

**Fascism
Rebranded:
Exposing the
Great Reset**

Paul Cudenec

Fascism
rebranded:
exposing the
Great Reset

Selected writing, 2018-2021

Paul Cudenec



winteroak.org.uk

Copyright © 2021 Paul Cudenec. The author formally retains copyright over this work but permits non-commercial reproduction or distribution

*“We are slaves of a mechanical system of
ideas”*

Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan
An Idealist View of Life

CONTENTS

Preface	vii
Organic radicalism: bringing down the fascist machine	1
Multiplication is division	72
Smash Vitaphobia!	77
Another world exists within us	84
Liberalism: the two-faced tyranny of wealth	88
We don't want your fascist future!	131
Reclaiming the revolutionary wisdom of the past	133
Resist the Fourth Industrial Repression!	138
Anarchists against freedom!	143
The rebels will return	154
Money, lies and power	164
Fascism, new normalism and the left	170
The Great Battle for the Future	189
Klaus Schwab and his Great Fascist Reset	201
Dismantling tyranny	254
Impactor alert!	262
Ten things we have learned during the Covid Coup	273
Fascism: three brief insights	276

PREFACE

I didn't see the Covid moment coming, of course. Who could have imagined, even at the start of 2020, that we were heading into a Brave New World of lockdowns and curfews, of travel bans, vaccine passports and police-state restrictions on every aspect of our lives?

But for many years I had understood that our society risked heading in a totalitarian direction and that, far from being the opposite of contemporary "liberalism", as we are always told, fascism was in fact a mode into which this hypocritical system could switch at any given time, when it felt the need.

This is why I chose to begin this pdf collection of essays with *Organic radicalism: bringing down the fascist machine*, published on the Winter Oak website on July 10, 2018.

Here we see how the dominant complex paints a false picture of historical fascism not just to smear its own current opponents, but also to hide its own close relationship with that very same monstrosity.

The same theme features in *Liberalism: the*

two-faced tyranny of wealth, which appeared on the Organic Radicals website on the cusp of the Covid crisis (March 11, 2020) and in which I conclude: “Liberalism has for many centuries been a convenient disguise for the rule of money, the concentration of power and wealth in the hands of a small but very dominant elite”.

In the meantime, I had mused on the false idea of quantity as overall increase (*Multiplication is division*, June 5, 2019), inveighed against the life-denying contemporary mindset (*Smash vitaphobia!* December 28, 2019) and reminded readers that, however grim the society which we find ourselves enduring, *Another world exists within us* (January 13, 2020).

By March 29, 2020, my direct response to the Covid clampdown was under way, with a short piece in Winter Oak’s *Acorn* bulletin entitled *We don’t want your fascist future!*

Reclaiming the revolutionary wisdom of the past (April 22, 2020) is a contribution to the Organic Radicals site which takes as its starting point a study of the Situationist thinker Guy Debord.

I argue that a critique of current society which does not challenge the whole reality of that society – a technocratic industrial capitalist reality – will always be built on sand.

If we are ever to successfully resist and bring down this ecocidal system, we will need to be

inspired by thinking which has its roots outside that system, which existed before that system took hold of our lives and our minds.

“We look to the past to see what we have lost – what has been stolen from us by the modern capitalist world”.

Resist the Fourth Industrial Repression!, published on April 25, 2020, is a defiant refusal of everything which the ruling clique has been trying to impose upon us under the feeble excuse of “fighting the virus”.

I warn: “The 4IR is a death cult which dreams of wiping out everything that is natural, everything that is wild, everything that is free”.

In *Anarchists against freedom!* (April 26, 2020) I hit back at certain so-called “anarchists” who had gone so far in cowing to the official Covid line that they were claiming that a love of freedom was in some way “right-wing”.

The rebels will return (April 29, 2020) provides a larger context to this tragic ideological collapse and reconfirms my commitment to anarchist *ideals*, regardless of the state of the anarchist *movement* at any given time.

In *Money, lies and power* (May 21, 2020), I raise the possibility that the ruling class now envisages going beyond the accumulation of money as the means to its domination and is instead planning a world in which it simply has total physical control over the rest of us, who will

be nothing but slaves.

“They have obviously calculated that they can get away with this, that their wealth, power and lies are now so all-conquering, and the majority of humankind so supine, gutless and malleable, that they will simply be able to trample all over us, for ever. It is up to us to prove them wrong”.

Fascism, newnormalism and the left (July 26, 2020) was inspired by a book on Italian fascism which I came across in an extremely random way and which clarified my thinking in a number of ways.

In particular, it helped me see how the dehumanising New Normal of the Great Reset is very much a continuation of the original fascist project under Benito Mussolini, in which 20th century industrial plutocracy sought to accelerate its production by reshaping living beings into regimented and obedient units of human capital.

The Great Battle for the Future (August 18, 2020) appeared first on the Organic Radicals site and explores Silvia Federici’s analysis of the Middle Ages, when ordinary people had escaped the outright slavery of the Roman Empire and were rebelling against authority to reclaim a better future – one based on social justice, freedom and local autonomy.

This massive uprising was crushed by the

emergence of capitalism and then industrialism. As Federici explains, capitalism was the “counter-revolution” that destroyed the possibilities that had emerged from the anti-feudal struggle.

I point out the striking parallels between this historical moment and the counter-revolutions represented by fascism, in the 20th century, and the Great Reset, in the 21st.

Klaus Schwab and His Great Fascist Reset, published on October 5, 2020, is by a long way the most-read article I have ever penned, despite its length. It has since been reposted on many websites and translated into various languages.

Here I take a close look at the agenda being led by the World Economic Forum, via three books by its boss, Schwab. I explain: “He and his accomplices are using the Covid-19 crisis to bypass democratic accountability, to override opposition, to accelerate their agenda and to impose it on the rest of humankind against our will in what he terms a ‘Great Reset’.”

Dismantling tyranny (December 14, 2020) looks at the long-term issues which underlie the Great Reset and insists that these have to be resolved if we are ever to make a clean break with the current system.

“If we were able to pull back from the brink of this global totalitarian coup, there would be no point in returning to the pre-Covid status quo, as

all the conditions would remain in place for the global ruling elite to try the same thing again, a few years down the road, using a different trick”.

Impact capitalism is a phenomenon which forms a central part of the New Normal agenda, and which is little understood. Researcher Alison McDowell has been producing some crucial information and analysis on this issue and in *Impactor Alert!* (March 16, 2021) I try to convey the essence of what she has been showing us.

Ten things we have learned during the Covid coup is an *Acorn* piece, published on May 5, 2021. It sums up, in a few words, much of what I have been writing about in recent years.

Finally, there is *Fascism: three brief insights* (June 10, 2021). Published nearly three years after the first piece in this selection, it seems to me to nicely complete this particular loop in an ongoing spiral of reflection.

Paul Cudenec, July 2021

ORGANIC RADICALISM: BRINGING DOWN THE FASCIST MACHINE

July 10, 2018

“We have realized that a detachment of man from Nature, from the Life-Whole, leads to his annihilation... No longer does man alone stand in the centerpoint of thinking, but rather Life as a Whole does, as it reveals itself in all living things on earth”.

On the face of it, this statement sounds rather good. It’s the sort of thing we send out on our Winter Oak “Quote for the Day” tweets.

But in this instance, we definitely won’t be doing that. Why? Because it comes from a 1934 book called *Biological Will: Means and Goals of Biological Work in the New Reich* by Ernst Lehmann, a leading Nazi biologist.¹

The occasional similarity in vocabulary or rhetoric between radical eco-anarchist thought and a certain strand of Nazi ideology has long provided a source of ammunition for enemies of radical green thinking.

Sometimes these attacks amount to little more than laughable right-wing propaganda, as

with a 2018 item² on the *Encounter Books* website focusing on the “totalitarian roots” of the green movement as a whole and, in particular, of wind power.

Others are taken a lot more seriously when they warn that a radical political philosophy which is too nature-based inevitably risks carrying us down into a dark underworld of proto-fascist ideology.

While Murray Bookchin was no doubt right to take elements of the American deep ecology movement to task for not fully recognising the social roots behind ecological problems, the rhetoric he deployed, condemning what he regarded as “ecofascism”, has ultimately only increased the perceived Nazi contamination of radical green thinking in general.

Fellow social ecologists Janet Biehl and Peter Staudenmaier carried on his approach with great enthusiasm. In *Ecofascism: Lessons from the German Experience*, they wrote: “The National Socialist ‘religion of nature,’ as one historian has described it, was a volatile admixture of primeval teutonic nature mysticism, pseudo-scientific ecology, irrationalist anti-humanism, and a mythology of racial salvation through a return to the land. Its predominant themes were ‘natural order’, organicist holism and denigration of humanity: Such arguments have a chilling currency within

contemporary ecological discourse”.³

More recently, Alexander Reid Ross, a one-time editor of *Earth First! Journal*, has identified parts of the EF! network, as well as anarchists and left-wingers generally, as being affected by what he terms ideological “fascist creep”.⁴

There are plenty of other examples out there, plus, it should be added, actual attempts by sections of the far right to hijack environmental positions and language for their own ends.⁵

All of this has, of course, not been without an impact on the thinking of the broader environmental movement.

Sensitive to comparison with Nazi policies, Germany’s Green Party has long gone out of its way to stress its rupture from this past.

For instance, in a 1987 interview with the Oxford journal *Green Line*, party representative Jakob von Uexküll, grandson and namesake of an archconservative behavioural biologist, said that the Greens in Germany had made a conscious decision to seek out allies in minority groups because critics had pointed out that ecological-holistic statements had historically been made by Nazi and Fascist governments.⁶

While forging alliances with minority groups is itself a positive move, the problem lies in the way that ecologists with a social critique find it safer to tack their environmentalism on to an

already-existing package of left-liberal thought rather than to source it from what is seen as an entirely discredited green tradition.

Historian Anna Bramwell wrote as long ago as 1994 that since the Second World War “any talk of holism, or a love of nature that adduced certain values from nature or strove to adapt humanity to those values, was suspect”⁷ – and things certainly haven’t improved since then.

We can testify to this ourselves. An article published in 2017 by Winter Oak, *Envisioning a Post-Western World*, proposing an exit from industrial capitalist ways of living and thinking, was only reposted by the radical American website *antidote zine* after much discussion and with a disclaimer that some of the arguments we put forward were “right on the knife’s edge”.⁸

The knife in question turned out to be the one being dramatically waved around by Reid Ross, which seems to have successfully intimidated a large part of the anti-capitalist movement in the US, even if some are still brave enough to publish “suspect” ideas in spite of his efforts.

But what is the truth behind this “Nazi” smear against organic deep green ideology? Is it justified? Is it something that should influence the way we collectively formulate our own vision of the world? If so, in what way?

To get to the roots of the matter, we will here

be asking, and answering, the following questions:

- 1. What were the origins of this organic thinking?**
- 2. To what extent was this thinking part of Nazi theory and practice?**
- 3. Are there other possible manifestations of organic ideology?**
- 4. What political ideology is the best fit with an organic approach?**
- 5. Is organic radicalism the only target of the contemporary Nazi smear?**
- 6. What is the relationship between anti-capitalism and anti-semitism?**
- 7. So what, do we conclude, is the smear all about?**
- 8. Why do we care so much about this issue?**
- 9. What would we like to see happen next?**

- 1. What were the origins of this organic thinking?**

By organic thinking, we mean a vision which regards human societies, as well as the environment, as being essentially *alive* and of consisting of countless subtle interactions and collectivities which can never fully be described because of their rich complexity.

It regards human beings as an extension of nature. It is a holistic approach, because it

understands that everything is connected, everything is ultimately one.

A holistic and nature-based view of the world was the starting point of all human cultures and inspires the indigenous spiritualities of North and South America, of Australia and Africa, and, yes, even of Europe.

It was the foundation stone on which were built the metaphysics of Chuang Tsu, Plotinus and Paracelsus. It remains a widely-shared, instinctive, “common sense” view of the world which has never been completely erased from the human spirit.

The coming of the Industrial Revolution sparked a reaction, in which some people actively sought out and revitalised these old ideas. This was not so much an intellectual movement as an instinctive response to cultural, social and environmental danger.

As Vivianne Crowley writes: “From the late eighteenth century onwards, rapid industrialization and the rape of Europe’s natural scenery and resources caused many people to feel that the time was out of joint; that common sense was being sacrificed to material progress with potentially disastrous results”.⁹

The organic thinking on which we are focusing here is this version, the one that emerged in reaction to the trauma of industrialisation, of Western civilization’s drift away from

that original wisdom and towards the cold and mechanical philosophies of the modern era.

In a sense it could be termed Organic Thinking II, because it included a conscious defence of Organic Thinking I in the face of the sterile dogmas of capitalist modernity.

Everywhere affected by industrialisation saw the emergence of anti-industrial currents of thought.

The English-speaking world had the likes of William Blake (1757-1827), William Wordsworth (1770-1850), Henry David Thoreau (1817-1862), John Ruskin (1819-1900), William Morris (1834-1896) and Richard Jefferies (1848-1887).

