

AP EUROPEAN HISTORY

UNIT 9

Dictatorships and World War II



Unit Plan

and Pacing Guide

Unit 9

Dictatorships and World War II

PART ONE <i>The Rise of Totalitarian Dictatorships</i>	Kagan, Chapter 27, 904-905 OR Wood, 466-475 Document 9.1 (Orwell) Document 9.2 (Pipes Interview) Document 9.3 (Hitler, <i>Mein Kampf</i>)
PART TWO <i>World War II: 1939-1945</i>	Wood, 476-486 [minus 481-482 on Holocaust]
PART THREE <i>The Holocaust</i>	Wood, 481-482 Document 9.4 (Borowski)
ASSESSMENT	MULTIPLE CHOICE TEST DBQ

Document 9.1

George Orwell, Preface to the Ukrainian Edition of *Animal Farm*

Source: <http://www.netcharles.com/orwell/articles/ukrainian-af-pref.htm>

In this preface they will most likely expect me to say something of how *Animal Farm* originated but first I would like to say something about myself and the experiences by which I arrived at my political position.

I was born in India in 1903. My father was an official in the English administration there, and my family was one of those ordinary middle-class families of soldiers, clergymen, government officials, teachers, lawyers, doctors, etc. I was educated at Eton, the most costly and snobbish of the English Public Schools.¹ But I had only got in there by means of a scholarship; otherwise my father could not have afforded to send me to a school of this type.

Shortly after I left school (I wasn't quite twenty years old then) I went to Burma and joined the Indian Imperial Police... I stayed five years in the service. It did not suit me and made me hate imperialism, although at that time nationalist feelings in Burma were not very marked, and relations between the English and the Burmese were not particularly unfriendly. When on leave in England in 1927, I resigned from the service and decided to become a writer: at first without any especial success. In 1928—9 I lived in Paris and wrote short stories and novels that nobody would print (I have since destroyed them all). In the following years I lived mostly from hand to mouth, and went hungry on several occasions. It was only from 1934 onwards that I was able to live on what I earned from my writing. In the meantime I sometimes lived for months on end amongst the poor and half-criminal elements who inhabit the worst parts of the poorer quarters, or take to the streets, begging and stealing. At that time I associated with them through lack of money, but later their way of life interested me very much for its own sake. I spent many months (more systematically this time) studying the conditions of the miners in the north of England. Up to 1931 I did not on the whole look upon myself as a Socialist. In fact I had as yet no clearly defined political views. I became pro-Socialist more out of disgust with the way the poorer section of the industrial workers were oppressed and neglected than out of any theoretical admiration for a planned society.

In 1936 I got married. In almost the same week the [civil war broke out in Spain](#). My wife and I both wanted to go to Spain and fight for the Spanish Government. We were ready in six months, as soon as I had finished the book I was writing. In Spain I spent almost six months on the Aragon front until, at Huesca, a Fascist sniper shot me through the throat.

In the early stages of the war foreigners were on the whole unaware of the inner struggles between the various political parties supporting the Government. Through a series of accidents I joined not the International Brigade like the majority of foreigners, but the POUM militia—i.e. the Spanish Trotskyists.

So in the middle of 1937, when the Communists gained control (or partial control) of the Spanish Government and began to hunt down the Trotskyists, we both found ourselves amongst the victims. We were very lucky to get out of Spain alive, and not even to have been arrested once. Many of our friends were shot, and others spent a long time in prison or simply disappeared.

These man-hunts in Spain went on at the same time as the great purges in the USSR and were a sort of supplement to them. In Spain as well as in Russia the nature of the accusations (namely, conspiracy with the Fascists) was the same and as far as Spain was concerned I had every reason to believe that the accusations were false. To experience all this was a valuable object lesson: it taught me how easily totalitarian propaganda can control the opinion of enlightened people in democratic countries.

¹ Oddly, the English use the term “public” to refer to independent schools that we would call “private” in the United States. Prince William and Prime Minister David Cameron were both educated at Eton, which is the most exclusive preparatory school in England.

My wife and I both saw innocent people being thrown into prison merely because they were suspected of unorthodoxy. Yet on our return to England we found numerous sensible and well-informed observers believing the most fantastic accounts of conspiracy, treachery and sabotage which the press reported from the Moscow trials.

And so I understood, more clearly than ever, the negative influence of the Soviet myth upon the western Socialist movement.

And here I must pause to describe my attitude to the Soviet regime.

I have never visited Russia and my knowledge of it consists only of what can be learned by reading books and newspapers. Even if I had the power, I would not wish to interfere in Soviet domestic affairs: I would not condemn Stalin and his associates merely for their barbaric and undemocratic methods. It is quite possible that, even with the best intentions, they could not have acted otherwise under the conditions prevailing there.

