated in particular against the "Parlamentarismus" and the multiple-party system, because these embodied and exacerbated conflict, rather than resolving it.

... Toward the end of his life, more and more insistently he called for a "Führer" who would so completely represent the people that in him they would be united and his command would be their will.

The negative expression of Lagarde's dedication to a Germanic or folk community was his violent hatred of all divisive agents in German society and of modern open society in general. He loathed the new industrialized life, with its impersonal, purely commercial ties, and longed for some rural idyll where a harmonious hierarchy had prevailed. Capitalism was evil, and all parasitic carriers of it should be extirpated. It was characteristic of this kind of conservative protest against capitalism that the main grievance was directed against those institutions - stock jobbing and banking, for example - that seemed to violate the sacred principle that a man should earn his daily bread. At bottom was a revulsion against the worship of money, against the elevation of traders over heroes. ... His hatred of the modern economic society fastened on two villains, the Jews and the liberals. They were the agents of a gigantic conspiracy aimed at the heart of Germany.

This anticapitalistic sentiment was of course endemic in the Western world; its history has yet to be written, and when it is, it most likely will reveal that this anticapitalistic mood sprang not only from nostalgia for the simple life of some lost Arcadia, but also from nostalgia for a religious faith that seemed doomed to extinction at the same time.

Jews and capitalists were synonymous, and Lagarde demanded their simultaneous destruction.

The identification of Jewry with the evils of capitalism became popular in Germany in the early 1870's.

To those who deplored modernity and the open society the Jew was an obvious target.

Certainly the Jews, German and non-German, were overwhelmingly attracted to the larger cities, where they engaged and excelled in such traditionally denigrated enterprises as journalism, finance, and commerce. Hence it became customary to identify Jews with all the hateful innovations of the new age.

In 1894, Hermann Bahr published a study of anti-Semitism based on his interviews with German and European writers and public figures, and concluded that "German anti-Semitism is reactionary, it is a revolt of the petty bourgeoisie against industrialization, of Germanic youth against modernity."

The Jews had "natural allies, the liberals," and Lagarde's attack on them was more pervasive, if less vitriolic, than on the Jews. Like most of the Germanic critics after him, Lagarde thought that both Jews and liberals were the agents of subversion, conspiring against the true Germanic society of faith and hierarchy. For Lagarde, liberalism was not primarily a political creed nor a particular set of political institutions; it was the dominant, diabolical, and thoroughly alien force in German culture, the force impelling toward sham and modernity.

... As early as 1853, Lagarde had written: "Our liberalism is always an object of pity for me," and twenty-five years later he ranted against "the principles of 1789 which have been transplanted to Germany and whose representatives we call liberals." Like all Germanic critics after him, Lagarde was repelled by the liberals' tolerance: "This is the enemy we have to fight, because it - this brand of tolerance - is fatal to everything serious."

Liberalism was also blamed for promoting materialism and Philistinism, for destroying metaphysics, converting scientists and educated men into mere fact finders, for encouraging dilettantism. The liberals eschewed the total view, the whole picture, and hence had no thorough-going "Weltanschauung" and no understanding of the religious life. They were pagans, he charged, and pedants as well, and he railed against this unpalatable combination. Tying Hegel and liberalism together - as did many conservatives of the 1850's - Lagarde alleged that both were responsible for feeding Germans every scrap of knowledge from the past instead of encouraging the development of a new and authentically German spiritual life. Liberalism, in its utter sterility, was responsible for all the cultural ills of the age. In Lagarde's hands it became a term of abuse which stood for cosmopolitanism, for materialism, for false individualism and tyranny, for oligarchy and democracy; the term comprehended everything - and nothing. It was the secular equivalent of Evil. In the end, even Lagarde's uncritical biographer had to conclude: "The liberals had more or less to accept the responsibility for all that did not suit [Lagarde] in the modern world."

Certainly the political machinery and the economic institutions of liberal Germany did not suit him. His denunciation of Manchesterism, of the unfettered capitalistic society, was entirely in keeping with the dominant mood of German conservative critics. It is an important fact that at the very moment when German capitalism entered its exuberant maturity, German intellectuals and industrialists turned strongly against laissez-faire and condemned it as a foreign importation. Ever since, Germans have been loath to admit that domestic conflict and competition were inevitable concomitants of modern society. Like so many other Germans, Lagarde believed that the denial of the existence of conflict was in itself tantamount to its abolition.

Lagarde also belonged to the handful of heroes that the later Wandervögel acclaimed. To them he appeared as the sworn enemy of their fathers, hence their friend. Other student associations cherished his memory as well, and the "Burschenschaftliche Bucherei" devoted one of its official publications to a detailed, sympathetic exposition of Lagarde's thought.

Julius Langbehn....

Langbehn's vilification of the dullness and mediocrity of adult, Philistine society perpetuated the nineteenth-century tradition of contempt for the bourgeoisie. ... But in his thundering against bourgeois life, one can hear the peculiar note which the National Socialists later tirelessly blared forth. The bourgeoisie had become "rootless," alienated from folk and nature, had lost its "Volksthümlichkeit" and childlike nature (Kindlichkeit) and thus had forfeited the prerequisites of manhood and greatness. And again, like so many of his conservative contemporaries, Langbehn roundly condemned all urban and especially all metropolitan communities.

.....

A new age, still unfamiliar to itself, with its intellectual concerns still undefined, will often gain self-knowledge for the first time from a programmatic book, even a bad book. For the decade of the 1890's, everywhere in the Western world a creative, groping, innovating period, such a book, at least for Germany, was Langbehn's "Rembrandt als Erzieher" ("Rembrandt as Educator"), published in 1890.

The decade was one of strife and unrest, when the cultural discontent which previously had been the complaint of a few artists and intellectuals became the faddish lament of the many. The revolt against modernity, the attack on civilization, gathered force, hundreds of voices inveighed against all sorts of evils and repressions, and multitudes of people everywhere were repeating these imprecations. ... Everywhere, and not only in Germany, sprang up the cry for greater freedom, for self-expression, for more experience and less theorizing, for a fuller life, for the recognition of the tortured, self-torturing individual. The intensity of this awakening in Germany can be gauged by the instantaneous success of Langbehn's book. The decade that ended with the exuberant fling of the German Youth Movement began with this wild book, this breathless tirade, this rhapsody of irrationalism.

However wild and chaotic the book was, its intent was unmistakable: to condemn intellectualism and science, to denounce modern culture, to praise the "free" individual and the true Germanic aristocrat, to revive the German past. Rembrandt, celebrated as a German, was to be the teacher of a new and final German reformation. Art, not science or religion, was the highest good, the true source of knowledge and virtue. ... "Rembrandt als Erzieher" was a shrill cry against the hothouse intellectualism of modern Germany which threatened to stifle the creative life, a cry for the irrational energies of the folk, buried for so long under layers of civilization.

Langbehn lacked the critical faculty which alone could have cast his intuitive impressions and vague aspirations into some kind of an analytical scheme or order. What emerged instead was a crude, even absurd, "Weltanschauung", a pseudo-religious, philosophical, mystical way of looking at the world, a characteristic mixture of thought and dream that has enjoyed great popularity in modern, secular Germany. The core of Langbehn's "Weltanschauung" was negative and nostalgic. He rejected contemporary culture, sneered at reason and feared science, and the temper of his

criticism evinced a desire not so much for the reform as for the annihilation of modern society. This rejection of modernity, and of the rational-scientific tradition which he identified with it, was the pervasive element of the book. However incoherent its expression, the book was dominated by a consistent aspiration toward a form of primitivism which, after the destruction of the existing society, aimed at the release of man's elemental passions and the creation of a new Germanic society based on Art, Genius, and Power.

One theme dominated the entire book: German culture was being destroyed by science and intellectualism and could be regenerated only through the resurgence of art and the rise to power of great, artistic individuals in a new society. Hatred of science dominated all of Langbehn's thought just as hatred of liberalism had dominated Lagarde's thought. Neither critic defined the object of his hatred, and in reality for both of them the two terms had become synonyms for evil. Undoubtedly he hated science as well because it presumed to penetrate the mystery of life and nature, to make comprehensible a universe that Langbehn wanted left shrouded in poetic obscurity.

Langbehn's attack [on science] ... was the irritated gesture of a man unwilling to admit the validity of science, unwilling to recognize the supremacy of intellect, unwilling even to study the findings of science. His was the prototype of the modern antiscientific temperament, yearning for mystery and religion, and disdainful of intellectual effort.

Langbehn's diatribes against modern education always included his avowal that he was the defender of the child; the purity and certainty of its instincts were recurrent themes in his thought Even in an urban culture the child had retained its closeness to nature and possessed an immediacy of perception which the overeducated adult lacked. "Simplicity is the panacea for the evils of the present." In the new Germany the talents and joys of the child would be preserved in the adult; even now the "genuine and pure" Germans had retained more of the childlike in their nature than had other peoples and none more so than his own unspoiled folk from "Niederdeutschland".

Langbehn had made every effort to woo the young. He was one of the first nationalist critics to propagate "the cult of youth." His book ended with repeated incantations to German youth: "The new intellectual life of the Germans is not a matter for professors, but for the German youth, especially for the uncorrupted, un-miseducated (unverbildeten) and uninhibited youth. Right is on its side."