Morris spoke for many others when he admitted in 1894, two years before he died: “Apart from the desire to produce beautiful things, the leading passion of my life has been and is hatred of modern civilization”.¹⁰

France had its own tradition, which flowed from the anti-industrialism of the eighteenth-century philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778) into the twentieth-century anti-productivism of Jacques Ellul (1912-1994) and Bernard Charbonneau (1910-1996) as well as the powerful critique of modernity voiced by George Bernanos (1888-1948), who declared: “The Civilization of the Machines is the civilization of quantity opposed to that of quality”.¹¹

German-speaking Europe had a particularly

strong concept of *Naturphilosophie*, intertwined with Romanticism, which could draw on the wisdom of Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749-1832), Novalis (1772-1801), Friedrich Hölderlin (1775-1854) and Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling (1775-1854).

In her book *Reenchanted Science: Holism in German Culture from Wilhelm II to Hitler*, Anne Harrington traces the evolution of one thread of this thinking from nineteenth-century scientists who developed holistic approaches in their own specific fields and then, as good holists, saw that there was also a bigger picture.

“From Berlin to Prague to Vienna to Zurich, these scientists began to mingle their voices with those of other kinds of cultural critics, would-be reformers, and crisis-mongers. Those other voices from outside the sciences also typically used the oppositional imagery of machine and wholeness in order to articulate what they believed had gone wrong in politics, the community and individual existence – and to identify roads to renewal. That imagery in turn had energetic links to other, overlapping political and societal oppositions of the time: *Gemeinschaft* (community) versus *Gesellschaft* (society), an opposition made famous by the nineteenth-century sociologist Ferdinand Tönnies; (German) *Kultur* versus (French) *Zivilization*; Life and Soul versus Mind and Reason, a squaring-off associated with

such ‘life philosophers’ as Ludwig Klages”.¹²

The starting point of Organic Thinking II was opposition to The Machine and all the damage it was doing to human culture and well-being, as well as to the natural world.

The Machine, which spawned the ugly coke furnaces and iron and steel factories of the Ruhr valley, powered the militarism of Otto von Bismarck, Chancellor of the German Empire between 1871 and 1890.

There was a process of extraordinarily rapid industrialization at the end of the nineteenth century that, notes Harrington, had left many feeling “uprooted and aesthetically revolted”.¹³

And The Machine also reached inside people’s heads, breaking down older ways of thinking and remodelling minds according to the demands of the new industrial civilization.

A fragmentation of understanding was identified by critics of the modern age. Like the living communities replaced by urban dormitories for the factory wage-slaves, everything seemed to be broken down and torn apart.

In the sciences, research was increasingly specialist and narrow, geared towards utilitarian pragmatism rather than a quest for knowledge.

The success of individuals or nations was judged in terms of material wealth, of productivity, rather than in terms of inner integrity or happiness.

A sense of belonging to the land, to the past, to a continuum, was rased by the brutal demands of so-called progress.

An individual's sense of self was swept away by the depersonalised speed and fury of steam-powered living and, at the same time, any sense of belonging to humanity as a whole was denied by the nationalistic fervour of industrial and imperial rivalry with other Europeans and officially-encouraged contempt for the "inferior" and "backward" peoples of the non-industrialised world.

The realm of offices, factories, newspapers and trains forced people into a state of existence where they seemed to exist purely in their own heads, on the surface of being, and were as cut off from their own bodies, their own physical reality, as they were from the natural world from which they had been separated for the first time in a million years of human history.

Organic Thinking II sought to counter that fragmentation, that separation, on every level, and to reinstate a sense of interconnecting wholeness.

Body and soul were not regarded as separate, but as two aspects of one and the same entity. Likewise with individuals and society – not industrial-capitalist society, of course, but the natural and organic one put forward as a healthy alternative.

Collective groups of people were described as living organisms, themselves forming part of even greater living organisms. Humanity itself was one living entity and part of the living natural world.

None of this was new. All of this had already been known by Organic Thinking I. But the difference here was that the new embrace of this holism was also a pro-active call for the realisation and return of that holism.

Organic Thinking II was a demand for change, for the overturning of shallow, fragmented, dehumanising, nature-destroying industrial society and for the rediscovery of authenticity, community, belonging and wholeness.

2. To what extent was this thinking part of Nazi theory and practice?

There is no doubt that Nazi rhetoric and ideology was partly shaped by the organic thinking that was such an influential counter-current in German-speaking Europe at the start of the twentieth century.

The Nazis painted themselves as being on a mission to put things to rights, to bring about a “great revolution in values”, to restore healthy attitudes towards nature.

Nazi language reflected the idea that human

life was, and should be, interlaced with nature. Notes Nina Lyon: “All manner of lengthy compound nouns abstracting this ideal prospered: *Erdebundenheit*, the binding or oneness with the earth; *Volksboden*, the connection of the people with the soil; *Bodenständigkeit*, or the nature by which life was shaped by earthly forces”.¹⁴

Nazi professor Friedrich Sander named “the longing for wholeness” as one of the two basic motives behind the movement. He added: “Present-day German psychology and the National Socialistic world view are both oriented towards the same goal: the vanquishing of atomistic and mechanistic forms of thought: vanquishing through organic thinking, in the structure of *völkisch* life here, in the researching of psychological reality there”.¹⁵

Lehmann, cited at the beginning of this article, wrote a book, *Biology in the Present Life*, which included chapters on “individual wholeness”, “transindividual wholeness”, “the cosmos of life” and “*völkische* wholeness”.

He argued: “This striving for connectedness with all of life, indeed with Nature in general into which we are born – that, so far as I can see, is the deepest purpose and true essence of National Socialistic thinking”.¹⁶

This holistic tendency even reached down to a practical level. The Nazis promoted healthy

eating and wholemeal bread. They were all in favour of homeopathy, herbalism and other natural therapies. There was a herbal plantation at Dachau concentration camp.

It is the jarring note of that last sentence that reminds us that there was something not quite *right* about the Nazi love affair with the organic ideal.

In fact, the closer you look, the more it becomes apparent that the Nazi version of organic thinking amounted to a distortion so severe as to render it philosophically unrecognisable. They used holistic and organic thought merely as “a fund of metaphors”¹⁷ with which to present and justify their own totalitarian ideology.

Adolf Hitler himself, for instance, wrote in *Mein Kampf* that to replace the “dead mechanism” of the liberal state “there must be formed a living organism with the exclusive aim of serving a higher idea”.¹⁸

It is clearly nonsense to speak of a living organism being “formed”, as any real follower of organic thinking would immediately understand. A living organism could be *freed* from certain restraints, or even *revived*, but not *formed* by the machineries of political will.

Hitler is in fact talking about the Nazi state – centrally controlled and ruthlessly hierarchical – to which he is trying to lend an aura of natural

authenticity by describing it as an organism in the language popular at the time.

He – and his followers – completely undermined Tönnies’ distinction between organic, bottom-up, community (*Gemeinschaft*) and artificial, top-down, modern society (*Gesellschaft*) by pretending that the Nazi *Gesellschaft* was really a kind of *Gemeinschaft*. The state and the Führer somehow magically represented the authentic will of the German people.

This notion of the state as organism had already been developed by the right wing of the organic movement, but in Nazi dogma it took on whole new proportions, because the idea of total power resting in the hands of the state was so central to their ideology.

Zeev Sternhell remarks: “Totalitarianism is the very essence of fascism, and fascism is without question the purest example of a totalitarian ideology. Setting out as it did to create a new civilization, a new type of human being and a totally new way of life, fascism could not conceive of any sphere of human activity remaining immune from intervention by the State”.¹⁹

The Nazi obsession with order imposed from above, with the absolute rule of the central state, is the opposite of an authentically organic vision.

As the anarcho-syndicalist Rudolf Rocker wrote: “Dictatorship is the negation of organic

development, of natural building from below upwards”.²⁰

A further corruption of the organic principle came from what Harrington describes as “the ‘racializing’ of holism’s struggle against mechanism”.²¹

The right-wing generation before the Nazis, inspired by Houston Stewart Chamberlain and others, had already formulated the concept of “race”, which broke down humanity into distinct groups – as with the scientific tables and hierarchical classifications of minerals, vegetables and animals which were favoured at the time.

These race theorists, both in France and in Germany, took the philosophical idea of *Gestalt*, of underlying form, and twisted it into a justification for rigid racial typology. This then fed into a racially-based definition of the social organism which excluded those of whom they disapproved.

Sternhell explains their argument thus: “The nation is a living organism, and nationalism is therefore an ethic, comprising all the criteria of behaviour which the common interest calls for, and on which the will of the individual has no bearing. The duty both of the individual and of society is to find out what this ethic may be, yet only those can succeed who have a share in the ‘national consciousness’, shaped over the course

of the centuries: the Jews, as a foreign race, cannot enter upon this quest”.²²

The anti-semitic thread incorporated into organic and holistic philosophy by right-wing nationalists became more pronounced in the 1920s. Germans projected on to Jews all the aspects of the German industrial capitalist system that they disliked most – Jews were demonized as being soulless, rootless and mercenary.

It was even said, or implied, explains Harrington, that the very capacity to think and see nature as a whole (the art of so-called *Ganzheitsbetrachtung*) was a trait peculiar to the “Indo-Germanic” mind, while the Jewish mind was fundamentally analytic, dissolutive, and materialistic.²³

A 1935 article that appeared in the official medical journal of the Nazi party, *Ziel und Weg*, said the dissolute, sterile nature of Jewish thinking and Jewish science could lead only to “death” and contrasted this with the “simple, organic, creative” thinking of the “healthy non-Jew”, who “thinks in wholes”.²⁴

The irony, of course, is that these racist and anti-semitic theories demonstrated that it was the Nazis themselves who were incapable of thinking holistically.

A holistic vision of the world understands the connection between all people, all creatures,

all of nature, all of the cosmos and bases its vision on a sense of overall unity.

An organic interpretation of the human species necessarily recognises the human species itself as an organism.

There may be lesser, shifting, “organisms” within that unity – and humanity may form part of larger natural and cosmic organisms – but the human species is undeniably the clearest instance of a biological unity, between that of the individual and that of the bio-system of Earth as a whole.

A sense of this unity is integral to the organic, holistic world-view, and yet it is entirely absent from racist, anti-semitic, Nazi ideology.

The ideas of universalism and humanism were anathema to Nazism and regarded as cosmopolitan Jewish inventions designed to undermine the German sense of national and racial identity.

Their stunted sense of human solidarity was limited to those they defined as being their own people. Anyone outside of that Teutonic enclave was simply a non-person, an object.

Like certain postmodern thinkers of a later era, the Nazis denied the very existence of humankind, which, as Johann Chapoutot points out, “makes fraternity, feeling the suffering of the other, impossible as an emotion and invalidates it as a principle”.²⁵

This was what lay behind the cold look in the eyes of the Nazi scientist famously described by Primo Levi in *Survival in Auschwitz*. He was looking at the Jewish prisoner as if he was observing a sea creature through “the glass window of an aquarium”.²⁶ There was no sense of human connection.

The anti-semitism displayed by the scientist here is not simply a prejudice, but a prejudice solidified into something self-justifying by a belief in the validity of the Nazis’ pseudo-scientific racial theorising.

Chapoutot says of this racism: “Slavs were presented as such strange beings that no communication of a human kind could be imagined with them. As for the Jews, they weren’t even considered as a foreign race, but rather as a phenomenon of a bacteriological or viral type”.²⁷

It was this capacity to regard fellow human beings as mere bacteria which enabled the Nazi state to embark on its inhuman policies of racial screening, sterilization, castration, experimentation and mass extermination.

Far from being inspired by a holistic view of the world, this outlook stems from the very fragmentation of which the proponents of organic thinking complained. This is mechanical thinking.

The Nazis’ approach is marked by a desire

not to understand, to include and to connect, but to separate, to classify and to objectivise. As Hitler himself said: “Nazism is applied biology”.²⁸

Rather than making a break with the cold, soulless, mechanical age, the Nazis were pushing it on to new levels of inhumanity.

As early as 1933, the psychoanalyst Wilhelm Reich observed that fascism was not about Wholeness at all, but rather was the culmination of modern civilization’s mad worship of The Machine.

Fascist man had let himself be transformed into a machine that was alienated from all authentic biological impulses and thus capable of “machine murder”.²⁹

Much the same point was made in an article by Gerhard Portele in *Gestalt Theory* in 1979 when he argued that, despite the Nazis’ use of holistic language, the essence of their ideology lay in their *neglect* of the whole: “The Nazis with their calculating book-keeping rationality were trained in piecemeal thinking to an extreme degree and viewed people as cogs”.³⁰

This fundamental incompatibility between organic, holistic thinking and Nazi ideology became increasingly apparent once their romantic rhetoric collided with the pragmatic realities of running the German industrial-capitalist state.

Hans Driesch (1867-1941), a biologist whose

organic vision was defiantly internationalist, was among the first non-Jewish German professors to be forcibly retired after Hitler came to power in 1933 and in 1935 all public speaking and travel privileges were taken away from him.

