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Why your revolution is no liberation!

With this reader, we want to take a stand against the currently predominating analyses, of the anti-globalisation movement, which, articulating themselves as in the broadest sense left-wing and anticapitalist, constantly boisterously trumpet their opinion, that another world was possible. We have serious doubts that this “other” world, was going to be of a better constitution than the current one. This anti-globalisation movement is of course not at all marginalised, but is enjoying broad sympathy which the reaches from the “bourgeois left” right to the so-called centre of society and which is even shared by Neo-Nazis.

The anti-globalisation movement is as its protagonists certainly emphasise when facing criticism a heterogenous movement, in which many groups and individuals have agreed to a minimum consensus. In the case of the activities against this year’s G8-summit this consensus will consist of the participating heads of government being evil, whereas demonstrators and activists on the other side of the fence are “good”. Within the last couple of years, another consensus has-explicitly and implicitly-been agreed on: An antagonism toward the USA and Israel, as well as a structurally anti-Semitic criticism of capitalism.

The closing statement of the world social forum of Porto Alegre expressed the forum’s solidarity with the “Palestinian people” - not a word about suicide bombings or Islamic anti-Semitism. The European Social Forum in Paris willingly offered a platform to the Islamist and anti-semit Tariq Ramadan, whilst activists, that criticised the anti-Semitism of the No-Globalists in a Flyer, were attacked and expelled from the forum. At an event during the EU-Summit in Copenhagen the Danish group “Global Roots” demanded a boycott of Israel stewards wore shirts with the slogan “Burn Israel Burn” on them. During an ATTAC meeting in Germany the Italian globalisation critic Alfonso de Vito compared Israel’s policy toward the Palestinians with the eviction of the Warsaw Ghetto. Noam Chomsky who can’t detect anti-Semitism in Robert Faurisson’s statement that the Holocaust was a Zionist lie authored a manifesto in summer 2006 which declares Israel guilty of the Hisbollahs attack on Israel’s North because it was aiming to liquidate the Palestinian state. This silly writ which not only ignores the fact that there is no Palestinian state but also turns a blind eye to Israel’s withdrawal from the Gaza strip and the subsequent terror offensive of the Palestinians was promptly signed by other idols of the anti-globalisation movement: Naomi Klein, Jose Sarango, Arundhati Roy (amongst others). The latter was recently only notable by a completely amiss analysis of capitalism in which globalisation - equated with imperialism - is understood as a conspiracy of “men in suits” (Americans of course), who “trek the world like locusts”. Not forgetting the marauding head-of-state of the No-Globalists, Hugo Chavez, close ally of the Iranian mullah regime which is currently sedulously working on the nuclear destruction of Israel and which flaunts its president as the international figurehead of an extermination-anti-Semitism.

Why the hatred for Israel and the Jews? After every attack on a synagogue or another Jewish institution Israel’s allegedly disproportional military policy is at least considered as the reason for the attack. No assault on a mosque or an African immigrant in Europe has ever been justified with a reference to the policy of Muslim or African states. Why the personalisation of the circumstances of capital? It should be known since Marx that capitalism is not an event staged by handful of “men in suits” but a total social condition. With this cognizance this reader wants to contribute to the formulation of a radical criticism.

Anti-Semitism

Hostility towards Jews has a long tradition. It originally mainly expressed itself in a religiously motivated rejection of the Jewish belief initially by polytheistic religions in ancient Rome, later also by monotheistic Christianity and Islam which entered into a competition of superstition with Judaism (which had been their own origin). However, the following will not mainly be about anti-judaism, religiously motivated hostility toward Jews in all its forms. We rather focus on the question why anti-Semitism came to life again with the advent of modernity in the middle of the 19th century, despite the loss of importance of religion that accompanied this era and why it could terrifyingly culminate in the extinction of the Jews by the Nazis. At the same time, current forms of anti-Semitism, particularly in relation with criticism of and resistance against dominance shall be looked at.

Anti-Semitism and social tensions

The hatred toward Jews at the beginning of modernity stands purely externally by its reference to the same object of resentment in the tradition of religious anti-Semitism and can partially avail itself with traditional prejudices and adscriptions. Internally however, modern anti-Semitism executes a break with the religiously and historically-cultural motivated hatred by converting pogroms and mass-murder into a means of articulation for social tensions which do not directly correlate with the respective society’s relation with the Jews. The pogroms are now detached from supposedly concrete events which in the middle ages, and the early modern ages served as the occasion for anti-judaistic pogroms and evictions from entire areas and dominions (Jews were then seen as the causes of the black plague and were made responsible for alleged infanticides and well-poisoning.). Modern anti-Semitism survives with Jews but
better still without them. Adorno and Horkheimer named this projective character as early as 1947:

“When the masses accept the reactionary ticket which contains the item against the Jews they obey social mechanisms in which experiences with Jews don’t play a part”.

The conflict of which anti-Semitism arose is of course a real one. The internal discord and resistance that finds its expression in anti-Semitic prejudices is the result of external perception. It is decisive however, that the experienced discord by which hatred for Jews is being fed is a completely different one and is independent of its object of reference. Anti-Semitism is the accomplishment of a shift which replaces a discordantly experienced reality with a compensatory reality and supposedly resolves the discord by doing so.

Besides that Jews are in the context of pseudo-scientific studies in the outgoing 19th century increasingly being defined as a racial-biological group that, apart from the character traits ascribed to them, would also differentiate itself from the rest of the population by physical features. Parallel to this development the concept of race is being introduced into the domestic political organisation of nations which are being increasingly racially charged. Because of their supposed biological difference alone Jews now constitute a foreign body and are, by being an imaginary counter-race, essential for the constitution of the self-depiction of those “Volkskörper”.

**Basics: exchange-and practical value, abstract and concrete work**

The organisation and constant extension of the merchandise trade since the outgoing middle ages led to a fundamental upheaval for producers. Peasants and the majority of craftsmen were being robbed of their self-sufficient economy by the extension of money-and market oriented processes. At the same time they were relieved of the direct compulsory duties payable to the feudal landlord and of his direct personal rule and were being integrated into the market happenings. A specialisation aimed at yield enhancement began which meant that people didn’t have to purchase or barter self-produced goods on the markets anymore. At this point the historical path of the reduction of own production starts which ends with only the abstract commodity of one’s own manpower being left - the emergence of the working class. The major advantages of the division of labour and specialisation, however, the enhancement of productivity and of the quality of production as the foundation of for a life liberated of needs the producers are deprived of. An enhanced productivity is not being translated into shorter working hours but leads, according to the laws of capitalist commodity production, to a depreciation in value of the commodities. In so far as this even results in a gain in value for the producers at all this gain is certainly not in any way proportional to the extent of the added value.

The rules and logic of the market economy see the exchange value, an abstract characteristic, that is constantly subject to fluctuations and changes take its place besides the practical value of the items carried to the market. As soon as items are being not manufactured for use but primarily for exchange their practical benefit becomes secondary for the producer. It is now mainly of interest, how many other items he can get for the one he made. The quid pro quo relation is decisive items become commodities, become goods meant for barter. With the development of capitalism commodities become the typical face of wealth.

If commodities have the twin-character of possessing practical-and exchange value this also holds true for the labour needed to manufacture it. Now, labour does not only produce a concrete item but generates a value. As all commodities are in an equivalent relation to each other each commodity-producing labour enters into such a relationship too. Besides the commodity labour produces a value abstract of the concrete shape of the work. By this, labour receives a twin-character too: it is concrete (producing the commodity) and abstract (generating the value).

**Whether craft enterprise or international corporation...**

This twin character of labour and commodity, immanent to capitalism, is not laid bare though. It exists independent of people’s awareness. With the addition of money the abstract side of the commodity and with it that of labour rather seems to be disposed of. The commodity, and with it the labour are being reduced to their practical value and their concrete character respectively. Money is depicted as the sole location of value as a manifestation of the abstract. Societies conditions and social relations are necessarily already predetermined in labour and commodity and are so being disguised: Commodities appear as purely objective, concrete articles of daily use whereas the form of value and with it the societal conditions, seem to manifest itself in the abstracted form of money. The contrariness of the abstract and the concrete which determines the alienated societal relations of capitalism is supposedly resolved the two opposites dependent of each other, are being disassociated.

The abstract side of capitalist socialization perceived as concrete in the form of money is often seen as the essence of capitalism as such and thereby becomes the target of the revolt against conditions experienced as insufferable. Money and with it value is repeatedly being seen as the reason for exploitation and economic distress while commodities as natural objects of utility, seem to exist independently of that. The Nazis in particular preached of an antagonism of natural “creating” capital and “money grubbing” capital rejected as being artificial and disintegrating which disguises the opposition of value developing a momentum of its own in money and concrete work as well as the necessary correlation of value-and commodity forms. At the same time it is proposed to eliminate the grievances immanent to capitalism by eliminating one side of the coin only. Moreover, this suspension of the connection between the form of value
and the form of commodity of concrete and abstract work clears the way for a personalisation of the criticism of capitalism. It is now possible to solely hold those companies and branches of the economy responsible for actually experienced hardship that administer financial capital: Banks and the stock exchange become the main targets of criticism if needed a major internationally acting corporation will do. It is certain however, that the craft enterprise has got nothing to do with all the misery.

Only at a first glance though, are there major differences between a local craft enterprise, Deutsche Bank and Daimler Chrysler. They all follow the same principle - capitalistic value addition - and can merely be distinguished between because of their economic success and the influence resulting from it. A criticism of capitalism limited to big players bypasses the totality of societal relations and disguises these by presenting a concrete scapegoat that can also serve as the object of violence for the anti-capitalist revolt. The character of capitalism as an abstract and total condition of society is being concealed behind this false ascertainment and is being revoked of a fundamental radical criticism.

The anti-semitism of the anticapitalist revolt

Moreover, the personalisation of the capitalist socialization creates the structure of modern anti-Semitism. Value, money and trade as abstract homeless and exploitative forms are being ascribed to particular persons: Bankers, Fat Cats and capitalists. The step then to the personalisation of anti-Semitism, to the Jew, which most globalisation critics have not taken yet, is only a small one. This association is, however, based on prejudices passed on since the middle ages of the Jew being a homeless huckster, extortioner and exploiter so perfectly obvious that it doesn’t need to be expressed openly. Yet, the Nazis did and justified the murdering of six million people in an industrially organised system with the fight against the “money grubbing” Jewish capital. From the standpoint of a misguided criticism of capitalism which limits itself to the abstract side of capitalist creation of value and to banks, capitalists, major corporations-and in this way of thinking to the Jew-as its face this was only consequent.

The anticapitalist revolt against the separated, abstract side of capitalist creation of value is thereby structurally anti-semitic. The pogrom is already arranged for. As depressing as it may be anticapitalist criticism always has to target the entire structure and must always consider the totality of societal relations. In those, capitalists are nothing but a another form of workers, neither better nor worse. The existence of classes and the relations of dominance immanent to them shall of course not be negated but we all contribute to the continuity of the system. Everybody is independent of his or her income and the economic circumstances he or she is living under simply a small cog in the wheel. There is no escape: Not by shopping at the local cooperative instead of at H&M, not by eating in the local soup-kitchen instead of at McDonald’s.

It’s about Israel

Since the 6-day war, a new version of anti-Semitism has developed and taken hold in the European left which originates in the criticism of Israel. It is the main feature of this ideology that it tries to depict its anti-Semitism as anti-racism by attacking Israel as a supposedly racist state. In this anti-israeli, anti-Zionist anti-Semitism, Islamism, neo-fascist, democratic and “globalisation-critical” anti-semites find a common ground. The pretended antiracist legitimation under the camouflage of anti-zionism also allows for the integration of anti-Semitism into even left-wing and universalist ideologies after the Shoah, by misusing an urgently necessary anti-racism which should not pretend to be culture-relativistic.

Zionism describes the Jewish national movement that developed in the last decades of the 19th century. Theodor Herzl’s pamphlet “Der Judenstaat” in 1896 and the first Zionist congress in Basel in 1897 were essential to this movement. The goal of the Zionists was the foundation of a Jewish national state in reaction to the continuing hostility towards Jews that did not recede with the creation of the bourgeois national states and the promise of equality that had been associated with it. The hope of the Jews of emancipation and of an end to resentment and persecution faded away during this time. Insofar, Zionism was a consequent reaction to anti-Semitism which grew to a Jewish mass movement during the rise of the persecution of the Jews in Germany in the 1930s, and in 1948 eventually resulted in the founding of Israel. The creation of a Jewish state in which Jews would be most possibly safe from anti-Semitism and in which they’d have the possibility to defend themselves militarily against it was a necessary consequence of the persecution of the Jews which found an atrocious climax in the industrial mass murder of six-million Jews by the Germans. Furthermore, the foundation of the nation state of Israel was also the only feasible consequence in a world that was not willing to up-root the causes of anti-Semitism once and for all. It must be noted that the extermination of the European Jews had of course not taken place as part of the murderous war-and occupation policy of the Nazis but was an end in itself in an ideology of which hatred was the main motor. The existence of the Jewish state is the basis for each form of emancipatory policy that seeks to overcome the conditions that made Auschwitz possible and that seeks to create circumstances under which man is a friend of man. In a world organised in nation states only the existence of Israel can guarantee the survival of Jews. This holds true even if one otherwise rejects the construct of the nation for good reasons. In other words: You can’t have anti-fascist policy without solidarity with Israel.

Not least because of this the mere plan of a Jewish state was attacked by various anti-semites. Jews could only live as a “third party” quasi as parasites within, and of other nations. They wouldn’t be able to build their own nation state as they weren’t capable of forming a community rather they embodied a society characterised by self interest, money, power, exploitation and internationalism that wasn’t viable on its own. These stereotypes with which the possibility and justification of Israels existence are being negated nowadays live on in the references repeated as in a prayer mill, to the inner struggle of Israel and the Israels: This was the case for example when an inner-Israeli civil war was evoked before the vacation of the settlements in the Gaza-strip. Wishful thinking which was debunked as such by the actual course of the withdrawal as Israel since 2005 is not at all shaken by inner tensions but is unabatedly being attacked by the supposedly victorious anti-semites in the neighbouring countries in particular the Hisbollah acting from Lebanon and financed by Syria and Iran.

In front of the background of the supposed incapability of Jews to build a state Israel could never be comprehended as a normal nation state by anti-semites of any shade. Its name is put in quotation marks, is written of as a “so called state” and is preferably being depicted as an imperialistic bulwark. This allegation is being extended by the claim that a Jewish state is really only an international power base.
The Zionists are claimed to be among the American monopolists and to serve American imperialism. This conjunction between Israel (or Jews) with the United States as a chiffre for an allegedly particularly brutal modernisation and the epitome of capitalism clarifies the closeness between anti-Semitism and anti-Americanism.

Anti-Zionism is Anti-Semitism

A fundamental feature of the anti-Zionist anti-Semitism which has the weakening and ultimately the extinction of the Jewish state as its goal is furthermore, the replacement of the “Jew” by the “Zionist” which is being equated with the “imperialist” or “racist”. By this, one can contentwise tie on the anti-semitic tradition of the equation of Jews with capitalism, yet, can employ a vocabulary that is tradeable apart from Nazi and Islamic coherences as well. A particularly audacious example for this was given by the periodical of the USSR’s embassy in Paris in 1972 that re-published excerpts from an article of 1906 whilst simply exchanging the words “Jew” and “Zionist”. This sort of disguise was particularly necessary after the Shoah in order to shield oneself from the accusation of “anti-Semitism” and to be politically centers in anti-zionism on the left. Against the background of the extermination of the Jews by the Nazis each anti-semit had the problem to justify his attitude. As an open denial of the holocaust is out of question by people on the left, although this denial is recently not confronted anymore when expressed by Islamists a reversal of perpetrator and victim is carried out in which it is alleged that Jews want to exploit the holocaust. The Charta of Hamas employs the same tactic by formulating in Art.22 that Jews had instigated World War II in order to prepare the founding of their own state. Ayatollah Chamenei pretended in 2001 that documents exist which prove a close collaboration of Zionists and Nazis in order to arouse sympathy for Israel with the use of wrong numbers about the holocaust.

The western left also repeatedly employs symbols and vocabulary that are clearly connected to Nazism and the holocaust for the defamation of Israel. Countless flyers swagger of Israels “extermination war” against the Palestinians, the respective Israeli Prime Minister is being furnished with a Hitler-moustache, star of David and swastika are being put into one, numerous other equations of Jews and Nazis are being carried out.

These contentwise absurd comparisons are accompanied by an almost pathological fixation of the left with Israel. No conflict on earth receives the same kind of attention as Israels conflicts with Palestinians and its neighbouring states. Murdering islamic militias in Sudan, suicide bombers in Afghanistan, Pakistan or Iraq, religious fanatics in India, pogroms against religious dissenters in Indonesia - none of that arouses any attention among the left. If Israel however, as in the summer of 2006, invades Southern Lebanon after being attacked by the Hisbollah and puts up a fight with the clerical-fascist mercenary troops of Iran for 4 weeks demonstrations and rallies are being organised at once, old flyers are being revamped in order to position the wider public against the self-defence of Jews. Similar fervour is aroused by the erection of a fence between Israel and the West Bank the purpose of which is to inhibit terrorists from reaching their destinations in Jerusalem, Tel Aviv, Haifa and elsewhere. The organic metaphor of the “barrier cutting deep into Palestinian territory” being used in this context, repeatedly expresses the biologic-reactionary hallucinations of a “Volkskörper” (The body of people) and the land as its its “lebensraum” of its authors.

Poor=good, rich =evil

The overwhelming sympathy with Palestinians and the Arabs living around Israel can also be put down to a misunderstood Marxism which accords unconditional solidarity to the poor and enshrines him as a revolutionary subject. The rich on the other hand are always the exploiters which must be fought. Starting from this point the distribution of goods between Israel and the Palestinians or Arabs only the fight against the Jews can appear justified. In the course of this contradictions and class differences in the Arabic societies are ignored but especially is a progressive disposition of the materially underprivileged being hallucinated about. Each ever so barbaric assault is being legitimated with the reference to poor living conditions violated pride and anger about the “occupying power” whereas the under-lying ideology of a longing for death self-abandonment and a people’s community, the major aim of which is the extermination of Jews, is not being questioned. The orientation along the "poor=good, rich=evil formula manipulates the view on reality and makes a criticism of the Islamic impossible. A policy always has to be measured by its means and goals, however. If suicide bombings are the means and the extermination of Israel and with it of another six million Jews or even only the creation of a Jew-free Zone in Gaza and the West Bank are the goals, this policy is running contrary to any societal emancipation.

The apologies of suicide bombings and Islamic murder gangs as acts and actors of resistance are also explained by the powerlessness of the western left. In the face of their own irrelevance and their own incapability to change anything, many have allowed themselves to be dumbed down the power of their opposition and their own impotence. Into each idiot to take up a gun the romanticised idea of a guerrilla fight against “the rulers” is projected. Determination and defiance of death impress so much that motives and content don’t matter anymore “national liberation” becomes self-serving. In the face of dozens of ethnicities and other folkloristic groups constantly discovering themselves, however, even the obsession with militancy of the left can not adequately explain the fixation on Israel. One can only conclude that only the concentration of anti-semites on the object of their desire can explain the immense criticism that each of Israel’s actions arouses.

A left wing policy deserving its name must - besides the ability to be critical of its own mistakes - also be prepared to confront reactionary liberation movements. After the Shoah as the most excessive rupture of civilisation in history, as the antipode of each emancipatory movement, taking the sides of Israel’s enemies completely ruled out for anti-fascist reasons.

“Israel is the state whose entire function is the defence of Jewish life. If Jews were to lose this Defence they’d again be subject to the moods of anti-semites and other proletarians of all countries. If one desires to attack the power of states one has two-hundred of them to choose from worldwide. A left which of its own strength is incapable of almost anything should at least refrain from everything that could infringe on Israel’s fight for its existence. (Gremzlia, konkret 5/02).

When worst comes to worst

In the very spot where a selective criticism of capitalism the ideal of a (clerical-fascist) “Volksgemeinschaft” and an obsession with militancy blend into one currently stands Islamism. Its partial proximity to Nazism becomes apparent with the offensive denial of the holocaust and the invitation of internationally known neo-Nazis to a conference.

Teheran at the latest. A denial restores the possibility of the holocaust as its non-existence meant that the consequences of the Shoah didn’t have to be drawn.

This affinity is not new, however, the mufti of Jerusalem was a close ally of Hitler in the fight against Jews. Consequently, the reasons for this alliance are not only of strategical but also of a contentual nature: In their origin both Islamism and Nazism refer to a organic society imagined to be organic and free of contradictions (the “Volksgemeinschaft” in one case, the Umma in the other one) which is mainly being threatened by exterior influences. The greatest such influence is the individualistic and hedonistic (“western”) way of life being vilified as “decadent” that misleads the individual into indulgence and enjoyment of life and which undermines his effort for and his submission under the collective (the agents of which are the Jews). The primacy of community, an obsession with work and asceticism all contradict the emancipatory, individual self-fulfillment and the Marxist goal of welfare and development for everybody. Nonetheless, the Islamic International enjoys the support and sympathy of many groups considering themselves as left-wing. Those groups in turn see many of their projections and wishes being realised by the various terror-gangs be they Hamas, Hisbollah or Al-Kaida. “Negligibilities” as the disfranchisement and submission of women, the hatred for homosexuals and not least the fanatic anti-Semitism are being aware ignored in the process. There must not be a place for such groups in a progressive movement, however. They must be fought as vigorously as the other ally of Islamism: European neo-Nazis.

The anti-globalisation movement and the Islamic movement are of course not to be equated. There are however, definitely ideological points of contact which unfortunately are not exhausted with appreciative references to alleged insults of Islamic culture after each Islamic outburst of violence by the west. The ideological similarities with Islamic terror are rather increasingly being discovered and propagated by parts of the western left. With the “10 Euros for Iraqi resistance” campaign of European anti-imperialists this intellectual closeness has already developed into a stalwart cooperation.