Langbehn's vilification of the dullness and mediocrity of adult, Philistine society perpetuated the nineteenth-century tradition of contempt for the bourgeoisie. ... But in his thundering against bourgeois life, one can hear the peculiar note which the National Socialists later tirelessly blared forth. The bourgeoisie had become "rootless," alienated from folk and nature, had lost its "Volksthümlichkeit" and childlike nature (Kindlichkeit) and thus had forfeited the prerequisites of manhood and greatness. And again, like so many of his conservative contemporaries, Langbehn

roundly condemned all urban and especially all metropolitan communities.

Berlin epitomized the evil in German culture: "Spiritually and politically, the provinces should be maneuvered and marshaled against the capital." The poison of commerce and materialism, or, as he sometimes called it, the "Amerikanisierung" [Americanizing] of Germany, was corroding the ancient spirit of the Prussian garrison town; even the natural defenders of the old order, the aristocracy and officer corps, capitulated before the new power, Mammon, and allowed the nouveau riche into society. Forty years later, millions of Germans were to echo the charge that, "the crude cult of money, a North American and at the same time a Jewish characteristic, predominates in Berlin more and more."

Nowhere was his influence more direct, nowhere did all the strands of his being and all the strands of the period coincide more closely than in that spontaneous, activist revolt against modernity, the Youth Movement. The comradeship of youth with nature, the rebellion against bookish learning, the simple, hardy life - these were the living thoughts of the Rembrandt book. Between Langbehn and the style of the decade - its search for values and morality, its melancholy and its hope, its individualism and its craving to organize, its fear and its grandiosity - a close affinity prevailed.

The German Youth Movement (the Wandervögel) erupted like a great phenomenon of nature. Out of unsuspected depths leapt forth defiance, hate, yearning, love, all the hopes and fears that for decades had been repressed, denied, forcibly sublimated. The movement was spontaneous, translating sentiment directly into action, with thought as a kind of intermittent and subordinate guide. Even the briefest description of the Youth Movement will demonstrate its close affinity, historical and psychological, to Langbehn. What he had confusedly articulated, the youths exuberantly acted out; they heeded his message, as they willingly acknowledged, and the few indispensable adults who helped and protected them, had also been followers of the Rembrandt-deutsche.

The movement had all the intensity of love in it, but of a love that had no future. The more enthralling the "Bunderlebnis", the "Fahrten", the greater the agony of its end, and of the gradual reentry into the real world, into their father's culture. They had to "get-on," as it was called, get-on in a drab, grubby world, and neither the wisdom of the "Gymnasium" nor the wild exuberance of the "Fahrten" prepared a boy quietly to accept his ticket, to do his job, to scramble, and to die. The Youth Movement was a complicated failure, but it called attention to the deeply rooted resentments and unsatisfiable aspirations of German youth.

The founder and greatest leader of the "Wandervögel", Karl Fischer, was clearly a disciple of Langbehn, and Blüher was right in calling Fischer that "Germanically thinking 'Rembrandt-Deutsche'." Frequently on the "Fahrten" he would read from the Rembrandt book, and he and others in the movement felt a greater affinity for Langbehn and Lagarde than for Nietzsche. ...

Beyond the demonstrable historical link between Langbehn and the Youth Movement

rests a deeper relationship, which helps to clarify his relationship to the other movements of his time as well. Langbehn was the prototype of the "Wandervögel" and of those Germanic movements which hoped to destroy the supremacy of reason and establish a vital, populistic, primitivistic society. At the beginning of a decisive cultural epoch in modern Germany, he had expressed his own alienation from society, his hatred of modernity and his search for salvation, finding it first in art and then in religion, but always in the community of a regenerated Volkstum. His discontent and his utopian search were symptomatic for the next generation, which only in the First World War found a release from its discontent and thus, for a time, from itself.

Appendix B.

Robert, put on your thinking cap; test exercise follows.

Below, in five-hundred words, compare and contrast Kaczynski's, Gore's, and Hobsbawm's world-views.

"The Industrial Revolution and its consequences have been a disaster for the human race. ... We therefore advocate a revolution against the industrial system. ... Its object will be to overthrow the economic and technological basis of the present society."

Dr. Theodore Kaczynski, from his manifesto, "Industrial Society And Its Future", 1995.

"Modern industrial civilization, as presently organized, is colliding violently with our planet's ecological system. The ferocity of its assault on the earth is breathtaking, and the horrific consequences are occurring so quickly as to defy our capacity to recognize them. [Therefore] We must make rescue of the environment the central organizing principle for civilization."

Albert Gore, from his, "Earth in the Balance".

"The forces generated by the techno-scientific economy are now great enough to destroy the human environment, that is to say, the material foundations of life. ... We have reached a point of historical crisis. ...

If we try to build the third millennium on that basis we shall fail. And the price of failure, that is to say the alternative to a changed society, is darkness."

Eric Hobsbawm ... a grizzled old British Marxist and defender of Stalin ... now in his eighties, the dear and treasured elder-statesman of today's revolutionary left - from his, "Age of Extremes - A History of the World, 1914-1991", 1995.

Sidebar:

Hobsbawm's "Age of Extremes" got sparkling reviews, written, certainly, by people who never read it through. This is an intolerably bad book, laced with flagrant errors of fact and all muddled and confused - more stream of semi-consciousness rather than concise argument.

And Hobsbawm sums up the 20th Century not with an alert to the depredations of socialism, the proven source of death and pain on a scale unprecedented in history, but rather with a warning against allowing technology to lead us into "darkness".

Hobsbawm's use of the word 'darkness' is a hallmark of leftist polemics. In leftist writings, starting well back in the nineteenth century, one often encounters the choice between socialism and capitalism presented as a choice between good and evil, light and darkness. Gore himself used it during the election campaign when, before a group of black ministers, he actually characterized the election as a choice between "light and darkness".

Sidebar: Hobsbawm and Jesse James...

In his, "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte," Marx depicted Europe's peasantry this way:

"Their mode of production isolates them from one another, instead of bringing them into mutual intercourse Each individual peasant family produces the major part of its consumption and thus acquires its means of life more through exchange with nature than in intercourse with society. They are consequently incapable of enforcing their class interests in their own name They cannot represent themselves, they must be represented."

Thus, per Marx, the peasant class consisted of homespun-clad yokels, isolated from their fellows, ignorant of their own class interests, and in need of but lacking representation.

Who then, one might ask, ought represent the peasant class?

Hobsbawm answers: Jesse James.

Hobsbawm has made this argument as far back as 1959 in his, "Social Bandits and Primitive Rebels", and, unaltered, he has continued to make the same argument since.

"Bandits belong to the peasantry," Hobsbawm sets forth, "They cannot be understood except in the context of peasant society." Their banditry represents, "... a special type of peasant protest and rebellion They are peasant outlaws whom the lord and state regard as criminals, but who remain within peasant society, and are considered by their people as heroes, as champions, avengers, fighters for justice, perhaps even leaders of liberation, and in any case as men to be admired, helped, and supported." Hobsbawm calls these characters, "social bandits", men such as Jesse James, who practiced, "an extremely primitive form of social protest, perhaps the most primitive there is."

Jesse James, claims Hobsbawm, robbed railroads and banks because, "U.S. rural society did not share the city enthusiasm for railroads, partly because it wanted to keep out government and strangers, partly because it regarded railroad companies as exploiters" and "banks are quintessential public villains," and "[bank robbery] marks the adaptation of social banditry to capitalism."

A couple problems with this picture. By insisting on viewing the world through Marx-colored glasses, Hobsbawm got it all wrong. We know he got it wrong because Jesse James left a record, which Hobsbawm, presumably, didn't bother to

read.

Newspapers and periodicals of the era assiduously recorded every Jesse James exploit, grinding out endless interviews with those who knew him, and Jesse himself wrote extensively to newspapers, letters published across the United States and Europe. In his time, he was a major public figure about whom millions of words have been written. Thus, we know a lot about Jesse James and his times. And, as usual, the facts torpedo Hobsbawm.

For starters, America never had a peasant class for Jesse James to liberate. Jesse James himself came from a central Missouri land-owning, slave-owning family that belonged to a well-organized farming class, sophisticated in trade, profit-oriented, politically active, well-represented at every level of American government, and a hotbed of pro-Confederate sentiment from before until well after the Civil War.

As a teenager during the war, Jesse rode with the likes of Quantrill and Bloody Bill Anderson, "bushwhackers", who, in the name of the South, rampaged throughout Missouri and its environs, killing, looting, and burning out Union sympathizers. After the war, Jesse kept right on killing and looting, although, in his letters to the newspapers, he always denied his crimes, portraying himself as a victim, a "Confederate hero", an "undefeated champion of the Lost Cause", claiming that, as an un-repentant Confederate Democrat, the Republicans were out to get him, blaming every imaginable horror upon him.

As a public relations ploy, Jesse quit robbing banks when newspapers began publishing letters from farmers who complained about Jesse stealing the peoples' money - after all, that cash in rural vaults did belong to the farmers who had deposited it there. So Jesse went after railroads. Correction: Jesse never robbed railroads, and the railroads could care less about Jesse James; he never cost the railroads a dime. It was the express companies who sicced the Pinkertons on Jesse James. Jesse James robbed express companies, enterprises that used the rails to transport "small, expensive, high-priority" goods, such as payrolls and cash in transfer between banks. In the course of cleaning out express cars, Jesse cleaned out the pockets of passengers too. And, if along the line a person or two got shot, well, them's the breaks.