After Germany's defeat in World War II, a number of other organic theorists, such as the philosopher and historian of biology Adolf Meyer-Abich, came forward to report that they too had been actively persecuted by the Third Reich because of the perceived threats their holism posed for Nazi policies.

The Nazi faction which had twisted organic thinking into a racist and anti-semitic theory was itself displaced by an even more hardline group.

Harrington explains: "The second faction was made up of more pragmatic medical technocrats who wanted to use a hard-nosed form of Mendelian genetics, Darwinism, and racial biology as the basis for Nazi social policy and military strategy. This group had found a home for itself under the jurisdiction of Himmler's SS and its daughter racial organizations, the *Lebensborn* and *Ahnenerbe*".³¹

Human geneticist Karl Astel and his technocratic colleagues, outraged at the influence wielded by the likes of Karl Kötschua and his "nature therapy", hatched a plot to discredit holistic views, which, he correctly concluded, flew

completely in the face of narrow Nazi theories of racial supremacy.

In the same way as today's anti-holistic propagandists try to blacken its name by linking it to the Nazis, these Nazis smeared holism by linking it to the Roman Catholic Church.

A 1936 article "exposing" this Catholic plot described "a skillfully organized and well-camouflaged attack on the entire exact sciences, including genetics and racial hygiene".

Under the name of holism, it said, sinister Jesuits were using scientific dupes to spread a Catholic doctrine and undermine Nazi science. Their cunning ploy involved making "full intentional use of words that sound National Socialistic, like 'wholeness', 'organic', 'biologic', and so on" in order to spread confusion while appearing to be on-message.³²

As a result of this propaganda, even Nazi exponents of organic theory were now hounded out of positions of influence. In 1938 Lehmann, previously quoted, was expelled from the *Biologen Verband* (Biologists' Organization) which he had headed since 1931 and removed from his position as editor of *Der Biologe*.

A new organization within the SS was created, the *Reichsbund für Biologie* (Reich Division for Biology) which, under the direct supervision of the *Ahnenerbe* and ultimately of Himmler himself, took over the editorship of *Der*

Biologe.

An organic theory of life, with its emphasis on natural harmony, human interconnectedness and symbiotic relationship, stood in stark ideological contradiction to the aims of the Nazi regime, which wanted to build up Germany's industrial and military power, build motorways, develop scientific racial engineering to strengthen "The Master Race", explore the potential of nuclear physics, and ruthlessly eliminate "alien" human elements from German society.

The new SS-run version of *Der Biologe* made it clear that there was no room for the woolly, holistic views of men like Lehmann and the *völkisch* anthropologist Ernst Krieck, even if they were Nazis and anti-semites. "Biology is research about facts!" it barked in a 1939 editorial.

Facts! This is the language of the atomistic, mechanistic, industrial thinking of The Machine, the very language that the Nazis had claimed to be opposing, at the stage when they were wooing the German population.

From the 1890s onwards, there had been a cultural battle between two German tendencies. On one side stood the tradition of Goethe, of a Romantic desire for life, for soul, for wholeness. On the other side was the new Germany, obsessed with efficiency and *Technik*, the

militarist “machine nation” of 1914.

While Nazism was clearly influenced on one level by the first, Romantic tradition, and happy to use that association to garner support from a German public despairing of capitalist modernity, it proved ultimately to belong firmly to the second.

It incarnated, in an exaggerated form, the thinking of the industrial capitalist Machine, for whom human beings are nothing but fodder. It was not simply a question of racism; even those accepted as German were expected to be “productive”, to serve the purposes of the Machine-State in some way. Non-performing, non-productive Germans (*leistungsunfähige Wesen*) and scroungers (*Asoziale*) were not deemed worthy of living in German society.

Because of the hideous crimes committed by the Nazi regime, there is today near-universal agreement that we do not like the Third Reich and its ideas.

But we should be clear as to what it is that we don't like. We don't like the mass extermination. We don't like the anti-semitism and racism. We don't like the warmongering militarism. We don't like the blind nationalism. We don't like the police state. We don't like the eugenics. We don't like the propaganda and mass hysteria.

There were other elements present in Nazism which are not among these evils and which

do not necessarily pave the way towards them.

Is wholemeal bread a bad thing because the Nazis said it was good? Are herbal plantations insidious because there was one at Dachau? Is *all* organic thinking suspect because a version of it was harnessed, and distorted, by some Nazi ideologues?

Continuing her discussion of the Nazis' use of an organic and nature-based vocabulary (*see above*), Lyon, who describes herself as a Jewish writer, adds: "There is nothing intrinsically problematic about any of these three terms. Their adoption to make the argument that one race of people should be superior to others, because it stemmed from those values and that soil, was where it all went wrong..."³⁴

3. Are there other possible manifestations of organic ideology?

As we have already noted in the last section, non-Nazi versions of organic ideology are not only possible, but existed in a very real form alongside the now-discredited right-wing racist variety.

Harrington correctly points out that it is useful to know something about the history of German holistic science, in order not to fall into the trap of thinking that any alternative to the prevailing mechanistic worldview is to be

avoided because it somehow points inevitably towards fascism.

She adds: "It is important that we resist 'discovering' the outline of a terrible future in holism's past or imagining that all holistic, vitalistic, or teleological views of nature are part of a larger 'destruction of reason' that can be tracked in some straight, degenerating line from the romantics to Hegel to Nietzsche to Hitler".³⁵

Sometimes these investigations might lead simply to the revelation that a particular scientist or thinker was not actually a Nazi. The biologist Jakob Von Uexküll, for instance, was certainly very conservative, politically, but was no white supremacist: he argued that all human groups must be respected in their distinctiveness, because all in the end are expressions of the same creative life energy.³⁶

At other times, it goes a lot further than that and we see the enormous ideological potential in variants of the organic theme which point in a libertarian, humanist, internationalist, left-wing direction.

Driesch, for example, defended an ideal of cultural cosmopolitanism and rejected any idea that a nation-state could be seen as an organism. The only supra-personal collective organism he was prepared to consider was the concept of a humankind that recognised no national or *völkisch* boundaries.

Before Hitler came to power, Driesch had been warning, both in academic and newspaper articles, of the dangers of the growing nationalistic mood. To counter this, he stressed the biological unity of the human species. He also voiced his opposition to militarism, describing this as the “the most terrible of all sins” against the vitalistic principles of life, holistic cooperation and higher development.³⁷

The Russian-Swiss neurobiologist Constantin von Monakow (1853-1930) also developed a holistic and organic theory which retained its logical coherence by talking about interconnected wholes, rather than veering off into the fragmented and divisive particularism of Nazi dogma.

Monakow came up with the idea of the *horme*, a kind of all-pervading intrinsic motivating and guiding force. He explained: “The *horme* is nothing other than the activity of the universe (*Worldhorme*), within which we human-children are highly organized necessary parts. As such we are temporally and partly also spatially – through free mobility – closely bound up with one another: we form ties with animals and plants and also with nonorganic bodies, into which last we merge after death. There is an undeniable glory in the thought that an indelible temporal bond links us, not only with our ancestors and our descendants, but above all also

with the whole rest of the organic world".³⁸

He interpreted our relationship to the outside world in terms of expanding concentric circles of awareness. The most basic level of existence involved a preoccupation with self and survival. This was often extended to a focus on family and the immediate community around the individual.

But more evolved human beings could grasp their belonging to increasingly larger entities, up to the human species, the organic world and the cosmos.

Monakow's holistic vision of all life as being enmeshed in one dynamic process of evolution thus naturally involved an internationalist perspective. Nothing else, in fact, would have made sense in that context.

It also placed him in opposition to the thinking of an industrial age which rejected any idea of organic subject-to-subject relationships with fellow parts of the natural organism in favour of a subject-to-object relationship based on domination and exploitation.

He saw that to heal itself and set itself back on its true evolutionary course, humanity had to trust in its deepest biological impulses. All the wisdom we needed to find that course was already within us, but stifled by the constructs of modern society. We had to tap into that natural sense of direction and rightness, he said, and

realise that every tiny living fibre inside us is “so much more wonderful than all the wonders of technology and a thousand times more clever”.³⁹

One of the most enthusiastic advocates of Monakow’s approach was Kurt Goldstein (1878-1965), a Jewish socialist critic of modernity, who set out to combine holistic and organic German philosophy with the values of reason, democracy and individual freedom.

Throughout his life, he warned against the dangers of applying narrow, fragmented scientific ways of thinking to other realms.

He wrote in an unpublished 1965 paper: “The progress by the application of science to all fields, also those which are related to the spiritual side of man, as education, psychology, sociology, etc, seems to be so enormous that somebody who today dares to oppose even a little this trend and warns against the fateful consequences for human existence is considered either stupid or uneducated, irresponsible or prejudiced”.⁴⁰

From Goldstein’s holistic perspective, everything was interconnected, outside and inside the individual human being. The words ‘mind’ and ‘body’, for instance, did not point to genuine entities but were just ‘symbols’, human abstractions, denoting different aspects of an overall organic reality that could not in fact be divided.

He has been described, by Ruth Nanda Anshen, as having introduced “a new doctrine of organism which may be said to be taking the place of the materialism with which, since the seventeenth-century, science has enmeshed philosophy”.⁴¹

The psychologist Max Wertheimer (1880-1943), took Goethe as a starting point, developing the idea of *Gestalt*, or underlying form, in a promising direction far removed from the dead-end of racism into which the Nazis tried to divert it.

Born in Prague, he fled central Europe before Hitler came to power and continued his work in the USA, later becoming an American citizen.

While the Nazis claimed piecemeal or fragmented thinking was a Jewish trait, Wertheimer, who was himself Jewish, turned this round against them. He argued that the modern world had cropped humanity’s thinking capacity. Piecemeal thinking – strings of propositions torn from their original living context – was being used by demagogues and certain intellectuals to hoodwink people into accepting their ideas.

In the 1934 essay ‘On truth’ he distinguished between truth and mere facts. Facts (as fetishised by the SS biologists – *see above*) meant nothing on their own. Truth was a holistic

understanding of the significance of various facts in the wider context of their relationship to one another and to a larger whole. He wrote: "A thing may be true in the piecemeal sense, and false, indeed a lie, as a part in its whole".⁴²

Wertheimer judged that the key concepts of truth, ethics, democracy and freedom were all under attack from contemporary academic thinking, influenced by positivism, pragmatism and cultural relativism. Indeed this anti-holistic stance had itself helped prepare an intellectual field in which it had become possible for the Nazis to succeed.

In an essay on ethics, he took a critical look at ethical relativity which – like the Nazis with their German/Aryan particularism – denied the existence of ethical universals.

As a believer in the organic unity of humankind, Wertheimer disputed this and insisted that experience showed that most people, "when faced with clear, actual injustice", responded spontaneously in ways that human beings would universally consider decent and ethical.⁴³

Gestalt psychology, which Wertheimer developed along with Kurt Koffka (1886-1941) and Wolfgang Köhler (1887-1967), was an influence on the anti-capitalist Critical Theory of Herbert Marcuse (1898-1979), Max Horkheimer (1895-1973) and the Frankfurt School in general.

The organic and anti-mechanistical ap-

proaches taken by Jewish thinkers like Wertheimer and Goldstein illustrate the fact that there existed a broad anti-industrial current in German-speaking Europe which was not simply non-Nazi, but *anti-Nazi*, and whose fundamental principles placed it in direct opposition to fascism.

The French-Brazilian sociologist and philosopher Michael Löwy has explored in depth the intellectual movement, mainly Jewish, which he terms “anti-capitalist Romanticism”.

Löwy writes: “In many respects, the Jewish intellectuals of *Mitteleuropa*, in the utopian-Romantic movement, grouped around Martin Buber’s review *Der Jude*, expressionist publications (such as *Die Aktion*), the Bar-Kokhba circle in Prague, the Frankfurt School or various left-wing parties, set themselves apart from Western or Eastern European Jewish intellectuals, as well as from their peers, the ‘gentile’ intellectuals of German culture, by the kind of culture they produced”.⁴⁴

Their vision, he says, revolved around “a cultural critique of modern capitalist civilization in the name of pre-modern or pre-capitalist values” and they were revolting “against the quantification and mechanisation of life, the reification of social relationships, the dissolution of community (*Gemeinschaft*) and, above all – to take up the terms used by Max Weber – the

disenchantment of the world (*Entzauberung der Welt*) resulting from the instrumental rationality (*Zweckrationalität*) and the corresponding calculating spirit (*Rechnenhaftigkeit*) which dominated modern culture".⁴⁵

The Jewish identity of thinkers like Buber or Gershom Scholem did not stop them drawing partly on the heritage of the German Romantic tradition to condemn the emptiness of modern life and search for a meaning to existence in myth, history or religion.

Buber, for instance, put forward a vision of libertarian socialist society inspired by, but not limited by, communities of the past. He wrote: "The new organic whole, founded on the regeneration of the 'cells' of the social tissue, will be the renaissance (rather than the return) of organic community in the shape of a decentralised federation of small communities".⁴⁶

His position was echoed in France by that of Bernard Lazare (1865-1903), a Jewish anarchist who rejected the myth of progress and the allure of the modern in favour of a respect for the past, particularly for medieval guilds or rural communities.