But on the other hand it was of the utmost importance to me that people in western Europe should see the Soviet regime for what it really was. Since 1930 I had seen little evidence that the USSR was progressing towards anything that one could truly call Socialism. On the contrary, I was struck by clear signs of its transformation into a hierarchical society, in which the rulers have no more reason to give up their power than any other ruling class. **Moreover, the workers and intelligentsia in a country like England cannot understand that the USSR of today is altogether different from what it was in 1917.** It is partly that they do not want to understand (i.e. they want to believe that, somewhere, a really Socialist country does actually exist), and partly that, being accustomed to comparative freedom and moderation in public life, totalitarianism is completely incomprehensible to them.

Yet one must remember that England is not completely democratic. It is also a capitalist country with great class privileges and (even now, after a war that has tended to equalise everybody) with great differences in wealth. But nevertheless it is a country in which people have lived together for several hundred years without major conflict, in which the laws are relatively just and official news and statistics can almost invariably be believed, and, last but not least, in which to hold and to voice minority views does not involve any mortal danger. In such an atmosphere the man in the street has no real understanding of things like concentration camps, mass deportations, arrests without trial, press censorship, etc. Everything he reads about a country like the USSR is automatically translated into English terms, and he quite innocently accepts the lies of totalitarian propaganda. Up to 1939, and even later, the majority of English people were incapable of assessing the true nature of the Nazi regime in Germany, and now, with the Soviet regime, they are still to a large extent under the same sort of illusion.

This has caused great harm to the Socialist movement in England, and had serious consequences for English foreign policy. Indeed, in my opinion, nothing has contributed so much to the corruption of the original idea of Socialism as the belief that Russia is a Socialist country and that every act of its rulers must be excused, if not imitated.

And so for the past ten years I have been convinced that the destruction of the Soviet myth was essential if we wanted a revival of the Socialist movement.

On my return from Spain I thought of exposing the Soviet myth in a story that could be easily understood by almost anyone and which could be easily translated into other languages. However, the actual details of the story did not come to me for some time until one day (I was then living in a small village) I saw a little boy, perhaps ten years old, driving a huge cart-horse along a narrow path, whipping it whenever it tried to turn. It struck me that if only such animals became aware of their strength we should have no power over them, and that men exploit animals in much the same way as the rich exploit the proletariat....

Document 9.2

Interview with Richard Pipes (Professor Emeritus, Harvard University)

PBS: http://www.pbs.org/heavenonearth/interviews_pipes.html

How did Lenin come to be a socialist?

I think the first thing you want to take into consideration is this sort of passion which drove him. It was not idealism. Not so much hope for a better future for humanity, the creation of a new human being, it was above all a passionate hatred for the established regime.

And that has a lot to do with personal biography. When he was a teenager, his brother was executed for plotting an assassination attempt on the life of the Czar. That did not, I think, affect him so much because he and his older brother did not get along very well. But what affected him was that after he got to the university, he took part in a demonstration which was not political, it was directed against some regulations of the university. When he was arrested and it was discovered that he was the younger brother of the executed terrorist, he was expelled from the university. And he was a top student. So he had to spend several years in idleness and he developed tremendous hatred for the existing regime and for what he called the bourgeoisie, the people, the middle class people who ostracized his family after this. So that was his driving passion, to destroy. He was never so much concerned with what kind of life he was going to build. But destruction was very much his passion.

What was Lenin's most important contribution to socialism?

Lenin's importance derives from the fact that he created the first one-party totalitarian state that ever existed, and that served as a model for numerous one-party totalitarian states subsequently. I see a very close connection between the Soviet state, which Lenin established and Stalin then built upon, and the Nazi state.

Hitler never quite admitted it but there are hints in his writings, in his speeches and his conversations that he took Marxism very seriously and learned from it a great deal. So that is his importance. Essentially destructive importance, but nonetheless it's important.

How did Lenin respond when it became clear that the working class wasn't ready to rebel against the established order?

To Lenin socialism was mainly an instrument for making a revolution, and revolution was an instrument for destroying the existing order. When someone like Eduard Bernstein came out and his Russian disciple Peter Struve, whose biography I have written, who said, "You know Marx was wrong. The working-class are not getting poorer and more dissatisfied. In fact they are getting richer and they're getting pulled into the mainstream of political life, therefore let's forget about revolution and think of evolution." Lenin was livid with rage because to him socialism was a step to revolution.

Therefore when his time of exile was over and he went to Western Europe, he founded a newspaper and founded a party which was committed to making a revolution from above, because he concluded that the working class really was not interested in revolution, that revolution has to be brought from up above.

How did Lenin's Bolshevik party get its start?

Well Lenin, after he decided that socialism was really accommodating itself to the existing capitalist order, decided to form his own party. And his tactic from then on, almost to his death, was to split the socialist movement; to form a tight organization, minority if you will, it doesn't matter how many there are as long as they are really totally committed people. And he wanted to achieve the same thing as the socialist parties of Western Europe. He didn't have a chance to do that before he came to power in Russia. But once he came to power in Russia, he founded the 3rd International, which consisted entirely of fragments of European socialist party committed to his program. So the idea was to split. Get rid of

the reformers and those who believe in evolution and not revolution and have a full time party devoted to revolutionary activity.