The Granger and Greenbacker parties of the era had bones to pick with both the railroads and banks, but not in terms of banks and railroads being evil capitalist exploiters of the landless peasantry, but rather in terms of how those institutions restricted free trade and the money supply. And no person in his right mind ever imagined that Jesse James' banditry could resolve such disputes.

Fact was, Jesse never robbed the rich to give to the poor. Rather, Jesse James robbed everybody and kept the loot for himself. He was sophisticated manipulator of public opinion, and a paranoid, murdering bushwhacker, feared by everyone round him, until the day Bob Ford snuck up from behind and blew his brains out.

(110)

Sidebar:

In case you missed it: Kaczynski's, Gore's, and Hobsbawm's world-views are identical.

Appendix C.

Ideas, ideas, ideas.

Let's look at some socialist ideas.

Below, note that you will find nothing that remotely resembles the classic liberalism espoused by Adam Smith or John Acton.

First, the fascist sort of socialist ideas....

From, "The Philosophy of Fascism", 1936, by Mario Palmieri, Italy's foremost fascist theologian...

Fascism, which is the very antithesis of Individualism, stands as the nemesis of all economic doctrines and all economic practice of both the capitalist and communistic systems.

Fascism holds that:

1. The economic life of man cannot be abstracted and separated from the whole of his spiritual life. In the words of Mussolini: "The economic man does not exist. Man is integral; he is political, economic, religious, saint and warrior at the same time".
2. The economic life of man is influenced, if not actually determined, by idealistic factors.
3. True economic progress can be derived only from the concerted effort of individuals who know how to sacrifice their personal egoism and ambitions for the good of the whole.
4. Economic initiatives cannot be left to the arbitrary decisions of private, individual interests.
5. Open competition, if not wisely directed and restricted, actually destroys wealth instead of creating it.
6. The wealth of a community is something intangible which cannot be identified with the sum of riches of single individuals.
7. The proper function of the State in the Fascist system is that of supervising, regulating and arbitrating the relationships of capital and labor, employers and employees, individuals and associations, private interests and national interests.
8. Class war is avoidable and must be avoided. Class war is deleterious to the orderly and fruitful life of the nation, therefore it has no place in the Fascist State.
9. More important than the production of wealth is its right distribution, distribution which must benefit in the best possible way all the classes of the nation, hence, the nation itself.
10. Private wealth belongs not only to the individual, but, in a symbolic sense, to the State as well.

Now, the Marxist sort of socialist ideas...

In his, "Main Currents of Marxism" 1978, Kolakowski sets down the thoughts of pre-Marxist socialists - folks such as: Owen, Babeuf, Saint-Simon, Fourier, Proudhon, Cabet, Blanqui, and Blanc - all of whom influenced Marx' ideas to a greater or lesser degree:

It is not difficult to select from the works of the utopian socialists a series of propositions that seem to anticipate the most important ideas of Marx, though they are not set out in the same order or expounded in the same way. They comprise three main topics: historiosophical premisses, the analysis of capitalist society, and the depiction of the future socialist order.

Under the first two headings we may list the following points:

- * No essential change is possible in the system of the distribution of wealth without a complete change in the system of production and property relations.
- * Throughout history, constitutional changes have been conditioned by technological ones.
- * Socialism is the outcome of inevitable historical laws.
- * The organization of capitalist society is in contradiction with the state of development of productive forces.
- * Wages, under capitalism, tend naturally to remain at the minimum level consistent with survival.
- * Competition and the anarchic system of production lead inevitably to exploitation, overproduction crises, poverty, and unemployment.
- * Technical progress leads to social disaster, not for inherent reasons but because of the property system.
- * The working class can only free itself by its own efforts.
- * Political freedom is of little value if the mass of society is enslaved by economic pressure.

As regards the socialist future - whether this goes by the name of Harmony, mutualism, or the industrial system - we may enumerate the following ideals:

- * The abolition of private ownership of the means of production.
- * A planned economy on a national or world scale, subordinated to social needs and eliminating competition, anarchy, and crises.
- * The right to work, as a basic human entitlement.
- * The abolition of class divisions and social antagonisms.
- * The whole-hearted, voluntary co-operation of associated producers.
- * Free education of children at the public expense, including technical training.
- * The abolition of the division of labor and the degrading consequences of specialization; instead, the all-round development of the individual, and free opportunity for the use of human skills in every direction.
- * Abolition of the difference between town and country, while permitting industry to concentrate as at present.
- * Political power to be replaced by economic administration; no more exploitation of man by man, or rule of one man over another.

- * Gradual effacement of national differences.
- * Complete equality of rights and opportunities as between men and women.
- * The arts and sciences to flourish in complete freedom.
- * Socialism as a boon to humanity as a whole; the exploitation of the proletariat as the chief factor tending to bring about socialism.

....

What, however, did it mean to be a Marxist in the twenty-five years preceding the First World War? In relation to the stereotypes of the period, the notion of Marxism may be most simply defined by enumerating some classic ideas that distinguished Marxists from the adherents of all forms of utopian socialism and anarchism, and a fortiori from liberal and Christian doctrines. A Marxist was one who accepted the following propositions:

- * The tendencies of capitalist society, in particular the concentration of capital, have activated the natural tendency of the historical process towards socialism, which is either the unavoidable or the most probable consequence of the processes of accumulation.
- * Socialism involves public ownership of the means of production and thereby the abolition of exploitation and unearned income, of privilege and inequality deriving from the unequal distribution of wealth. There must be no discrimination of race, nationality, sex, or religion, and no standing armies. There must be equal opportunities for education, democratic freedom for all freedom of speech and assembly, popular representation at all levels-and a comprehensive system of social welfare.
- * Socialism is in the interest of all mankind and will make possible the universal development of culture and welfare, but the standard-bearer in the fight for socialism is the working class as the immediate producer of all basic values and as the class most strongly and directly interested in abolishing wage-labour.
- * The advance towards socialism calls for an economic and political struggle on the part of the proletariat, which must fight for the short-term improvement of its lot within the capitalist system and must make use of all political forms, especially parliamentary ones; in order to fight for socialism, the proletariat must organize itself into independent political parties.
- * Capitalism cannot be radically altered by the accumulation of reforms, and its catastrophic consequences of depression, poverty, and unemployment are unavoidable. Nevertheless, the proletariat must fight for reforms in the shape of labour legislation, democratic institutions, and higher wages, since these make conditions more tolerable and also provide training in class solidarity and in the technique of battles to come.
- * Capitalism will finally be swept away by revolution, when economic conditions under capitalism and the class-consciousness of the proletariat are ripe for this. The revolution, however, is not a coup d'etat to be carried out by a handful of conspirators, but must be the work of an overwhelming majority of the labouring population.
- * The interests of the proletariat are identical on the world scale, and the socialist revolution will come as an international event, at all events in the advanced industrial

societies.

* In human history, technical progress is the deciding factor in bringing about changes in the class structure, and these changes determine the basic features of political institutions and the reigning ideology.

* Socialism is not only a political programme but a world-view based on the premiss that reality is susceptible of scientific analysis. Only rational observation can reveal the nature of the world and the meaning of history. Religious and spiritualist doctrines are the expression of a 'mystified' consciousness and are bound to disappear when exploitation and class antagonisms are abolished. The world is subject to natural laws and not to any kind of Providence; man is the work of nature and is to be studied accordingly, although the rules that govern his being cannot be simply reduced to those of the pre-human universe.

Appendix D. The Soviet media and T.D. Lysenko - a lesson in science as politics...

At the insistence of environmentalists, for the better part of 1972, in public hearings chaired by Judge Edmund Sweeney, the EPA took testimony from leading scientists into the effects of DDT upon humans and animals, and, based upon the evidence submitted, in his final report, Judge Sweeney concluded that:

1. "DDT is not a carcinogenic hazard to man..."
2. "DDT is not a mutagenic or teratogenic hazard to man..."
3. "The uses of DDT under the regulations involved here do not have a deleterious effect on freshwater fish, estuarine organisms, wild birds or other wildlife..."

Shortly thereafter, William Ruckelshause, then the EPA administrator, ignored the hard evidence Sweeney had amassed and instead banned DDT, and, in a letter to Allen Grant, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, justified his ban with:

"Decisions by the government involving the use of toxic substances are political with a small 'p'. Science has a role to play, but the ultimate judgment remains political..."

(111)

Which proves O'Brien's truth:

"... Sometimes they are five. Sometimes they are three. Sometimes they are all of them at once. You must try harder. It is not easy to become sane."

Thank you, Trofim Denisovich!

* * * *

"While scientists have no reason to expect journalists to be defenders of the faith, we do expect that reason and soundness of method - the scientific equivalent of checking the veracity of one's sources - should also be prerequisites for science reporting."

Dr. Brent Dalrymple, president, American Geophysical Union and consulting professor, Stanford U. ... (112)

"The fate of the bourgeois scientists is not a happy one."

Trofim Denisovich Lysenko, speaking at the Kremlin, Pravda, February 15, 1935.

"Bravo! Comrade Lysenko, bravo!"