There was nothing reactionary in this opposition to the mass-produced solitude of the modern capitalist world and this desire to revive, in a different form, the organic communities which had been steamrolled by The Machine.

Löwy comments that Lazare was “projecting his Romantic nostalgia for the past into a utopian future, by embracing anarchist ideas”.⁴⁷

Walter Benjamin, for his part, insisted: “The deconstruction of the ideology of progress isn’t carried out in the name of conservation or of restoration, but in the name of *revolution*”.⁴⁸ He pointed out that, in stark contrast, fascism involved the typically modern combination of technological progress and social regression.⁴⁹

From this radical organic perspective, fascism is clearly revealed to be a counter-revolutionary force protecting the industrial capitalist system.

4. What political ideology is the best fit with an organic approach?

A good starting point is the immensely influential German sociologist Ferdinand Tönnies (1855-1936), famous for contrasting *Gemeinschaft* (traditional community) with *Gesellschaft* (modern society).

His analysis was not new in itself and could virtually be said to be part of Organic Thinking I, as set out above. It was almost a traditional way of regarding authentic society as being one rooted in the symbiotic human relationships of small-scale community.

But Tönnies’ own experience was shaped by

the mechanisation and commercialisation of the German society in which he lived. His theory was very much a political response to industrial capitalism and therefore part of the ideological wave we have termed Organic Thinking II.

It is clear throughout his best-known work, *Community and Society*, as well as in *Geist der Neuzeit*, that Tönnies regarded the Western transition from *Gemeinschaft* to *Gesellschaft* as a social and cultural decline rather than a triumph of progress.

Since the Middle Ages, people had been reduced from participants in a generally harmonious, living entity into atomised victims of a system which imposed its demands and laws from above.

Tönnies spelled out clearly the difference between the two ways of living: "There exists a *Gemeinschaft* of language, of folkways or mores, or of beliefs; but, by way of contrast, *Gesellschaft* exists in the realm of business, travel, or sciences... *Gemeinschaft* is old. *Gesellschaft* is new as a name as well as phenomenon".⁵⁰

The term "organic" is used frequently, and always in a positive sense, by the sociologist and is placed in direct contrast with the word "mechanical".

He writes, for instance, in *Community and Society*: "In contrast to *Gemeinschaft*, *Gesellschaft* is transitory and superficial. Accordingly,

Gemeinschaft should be understood as a living organism, Gesellschaft as a mechanical aggregate and artifact”⁵¹ and adds that “the tendencies and inevitableness of organic growth and decay cannot be understood through mechanical means”.⁵²

Tönnies subscribes to the holistic view of the human being, writing: “The conclusion is drawn that the soul (or the will) influences the body. This is impossible as both are identical”.⁵³

He puts forward the idea of “natural will”, a kind of individual manifestation of *Gemeinschaft* – innate, organic and artistic – as opposed to the “rational will” of increasingly artificial modern society.

Tönnies refers to “the masterly analysis of Karl Marx”,⁵⁴ one of his principal influences, and clearly presents a left-wing anti-capitalist version of organic ideology – it was not for nothing that he was ousted from his long-term presidency of the German Sociological Association when the Nazis took power in 1933.

He explicitly equates *Gesellschaft*, the opposite of his organic *Gemeinschaft*, with capitalism. “The merchants or capitalists”, he writes, “are the natural masters and rulers of the Gesellschaft. The Gesellschaft exists for their sake. It is their tool”.⁵⁵

The move to *Gesellschaft* “meant the victory of egoism, impudence, falsehood, and cunning,

the ascendancy of greed for money, ambition and lust for pleasure”.⁵⁶

The city, for Tönnies, is the epitome of the soulless, artificial, capitalist modern world: “The city is typical of Gesellschaft in general... Its wealth is capital wealth which, in the form of trade, usury, or industrial capital, is used and multiplies. Capital is the means for the appropriation of products of labor or for the exploitation of workers”.⁵⁷

Alongside his critique of how mercantile relationships – capitalist society – destroy authentic communities, comes a scathing condemnation of the modern state.

The state, says Tönnies, “is nothing but force”⁵⁸ and totally opposed to the “folk life and folk culture”⁵⁹ which underpin the cohesion of *Gemeinschaft*, suppressing all possibility of “a natural order in which every member does his part harmoniously in order to enjoy his share”.⁶⁰

The common people are all too aware that the state acts against their interests, he says, and effectively stops them existing as an organic entity.

“The state is their enemy. The state, to them, is an alien and unfriendly power; although seemingly authorized by them and embodying their own will, it is nevertheless opposed to all their needs and desires, protecting property which they do not possess, forcing them into

military service for a country which offers them hearth and altar only in the form of a heated room on the upper floor or gives them, for native soil, city streets where they may stare at the glitter and luxury in lighted windows forever beyond their reach! Their own life is nothing but a constant alternative between work and leisure, which are both distorted into factory routine and the low pleasure of the saloons. City life and Gesellschaft down the common people to decay and death..."⁶¹

This understanding of the state as an artificial entity which claims to embody community, but in reality kills it, is very much part of the classical anarchist tradition, particularly when combined with Tönnies' class awareness and fundamental rejection of the capitalist mindset.

The idea of an organic community, *Gemeinschaft*, which is prevented from flourishing because of the state, is in fact *essential* to the anarchist argument.

Opponents claim that doing away with the state would lead to chaos, but anarchists maintain that this is not the case, because people have a natural capacity (even if this is not realised) for living harmoniously and cooperatively outside of any state hierarchy.

The anarchist vision is inherently organic, because it is based on the concept of free and authentic communities as living, collective

entities.

Theodore Roszak draws attention to this in *Where the Wasteland Ends*, noting: “Anarchism has always been, uniquely, a politics swayed by organic sensibility; it is born of a concern for the health of cellular structure in society and a confidence in spontaneous self-regulation”.⁶²

Up against this, he identifies “the anti-organic fanaticism of western culture”, which is essentially the *Gesellschaft’s* hatred of *Gemeinschaft*.

Rozzak explains: “Organism is spontaneous self-regulation, the mystery of formed growth, the inarticulate wisdom of the instincts. Single vision cannot understand such a state of being, let alone trust it to look after itself”.⁶³

The concept of (possible) organic community, allowing human beings to live without a top-down state structure, is necessarily *implicit* in all coherent anarchist thought, but is sometimes more explicitly expressed.

Gustav Landauer (1870-1919) was a German-Jewish anarchist close to Martin Buber and very much part of the anti-capitalist tradition identified by Löwy. His philosophy illustrates the exciting potential of organic thinking which is developed in an anarchist and internationalist direction.

“Landauer represents a left-wing form of the *völkisch* current in thought,” say Russell Berman

and Tim Luke in their introduction to his book *For Socialism*.⁶⁴

Landauer condemned the “unculture” of mechanistic capitalism and wrote that “anarchism’s lone objective is to end the fight of men against men and to unite humanity so that each individual can unfold his natural potential without obstruction”.⁶⁵

Like Monakow, Landauer extended his concept of the organic to a cosmic level, regarding the universe as a living creature with a collective soul and writing that “the psyche [*das Seelenhafte*] in the human being is a function or manifestation of the infinite universe”.⁶⁶

He rejected the idea that the onward evolution of humanity was dependent on the progress of science and proposed instead a regeneration based on social spirituality, or *Geist*, the collective energy animating authentic human community.

The Russian anarchist Peter Kropotkin (1842-1921) is well known for having developed the idea of mutual aid as a way of understanding human society.

He argued, against right-wing social Darwinists, that co-operation is at least as important in evolution as competition and that, therefore, human beings have the capacity to live together in a free anarchist society, based on organic solidarity, without any state control.

But, in fact, Kropotkin went even further in developing a nature-based philosophy which was similar in many ways to those of Driesch, Monakow and Goldstein.

He argues, in *Ethics*, that not only are we human beings physically part of nature but that our thinking, too, including our morality, arises from the same source. Nature was “the first ethical teacher of man”,⁶⁷ he says, our ideas of bad and good being reflections of what our ancestors saw in animal life.⁶⁸

“*Mutual Aid-Justice-Morality* are thus the consecutive steps of an ascending series, revealed to us by the study of the animal world and man. They constitute an organic necessity which carries in itself its own justification, confirmed by the whole of the evolution of the animal kingdom, beginning with its earliest stages (in the form of colonies of the most primitive organisms), and gradually rising to our civilized human communities. Figuratively speaking, it is a *universal law of organic evolution*, and this is why the sense of Mutual Aid, Justice, and Morality are rooted in man’s mind with all the force of an inborn instinct”.⁶⁹

Like Tönnies, Kropotkin looks back favourably on the Middle Ages and previous societies where customs and codes served to protect the collective community from greedy or power-hungry individuals.

He does not shy away from talking about the “social organism”⁷⁰ and from expressing a classically holistic and nature-orientated view of the world. He writes, for example, that “we are compelled to acknowledge that every natural phenomenon – the fall of any particular stone, the flow of a brook, or the life of any one tree or animal, constitutes the necessary manifestation of the properties of the whole, of the sum total of animate and inanimate nature”.⁷¹

This should not surprise us, even if many of Kropotkin’s 21st century anarchist successors seem afraid of any talk of nature, social organisms, inborn instincts and universality.

Anarchism is a political philosophy whose revolutionary, destructive aspect only makes sense if it is backed up by this positive vision of a natural, organic society which will be set free to flourish once the state-capitalist machine is brought down.

It is, to directly answer the question at the top of this section, quite clearly the best political fit with the current of holistic and organic philosophy that we have been outlining in this article.

5. Is organic radicalism the only target of the contemporary Nazi smear?

So far we have seen that, although a certain

strand of Nazi ideology was influenced by aspects of organic thinking, it was very much a *departure* from that tradition. In rejecting a universalist humanist vision in favour of narrow racism, these Nazi thinkers essentially turned their back on holism as a philosophy.

Their fragmented, piecemeal, divisive approach instead reflected the fragmented thinking of the industrial age which the new wave of organic thought had emerged to attack. Critiques of industrialism within the Nazi movement were almost entirely eclipsed by a pragmatic obsession with *Technik* and industrial advance.

Indeed, fascism looks more like a grotesque caricature of the inhuman industrial society opposed by organic thinking, a chillingly efficient 20th century upgrade of the steam-powered capitalist machine of the previous era.

So why, we might ask, do so many political writers seek to make a connection between the Nazis and anti-industrial, ecological, organic ways of thinking?

To help answer this, it is worth placing the issue in a wider context and looking at another instance in which alleged Nazi associations have been deployed as a political tool.

The global anti-capitalist movement, ever since the heady successes around the turn of the 21st century, has often being accused of harbouring some kind of hidden fascistic or anti-

semitic tendencies.

One of the main themes of this critique was that voiced in June 1999 by the Dutch organisation *De Fabel van de illegaal* (“The myth of illegality”) which withdrew from the anti-globalization movement, complaining that it was leading left-wingers towards a kind of nationalism.

While examples were given of right-wing individuals or groups influencing the fringes of the movement, the gist of the criticism was more ideological.

De Fabel wrote back then that analyzing in terms of “international capital” or “speculation capital” is “potentially anti-Semitic”. “Potentially”, because the ideology of this kind of anti-capitalism was said to show “enormous structural similarities with anti-Semitism” even when there was no talk of “the Jews” owning international capital, as Eric Krebbers explained in 2003.⁷²

In the same article, Krebbers also took issue with the solidarity with Palestinian struggles being expressed by anti-capitalists, complaining: “At the recent huge demonstrations in Italy, where the anti-globalization movement probably is the strongest, Palestine seems to have become the central point of reference. Many activists speak of ‘a worldwide intifada against globalization’ and they often shout: ‘We are all

Palestinians'. Why do anti-globalization activists need to identify with 'the Palestinians', with some 'nation'? Why do these inhabitants of worldpower European Union continually make out Israel and the US as 'main imperialist enemies'?"

A similar point was made three years later, in 2002, in an article entitled 'Anti-Globalization: The New Anti-Semitism' which appeared on "the leading Jewish content website" *aish.com*.

This suggested there was an "association between the Arab world and the anti-globalization movement" which "has its roots in a common opposition to American 'domination'. Israel and the Jews represent American capitalism".⁷³

The same line of attack was notably developed by the late Moishe Postone, an academic who detected affinities between forms of anti-capitalism and anti-semitic conspiracy theory.

The anti-elitist, anti-capitalist message of the 99 per cent against the 1 per cent, which was so central to the Occupy movement, is seen from this perspective as being a disguised attack on Jews.

If you talk about bankers and financiers running the world, controlling the media, and cheerleading for war, it is argued, you are really blaming Jewish people or, at the very least, falling into the hands of those who do.