These efforts - as well as the idolising reference to other anti-semitic murder-squads - encounters alarmingly little resistance within the movement. In order not to endanger the capabilities of mobilisation in advance of big events as the G8 summit that only possesses the omnipotence ascribed to it in its false analysis critical voices mostly fall silent quickly.

As long as a misguided and wrong analysis of capitalism and with it of its criticism prevails the anti-globalisation movement can not be considered as a step in the right direction toward the realisation of an “association of free people” but has to be seen as a reformist mostly state- and policy fixed movement to which a potential of reactionary barbarity is inherent which could erupt at any instance. To take the overthrow of the existing conditions seriously means to accept the totality of capitalism instead of mainly focusing on the circulation sphere and on pillowing big business. This brochure wants to advance this urgently necessary step.
We wish you fruitful reading.
Moishe Postone <<

History and Helplessness: Mass Mobilization and Contemporary Forms of Anticapitalism

As is well known, the period since the early 1970s has been one of massive historical structural transformations of the global order, frequently referred to as the transition from Fordism to post-Fordism (or, better, from Fordism to post-Fordism to neoliberal global capitalism). This transformation of social, economic, and cultural life, which has entailed the decline of the state-centric order of the mid-twentieth century, has been as fundamental as the earlier transition from nineteenth-century liberal capitalism to the stateinterventionist, bureaucratic forms of the twentieth century.

These processes have entailed far-reaching changes in not only Western capitalist countries but communist countries as well, and led to the collapse of the Soviet Union and European communism in addition to fundamental transformations in China. Consequently, they have been interpreted as marking the end of Marxism and of the theoretical relevance of Marx’s critical theory. And yet these processes of historical transformation have also reasserted the central importance of historical dynamics and large-scale structural changes. This problematic, which is at the heart of Marx’s critical theory, is precisely that which eludes the grasp of the major theories of the immediate post-Fordist era — those of Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, and Jürgen Habermas. Recent transformations have revealed those theories to have been retrospective, focused critically on the Fordist era, but no longer adequate to the contemporary post-Fordist world. Emphasizing the problematic of historical dynamics and transformations casts a different light on a number of important issues. In this essay I begin to address general questions of internationalism and political mobilization today in relation to the massive historical changes of the past three decades. Before doing so, however, I shall briefly touch upon several other important issues that become inflected differently when considered against the background of recent overarched historical transformations: the question of the relation of democracy to capitalism and its possible historical negation — more generally, of the relation of historical contingency (and, hence, politics) to necessity — and the question of the historical character of Soviet communism. The structural transformations of recent decades have entailed the reversal of what had appeared to be a logic of increasing state-centrism. They thereby call into question linear notions of historical development — whether Marxist or Weberian. Nevertheless, large-scale historical patterns of the “long twentieth century,” such as the rise of Fordism out of the crisis of nineteenth-century liberal capitalism and the more recent demise of the Fordist synthesis, suggest that an overarching pattern of historical development does exist in capitalism. This implies, in turn, that the scope of historical contingency is constrained by that form of social life. Politics alone, such as the differences between conservative and social democratic governments, cannot explain why, for example, regimes everywhere in the West, regardless of the party in power, deepened and expanded welfare state institutions in the 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s, only to cut back such programs and structures in subsequent decades. There have been differences between various governments’ policies, of course, but they have been differences in degree rather than in kind. Such large-scale historical patterns, I would argue, are ultimately rooted in the dynamics of capital and have been largely overlooked in discussions of democracy as well as in debates on the merits of social coordination by planning versus that effected by markets. These historical patterns imply a degree of constraint, of historical necessity. Yet attempting to come to grips with this sort of necessity need not reify it. One of Marx’s important contributions was to provide a historically specific grounding for such necessity, that is, for large-scale patterns of capitalist development, an determinate form of social practice expressed by categories such as commodity and capital. In so doing, Marx grasped such patterns as expressions of historically specific forms of heteronomy that constrain the scope of political decisions and, hence, of democracy. His analysis implies that overcoming capital entails more than overcoming the limits to democratic politics that result from systematically grounded exploitation and inequality; it also entails overcoming determinate structural constraints on action, thereby expanding the realm of historical contingency and, relatedly, the horizon of politics. To the degree we choose to use “indeterminacy” as a critical social category, then, it should be as a goal of social and political action rather than as an ontological characteristic of social life. (The latter is how it tends to be presented in poststructuralist thought, which can be regarded as a reified response to a reified understanding of historical necessity.) Positions that ontologize historical indeterminacy emphasize that freedom and contingency are related. However, they overlook the constraints on contingency exerted by capital as a structuring form of social life and are, for this reason, ultimately inadequate as critical theories of the present. Within the framework I am presenting, the notion of historical indeterminacy can be reappropriated as that which becomes possible when the constraints exerted by capital are overcome. Social democracy would then refer to attempts to ameliorate inequality within the framework of the necessity imposed structurally by capital. Although indeterminate, a postcapitalist social form of life could arise only as a historically determinate possibility generated by the internal tensions of capital, not as a “tiger’s leap” out of history. A second general issue raised by recent historical transformations is that of the Soviet Union and communism, of “actually existing socialism.” Retrospectively, it can be argued that the rise and fall of the USSR was intrinsically related to the rise and fall of state-centric capitalism. The historical transformations of recent decades suggest that the Soviet Union was very much part of a larger historical configuration of the capitalist social formation, however great the hostility between the USSR and Western capitalist countries had been. This issue is closely related to that of internationalism and antihegemonic politics, the theme of this essay. The collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War opened the possibility of a reinvigorated internationalism that is globally critical. Such an internationalism would be very different from those forms of “internationalism” characteristic of the long Cold War, which were essentially dualistic and, in terms of their form, nationalistic; they were critical of one “camp” in ways that served as a legitimating ideology for the other, rather than regarding both “camps” as parts of a larger whole that should have been the object of critique. Within this framework, the post-1945 world contained only one universal power — the hegemon within the other “camp.” This basic pattern also holds true for supporters of China following the Sino-Soviet split, with the difference that the other “camp” was constituted by two imperialist...
powers - the United States and the USSR. Nevertheless, the critique of imperialism remained dualistic: a critique of one camp from the standpoint of another camp. Yet the first decade of the twenty-first century has not been marked by the strong emergence of a post – Cold War form of internationalism. Instead it has Public Culture 9 6 seen a resurgence of older forms, of hollowed-out afterforms of Cold War “internationalism.” This essay presents some very preliminary reflections on this resurgent dualistic “internationalism,” as an expression of an impasse reached by many antihegemonic movements, while reflecting critically on different forms of political violence. The impasse to which I am referring has been dramatized recently by many responses on the Left, in the United States and in Europe, to the suicide bombing of the World Trade Center on September 11, 2001, as well as by the character of the mass mobilizations against the Iraq War. The disastrous nature of the war and, more generally, of the Bush administration should not obscure that in both cases progressives found themselves faced with what should have been viewed as a dilemma — a conflict between an aggressive global imperial power and a deeply reactionary counterglobalization movement in one case, and a brutal fascistic regime in the other. Yet in neither case were there many attempts to problematize this dilemma or to try to analyze this configuration with an eye toward the possibility of formulating what has become exceedingly difficult in the world today — a critique with emancipatory intent. This would have required developing a form of internationalism that broke with the dualisms of a Cold War framework that all too frequently legitimated (as “anti-imperialist”) states whose structures and policies were no more emancipatory than those of many authoritarian and repressive regimes supported by the American government. Instead of breaking with such dualisms, however, many who opposed American policies have had recourse to precisely such inadequate and anachronistic “anti-imperialist” conceptual frameworks and political stances. At the heart of this neo-anti-imperialism is a fetishistic understanding of global development — that is, a concretistic understanding of abstract historical processes in political and agentic terms. The abstract and dynamic domination of capital has become fetishized on the global level as that of the United States, or, in some variants, as that of the United States and Israel. It goes without saying that the disastrous, imperial, and imperious character of the Bush administration has helped heighten this confutation. Nevertheless it is unfortuitously ironic that in many respects, this worldview recapitulates one of a century ago in which the subject positions of the United States and Israel were occupied by Britain and the Jews. However counterintuitive this similarity — between a critique of hegemony today that understands itself as a critique from the Left and what had been a rightist critique of hegemony — it points to overlapping fetishesizing understandings of the world and suggests that such understandings have very negative consequences for the constitution of adequate antihegemonic politics today.

This reawakened Manichaeism — which is at odds with other forms of antiglobalization, such as the antisweatshop movement, that developed over the previous decade — has been accompanied by the reappearance of a deep confusion regarding political violence that had, at times, plagued the New Left. The result is a form of opposition that highlights some difficulties faced by antihegemonic movements in formulating an adequate critique in the post-Fordist era. This dualistic form of antihegemonic opposition is not adequate to the contemporary world and, in some cases, can even serve as a legitimating ideology for what a hundred years ago would have been termed imperialist rivalries. Let me elaborate by first turning briefly to the ways in which many liberals and progressives responded to the attack of September 11. The most general argument made was that the action, as horrible as it may have been, had to be understood as a reaction to American policies, especially in the Middle East.1 While it is the case that terrorist violence should be understood as political (and not simply as an irrational act), the understanding of the politics of violence expressed by such arguments is, nevertheless, utterly inadequate. Such violence is understood as a reaction of the insulted, injured, and downtrodden, not as an action. While the violence itself is not necessarily affirmed, the politics of the specific form of violence committed are rarely interrogated. Instead, the violence is explained (and at times implicitly justified) as a response. Within this schema, there is only one actor in the world: the United States. This sort of argument focuses on the grievances of those who carry out such actions without engaging the framework of meaning within which those grievances are expressed. The actions that flow from those meanings are taken simply as expressions of anger, however unfortunate.2 Such arguments neither interrogate


2. The absence of any sustained critical analysis of movements such as al-Qaeda or Hamas, or of regimes such as those of Baathist Iraq or Syria, suggests that this sort of “chickens come home to roost” position involves the projection of political opposition to American policies by Western critics onto the actors in the Middle East. The suffering and misère of those actors are taken seriously, but their politics and ideologies are bracketed.
whereas most forms of race thinking commonly impu...e. The modern anti-Semitism attributes enormous power to Jews, which is abstract, universal, global, and intangible. At the heart of modern anti-Semitism is a notion of the Jews as an immensely powerful, secret international conspiracy. I have argued elsewhere that the modern anti-Semitic worldview understands the abstract domination of capital — with people subject to the compulsion of mysterious forces they cannot ignore and receive — as a manifestation of anti-Semitism. Anti-Semitism, consequently, can appear to be antihegemonic. This is the reason why a century ago August Bebel, the German Social Democratic leader, characterized it as the socialism of fools. Given its subsequent development, it could also have been called the anti-imperialism of fools. As a fetishized form of oppositional consciousness, it is particularly dangerous because it appears to be antihegemonic, the expression of a movement of the little people against an intangible, global form of domination. It is as a fetishized, profoundly reactionary form of anti-capitalism that I would like to begin discussing the recent surge of modern anti-Semitism in the Arab World. It is a serious mistake to view this surge of anti-Semitism only as a response to the United States and Israeli occupations. The claim to justify the prohibition of explaining Nazi anti-Semitism simply as a reaction to the Treaty of Versailles. While American and Israeli policies have doubtlessly contributed to the rise of this new wave of anti-Semitism, the United States and Israel occupy subject positions in the ideology that go far beyond their actual empirical roles. Those positions, I would argue, must also be understood with reference to the massive historical transformations since the early 1970s, to the transition from Fordism to post-Fordism. An important aspect of this transition has been the increasing importance of supranational (as opposed to international) economic networks and flows, which has been accompanied by a decline in effective national sovereignty — by the Public Culture 1 0 0. Growing inability of national state structures (including those of national metropoles) to successfully control economic processes. This has been manifested by the decline of the Keynesian welfare state in the West and the collapse of bureaucratic party states in the East. It has been associated with increasing vertical differentiation between the rich and the poor within all countries, and among countries and regions. The collapse of Fordism has meant the end of the phase of state-directed, nationally based development — whether on the basis of the communist model, the social-democratic model, or the statist-developmentalistic Third World model. This has posed enormous difficulties for many countries and huge conceptual difficulties for all those who viewed the state as an agent of positive change and development. The effects of the collapse of the midcentury Fordist synthesis have been differential: they have varied in different parts of the world. The relative East Asian success in riding the new wave of post-Fordist globalization is well known, as is the disastrous decline of sub-Saharan Africa. Less well known is the steep decline of the Arab world, which was dramatically revealed in the United Nations Arab Human Development Report of 2002, according to which per capita income in the Arab world has shrunk in the past twenty years to a level just above that of sub-Saharan Africa. Even in Saudi Arabia, for example, the per capita GDP fell from 24,000 in the late 1970s to 7,000 at the beginning of this century. The reasons for this decline are complex. I would suggest that an important framing condition for the relative decline of the Arab/Muslim world has been the fundamental historical restructuring alluded to above. For whatever reasons, the authoritarian state structures associated with the Arab nationalism of the postwar Fordist epoch proved incapable of adjusting to these global transformations. These transformations, it could be argued, weakened and undermined Arab nationalism even more than did the military loss to Israel in 1967. Such abstract
reaction to Israeli policies in Gaza and the West Bank. This basically uncritical political stance, I would argue, is related to a fetishized identification of the United States with global capital. There are many implications of this conflation. One is that other powers, such as the European Union, are not treated critically as rising hegemons/competitors in a global capitalist dynamic order, whose rising positions help shape the contours of global power today. Rather, the role of the EU, for example, is bracketed or Europe is implicitly treated as a haven of peace, understanding, and social justice. This form of misrecognition is related to the tendency to grasp the abstract (the domination of capital) as concrete (American hegemony). This tendency, I would argue, is an expression of a deep and fundamental helplessness, conceptually as well as politically. Let me try to elaborate by reflecting on the mass antiwar mobilizations in so many parts of the world against the American war in Iraq. At first glance, recent mobilizations appear to be a reprise of the great antiwar movement of the 1960s. Yet, I would argue, there are fundamental differences between them. Considering those differences may shed light on the current impasse of the Left. The antiwar movements in the 1960s were spearheaded by many people for whom opposition to the war waged by the United States in Vietnam was intrinsically related to a larger struggle for progressive social change. It was not just the case of movements opposed to the American policies toward the regime in Cuba, the socialist government in Chile, the Sandinistas in Nicaragua, and the ANC in South Africa. In all these cases, the United States was regarded as a conservative force opposed to such change. American opposition to movements of national liberation was criticized particularly strongly precisely because such movements were regarded positively. It is the case that there were important differences among those who regarded movements of national liberation as forces for progressive change. One important difference was between those who regarded such movements positively because they were seen to be at the forefront of the expansion of the “socialist camp,” hence part of the Cold War, and those that from such movements were important because they were regarded as authentic liberation movements that undermined the bipolarity of the Cold War and whose positive relation to the USSR was contingent — a function of American hostility. Nevertheless, in spite of their differences, both general positions had in common a positive evaluation of such movements within a global context. Regardless of how one judges such positive evaluations today, then, what characterized the antiwar movements of a generation ago was that opposition to American policy was, for many, one expression of a more general struggle for progressive change. The recent massive antiwar mobilizations appear at first glance to be the same. But closer consideration reveals that, politically, they are very different. Their opposition to the United States has not been in the name of a more progressive alternative. On the contrary, the Baath regime in Iraq — a regime characterized by anti-Semitic ideology and policies (the Palestinian offshoot, Hamas) should be understood as the spread of a fetishized anticapitalist ideology which claims to make sense of a world perceived as threatening. This ideology may be sparked and exacerbated by Israeli and Israeli policies, but its resonance is rooted in the relative decline of the Arab world against the background of the massive structural transformations associated with the transition Public Culture 1 0 2 from Fordism to neoliberal global capitalism. The result is a populist antihegemonic movement that is profoundly reactionary and dangerous, not least of all for any hope for progressive politics in the Arab/Muslim world. Rather than analyzing this reactionary form of resistance in ways that would help support more progressive forms of resistance, however, many on the Western Left have either ignored it or rationalized it as an unfortunate, if understandable,
the Right. This does not, in any way, mean that proponents of progressive change should have supported the Bush administration and its war. But recent mass mobilizations neither expressed nor helped constitute what, arguably, was called for in this context — a movement opposed to the American war that, at the same time, was a movement for fundamental change in Iraq and, more generally, the Middle East. In the United States, very little political education was undertaken that extended beyond the crude slogans proffered. It is significant in this regard that, to the best of my knowledge, none of the massive demonstrations against the war featured oppositional progressive Iraqis who could provide a more nuanced and critical perspective on the Middle East. And this, I would argue, represents a telling political failure on the part of the Left. One of the ironies of the current situation is that, by adopting a fetishized “anti-imperialist” position, one where opposition to the United States no longer is bound to advocacy of progressive change, liberals and progressives have allowed the American neconservative Right in the Bush administration to appropriate and even monopolize what traditionally had been the language of the Left, the Public Culture language of democracy and liberation. It is the case, of course, that, although the Bush regime speaks of democratic change in the Middle East, it will not really help effect such change. Nevertheless, that only the Bush administration raised this issue reveals starkly that the Left did not do so. If a generation ago, opposition to American policy consciously entailed supporting struggles for liberation deemed progressive, today the opposition to American policy in and of itself is deemed antihegemonic. This, paradoxically, is, in part, an unfortunate legacy of the Cold War and the dualistic worldview associated with it. The spatial category of “camp,” which expressed a global version of the Great Game, was substituted for temporal categories of historical possibilities and of emancipation as the determinate historical negation of capitalism. This not only helped blur the idea of socialism as the historical beyond of capitalism but also helped skew understandings of international developments. Inasmuch as the progressive camp was defined by a spatial, essentially dualistic framework, the content of the term progressive could, on the international level, become increasingly contingent, a function of a global balance of power. What the Cold War seems to have eradicated from memory, for example, is that opposition to an imperial power is not necessarily progressive, that there were fascist “anti-imperialisms” as well. This distinction was blurred during the Cold War in part because the USSR aligned itself with authoritarian regimes, for example, in the Middle East, that had little in common with socialist and communist movements, that, if anything, had more in common with fascism than communism and that, in fact, sought to liquidate their own Left. Consequently, anti-Americanism per se became coded as progressive, although there had and have been deeply reactionary as well as progressive forms of anti-Americanism. Why did many on the Left — including those who did not regard the Soviet Union affirmatively — adopt this dualistic Cold War framework, retaining its shell even after the Cold War? How did so many progressives back themselves into a corner where it appeared that the only political issue globally was U.S. policy, regardless of the nature of other regimes? I would like to begin addressing this problem indirectly, with reference to the issue of political violence. As I mentioned, those who were critical of the enormous tide of anger and nationalism that swept the United States after September 11 frequently noted that there was a great deal of rage directed against the United States, especially in Arab and Muslim countries. This general position, however, usually sidestepped analyzing the sort of politics the attack on September 11 expressed. It is significant that such an attack was not undertaken two or three decades ago by groups that had every reason to be angry at the United States — for example the Vietnamese Communists or the Chilean Left. It is important to note that the absence of such an attack then was not contingent, but an expression of political principle. Indeed, an attack directed primarily against civilians was outside of the horizon of the political imaginations of such groups. The category of “anger” is not sufficient to understand the violence of September 11. Forms of violence have to be understood politically, not apologetically. Let me give an example: in the mid-1980s, there was internal political pressure on the central committee of the African National Congress to begin a campaign of terror against white South African civilians. Such demands expressed the desire for revenge as well as the idea that white South Africans would agree to dismantle apartheid only if they suffered just as black South Africans had suffered. The ANC central committee refused to countenance such demands, not only for tactical, strategic, and pragmatic reasons (the effects of such forms of violence on postapartheid civil society and on the regime), but also for reasons of political principle. It was argued that movements for emancipation do not choose the civilian population as their main target. I would like to suggest that there is a fundamental difference between movements that do not target civilians randomly (such as the Viet Minh and Viet Cong and the ANC) and those that do (such as the IRA, al-Qaeda, and Hamas). This difference is not simply tactical but profoundly political: a relation exists between the form of violence and the form of politics. That is, I want to suggest that the sort of future society and polity implicitly expressed by the political praxis of militant social movements that distinguish military from civilian targets differs from that implied by the praxis of movements that make no such distinction. The latter tend to be concerned with identity. In the broadest sense they are radically nationalist, operating on the basis of a friend/foe distinction that essentializes a civilian population as the enemy and closes off the possibility of future coexistence. For that reason, the programs of such movements present little in the way of socioeconomic analysis aimed at transforming social structures (which should not be conflated with social services, which movements may or may not provide). In such cases, the twentieth-century dialectic of war and revolution is transformed into the subsumption of “revolution” under war. My concern here, however, has less to do with such movements than it does with contemporary metropolitan opposition movements and why they
apparently have had difficulty distinguishing between these very different forms of “resistance.” The attack of September 11, 2001, calls into question some notions of violence and resistance that spread among parts of the New Left in the late 1960s and early 1970s, as fundamentally as the Soviet invasion of Prague in August 1968 and Public Culture 1 0 6 then, finally, the collapse of European Communist states between 1989 and 1991 called into question Leninism as a hegemonic discourse and marked the end of the trajectory that began in 1917. Looking back to the late 1960s and the early 1970s, we can discern an important political shift when what was then the New Left moved from a loose movement advocating nonviolent resistance and social transformation to a fragmented militant movement. Some of those fragmented groups began glorifying armed struggle or perpetrated violence themselves. Relatedly, there was an increase in support for groups like the provisional IRA (Irish Republican Army) and the PFLP (Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine), groups that had little in common with the communist and socialist movements that earlier had characterized and informed the Left. Increasingly a form of violence was promulgated domestically and supported internationally that was fundamentally different from that which generally had been hegemonic on the Left for much of the twentieth century. The way violence became conceptualized had a great deal in common with the view of violence promulgated by Georges Sorel at the beginning of the twentieth century. In Reflections on Violence, he presented violence as a cleansing act of self-constitution directed against the decadence of bourgeois society. A similar notion of violence as a redemptive act of regeneration, a political expression of the dictates of pure will, was, of course, central to the fascist and Nazi notion of the new man and the new order. After World War II this complex of attitudes became adopted by some on the Left, transmitted in some cases via the medium of existentialism. This was particularly the case in the late 1950s and 1960s, as social critique focused increasingly on technocratic bureaucratic forms of domination and as the Soviet Union increasingly became perceived as sharing in a dominant culture of instrumental rationality. Within this context violence became seen as a nonreified, cleansing force erupting from the outside, identified now as the colonized, attacking the very foundations of the existing order. An irony involved in this “radical” stance, in the idea of violence as creative, cleansing, and revolutionary, is that it expresses and affirms a central characteristic of capitalism: its ceaseless revolutionizing of the world through waves of destruction that allow for creation, for further expansion. (Like the liberal notion of the rational actor, the existentialist and anarchist notions of the self-constitution of personhood through violence entail a projection onto the individual of that which characterizes collaborative entities: capital.) Hans-Hermann Hoppe provided a telling critique of the sort of thinking about violence found in the works of Georges Sorel, Vilfredo Pareto, and Frantz Fanon. Those thinkers, according to Arendt, glorified violence for the sake of violence. Motivated by a much deeper hatred of bourgeois society than the conventional Left for whom violence could be a means in the struggle for a just society, Sorel, Pareto, and Fanon regarded violence per se as inherently emancipatory, as a radical break with society’s moral standards. Retrospectively, we can see that the sort of existentialist violence promulgated may have effected a break with bourgeois society—but not, however, with capitalism. Indeed, it seems to acquire most importance during transitions from one historical configuration of capitalism to another. Thinking with Arendt, I will briefly consider the resurgence in the late 1960s of Sorelian-type violence. The late 1960s saw a crucial historical moment, one when the necessity of the present, of the current social order, was fundamentally called into question. Viewed retrospectively, it was a moment when state-centered Fordist capitalism and its statist “actually existing socialist” equivalent ran up against historical limits. Attempts to get beyond those limits were, however, singularly unsuccessful, even on a conceptual level. As the Fordist synthesis began to unravel, utopian hopes were nourished. At the same time, the target of social, political, and cultural discontent became maddeningly elusive and all-pervasive. The felt pressures for change were present, but the road to change was very unclear. In this period, students and youth were not so much reacting against exploitation as they were reacting against bureaucratization and alienation. Not only did classical workers’ movements seem unable to address the burning issues for many young radicals, but those movements — as well as the “actually existing socialist” regimes — seemed to be deeply implicated in precisely what the students and youth were rebelling against. Faced with this new historical situation, this political terra incognita, many oppositional movements took a turn to the conceptually familiar, to a focus on concrete expressions of domination, such as military violence or bureaucratic police-state political domination. Such a focus allowed for a conception of oppositional politics that was itself concrete and, frequently, particularistic (e.g., nationalism). Examples were concretic forms of anti-imperialism as well as the growing focus by some on concrete domination in the communist East. As different, and even opposed, as these political responses may have appeared at the time, both reflected the nature of the abstract domination of capital just when capital’s regime was becoming less state-centric and, in that sense, even more abstract. The turn to Sorelian violence was a moment of this turn to the concrete. VioPublic Culture 1 0 8 lence, or the idea of violence, was seen as an expression of political will, of historical agency, countering structures of bureaucratization and alienation. In the face of alienation and bureaucratic stasis, violence was deemed creative, and violent action per se became viewed as revolutionary. In spite of the association of violence with political will, however, I would argue, as did Arendt, that the new glorification of violence of the late 1960s was caused by a severe frustration of the faculty of action in the modern world. That is, it expressed an underlying despair with regard to the real efficacy of political will, of political agency. In a historical situation of heightened helplessness, violence both expressed the rage of helplessness and helped suppress such feelings of helplessness. It became an act of self-constitution as outsider, as other, rather than an instrument of transformation.
Yet, focused as it was on the bureaucratic stasis of the Fordist world, it echoed the destruction of that world by the dynamics of capital. The idea of a fundamental transformation became bracketed and, instead, was replaced by the more ambiguous notion of resistance. The notion of resistance, however, says little about the nature of that which is being resisted or of the politics of the resistance involved — that is, the character of determine forms of critique, opposition, rebellion, and “resistance.” The notion of resistance expresses a deeply dualistic worldview that tends to reify both the system of domination and the idea of agency. It is rarely based on a reflexive analysis of possibilities for fundamental change that are both generated and suppressed by a dynamic heteronomous order. In that sense it lacks reflexivity. It is an undialectical category that does not grasp its own conditions of possibility; that is, it fails to grasp the dynamic historical context of which it is a part. Relatedly, it blurs important distinctions between politically very different forms of violence. What I have characterized as a turn to the concrete in the face of abstract domination is, of course, a form of reification. It can take various shapes. Two that have emerged with considerable force in the past 150 years have been the conflation of British and, then, American hegemony with that of global capital and reification of the latter as the Jews. This turn to the concrete, together with a worldview strongly influenced by Cold War dualisms (even among leftists critical of the Soviet Union), helped constitute a framework of understanding within which recent mass antiwar mobilizations operated, where opposition to a global power did not even implicitly point to a desired emancipatory transformation, certainly not in the Middle East. Such a reified understanding ends up tacitly supporting movements and regimes that have much more in common with earlier reactionary — even fascist — forms of rebellion than they do with anything we can call progressive. I have described an impasse of the Left today and sought to relate it to a form of reified thought and sensibility that expressed the disintegration of the Freudist synthesis beginning in the late 1960s and early 1970s. In my view this impasse expresses a complex crisis of the Left related to a perception that the industrial working class was not and would not become a revolutionary subject. At the same time, this crisis was related to the end of the state-centric order. The power of the state as an agent of social and democratic change was undermined, and the global order was transformed from an international to a supranational one. I would like to briefly outline an additional aspect of the reification associated with the impasse of the Left in the face of the collapse of Fordism. Neoliberal global capitalism has, of course, been promoted by successive American regimes. To completely conflate the global neoliberal order and the United States would, nevertheless, be a colossal mistake, politically as well as theoretically. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the hegemonic role of Great Britain and the liberal world order was challenged by the growing power of a number of nation-states, most notably Germany. These rivalries, which culminated in two world wars, were referred to as imperialist rivalries. Today we may be seeing the beginnings of a return to an era of imperialist rivalry on a new and expanded level. One of the emerging ongoing areas of tension is between the Atlantic powers and a Europe organized around a French-German condominium. The war in Iraq can, in part, be seen as an opening salvo in this rivalry. Whereas a century ago, the Germans sought to challenge the British Empire by means of the Berlin – Baghdad Railroad, more recently the Iraqi Baath regime was on its way to becoming a Franco-German client state. It is very significant that in 2000, Saddam Hussein’s Iraq became the first country to replace the dollar with the euro as the currency mediating the sale of oil. This substitution, of course, challenged the dollar’s position as a world