Stalin's response to Lysenko's Kremlin speech, Pravda, February 15, 1935.

"They called him a genius, when he was merely an inspired mediocrity. But he lived in a world where mediocrities had seized power and ruled every sphere of life."

V.N. Soyfer, from his, "Lysenko and the Tragedy of Soviet Science", Rutgers U. Press, 1994.

"From about 1934 until October, 1964 - that is, for thirty years - the central press (Pravda and Izvestiya) did not allow any serious articles criticizing Lysenkoism... Of course, under a free exchange of opinion, Lysenkoism could not have lasted one or two years..."

Z.A. Medvedev, from his, "The Rise and Fall of T.D. Lysenko", Columbia U. Press, 1971.

In the early 1920s, Trofim Denisovich Lysenko, a hyper-ambitious socialist zealot who happened also to be an agronomist, burst upon the Soviet scientific scene. Lysenko arrived condemning Western science in general and, in particular, Western genetics and agricultural practices, such as selective breeding, which Lysenko denounced as bourgeois, and hostile to dialectical materialism, the working class, and the socialist revolution. Based upon an experiment he claimed he'd seen his father conduct, Lysenko proposed a better way, a socialist way, to improve flagging Soviet agricultural production.

Lysenko had learned early in his career never to publish his claims in scientific journals. Rather, he published in the popular media, where he always found a sympathetic ear. Because Lysenkoism conformed perfectly with socialist orthodoxy, the Soviet media uncritically accepted all Lysenko's claims as true and presented only the views of Lysenko and his supporters and their virulent political attacks against their critics. Thus, Lysenko, in tandem with the Soviet media, successfully transmuted a debate over the science of genetics instead into a debate over whether Lysenko's critics were right-thinking socialist revolutionaries, or were they in fact the bourgeois, counter-revolutionary agents of a "...festering capitalism [that] has brought forth a stillborn mongrel of biology, the anti-historical doctrine of formal genetics."

A debate ensued within the Soviet scientific community over Lysenko's scientific integrity. His peers criticized him for having failed to produce evidence to support some of his claims or for having manipulated experiments to produce results that fraudulently confirmed other of his claims.

Reacting in accordance with the inexorable logic of socialist orthodoxy, Stalin finally settled all debates by declaring Lysenkoism to be Communist Party doctrine on the science of genetics. Thereafter, Lysenko's critics were arrested as "enemies of the state", tried, convicted, and hauled off to the Gulag. A few were condemned to death; for example, N.M. Tulaikov, a prominent agriculturist, who, because of Lysenko, took an NKVD bullet to the skull. Another, N.I. Valivov, Lysenko's chief antagonist, a scientist of immense and rightly-deserved reputation and prestige, was arrested in October of 1940 and taken to a cell and beaten by NKVD truncheons until he confessed to: belonging to a rightist conspiracy, spying for England, being a leader of the Labor Peasant Party, sabotaging Soviet agriculture, having links with white emigres, engaging in "wrecking activity", and, in a trial that took five minutes, the court sentenced him to be shot

dead.

They never actually shot Valivov; instead, they starved him to death. In January of 1943, he died of malnutrition in a NKVD prison, and they dumped his emaciated carcass into an unmarked common grave along with other murdered enemies of socialism.

With his embrace of Lysenkoism, Stalin sent this crystal clear message to Soviet scientists: Politics rules science. Thereafter, the work of Soviet scientists no longer had to meet the test of the scientific method as administered by their peers, but rather, Soviet science had to meet the test of socialist orthodoxy as administered by the secret police.

Fear rushed like wildfire through the Soviet scientific community. In agriculture, genetics, biology, botany, physics, medicine, even astronomy and mathematics, scientists scrambled to renounce their life's work and pledge devotion to Lysenkoism. Old scores were settled, and anyone with a grudge could have a colleague or a superior summarily dismissed simply by accusing a person of belief in bourgeois science; or scientists not quick enough to endorse the new orthodoxy lost their jobs in disgrace and humiliation; and libraries were stripped of books that in any way might contradict Lysenkoism. It became a world of science by proclamation; Lysenko spoke for Stalin, and if Lysenko said it, it was true; no proof required. And the Soviet media relentlessly hammered out praise for Lysenko, celebrating him endlessly for the heroic advances he'd brought about in Soviet agriculture; with a wave of his hand, Lysenko had turned the deserts green.

But, of course, the advances never really happened; the deserts never really turned green; it was all a rats-nest of sham and lies and deceit and self-delusion all encased in an impenetrable husk of political orthodoxy. In truth, large areas of Soviet science fell hopelessly behind the West, and Soviet agriculture collapsed.

In 1964, partly because of the USSR's continuing failure in agriculture, the Central Committee deposed Nikita Khrushchev, Lysenko's last great champion. The Central Committee then sent a commission composed of respected scientists to investigate Lysenko's work at Lenin Hills, the agricultural experimental station near Moscow where for thirty years Lysenko had produced many of his "discoveries". The commission concluded that Lysenko had regularly manipulated experiments to produce preconceived results or simply falsified results.

The Central Committee never published its commission's report, but other criticisms of Lysenkoism soon appeared. A low key propaganda campaign started against Lysenko, and the very media that for so long had exalted him, now turned against him, bit by bit laying the groundwork for the gradual elimination of his influence. Over time, Lysenko's advocates were removed from positions of authority and could no longer find publishers, Lysenkoist texts were removed from libraries and class rooms, Lysenko himself lost all trappings of status, and, finally, they left him only with his directorship of Lenin Hills.

At his death in 1976, his family sought permission to bury him in Moscow's Novo-Devichi cemetery, a place of national honor for Soviet heroes. Permission was denied. Only a few dozen people attended his funeral, and no record exists of him ever having expressed the least remorse for the shambles he'd made of Soviet science or for the hundreds of gifted scientists who, because

of his socialist zealotry, had dribbled out their lives in the labor camps.

In 1987, in the course of gathering data for a book, Soviet writer Yevgenia Albats interviewed colonel A.G. Khvat, the long-since retired NKVD officer who had interrogated Valivov prior to Valivov's trial. Khvat admitted to Albats that the charges against Valivov had been fabricated and that Valivov had been a decent, honorable man. When asked if he felt any regret for what he'd done to Valivov, Khvat sighed, "Ah, how many of them there were."

Appendix E.

The Wandervögel had a "feminist" side, as described in the essay, "The Domain of the Wandervögel Girls: Pedagogical Eros and the Utopia of a Holy Island", by Marion E.P. de Ras (It's on the web).

Excerpts from same...

The Wandervögel youth movement, originally established by boys and young men, had as early as 1905 to reckon with the formation of the first girl's groups. Certainly, after 1911, their presence could no longer be ignored. That year, two hundred enthusiastic girls, decked out in brightly colored clothing, had shown up for a walking tour of Berlin. At first, opposition to their growing participation came less from parents, leaders, and teachers, than from the boys themselves. They considered the girls' participation as an "invasion," labelled the young women who acted as leaders of the girls' groups as "nuns" or "aunties," and labelled those girls who wished to hike along with them as "unfeminine."

The girls themselves had little or nothing to say in response until about 1918. By then, many of the boys, and with them the most important figures in the leadership, had gone off to the front in the First World War, and the girls had de facto inherited the Wandervögel movement. One consequence was that they underwent an "awakening." It set them thinking about what they themselves, as girls, wanted from the movement. Pronouncements such as this began to appear:

And girls! Do you not already feel that pure feminine domain? We must once again become conscious of that pure and bright spring welling up within. We must seek this feminine realm and her holy oracle. Deep within us, it is she who binds us with our sisters. Only through her can we have love for one another. Here you have the essence of our bond: finding anew that which is female within yourself through love of one another. Do you understand now why we can admit no boys to our feminine realm?

Roughly between 1918 and 1928, the female branch of the German youth movement was dominated by the ideals of "women's culture," of a return to nature and the physical. These elements fused together into a specific image of Eros; they formed the foundation for an erotic utopian vision of a community of girls and women. This erotic utopia was described in many ways, as a "spiritual experience," a "quest for the source," or a "realm." It was expressed still more strongly as the "island," or

sometimes even the "holy island." All these terms had the same referent: a domain that could not really be named nor rationally comprehended, yet which could be "felt" and "experienced." It was mystical and eternal, rooted in the primeval, and belonged exclusively to women and girls. It was the secret of womanhood, the seed at the center of the feminine. The driving force in finding and cultivating this seed was pedagogical Eros. Writers credited pedagogical Eros with being the source of creativity. This Eros was also the preeminent bonding force in the community of girls and women. Eros between women and girls was seen as the catalyst for the process of becoming a woman. A clear distinction was made between Eros and sexuality. Whereas Eros represented order, art, and culture, sexuality was the realm of chaos and uncontrolled passion.

.....

At the beginning of the 1920s, Charlotte Buhler, a well known Viennese youth psychologist, wrote in her book, "Das Seelenleben des jugendlichen", in the chapter "Fuhrer und Schwarm":

The infatuations (Schwarmen) which I have discussed here are a developmental factor, and are as important ethically as they are psychologically. Only in the form in which we have described them do they become a fulfilling and rich experience. These infatuations can be found in cases of deep inner development, and they can become the most important factor in self-realization.

.....