As Daniel Finn crucially pointed out in a 2018 article in *Jacobin* magazine, insinuations of anti-semitism can thus be used, not merely to defame critics of Israel, but “to discredit any radical critique of capitalism or imperialism in the modern world”.⁷⁴

6. What is the relationship between anti-capitalism and anti-semitism?

At this point it is worth lending some historical perspective to this alleged connection between anti-capitalism and anti-semitism.

Very instructive in this respect is the work of Lazare, one of Löwy’s anti-capitalist Romantics, who became known as one of the principal defenders of Alfred Dreyfus, a famous victim of institutional 19th century anti-semitism in France.

As a young man, Lazare had read socialist and anarchist literature explaining that Jews were big businessmen and capitalists, and so he decided that he himself could not possibly be ‘Jewish’, even if he remained an ‘Israelite’.

He wrote in 1890, at the age of 25: “The Jew (there are many who become Jews, without being destined by their race to do so, but who are rather doomed by their native virtues) is someone who is dominated by the sole preoccupation of making a quick fortune, which

he will more easily obtain by fraud, lies and cunning. He despises virtue, poverty, selflessness".⁷⁵

Lazare was therefore driven into an absurd form of anti-semitism by the social stereotype of the Jew as a capitalist – any anti-capitalist, it appeared even for this young Jew, therefore had to be anti-‘Jewish’.

Wertheimer was later to comment on this phenomenon in his 1935 essay on ethics. Here he describes “a young, idealistic party member” – Nazi Party, that is – who is “passionate in the negative evaluation of members of a certain race” – in other words, of Jews.

Wertheimer adds: “This young man perhaps behaves thus only because he has been brought to this state through suggestion, propaganda, through the wanton slander that this race is a poisonous snake. He does not really behave with respect to A (members of this race) but to a B which he has been taught to identify with this race”.

In other words the young idealist is instinctively opposed to capitalism, usury, greed or whatever other negative qualities have been ascribed to Jews by the Nazis. Because of their anti-semitic propaganda, he associates these negative qualities entirely with Jews and is thus turned into an anti-semite, even though he did not necessarily originally bear any ill will

towards Jews as such.

Continues Wertheimer: “The real problem here lies not only in the behaviour of the young man, but in the enforcement of the blind identification... *To take away by artifice the possibility of seeing the true situation, through the enforcement of blind judgments, of improper narrowing of the mental field, induction of blind centering, deprives man of the prerequisites for our problems*”.⁷⁶

While a non-Jew might find themselves stuck in this induced anti-semitism, Lazare’s own Jewishness enabled him to quickly realise that what he really disliked were the materialistic and greed-driven capitalist attitudes which made life a misery both for non-Jews and for ‘Israelites’ like himself.

He wrote in another essay: “There are now thousands of Jewish workers in France, exploited like the Christians, dying of hunger like the Christians, unhappy like the Christians. They are also there in England, in Germany, in Russia...”⁷⁷

As he matured, Lazare asked himself why it was that the sins of capitalism were conventionally heaped on this scapegoat figure of the archetypal Jew.

He noted, in an 1892 article entitled ‘Jews and Anti-Semites’, that when “liberal anti-semites” declared war on the Jews they claimed

to be opposing crooked financiers. But, in fact, they were targeting anyone who was circumcised or went to the synagogue, including workers.⁷⁸

Increasingly Lazare saw this phenomenon as one carefully fabricated by the upper classes. They used the stereotype of the greedy materialistic Jew to divert attention and anger away from their own greedy materialism.

Anti-semitism, he wrote in 1899, “is good for vicars, reactionaries and the bourgeoisie, because they are the only ones who can – or who hope – to gain from it; they rely on it to dodge the blows coming their way and to solidify their power”.

He added: “Beware of those pseudo-socialists who tell you that if your wages are too low, the fault lies with foreign workers and Jews, and that you’ll be happier when they’ve all been kicked out. How the bourgeois would laugh if he could set you against your brothers in misery, against your companions in chains, so as to save his own skin”.⁷⁹

Lazare refuted the supposed link between materialism and Jewishness and pointed out that there were plenty of Christian capitalists around, not least the Roman Catholic Church, which even had its own banking wing. Indeed, he suggested, the influence of Roman civilization was in fact behind many of the social ills blamed on Jews. “The deification of money, capitalist barbarity, ignorance of all human interest other

than the financial or commercial interest, are the traits of the Roman soul, but not of the Jewish soul".⁸⁰

Lazare thus clearly explained the way that anti-semitism was used, by the ruling classes, as a way of deflecting attention away from the fundamental problems and injustices of their hierarchical industrial capitalist society and of shunting opposition into a sordid dead end of racial scapegoating.

He died in 1903, but he would surely have identified exactly the same processes at work in Nazi Germany. The Nazis were used by the ruling classes to save Germany from a genuine rebellion against industrial capitalism.

People's natural and healthy animosity towards profiteering materialism, towards the commercialisation of society, was deliberately hijacked and diverted into anti-semitism, leaving the field clear for German capitalism to storm ahead under the Nazi banner.

The key element which allowed this scapegoating to take place was, obviously, the equation of Jewishness with capitalism, materialism and so on – the fake definition which had confused the young Lazare.

To stop it ever resurging, it would therefore seem crucial to break that link, to demolish the lie that capitalism was the property of any one people, nation or religion.

However, unfortunately, the Jewish stereotype lives on today. Even more unfortunate is that it is often kept alive by people who are ostensibly countering anti-semitism.

As we have seen, left-wingers who criticise bankers, industrialists and capitalist organisations are sometimes accused of deploying a “coded” form of anti-semitism.

Now, perhaps those making the allegations are justified in fearing a return of the scapegoating of Jews under the pretext of anti-capitalism. But it is beyond dispute that in automatically equating opposition to the global banking system with anti-semitism, they are in fact *reinforcing* the old stereotypes.

What appears to be happening, in some cases at least, is that the “Jewish banker” figure is again being deliberately deployed to thwart opposition to capitalism.

Previously, it was used to steer people away from anti-capitalism and into anti-semitism, but now the aim is rather to steer people away from anti-capitalism with the threat of being *labelled* anti-semitic.

The aim of this ideological scaremongering is not, in fact, to combat anti-semitism, but to *use the smear* of anti-semitic associations as a means of discrediting opposition to the dominant economic system.

In other words, capitalists, in the past,

deliberately whipped up anti-semitism to protect themselves from popular fury (as Lazare outlines) and their successors are now differently – but equally dishonestly – using the spectre of that very same anti-semitism to protect themselves from a 21st century wave of anti-capitalist anger.

7. So what, do we conclude, is the smear all about?

There are several factors that might lie behind the way that radical ecological thinking is sometimes tarred with Nazi associations – wrongly, as we have established.

One is that there is a genuine fear that organic language could again be co-opted and diverted into a sinister direction by modern-day fascists. The trauma inflicted by Nazism remains so intense, more than 70 years later, that terms (mis-)used by its adherents in the past are still capable of triggering fearful reactions.

Another possible cause for the misunderstanding may lie in the way that our civilization and culture have drifted ever further from a nature-based understanding of humankind, and the organic approach is thus faced with a concrete wall of non-comprehension, which leaves the way clear for all kinds of misinterpretations of the intentions behind its approach.

Most likely is that both these factors have played a role and that they have combined to reinforce a still-more important element – *a deliberate attack on the deep green, organic, ideology.*

The aim of this would be, like the anti-semitism accusations described by Finn, “to discredit any radical critique of capitalism or imperialism in the modern world”.

As with the anti-semitism smears, the “eco-fascism” accusation is presented as a noble attempt to stop a new form of fascism from arising, thus seeking the support and gratitude of people who fear that very outcome.

But, in reality, it is a *cynical ploy* designed to attack anti-capitalist thought from behind the safe smokescreen of anti-fascism.

It has just enough evidence (of the superficial similarities of rhetoric we have discussed, of various right-wing extremists trying to co-opt deep green thought, etc) to make the claim sound plausible for those who do no further research of their own, but the accusation is fundamentally disingenuous.

To understand what is happening we need to go back to the 19th century, at the time when Organic Thinking II was developing. It was, as we have said, a reaction against The Machine in all its guises, against the industrial capitalist system that was destroying communities,

countryside, everything that was worthwhile, authentic, beautiful and everlasting about our world.

To counter this opposition, The Machine (by which we mean a theoretical collective entity consisting of all the individuals who worked for it and with it) disguised itself as something other than the exploitative, destructive, inhuman, monstrous phenomenon that it really was.

Everywhere it depicted itself as representing “progress”, “prosperity”, “scientific advance” and so on and its enemies as backward-looking barbarians, stuck-in-the-mud reactionaries and dim-witted Luddites.

In German-speaking Europe, this Machine also managed to recuperate part of the very movement which had emerged to oppose it by stealing parts of its language – in the same way that capitalism recuperated punk music, for instance, or that Tony Blair’s New Labour used the language of social democracy to gain power for a neoliberal clique.

The promotion of communal *Gemeinschaft*, social organism and mutual aid against mechanistic industrial capitalism was transformed into a narrow racism and nationalism which diverted criticism of capitalism on to Jews and foreign powers, leaving the industrial capitalist system in Germany very much intact.

Fascism was, as we have seen, nothing but a reincarnation of The Machine itself.

It was not the only incarnation, though – and after defeating fascism, and using some of its know-how and personnel in its struggle against Soviet communism, the US/UK branch of the Machine was keen to present itself as the world’s great defender of democracy.

But by “defending democracy” what they really mean is repelling all threats to the continuation of their military-industrial-economic-prison-complex, the capitalist Machine.

In the language of contemporary “centrist” neoliberals, any political position which challenges their version of capitalism is necessarily “extremist”. They like to claim that extreme right and far left are essentially the same thing; a “red-brown” alliance against the neoliberal democratic values enshrined and protected by the USA and its allies.

This is the context in which anti-capitalism is equated with anti-semitism and in which deep green organic thinking is equated with fascism.

The Machine which we face today is indisputably the same Machine which provoked the anti-industrial, anti-capitalist philosophical revolt of the 19th century. There is an unbroken continuity there.

And that Machine, which in its fascist guise co-opted organic terminology for its own ends, is

now happy to use that co-option, that misuse of organic language by the fascists, to try to discredit the original, non-fascist, organic philosophy by a fake association with fascism.

It aims to disqualify organic/holistic thought, a philosophy which threatens the domination of its industrial capitalist system.

To do this it will use which ever means seems most effective – and the “Nazi” smear is the perfect weapon.

The immensity of this ideological deceit becomes even clearer if we look again at what it is that we, today, particularly dislike about Nazism. It is, as we said, the mass extermination, the anti-semitism and racism, the warmongering militarism, the police state, the blind nationalism, the eugenics, the propaganda and mass hysteria.

Which of those elements is present in deep green organic thinking? None of them! How can you accuse an ideological current of being “fascist” or “eco-fascist” if it doesn’t contain the ideological elements typical of fascism?

Now let’s look at the industrial capitalist system. How does that compare with the Nazi model? Warmongering militarism? Yes. Police state? Yes. Propaganda and mass hysteria? Yes. Blind nationalism? Yes, despite its global character, capitalism is always happy to use this to rally the public. Eugenics? Yes, although they

don't call it that these days. Cold inhumanity?
Yes. Racism? Very much so.

Anti-semitism? Although anti-semitism exists in our society, it is not systematically encouraged by the ideology of industrial capitalism. It is, however, systemically *abused*, as we have seen – being turned into an ideological weapon to be used not principally against anti-semites, but against anti-capitalists. The victims of this cheap weaponising of the term will be those who find it leaves them horribly exposed to the real thing.

Contemporary capitalism has not yet plumbed the depths of depravity achieved by the Hitler regime and operated mass extermination camps, but that is pretty much the only way in which it can claim any moral high ground over Nazism.

In other respects, it shares the thinking of the Nazi Machine, which is not surprising because it is essentially the *same* Machine. It is obsessed with industrialisation, production, technology and war. It regards people as human resources, as labour units, as consumers, as cannon fodder and as collateral damage. Its thinking is utilitarian, fragmented, non-holistic. It is cold, mechanical, exploitative. Its own inner logic of self-interest blinds itself to all morality, ethics, humanity.

And this system dares accuse its opponents

of being “fascist”?

8. Why do we care so much about this issue?

Why open this particular can of worms about supposed fascist influences on organic, nature-based ideology? Why do we think this issue is so important that we feel the need to address it in this article?

There are two aspects involved here. The first is that we are concerned at the adverse effects the “Nazi” smears, and the fear of such smears, have had on radical thinking.

There are, again, strong parallels with the “anti-semitic” smears levelled against some forms of anti-capitalism.

The aim of equating talk of “the one per cent” with anti-semitism is presumably to deter people from drawing attention to the existence of a very real capitalist ruling class.

Instead, anti-capitalists are supposed to address the matter in a convoluted, theoretical way which may make sense to postmodern academics but is never going to spark a wave of public support in the way that the direct approach can.

In radical environmental circles it likewise becomes impossible to talk about nature, a return to the land or organic communities without someone like Staudenmaier popping up

to identify a “chilling” resemblance to Nazi thought.