What does “Bolshevik” mean?

Well the term Bolshevik is misleading because as you know it comes from the word *bolshe* in Russian, which means more, majority party. And his opponents were labeled Mensheviks, comes from the Russian word *menshe* which means less. He achieved a temporary majority at this conquest because the Jewish organization called Bund walked out. So he achieved a temporary majority and he immediately adopted the name Bolshevik, *Bolshevikee*, meaning the majority party, and he kept it even though he was not the majority at all when the dust settled. His tactics were to create in Russia a highly disciplined party that would obey his orders and get ready for seizing power when the opportunity presented itself.

So what was Lenin doing in the years leading up to 1917 and the Bolshevik Revolution?

Now the history of the party from 1903 to 1917 isn't terribly interesting. It's full of intrigues. Lenin was attacking everybody who didn't agree with him as a renegade, as an accommodator, as a liquidator and so on. It's really not very interesting history. But what he did have was cadres of very disciplined followers. No other party had that. And no party on the right, left or middle had that. So when government collapsed in Russia in the middle of 1917 he was the only one who could take power.

How did Lenin govern after the Bolsheviks came to power?

Once he took power basically it was only his followers that manned the government. For a short time he allowed left socialists to join in but only for a very short time. Basically it was a one-party state. Only his people run the state, and they run it in a very peculiar fashion, which nobody had seen before... the party was separate from the state but it controlled the state. So that's an extraneous body, actually controlled the government. That's unique. And Hitler emulated that when he formed the Nazi party, and Mussolini the same thing in Italy.

Just before the February revolution, life was very harsh, because it was war and the government didn't manage the war very well. There was a breakdown of transport. There was inflation. By our standards it wasn't terrible inflation but prices went up much faster than wages. And in the northern cities, particularly the capital city of St. Petersburg, or Petrograd as it was then called, there were great shortages in food and fuel. So the winter was very, very harsh. And the ministry of the interior, which controlled the police rendered reports in October 1916 in which it said that it was quite possible that it would have major disturbances leading to revolutionary activity because of the hardships....

It was an axiom among other socialists who were Marxists that Russia has to go through a bourgeois phase, a liberal phase before it could go socialist. This is what Marx taught. And they felt one has to give a chance to the bourgeoisie to run Russia and then eventually they would take over. Lenin came back and said, “Nothing doing. We already are bourgeois, Russia is already bourgeois, let's overthrow them -- arm the workers and stage a coup.”

Well, the... socialist-Marxist axiom was that before you establish a socialist state you must have a bourgeois state, a capitalist state. And most of the socialists felt that Russia was too primitive. I mean 80% of the population consisted of peasants who lived on the land and engaged in agriculture. So you must have really developed industrial capitalism before you can have socialism.

Therefore they were willing to let this so-called Provisional government run Russia for an indefinite period while they prepare themselves for the revolution. But Lenin came back in April and said, “No. We will seize power right away. Russia already is a bourgeois state. Let's seize power.” He tried ineffectively to do that in July of 1917. The government smashed this attempt and he had to flee to Finland where he bided his time.

Why did the Revolution take place when it did?

The point is that it's true that the Bolsheviks were gaining popularity in the Soviets, particularly in September and October. That's largely as a result of their propaganda calling for the end to the war, which was causing tremendous hardships and didn't seem to be getting the Russians anywhere. The

army was really quite demoralized. Tens of thousands of soldiers were deserting the front, coming home and so on. But he never proclaimed a one-party regime. He called for all power to the soviets.

Now Soviets were democratic institutions. They were like town-hall meetings consisting of ordinary working people and soldiers and peasants. And Lenin wanted all power to be transferred to the Soviets and he did not talk about one-party ruling another or even about socialism.

He felt in October, that's by the old Russian calendar -- November by our calendar, that the time had come. It was ripe to seize power. And he had sufficient forces, he thought, to seize power first in Petrograd, the capital, and then in Moscow and the other cities. But he took this power quietly, silently, without much support, simply by taking over. Because the Provisional government was demoralized, the army was neutral sitting on its hands. So he had this apparatus, which he had been creating for fifteen years at his disposal. And he later said that taking power in Russia was as easy as lifting a feather because there was no opposition. It was a *coup d'etat*, carried out at night, in Petrograd. Nobody really knew what was happening.

How did the Bolsheviks expand their control?