While Charlotte Buhler also worked with the concept of Eros and the practice of Verstehen, she dealt with them in a more clinical and empirical manner than Spranger. However, when it came to what she called the Seelenleben (soul-life) of the adolescent, she imputed great power to Eros. Moreover, she spoke from experience, because, as she said in an interview, she worked by choice with younger female assistants who were a little in love with her.

.....

... Buhler, who maintained a life-long relationship with Helene Lange - both were well-known feminists in the middle-class women's movement - knew firsthand the force of pedagogical Eros:

When I spoke a moment ago about the cool relationships with male and female teachers, I left out of consideration one brilliant and unusual star which shone, not only in my firmament, but in the school heavens of many of my fellow schoolgirls: the physical education teacher. She awakened in many of us the experience of Infatuation, an emotion that I know not if any others than schoolgirls between the ages of thirteen and sixteen can comprehend. For three years she was the center of our being. Not an hour went by - literally - that you did not think of her; you never crossed the street without cherishing the silent hope of meeting her. The two hours of physical education each week, the only hours that you were in her presence, were quite simply the high point of existence. The most terrible expeditions were undertaken in order to find out where you might meet her, the strangest occurrences were invented in order to get something to do with her. If it froze, you went outside in a thin cotton gym suit just so that she would

chase you in again; you threw the shuttlecock over the wall into the neighbor's yard, so that you could ask her if you could climb over to get it; you tore your clothing to shreds so as to be able to ask her to mend it. The whole school literally sank into nothingness, into an indifferent twilight, compared to this all-consuming interest.

.....

Another tension in the girls' movement was that between the erotic and the sexual. Although this was never publicly discussed by any of the girls' groups, it is clear in the descriptions of camping trips, especially in descriptions of being and sleeping together. Eros provided a reservoir for sexual desires and sexual acts. The veneration of the body, culture, and Eros created many opportunities for contemplating the body of a girlfriend in nude dancing or nude swimming, for touching her body in the countless gymnastic exercises that were conducted in the open air, or for snuggling up to her at the rituals by the campfire, on the hikes, and at the innumerable celebrations that took place in the encampments. As was written in one journal:

What did we care about the rocks we tripped over in the darkness, or the many ravines and crevices we might have fallen into? . . . Klara and I held tight to each other's hands, one in the other...

Can you understand how deeply we experienced the events of that night? That it appeared to us as a symbol of a time in which we really encountered one another and we alone? I believe that every girl has hidden deep within her a secret something she carries with her - not expressed, indeed hardly known - that allows her to find her way. Like a heavenly song or some half-forgotten, primeval melody, it beckons us onward. Only if we have complete inward calm, if we find peace within ourselves to listen to our soul, shall we hear it, at first softly and trembling. But wonderfully beautiful in purity and simplicity.

.....

There was one person who clearly understood his own interpretation of Eros (including pedagogical Eros) and sexuality. For the "erotomaniac" (as he was labelled) Hans Buhler, the "infamous" chronicler of the Wandervögel movement, it was all crystal clear. His view is best seen in a description he gives of an event that took place shortly after the first World War. It is in the revised edition of his book "Werke und Tage".

He had hiked up a rugged mountain where a group of girls clad in hooded capes awaited him. They silently escorted him to a place where he would speak to the leaders of a colony of women and girls. According to him, these women and their followers had made their nest, in the wilds of nature, like "queen bees in a swarm." They had created an agricultural community and their own special dances. The outside world thought that the community was based on a love of nature, vegetarianism, dance, and the ideals of the Wandervögel movement, but as an insider he knew that the driving force was mutual love between females, that is, the holy island and pedagogical Eros. Interpreting this pedagogical Eros presented no problem

at all for him.

On the slopes of a low German mountain range in the region of the great Hanseatic cities, the women had established themselves, as figures of express beauty and grace, or if not that, then certainly of impressive energy. They are surrounded and waited upon by girls who would spill their heart's blood for them, creating works and institutions which those around them who pluck the fruit of their labors little suspect are secretly ruled over by the goddess of lesbian love.

Appendix F.

A few randomly selected remarks made by environmentalists, their comrades, and those who see the world in a different light...

"Workers of the world, unite!"
Karl Marx...

"We shall tell the people that their interests are superior to the interests of a democratic institution. We must not return to the old prejudices, which subordinate the interests of the people to formal democracy."
Lenin, December 14, 1917...

"The proletariat cannot be indifferent to the political, social and cultural conditions of its struggle; consequently it cannot be indifferent to the destinies of its country. But the destinies of the country interest it only to the extent that they affect its class struggle, and not in virtue of some bourgeois "patriotism", quite indecent on the lips of a social democrat."
Lenin, "Collected Works" Vol. 15.

"We do not support 'national culture' but international culture, which includes only part of each national culture - only the consistently democratic and socialist content of each national culture ... We are against national culture as one of the slogans of bourgeois nationalism. We are in favour of the international culture of a fully democratic and socialist proletariat."
Lenin, "Collected Works" Vol. 19.

"No Marxist, without renouncing the principles of Marxism and of socialism generally, can deny that the interests of socialism are higher than the interests of the right of nations to self-determination."
Lenin, from his, "Theses on the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk"...

"Our accepted definition of the limits of national sovereignty as coinciding with national borders is obsolete. ... "
Jessica Tuchman Matthews, World Resources Institute... (113)

"It is simply not feasible for sovereignty to be exercised unilaterally by individual

nation-states, however powerful."

Maurice Strong, currently, Co-chairman, UN Commission on Global Governance Analysis, and an organizer of the Earth Summit. (114)

"Nationhood as we know it will be obsolete, all states will recognize a single, global authority...

National sovereignty wasn't such a great idea after all."

Strobe Talbott, Clinton administration's Deputy Secretary of State, comments prior to hosting the U.N.'s Millennium Peace Summit of Religious and Spiritual Leaders (WPS), August 28-31, 2000.

Prior to joining the Clinton administration (February, 1993), while still an editor for Time Magazine, Strobe Talbot published in Time, "The Birth of the Global Nation" (July 20, 1992), in which Talbot espoused this world-view...

...within the next hundred years ... nationhood as we know it will be obsolete; all states will recognize a single, global authority.

...

All countries are basically social arrangements, accommodations to changing circumstances. No matter how permanent and even sacred they may seem at any one time, in fact they are all artificial and temporary.

...

The internal affairs of a nation used to be off limits to the world community. Now the principal of "humanitarian intervention" is gaining acceptance.

...

However limited its accomplishments, last month's Earth Summit in Rio [1992] signified the participants' acceptance of what Maurice Strong, the main impresario of the event, called "the transcending sovereignty of nature": since the by-products of industrial civilization cross borders, so must the authority to deal with them.

...

They are the disputatious representatives of a larger, basically positive phenomenon: a devolution of power not only upward toward supranational bodies and outward toward common-wealths and common markets, but also downward toward freer, more autonomous units of administration that permit distinct societies to preserve their cultural identities and govern themselves as much as possible.

If one takes Mr. Talbot at his word, then his Brave New World will consist not of nations - which are, after all, "artificial and temporary" - but rather of "autonomous units of administration" (which are, presumably, 'natural and eternal'), governing themselves "as much as possible".

And these units shall owe allegiance to Mr. Talbot's "global authority", which will decide what degree of self-governance each unit shall enjoy.

And - one might reasonably infer - if a unit declines to obey the instructions passed down by the global authority, then, according to Mr. Talbot's principle of "humanitarian intervention", the global authority shall deploy whatever means it sees fit to set the recalcitrants' minds right.

And, "transcending" it all, shall be the splendor of Mr. Strong's, "sovereignty of nature".

Sidebar:

On this Millennium Peace Summit of Religious and Spiritual Leaders" (WPS)... First of all, they refused to invite the Dalai Lama; the Chinese Communists - those most industrious defenders of religious liberty - objected to his presence; he might have had the effrontery to demand his country back.

And, Maurice Strong, as the UN's Chairman of the WPS's Advisory Board, as he did at the Earth Summit, loomed large here too. And such sanctifieds as Ted Turner popped up as Honorary Chairman and Jesse Jackson as a featured attendee. They all signed off on something called the, "Commitment to Global Peace", which addressed their concern with, "problems of conflict, poverty and the environment" (Environment!?! Anymore, EVERYTHING coming out of the U.N. contains a reference to the environment.), and was filled with slogans, high-sounding phrases, and buzz-words, which are what comprise reality for these sorts of folk.

Moving right along....

"Since environmental destruction [caused by 'irresponsible industrialism'] extends across national frontiers, environmental protection must be international. ... The best and cheapest solutions to the crisis are those that change the [world's] basic framework of production and consumption..."

From Principle #45 of the Socialist International's "Declaration of Principles".

"... patterns of production and consumption in the industrialized world are undermining Earth's life-support systems. To continue along this pathway could lead to the end of our civilization... .

This conference [Earth Summit] must establish the foundations for effecting the transition to sustainable development. This can only be done through fundamental changes in our economic life and international economic relations.... ."

Maurice Strong, at the time spoken, Secretary General of the Earth Summit. (115)

The phrase, "sustainable development" appears everywhere in eco-scripture, but damned if I can figure out what "sustainable development" means - except that, if, for whatever reason, the coercive power decrees a thing NOT "sustainable", then the coercive power claims the right to use whatever means it deems fit to shut that thing down.