currency. At issue is not whether the Euro Bloc represents a progressive or regressive alternative to the United States. Rather, it is that this action (and the American reaction) may plausibly be seen as expressing the beginnings of an intercapitalist rivalry on a global scale. “Europe” is changing its meaning. It is now being constructed as a possible counterhegemon to the United States. The American attempt to reassert control over the Gulf and its oil should be understood as preemptive, but in a different sense than the way the term was used by the ideologues of the Bush administration and their critics. The American Public Culture action is, I would argue, a preemptive strike against the possible emergence of Europe or China (or any other power) as a rival military as well as economic superpower, that is, as an imperial rival. The reemergence of imperialist rivalries calls for the recovery of nondualistic forms of internationalism. However objectionable the current American administration is — and it is deeply objectionable on a very wide range of issues — the Left should be very careful about becoming, unwittingly, the stalking horse for a would-be rival hegemon. On the eve of World War I, the German General Staff thought it important for Germany that the war be fought against Russia as well as France and Great Britain. Because Russia was the most reactionary and autocratic European Power, the war could then be presented as a war for central European culture against the dark barbarism of Russia, which would guarantee Social Democratic support for the war. This political strategy succeeded — and resulted in a catastrophe for Europe in general and for Germany in particular. We are very far from a prewar situation like that of 1914. Nevertheless, the Left should not make a similar mistake by supporting, however implicitly, rising counterhegemons in order to defend civilization against the threat posed by a reactionary power. However difficult the task of grasping and confronting global capital might be, it is crucially important that a global internationalism be recovered and reformulated. Retaining the reified dualistic political imaginary of the Cold War runs the risk of constituting a form of politics that, from the standpoint of human emancipation, would be questionable, at the very best, however many people it may rouse.
Moishe Postone <<
Anti-Semitism and National Socialism

What is the relation of anti-Semitism to National Socialism? The public discussion of this problem in the Federal Republic has been characterized by a dichotomy between liberals and conservatives, on the one side, and the Left, on the other. Liberals and conservatives have tended to emphasize the discontinuity between the Nazi past and the present. In referring to that past they have focused attention on the persecution and extermination of the Jews and have tended to de-emphasize other central aspects of Nazism. By underlining the supposed total character of the break between the Third Reich and the Federal Republic, this sort of emphasis on anti-Semitism has paradoxically helped avoid a fundamental confrontation with the social and structural reality of National Socialism. That reality certainly did not completely vanish in 1945. The condemnation of Nazi anti-Semitism, in other words, has also served as an ideology of legitimation for the present system. This instrumentalization was only possible because anti-Semitism has been treated primarily as a form of prejudice, as a scapegoat ideology, thereby obscuring the intrinsic relationship between anti-Semitism and other aspects of National Socialism. On the other hand, the Left has tended to concentrate on the function of National Socialism for capitalism, emphasizing the destruction of working-class organizations, Nazi social and economic policies, rearmament, expansionism, and the bureaucratic mechanisms of party and state domination. Elements of continuity between the Third Reich and the Federal Republic have been stressed. The extermination of the Jews has not, of course, been ignored. Yet, it has quickly been subsumed under the general categories of prejudice, discrimination, and persecution. [1] In comprehending anti-Semitism as a peripheral, rather than as a central, moment of National Socialism, the Left has also obscured the intrinsic relationship between the two. Both of these positions understand modern anti-Semitism as anti-Jewish prejudice, as a particular example of racism in general. Their stress on the mass psychological nature of anti-Semitism isolates considerations of the Holocaust from socioeconomic and sociohistorical investigations of National Socialism. The Holocaust, however, cannot be understood so long as anti-Semitism is viewed as an example of racism in general and so long as Nazism is conceived of only in terms of big capital and a terroristic bureaucratic police state. Auschwitz, Belzec, Chelmo, Maidanek, Sobibor, and Treblinka should not be treated outside the framework of an analysis of National Socialism. They represent one of its logical end points, not simply its most terrible epiphenomenon. No analysis of National Socialism that cannot account for the extermination of European Jewry is fully adequate. In this essay I will attempt to approach an understanding of the extermination of European Jewry by outlining an interpretation of modern anti-Semitism. My intention is not to explain why Nazism and modern anti-Semitism achieved a breakthrough and became hegemonic in Germany. Such an attempt would entail an analysis of the specificity of German historical development, a subject about which a great deal has been written. This essay attempts, rather, to determine more closely what it was that achieved a breakthrough, by suggesting an analysis of modern anti-Semitism that indicates its intrinsic connection to National Socialism. Such an examination is a necessary precondition to any substantive analysis of why National Socialism succeeded in Germany. The first step must be a specification of the Holocaust and of modern anti-Semitism. The problem should not be posed quantitatively, whether in terms of numbers of people murdered or of degree of suffering. There are too many historical examples of mass murder and of genocide. (Many more Russians than Jews, for example, were killed by the Nazis.) The question is, rather, one of qualitative specificity. Particular aspects of the extermination of European Jewry by the Nazis remain inexplicable so long as anti-Semitism is treated as a specific example of a scapegoat strategy whose victims could very well have been members of any other group. The Holocaust was characterized by a sense of ideological mission, by a relative lack of emotion and immediate hate (as opposed to pogroms, for example), and, most importantly, by its apparent lack of functionality. The extermination of the Jews seems not to have been a means to another end. They were not exterminated for military reasons or in the course of a violent process of land acquisition (as was the case with the American Indians and the Tasmanians). Nor did Nazi policy toward the Jews resemble their policy toward the Poles and the Russians which aimed to eradicate those segments of the population around whom resistance might crystallize in order to exploit the rest more easily as helots. Indeed, the Jews were not exterminated for any manifest “extrinsic” goal. The extermination of the Jews was not only to have been total, but was its own goal - extermination for the sake of extermination - a goal that acquired absolute priority. [2] No functionalist explanation of the Holocaust and no scapegoat theory of anti-Semitism can even begin to explain why, in the last years of the war, when the German forces were being crushed by the Red Army, a significant proportion of vehicles was deflected from logistical support and used to
transport Jews to the gas chambers. Once the qualitative specificity of the extermination of European Jewry is recognized, it becomes clear that attempts at an explanation dealing with capitalism, racism, bureaucracy, sexual repression, or the authoritarian personality, remain far too general. The specificity of the Holocaust requires a much more determinate mediation in order even to approach its understanding. The extermination of European Jewry is, of course, related to anti-Semitism. The specificity of the former must be related to that of the latter. Moreover, modern anti-Semitism must be understood with reference to Nazism as a movement—a movement which, in terms of its own self-understanding, represented a revolt. Modern anti-Semitism, which should not be confused with everyday anti-Jewish prejudice, is an ideology, a form of thought, that emerged in Europe in the late nineteenth century. Its emergence presupposed earlier forms of anti-Semitism, which had for centuries been an integral part of Christian Western civilization. What is common to all forms of anti-Semitism is the degree of power attributed to the Jews: the power to kill God, to unleash the Bubonic Plague, and, more recently, to introduce capitalism and socialism. Anti-Semitic thought is strongly Manichaean, with the Jews playing the role of the children of darkness. It is not only a conspiracy theory, it is, for the most part, a conspiracy attributed to the Jews that distinguishes anti-Semitism from other forms of racism. Probably all forms of racism attribute potential power to the Other. This power, however, is usually concrete, material, or sexual. It is the potential power of the oppressed (as repressed), of the "Untermenschen." The power attributed to the Jews is much greater and is perceived as actual rather than as potential. Moreover, It is a different sort of power, one not necessarily concrete. What characterizes the power imputed to the Jews in modern anti-Semitism is that it is mysteriously intangible, abstract, and universal. It is considered to be a form of power that does not manifest itself directly, but must find another mode of expression. It seeks a concrete carrier, whether political, social, or cultural, through which it can work. Because the power of the Jews, as conceived by the modern anti-Semitic imagination, is not bound concretely, is not "rooted," it is presumed to be of staggering immensity and extremely difficult to check. It is considered to stand behind phenomena, but not to be identical with them. Its source is therefore deemed hidden— conspiratorial. The Jews represent an immensely powerful, intangible, international conspiracy. A graphic example of this vision is provided by a Nazi poster depicting Germany—represented as a strong, honest worker—threatened in the West by a fat, plutocratic John Bull and in the East by a brutal, barbaric Bolshevick Commissar. Yet, these two hostile forces are mere puppets. Peering over the edge of the globe, with the puppet strings firmly in his hands, is the Jew. Such a vision was by no means a monopoly of the Nazis. It is characteristic of traditional anti-Semitism that the Jews are considered to be the force behind those "apparent" opposites: plutocratic capitalism and socialism. "International Jewry" is, moreover, perceived to be centered in the "asphalt jungles" of the newly emergent urban megalopolis, to be behind "vulgar, materialist, modern culture" and, in general, all forces contributing to the decline of traditional social groupings, values, and institutions. The Jews represent a foreign, dangerous, destructive force undermining the social "health" of the nation. Modern anti-Semitism, then, is characterized not only by its secular content, but also by its systematic character. Its claim is to explain the world - a world that had rapidly become too complex and threatening for many people. This descriptive determination of modern anti-Semitism, while necessary in order to differentiate that form from prejudice or racism in general, is in itself not sufficient to indicate the intrinsic connection to National Socialism. That is, the aim of overcoming the customary separation between a sociohistorical analysis of Nazism and an examination of anti-Semitism is, on this level, not yet fulfilled. What is required is an explanation that can mediate the two. Such an explanation must be capable of grounding historically the form of anti-Semitism described above by means of the same categories that could be used to explain National Socialism. My intention is not to negate sociopsychological or psychoanalytical explanations, [3] but rather to elucidate a historical-epistemological frame of reference within which further psychological specifications can take place. Such a frame of reference must be able to elucidate the specific content of modern anti-Semitism and must be historical, that is, it must contribute to an understanding of why that ideology became so prevalent when it did, beginning in the late nineteenth century. In the absence of such a frame, all other explanatory attempts that focus on the subjective dimension remain historically indeterminate. What is required, then, is an explanation in terms of a social-historical epistemology. A full development of the problematic of anti-Semitism would go beyond the bounds of this essay. The point to be made here, however, is that a careful examination of the modern anti-Semitic worldview reveals that it is a form of thought in which the rapid development of industrial capitalism, with all its social ramifications, is given moral form, if not explicitly. It is not merely that the Jews were considered to be the owners of money, as in traditional anti-Semitism, but that they were held responsible for economic crises and identified with the range of social restructuring and dislocation resulting from rapid industrialization: explosive urbanization, the decline of traditional social classes and strata, the emergence of a large, increasingly organized industrial proletariat, and so on. In other words, the abstract domination of capital, which - particularly with rapid industrialization - caught people up in a web of dynamic forces they could not understand, became perceived as the domination of International Jewry. This, however, is no more than a first approach. The personification has been described, not yet explained. There have been many attempts at an explanation yet none, in my opinion, have been complete. The problem with those theories, such as that of Max Horkheimer, [4] which concentrate on the identification of the Jews with money and the sphere of circulation, is that they cannot account for the notion that the Jews also constitute the power behind social democracy and communism. At first glance, those theories, such as that of George L. Mosse, [5] which interpret modern anti-Semitism as a revolt against modernity, appear more satisfying. But plutocracy and working-class movements were concomitants of modernity, of the massive social restructuring resulting from capitalist indus-trialization. The problem with such approaches, however, is that "the modern" would certainly include industrial capital. Yet, as is well known, industrial capital was precisely not an object of anti-Semitic attacks, even in a period of rapid industrialization. Moreover, the attempt to identify modernity with, for example, National Socialism, in which modernity, especially toward modern technology, was affirmative rather than critical. The aspects of modern life that were rejected and those that were affirmed by the National Socialists form a pattern. That pattern should be intrinsic to an adequate conceptualization of the problem. Since that pattern was not unique to National Socialism, the problematic has far-reaching significance. The affirmation by modern anti-Semitism of industrial capital indicates that an approach is required that can distinguish between what modern capitalism is and the way it manifests itself, between its essence and its appearance. The term "modern" does not itself possess an intrinsic differentiation allowing for such a distinction. I would like to suggest that the social categories developed by Marx in his mature critique, such as "commodity" and "capital," are more adequate, inasmuch as a series of distinctions
between what is and what appears to be are intrinsic to the categories themselves. These categories can serve as the point of departure for an analysis capable of differentiating various perceptions of "the modern." Such an approach would attempt to relate the pattern of social critique and affirmation we are considering to characteristics of capitalist social relations themselves. These considerations lead us to Marx's concept of the fetish, the strategic intent of which was to provide a social and historical theory of knowledge grounded in the difference between the essence of capitalist social relations and their manifest forms. What underlies the concept of the fetish is Marx's analysis of the commodity, money and capital not merely as economic categories, but rather as the forms of the peculiar social relations that essentially characterize capitalism. In his analysis, capitalist forms of social relations do not appear as such, but are only expressed in objectified form. Labor in capitalism is not only social productive activity ("concrete labor"), but also serves in the place of overt social relations as a social mediation ("abstract labor"). Hence its product, the commodity, is not merely a product in which concrete labor is objectified; it is also a form of objectified social relations. In capitalism the product is not an object socially mediated by overt forms of social relations and domination. The commodity, as the objectification of both dimensions of labor in capitalism, is its own social mediation. It thus possesses a "double character": use-value and value. As object, the commodity both expresses and veils social relations which have no other, "independent" mode of expression. This mode of objectification of social relations is their alienation. The fundamental social relations of capitalism acquire a quasi-objective life of their own. They constitute a "second nature," a system of abstract domination and compulsion which, although social, is impersonal and "objective." Such relations appear not to be social at all, but natural. At the same time, the categorial forms express a particular, socially constituted conception of nature in terms of the objective, lawful, quantifiable behavior of a qualitatively homogeneous essence. The Marxian categories simultaneously express particular social relations and forms of thought. The notion of the fetish refers to forms of thought based upon perceptions that remain bound to the forms of appearance of capitalist social relations. [6] When one examines the specific characteristics of the forms attributed to the Jews by modern anti-Semitism: abstractness, intangibility, universality, mobility - it is striking that they are all characteristics of the value dimension of the social forms analyzed by Marx. Moreover, this dimension, like the supposed power of the Jews, does not appear as such, but always in the form of a material carrier, the commodity. At this point I will commence with a brief analysis of the way in which capitalist social relations present themselves. I will thereby attempt to explain the personification described above and clarify the problem of why modern anti-Semitism, which railed against so many aspects of the "modern," was so conspicuously silent, or was positive, with regard to industrial capital and modern technology. I will begin with the example of the commodity form. The divided and tension between value and use-value in the commodity form requires that this "double character" be materially externalized. It appears "doubled" as money (the manifest form of value) and as the commodity (the manifest form of use-value). Although the commodity is a social form expressing both value and use-value, the effect of this externalization is that the commodity appears only as its use-value dimension, as purely material and "thiny." Money, on the other hand, then appears as the sole repository of value, as the manifestation of the purely abstract, rather than as the externalized manifest form of the value dimension of the commodity itself. The form of materialized social relations specific to capitalism appears on this level of the analysis as the opposition between money, as abstract, and "thiny" nature. One aspect of the fetish, then, is that capitalist social relations do not appear as such and, moreover, present themselves antinomically, as the opposition of the abstract and concrete. Because, additionally, both sides of the antinomy are objectified, each appears to be quasi-natural. The abstract dimension appears in the form of abstract, universal, "objective," natural laws; the concrete dimension appears as pure "thiny" nature. The structure of alienated social relations that characterize capitalism has the form of a quasi-natural antinomy in which the social and historical do not appear. This antinomy is recapitulated as the opposition between positivist and romantic forms of thought. Most critical analyses of fetishized thought have concentrated on that strand of the antinomy that hypothesizes the abstract as transhistorical—so-called positive bourgeois thought—and thereby disguises the social and historical character of existing relations. In this essay, the other strand will be emphasized—that of forms of romanticism. The forms of romanticism, which, in terms of their own self-understandings, are antibourgeois, but which in fact hypothesize the concrete and thereby remain bound within the antinomy of capitalist social relations. Forms of anticapitalist thought that remain bound within the immediacy of this antinomy tend to perceive capitalism, and that which is specific to that social formation, only in terms of the manifestations of the abstract dimension of the antinomy; so, for instance, money is considered the "root of all evil." The existent concrete dimension is then positively opposed to it as the "natural" or ontologically human, which presumably stands outside the specificity of capitalist society. Thus, as with Proudhon, for example, concrete labor is understood as the noncapitalist moment opposed to the abstractness of money. [7] That concrete labor itself incorporates and is materially formed by capitalist social relations is not
understood. With the further development of capitalism, of the capital form and its associated fetish, the naturalization immanent to the commodity fetish acquires new dimensions. The capital form, like the commodity form, is characterized by the antinomic relation of concrete and abstract, both of which appear to be natural. The quality of the "natural," however, is different. Associated with the commodity fetish is the notion of the ultimately lawlike character of relations among individuals, while this emphasis is expressed, for example, in classical political economy or natural law theory. Capital, according to Marx, is self-valorizing value. It is characterized by a continuous, ceaseless process of the self-expansion of value. This process underlies rapid, large-scale cycles of production and consumption, creation and destruction. Capital has no fixed, final form, but appears at different stages of its spiraling path in the form of money and in the form of commodities. As self-valorizing value, capital appears as pure process. Its concrete dimension changes accordingly. Individual labors no longer constitute self-contained units. They increasingly become cellular components of a large, complex, dynamic system that encompasses people and machines and which is directed by one goal, namely, production for the sake of production. The alienated social and individual roles of the individual, constituting individuals and has a goal external to itself. That goal is a nonfinite process. The capital form of social relations has a blind, processual, quasi-organic character. With the growing consolidation of the capital form, the mechanical worldview of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries begins to give way; organic process begins to supplant mechanical statues as the form of the fetish. Organic theory of the state and the proliferation of racial theories and the rise of Social Darwinism in the late nineteenth century are cases in point. Society and historical process become increasingly understood in biological terms. I shall not develop this aspect of the capital fetish any further here. For our purposes what must be noted is the implications for how capital can be perceived. As indicated above, at the logical level of the analysis of the commodity, the "double character" allows the commodity to appear as a purely material entity rather than as the objectification of mediated social relations. Relatedly, it allows concrete labor to appear as a purely material, creative process, separable from capitalist social relations. On the logical level of capital, the "double character" (labor process and valorization process) allows industrial production to appear as a purely material, creative process, separable from capital. The manifest form of the concrete is now more organic. Industrial capital then can appear as the linear descendent of "natural" artisanal labor, as "organically rooted," in opposition to "rootless," "parasitic" finance capital. The organization of the former appears related to that of the guild; its social context is grasped as a superordinate organic unity: Community (Gemeinschaft), Volk, Race. Capital itself - or what is understood as the negative aspect of capitalism - is understood only in terms of the manifest form of its abstract dimension: finance and interest capital. In this sense, the biological interpretation, which opposes the concrete dimension (of capitalism) as "natural" and "healthy" to the negativity of what is taken to be "capitalism," does not stand in contradiction to a glorification of industrial capital and technology. Both are the "thingly" side of the antinomy. This relationship is commonly misunderstood. For example, Norman Mailer, defending neo-romanticism (and sexism) in The Prisoner of Sex, wrote that Hitler spoke of blood, to be sure, but built the machine. The point is that, in this form of fetishized "anticapitalism," both blood and the machine are seen as concrete counterpart-principles to the abstract. The positive emphasis on "nature," on blood, the soil, concrete labor, and Gemeinschaft, can easily go hand in hand with a glorification of technology and industrial capital. [8] This form of thought, then, is not to be understood as anachronistic, as the expression of historical nonsynchronism (Ungleichzeitigkeit), any more than the rise of racial theories in the late nineteenth century should be thought of as atavistic. They are historically new forms of thought and in no way represent the reemergence of an older form. It is because of the emphasis on biological nature that they appear to be atavistic or anachronistic. Herein lies the problem of this emphasis as expressed, for example, in classical political economy or natural law theory. The turn to biology and the desire for a return to "natural origins," combined with an affirmation of technology, which appear in many forms in the early twentieth century, should be understood as expressions of the aninomic fetish that gives rise to the notion that the concrete is "natural," and which increasingly presents the socially "natural" in such a way that it is perceived in biological terms. The hypostatization of the concrete and the identification of capital with the manifest abstract underlie a form of "anticapitalism" that seeks to overcome the existing social order from a standpoint which actually remains immanent to that order. Inasmuch as that standpoint is the concrete dimension, this ideology tends to point toward a more concrete and organized form of overt capitalist social synthesis. This form of "anticapitalism," then, is based on a one-sided attack on the abstract. The abstract and concrete are not seen as constituting an antinomy where the real overcoming of the abstract - of the value dimension - involves the historical overcoming of the antinomy itself as well as each of its terms. Instead there is the one-sided attack on abstract reason, abstract law, or, at another level, money and finance capital. In this sense it is antinomically complementary to liberal thought, where the domination of the abstract remains unquestioned and the distinction between positive and critical reason is not made. The "anticapitalist" attack, however, did not remain limited to the attack against abstraction. On this level of the capital fetish, it is not only the concrete side of the antinomy which can be naturalized and biologized. The manifest abstract dimension was also biologized - as the Jews. The fetishized opposition of the concrete material and the abstract, of the "natural" and the "artificial," became translated as the world-historically significant racial opposition of the Aryans and the Jews. Modern anti-Semitism involves a biologization of capitalism - which itself is only understood in terms of its manifest abstract dimension - as International Jewry. According to this interpretation, the Jews were identified not merely with money, with the sphere of circulation, but with capitalism itself. However, because of its fetishized form, capitalism did not appear to include industry and technology. Capitalism appeared to be only its manifest abstract dimension which, in turn, was responsible for the whole range of concrete social and cultural changes associated with the rapid development of modern industrial capitalism. The Jews were not seen merely as representatives of capital (in which case anti-Semitic attacks would have been much more class-specific). They became the personifications of the intangible, destructive, immensely powerful, and international domination of capital as an alienated social form. Certain forms of anticapitalist discontent became directed against the manifest abstract dimension of capital personified in the form of the Jews, not because the Jews were consciously identified with the value dimension, but because, given the antinomy of the abstract and concrete dimensions, capitalism appeared that way. The "anticapitalist" revolt was, consequently, also the revolt against the Jews. The overcoming of capitalism and its negative social effects became associated with the overcoming of the Jews. [9] Although the immersion
connection between the sort of “anticapitalism” that informed National Socialism and modern anti-Semitism has been indicated, the question remains why the biological interpretation of the abstract dimension of capitalism found its focus in the Jews. This “choice” was, within the European context, by no means fortuitous. The Jews could not have been replaced by any other group. The reasons for this are manifold. The long history of anti-Semitism in Europe and the related association of Jews with money are well known. The period of the rapid expansion of industrial capital in the last third of the nineteenth century coincided with the political and civil emancipation of the Jews in central Europe. There was a veritable explosion of Jews in the universities, the liberal professions, journalism, the arts, retail. The Jews rapidly became visible in civil society, particularly in spheres and professions that were expanding and which were associated with the newer form society was taking. One could mention many other factors, but there is one that I wish to emphasize. Just as the commodity, understood as a social form, expresses its “double character” in the externalized opposition between the abstract (money) and the concrete (the commodity), so is bourgeois society characterized by the split between the state and civil society. For the individual, the split is expressed as that between the individual as citizen and as person. As a citizen, the individual is abstract as is expressed, for example, in the notion of equality before the (abstract) law, or in the principle of one person, one vote. As a person, the individual is concrete, embedded in real class relations that are considered to be “private,” that is, pertaining to civil society, and which do not find political expression. In Europe, however, the notion of the nation as a purely political entity, abstracted from the substantiality of civil society, was never fully realized. The nation was not only a political entity, it was also concrete, determined by a common language, history, traditions, and religion. In this sense, the only group in Europe that fulfilled the determination of citizenship as a pure political abstraction was the Jews following their political emancipation. They were German or French citizens, but not really Germans or Frenchmen. They were of the nation abstractly, but rarely concretely. They were, in addition, citizens of most European countries. The quality of abstractness, characteristic not only of the value dimension in its immediacy, but also, mediatly, of the bourgeois state and law, became closely identified with the Jews. In a period when the concrete became glorified against the abstract, against “capitalism” and the bourgeois state, this became a fatal association. The Jews were rootless, international, and abstract. Modern anti-Semitism, then, is a particularly pernicious fetish form. Its power and danger result from its comprehensive worldview which explains and gives form to certain modes of anticapitalist discontent in a manner that leaves capitalism intact, by attacking the personifications of that social form. Anti-Semitism so understood allows one to grasp an essential moment of Nazism as a foreshortened anticapitalist movement, one characterized by a hatred of the abstract, a hypostatization of the existing concrete and by a single-minded, ruthless - but not necessarily hate-
filled - mission: to rid the world of the source of all evil. The extermination of European Jewry is the indication that it is far too simple to deal with Nazism as a mass movement with anticapitalist overtones which shed that husk in 1934 ("Roehm Putsch") at the latest, once it had served its purpose and state power had been seized. In the first place, ideological forms of thought are not simply conscious manipulations. In the second place, this view misunderstands the nature of Nazi “anticapitalism” - the extent to which it was intrinsically bound to the anti-Semitic worldview. Auschwitz indicates that connection. It is true that the somewhat too concrete and plebeian “anticapitalism” of the SA was dispensed with by 1934; not, however, the anti-Semitism thrust - the “knowledge” that the source of evil is the abstract, the Jew. A capitalist factory is a place where value is produced, which “unfortunately” has to take the form of the production of goods, of use-values. The concrete is produced as the necessary carrier of the abstract. The extermination camps were not a terrible version of such a factory but, rather, should be seen as its grotesque, Aryan, “anticapitalist” negation. Auschwitz was a factory to “destroy value,” that is, to destroy the personifications of the abstract. Its organization was that of a fiendish industrial process, the aim of which was to “liberate” the concrete from the abstract. The first step was to dehumanize, that is, to rip away the “mask” of humanity, of qualitative specificity, and reveal the Jews for what “they really are”—shadows, ciphers, numbered abstractions. The second step was to then eradicate that abstractness, to transform it into smoke, trying in the process to wrest away the last remnants of the concrete material “use-value”: clothes, gold, hair, soap. Auschwitz, not the Nazi seizure of power in 1933, was the real “German Revolution,” the attempted “overthrow,” not merely of a political order, but of the existing social formation. By this one deed the world was to be made safe from the tyranny of the abstract.In the process, the Nazis “liberated” themselves from humanity. The Nazis lost the war against the Soviet Union, America, and Britain. They won their war, their “revolution,” against the European Jews. They not only succeeded in murdering six million Jewish children, women, and men. They succeeded in destroying a culture—a very old culture—that of European Jewry. It was a culture characterized by a tradition incorporating a complicated tension of particularity and universality. This internal tension was duplicated as an external one, characterizing the relation of the Jews with their Christian surroundings. The Jews were never fully a part of the larger societies in which they lived nor were they ever fully apart from those societies. The results were frequently disastrous for the Jews. Sometimes they were very fruitful. That field of tension became sedimented in most individual Jews following the emancipation. The ultimate resolution of this tension between the particular and the universal is, in the Jewish tradition, a function of time, of history—the coming of the Messiah. Perhaps, however, in the face of secularization and assimilation, European Jewry would have given up that tension. Perhaps that culture would have gradually disappeared as a living tradition, before the resolution of the particular and the universal had been realized. This question will never be answered.