They concerted their power by a variety of means. First they made very quickly, peace with the Germans. So that was popular. The troops could come back. Secondly, they began to use terror, frightening people, shooting people. All of a sudden all over Russia there was a kind of lawlessness, that which people were not accustomed. They allowed peasants to seize land, which did not belong to them. He allowed workers to seize apartments, seize factories. He didn't intend for this to last, but for the time being he did that to gain public support. But even so by spring, his popularity waned a great deal. In elections, to the Soviets where in the fall he had majorities, he now began to get minorities because people voted for the other socialist parties. So what did he do? He called for a re-elections, re-elections, re-elections until he got his majorities. So by these various means he was in such a position of power that by the spring, nobody could dislodge him.

Did Lenin use terror to gain power?

Well Lenin believed in terror. He believed that you have to intimidate people and you have to kill people who are in your way. He had absolutely no qualms about it. He was not a sadist. He was not a man who enjoyed cruelty, but he was totally inured to human suffering. It just didn't mean anything to him at all...

What was the "Red Terror"?

Lenin was afraid that Czar Nicholas II could become the rallying point for anticommunist forces, which were gathering strength in the summer of 1918, particularly since there was a rebellion of the Czech, ex-Czech prisoners of war who came out against the Bolsheviks although Nicholas showed no interest in politics at all. Inevitably he and his whole family were executed in the most brutal way, gangsterish way. Him, his wife, their five children, their doctor, their servants were all massacred. Then their bodies were cut up and burned and then what remained was buried in a shaft, which was only discovered a few years ago. Then in August of 1918 a revolutionary who felt that Lenin had betrayed the Russians, took two shots at him --wounded him, almost fatally, whereupon Lenin and his henchmen agreed to carry out Red Terror. This was a terrible thing.

People were taken out of prison where they were political prisoners, who had never been tried, they'd done nothing against the Bolsheviks and were just similarly shot. This shooting went on, hundreds of people shot at night, by the glare of searchlights in a park near Moscow and in Petersburg and other cities of Russia. Thousands of people were shot in this way. And that cowered the population to a very large extent.

All socialists believed, this goes back actually even to pre-socialist days, to the French Jacobins, to Robespierre, to the notion that people as they exist today are sort of a travesty of human beings as they should be and as they could be. Once you establish a proper social order and you educate people through legislation, through schooling, and so on. You create a new man, who for one thing will not be acquisitive, will not want property, who will share everything with others and who really will be a totally new human being.

Trotsky wrote passages, very eloquent passages of what this human being would be like. Some of the more extreme Bolsheviks believed that human beings would be immortal, they would not be suffering disease, they would not be subject to death and soon. So the people who lived in this time, they were sort of a travesty of human beings. So their liquidating them was nothing. Of course Lenin believed in having to do that because he felt they are a possible source of opposition to his regime. So anybody who opposed him was liable to be shot.

Lenin in general had no sympathy for human beings such as they were. He thought that once you created a new human being, the primary feature of the new human being would be they would not be that acquisitive. They would not want to possess. But that's not his idea, because way back to the 18th century to the French, philosophers wrote about it. The French philosophers in the 18th century, and others, argued that all human sins, human flaws, come from the desire to possess. If you destroy that in people, he believed, as did others, that through education, legislation you can make people not want to own things. You create new human beings. So the existing human race was so rotten and killing them was actually progressive.

Did Lenin intend for communism to spread outside of Russia?

Well, Lenin said more than once that he never believed that the revolution could be confined to Russia. Altogether it could not be confined to one country, particularly Russia which is really a very backward country in many respects. The more he ruled Russia the more he realized how backward Russia was. No, the revolution had to spread. It had to spread to the industrial countries of the west; first of all Germany, Great Britain, ultimately the United States and so on....

Did Lenin look to other revolutions in the past for inspiration or to take lessons from?

Well Lenin of course, like all Russian revolutionaries, was a keen student of past revolutions. Now every revolution ultimately failed, every social revolution I mean. Even the French revolution, because it lasted for a few years, then you have Napoleon, then you have the restoration, revolution gone.

In 1848, revolutions all over Europe ended in nothing. Well, not exactly nothing, but not in a socialist system. The Parisian commune in 1870-1871, again. So Lenin asked himself, why was this so? He felt that revolutions were never thorough enough. They tried to reform the existing regime rather than destroy it. So ultimately the existing regime always took over and reinvented itself. So he concluded they were going to completely destroy root and branch, the existing system. And he proceeded to do that, to create a completely new regime....

Did the new government govern the nation any better than the old one?

The people who took over Russia -- not only the Russian government but the Russian economy which was the fifth largest in the world -- had absolutely no experience with running anything, either government offices or businesses. They mismanaged things terribly. And before long they had to bring in, they call them specialists, specialists, particularly in the economy. They were under very tight control of the party but they had the know-how. Nevertheless, they messed things up terribly. And Stalin bided his time and ten years later after he came to power he'd aimed to get rid of these people. By get rid of I mean, he had phony trials, short trials in which they were accused of sabotage and espionage and be executed. And he grew up a whole new cadre of Soviet specialists, but they were not as good as the old ones.