For example...

The Earth Summit spawned the United Nations', "Sustainable Development Commission" (General Assembly resolution A/47/191, 29 Jan, 1993), a sort of watchdog agency authorized to monitor states' compliance with international environmental agreements reached.

Which leads one to wonder... if the U.N.'s Sustainable Development Commission finds a nation's (or "unit's"?) behavior NOT consistent with agreements reached, then what?

Not to worry...

...the nature of the people is variable, and whilst it is easy to persuade them, it is difficult to fix them in that persuasion. And thus it is necessary to take such measures that, when they believe no longer, it may be possible to make them believe by force.

Machiavelli, The Prince...

Ecologists are the saved. [They believe that they] ...are better able to plan man, space, and the environment than existing institutions are... Their method of returning to the natural world involves mass planning and coercion...

Anna Bramwell, historian... (116)

"We need a real world authority, to which should be delegated the followup of the international decisions, like the treaties signed [at Rio]... This authority must have the capacity to have its decisions obeyed. Therefore, we need means of control and sanctions...

Let's not deceive ourselves. It is necessary that the community of nations exert pressure, even using coercion, against countries that have installations that threaten the environment.

International instruments must be transformed into instruments of coercion, of sanctions, of boycott, even - perhaps in 15 years' time - of outright confiscation of any dangerous installation.

What we seek, to be frank, is the legitimacy of controlling [by force] the application of the international decisions."

Michel Rocard, an organizer of the Earth Summit the Earth Summit. (117)

To a lucid person, this all sounds ludicrous.

But it ain't ludicrous!

Make no mistake; these are not the scatterbrained ruminations of naive daydreamers. Rather, these are concrete goals stipulated by relentlessly dedicated activists, superbly organized and financed. These people exercise immense power and influence...

... their writings are acclaimed round the world

... every legislative council on the planet heeds their voices

... they occupy important positions of authority in our governments

... they inspire ground-breaking legislation that effects our lives in every way

... their canons are taught in all our schools

... their doctrines are promulgated as gospel by all the media

... they perceive their work as barely begun

... and they won't quit until they have achieved it all.

Dr. Dixy Lee Ray's resume reads: Governor of Washington state, Assistant Secretary of State, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, recipient of many awards and honors, including the United Nations Peace Prize, 21 honorary doctorates, Woman of Achievement Award in Energy, and the Susan B. Anthony Award.

Dr. Ray dedicated the last few years of her life to battle against revolutionary environmentalists, during which she attended the Earth Summit and summed it up with...

"The objective, clearly enunciated by the leaders of UNCED, [Earth Summit] is to bring about a change in the present system of independent nations. The future is to be world government, with central planning by the UN. Fear of environmental crises, real or not, is expected to lead to compliance. If force is needed, it will be provided by a green-helmeted, UN police force." (118)

Let's allow Hayek the last word here ... from his, "Road to Serfdom"...

It is necessary now to state the unpalatable truth that it is Germany whose fate we are in some danger of repeating. ... Only if we recognize the danger in time can we hope to avert it.

But students of the currents of ideas can hardly fail to see that there is more than a superficial similarity between the trend of thought in Germany during and after the last war and the present current of ideas in the democracies. ... There is the same contempt for nineteenth-century liberalism, the same spurious "realism" and even cynicism, the same fatalistic acceptance of "inevitable trends." And at least nine out of every ten of the lessons which our most vociferous reformers are so anxious we should learn from this war are precisely the lessons which the Germans did learn from the last war and which have done much to produce the Nazi system. We shall have opportunity in the course of this book to show that there are a large number of other points where at an interval of fifteen to twenty-five years we seem to follow the example of Germany. Although one does not like to be reminded, it is not so many years since the socialist policy of that country was generally held up by progressives as an example to be imitated, just as in more recent years Sweden has been the model country to which progressive eyes were directed. All those whose memory goes further back know how deeply for at least a generation before the last war German thought and German practice influenced ideals and policy in England and, to some extent, in the United States.

The author has spent about half of his adult life in his native Austria, in close touch with German intellectual life, and the other half in the United States and England. In the latter period he has become increasingly convinced that at least some of the forces which have destroyed freedom in Germany are also at work here and that the character and the source of this danger are, if possible, even less understood than they were in Germany. The supreme tragedy is still not seen that in Germany it was largely people of good will, men who were admired and held up as models in the democratic countries, who prepared the way for, if they did not actually create, the forces which now stand for everything they detest. Yet our chance of averting a similar fate depends on our facing the danger and on our being prepared to revise even our most cherished hopes and ambitions if they should prove to be the source of the danger. There are few signs yet that we have the intellectual courage to admit to ourselves that we may have been wrong. Few are ready to recognize that the rise of fascism and nazism was not a reaction against the socialist trends of the preceding period but a necessary outcome of those tendencies. This is a truth which most people were unwilling to see even when the similarities of many of the repellent features of the internal regimes in communist Russia and National Socialist Germany were widely recognized. As a result, many who think themselves infinitely superior to the aberrations of nazism, and sincerely hate all its manifestations, work at the same time for ideals whose realization would lead straight to the abhorred tyranny.

.....
That socialism has displaced liberalism as the doctrine held by the great majority of progressives does not simply mean that people had forgotten the warnings of the great

liberal thinkers of the past about the consequences of collectivism. It has happened because they were persuaded of the very opposite of what these men had predicted. The extraordinary thing is that the same socialism that was not only early recognized as the gravest threat to freedom, but quite openly began as a reaction against the liberalism of the French Revolution, gained general acceptance under the flag of liberty. It is rarely remembered now that socialism in its beginnings was frankly authoritarian. The French writers who laid the foundations of modern socialism had no doubt that their ideas could be put into practice only by strong dictatorial government.

Where freedom was concerned, the founders of socialism made no bones about their intentions. ... the first of modern planners, Saint-Simon, even predicted that those who did not obey his proposed planning boards would be "treated as cattle."

Planning on an international scale, even more than is true on a national scale, cannot be anything but naked rule of force, an imposition by a small group on the rest that sort of standard and employment which the planners think suitable.

To undertake the direction of economic life of people with widely different ideals and values is to assume responsibilities which commit one to the use of force... . [Planning on an international scale] would make the very men who are most anxious to plan society the most dangerous if they were allowed to do so. ... From the saintly and single-minded idealist to the fanatic is often but a step.

And while the planning authority will constantly have to decide issues on merits about which there exist no definite moral rules, it will have to justify its decisions to the people The need to rationalize the [arbitrary] likes and dislikes, which, for lack of anything else, must guide the planner in many of his decisions, and the necessity of stating his reasons in a form in which they will appeal to as many people as possible, will force him to construct theories, i.e., assertions about the connections between facts, which then become an integral part of the governing doctrine.

... [In making his decisions] The totalitarian leader may be guided by [nothing more than] an instinctive dislike of the state of things he has found and a desire to create a new hierarchical order which conforms better to his conception of merit; he may merely know that he dislikes the Jews ... [so] he will readily embrace theories which seem to provide a rational justification for the prejudices which he shares with many of his fellows. Thus a pseudo-scientific theory becomes part of the official creed which to a greater or lesser degree directs everybody's action.

Or the widespread dislike of the industrial civilization and a romantic yearning for country life, ... provide the basis for another myth: "Blut und Boden" ("blood and soil"), expressing not merely ultimate values but a whole host of beliefs about cause and effect which, once they have become ideals directing the activity of the whole community, must not be questioned.

Perhaps the most alarming fact is that contempt for intellectual liberty is not a thing

which arises only once the totalitarian system is established, but one which can be found everywhere among intellectuals who have embraced a collectivist faith and who are acclaimed as intellectual leaders even in countries still under a liberal regime.

Notes:

1. From Arndt's, "On the Care and Conservation of Forests".
2. From Lagarde's, "Deutsche Schrifften" (German Scriptures), 1878, a "classic in [German] cultural criticism"...
3. From, "Who Should Play God?", Jeremy Rifkin and Ted Howard, Dell, 1973.
4. Brower as cited in James Weber's, "Power Grab: The Conserver Cult and the Coming Energy Catastrophe", 1979.
5. Shuttlesworth speaking in his, "Progress as If Survival Mattered: A Handbook for a Conserver Society", Friends of Earth, 1977.
6. From Graber's review of Bill McKibben's, "End of Nature", Los Angeles Times Book Review, October 22, 1990...
7. Lehmann as cited by Peter Staudenmaier in his, "Fascist Ecology: The "Green Wing" of the Nazi Party and its Historical Antecedents". It's on the web.
8. From Rosenberg's, "The Myth of the Twentieth Century".
9. Bormann as cited in, "The Secretary - Martin Bormann: The Man Who Manipulated Hitler", Jochen von Lang, 1979.
10. From Dominick's piece, "The Nazis and the Nature Conservationists", appearing in, "The Historian", August, 1987.
11. From David Schoenbaum's, "Hitler's Social Revolution", 1966.
12. From Alan Bullock's, "Hitler and Stalin", 1991.
13. See Nisbet's "History" and/or Greenslade's, "Early Latin Theology", Westminster Press, 1956.