This simply rips the heart out of the ideology, destroying its fundamental coherency. How can we criticise modern capitalist society, and propose a radical alternative, if the language in which we do so has been ruled out of bounds by some kind of ideological thought police?

Instead of getting to the core of the problem with industrial capitalism, and everything that goes along with it, people are forced to retreat into positions which do not fundamentally challenge capitalism.

Either they end up accepting its claims that we “need” economic growth, never-ending technological progress and so on, or they adopt superficial nihilistic approaches which condemn capitalism without being able to propose an authentic alternative.

The second aspect of the problem relates to the ideological gap left by the abandonment of organic anti-capitalist thinking by left-wingers scared off by the smear campaigns.

Just because those ideas are not being expressed in certain circles, does not mean that they do not exist, or that they will magically be stopped from taking shape in people’s minds.

Imagine a young person who feels aesthetically revolted by the capitalist society in which they have been brought up – by its materialism,

environmental destruction, fragmentation and consumer shallowness.

In contrast to all of that, this young person imagines a different world, a world where people live more simply and sanely, in small communities imbued with healthy values, feeling a strong connection to the land and to the other creatures who live on it.

This young person looks around for other people saying the same thing, for a movement which voices those ideals and seeks to realise them.

The ideology they are looking for is organic radicalism, green anarchy, but maybe, thanks to the efforts of the ideological thought police, this ideology is no longer visible.

Imagine that there is, however, a group expressing some of these ideas in a slightly different way. They talk of going back to the land, building healthy small-scale communities and of respecting nature. The only thing is that they also talk a lot about kinship and ethnic identity, which our young person is not quite sure about, but feels is perhaps just one detail that they can learn to live with.

Later, the new recruit discovers that this movement has been exposed as extreme right-wing and fiercely criticised. But because the criticisms come from a left-wing movement which seems to reject all of the young person's ideals,

they fall on deaf ears. “If these ideas are extreme right-wing ideas,” they think to themselves, “then I myself must naturally belong to the extreme right”.

This is roughly the same process that led Lazare, a Jew, into expressing anti-semitic ideas because he had swallowed the lie equating capitalism and Jewishness and the process that Wertheimer depicts twisting the mind of the young Nazi idealist.

Maybe in due course our young person will, like Lazare, see through the emptiness and inhumanity of fascist rhetoric and walk away from it in order to rebuild their own personal philosophy on a healthier basis, but that is far from being sure.

The damage will already have been done by the way the left has turned its back on a deep critique of capitalism with a powerful vision of an alternative society.

This, in fact, is what happened a hundred years ago, when much of the left, particularly in German-speaking Europe, had abandoned a nature-based, holistic anti-capitalism in favour of an industrially-orientated Marxism.⁸¹

Juan J. Linz, in ‘Some Notes Toward a Comparative Study of Fascism in Sociological Historical Perspective’ explains that “the lack of understanding of traditional Marxist theory and especially Central European social democracy for

the plight of the peasant and pre-industrial strata”⁸² left the way clear for Nazi recruitment. “A romantic youth protest against bourgeois society was captured by the fascists,”⁸³ he adds.

Landauer was very aware of this problem. Berman and Luke explain that he saw the need for society to break free from “the false mechanical concepts of science that impoverish human understanding”⁸⁴ but understood that Marxism was itself trapped inside this mindset, with its “scientific” belief in the supposedly inevitable transition of capitalism into socialism.

This meant orthodox Marxists had to applaud capitalist growth and capitalist progress. “In the light of Landauer’s critique, nineteenth century scientific socialism ceases to appear as a radical critique of the *status quo*. Rather, behind its revolutionary pretenses, it buttresses the development of capitalist structures”.⁸⁵

In failing to take up the Romantic struggle against industrial capitalism, building on the rich organic and holistic philosophy which was being developed in German-speaking lands, the Marxists allowed this powerful anti-capitalist current to flow into the stagnant waters of fascism.

Comment Berman and Luke: “The turn of *völkisch* thought to the right is ultimately not indicative of the quality of such thought, but rather of the self-imposed constraints of the

traditional Marxist left, which failed to appropriate the leftist potential of the *völkisch* movement”.⁸⁶

The Marxist left of that place and period had become sterile and dogmatic and shied away from appealing to those who wanted to fundamentally challenge the assumptions and infrastructures of capitalist society, who were ready to embark on a total revolt against the *Gesellschaft* of state and business.

As Sternhell notes: “With their thirst for action for action’s sake and struggle for struggle’s sake, the fascists appeared to be the only authentically revolutionary political organizations, the only movements unconditionally opposed to the established order, the only people whose revolutionary credibility – unlike that of the parties of the left, including the communist parties – had not been damaged by compromise”.⁸⁷

It is ironic that contemporary leftists are being urged to steer clear of emotive anti-capitalism and nature-based organic environmentalism, because of an alleged taint by Nazi associations, when it was actually a previous left-wing generation’s drift in that very same direction – its abandonment of authentic anti-capitalist ideals – which allowed the Nazis to co-opt and distort those ideals for their own dishonest ends.

9. What would we like to see happen next?

Antidote zine, the American website which reposted our *Envisioning a Post-Western World* article, commented that “it behooves people in contested cultural terrain to, well, contest it”.⁸⁸

This is what we would like to see happen next. We would like to see the terrain of organic ideology contested with the aim of lifting the Nazi curse which has stifled its voice and restoring it to its rightful role as the ideological heart of anarchist and anti-capitalist thinking.

We wrote above that the holistic philosophy which emerged in the 19th and early 20th century was a kind of Organic Thinking II, because it had added a specifically anti-industrial and anti-capitalist layer on top of the older holistic heritage.

It is now time to develop Organic Thinking III, a 21st century version of the ideology that is not only anti-industrial and anti-capitalist, but specifically anti-fascist.

The reasons for this should by now be obvious. By clearly defining and explaining itself as anti-fascist, Organic Thinking III can not only shake off the smears with which Organic Thinking II has been attacked, but also shed light on the *real* successor to fascist ideology – the authoritarian, militaristic, racist, industrialist, science-obsessed, capitalist Machine.

It will condemn fascism not for being the “religion of nature” that it never really was, but for being the epitome of industrialism, the death-cult military-technocratic system pushed to its brutal limits.

Organic Thinking III will include the awareness that the Machine has tried to destroy anti-capitalist organicism by tarring its language with the broad brush of a deliberately misinterpreted fascism.

It will relaunch the ideological war on industrial capitalism begun by Organic Thinking II, but inoculate itself against a new take-over bid by the extreme right by placing at its core the left-wing values of humanity, solidarity, compassion and universality.

It will declare itself an implacable enemy of fascism and present a coherent and self-contained organic political vision that could *never* be acceptable to fascists – one fuelled by the ideas of anarchists, non-nationalist socialists and Jews, from Morris to Goldstein, from Monakow to Kropotkin, from Tönnies to Wertheimer, from Landauer to Roszak.

It will be unflinching in its complete rejection of this capitalist-fascist system in all respects – its economics, its infrastructures and its ideology.

It will condemn all the new forms being taken by fascism – the sinister techno-

totalitarianism of genetic engineering, nanotechnology, surveillance, drone warfare and transhumanism.

It will challenge head-on the productivist obsession with quantity over quality, with profit, with economic growth, with “progress”, and it will call for a society built on ethics, values, humanity and solidarity.

It will favour the authentic over the artificial, the beautiful over the ugly, the living over the sterile.

It will understand the distinction between *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft*, as set out by Tönnies, and struggle for the revival of the former.

It will pay no heed to the demands of authority, with its states, currencies, laws, police forces, armies, courts, prisons and concentration camps.

It will reject the mercantile mindset and seek to build a society based on exchange, mutual aid and common interest, where food is grown and objects are produced on the basis of collective need rather than for private gain.

It will refuse the false construct of land ownership, recognising the land as something to which we belong, rather than as something which could ever belong to us.

It will go beyond contemporary society’s toxic separation of body and mind and embrace the holistic reality of our being.

It will likewise embrace the holistic unity of humankind and insist that within that unity all borders are fluid, all particularisms imbued with the universal human essence.

It will condemn the arrogance of Western civilization in imposing its structures and ideology on the rest of the world and find inspiration and alliance with peoples everywhere seeking to protect or restore non-Western, non-capitalist, ways of living and thinking.

It will acknowledge that humankind is nothing but part of nature and that our future can only be healthy in the context of a healthy natural world, free from pillage, pollution and destruction.

It will understand that human well-being depends on individuals acting as part of a greater whole, a social organism.

It will know that these individuals can only be free within a free community and that this free community must always be made up of free individuals.

It will break through all the lies and taboos to spread the message that the planetary destruction being wreaked by the industrial capitalist system must be stopped.

It will inspire people to dream, to hope, to speak out, to discuss, to write, to mobilise and to turn their ideas into action.

One day it will bring down The Machine –

the industrial, capitalist, fascist Machine – and clear the way for natural life once more to flourish.

1. Ernst Lehmann, *Biologischer Wille. Wege und Ziele biologischer Arbeit im neuen Reich* (Munich: J.F.Lehmann, 1934), cit. Anne Harrington, *Reenchanted Science: Holism in German Culture from Wilhelm II to Hitler* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999), p. 177.
2. <https://www.encounterbooks.com/features/ruPERT-darwall-totalitarian-roots-environmentalism/>
3. <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/janet-biehl-and-peter-staudenmaier-ecofascism-lessons-from-the-german-experience>
4. www.akpress.org/against-the-fascist-creep.html
5. www.redpepper.org.uk/darker-shades-of-green/
6. Anna Bramwell, *Ecology in the Twentieth Century: A History* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1989), pp. 272-73.
7. Anna Bramwell, *The Fading of the Greens: The Decline of Environmental Politics in the West* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1994), p. 43.
8. <https://antidotezine.com/2017/08/19/envisioning-a-post-western-world/>
9. Vivianne Crowley, *Wicca: The Old Religion in the New Millennium* (London: Thorsons, 1996), p. 32
10. William Morris, 'How I Became A Socialist', *News From Nowhere and Selected Writings and Designs*, ed. by Asa Briggs (London: Penguin, 1984), p. 36.
11. Georges Bernanos, 'La France contre les robots', cit. *Aux origines de la décroissance – Cinquante*

penseurs, coordonné par Cédric Biagini, David Murray, Pierre Thiesset (Paris: L'Échappée, 2017), p. 28.

12. Harrington, pp. xvii-xviii.

13. Harrington, p. 20.

14. Nina Lyon, *Uprooted: On the Trail of the Green Man* (London: Faber & Faber, 2016), p. 192.

15. F. Sander, 'Deutsche Psychologie und nationalsozialistische Weltanschauung'. *Nationalsozialistisches Bildungswesen*. 2. pp. 641-643, cit. Harrington, p. 178.

16. Lehmann, cit. Harrington, p. 177.

17. Harrington, p. 188.

18. cit. Harrington, p. 175.

19. Zeev Sternhell, 'Fascist Ideology', *Fascism: A Reader's Guide. Analyses, Interpretations, Bibliography*, ed. Walter Laqueur (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1991), p. 356.

20. Rudolf Rocker, *Anarcho-Syndicalism* (London: Pluto Press, 1989), p. 75.

21. Harrington, p. 182.

22. Sternhell, pp. 324-35.

23. Harrington, p. 181.

24. Alfred Böttcher, 1935, 'Die Lösung der Judenfrage', *Ziel und Weg* 5: 226. cit. Harrington, pp. xx-xxi.

25. Johann Chapoutot, *La révolution culturelle nazie* (Paris: Gallimard, 2017), p. 83.

26. Primo Levi, *Survival in Auschwitz: The Nazi Assault on Humanity*, trad. Stuart Woolf (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996), p. 105.