Did living conditions and the standard of living get better or worse under Lenin and communism?

It worsened them tremendously. The standard of living of the population in the years immediately following the revolution sank to the lowest levels, levels not seen long under Czarism. The situation improved after 1921 because Lenin chose a New Economic Policy. He had such rebellions from the population at large that he was afraid he was going to be toppled from power. So he allowed some private property, particularly in agriculture produce, and also in consumer goods. So by 1928 -- this is already four years after his death -- the general standard of living in the country was not worse than had been before the revolution. But then Stalin came in and everything got bad again.

What aspects of Lenin's personality are reflected in the communist system?

Well, it reflects his personality in the sense that he imprinted it with this idea of destructiveness of the existing order and the necessity of establishing a completely different order. That was deeply embedded in him, in his mentality and his psychology, the lack of tolerance for other views, the lack of sympathy. His favorite word was merciless. He used it all the time.

It was a system that knew the truth -- that did not tolerate any other truth. That's very much how Lenin looked at things. He knew, and anybody that disagreed with him as they say was a renegade, liquidator, apostate, what have you. And the system was built that way. The party had the truth at its disposal and if you're not with it you're against it, and therefore your life was worthless. That was very Leninist. That was embedded in the system. There's no such thing as a human right, there are only human duties, total commitment to the system. That also flowed from his psychology -- the intolerance, the lack of empathy, lack of pity. All that reflected in his personality.

When there was a famine in Russia in the late 19th century and people tried to organize famine relief, he was against it. He was the only intellectual in that region where he lived to be against it. He said it's doing something very progressive economically, it's forcing the peasants to move into the cities and so on and industrialize the country. He had no such human feelings at all. The whole system became like that -- totally inhumane.

How did the rest of the world react to the Bolshevik revolution?

At first there was not much reaction to the Russian revolution abroad because the world was in the midst of World War I, which preoccupied people totally. Millions of young men were at the front dying each day. So I was surprised that for example, in the newspaper, in the leading Swiss newspaper of March 1917, from which Lenin learned about the revolution in Russia, the news was on page two. It was a small item.

And that lasted through 1918, 1919. And then of course, when peace settled in Europe, uneasy peace, people began to wonder what's happening in Russia, particularly since the Russians tried to export the revolution. And then a lot of attention was paid. Some people thought that Russians are saviors of the world. But the real influence of communism did not really begin until the 1930s, under the impact of two big events, which was The Depression, which seemed to foreshadow the doom of capitalism, and the rise of Nazism.

Yes the Cold War however was different, because the Cold War we confronted a great military power, a state with great military power. In the 1920s and 1930s, Russia was not a great military power; at least, it wasn't viewed as such. And what people mostly feared was the spread of communism to their countries, which was not so much of a problem in the Cold War.

Revolution sponsored by, particularly in countries like Germany, people really did fear Bolsheviks' coup. But they suppressed it. And on the whole it was the internal concerns that predominated the 1920s and 1930s and it was the external ones that dominated the Cold War.

Did Lenin's successors admire Lenin and his legacy?

Stalin considers himself a pupil of Lenin, and this answers the question of what imprint did he have on the revolution subsequently. Stalin was his pupil. He learned what Lenin taught, particularly the strategy and tactics of revolutionary activity. He gave up the notion, Stalin that is, of exporting revolution abroad because he realized that it was a non-starter, and he began to emphasize the need for another world war -- World War II -- which would spread communism. That actually was Lenin's conclusion, too, by 1921.

The ideals of Lenin persisted with this time period, then they began to somehow to decline. Khrushchev revived the Lenin cult because he wanted to get rid of the legacy of Stalin. Stalin was such a horrid human being that Khrushchev began to idealize Lenin, the human Lenin, the idealist Lenin. So there are many myths about Lenin that come from the Khrushchev period. And that had its effect. I'm astonished that after all the revelations we have about Lenin a few years ago, polls were conducted in Russia and

Russians were asked who are their ten greatest men in human history of all countries, all ages, Lenin came out third, all the thousands of years of human history. So it made an impression on the Russian mentality.

Moving to another topic – how does socialism fit into the ideology of Italy's Mussolini?

Mussolini, contrary to prevailing opinion, was not born a fascist; Mussolini was an extreme left-wing socialist. He came from a socialist family, an anarchist family. He was an extreme socialist. And in the early 1900s was really a kind of counterpart of Lenin in the Italian socialist party. He chased out the reformers. He wanted a revolution. He wanted a tight party. Like Lenin, Mussolini lost faith in the working class. He thought the working class consisted of accommodators, appeasers and he wanted to bring revolution from above, a militant party. And when he chased out the reformist from the socialist party of Italy and became editor of the main organ of the Italian socialist party, Lenin congratulated him. Not by name but he wrote an article in which he praised what the Italian revolutionist had done.