The entire Tertullian quote from Nisbet:

"Most convincing as evidence of populousness, we men have actually become a burden to the earth, the fruits of nature hardly suffice to sustain us, there is a general pressure of scarcity giving rise to complaints, since the earth can no longer support us. Need we be astonished that plague and famine, warfare and earthquake come to be regarded as remedies, serving, as it were, to trim and prune the superfluity of population."

14. See "Melting The Global Warming Myth", María Graciela Arias, Mar 27, 02, Accuracy in Media.
15. Balling is a statistician, climatologist, Director of the Office of Climatology, Arizona State, "recognized internationally as an expert in global warming and the greenhouse effect", and the author of two books and dozens of papers on climatology published in leading journals.
16. Dr. Idso is a research physicist, U.S. Water Conservation Laboratory, Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. He is author of two books on atmospheric CO₂ and more than 400 journal articles. Winner of the Arthur S. Flemming Award, 1977. The citation above comes from Idso's, "Carbon Dioxide and Global Change", published in, "Rational Readings on Environmental Concerns", edited by, Jay H. Lehr, Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1992.

To get the straight scoop on what real scientists have to say about global warming, see Idso's

"www.co2science.org" .

17. Dr. Stevenson's quote comes from his presentation to a conference on "Climate, Volcanism and Global Change", Hawaii, April 92.

18. See Dr. James Hansen's, "Antarctic Cooling Down; The Antarctic Ice Sheet is Growing", NASA website, 2000.

19. Dr. Ellsaesser is author of several books and over 100 articles on atmospheric science. The citation come from his, "The Great Greenhouse Debate", as published in, "Rational Readings on Environmental Concerns", edited by, Jay H. Lehr, Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1992.

20. From Lassen's paper, "Long-term Variations in Solar Activity and their Apparent Effect on the Earth's Climate" (It's on the web.).

21. See NASA's 'Earth Observatory' (EO) archive, "Milutin Milankovitch Page 3".

22. See Dyson's piece in the American Physical Society Newsletter, May, 1999.

23. Russell Seitz, "In From The Cold: 'Nuclear Winter' Melts Down," The National Interest, Fall, 1986. Expanded citation:

"Instead of a planet with continents and oceans, the TTAPS model postulated a featureless bone-dry billiard ball. Instead of nights and days, it postulated twenty-four-hour sunlight at one-third strength. Instead of realistic smoke emissions, it simply dumped a ten-mile-thick soot cloud into the atmosphere instantly. The model dealt with such complications as east, west, winds, sunrise, sunset, and patchy clouds in a stunningly elegant manner - they were ignored."

24. George Rathjens and Ronald Siegel, "Comment and Correspondence: The Nuclear Winter Debate," Foreign Affairs, Fall, 1986.

Rathjens had been president of the Council for a Livable World and an executive of SANE, "groups not known for their tolerance of nuclear weapons". Nevertheless, Sagan's work was so flagrantly outside the realm of legitimate science that Rathjens felt compelled to denounce Sagan.

25. On ABC's "Nightline", Sagan predicted that...

"We think the net effects will be very similar to the explosion of the Indonesian volcano Tambora in 1815, which resulted in the year 1816 being known as the year without a summer. There were massive agricultural failures in North America and in Western Europe, and very serious human suffering, and, in some cases starvation. Especially for South Asia; that seems to be in the cards, and perhaps for a significant fraction of the Northern Hemisphere as well."

And on an appearance on "60 Minutes", Sagan predicted...

"You might have massive agricultural failures in the United States as a result."

26. See Schneider's piece in, "Discover", October, 1989,

27. Hansen, J., Mki. Sato, A. Lacis, R. Ruedy, I. Tegen, and E. Matthews 1998.

Perspective: Climate forcings in the industrial era. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 95, 12753-12758.

28. For a full discussion of Hansen's testimony, see chapters 6, 7, and 8 of , "The Satanic Gasses, Clearing the Air about Global Warming", By Patrick J. Michaels and Robert C. Balling, Jr., 2000.

29. You can get both the 1960 map and the 1990 map off the web. A comparison of the two reveals that the climate in North America is cooling,

30. See the piece, "A Large Terrestrial Carbon Sink in North America Implied by Atmospheric and Oceanic Carbon Dioxide Data and Models", by S. Fan, M. Gloor, J. Mahlman, S. Pacala, J. Sarmiento, T. Takahashi, P. Tans, Science Magazine, Vol 282, Oct 16, 1998.

31. See Dr. Fred Singer's, 'My Adventure in the Ozone Layer' , "Rational Readings on Environmental Concerns", edited by, Jay H. Lehr, Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1992.

32. P. Rigaud and B. Leroy, "Presumptive Evidence for a Low Value of the Total Ozone Content Above Antarctica in September 1958," *Annales Geophysicae*, 1990. (If you look hard enough, you can find this thing on the web.)
33. Susan Weiler, cited in Keith Schneider's, "Ozone Depletion Harming Sea Life," *The New York Times*, Nov. 16, 1991.
34. Osmond Holm-Hansen, Scripps Institute of Oceanography, interviews, Jan-Feb, 1992, with Ronald Bailey, for his, "Eco-Scam - The False Prophets of Ecological Apocalypse", St. Martin's Press, 1993.
35. Manfred Tevini and Alan Teramura, "UV-B Effects on Terrestrial Plants," *Photochemistry and Photobiology*, Oct, 1989 and interviews with Ronald Bailey, for his, "Eco-Scam - The False Prophets of Ecological Apocalypse", St. Martin's Press, 1993.
36. Melvyn Shapiro, as cited in Micah Morrison, "Ozone Scare," *Insight*, April 6, 1992.
37. Dr. Fred Singer, 'My Adventures in the Ozone Layer', published in, "Rational Readings on Environmental Concerns".
38. From Bryson's piece in, "Environmental Roulette, Global Ecology: Readings Toward a Rational Strategy for Man", John P. Holdren and Paul R. Ehrlich, editors, 1971.
39. From Calder's, "In the Grip of a New Ice Age," *International Wildlife*, July 1975
40. From the Schneider/Rasool piece, "Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide and Aerosols: Effects of Large Increases on Global Climate," *Science*, July 9, 1971.
41. From "Defending the Earth: A Dialogue Between Murray Bookchin and Dave Foreman", Boston, South End Press, 1991.
42. From Ridgeway's, "The Politics of Ecology", E.P. Dutton, 1970.
43. From Commoner's, "The Closing Circle", Bantam Books, 1971.
44. Caldicott's remarks recorded in , "Toxic Terror", by Lizy Whelan, James Books, 1985
45. Bari as quoted by Walter Williams, Heritage Features Syndicate, *State Journal-Register*, June 25, 1992.
46. See James J. Sheehan's, "German History - 1770-1866", Clarendon Press - Oxford 1989.
47. Lefebvre's, "The Coming of the French Revolution", was first published in French, 1939, under the auspices of the Institute for the History of the French Revolution, University of Paris.
48. Burleigh is the William R. Keenan Visiting Professor at Washington and Lee and Distinguished Research Professor in Modern History at Cardiff University.
49. See Paul M. Hayes, "Fascism", The Free Press, 1973.
50. See Alastair Hamilton, "The Appeal of Fascism: A Study of Intellectuals and Fascism, 1919-1945" Macmillan, 1971.
51. From Strasser's, "Thoughts on the Tasks of the Future" 1933. First published as "Nationalsozialistische Briefe", 1926. The expanded quote reads:

We are socialists. We are enemies, deadly enemies, of today's capitalist economic system with its exploitation of the economically weak, its unfair wage system, its immoral way of judging the worth of human beings in terms of their wealth and their money, instead of their responsibility and performance, and we are determined to destroy this system whatever happens!

...

And yet it is not enough just to change the system, to replace one economic system by another; what is needed above all is to change the spirit! The spirit to be overcome is the spirit of materialism!

....

We must learn that work means more than possessions! Performance is more than

dividends! It is the most wretched legacy of this capitalist system that the criterion for everything's value is money, wealth, possessions! The decline of a people is the inevitable consequence of the use of this yardstick, because selection on the basis of property is the arch-enemy of race, blood, life! We have never left any doubts about the fact that our national socialism puts an end to the privileges of wealth, and that the emancipation of the worker involves participation in profits, property, and management.