Max Horkheimer/Theodor W. Adorno <<
Elements of Anti-Semitism: Limits of Enlightenment

1
Anti-Semitism today is for some a question affecting human destiny and for others a mere pretext. For the fascists the Jews are not a minority but the antirace, the negative principle as such; on their extermination the world’s happiness depends. Diametrically opposed to this is the thesis that the Jews, free of nativistic or racial features, form a group through religious belief and tradition and nothing else. Jewish traits relate to Eastern Jews, and only to those not yet assimilated. Both doctrines are true and false at same time. The first is true in the sense that fascism has made it true. The Jews are today the group which, in practice and in theory, draws to itself the destructive urge which the wrong social order spontaneously produces. They are branded as absolute evil by absolute evil. In this sense they are indeed the chosen people. Now that power is no longer needed for economic reasons, the Jews are designated as its absolute object, existing merely for the exercise of power. The workers, who are the real target, are understandably not told as much to their faces; the blacks must be kept in their place, but the Jews are to be wiped from the face of the earth, and the call to exterminate them like vermin finds an echo among the prospective fascists of all countries. In the image of the Jew which the racial nationalists hold up before the world they express their own essence. Their craving is for exclusive ownership, appropriation, unlimited power, and at any price. The Jew, burdened with his tormentors’ guilt, mocked as their lord, they nail to the cross, endlessly repeating a sacrifice in whose power they are unable to believe.

The other, liberal thesis is true as an idea. It contains an image of the society in which rage would no longer reproduce itself or seek qualities on which to be discharged. But by assuming the unity of humanity to have been already realized in principle, the liberal thesis serves as an apology for the existing order. The attempt to avert the direct threat by minority policies and other democratic measures is ambiguous as is the defensive strategy of the last liberal citizens. Their powerlessness attracts the enemy of powerlessness. The mode of life and appearance of the Jews compromise the existing universal by deficient adaptation. Their inflexible adherence to their own order of life has placed them in an insecure relationship to the prevailing one. They are expected to be sustained by that order without subscribing to it. Their relationship to the dominant nations was one of greed and fear. Yet whenever they sacrificed their difference to the prevailing mode, the successfully adapted Jews took on in exchange the cold, stoical character which existing society imposes on human beings. The dialectical intertwining of enlightenment and power, the dual relationship of progress to both cruelty and liberation, which has been brought home to the Jews no less by the great exponents of enlightenment than by democratic popular movements, manifests itself in the makeup of the assimilated Jews themselves. The enlightened self-control with which adapted Jews effaced within themselves the painful scars of domination by others, a kind of second circumcisation, made them forsake their own dilapidated community and wholeheartedly embrace the life of the modern bourgeoisie, which was already advancing inductively toward a reversion to pure oppression and reorganization into an exclusively racial entity. Race is not, as the racial nationalists claim, an immediate, natural peculiarity. Rather, it is a regression to nature as mere violence, to the hidebound particularism which, in the existing order, constitutes precisely the universal. Race today is the self-assertion of the bourgeois individual, integrated into the barbaric collective. The harmonious society in which Jews declared their allegiance has finally been granted to them in the form of the national community. They believed that only anti-Semitism disfigured this order, which in reality cannot exist without disfiguring human beings.

The persecution of the Jews, like any persecution, cannot be separated from that order. Its essence, however it may hide itself at times, is the violence which today is openly revealed.

2
Anti-Semitism as a popular movement has always been driven by the urge of which its instigators accuse the social democrats: to make everyone the same. Those without the power to command must fare no better than ordinary people. From the German civil servant to the Negroes in Harlem, those avidly emulating their betters have always known that they would really gain nothing but the satisfaction of seeing-others no better off than themselves. The Aryanization of Jewish property, which in any case primarily benefited those at the top, enriched the masses in the Third Reich hardly more than the wretched booty pillaged from Jewish quarters enriched the Cossacks. The real benefit it brought was a half-understood ideology. That the demonstration of its economic futility heightened rather than moderated the attraction of the racialist panacea points to its true nature: it does not help human beings but assuages their urge to destroy. The actual advantage enjoyed by the racist comrade is that his rage will be sanctioned by the collective. The less he gains in any other way, the more obstinately, against better knowledge, he clings to the movement. Anti-Semitism has proved immune to the charge of inadequate profitability. For the common people it is a luxury. Its usefulness for the rulers is evident. It serves as a distraction, a cheap means of corruption, a terrorist warning. The respectable rackets condone it, the disreputable ones carry it out. But the form of the mentality, both social and individual, which manifests itself in anti-Semitism, the primeval-historical entrapment from which it is a desperate attempt to escape, remains wholly obscure. If a madly so deeply embedded in civi lization is not properly accounted for by knowledge, the individual, too, though he may be as well intentioned as the victim himself, cannot mitigate it through understanding. The plausibly rational, economic, and political explanations and counterarguments - however correct their individual observations - cannot appeased it, since rationality itself, through its link to power, is submerged in the same malady. Whether blindly dealing out blows or blindly lending them off, persecutors and victims form part of the same calamitous cycle. Anti-Semitic behavior is unleashed in situations in which blinded people, deprived of subjectivity, are let loose as subjects. Their actions - for those involved - are lethal yet meaningless reactions, of the kind which behaviorists register but fail to interpret. Anti-Semitism is a well-rehearsed pattern, indeed, a ritual of civilization, and the pogroms are the true ritual murders. They demonstrate the impotence of what might have restrained them - reflection, meaning, ultimately truth. The mindless
pastime of beating people to death confirms the drab existence to which one merely conforms.

The blindness of anti-Semitism, its lack of intention, lends a degree of truth to the explanation of the movement as a release valve vented on those who are both conspicuous and unprotected. And just as, depending on the constellation, the victims are interchangeable: vagrants, Jews, Protestants, Catholics, so each of them can replace the murderer, in the same blind lust for killing, as soon as he frets the power of representing the norm. There is no authentic anti-Semitism, and certainly no born anti-Semite. The older adults to whom the call for Jewish blood has become second nature are as ignorant of the reason as the young people who have to shed it. The high-placed instigators, who know the reason, neither hate the Jews nor love their own followers. The latter, however, who always go short, economically and sexually, hate without end; they find relaxation unbearable because they do not know fulfillment. Indeed, the organized robbers and murderers are animated by a kind of dynamic idealism. Setting out on their pillages, they construct a grandiose ideology for what they do, with famous talk of saving the family, the fatherland, humanity But as they remain the dupes they secretly suspect themselves to be, their pitiful rational motive, the theft, which was supposed to rationalize the deed, is finally discarded entirely, and the rationalization becomes truthful against its will.

The obscure impulse which was always more congenial to them than reason takes them over completely. The rational island sinks beneath the flood, and those desperately floundering now appear only as defenders of truth, restorers of the earth which has to be reformed to its farthest corners. All living things become material for their ghastly duty, which now flinches at nothing. Action becomes a purpose in itself, cloaking, its own purposelessness. Anti-Semitism always starts with an appeal to complete the task. Anti-Semitism and totality have been profoundly connected. Blindness encompasses everything because it comprehends nothing.

Liberalism had granted the Jews property, but without the authority to command. The purpose of human rights was to promise happiness even where power was lacking. Because the cheated masses are dimly aware that premise, being universal, remains a lie as long as classes exist, it arouses their Danger they feel themselves scorned. They must continually repress the thought of that happiness even as a possibility, an idea, and they deny it all the more fiercely the more its time has come. Wherever it appears to be realized amid the systematic deprivation, they must reenact the suppression which has been applied to their own longing. Whatever that reenactment is directed against, however unhappy it may itself be Ahasuerus and Mignon, exoticism which evokes the promised land, beauty which summons the thought of sex, the animal Whose hint of promiscuity con demnis it as repulsive draws down on itself the destructive fury of the civilized, who can never fully complete the painful process of civilization. To those who compulsively control it, tormented nature provocatively reflects back the appearance of powerless happiness. The idea of happiness without power is unendurable because it alone would be happiness. The fantasy of the conspiracy of lascivious Jewish bankers who finance Bolshevism is a sign of innate powerlessness, the good life an emblem of happiness. These are joined by the image of the intellectual, who appears to enjoy in thought what the others deny themselves and is spared the sweat of toil and bodily strength. The banker and the intellectual, money and mind, the exponents of circulation, are the disowned wishful image of those mutilated by power, an image which power uses to perpetuate itself.

3

The present society, in which primitive religious feelings, new cults and the legacy of revolutions are peddled in the market, in which the fascist leaders barter the land and lives of nations behind locked doors while the public lulled
by their radio sets calculate the cost: this society in which even the word which unmasks it doubles as an invitation to join a political racket in which no longer is politics merely business but business is the whole of politics this society is scandalized by the Jew with his obsolete shopkeeper's mannerisms, labeling him a materialist, a haggler, who should make way for the pioneering spirit of those who have elevated business to an absolute.

Bourgeois anti-Semitism has a specific economic purpose: to conceal domination in production. In former epochs the rulers were directly repressive, so that they not only left work exclusively to the lower orders but declared it the ignominy it always was under domination, in the age of mercantilism the absolute monarch transformed himself into the supreme master of manufactories. Production became presentable at court. Finally, as bourgeois, the masters replaced their colorful robes with civilian dress. Work is no disgrace, they said the more rationally to take possession of that of others. Aligning themselves with the productive elements, they remained the parasites of old. The factory owner ventured and raked in like a great merchant or banker. He calculated, procured, bought, sold in the market he competed with the merchants and bankers for the profit due to his capital. But he grabbed not merely from the market but from the source: as a functionary of the class system he had to throw in the fruits of the workers' labor. The workers had to deliver as much as possible. Like a true Shylock he insisted on his contract. By virtue of owning the machines and materials, he forced the others to produce. He called himself the producer, but he and everyone secretly knew the truth. The productive work of the capitalist, whether he justified his profit as the reward of enterprise, as under liberalism, or as the director's salary, as today, was the ideology which concealed the nature of the labor contract and the rapacity of the economic system in general.'