Then came the war, World War I in 1914 and Mussolini was stunned to see how much stronger nationalism is than class antagonism, because it was always said among socialists that nationalism is not something that the workers share. **According to Marx, the workers have no fatherland. They only know their class. It turned out that was not true at all. And the workers very happily went to massacre each other in World War I.** Mussolini very quickly drew the conclusion from this and said all right, the class struggle is an important thing and it guides history, but it's a class struggle not within nations but between nations. So, he sort of married, combined socialism and nationalism. He said there are "have" nations and "have-not" nations. Italy is a have-not nation. We have to defend our interests. And of course Hitler did the same, although Hitler never had the socialist background.

Was the Fascist Party a "right-wing" party?

Mussolini's party was a right-wing party but only to some extent, just as the Nazi party. These were not conservative parties. They were radical, radical nationalist parties, which in the programs very much maintained the socialist ideals. For example, Mussolini's corporate state workers participated in the decision making in the business enterprises. They had as much say in some respects, as did the owners of factories.

Mussolini did shift to the right gradually because I think he was afraid of the power of the communist and the socialists, and since he was a dictator and wanted dictatorial power he felt that one has to suppress these parties and they were suppressed.

Were the parties really that dangerous?

Well the parties did present a danger. I mean after the fall of Mussolini, the socialists and communists became majority parties in Italy and, for a while, it looked as if, in 1948 if you recall, it looked as if the Communists were going to take power in Italy. And we were very upset by this and prepared even military contingency plans.

Are Communism and Fascism totally different things, completely opposed to one another?

Well, the notion that Communism and fascism are diametrically opposed is something that was fostered by the Communist party, by the Communist International. In the 1920s, basically the International defined fascism as any anti-communist movement. If you were anti-communist, it doesn't matter what platform, you were automatically fascist. So that even the western democracies were called fascist. This is a meaningless term. I use the term Fascism concretely, to apply only to the Italian fascist party and the Nazi to the Nazi party. Later these two movements had a great deal in common. They were one-party states which gave the workers considerable input into the running of the state, that used socialist slogans without giving them really socialist rights. I mean, the same thing was true in the Soviet Union. They bannered about socialist slogans but they came nowhere near fulfilling socialist programs. And they felt a great deal of empathy for each other, all these fascists and communists, because they had a common enemy. The common enemy was liberal, democratic, capitalist state. They hated it, all of it, equally. And they had a great deal of admiration for each other. You know, Hitler, at the height of the war which his troops were waging with the Russians in 1942-1943, spoke freely to his associates about

how after having triumphed over Stalin he will make Stalin his governor over Russia. And Mao Zedong, when he was criticized for killing so many of his associates during the Cultural Revolution is quoted as saying, "Look at Hitler. The more cruelty, the more revolutionist zeal." They greatly admired each other and hated equally well the Roosevelts and the Churchills and the other democratic leaders in West.

How did Mussolini view human nature? Did he think one could remold a human being into an ideal person?

The difference between Lenin and Mussolini about human nature was the following. Lenin believed, in line with the philosophic tradition which goes back to the eighteenth century, that human nature is perfectly malleable. You can make human beings be anything you want. They followed Locke who said, "Human beings when they are born are *tabula rasa*, they have no personality. The personality is formed by experience, sensory experience." So you can make anything out of human beings you want. And Mussolini was not heir to this tradition, anyway not when he became a fascist leader.

And he once said about Lenin, in the early 1920s that Lenin failed, because Lenin was a sculptor working on human nature and he failed because human nature is harder than any stone or any metal you can refashion. And, he didn't try to.

Unlike Lenin, Mussolini did not believe you could change human nature, that humans are what they are, and he thought that Lenin waged a futile attempt to change human nature. And that's why the dictatorship of Mussolini was much gentler than that of Lenin.

....

Do you know any anecdotes about Lenin that you'd like to share?

Russia was hit by a terrible famine, five million people died. And Lenin wrote a letter to the Central Committee which had been published in 1970 but was considered to be spurious, and I found the original and published it in my book, "The Unknown Lenin," in which he says to the Central Committee, "look now that people are dying by the thousands and even resorting to eating human flesh, now is the time we should go after the church and confiscate this wealth. We need this wealth for ourselves." He doesn't say we need it to feed the hungry. We fed the hungry -- we the Americans from the American Relief Administration. He said, "We need it for the state." That's a horrible story. But all the stories about him are of that kind.

I can tell you another anecdote about Lenin. He was so simpleminded. He liked music. He liked Beethoven particularly. And he once said that he doesn't want to hear it anymore. He doesn't want to listen to music because it makes you soft and you want to embrace and hug and kiss people. And what you have to do is hit them over the head. So he stopped listening to music. That's the kind of human being he was.

Document 9.3

Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*

Source: <http://history.hanover.edu/courses/excerpts/111hitler.html>

Volume One, Chapter Six: "War Propaganda"

{1}The function of propaganda does not lie in the scientific training of the individual, but in calling the masses' attention to certain facts, processes, necessities, etc., whose significance is thus for the first time placed within their field of vision.