52. See Stanley G. Payne, "A History of Fascism, 1914-1945", The University of Wisconsin Press, 1995
53. See Orwell's, "Homage to Catalonia" 1938. Find at:
<http://www.netcharles.com/orwell/essays/col-catalonia2.htm>
54. See Agursky's, "The Third Rome", 1963.
55. See Stanley G. Payne's, "A History of Fascism, 1914-1945", 1995.
56. From Plenge's, "1789 and 1914: The Symbolic Years in the History of the Political Mind", 1917, a work devoted to the conflict between the "Ideas of 1789," the ideal of freedom, and the "Ideas of 1914," the ideal of organization.
57. As cited by Hayek in his, "Road to Serfdom".
58. As cited in, "Blood and Iron: From Bismarck to Hitler, The von Moltke Family's Impact on German History", by Otto Friedrich, 1995.
59. See James J. Sheehan's, "German History - 1770-1866", Clarendon Press - Oxford 1989.
60. For more on Red-youth in the United States, see, "Raising Reds: The Young Pioneers, Radical Summer Camps, and Communist Political Culture in the United States", by Paul C. Mishler, 1999.
61. See Payne's, "The Life and Death of Adolf Hitler", the chapter, 'The Loneliest Years', for an excellent description of Hitler as starving-artist.
62. As cited in, "Hitler's Scientists - Science, War and the Devil's Pact John Cornwell, 2003.
63. As cited in, "The Black Book of Communism - Crimes, Terror, Repression", by Stephane Courtois, Nicolas Werth, Jean-Louis Panne, Andrzej Paczkowski, Karel Bartosek, and Jean-Louis Margolin. Translated by Jonathan Murphy and Mark Kramer Consulting Editor Mark Kramer, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England, 1999.
64. From Burleigh's, "The Third Reich - A New History", 2000.
65. For a detailed rendition of these events, see, Hugh Thomas', "The Spanish Civil War", 1986.
66. Cited by John Toland in his, "Adolf Hitler", 1976.
67. As cited in Stanley G. Payne's, "A History of Fascism, 1914-1945", U. of Wisconsin Press, 1995.
68. As Cited in Hugh Thomas', "The Spanish Civil War", 1986.
69. A few months after his speech, a hit-squad composed of Republican army officers and agents from the Spanish Socialist-Communist Youth League murdered Sotelo, thus triggering the Spanish Civil War.
70. From Mussolini's, "The Political and Social Doctrine of Fascism", 1935.
71. From Hayek's, "Road to Serfdom"....
No less significant is the intellectual history of many of the Nazi and Fascist leaders. Everyone who has watched the growth of these movements in Italy or in Germany has been struck by the number of leading men, from Mussolini downward (and not excluding Laval and Quisling), who began as socialists and ended as Fascists or Nazis.
72. See, "Mussolini in the Making", 1938, by Gaudens Megaro, an excellent account of

Mussolini's pre-fascist, Marxist years.

73. For a comprehensive view of the bureaucratic nightmare Mussolini created, see, "The Economic Foundations of Fascism", by Paul Einzig, Macmillan, London, 1933.

74. As cited by Dr. Thomas J. DiLorenzo, in his monograph, "Economic Fascism". It's on the web.

75. Ibid..

76. As cited in Payne's, "A History of Fascism, 1914-1945".

77. From David Schoenbaum's, "Hitler's Social Revolution", 1966.

78. See Hayek's, "Road to Serfdom".

79. For more, see works such as, "Designing a New America: The Origins of New Deal Planning, 1890 - 1943", by Patrick D. Reagan, 2000, and, "The End of Reform: New Deal Liberalism in Recession and War", by Alan Brinkley. 1995.

80. As cited in Gaetano Salvemini's, "Under the Axe of Fascism", Viking Press, 1936.

81. Ibid..

82. See "Hitler -1889-1936, by Ian Kershaw, 1998 and/or "The Life and Death of Adolf Hitler", by Robert Payne, 1973.

83. See "1918 - War and Peace", by Gregor Dallas, 2000.

84. As cited by Mona Charen, in her, "Useful Idiots" 2003.

85. See Pipes', "A Concise History of the Russian Revolution", 1995, pages 159-163, for a rendition of how Lenin pulled this one off.

86. Gregor Dallas in his, "1918 - War and Peace", 2000,

87. All celebrity citations come from FrontPage magazine.com, "Critics Assail Castro's 'Sickening' Grip on Hollywood Celebs", by Marc Morano, July 11, 2004.

88. For a detailed account of Lenin at the helm, see works such as Melgounov's, "The Red Terror in Russia".

89. The full paragraph in Clinton's speech reads:

"And so, in New Orleans 10 years ago, we set out to outline what we believed ought to be done. Our approach came to be known as the Third Way. Basically it was rooted in common sense, a common devotion to our party's oldest values, and a common vision of the new era in which we were living."

90. "The New Orleans Declaration - Statement Endorsed at the Fourth Annual DLC Conference", March 1, 1990, declares fifteen meaningless platitudes as the guiding principles of the Democratic Leadership Council. Full text available at www.ndol.org.

91. Full text available at www.ndol.org.

92. From Clinton's State of the Union message, 1995.

93. From Hillary Clinton's "Third Way" article published in the New York Times in 1993.

The quote expanded:

"I am seeking a unified field theory of life which would marry conservatism and liberalism, capitalism and statism, and tie together practically everything: the way we are, the way we were, the faults of man and the word of God, the end of communism and the beginning of the third millennium, crime in the streets and on Wall Street, teenage mothers and foul-mouthed children and frightening drunks in the parks, the cynicism of the press and the corrupting role of television, the breakdown of civility and the loss of community."

On September 21, 1998, Mrs. Clinton held a, "Third Way" conference in New York.

94. See, "The Third Way: summary of the NEXUS on-line discussion". (Google for it.)

95. See Stephen Chapman's piece in the Chicago Tribune, June 01, 1997.

96. As cited by Ronald Bailey, in his, "What I Did on My Summer Vacation", Reason, October 1992.
97. For Shalala's full remarks, see, "www.hhs.gov/news/speeches/brun.html".
98. See "The Twenty Five Points", the political platform of the original NSDAP, adopted, February 2, 1920.
99. See "1918 - War and Peace", Gregor Dallas, 2000.
100. For more on the Bolshevik war on the kulaks, see works such as, "The Great Soviet Peasant War", Andrea Graziosi, Harvard, 1996.
101. For the complete Social Democrat argument, see, "Evolutionary Socialism", by, Eduard Bernstein, 1899, in which Bernstein contends that: "the task of social democracy was gradually to socialize political institutions and property". And, for an overview of the disputes between Lenin and the Social Democrats, see Kolakowski's, "Main Currents of Marxism", Volume 2, Chapter 16, "The Rise of Leninism".
102. In April, 1905, Stalin speaks at a big meeting in Batum in a debate with the Menshevik leaders N. Ramishvili, R. Arsenidze, and others. See, www.stel.ru/stalin/.
103. See Rosa Luxemburg's, "The Junius Pamphlet", written April, 1915.
104. All this stuff is on the web. Google for it.
105. From the New Democrats Online (www.ndol.org), "The Third Way, Key Documents, Fact Sheet/DLC/PPI/June 01, 1998"...
106. See Bahro's, "Building an Unlimited Future," Imprimis, January 1992.
107. The Socialist International does NOT!, repeat, does NOT!, allow free development and disbursement of technology. Far from it. Under Socialist International rule, there shall be, "Social Controls of Technological Development", and there shall be NO! "socially unacceptable technologies". For more, see articles 49-53 of the Socialist International Declaration.
108. See Janet Biehl's, "Ecology and the Modernization of Fascism in the German Ultra-right". It's on the web.
109. David Horowitz, from his, "The Politics of Bad Faith: The Radial Assault on America's Future", 1998.
110. See "Jesse James: Last Rebel of the Civil War", T.J. Stiles, 2002; "Jesse James: The Man and the Myth", Markey Brant, 1998; "Jesse James Was My Neighbor", Homer Croy, 1997; and many more.
111. See Dr. J. Gordon Edwards' piece, "DDT Effects on Bird Abundance and Reproduction", published in, "Rational Readings on Environmental Concerns", 1992.
112. Cited from Dalrymple's piece in EOS, Jan 1991.
113. See Matthews' piece in Foreign Affairs, Spring, 1989.
114. See, "Maurice Strong: The new guy in your future!", by Henry Lamb, Jan, 1997, find at: <http://www.sovereignty.net/p/sd/strong.html>.
- Quote comes from Strong's essay, "Stockholm to Rio: A Journey Down a Generation". Entire quote reads (hear the echoes of Marx and Langbehn and Lagarde across a century):
- "The concept of national sovereignty has been an immutable, indeed sacred, principle of international relations. It is a principle which will yield only slowly and reluctantly to the new imperatives of global environmental cooperation. What is needed is recognition of the reality that in so many fields, and this is particularly true of environmental issues, it is simply not feasible for sovereignty to be exercised unilaterally by individual nation-states, however powerful. The global community must be assured of environmental security."
- And "Stockholm to Rio..", contains additional thoughts, such as (this is scary stuff, but it's where

they intend to take us):

"Strengthening the role the United Nations can play...will require serious examination of the need to extend into the international arena the rule of law and the principle of taxation to finance agreed actions which provide the basis for governance at the national level. But this will not come about easily. Resistance to such changes is deeply entrenched. They will come about not through the embrace of full blown world government, but as a careful and pragmatic response to compelling imperatives and the inadequacies of alternatives."

And at the opening session of the Rio Conference, 1992, Strong stated:

"[Industrialized countries have] developed and benefited from the unsustainable patterns of production and consumption which have produced our present dilemma. It is clear that current lifestyles and consumption patterns of the affluent middle class -- involving high meat intake, consumption of large amounts of frozen and convenience foods, use of fossil fuels, appliances, home and work-place air-conditioning, and suburban housing -- are not sustainable. A shift is necessary toward lifestyles less geared to environmentally damaging consumption patterns."

115. Strong's statement printed and distributed at Rio, June 3, 1992.

116. From Bramwell's, "Ecology in the 20th Century: A History". Yale U. Press, 1989.

117. From Rocard's press release at Rio, June, 1992.

118. See, "Environmental Overkill", 1993, by Dr. Dixy Lee Ray (with Lou Guzzo).

End...