That is why people shout: "Stop thief!" and point at the Jew. He is indeed the scapegoat, not only for individual maneuvers and machinations but in the wider sense that the economic injustice of the whole class is attributed to him. The factory owner has his debtors the workers, under observation in his factory and can check their performance before he parts with his money. They only find the true nature of the exchange only when they see what they can buy with it: the smallest magnate has access to a quantity of services and goods available to no ruler before him: but the workers receive what is called the cultural minimum. Not content with letting the market tell them how few goods can be theirs, the salesman sings the praises of those they cannot afford. Only the relationship of wages to prices expresses what is withheld from the workers. With their wages they have accepted the principle of just remuneration. The merchant presents them with the promissory note they have signed on behalf of the manufacturer. The merchant is the bailiff for the whole system, taking upon himself the blame due to the others. That the circulation sphere is responsible for exploitation is a socially necessary illusion.

The Jews had not been the only people active in the circulation sphere. But they had been locked up in it too long not to reflect in their makeup something of the hatred so long directed at that sphere. Unlike their Aryan colleagues, they were largely denied access to the source of added value. Only at a late stage and with difficulty were they allowed to gain ownership of the means of production. To be sure, in the history of Europe, and even in imperial Germany, baptized Jews had reached high positions in administration and industry. But they always had to justify this with redoubled devotion and diligence, and stubborn self-denial. They were only admitted if, through their behavior, they tacitly adopted and confirmed the verdict on the other Jews: that is the purpose of baptism. All the great achievements of their prominent members were not enough to allow Jews to be admitted to the peoples of Europe; having been prevented from putting down roots they were then criticized as rootless. They always remained the protected Jews, dependent on emperors, princes, or the absolutist state. These patrons were economically more advanced than the rest of the population. To the extent that they could make use of the Jew as an intermediary, they protected him against the masses who had to foot the bill for progress. The Jews were the colonizers of progress. Having helped as merchants to disseminate Roman civilization throughout Gentile Europe, they became, in keeping with their patriarchal religion, representatives of urban, civic, and finally industrial conditions. As bearers of capitalist modes of existence from country to country they earned the hatred of those who suffered under that system. For the sake of the economic progress which today is their downfall the Jews were from the first a thorn in the side of the craftsmen and farmers whose status capitalism undermined. Now it is their turn to bear the brunt of its exclusive, particularist character. They, who always wanted to be first, are left far behind. Even the Jewish head of an American entertainment trust is hopelessly defensive amid his wealth. The caftan was the ghostly residue of ancient civic dress. Today it is a sign that its wearers have been flushed from the modern society to the fringes of a new social order.
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Nationalist anti-Semitism seeks to disregard religion. It claims to be concerned with purity of race and nation. Its exponents notice that people have long ceased to trouble themselves about eternal salvation. The average believer today is as crafty as only cardinals were in former times. To accuse the Jews of being obdurate unbelievers is no longer enough to incite the masses. But the religious hostility which motivated the persecution of the Jews for two millennia is far from completely extinguished. Rather, anti-Semitism's eagerness to deny its religious tradition indicates that that tradition is secretly no less deeply embedded in it than secular desacralization once was in religious zealotry. Religion has been incorporated as cultural heritage, not abolished. The alliance between enlightenment and power has debarred from consciousness the moment of truth in religion while conserving its refined forms. Both circumstances finally benefit fascism: the unchanneled longing is guided into racial-nationalist rebellion, while the descendants of the evangelical zealots are converted into conspirators of blood communities and elite guards, on the model of the Wagnerian knights of the Grail. In this way religion as an institution is partly meshed directly into the system and partly transposed into the pomp of mass culture and parades. The fanatical faith on which leader and followers pride themselves is no other than the grim doctrine which was earlier used to discipline the desperate, except that its content has gone astray that content lives on only as hatred of those who do not share the among the "German Christians," all that remained of the religion love was anti-Semitism.
Christianity is not only a regression beyond Judaism. The latter's God, passing from a henotheistic to a universal form, did not entirely abandon the features of the nature demon. The terror originating in remote preanaim times passes from nature into the concept of the 'absolute self which, as its creator and ruler, entirely subjugates nature. Despite the ineffable power and splendor in which such alienation clothes it, that ruler is still attainable to thought, which becomes universal through this very relationship to something supreme, transcendent. God as spirit is the principle opposed to nature; it not only stands for nature's blind cycle as do all the mythical gods, but offers liberation from it. But in its remote abstractness, the incommensurable has at the same time become more terrible, and the pitiless statement: "I am who am" which tolerates nothing besides itself, surpasses in its inescapable power the blinder and therefore more ambiguous judgment of anonymous fate.

The God of Judaism demands what he is owed and settles accounts with the defaulters. He enmeshes his creatures in a tissue of debt and credit, guilt and merit in contrast. Christianity emphasized the moment of grace, although that, too, is contained in Judaism, in God's covenant with men and in the Messianic promise. It softened the terror of the absolute by allowing the creature to find itself reflected in the deity: the divine mediator is called by a human name and dies a human death. His message is: fear not; the law yields before faith; love becomes greater than any majesty, the only commandment.

But by virtue of the same moments by which it lifted the spell of nature religion, Christianity is producing ideology once again in a spiritualized form. To the same degree as the absolute is brought closer to the finite*, the finite is made absolute. Christ, the incarnated spirit, is the deified sorcerer. The human self-reflection in the absolute, the humanization of God through Christ, is the proton pseudos [first substitution]. The progress beyond Judaism is paid for with the assertion that the mortal Jesus was God. The harm is done precisely by the reflective moment of Christianity, the spiritualization of magic. A spiritual essence is attributed to something which mind identifies as natural. Mind consists precisely in demonstrating the contradiction inherent in such pretension of the finite. Bad conscience is therefore obliged to present the prophet as a symbol, the magical practice as transubstantiation. It is that which makes Christianity a religion, and, in a sense, the only one: an intellectual link to something intellectually suspect, a special sphere of culture. Like the great Asiatic belief systems, pre-Christian Judaism was hardly separable from national life, from collective self-preservation. The reshaping of the heathen ritual of sacrifice not only took place in worship and in the mind but determined the form of the labor process. In providing the schema for the latter, sacrifice becomes rational. The taboo is transformed into the rational Organization of the work process. It regulates administration in war and peace, sowing and harvesting, food preparation and slaughter. Although the rules may not arise from rational reflection, rationality arises from them. The effort of primitive peoples to free themselves from immediate fear engendered among them the institution of ritual; this was refined by Judaism into the sanctified rhythm of family and national life. The priests were appointed to watch over the proper observance of custom. Their function within the power structure was clearly displayed in theocratic practice; Christianity, however, wanted to remain spiritual even where it aspired to power; in ideology it repudiated self-preservation by the ultimate sacrifice, that of the man-god, but thereby relegated devalued life to the sphere of the profane: it abolished the law of Moses but rendered what was theirs unto both God and Caesar. Secular authority is either confirmed or usurped, while Christianity acquires a license to manage salvation. Self-preservation is to be conquered though the
anti-Semitism. The adherents of the religion of the Son hated the supporters of the religion of the Father as one hates those who know better. This is the hostility of spirit hardened as faith in salvation for spirit as mind. What is vexatious for the Christian enemies of the Jews is the truth which withstands evil without rationalizing it, and clings to the idea of unearned beatitude in disregard of worldly actions and the order of salvation which allegedly bring it about. Anti-Semitism is supposed to confirm that the ritual of faith and history is justified by ritually sacrificing those who deny its justice.
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"I simply can't abide you - so don't forget it," says Siegfried to Mime, who is trying to win his love. The stock reply of all anti-Semites is the appeal to idiosyncrasy. Society’s emancipation from anti-Semitism depends on whether the content of that idiosyncrasy is raised to the level of a concept and becomes aware of its own senselessness. But idiosyncrasy attaches itself to the peculiar. The universal, that, which fits into the context of social utility, is regarded as natural. But anything natural which has not been absorbed into utility by passing through the cleansing channels of conceptual order the screech of stylos on slate which sets the teeth on edge the haut goût which brings to mind filth and corruption the sweat which appears on the brow of the diligent whatever is not assimilated, or infringes the commands in which the progress of centuries has been sedimented, is felt as intrusive and arouses a compulsive aversion. The motifs which trigger such idiosyncrasy are those which allude to origin. They recreate moments of biological prehistory: danger signs which made the hair stand on end and the heart stop. In the idiosyncratic aversion individual organs escape the subject’s control, autonomously obeying fundamental biological stimuli. The self which experiences itself in such reactions rigidity of the skin, muscles, and limbs is not quite master of them. For a few moments they mimic the motionlessness of surrounding nature. But as what is mobile draws closer to the immobile, more highly developed life to mere nature, it is also estranged from it, since immobile nature, which living creatures, like Daphne, seek with utmost agitation to become, is capable only of the most external, spatial relationships. Space is absolute alienation. Where the human seeks to resemble nature, at the same time it hardens itself against it. Protection as petrified terror is a form of camouflage. These numb human reactions are archaic patterns of self-preservation: the tribute life pays for its continued existence is adaptation to death.

Civilization replaced the organic adaptation to otherness, mimetic behavior proper, firstly, in the magical phase, with the organized manipulation of mimesis, and finally, in the historical phase, with rational praxis, work. Uncontrolled mimesis is proscribed. The angel which, with fiery sword, drove humans out of paradise and on to the path of technical progress is itself the symbol of that progress. The severity with which, over the centuries, the rulers have prevented both their own successors and the subjugated masses from relapsing into mimetic behavior from the religious ban on graven images through the social ostracizing of actors and gypsies to the education which "cures" children of childishness is the condition of civilization. Social and individual education reinforces the objectifying behavior required by work and prevents people from submerging themselves once more in the ebb and flow of surrounding nature. All distraction, indeed, all devotion has an element of mimicry. The ego has been forged by hardening itself against such behavior. The transition from reflecting mimesis to controlled reflection completes its formation. Bodily adaptation to nature is replaced by "recognition in a concept," the subsuming of difference under sameness.

However, the constellation under which sameness is established, both the direct sameness of mimesis and the indirect sameness of synthesis, the adaptation of the self to the, thing in the blind act of living no less than the comparison or reified elements in scientific conceptualization that constellation remains terror. Society perpetuates the threat from nature as the permanent, organized compulsion which, reproducing itself in individuals as systematic self-preservation, rebounds against nature as society’s control over it. Science is repetition, refined to observed regularity and preserved in stereotypes. The mathematical formula is consciously manipulated regression, just as the magic ritual was; it is the most sublimated form of mimicry. In technology the adaptation to lifelessness in the service of self-preservation is no longer accomplished, as in magic, by bodily imitation of external nature, but by automating mental processes, turning them into blind sequences. With its triumph human expressions become both controllable and compulsive. All that remains of the adaptation to nature is the hardening against it. The camouflage used to protect and strike terror today is the blind mastery of nature, which is identical to earthed instrumentality.

In the bourgeois mode of production the ineradicable mimetic heritage present in all praxis is consigned to oblivion. The pitless ban on regression appears like an illusion: we will develop in this sense. The need to totalize is consciously registered. Those blinded by civilization have contact with their own tabooed mimetic traits only through certain gestures and forms of behavior they encounter in others, as isolated, shameful residues in their rationalized environment. What repels them as alien is all too familiar. It lurks in the contagious gestures of an immediacy suppressed by civilization; gestures of touching, nestling, soothing, coxing. What makes such impulses repellent today is their outmodedness. In seeking to win over the buyer with flattery, the debtor with threats, the creditor with supplication, they appear to translate long-reified human relationships back into those of personal power. Any emotion is finally embarrassing; mere excitement is preferable. All unmanipulated expression appears like the grimace which the manipulated expression of the film actor, the Lynch mob, the Führer’s speech always was. Undisciplined mimicry is the brand burned by the old domination into the living substance of the dominated, and is inherited through an unconscious process of imitation in early childhood from generation to generation, from the Jewish rags-and-bones man to the banker. Such mimicry provokes anger, because it puts on show, in face of the new relationships of production, the old fear which one has had to forget in order to survive them. It is the compulsive moment in behavior, the rage of the tormentor and of the tormented, reappearing indistinguishably in the grimace, that triggers the specific rage of civilized people. Impotent appearance is answered by deadly reality, play by seriousness.

The grimace seems like play-acting because, instead of performing serious work, it prefers to portray displeasure. It appears to evade the seriousness of life by admitting it without restraint: therefore it is false. But expression is the painful echo of overwhelming power, violence which finds utterance in complaint. It is always overdone, no matter how heartfelt it may be, because, as in each work of art, the whole world seems contained in every plaintive sound. Only activity is proportionate. It, and not mimesis, can bring an end to suffering. But its consequence is the rigid, unmove visage, culminating, at the end of this age, in the baby faces of the practical men, the politicians, priests, managing directors, racketeers. The strident voices of fascist rabble-rousers and camp commanders show the reverse side of the same social condition. The screaming is as cold-blooded as business. Even the plaintive sounds of nature are appropriated as an element of technique.
bellowing of these orators is to the pogrom what its howling klaxon is to the German flying bomb: the cry of terror which announces terror is mechanically switched on. The screamers deliberately use the wail of the victim, which first called violence by its name, and even the mere word which designates the victim - Frenchman, Negro, Jew - to induce in themselves the desperation of the persecuted who have to hit out. They are the false likeness of the terrified mimesis. They reproduce within themselves the insatiability of the power of which they are afraid. Everything must be used, everything must belong to them. The mere existence of the other is a provocation. Everyone else "gets in the way" and must be shown their limits - the limits of limitless horror. No one who seeks shelter shall find it; those who express what everyone craves - peace, homeland, freedom - will be denied it, just as nomads and traveling players have always been refused rights of domicile. Whatever someone fears, that is done to him. Even the last resting place shall be none. The despoiling of graveyards is not an excess of anti-Semitism; it is anti-Semitism itself. Those evicted compulsively arouse the lust to evict them even here. The marks left on them by violence endlessly inflame violence. Anything which merely wants to vegetate must be rooted out. The chaotically regular flight reactions of the lower animals, the patterns of swarming crowds, the convulsive gestures of the tortured all these express what wretched life can never quite control: the mimetic impulse. In the death throes of the creature, at the furthest extreme from freedom, freedom itself irresistibly shines forth as the thwarted destiny of matter. It is against this freedom that the idiosyncratic aversion, the purported motive of anti-Semitism, is ultimately directed. The psychic energy harnessed by political anti-Semitism is this rationalized idiosyncrasy. All the gesticulations devised by the Führer and his followers are pretexts for giving way to the mimetic temptation without openly violating the reality principle with honor, as it were. They detest the Jews and imitate them constantly. There is no anti-Semite who does not feel an instinctive urge to ape what he takes to be Jewishness. The same mimetic codes are constantly used: the argumentative jerking of the hands, the singing tone of voice, which vividly animates a situation or a feeling independently of judgment, and the nose, that physiognomic principium individuationis, which writes the individual's peculiarity on his face. In the ambiguous partialities of the sense of smell the old nostalgia for what is lower lives on, the longing for immediate union with surrounding nature, with earth and slime. Of all the senses the act of smelling, which is attracted without objectifying, reveals most sensuously the urge to lose oneself in identification with the other. That is why smell, as both the perception and the perceived - which are one in the act of olfaction - is more expressive than other senses. When we see we remain who we are, when we smell we are absorbed entirely. In civilization, therefore, smell is regarded as a disgrace, a sign of the lower social orders, lesser races, and baser animals. The civilized person is allowed to give way to such desires only if the prohibition is suspended by rationalization in the service of practical purposes, real or apparent. One is allowed to indulge the outlawed drive if acting with the unquestionable aim of expunging it. This is manifested in the practical joke. It is a wretched parody of fulfillment. The mimetic function is sneeringly enjoyed as something despised and self-despising. Anyone who sniffs out "bad" smells in order to extirpate them may imitate to his heart's content the sniffing which takes its unrationaized pleasure in the smell itself. Disinfected by the civilized sniffer's absolute identification with the prohibiting agency, the forbidden impulse eludes the prohibition. If it crosses the threshold, the response is laughter. That is the schema of the anti-Semitic reaction. The anti-Semites gather to celebrate the moment when authority lifts the ban; that
moment alone makes them a collective, constituting the community of kindred spirits. Their ranting is organized laughter. The Inure dreadful the accusations and threats, the greater the fury, the more withering is the scorn. Rage, mockery, and poisoned imitation are fundamentally the same thing. The purpose of the fascist cult of formulae, the ritualized discipline, the uniforms, and the whole allegedly irrational apparatus, is to make possible mimetic behavior.

The elite—symbols proper to every counterrevolutionary movement, the death's heads and masquerades, the barbaric drumming, the monotonous repetition of words and gestures, are so many organized imitations of magical practices, the mimesis of mimesis. The Führer, with his ham-actor's facial expressions and the hysterical charisma turned on with a switch, leads the dance. In his performance he acts out by proxy and in effigy what is denied to everyone else in reality. Hitler can gesticulate like a clown, Mussolini risk false notes like a provincial tenor, Goebbels talk as glibly as the Jewish agent whose murder he is recommending, Coughlin preach love like the Savior himself, whose crucifixion he impersonates for the sake of yet more bloodshed. Fascism is also totalitarian in seeking to place oppressed nature's rebellion against domination directly in the service of domination.

This mechanism needs the Jews. Their artificially heightened visibility acts on the legitimate son of gentle civilization like a kind of magnetic field. In being made aware, through his very difference from the Jew, of the humanity they have in common, the rooted gentile is overcome by a feeling of something antithetical and alien. In this way the tabooed impulses which run counter to work in its dominant form are converted into conforming idiosyncrasies. Against this the economic position of the Jews, the last defrauded fraudsters of the liberal ideology, offers no reliable protection. Because they are so eminently suited to generating these inductive psychic currents they are unresistingly allocated to such functions. They share the fate of the rebellious nature for which fascism subordinates them, being put to the test on the bane peculiarity of the blind. It makes little difference whether the Jews as individuals really display the mimetic traits which cause the malign infection or whether those traits are merely imputed. If the holders of economic power have once overcome their fear of employing fascist agents, in face of the Jews the harmony of the national community is automatically established. They are sacrificed by the dominant order when, through its increasing estrangement from nature, it has reverted to mere nature. The Jews as a whole are charged with practicing forbidden magic and bloody rituals. Disguised as an accusation, the subliminal craving of the indigenous population to revert to mimetic sacrificial practices is joyously readmitted to their consciousness. Once the horror of the primeval age, sent packing by civilization, has been reestablished as a rational interest through projection onto the Jews, there is no holding back. It can be acted out in reality, and the evil which is acted out surpasses even the evil content of the projection. The popular nationalist fantasies of Jewish crimes, of infanticide and sadistic excesses, of racial poisoning and international conspiracy, precisely define the anti-Semitic dream, and fall short of its realization. Once things have gone so far, the mere word Jew appears like the bloody grimace whose image - skull and mangled cross in one - is unfurled on the swastika flag; the fact that someone is called a Jew acts as a provocation to set about him until he resembles that image. Civilization is the triumph of society over nature a triumph which transforms everything into mere nature. The Jews themselves, over the millennia, have played their part in this, with enlightenment no less than with cynicism. As the oldest surviving patriarchy, the incarnation of oppression, they converted taboos into maxims of civilization while the others were still enmeshed in magic. The Jews appeared to have successfully achieved what Christianity had attempted in vain: the disempowerment of magic by means of its own strength, which, as worship of God, is turned against itself. They have not so much eradicated the adaptation to nature as elevated it to the pure duties of ritual. In this way they have preserved its reconciling memory, without relapsing through symbols into mythology. They are therefore regarded by advanced civilization as both backward and too advanced, like and unlike, of owd and stupid. They are pronounced guilty of what, as the first citizens, they were the first to subdue themselves: the susceptibility to the lure of base instincts, the urge toward the beast and the earth, the worship of images. Because they invented the concept of the kosher, they are persecuted as swine. The anti-Semites appoint themselves executors of the Old Testament: they see to it that the Jews, having eaten of the Tree of Knowledge, unto dust shall return.
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Anti-Semitism is based on false projection. It is the reverse of genuine mimesis and has deep affinities to the repressed; in fact, it may itself be the pathetic character trait in which the latter is precipitated. If mimesis makes itself resemble its surroundings, false projection makes its surroundings resemble itself. If, for the former, the outworld becomes the model to which the inward clings, so that the alien becomes the intimately known, the latter displaces the volatile inward into the outer world, branding the intimate friend as foe. Impulses which are not acknowledged by the subject and yet are his, are attributed to the object: the prospective victim. For the ordinary paranoid the choice of victim is not free; it obeys the laws of his illness. In fascism this behavior is adopted by politics; the object of the illness is declared true to reality, the system of delusions the reasonable norm in a world which makes deviation neurosis. The mechanism which the totalitarian order takes into its service is as old as civilization. The sexual impulses suppressed by humanity survived in both individuals and peoples and asserted themselves in the imaginary transformation of the surrounding world into a diabolic system. Those impelled by blind murderous lust have always seen in the victim the pursuer who has driven them to desperate self-defense, and the mightiest of the rich have experienced their weakest neighbor as an intolerable threat before falling upon him. The rationalization was both a ruse and a compulsion. The person chosen as foe is already perceived as foe. The disorder lies in the subject's faulty distinction between his own contribution to the projected material and that of others. In a certain sense, all perception is projection. The projection of sense impressions is a legacy of animal prehistory, a mechanism for the purposes of defense and obtaining food, an extension of the readiness for combat which higher species reacted actively or passively to movements, regardless of the intention of the object. Projection has been automated in man like other forms of defensive or offensive behavior which have become reflexes. In this way his objective world has been constituted as a product of “an art concealed in the depths of the human soul, whose real modes of activity nature is hardly likely ever to allow us to discover, and to have open to our gaze.” The system of things, the fixed universal order of which science is merely an abstract expression, is, if Kant's critique of knowledge is applied anthropologically, the unconscious product of the animal tool in the struggle for existence - it is the automatic projection. In human society, however, where both the affective and the intellectual life grow complex with the formation of the individual, projection must be increasingly controlled; individuals must learn both to refine and to inhibit it. As economic compulsion teaches them to distinguish between their own thoughts and feelings and those of others, a distinction emerges between outer and inner, the
possibility of detachment and of identification, self-consciousness and conscience. More precise reflection is needed to understand this controlled form of projection and its degeneration into the false projection which is essential to anti-Semitism. The physiological theory of perception, which has been despoiled by philosophers since Kant as naively realistic and as a circular argument, holds the world of perception to be a reflection, guided by the intellect, of the data received from sense organs. But from the vantage point of view, punctual indices, or impressions, are registered physiologically and then ordered by the mind. Although the Gestalt people may insist that the physiological substance receives not merely points but structure, Schopenhauer and Helmholz, despite or even because of the circularity of their view, knew more about the intermeshed relationship of subject and object than is reflected in the official logical consistency of the schools, whether neopsychological or neo-Kantian: the perceptual image does indeed contain concepts and judgments. Between the actual object and the indubitable sense datum, between inner and outer, yawns an abyss which the subject must bridge at its own peril. To reflect the thing as it is, the subject must give back to it more than it received from it. From the traces the thing leaves behind in its senses the subject recreates the world outside it: the unity of the thing in its manifold properties and states; and in so doing, in learning how to impart a synthetic unity not only to the outward impressions but to the inward ones which gradually separate themselves from them, it retroactively constitutes the self. The identical ego is the most recent constant product of projection. In a process which could only be accomplished historically when the powers of the human physiological constitution were fully developed, this self has emerged as a unified and, at the same time, an eccentric function. But even as an autonomously objectified subject it is only what the objective world is for it. The inner depth of the subject consists in nothing other than the delicacy and richness of the outer perceptual world. If this intertwining is broken, the self petrifies, if it is confined, positively, to registering the given without itself giving, it shrinks to a point, and if, ideally, it projects the world out of the bottomless origin or its own self, it exhausts itself in monotonous repetition. In both cases it gives up the ghost—in this case the mind or spirit. Only mediation, in which the insensate significant sense datum raises thought to the fullest productivity of which it is capable, and in which, conversely, thought gives itself up without reservation to the overwhelming impression—only mediation can overcome the isolation which aids the whole of nature. Neither the certainty untroubled by thought, nor the pre-conceptual unity of perception and object, but only their self-reflective antithesis contains the possibility of reconciliation. The antithesis is perceived in the subject, which has the external world within its own consciousness and yet recognizes it as other. Reflection on that antithesis, therefore, the life of reason, takes place as conscious projection.