27. Chapoutot, p. 79.

28. Chapoutot, p. 85.

29. Harrington, p. 189.

30. Gerhard Portele, 'Gestalttheorie und Wissenschaftstheorie. Pläyoder für eine alternative Wissenschaft', *Gestalt Theory I* (I), pp. 26-38, cit. Harrington, p. 211.
31. Harrington, p. 195.
32. *NSDAP's Mitteilungen zur weltanschaulichen Lage*, Nov 27, 1936, cit. Harrington, p. 196.
33. Harrington, pp. 197-98.
34. Lyon, p. 192.
35. Harrington, p. xxi.
36. Harrington, p. 62.
37. Harrington, p. 190.
38. Harrington, p. 92.
39. Harrington, p. 98.
40. Harrington, p. 172.
41. Ruth Nanda Anshen, 'Open letter to Dr Kurt Goldstein in commemoration of his eightieth birthday, November 6, 1958, *Goldstein Papers*, cit. Harrington, p. 172.
42. Max Wertheimer, 'On truth', *Social Research* 1 (2), cit. Harrington, pp. 133-34.
43. Max Wertheimer, 'Some problems in the theory of ethics', *Social Research* 2 (3), cit. Harrington, p. 134.
44. Michael Löwy, *Juifs hétérodoxes: Romantisme, messianisme, utopie* (Paris: Éditions de l'éclat, 2010), p. 23.
45. Löwy, *Juifs hétérodoxes*, pp. 33-34.
46. Michael Löwy, *Rédemption et utopie: le judaïsme libertaire en Europe centrale* (Paris: Editions du Sandre, 2009), p. 74.
47. Löwy, *Juifs hétérodoxes*, p. 82.
47. Löwy, *Juifs hétérodoxes*, pp. 82-83.
48. Löwy, *Juifs hétérodoxes*, p. 36

49. Löwy, *Juifs hétérodoxes*, p. 121.
50. Ferdinand Tönnies, *Community and Society: Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft*, trad. Charles P. Loomis (New York: Dover Publications, 2002), p. 34.
51. Tönnies, p. 35.
52. Tönnies, p. 36.
53. Tönnies, p. 121.
54. Tönnies, p. 89.
55. Tönnies, p. 83.
56. Tönnies, p. 202.
57. Tönnies, pp. 227-28.
58. Tönnies, p. 216.
59. Tönnies, p. 225.
60. Tönnies, p. 208.
61. Tönnies, pp. 230-31.
62. Theodore Roszak, *Where the Wasteland Ends: Politics and Transcendence in Postindustrial Society* (New York: Doubleday, 1972), p. 424.
63. Roszak, pp. 95-96.
64. Russell Berman & Tim Luke, 'Introduction', Gustav Landauer, *For Socialism*, trans. by David J Parent (St Louis: Telos Press, 1978), p. 8.
65. Gustav Landauer, *Revolution and Other Writings: A Political Reader*, ed. and trans. by Gabriel Kuhn (Oakland: PM Press, 2010), p. 22.
66. Gustav Landauer, *Skepsis und Mystik: Versuche im Anschluss an Mauthners Sprachkritik* (Cologne: 2d ed, 1923), p. 7, cit. Charles B Maurer, *Call to Revolution. The Mystical Anarchism of Gustav Landauer* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1971), p. 69.
67. Peter Kropotkin, *Ethics: Origin and Development* (Dorchester: Prism Press, n/d), p.45.

68. Kropotkin, pp. 16-17.
69. Kropotkin, pp. 30-31.
70. Kropotkin, p. 18.
71. Kropotkin, p. 87.
72. www.doorbraak.eu/gebladerte/30046v01.htm
73. <http://www.aish.com/jw/me/48898397.html>
74. <https://www.jacobinmag.com/2018/04/jeremy-corbryn-antisemitism-labour-party>
75. Bernard Lazare, 'Juifs et Israélites', *La Question Juive* (Paris: Éditions Allia, 2012), p. 26.
76. Wertheimer, 'Some problems in the theory of ethics', cit. Harrington, p. 135.
77. Lazare, 'La Solidarité Juive', p. 41.
78. Lazare, 'Juifs et Antisémites', p. 58
79. Lazare, 'Antisémitisme et révolution', p. 84.
80. Lazare, 'Conception Sociale du Judaïsme', p. 185.
81. See Paul Cudenec, *The Stifled Soul of Humankind* (Sussex: Winter Oak, 2014).
82. Juan J. Linz, 'Some Notes Toward a Comparative Study of Fascism in Sociological Historical Perspective', *Fascism: A Reader's Guide*, p. 17.
83. Linz, p. 19.
84. Berman & Luke, p. 7.
85. Berman & Luke, p. 11.
86. Berman & Luke, p. 8.
87. Sternhell, p. 343.
88. <https://antidotezine.com/2017/09/19/envisioning-a-post-western-world/>

MULTIPLICATION IS DIVISION

June 5, 2019

We live in a society in which quantity is considered more important than quality.

According to the prevailing wisdom, the more we collectively produce, the better. We have to keep making, selling and buying more and more stuff, not because we need it but because this is good for “growth”, for “the economy”, for “jobs” and “wealth creation”.

This commercial mindset is so deeply ingrained in what is called Western civilization that it is accepted even by people who consider themselves in some way “left-wing”.

To understand why this perspective has been able to get such a hold on our society, we have to perhaps go beyond the economic and social level and look at the way in which we see reality itself.

To describe reality as a whole, of every kind and everywhere, we use the term “the universe”.

Everything that exists is, therefore, part of that overall reality, that universe.

Modern thinking does not take the existence of the universe as its starting point. Ever since

Descartes declared that he thought and therefore was, our culture has been looking at things the wrong way round.

We vainly try to build up an idea of the cosmos starting from our own personal consciousness and experience, which we consider the only “provable” reality.

The holistic metaphysics of Plotinus, who declared 1,800 years ago that “the universe is one living organism” has not been very fashionable over the last few centuries.

In our mechanistic society, categories are often rejected as illusions or as evidence of a terrible heresy termed “essentialism”.

There is no such quality as “dogness”, of being a dog, it is argued. Instead, there are merely a lot of individual creatures to whom we have given the label “dog”.

There is no such thing as society, a thoroughly modern politician like Margaret Thatcher could claim. There are merely a lot of competing individuals.

There is no such thing as a living planet, just a lot of “resources” which can be divided from the whole in order to “create” a great quantity of “products” and “wealth”.

Imagine a cake. Imagine you cut the cake into eight slices. Have you just “created” the slices or simply reorganised something that already existed?

Now imagine you have cut it into 16 slices. Does the greater quantity of slices mean there is more cake or that the cake is better?

The bigger the number of slices, the smaller the size of the individual slice. This is because we are talking about division, rather than multiplication.

We are dividing the unity of the cake into eight or 16 slices, rather than multiplying one slice eight or 16 times.

The same applies when we take, for our philosophical starting point, the universe as a whole.

We place a figure “1” at the top of our page and draw a line under it. Under the line we put all the “quantity” of the objects or concepts into which this overall unity is divided.

Because we are dealing with fractions, the greater the number below the line, the smaller the individual part it denotes.

And whatever number we place below the line, the one above remains the same. All the activity of “quantity” going on below the line does not have any effect on the overall reality, which embraces and contains all the apparent multiplication of individual elements.

When we take contrasting qualities like “dark” and “light”, we are placing them below the line of the fraction.

An idea that unites these opposites, that

includes “dark” and “light” within itself, is not something we “create” by combining the two concepts.

Instead it is the overall reality which we have divided into two sub-concepts. Both “dark” and “light” are $\frac{1}{2}$ – half of overall reality.

The manufacture of “quantity” goes hand in hand with a way of thinking that divides reality by classifying and separating.

If we invent words to describe hundreds of different human “nationalities” we are not multiplying anything, but instead we are dividing the human species into hundreds of groups.

The more we attach labels to people to define them in terms of ethnicity, sexual preference or lifestyle choices, the more we risk losing sight of the essential insight that we are all human beings.

The more we regard other living creatures as “resources” or “investments” to be manipulated for our gain, the more we lose sight that we are fellow parts of one Gaian organic whole.

To argue that we should start from the whole rather than the parts is not to say that the parts, such as individual human beings or animals with all their different characteristics and diversities, are not important.

However, in order to understand the part, we have to see it in the context of the whole to

which it belongs.

This context is not just about its relationship to the greater whole (the species, the planet) but to other parts (individuals).

An individual who understands that they are part of a whole, also understands that they are no less or more important than other parts, that they and the other parts are completely dependent on each other for their existence and survival.

The enlightened "I" sees others not as objects, but as fellow subjects, part of the same greater subject.

"They" is transformed, by this realisation, into "you and I" and then "we".

One divided by nothing.

SMASH VITAPHOBIA!

December 28, 2019

Human minds are all too often distracted and polluted by phobias, fears so entrenched and exaggerated that they take the form of outright hatred.

These fears are mostly of the Other, the not-Me whose very existence risks puncturing all the certainties and assumptions through which the insecure Me manages to keep afloat in the murky and turbulent waters of contemporary life.

Inner doubts and insecurities are thrown outwards, their dark beam alighting on whatever surface is most readily available, and a fellow living subject is treated as nothing but a dead object, a scape-screen on to which our own deepest anxieties can be projected, externalised, neutralised.

Here already we are in the realm of separation, a lost awareness of our shared belonging with all that lives outside our personal experience, a psychological retreat into the narrowest and shallowest levels of identity which are defined in terms of what, and who, they are not.

But another kind of phobia is emerging today which takes this separation still further, which blindly turns the projected hatred back on itself and finds itself fearing the underlying essence which it is not even able to recognise as its own.

Vitaphobia is the fear of life itself, a fear which becomes hatred, a hatred which begets unlimited violence against everything that is alive.

It is the violence of vitaphobia which is flattening our forests, choking our oceans with plastic, wiping out species after species, poisoning our soil, contaminating our rivers, polluting our air, radiating disease.

Smash vitaphobia!

Because vitaphobia is a state of mind, its toxic effects go much deeper than these deadly physical realities. Vitaphobia is the mindset which justifies this violence, which denies this violence, which will never stop inflicting this violence even when it reassures us of its good intentions.

Vitaphobia leads people, for example, to frame the untold damage it has wreaked in the most limited of terms, as a mere “problem” or ephemeral “crisis” for which the only “solution” is yet more vitaphobic violence.

It is also the soul-sickness of vitaphobia that leads other people to deliberately (if not necessarily consciously) suppress their own

critical faculties so as to be able to buy into the comforting lies that vitaphobia spins in order to protect its own ongoing control of the human spirit.

It leads them to swallow the absurd idea, for example, that life consists merely of objects, like the mass-produced products of a vitaphobic manufactory, which can be neatly classified, organised, assigned monetary value and traded for profit.

Vitaphobia blinds people to the very existence of vitaphobia and they see simply a contemporary reality that cannot be challenged, a permanent state of affairs from which there is no possibility of escaping.

Vitaphobia is not just the physical reality of its violence, and the mindset which spawns such violence, but the defensive mechanisms which deny what is happening and work to conceal the vitaphobic illness.

In short, it makes people very angry with anyone who points out that the deceit and violence of vitaphobia will not end until vitaphobic culture has been destroyed.

Smash vitaphobia!

In order to maintain its control over people's minds, and head off the possibility that its role will be challenged, vitaphobia has carefully constructed a philosophical system which justifies its insanity and which disallows the

possibility of dissenting opinions.

That is to say, of course, that human beings suffering from vitaphobia have constructed this system. Vitaphobia is an abstract entity and not capable of doing anything at all without its physical hosts...

The origins of the vitaphobic madness lie, as with other phobias, in a false sense of separation – but separation, here, on an unimaginable scale!

In one fell swoop the high priests of vitaphobia tried to slice off human consciousness from all that surrounds it.

On the one hand they flattered humankind by telling it that it was special, not a part of filthy, brutal nature but a higher entity born to rule over it.

On the other hand they denigrated humankind by telling it that it was base, sinful, unworthy and that it was born to be ruled over by a much higher entity.

Conveniently for the vitaphobia-promoting elites, their “divine authority” extended downwards into human society, presenting certain human beings (such as themselves!) as possessing unchallengeable power over the majority.

Vitaphobics seek to deny the truth that we are all part of nature and part of the living cosmos and that the only divinity is the spirit of life which illuminates us and the organic world

around us.

Their mental disease wipes out our awareness of a horizontal connection with life as a whole, leaving us only with a vertical connection to “authorities” to whom we are supposed to surrender our free will.

As part of this attack on our freedom and autonomy, vitaphobia makes us think that we are incapable of living without dependence on its “authorities”.

It does so by denying that human societies are living entities, arising organically from our very natures, which allow us to organise ourselves according to our own collective desires.

It extends its claim that we are not part of nature by insisting that nature is not part of us, or that if it is part of us, it is a “bad” part that needs to be overcome and repressed.

Smash vitaphobia!

Allowing the nature within us to flower and flourish and to guide us through our lives is anathema to the vitaphobes.

Who can tell which came first – their fear of freedom or their fear of life? In any case, vitaphobes are always keen to warn of the dire consequences of allowing freedom and natural inclinations to lead humankind.

For them, the dead hand of control, authority and obedience is always needed to impose the sterile, lifeless, grey world which their mental

illness makes them crave.

As the grip of vitaphobia on humanity increased, so the terms it used to justify its insanity began to sound like common sense. “Oh yes”, its deluded victims parrot in unison, “of course our world needs to be built on law and property, on policing and punishment, on reason and science, on work and money, on progress and growth!”

Behind it all was always the same desire to control and subdue, the same twisted craving, in the minds of living creatures, to destroy the very force that brought them into being.

Today, in our midst, are some pitiful characters whose mental faculties have been entirely destroyed by the vitaphobic disease.

There are those who actually believe that human beings have no innate biological reality and that any such notion is merely a label, imposed from the outside.

There are those who actually think there is no essential difference between real living fruit and “fruit of the future” manufactured by a 3-D printer.

There are those who actually think that there is no essential difference between real living human beings and robots and who welcome the idea of our bodies being replaced by machinery and our minds “uploaded” on to a computer.

There are those who worship the empty

sterility of artifice and despise the abundance and energy of nature.