{2}The whole art consists in doing this so skillfully that everyone will be convinced that the fact is real, the process necessary, the necessity correct, etc. But since propaganda is not and cannot be the necessity in itself, since its function. . . consists in attracting the attention of the crowd, and not in educating those who are already educated or who are striving after education and knowledge, its effect for the most part must be aimed at the emotions and only to a very limited degree at the so-called intellect. . . .

{3}The art of propaganda lies in understanding the emotional ideas of the great masses and finding, through a psychologically correct form, the way to the attention and thence to the heart of the broad masses. The fact that our bright boys do not understand this merely shows how mentally lazy and conceited they are. . . .

{4}The receptivity of the great masses is very limited, their intelligence is small, but their power of forgetting is enormous. In consequence of these facts, all effective propaganda must be limited to a very few points and must harp on these in slogans until the last member of the public understands what you want him to understand by your slogan. As soon as you sacrifice this slogan and try to be many-sided, the effect will piddle away, for the crowd can neither digest nor retain the material offered. In this way the result is weakened and in the end entirely cancelled out.

{5}Thus we see that propaganda must follow a simple line and correspondingly the basic tactics must be psychologically sound. For instance, it was absolutely wrong to make the enemy ridiculous, as the Austrian and German comic papers did. It was absolutely wrong because actual contact with an enemy soldier was bound to arouse an entirely different conviction, and the results were devastating; for now the German soldier, under the direct impression of the enemy's resistance, felt himself swindled by his propaganda service. His desire to fight, or even to stand firm, was not strengthened, but the opposite occurred. His courage flagged.

{6}By contrast, the war propaganda of the English and Americans was psychologically sound. By representing the Germans to their own people as barbarians and Huns, they prepared the individual soldier for the terrors of war, and thus helped to preserve him from disappointments. After this, the most terrible weapon that was used against him seemed only to confirm what his propagandists had told him; it likewise reinforced his faith in the truth of his government's assertions, while on the other hand it increased his rage and hatred against the vile enemy. For the cruel effects of the weapon, whose use by the enemy he now came to know, gradually came to confirm for him the 'Hunnish' brutality of the barbarous enemy, which he had heard all about; and it never dawned on him for a moment that his own weapons possibly, if not probably, might be even more terrible in their effects. . . .

{7}The function of propaganda is . . . not to weigh and ponder the rights of different people, but exclusively to emphasize the one right which it has set out to argue for. Its task is not to make an objective study of the truth, in so far as it favors the enemy, and then set it before the masses with academic fairness; its task is to serve our own right, always and unflinchingly.

{8}It was absolutely wrong to discuss war-guilt from the standpoint that Germany alone could not be held responsible for the outbreak of the catastrophe; it would have been correct to load every bit of the blame on the shoulders of the enemy, even if this had not really corresponded to the true facts, as it actually did. . . .

Volume One, Chapter Ten:
"Causes of the Collapse"

{9}The easiest and hence most widespread explanation of the present misfortune is that it was brought about by the consequences of the lost War and that therefore the War is the cause of the present evil.

{10}There may be many who will seriously believe this nonsense but there are still more from whose mouth such an explanation can only be a lie and conscious falsehood. . . . Didn't these apostles of world conciliation . . . glorify the benevolence of the Entente, and didn't they shove full blame for the whole bloody struggle on Germany? . . . Will you claim that this was not so, you wretched, lying scoundrels?

{11}It takes a truly Jewish effrontery to attribute the blame for the collapse solely to the military defeat...

{12}The foremost connoisseurs of this truth regarding the possibilities in the use of falsehood and slander have always been the Jews; for after all, their whole existence is based on one single great lie, to wit, that they are a religious community while actually they are a race - - -and what a race! . . .

[The text continues, asserting a connection between Jewish businessmen and the process of industrialization and modernization.]

{13}In proportion as economic life grew to be the dominant mistress of the state, money became the god whom all had to serve and to whom each man had to bow down. More and more, the gods of heaven were put into the corner as obsolete and outmoded, and in their stead incense was burned to the idol Mammon. . . .

{14}Unfortunately, the domination of money was sanctioned even by that authority which should have most opposed it: His Majesty the Kaiser acted most unfortunately by drawing the aristocracy into the orbit of the new finance capital. . . . It was clear that once a beginning had been made in this direction, the aristocracy of the sword would in a short time inevitably be overshadowed by the financial aristocracy. Regarded purely from the standpoint of blood, such a development was profoundly unfortunate: more and more, the nobility lost the racial basis for its existence, and in large measure the designation of 'ignobility' would have been more suitable for it.

{15}A grave economic symptom of decay was the slow disappearance of the right of private property, and the gradual transference of the entire economy to the ownership of stock companies.