The pathetic element in anti-Semitism is not projective behavior as such, but the exclusion of reflection from that behavior. Because the subject is unable to return to the object what it has received from it, it is not enriched but impoverished. It loses reflection in both directions: as it no longer reflects the object, it no longer reflects on itself, and thereby loses the ability to differentiate. Instead of the voice of conscience, it hears voices; instead of inwardly examining itself in order to draw up a protocol of its own lust for power, it attributes to others the Protocol of the Elders of Zion. It overflows at the same time as it dries up. It invests the outside world boundlessly with what is within itself; but what it invests is something utterly insignificant, an inflated accumulation of mere means, relationships, machinations, a grim praxis unilluminated by thought. Domination itself, which, even as absolute power, is inherently only a means, becomes in untrammeled projection the purpose both of oneself and of others, purpose as such. In the sickness of the individual, humanity’s sharpened intellectual apparatus is turned once more against humanity, regressing to the blind instrument of hostility it was in animal prehistory, and as which, for the species, it has never ceased to operate in relation to the rest of nature. Just as, since its rise, the human species has manifested itself toward others as developmentally the highest, capable of the most terrible destruction; and just as, within humanity, the more advanced races have confronted the more primitive, the technically superior nations the more backward, so the sick individual confronts the other individual, in megalomania as in persecution mania. In both cases the subject is at the center, the world a mere occasion for its delusion; it becomes the impotent or omnipotent quintessence of what is projected on to it. The opposition of which the paranoiac complains indiscriminately at every step is the result of the lack of resistance, of the emptiness which the encapsulated subject generates around itself. The paranoiac cannot stop. The idea, having no firm hold on reality, insists all the more and becomes the fixation.

Because paranoiacs perceive the outside world only in so far as it corresponds to their blind purposes, they can only endlessly repeat their own self, which has been alienated from them as an abstract mania. This naked schema of power as such, equally overwhelming toward others and toward a self at odds with itself, seizes whatever comes its way and, wholly disregarding its peculiarity, incorporates it in its mythic web. The closed circle of perpetual sameness becomes a surrogate for omnipotence. It is as if the serpent which told the first humans “Ye shall be as gods” kept his promise in the paranoiac. He creates everything in his own image. He seems to need no living thing yet demands that all shall serve him. His will permeates the whole universe; nothing may be unrelated to him. His systems know of no gaps. As astrologer, he endows the stars with power which brings about the ruin of the unsuspecting, whether it is the ruin of others in the preclinical stage or of his own ego in the clinical stage. As philosopher, he makes world history the executor of inescapable catastrophes and downfalls. As completely insane or absolutely rational, he annihilates those marked down as victims either by the individual act of terror or by the well-considered strategy of extermination. In this way he succeeds. Just as women adore the unmoved paranoid man, nations fall to their knees before totalitarian fascism. The paranoid element in the devotees responds to the paranoiac as to the evil spirit, their fear of conscience to his utter lack of scruples, for which they feel gratitude. They follow the man who looks past them, who does not treat them as subjects but hands them over to the operations of his many purposes. Like everyone else, these women have made the occupation of grief, of lesser purposes, into a life of their own. And themselves the malignant creatures society takes them for. And so the gaze which reminds them of freedom must strike them as that of the over-naive seducer. Their world is inverted. Rut at the, same time they know, like the ancient gods who shunned the gaze of the faithful, that something lifeless resides behind their veil. In the trusting look of the nonparanoid they are reminded of the spirit which has died in them, because they see outside them only the cold means of their self-preservation. To be touched in this way awakens in them shame and rage. Yet the madman does not reach them, even though he may stare them in the face like the Führer. He merely inflames them. His proverbial gait straight into the eyes, unlike the free gaze, does not preserve individuality. It fixates. It binds others to one-sided loyalty by confining them to the windowless monadic fortress of their own person. It does not awaken conscience, but prematurely imposes responsibility. The penetrating
look and the one that goes past you, the hypnotic and
the disregarding gaze, are of the same kind: in both, the
subject is extinguished. Because in both looks reflection
is absent, the unreflecting are electrified by them. They
are betrayed: the women cast away, the nation
incinerated. Thus, the self-encapsulated figure remains a
caricature of divine power. Just as his lordly gesture is
entirely without creative power in reality, so, like the
devil, he lacks the attributes of the principle he usurps:
mindful love and freedom secure within itself. He is
malignant, driven by compulsion and as weak as he is
strong. If divine omnipotence is said to draw creation
unto itself this satanic, imagined omnipotence draws
everything into its impotence. That is the secret of its
rule. The compulsively projecting self can project nothing
except its own unhappiness, from the cause of which,
residing in itself, it is yet cut off by its lack of reflection.
For this reason the products of false projection, the
stereotyped schemata of both thought and reality, bring
calamity. For the ego, sinking into the meaningless
abyss of itself, objects become allegories of ruin, which harbor
the meaning of its own downfall. The psychoanalytic
theory of paroch projection has identified the transference
of socially tabooed impulses from the subject to the
object as the substances of that projection. Under the
pressure of the superego, the ego projects aggressive
unconscious, and dominates the objects of its need for
strength, are a danger to itself. As malign intentions onto
the outside world, and succeeds in ridding itself of them
as reactions to that outside world, either in fantasy by
identification with the alleged malefactor or in reality by
ostensible self-defense. The proscribed material
converted into aggression is usually homosexual in
nature. Through fear of castration, obedience toward the
father preempts castration by adapting the conscious
emotional life to that of a little girl, and hatred of the
father is repressed rancor. Its paranoia, this hatred is
intensified to a castration wish expressed as a universal
urge to destroy. The sick subject regresses to an archaic
confusion between love and dominance. It is concerned
with physical closeness, with taking possession, finally
with relationship at any price. Because it cannot
acknowledge desire within itself, it assails the other with
jealousy or persecution, as the repressed sodomy
hounds the animal as hunter or driver. The attraction
stems from excessive attachment or develops at first
sight; it can emanate from great figures, as in the case of
malcontents and murderers of presidents, or from the
most wretched as in the pogrom itself The objects of the
fixation are replaceable like father figures in childhood;
whatever it hits on fits its purpose; the delusion of
relatedness strikes out unrelatedly. Pathic projection is a
desperate exertion by an ego which, according to Freud
has a far weaker resistance to internal than to external
stimuli: under the pressure of pent-up homosexual
aggression the psychic mechanism forgets its most
recent phylogenetic attainment, the perception of self
and experiences that aggression as an enemy in the
world, and persecutes it.

This pressure acts also, however, on the healthy
cognitive process as a moment of its unreflecting
naivety, which tends toward violence. Wherever
intellectual energies are concentrated on an external
intention, wherever it is a matter of pursuing,
ascertaining, grasping - of exerting those functions which
have been sublimated from the primitive overpowering of
animals into the scientific methods of controlling nature
- the subjective process is easily overlooked in the
schematization, and the system is posited as the thing
itself. Objectifying thought, like its pathological
counterpart, has the arbitrariness of a subjective purpose
extraneous to the matter itself and, in forgetting the
matter, does to it in thought the violence which later will
be done in practice. The unconditional realism of civilized
humanity, which culminates in fascism, is a special case
of paranoid delusion which depopulates nature and finally
nations themselves. In the abyss of uncertainty, which
every objectifying act must bridge, paranoia installs itself.
Because there is no absolutely compelling argument
against materially false judgments, the distorted perception
in which they lurk cannot be healed. Every percept
unconsciously contains conceptual elements, just as every
judgment contains undifferentiated phenomenalistic ones.
Because imagination is involved in truth, it can always
appear to this damaged imagination that truth is fantastic
and its illusion the truth. The maimed subject lives on the
elment of imagination immanent in truth by ceaselessly
putting it on show. Democratically, he insists on equal
rights for his delusion, because in fact, not even truth is
stringent. While the citizen may admit that the anti-Semitic
is in the wrong, he requires the victim to be guilty too. Thus
Hitler demands the right to practice mass murder in the
name of the principle of sovereignty under international
law, which tolerates any act of violence in another country.
Like every paranoid he takes advantage of the hypochritical
identity of truth and sophistry; the distinction between
them is as uncompelling as it nevertheless is strict.
Perception is only possible in so far as the thing is already
apprehended as determinate - for example, as a case of
a genus or type. It is a mediated immediacy, thought infused
with the seductive power of sensuality. It blindly transfers
subjectivity, as an element of truth, onto the phenomenon
as a substrate. Only the self-conscious work of thought - that is,
according to Leibnizian and Hegelian idealism, only
philosophy - can escape this hallucinatory power. As, in the
course of cognition, thought identifies the conceptual
moments which are immediately posited in perception and
are therefore compelling, it progressively takes them back
into the subject and strips them of their intuitive power. In
this process every earlier stage, including science, turns out
to be, in comparison to philosophy, a kind of percept, an
estranged phenomenon permeated with unrecognized
intellectual elements; persistence at this stage, without
negation, forms part of the pathology of cognition. The
subject which naively postulates absolutes, no matter how
universally active it may be, is sick, passively succumbing
to the dazzlement of false immediacy.

Such blindness is, however, a constitutive element of all
judgment, a necessary illusion. Every judgment, even
negative, is reassuring. However much a judgment may
stress its own isolation and relativity for the purpose of self-
correction, it must assert its own content, no matter how
cautiously formulated, as something not merely isolated
and relative. That constitutes its nature as judgment,
whereas the clause merely entrenches a claim. Truth, unlike
probability, has no gradations. The negating only beyond
the individual judgment, which rescues its truth, is possible
in so far as it takes itself to be truth and in that sense is
paranoid. True derangement lies only in the immovable, in
thought's incapacity for the negation in which, unlike the
fixed judgment, thought actually consists. The paranoid
over-consistency, the bad infinity of never-changing
judgment, is a lack of a real judgment. The thought
conceptually carrying through the failure of the absolute
claim and thereby continuing to qualify his or her judgment,
the paranoiac clings obdurately to the claim which has
caused the judgment to fail. Instead of going further by
penetrating its subject matter more deeply, thought places
itself entirely in the hopeless service of the particular
judgment. The latter's irresistibility is the same as its intact
positivity, and the paranoiac's weakness is that of thought
itself. For reflection, which in the healthy subject breaks the
power of immediacy, is never as compelling as the illusion
it dispels. As a negative, reflective movement not directed
straight ahead, it lacks the brutality inherent in the positive.
If the psychic energy of paranoia stems from the libidinal
dynamic laid bare by psychoanalysis, its objective
impregnability is founded on the ambiguity inseparable
from the objectifying act; indeed, the latter's hallucinatory
power will have been originally decisive. To clarify, it can be said in the language of natural selection theory that during the formative period of the human sensorium those individuals survived in whom the power of the projective mechanisms extended most deeply into their rudimentary logical faculties, or was least moderated by the premature onset of reflection. Just as, even today, practically fruitful scientific enterprises call for an unimpaired capacity for definition, for shutting down thought at a point designated by social need, for demarcating a field which is then investigated in the minutest detail without passing outside it, paranoiaics cannot step outside a complex of interests designated by their psychological fate. Their mental acuteness consumes itself within the circle drawn by their fixed idea, as human ingenuity is liquidating itself under the spell of technical civilization. Paranoia is the shadow of cognition.

So calamitous is the mind's tendency to false projection that, as the isolated schema of self-preservation, such projection threatens to dominate everything which goes beyond self-preservation: culture. False projection is the usurper in the realm of freedom as of culture; paranoia is the symptom of the half-educated. For such people, all words become a system of delusion, an attempt mentally to transplant to their body that which the crude strength of their intellect extends, violently to give meaning to a world which makes them meaningless, but at the same time to denigrate the intellect and the experience from which they are excluded and to burden them with the guilt really borne by the society which has brought about that exclusion. The half-educated who, unlike the merely uneducated, hypostatize limited knowledge as truth, cannot endure the breach between inward and outward, individual fate and social law, appearance and essence, which for them is heightened to unbearable levels. To be sure, their suffering does contain an element of truth, compared to the mere acceptance of the given to which superior understanding has sworn allegiance. Nevertheless, the half-educated reach out stereotypically in their fear for the formula which surges their desire not to justify the disaster which has happened, nor to predict the catastrophe still to come, which is sometimes disguised as a regeneration. The explanation, in which their own desires appear as an objective power, is always as external and meaningless as the isolated event itself, at once feeble-minded and sinister. The obscurantist systems of today bring about what the devil myth of the official religion enabled people to do in the Middle Ages: to imbue the outside world with an arbitrary meaning, which the lone paranoia now constructs according to a private schema shared by no one, and which only for that reason appears actually mad. Relief is provided by the dire conventicles and panaceas which put on scientific airs while cutting off thought: theosophy, numerology, naturopathy, eurhythmry, teetotalism, Yoga, and countless other sects, competing and interchangeable, all with acronyms, hierarchies and specialist jargon, the fetishized officialese of science and religion. When confronted by an educated public, they remained apocryphal and-disreputable. But today, when education itself is withering for economic reasons, unprecedented conditions are created for the paranoia of the masses. The belief systems of the past, which were embraced by the populace as self-contained paranoid forms, had wider meshes. Just because they were so rationally elaborated and specific, they left room, at least above them, for culture and mind, which, conceived as spirit, were their true medium. Indeed, to an extent they counteracted paranoia. Freud calls neuroses - even rightly in this instance - "asocial formations"; they endeavor to achieve by private means what is affected in society by collective effort. Those belief systems retain something of the collectivity which preserves individuals from pathological symptoms. The sickness is socialized: in the intoxication of the communal ecstasy - indeed, as itself a community - blindness becomes a relationship and the paranoid mechanism is made controllable, without losing the power to strike terror. Perhaps that was one of the major contributions of religions to the survival of the species. Paranoiac forms of consciousness tend to give rise to leagues, factions, rackets. Their members are afraid to believe their madness on their own. Projecting it, they everywhere see proselyizing and conspiracy. The established group has always taken a paranoid stance toward others; in this the great empires, indeed, organized humanity as a whole, are no better than headhunters. Those who were excluded from humanity against their will, like those who excluded themselves from it out of longing for humanity, knew that the pathological cohesion of the established group was strengthened by persecuting them. Its normal members relieve their paranoia by participating in the collective one, and clinging passionately to the objectified, collective, approved forms of delusion. The horror vacui with which they devote themselves to their confederacies welds them together and gives them their almost irresistible power.

With bourgeois property, education and culture spread, driving paranoia into the dark corners of society and the psyche. But as the real emancipation of humanity did not come to pass, the world that was presented as a reality itself became sick. The less social reality kept pace with educated consciousness, the more that consciousness itself succumbed to a process of refication. Culture was entirely commoditized, disseminated as information which did not permeate those who acquired it. Thought becomes shortwinded, confines itself to apprehending isolated facts. Intellectual connections are rejected as an inconvenient and useless exertion. The developmental moment in thought, its whole genetic and intensive dimension, is forgotten and leveled down to what is immediately present, to the extensive. The present order of life allows the self no scope to draw intellectual or spiritual conclusions. Thought, stripped down to knowledge, is neutralized, harnessed merely to qualifying its practitioner for specific labor markets and heightening the consumed value of the personality. In this way the self-reflection of the mind, which counteracts paranoia is disabled. Finally, under the conditions of late capitalism, the half-educated condition has become the objective spirit. In the totalitarian phase of government its exponents reinstate the provincial charlatans of politics, and with them the system of delusion, as the ultima ratio, imposing it on the majority of the administered, who have already been softened up by big politics and the culture industry. The absurdity of the present system of rule is so transparent to healthy consciousness that it needs sick consciousness to keep itself alive. Only those suffering from persecution mania can tolerate the persecution which domination inevitably becomes, provided they are allowed to persecute others.

In fascism, where the responsibility for wife and child painfully inculcated by bourgeois civilization is being obscured by the individual’s insistent conformity to regulations, conscience is being liquidated in any case. Contrary to the ideas of Dostojevskii and the German apostles of inwardness, conscience consisted in the self's devotion to something substantial outside itself, in the ability to make the true concerns of others one's own. This ability involves reflection as an interpenetration of receptivity and imagination. Because the abolition of the independent economic subject by big industry - partly by absorbing free entrepreneurs and partly by transforming the workers into objects of trades unions - is irresistibly eroding the basis of moral decisions, reflection too, must wither. The soul, as the possibility of guilt awares of itself, decays. Conscience is deprived of objects, since individuals' responsibility for themselves and their dependents is replaced - although still under the old moral title - by their mere performance for the apparatus.
The internal conflict of drives, in which the agency of conscience is formed, can no longer be worked through. If internalized, the social injunctions would not only be made both more binding and more open but also would be emancipated from society and even turned against it; instead, the individual identifies himself or herself promptly and directly with the stereotyped scales of values. The exemplary German woman, who has a monoply on femininity as the true German man has on masculinity, cannot cope with the paralyzing character of conformity, asocial human types. Despite and because of its obvious deficiency, the system of power has become so preponderant that powerless individuals can avert their fate only through blind compliance.

In face of such power, it is left to chance - guided by the Party - to decide where despairs self-preservation is to project the guilt for its terror. The Jews are the predestined target of this guided chance. The circulation sphere, in which they once held positions of economic power, is vanishing. The liberal form of commercial enterprise once endowed fragmented wealth with political influence. Now, no sooner emancipated, its owners are merged with the state apparatus and placed at the mercy of capital powers which have outgrown competition. No matter what the makeup of the Jews may be in reality, their image, that of the other defeated, has characteristics which must make totalitarian rule their mortal enemy: happiness without power, reward without work, a homeland without frontiers, religion without myth. These features are outlawed by the ruling powers because they are secretly coveted by the ruled. The former can survive only as long as the latter turn what they yearn for into an object of hate. They do so through pathic projection, since even hatred leads to union with the object - in destruction. It is the negative of reconciliation. Reconciliation is Judaism's highest concept, and expectation its whole meaning. The paranoid reaction stems from the incapacity for expectation. The anti-Semites are realizing their negative absolute through power, by transforming the world into the hell they have always taken it to be. A radical change would depend on whether the ruled, in face of absolute madness, could master themselves and hold the madness back. Only the liberation of thought from power, the abolition of violence, could realize the idea which has been unrealized until now: that the Jew is a human being. This would be a step away from the anti-Semitic society, which drives both Jews and others into sickness, and toward the human one. Such a step would fulfill the fascist lie by contradicting it: the Jewish question would indeed prove the turning-point of history. By conquering the sickness of the mind which flourishes on the rich soil of self-assertion unhampered by reflection, humanity would cease to be the universal antrance and become the species which, as nature, is more than mere nature, in that it is aware of its own image. The individual and social emancipation from domination is the countermovement to false projection, and the Jews are the countermovement's representatives. They appease the evil senselessly visited on them as on all the persecuted, whether animals or human beings.

But there are no longer any anti-Semites. The last of them were liberals who wanted to express their antibiblical opinions. By the end of the nineteenth century the old-style conservative aloofness of the nobility and the officer corps toward the Jews was merely reactionary. The people abreast of the times were the Ahlwardts and the Knüppelkunzes. They drew their followers from the same groups as the Führer, but their support came from troublemakers and malcontents throughout the country. When people voiced anti-Semitic attitudes, they felt they were being bourgeois and rebellious at the same time. Their nationalistic grumbling was still a distorted form of civil freedom. The beer hall politics of the anti-Semites exposed the lie of German liberalism, on which it fed and whose demise it finally brought about. Even though they used their own mediocrity as a license to subject the Jews to beatings in which universal murder was already latent, they were economically farsighted enough to weigh the risks of the Third Reich against the advantages of a hostile form of tolerance. Anti-Semitism was still a competing motif within a range of subjective choices. But the outcome related specifically to it. The whole chauvinistic vocabulary was implied from the start in the adoption of the völkisch thesis. Anti-Semitic views always reflected stereotypical thinking. Today only that thinking is left. People still vote, but only between totalities. The anti-Semitic psychology has largely been replaced by mere acceptance of the whole fascist ticket, which is an inventory of the slogans of belligerent big business. Just as, on the ballot paper of the mass party, voters are presented with the names of people remote from their experience for whom they can only vote en bloc, the central ideological concepts have been codified into a small number of lists. One has to opt for one of them en bloc if one's own position is not to seem as futile as splinter votes on polling day in face of the statistical mammoths. Anti-Semitism has practically ceased to be an independent impulse and has become a plank in the platform: anyone who gives fascism its chance subscribes to the settlement of the Jewish question along with the business of the underwater structure of the state. The anti-Semite's conviction, however mendacious it may be, has been absorbed into the preconditional reflexes of the subjectless exponents of a particular standpoint. When the masses accept the reactionary ticket containing the clause against the Jews, they are obeying social mechanisms in which individual people's experiences of Jews play no part. It has been shown, in fact, that anti-Semitism's prospects are no less good in "Jew-free" areas than in Hollywood itself. Experience is replaced by cliche, the imagination active in experience by diligent acceptance. The members of each class have to absorb their quota of guidelines on pain of rapid downfall. Just as they need to be instructed on the technical merits of a particular aircraft, so do they, too, on their allegiance to the prescribed agencies of power.

In the world of mass production, stereotypes replace intellectual categories. Judgment is no longer based on a real act of synthesis hut on blind submission. If, at an early historical stage, judgment consisted in the swift decision which immediately unleashed the poisoned arrow, in the meantime exchange and the institutions of law have taken their effect. The act of judgment passed through a stage of deliberation which afforded the judging subject some protection from brutal identification with the predicate. In late-industrial society there is a regression to judgment without judging. When, in fascism, the protracted legal process was replaced by an accelerated procedure in criminal trials, up-to-date people had been economically prepared for this development. They had learned to see things unreflectingly, through ready-made thought models, the mind termi technici which provide them with iron rations following a diet. The determination of the time factor is present in the process of perception. He or she is incapable of the active passivity of cognition, in which categorial elements are appropriately reshaped by preformed conventional schemata and vice versa, so that justice is done to the perceived object. In the field of the social sciences, as in that of individual experience, blind intuition and empty concepts are brought together rigidly and without mediation. In the age of the "three hundred basic words" the ability to exercise judgment, and therefore to distinguish between true and false, is vanishing. Thinking, where it is not merely a highly specialized piece of professional equipment in this or that branch of the division of labor, is suspect as an old-fashioned luxury: "armchair thinking." It is supposed to "produce" something. The more superfluous physical labor is made by the development of technology, the more enthusiastically it is set up as a model.
for mental work, which must not be tempted, however, to draw any awkward conclusions. That is the secret of advancing stupidity, on which anti-Semitism thrives. If, even within the field of logic, the concept stands opposed to the particular as something merely external, anything which stands for difference within society itself must indeed tremble. Everyone is labeled friend or foe. The disregard for the subject makes things easy for the administration. Ethnic groups are transported to different latitudes; individuals labeled "jew" are dispatched to the gas chambers.

The indifference to the individual expressed in logic draws its conclusions from the economic process. The individual had become an impediment to production. The lack of synchronicity between technical and human development, the "cultural lag" which used to exercise the minds of sociologists, is beginning to disappear. Economic rationality, the vaunted principle of the smallest necessary means, is unerringly reshaping the last units of the economy: businesses and human beings. The most advanced form at a given time becomes the predominant one. Once, the department store expropriated the old-style specialist shop. The latter, having outgrown mercantile regulation, had absorbed initiative, control, and organization within itself and become a model. The small business set out to become a free enterprise. Its mode of operation was complicated, expensive, risky. Competition therefore replaced it by the more efficient, centralized form of retail shop, the department store. The psychological small business - the individual - is meeting the same fate. It came into being as the power cell of economic activity. Emancipated from the tutelage of earlier economic stages, individuals fended for themselves alone: as proletarians by hiring themselves out through the labor market and by constant adaptation to new technical conditions, as entrepreneurs by tirelessly realizing of the ideal type of homo oeconomicus. Psychoanalysis has portrayed the internal small business which thus came into being as a complex dynamic of unconscious and conscious elements, of id, ego, and superego. In its negotiations with the superego, the ego, the agency of social control within the individual, keeps the drives within the limits set by self-preservation. The areas of friction are large and neuroses, the incidental expenses of such a drive economy, inevitable. Nevertheless, this complex psychical apparatus made possible the relatively free interplay of subjects which constituted the market economy. In the era of large combines and world wars, however, the mediation of the social process by innumerable monads is proving obsolete. The subjects of the drive economy are being psychologically expropriated, and the drive economy is being more rationally operated by society itself. The individual no longer has to decide what he or she is supposed to do in a given situation in a painful inner dialogue between conscience, self-preservation, and drives. For the worker, being as wage earner the decision is taken by a hierarchy extending from trade associations to the national administration; in the private sphere it is taken by the schema of mass culture, which appropriates even the most intimate impulses of its forced consumers. The committees and stars function as ego and superego, and the masses, stripped of even the semblance of personality, are molded far more compliantly by the catchwords and models than ever the instincts were by the internal censor. IC in liberalism, the individuation of a section of the population was necessary for the adaptation of society as a whole to the state of technology, today the functioning of the economic apparatus demands that the masses be directed without the hindrance of individuation. The economically determined direction of the whole society, which has always governed the mental and physical constitution of human beings, is causing the organs which enabled individuals to manage their lives autonomously to atrophy. Now that thinking has become a mere sector of the division of labor, the plans of the authorized experts and leaders have made individuals who plan their own happiness redundant. The irrationality of the unresisting and eager adaptation to reality becomes, for the individual, more reasonable than reason. If, previously, the bourgeoisie had introjected the compulsions of conscience and duty into themselves and the workers, now the entire human being has become at one with subject and the object of repression. In the progress of industrial society, which is supposed to have conjured away the law of increasing misery it had itself brought into being, the concept which justified the whole - the human being as person, as the bearer of reason - is going under. The dialectic of enlightenment is culminating objectively in madness.

This is also a madness of political reality. As a dense web of modern communications, the world has become so standardized that the differences between diplomatic breakfasts in Dumbarton Oaks and Persia have to be specially devised as an expression of national character, while actual national peculiarity is experienced primarily by the millions hungering for rice who have fallen through the narrow meshes. Although the abundance of goods which would be produced in an industrial world makes the struggle for raw materials and markets seem ever more anachronistic, humanity is nevertheless divided into a small number of armed power blocs. They compete more pitilessly than the firms involved in the anarchy of commodity production ever did, and strive toward mutual liquidation. The more senseless the antagonism, the more rigid the blocs. Only the total identification of the population with these monstrosities of power, so deeply imprinted as to have become second nature and stopping all the pores of consciousness, maintains the masses in the state of absolute apathy which makes them capable of their miraculous achievements. As far as any decisions are still left to individuals, they are effectively decided in advance. The irreconcilability of the ideologies trumpetted by the politicians from the different camps is itself just one more ideology of the blind constellation of power. Ticket thinking, a product of industrialization and its advertising, is being extended to international relations. Whether a citizen chooses the communist or the fascist ticket depends on whether he happens to be more impressed by the Red Army or the laboratories of the West. The reification by virtue of which the power structure, made possible solely by the passivity of the masses, appears to those same masses as an iron reality, has been consolidated to the point where any spontaneity, or even the ability to conceive of the true state of affairs, has necessarily become an eccentric utopia, an irrelevant sectarianism. Illusion has become so concentrated that to see through it objectivly assumes the character of hallucination. For the worker, in a ticket, by contrast, means to practice adaptation to illusion petrified as reality, which endlessly reproduces itself through such adaptation. The reluctant voter is therefore ostracized as a deserter. Since Hamlet, hesitation was for modern people a sign of reflection and humanity. The wasted time at once represented and mediated the gap between individual and universal, as circulation does between consumption and production in the economy. Today individuals receive their tickets ready-made from the powers that be, as consumers receive their automobiles from the sales outlets of factories. Conformity to reality, adaptation to power, are no longer the result of a dialectical process between subject and reality but are produced directly by the cogs and levers of industry. The process is one of liquidation instead of sublation, of formal instead of determinate negation. The unleashed energies of production have subdued the individual not by granting
him or her full satisfaction, but by extinguishing the subject. Precisely therein lies their perfect rationality, which coincides with their insanity. The extreme disproportion between collective and individual eliminates tension, but the untroubled harmony between omnipotence and impotence is itself unmediated contradiction, the absolute antithesis of reconciliation. For this reason the psychological determinants of the individual - which have always been the internal human agencies of wrong society - have not disappeared with the individual itself. However, these character types are now being assigned to their mathematically exact positions within the coordinates of power. Both their efficiency and their coefficient of friction are included in the calculation. The ticket acts as a gearwheel in this process. Anything in the old psychological mechanism which was compulsive, unfree, and irrational is precisely adjusted to it. The reactionary ticket which includes anti-Semitism is suited to the destructive-conventional syndrome. It is not so much that such people react originally against the Jews as that their drive-structure has developed a tendency toward persecution which the ticket then furnishes with an adequate object. The "elements of anti-Semitism" once derived from experience and now rendered inoperative by the loss of experience reflected in ticket thinking, are remobilized by the ticket. Being already corrupted, these elements also provide the neo-anti-Semitic with the bad conscience and thus with the insatiable of evil. Just because the psychology of the individual can now construct itself and its content only from the synthetic schemata supplied by society, contemporary anti-Semitism takes on its empty but impenetrable character. The Jewish middleman fully becomes the image of the devil only when economically he has ceased to exist. Victory is thus made easy, and the anti-Semitic family man becomes the spectator, exempt from responsibility, of an irresistible historical tendency, intervening only when called to do so by his role as an employee of the Party or the Zyklon gas factories. As they designate obsolete sections of the population for extermination, the administrations of totalitarian states are merely the executors of economic verdicts passed long ago. Members of other branches of the division of labor can look on with the indifference of people reading newspaper reports on clean-up operations at the scene of yesterday's catastrophe. The peculiarities for the sake of which the victims are killed have long been effaced. Those who fall within the terms of the decree as Jews have to be identified by means of elaborate questionnaires, now that the antagonistic religions which once differentiated them have been successfully remodeled and assimilated as cultural heritage under the leveling pressure of late-industrial society. The Jewish masses themselves are no more immune to ticket thinking than the most hostile youth organization. In this sense fascist anti-Semitism is obliged to invent its own object. Paranoia no longer pursues its goal on the basis of the individual case history of the persecutor; having become a vital component of society it must locate that goal within the delusive context of wars and economic cycles before the psychologically predisposed "national comrades" can support themselves on it, both inwardly and outwardly, as patients. The tendency according to which anti-Semitism now exists only as one item on an interchangeable ticket gives irrefutable reason to hope for its end. The Jews are being murdered at a time when the leaders could replace the anti-Semitic plank in their platform just as easily as their followers can be transplanted from one location of wholly rationalized production to another. The development which leads to ticket thinking is based, in any case, on the universal reduction of every specific energy to the one, identical, abstract form of labor, from the battlefield to the studio. However, the transition from those conditions to a more humane state cannot take place, because benign and malignant tendencies suffer the same fate. The freedom on the progressive ticket is as far removed from the existing political power structures, to which progressive decisions necessarily lead, as hostility to the Jews is external to the chemical cartel. To be sure, the psychologically more humane are attracted to freedom, but the advancing loss of experience is finally turning even the supporters of the progressive ticket into enemies of difference. It is not just the anti-Semitic ticket which is anti-Semitic, but the ticket mentality itself. The rage against difference which is teleologically inherent in that mentality as the rancor of the dominated subjects of the domination of nature is always ready to attack the natural minority, even though it is the social minority which those subjects primarily threaten. The socially responsible elite is in any case far harder to pin down than other minorities. In the murky intertwining of property, ownership, control, and management it successfully eludes theoretical definition. The ideology of race and the reality of class both equally reveal only an abstract difference from the majority. But although the progressive ticket tends to produce something worse than its content, the content of the fascist ticket is so vacuous that it can be maintained as a substitute for something better only by desperate efforts on the part of the deceived. Its horror is that of the blatant but insistent lie. While it admits no truth by which it might be measured, its absurdity is so monstrous as to bring truth negatively within reach, so that it can be kept apart from those deprived of judgment only by their total abstention from thought. Enlightenment itself, having mastered itself and assumed its own power, could break through the limits of enlightenment.

Whoever wanted to find out whether there is some truth in the rumors about left-wing anti-Semitism already had a constantly growing amount of literature at his/her disposal for years. Already during the 1950’s Hannah Arendt knew that the assumption that anti-Semitism was an exclusive right-wing phenomenon was a mere but persistent prejudice. Numerous studies on anti-Semitism among early socialists, on anti-Semitism in the labour movement of the 19th and 20th century as well as on the relationship between classical Marxist literature and Judaism have been published. Research was conducted on anti-Semitism in socialist states as well as on anti-semitically charged anti-Zionism within the New Left in most Western European countries and the USA. However, the scientific preoccupation with this topic was met by a firm denial by the left. Yet for a couple of years things have been changing significantly. To deal with anti-Semitism among the left is en vogue. Recently events like this one have been organised in almost every major German city and with the book “We are the good guys. Anti-Semitism and the Radical-Left” the scene has produced its own bestseller. The latter, I will discuss this below in detail, provides the opportunity to somehow deal with anti-Semitism without actually giving profound thought to it.

The timeliness of topic is obvious. Especially the latest escalation of the Israeli conflict and the reactions among leftist activists have shown that although the debate on anti-Semitism within the left made some of the worst excesses like folksiness and blood-and-soil-romanticism vanish but still there is no actual will to take subsequent logical steps from what has been at least partly recognised. In the following I will try to give an overview. What are we actually talking about when we use the term left-wing anti-Semitism? There are

1. The classical works, their position towards anti-Semitism and towards Judaism

2. The traditional labour movement referring to these works and the New Left, which is to be considered a historical phenomenon as well

3. The pivotal relationship between anti-Semitism and anti-Zionism and therewith the relationship between the left and Israel

4. Structural anti-Semitism - one needs to talk about the affinities of a short-sighted or false left-wing critique of capitalism to anti-Semitic resentments

Even though the majority of the left is constituted by opponents of anti-Semitism there is a tradition in the left anti-Semitism that can be traced back to the days of early socialism. From Blanqui to Fourier, from Saint-Simon and Proudhon to Bakun, one can find anything from belittlements of anti-Semitic resentments to forthright racist anti-Semitic lines of reasoning. Although Marx and Engels were by no means anti-Semites like Edmund Silberner repeatedly claimed in his influential works but one can find several phrases and arguments in the early works of Marx as well as in the correspondence between him and Engels that show a distorted view of Judaism and anti-Semitic clichés. The interpretation of Marx’ text “On the Jewish Question” (Zur Judenfrage) published in 1844 as an invocation to kill Jews though is based on a considerable misconception of the Marxian line of argumentation.

However certain paragraphs of the text are a direct invitation for the reader to misconceive. In his early critique of capitalism Marx has not yet developed the terminological sharpness that we know from his theory of value in the critique of political economy and that is necessary to make it impossible for or at least hinder the critique of economy turning into a persecuting political resentment.

Within the European labor movement – especially the German one – anti-Semitism was denied, trivialised or excused over and over again. In the worst case it was – justified as a form of consequent anti-capitalism – openly publicised. To give an example Ruth Fischer, member of the central committee of the German Communist Party claimed in one of her speeches dating back to 1923 “Tread down the Jewish capitalists, hang them on the lanterns, trample them down!”

Stalin’s campaigns against zionism and cosmopolitism can be regarded as the most radical form of leftwing anti-Semitism. Previously and in the first place the Russian Jews benefited from the October-Revolution under leadership of Lenin – despite structural similarities between Lenin’s critique of imperialism and anti-Semitism. However, with Stalin a man came to power who already used anti-Semitism as a political instrument when he was still fighting to become Lenin’s successor. When investigating the subsequent developments one might assume that Stalin changed from being a tactical to a convinced anti-Semitic, who at the end of his life thought about a violent relocation of the soviet jews.

After World War II the Soviet Union for a short time supported the foundation of the State of Israel. However, by the late 1940’s anti-Zionism had become the official national doctrine – and it became an element of state ideology and practice in which the populations of the USSR, Poland and the DDR followed their authorities in a manner they hardly ever did in anything else.

While -before Auschwitz- Lenin’s anti-Zionismus was mainly of a politic-organisational nature -zionism was disapproved for being a form of nationalism on side with many others- the anti-Zionism after WW II is fighting Zionism as a distinct perfidious kind of nationalism that was illegitimate by itself and a threat to other nations. In Eastern Europe this kind of transformation was executed by the Stalinist leaders and kept to even after de-Stalinisation. In Western Europe for a long time post-1945-anti-Zionism had been a phenomenon of the far right. Apart from the dogmatic communist parties that were politically oriented towards the USSR before 1967 the Western European left – especially in western Germany – had a downright attitude towards Israel. That changed abruptly after the Six-Day- War. On the one hand a left-wing criticism of the politics of the Israeli government emerged defended itself against an over-simplified accusation of anti-Semitism by the conservatives. On the other hand an anti-Zionist agitation evolved in those days that showed a clear affinity to anti-Semitism and that should dominate almost the whole left soon. This was especially obvious in western Germany. Among the
western German left, from the socialdemocrats, the greens, alternative feminist groups, the communist-groups, the autonomous and the anti-imperialists up to the armed groups, statements and actions can be found that make a distinction between anti-Zionism and anti-Semitism seem to be unnecessary.

Popular examples are the attack on the Jewish parish hall in year 1969 in Westerlin by the “Tupamaros Westerlin”, a precursor of the “Bewegung 2. Juni”, the puff pieces by the RAF and other leftwing groups on the occasion of the murder of Israeli athletes in 1972 in Munich. Demonstrations in front of synagogues not Israeli embassies against Israel’s war in Lebanon during the 1980’s, or - a classic - a graffiti on one of the houses at Hamburg’s Hafenstrasse that reads “Boycott Israel! Goods, Kibbutzim and beaches/Palestine – your people will liberate you/Revolution until victory”. This slogan exemplifies the central elements of left-wing anti-Zionism. Namely the de-legitimation of the State of Israel that is put in annotation marks -something that only the Springer press did to the DDR-, the ignorance of the persecution of the Jews under the National Socialists (The slogan actually does not sound very different from Do not buy from Jews!) and the enthusiasm for nation and land. Those who still are not convinced of an existence of left-wing anti-Semitism are referred to the legendary “Green Calendar” from the 1980’s where the authors gave a piece of their mind and ask the reader to not buy from Jews.

As I already mentioned this kind of anti-Semitism has a tradition. The accusation of a party to be a “Guard of Jews” (JudenSchutzgruppe) was common in the period between the world wars e.g. in Austria and frequently applied by all political parties against the respective opponent. As a specific form of socialdemocrat or left anti-Semitism one might regard the agitation against Jews as “rich Jews”, against the “Jewish bourgeoisie” and “Jewish capitalism”. Within the labour movement of the Weimar or First Republic the members made efforts to feed the anti-Semitism of the masses which is reflected by the fact that the personification of the capital on the posters of the socialdemocratic and communist parties often had physiognomic signs that the anti-Semites had reserved for Jews. That e.g. the Rothschilds have been at the center of socialdemocrat-criticism was not only due to banker family’s actual influence but perfectly fitted the structural anti-Semitic premises of the fundamental critique on capitalism by labour movement. It was no coincidence that the radical anti-Semitic Georg von Schönnerer one of the central word-feeder for Hitler who had become famous for his demagogic attacks against the Rothschilds, equally enjoyed sympathies among socialdemocrats.5

Because of their close relationship to the Soviet Union apparently Western European communist parties understood it as their duty to support the states of the Eastern bloc in their battle against their anti-Zionist propaganda had absolutely nothing to do with anti-Semitism. According to this during the 1950’s even the anti-Semitic show processes found legitimacy. E.g. during the Słansky process in Czechoslovakia eleven of the fourteen defendants that were accused of conspiratorial Trotzkist-Zionist- Titioist activities by the designated major Smola6 were Jews. Also was the so-called doctors’-conspiracy-process in the Soviet Union where six Jews und three others had to defend themselves as “agents of Zion” in front of the judge against supposed killings of state officials and party functionaries as well as against alleged plans to kill Stalin were justified among Western-European communists. Communist party-newspapers would not recognise the accused as victims of anti-Semitic campaigns but referred to the doctors as incarnation of evil: “man-shaped beasts” was the term

the Austrian “Völkstimme” for example used. Since 1968 the traditional left hardened in their criticism of Israel. The anti-Zionism of the New Left had become increasingly important. Since the early 1970’s left-wing and Arabic groups are spreading propaganda against Israel especially in the universities that in some aspects only marginally differs from the flyers distributed simultaneously by right-wing groups. It was for example stated, that the Zionist regime would use the same means against the Palestinians from which the Jews suffered under the Nazi regime. Yet, the proof of Israeli camps where the bureaucratic and industrial mass-annihilation of humans was taking place has never been presented.

Especially during the Lebanon-War comparisons between Israel and Nazi-Germany were on the common. Almost habitually Menachim Begin was called a Nazi-Fascist.