{16}Now for the first time labor had sunk to the level of an object of speculation for unscrupulous Jewish business men; the alienation of property from the wage-worker was increased ad infinitum. The stock exchange began to triumph and prepared slowly but surely to take the life of the nation into its guardianship and control. . . .

{17}What food did the German press of the pre-War period dish out to the people? Was it not the worst poison that can even be imagined? Wasn't the worst kind of pacifism injected into the heart of our people at a time when the rest of the world was preparing to throttle Germany, slowly but surely? Even in peacetime didn't the press inspire the minds of the people with doubt in the right of their own state, thus from the outset limiting them in the choice of means for its defense? Was it not the German press which knew how to make the absurdity of 'Western democracy' palatable to our people until finally, ensnared by all the enthusiastic tirades, they thought they could entrust their future to a League of Nations? . . . Did it not ridicule morality and ethics as backward and petty-bourgeois, until our people finally became 'modern'? . . . Did it not belittle the army with constant criticism, sabotage universal conscription, demand the refusal of military credits, etc., until the result became inevitable?

{18}The so-called liberal press was actively engaged in digging the grave of the German people and the German Reich. We can pass by the lying Marxist sheets in silence; to them lying is just as vitally

necessary as catching mice for a cat; their function is only to break the people's national and patriotic backbone and make them ripe for the slave's yoke of international capital and its masters, the Jews. . . .

{19}And what did the state do against this mass poisoning of the nation? Nothing, absolutely nothing. A few ridiculous decrees, a few fines for villainy that went too far, and that was the end of it. Instead, they hoped to curry favor with this plague by flattery, by recognition of the 'value' of the press, its 'importance,' its 'educational mission,' and more such nonsense - -as for the Jews, they took all this with a crafty smile and acknowledged it with sly thanks. . . .

{20}This poison was able to penetrate the bloodstream of our people unhindered and do its work, and the state did not possess the power to master the disease. . . . For an institution which is no longer resolved to defend itself with all weapons has for practical purposes abdicated. Every half-measure is a visible sign of inner decay which must and will be followed sooner or later by outward collapse.

{21}I believe that the present generation, properly led, will more easily master this danger. It has experienced various things which had the power somewhat to strengthen the nerves of those who did not lose them entirely. In future days the Jew will certainly continue to raise a mighty uproar in his newspapers if a hand is ever laid on his favorite nest, if an end is put to the mischief of the press and this instrument of education is put into the service of the state and no longer left in the hands of aliens and enemies of the people. But I believe that this will bother us younger men less than our fathers. A thirty-centimeter shell has always hissed more loudly than a thousand Jewish newspaper vipers-so let them hiss!

Volume One, Chapter Eleven: "Nation and Race"

{22}Any crossing of two beings not at exactly the same level produces a medium between the level of the two parents. This means: the offspring will probably stand higher than the racially lower parent, but not as high as the higher one. Consequently, it will later succumb in the struggle against the higher level. Such mating is contrary to the will of Nature for a higher breeding of all life. The precondition for this does not lie in associating superior and inferior, but in the total victory of the former. The stronger must dominate and not blend with the weaker, thus sacrificing his own greatness. Only the born weakling can view this as cruel, but he after all is only a weak and limited man. . . .

{23}The consequence of this racial purity, universally valid in Nature, is not only the sharp outward delimitation of the various races, but their uniform character in themselves. . . .

{24}Nature looks on calmly, with satisfaction, in fact. In the struggle for daily bread all those who are weak and sickly or less determined succumb, while the struggle of the males for the female grants the right or opportunity to propagate only to the healthiest. And struggle is always a means for improving a species' health and power of resistance and, therefore, a cause of its higher development.

{25}No more than Nature desires the mating of weaker with stronger individuals, even less does she desire the blending of a higher with a lower race, since, if she did, her whole work of higher breeding, over perhaps hundreds of thousands of years, might be ruined with one blow.

{26}Historical experience offers countless proofs of this. It shows with terrifying clarity that in every mingling of Aryan blood with that of lower peoples the result was the end of the cultured people. North America, whose population consists in by far the largest part of Germanic elements who mixed but little with the lower colored peoples, shows a different humanity and culture from Central and South America, where the predominantly Latin immigrants often mixed with the aborigines on a large scale. By this one example, we can clearly and distinctly recognize the effect of racial mixture. The Germanic inhabitant of the American continent, who has remained racially pure and unmixed, rose to be master of the continent; he will remain the master as long as he does not fall a victim to defilement of the blood....

{27}If we pass all the causes of the German collapse in review, the ultimate and most decisive remains the failure to recognize the racial problem and especially the Jewish menace...

Document 9.4

From Tadeusz Borowski, *This Way for the Gas, Ladies and Gentlemen*

Link: <http://www.box.net/shared/umc6mrannb>

Press ctrl+click on the link above to open the document (password: bobcat) or paste the link into a web browser.