Since the 1990’s an anti-Zionism charged with anti-Semitism is basically cultivated by a few trotzquist groups and the leftovers of the anti-imperialist and autonomous scene. Even today the national-anti-Zionist Karam Khella member of the University in Hamburg is still flattered. A person who is making use of traditional anti-Semitic anti-Semites in his writings by stating that Jews as long as they hold on to Zionism are responsible themselves for their persecution.

Leaving the reader speechless in astonishment anti-imperialists announce in flyers that since its foundation Israel has based its existence on violence. It is – of course – claimed that this was an Israeli speciality. The massive criticism of Israel within anti-Zionist circles goes along with a complete absence of a fundamental critique of the nation state as such. What is criticised about Israel – its sovereignty, authority and its evolution as a nation including all the national myths – is at the same time demanded for the Palestinian brothers and sisters. That is because most anti-Zionists think of state and nation as vehicles on the way to emancipation – unless Jews make a claim on them.

While in their brochures anti-imperialists know how to report about deportations of Jewish people from Eastern Europe and Nazi-Germany to Palestine they keep silent about actual deportations to Auschwitz and Treblinka. Giving a lead to alleged deportations of Jews to Palestine this kind of anti-Imperialists refer to a all time classic of anti-Zionist agitation: the suggested collaboration between Zionists and the Nazis that according to some anti-Zionists was operating even inside of the extermination camps. This permanent hint at the alleged collaboration between Zionists and Nazis goes along with a complete ignorance regarding the sympathy many Palestinians felt for the German national-socialism. A clear sign of this sympathy was demonstrated by the grand multi of Jerusalem el Husseini when he paid a visit to Hitler in 1941 and examined national-socialist extermination camps together with Eichmann.8

There is not much more than this supposed collaboration between the Nazis and Zionists the radical anti-Zionists have to tell about the NS-period. They have no clue about the anti-Semitism that according to a brochure from the anti-Imperialist-scene is aimed against people of Jewish belief9 - as if the persecution of Jews and the holocaust in the 20th century was some sort of a religious conflict. However, about Zionism they seem to know everything. There is no anti-Zionist who cannot enumerate all Zionist congresses that have taken place since the 19th century and cite by vote from the Balfour-declaration and Herzl’s “The Jewish State” (“Der Judenstaat”). A discussion of the latter is not necessary. The actual reason for the foundation of the State of Israel cannot be found in Basel but in Auschwitz. Albeit Zionist groups in Palestine had
demonstrated in their activities that the project of a Jewish state might be possible it was the national-socialist annihilating anti-Semitism that proved the necessity of such a state. The whole perfidiousness of anti-Zionist argumentation becomes obvious in the contemporaneous recognition of the central role of Auschwitz on the one hand and presentation of this mass-annihilation as a kind of co-operation between the Nazis and the Zionists on the other.

While anti-Zionists regard it as a fact that Jews are neither people nor a nation they can hardly refer to Palestinians other than in the collective of “the Palestinian people”. This is typical for a left that is capable to show their solidarity with humans only in cases in which it previously has constructed the objects of solidarity to be “people” or has taken over their self-collectivisation. That Palestinians are people is a matter of fact within anti-Zionism. After all they have land of their own that they are – supposedly other than the Jews – the are legally entitled to have. If one takes the anti-Zionist propaganda literally it is not the people that need to be liberated but the land. While in the initially mentioned slogan at the Hamburg Hafenstrasse the promise was made to this piece of land named “Palestine” that “the people will liberate you” in other places this land is assured: “your people will prevail”\(^\text{10}\). However, it is a fact that humans are capable to liberate themselves from exploitation and oppression. On contrary a piece of earth can only be freed from the people that are living on it, in other words cleared. In this context these people are the Jews living in Israel.

No wonder that anti-Zionists not only ask for - to use the Marxist term relating to sovereignty - the “destruction” of Israel - which would be already unbearable - but rather directly for its “annihilation”.

Even if the obsession of German and Austrian anti-Imperialists with the conflict in Israel and Palestine is suspicious, of course not every criticism of the policies of Israel can be regarded as anti-Semitic. The point is not if Israel can be criticised, but how it is criticised. Not every anti-Zionist statement is anti-Semitic. If anti-Zionists are open to a critique that points to the latent or manifested anti-Semitism within their argumentation or if they will regard this critique as nothing but another proof for the global terror of by a “Zionist lobby” will be a vital criteria in the decision whether anti-Zionism is based on an manifested anti-Semitic world view or not.

Irrespective of this one must insist as a matter of principle that in a strict sense a radical left-wing, anti-Zionism is already self-defeating in its terminology. If the Left was as anti-national as it is supposed to be, it would of course have difficulties with the national ideology of Zionism. Yet, this would not be something extraordinary and hence would not have to be proclaimed as anti-Zionism. In the end some of the lefties that are engaged in the struggle for the rights of Kurds may be anti-Kemalists but they do not introduce themselves as anti-Kemalists, In the same sense people who pay solidarity to the Polisario are probably not very much interested in the specific name of the Moroccan national ideology.

However, this does not mean that it is possible to treat Zionism like any other nationalism and Israel like any other civil state and to criticise it in the same way. The anti-national language closes all eyes to the distinct conditions of Israel’s origin and existence and is nothing but an excuse to refuse solidarity with the Israeli self-defence.

The existence of anti-Semitism within the left is evident. Disguised as anti-Zionism it appears as a specific form of anti-Semitism after Auschwitz that – due to a lack of objects for its hate – is aimed against the collective Jew, the State of Israel. The fact that the fantasies of extermination that are

immanent within anti-Zionism have not become reality is owed – and it seems to me that especially in front of the present situation this cannot be over-mentioned – to the Israeli authorities and their self-defense policy. Anti-Semitism within the left is hence nothing but anti-Zionism. Actually, since there recently is a massive criticism of anti-Zionist groups among the left, a discussion about structural anti-Semitism would be desirable. A central aspect of modern anti-Semitism is the hate against the abstract sides of the capitalist mode of production that – in the view of anti-Semitism – are embodied by the Jews. This became most obvious through the distinction made by German National-Socialism between “German” “creating capital” and “Jewish” “reaping capital”. However, his separation was not invented by the national-socialist ideology but is rather subjects to all civilian societies familiar with the distinction between the industrial capitalists who create jobs on the one hand and apparently non-productive capital of the sphere of circulation on the other hand. Especially within present debates about globalisation there are numerous arguments argued by the left that do not necessarily show affinities in respect of content by rather structural similarities with anti-Semitism.

Strikingly left anti-Semitism was never criticised in the context of left ideology. The anti-Zionism in former socialist states has mostly been regarded as a mere tactical manoeuvre by state authorities instead of linking it to the Marxist-Leninism. One can notice that critics of left anti-Semitism often have an equally shortened and functionalist understanding of anti-Semitism like the ones they criticise.

Of course anti-Semitism within the left has something to do with prevailing left ideas about capitalism and imperialism, state and nation, fascism and national-socialism. In most parts of the left national-socialism was reduced to an especially horrible form of class rule dominated by the most aggressive fractions of the bourgeoisie. The exterminating anti-Semitism by the German Nazis has been either ignored for a long time or it was perceived as a vehicle for the enforcement of something different from itself, as a means of rulership and diversionary tactics.\(^\text{11}\) Capitalism is not understood as a fetisheid, societal totality but as an addition of all capitalists who are unforgivingly opposed by the working class as an antagonism in principle. “In this way” Thomas Haury correctly writes “inevitably a binary and reified, a personalising and marginalising way of thinking develops, that suggests the existence of a clique of evil rulers who subjugate the good, the ruled, via direct repression, corruption in social politics and mean propaganda by the media.”\(^\text{12}\) By this the object of criticism, the thing engaged, the thing to be abolished is no longer – and that is the fatal structural similarity to anti-Semitism – a societal situation but humans that putatively or really represent a part, one side of this societal situation.

Due to their restricted understanding of imperialism greater parts of the left have reduced dominance to foreign domination and capitalism to exploitation by foreign capital. The non-critical reference to a liberation-nationalism in the third world lead to an affirmation of the categories of power like state, nation and people. Such an anti-Imperialism that is not able to distinguish between the critique of what once was called imperialist policy on the one hand and an unconditional partisanship with the victims of such politics on the other inevitably leads to a collaboration with dictators, nationalists and anti-Semists.

This view of life fed by a Stalinist ideology of legitimacy –by name the Marxist-leninism- that one might call an anti-Imperialist world view shows numerous affinities to anti-Semitism. The anti-Zionism of the left - Thomas Haury
again - „is the application of the anti-imperialistic scheme onto the conflict between Israel and the Palestinian national liberation movement. By this the structural affinity leads to a partial affinity with respect to content: The anti-imperialist world view is not only not immune towards anti-Semite stereotypes but also tends to, if it becomes substantiated as anti-Zionism, produce these stereotypes itself." 13

In summary one can say: a left that regards the national-socialism only as an extraordinarily extreme form of suppression of the labour class but does not want to know about national consensus and about Auschwitz, a left that is arguing apologetically in the name of the state instead of recognising an ideology of the national community within the civilian idea of public welfare, that does not reject the fetishised form of rule of a nation but only excessive nationalism, that does affirm the value in the sense of the critique of political economy but that denounces the suggested negative spin-offs of the free and rootless capitalism, that is constantly conducting a personalised critique of capitalism and state and for this reason does not criticise politics as a formal principle but politicians, not the ratio of the capital but the capitalists, will always be sojourning in a dangerously viciousity to anti-Semitism.

This remains true even though that during the early 1990’s critics from the anti-German left found themselves with their polemic against left wing anti-Semitism in opposite to a flailing front line of defence, while meanwhile as I initially stated, dealing with anti-Semitism within the left has become a matter of course in further circles. This preoccupation obviously is in particular such a matter of course that it is possible without any efforts in thinking. The mentioned book “We are the good guys” is a documentation of how a critique of left-wing anti-Semitism that first of all would have to define its subject (that should not be confused with the pseudo-critical attitude that in the meantime within parts of the left it has become fashionable to talk about anti-Semitism instead of anti-Semitism) can become replaced by an emotional bogg of sensitivity, of self-pity and moroseness. Meanwhile the publisher enjoys numerous positive reviews of its book. Apparently it serves the existing need for an analysis of left anti-Semitism that is taking direction in a kind of alternative coping with the past including an inter-generational dialogue instead of withdrawing any rationale for left anti-Semitism through a critique of ideology.

How essential that would be is demonstrated best in the straddling statements made by the left about the present situation in Israel. That one cannot question the existence of a nation of Shoah-survivors most of lefties have learned in the meantime. However, usually this admission is a mere lip service as at the same time ridiculous claims have been directed at the Israeli government that if they were allowed would straightforward threaten Israel’s existence. Additionally there is a certain kind of displayed pseudo-differentiation that for instance manifested itself in an unutterable banner in Berlin that read „Against German anti-Semitism and Israeli imperialism“. The attempt to once make a turn for the better has made things even worse and puts what one understands as Israeli expansion on the same level with Nazi-German delusion of extermination. However, this example is already one year old. I am going to keep myself from listing the madness that has taken place among the global terror intifada from Palestine through New York to France and Berlin among the left in detail. A left - and I say this as a communist – one does not really want to be part of anymore.
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De Gaulle fell. Some felt cheerless like Heine’s rifleman; me too, me too. But unfortunately nothing better occurred to the French delegate to the UN in New York, Armand Bérand, than to desperately cry out (according to “Nouvel Observateur”, May 5th): “C’est l’or juif!”. And no denial. Right hand, left hand all interchanged. The anti-Semitism does it and, like Stefan George called it once: “...he pulls into the ring.”

The classical phenomenon of anti-Semitism is taking a current shape. The old yet remains, this I call co-existence. What was, remained and will remain: the bandy-legged Jew with buckled nose, who runs away from something – what do I say? – everything. This is how he can as well be seen on the posters and in the pamphlets of the Arabiic propaganda, on which once brown men with German as native language, well hidden behind Arabic names are reportedly supposed to cash in. The new images appeared just after the Six-Day-war and that slowly preval: the Israeli oppressors, who, with iron steps of roman legions trample down peaceful Palestinian territory. Anti-Israelism, anti-zionism in pristine consultation with anti-Semitism from the past. The iron trampling oppressor-legionnaire and the bandy-legged runaway don’t disturb each other. How finally the images match!

But new indeed is the appearance of anti-Semitism purporting to be anti-Israelism on the left. Once it was the stupid lad’s socialism. Now it is about to be an integral part of socialism and so every socialist willingly turns into a stupid lad. This process can fruitfully be observed in the book “La Gauche contre Israel” by Givet, published in France more than a year ago. But it is sufficient to recognize certain milestones, for example to read a report in the magazine “konkret”: “the third front”. “Is Israel a police-state?” is one of the subheadings. The question is a rhetorical one. Of course Israel is. And napalm and blown up houses of peaceful Arab farmers and anti-Arab pogroms in the streets of Jerusalem. One knows it all. It is like Vietnam or how it was once in Algeria. The bandy-legged runaway naturally is the terror spreading goatherd. We are talking about the left and not only about the more or less orthodox communist parties in the west or even the policy of the socialist states. For there, where anti-Semitism is inscribed on the traditional Slavonic anti-Semitism, is simply strategy and tactic in an anyway existing political constellation. The stars do not lie and the Gomulkas know what they can count on. C’est de bonne guerre. There is not a word to lose about this. But that the intellectual left, which is free of any ties by political parties, adopts this image is worse. For years – to talk about Germany – one celebrated the Israeli defence-farmers and the jaunty girls in uniforms. In bad currency certain feelings of guilt were made good. But this had to get boring. Good luck, that for once the Jew was not burned but stood there as an imperious victor, as an occupying force. Napalm and so on. A sigh of relief went through the lands.

Everybody could talk like the “Deutsche National- und Soldatenzeitung”; whoever stood left was nonetheless routinely able to execute the jargon of engagement. Certain is: The anti-Semitism, contained inside anti-Israelism and anti-Zionism like the thunderstorm in the cloud, is respectable again. It can talk brassy, than it is “criminal state Israel”. It can do the same decently and talk about the “bridgehead of imperialism”, and regretfully hint at the misconceived solidarity, that binds nearly all the Jews to this dwarf-state - apart from a few commendable exceptions - and find it outrageous, that the Parisian baron Rothschild claims the French donations for Israel as a tax.

It is easy for anti-Semitism everywhere. The emotional infrastructure exists and not only in Poland or Hungary. The anti-Semitic de-mystifies the pioneer-state feeling comfortable. It occurs to him, that behind this creation there has always been capitalism in the shape of the Jewish plutocracy. But the latter he does not mention, that would be an ideologic lapsus linguæ, but – c’est l’or juif – nobody will mistaken the nature of a country, that was born from a bad idea, erected in a bad place, that fought several bad wars and achieved bad victories. Misunderstandings are to be avoided if possible. I know as well as anybody and everybody, that Israel does objectively bear the role of the occupying force. To justify everything the different governments of Israel undertake does not come to my mind. My personal relations to this land, about which Thomas Mann once said in the Josef-Tetralogy, it was a “Mediterranean land, not very cosy, a little dusty and stony” are slim to none: I have never visited it, I do not speak its language, its culture is ingnomiously alien to me, its religion is not mine. Still the existence of this state is more important to me than any other. And herewith we reach a point where all describing and analysing objectivity ends and where engagement is not a voluntarily accepted obligations but a matter of existence, the word understood in various meanings. Everybody who somehow belongs to “Jews, persons who in the sense of the Reichsburgergesetz (3rd Reich citizen code) from 15 September 1935 are considered to be Jews” can only talk about Israel existential subjectively and maybe therefore in the end reaches in the end an objectivity of nearly natural justice. Because finally the simplest as well as the most founded and prudent thought realizes, that Pioneer’s Land - even if it according to some perverted pseudo-marxist theology is in the sinful state of high development a hundred times – among all the states in this geopolitical area is the most endangered. Victory, victory and victory again: the catastrophe lurks and one cannot avoid it by running straight into it, making Israel part of a Palestinian federation. The Arabic states, to whom I wish fortune and peace, will catch up with the Israeli economic advance. The demographical overpressure will do the rest. In any circumstance Israel must be maintained until peace, economic and technic advantage of the Arabs put them into a general affection that allows them to accept Israel inside secured borders. It is about this. For whom? The subjective constitution, that wants to become historical objectiveness, has a say in the matter here.

Israel's existence is essential for all Jews (“Jews, persons who in the sense of...” and so on), wherever they may live.

“Will I be forced to celebrate Johnson? I am ready for it!” shouted Claude Lanzmann, French left-radical publicist and Satre-scholar, at the eve of the Six-Day-War. He knew what he meant and wanted. Because every Jew is the “catastrophe-Jew”, at the mercy of a catastrophic fate, if he realises it or not. The Black-Panther-Men write “Run, pale Jew” on the stores and houses of Jewish business men in Harlem and light-hearted forget about the old alliance, that bound the Jew to the Negro in the USA and that was not even the worst Jewish merchant never solate is out. Who guarantees that some government of the United States will not on a great day of conciliation surrender the Jews to the Negroes? Who guarantees the influential and partially rich Jews in France, that not one day the heritage of Drumont, Maurras, Xavier Valliant reaches new virulence? Who...
avouches that not Mr. Strauss, once he came into power, comes up with something, after which a certain newspaper tycoon would beware of giving any further disdainful donations to an Israeli government ready to disdainfully accept them?

Nobody guarantees nothing. This is no paranoid fantasy and more in danger than the human commonsense. The recent past is burning. And now every friend from the left who will tell me, I was joining the big army of those, who blackmail the public opinion with six (or five or four) million dead. This risk is to be taken, it is lower than that, which the friends suggest, pleading for the self-abandonment of “Zionist” Israel.

The demand on the practical-political reason is the solidarity of a left, who does not want abandon itself, has to reach Israel, has to focus on Israel (which does not mean, that it has to ignore the unbearable fate of the Arab refugees). This demand does not bind the non-Jewish man from the left the way it does bind the Jew, may he stands politically left, midway, right or nowhere. One can resign from the left; nobody is released from being a Jew, as even the early anti-Semitic Lanz-Liebenfels knew. Admittedly the left has its unwritten moral law, which it cannot pervert. “Where there are stronger ones, always take sides with the weak”, what an unvulnerable trivial truth. And stronger – who dares to protest? – are the Arabs. Stronger in numbers, stronger in oil, stronger in Dollars, one may just ask Aramco or Kuwait, stronger, for sure, in the potential for the future.

But the left obviously like spellbound watches the brave Palestinian guerrillas, who are certainly poorer than Moshe Dayan’s men. The left does not see that despite Rothschild and a wealthy American-Jewish middle class the Jew is worse off than Frantz Fanon’s colonized, does not see this as it does not see the phenomenon of the anti-imperialist Jewish struggle for freedom against England. In the end it is also not the Israelis fault, when the Soviet Union forgets what Gromyko declaimed in front of the UN in 1948 with a pretty vibrato: “As for the Jewish State, its existence is already a fact, whether favoured or not (...). The delegation of the CCCP cannot refrain from expressing its astonishment about the Arab states attitude towards the Palestinian question. We are very much surprised to see that some of those states have decided to take military steps to destroy the Jewish liberation movement. We cannot identify the statements of some Arab politicians and governments we whiteness with vital interests of the people in Middle East.” So spoke, as said already, the Soviet Union, a superpower, pursuing according politics, that on the long run was not able to ignore the obvious fact that there are more Arabs than Jews, more Arab than Jewish oil, more military bases with a higher strategic importance inside the Arab countries than within Israel. But the left in a wider and widest sense and especially the protesting far left, which I am affiliated to in many aspects, does not have such a superpower excuse.

The left, according to the law it reports to, is compelled to understand; to understand the tragic weakness of the Jewish state and of every Jew in the diaspora, to understand what is lurking behind the scenes of a Jewish middle class, behind the myth of the Money- and Gold-Jew (from “Jud Süss” to the contemporary Rothschilds and a few Hollywood-Stars). The Jews temporarily manipulate capital; they never control it. They have as little influence in today’s Wall Street as they had once in the Wilhelminian heavy industry. The State of Israel today is as little a bulwark of capitalism as it was when the first pioneers dug into the ground there, as little as the Arab states can be regarded progressive. The left – that is a crying shame – closes its eyes. Coincidence leaks a text by Hans Blüher to me: “A true history of Europe could not be written the way it was until now, anecdotally mentioning a Jew here and there... Rather the continuous historical power of Jewry as an empire latenly and constantly playing along has to become visible.” This text could literally appear in one of the countless pseudo-intellectual publications flooding the press. And Blüher – or even Streicher, because anti-Semitism does level the intellectual differences – could have said what the education minister of the progressive state Syria wrote to the general director of the UNESCO: “The hatred that we engrave in our children is a holy hatred.” All this would hardly be worth a note, if not the intellectual left of western Europe (including some Jews like Maxim Robinson who are mutilated by self-hatred) would run this vocabulary and adopt the system of norms coming along with the words. If the idea of a Jewish guilt arises from the historical fate of the Jewish, respectively anti-Semiticic question, to which the formation of the State of Israel may be linked, then a left that forgets itself, is to be held responsible. “Anti-zionism is a deeply reactionary phenomenon that is disguised by revolutionary, progressive, anti-colonial phrases about Israel” said the French Philosopher Robert Misrahi recently, who belongs to the wider Sature-Family like the above quoted Clause Lanzmann.

The time of a revision and new intellectual self-criticism has come; because it is the left that gave back an unrespectable dialectic respectability to anti-Semitism. The alliance of the square regular’s table with the barricades is against nature, sinful to the intellect, to run the terminology enforced by the topic. People like the polish general Moczar can allow themselves to forge crude anti-Semitism into current anti-israelism: the left must be more honest. There is no respectable anti-Semitism. How Satre put it once in his “Considerations upon the Jewish Question”: “What the anti-Semite seeks and prepares it the death of the Jew.”

---

1. Reference to a poem by Heinrich Heine about to soldiers mourning the imprisonment of Napoleon.