They sometimes go so far as to designate the very idea of nature as their enemy, a “reactionary” force which oppresses or confines them, while they imagine their liberation will come from everything which is gloriously and “progressively” fake.

They fear the pulsating, breathing, sweating, self-renewing flesh of Gaia and welcome its replacement with a hygienically shrink-wrapped replica world, a safer space for their dead-eyed dead-end delusions of plastic purity.

Smash vitaphobia!

ANOTHER WORLD EXISTS WITHIN US

January 13, 2020

Nostalgists conjure up a vision of the past in which people lived peacefully and happily in small communities, close to nature, free from outside interference, producing just enough for their collective needs and organising themselves in a spirit of mutual aid and social solidarity.

Idealists, on the other hand, dream of a future in which people live peacefully and happily in small communities, close to nature, free from outside interference, producing just enough for their collective needs and organising themselves in a spirit of mutual aid and social solidarity.

It is a familiar theme of anarchist (and some other left-wing) thinking that these idealistic visions, of the past and the future, are in fact one and the same vision.

But which is the original? When we romanticise the past, are we projecting our hopes for the future on to it?

Or is it a question of basing our dreams of the future on a mythologised romantic past?

I would argue that neither is the case. What we are “projecting” in each instance is an archetype of how we think society could be organised.

It is an “ideal form” (to use an immensely unfashionable neoplatonic term), a kind of abstract template.

Of course, real life will never correspond exactly to the ideal, which is why attempts to prove that this model has existed in the past will always be problematic.

This is also why people are often sceptical about the potential for it becoming real in the future – we all know that real life is never perfect.

But this ideal society does exist – on an abstract level within the collective mind of the human species.

It is a possibility, as a way in which people *could* live, if they wanted.

More than that, it is the model of the way we *should* live.

This ideal notion of how society should be arranged is innate. It is as much a part of the human psyche as the idea of living in a herd is part of the cattle psyche, or building a termitary is part of the termite psyche.

Because we, as modern humans, have been brought up to think that all knowledge has to be learned, we can forget that this is not the case

within nature as a whole.

Even when they have not had the chance to learn from their parents' behaviour, other creatures know, instinctively, how to go about their lives.

Cuckoos, for instance, are born, in the nest of another species, knowing where to find their own cuckoo African wintering grounds, thanks to what scientists call an "innate migration programme".

Humans are certainly less controlled by instinctive behaviour. We, like baboons and other apes (as Eugène Marais described) have been able to separate ourselves from instinct to some extent and are thus freer to adapt to external circumstances.

But those instincts are still inside us somewhere, even if they do not necessarily control our behaviour.

Notions of what exactly is "right" or "wrong" can, for instance, vary between cultures, but the overall idea of justice – that there is such a thing as "right" and "wrong" – is shared by all of them.

Peter Kropotkin wrote in *Ethics* that "the sense of Mutual Aid, Justice, and Morality are rooted in man's mind with all the force of an inborn instinct".

Even if certain individuals and groups have overridden this impulse in favour of narrow self-interest, the collective desire for solidarity,

freedom, autonomy and a natural way of life remains innate to the human species as a whole.

This is why this ideal – which today we might call anarchy or real socialism – keeps welling up time and time again throughout history.

This is also why the self-interested ruling elite have to devote so much time and resources into discrediting and suppressing this ideal.

If it became a physical reality, they would lose all their power, status and wealth.

So they do all they can to prevent it from ever rising to the surface of the collective mind and inspiring people into powerful and unstoppable revolt against the unnatural infrastructures which obstruct its realisation.

LIBERALISM: THE TWO-FACED TYRANNY OF WEALTH

March 11, 2020

1. The rule of money

The spring of 1649 was a time of unprecedented hope for the people of England. Civil war had turned to revolution, King Charles I had lost his head and a republic had been declared.

The victorious “roundhead” parliamentary army which had defeated the royalist “cavaliers” was heavily imbued with the radical ideas of the Levellers and at St George’s Hill in Surrey a little group of rural rebels were setting out to reclaim the land as a “common treasury for all”.¹

But the hope did not last and the moment turned out to be the high water mark of popular revolt. The agitators of the New Model Army were crushed at Burford by Oliver Cromwell’s cronies, the Diggers were attacked and evicted from their squatted land and “law and order” were restored. Eventually, of course, the monarchy came back as well, albeit in “constitutional” guise.

Instead of becoming a country of free men and women, growing their own food and deciding their own destinies, England became the birthplace of liberal capitalism.

The tyranny of privilege maintained by the old Stuart regime had not been ended, simply transferred into new hands.

Popular anger against feudal hierarchy had been harnessed by the entrepreneurial and banking classes to get rid of all those inconvenient old-fashioned barriers to trade and money-making.

Once the people had played their revolutionary role, and the old regime was gone, they became the enemy within and had to be quickly put back in their place before things went too far.

The essence of this commercial coup d'état is nicely symbolised by the fact that a lavish feast was laid on for Cromwell by the City of London to celebrate his crushing of the radicals at Burford.²

By the first decades of the next century, Merrie England had already been replaced by the kind of society that is all too familiar today.

Writes Christopher Hill, referring specifically to 1714: "We are already in the modern world – the world of banks and cheques, budgets, the stock exchange, the periodical press, coffee-houses, clubs, coffins, microscopes, shorthand, actresses, and umbrellas. It is a world in which

governments put first the promotion of production".³

This new modern world was, of course, thoroughly commercial. It was the *Gesellschaft* which Ferdinand Tönnies identifies as having replaced the *Gemeinschaft*, or community, of earlier ages. It meant, in his words, "the ascendancy of greed for money, ambition and lust for pleasure".⁴

As Georges Lapierre says, this commercial spirit came to dominate not only the social and economic life of the Western world, but also the inner worlds of its populations: "In a mercantile society we are all merchants, our heads are filled with the thoughts of big capitalist merchants, we all think about money".⁵

The modern *Gesellschaft* was also expansionist and imperialist, driven by an insatiable hunger for new "markets", more "growth", greater profits.

It is no coincidence that English expansionism, long held back by the reluctance of the Stuart monarchy, took a great leap forward under Cromwell's republic, with the acquisition of Jamaica, St Helena, Surinam, Novia Scotia and New Brunswick.

This imperialism, like the suppression of popular revolt at home, was not carried out by means of the magical workings of the capitalist "free market", but by brute force.

Lapierre cites the example of Australia, where “the Aborigines had to submit to the idea of exchange held by the British colonists, or else disappear: massacres, deportations, reserves or concentration camps; the indigenous people and their way of seeing the world do not interest the British colonists, they are wiped out or fenced in”.⁶

Again and again, says Lapierre, “absolute violence” had been used to impose the rule of money: “Violence is at the heart of capitalism. To submit to the capitalist system, consciously or not, is always to do violence to yourself”.⁷

2. Liberalism as deception

At this point, the reader might begin to wonder what all this has got to with liberalism. Liberalism, after all, is supposed to be all about liberty and human rights, not violence and enslavement.

The answer is that, as Ishay Landa points out in some detail in an excellent 2012 study,⁸ there are two faces to liberalism.

On the one side there is political liberalism, which favours individual freedom and an open and democratic society. And on the other side there is economic liberalism, which is just capitalism.

The trouble is that these aspects are not

really compatible. When liberalism is battling against a feudal regime, it does seem to represent the cause of the people, as a whole, against a ruling elite.

But once it has achieved that goal and holds the reins of power, the limits of this political liberalism quickly become apparent. The law, which it once used as a weapon to fight entrenched injustice, suddenly becomes “law and order”, a tool for the defence of the liberal status quo.

Democracy, which seemed like such a good idea at the time, is now seen as a threat, a means by which “the masses” might interfere with the wealth and privilege of the mercantile classes.

Therefore, whenever economic liberalism finds itself under threat from “populism”, it quickly jettisons the principles of political liberalism to which it is theoretically tied.

In other words, these “principles” are not principles at all, just convenient postures designed to cloak the unpleasant reality of the economic liberals’ capitalist system.

We might even define liberalism as being the deception maintained by capitalism to hide its true nature.

This deception, this “egoism, impudence, falsehood, and cunning”⁹ as Tönnies put it, can be seen lurking behind all the mainstays of liberalism.

Property. This is the bedrock of liberal ideology on which its notion of individual “freedom” depends. Liberalism will not entertain the thought that the property of one individual amounts to a theft from the communal whole and will always justify and deploy the use of state violence to protect property. Its “freedom” is therefore fake, being merely the “freedom” of a minority to benefit at the expense of the majority. Furthermore, liberalism betrays its own supposed commitment to freedom of expression and debate by enshrining the sacredness of property in its laws and constitutions in such a way as to remove the very issue from the realm of possible political debate. [For a discussion of this point in a Great Reset context, see *Dismantling Tyranny*]

The Economy. This familiar term is, in itself, aimed at deceiving. Most people will assume that it merely refers to the everyday practical functioning of society in a vaguely-imagined general public interest. A threat to “The Economy” is always presented as bad news for all of us. In fact, of course, it refers to the *capitalist* economy, which is a mechanism by which the rich minority exploits the majority. Again, liberalism deceives the public by pretending that *its* interests and *ours* are one and the same, whereas they are usually diametrically opposed.

Work. The work ethic is at the heart of liberalism. When directed at “the masses” this is an order to keep slaving away to make profits for the liberal bosses. But when applied to the bosses themselves, it is used to explain the wealth they have accumulated by exploiting their workforce and the natural world. These people have “succeeded” because they have “worked so hard” and there can be nothing immoral about this, liberals are keen to tell us.

Progress. This is a key word in the liberal vocabulary and nicely reflects the two-faced nature of the creed. It is used, at the same time, to describe the advance of industrial capitalism (economic liberalism) and also to describe the gaining of certain human rights and individual liberties (political liberalism). The liberals’ trick is to conflate these two very different concepts into one and the same, deceiving those “progressives” who support the latter into imagining that it inevitably goes hand in hand with the former. This is evidently not the case, especially since, as we have seen, the “liberties” offered by political liberalism are illusory and will always be secondary to the maintenance of economic liberalism and its capitalist system.

Democracy. Ever since the victory of “Parliament” over the monarchy in the English Revolution, liberals have claimed to champion democracy. But their sense of democracy is very

limited as it must always be balanced by their need to protect “property” and “The Economy”. The representative parliamentary party-political system has therefore been carefully manufactured and fine-tuned to ensure control remains in “safe” hands, namely in those of the wealthy elite. The gulf between the liberal fantasy of “democracy” and actual reality is so wide that many see through the lie, and the liberal system is forced to constantly deploy a wide variety of propaganda techniques to keep its flimsy illusion intact.

Niceness. Liberalism always claims to be motivated by the very best intentions. When it takes away our rights and freedoms, it reassures us that this is for our own “protection”. When its armies invade people’s lands, it is “liberating” them. When it destroys their cultures and communities it is “civilising” or “modernising” them. Its enemies are always despicable dictators, its wars are always “unavoidable”, the death it deals out is mere collateral damage in its invariably “humanitarian” missions against all the evils to which it is diametrically opposed simply by virtue of its liberal nature. Its imperial armed forces are its “defence” and its death-dealing arms-dealers are part of a crucial “defence industry” that not only keeps “us” safe but creates “jobs” and is very good for “The Economy”.

Normality. The idea that liberal capitalism is a natural state of affairs, the inevitable outcome of “progress”, is one of the main planks of the system’s mendacious narrative. From the reassuring framing of “the news” and social reality by the capitalist media to the sneering contempt for “extremists”, “populists” or “lefties”, the message is always that “There Is No Alternative”, that the capitalist world is “the real world” and any other version is not only undesirable but, in fact, impossible.

3. Liberalism and fascism

If one pillar of liberalism is deceit, the other is the inherent violence of the capitalist system, which this deceit serves to conceal.

This violence is deeply embedded in the system. There is violence in the fact that we are excluded from living freely on and from the land; there is violence in the way that refusal to take part in the capitalist system risks leading to homelessness, hunger and early death; there is violence in the imposition of the system’s laws, whether this is carried out by a bailiff, a cop, a judge or a prison warden.

Sometimes this violence does not even have to be real. It is the *threat* of violence which imposes the system’s will and control. But this threat is still violence, in the same way that it is

violence to hold a knife at someone's throat to force them to act in a certain way.

When things are going well for capitalist society, economic liberals can put on the mask of political liberalism and pretend that they are absolutely committed to “freedom and democracy”.

But when their power is under threat, they are forced to qualify such commitment with talk of emergencies and crises and very quickly withdraw the “rights” they were so proud to hand out to the population.

Usually, a brief period of repression will be enough to restore liberal order and they can then go back to showing their other, smiley, face. But sometimes faith in their system has been so eroded, and the threat of radical change or even revolution so great, that liberalism is forced to take on an even more severe form.

This is, roughly, the argument made by Ishay Landa in his book *The Apprentice's Sorcerer: Liberal Tradition and Fascism*. As the title hints, Landa regards fascism as being a continuation and adaptation of liberalism.

He writes: “Far from being the antithesis of fascism, an absolute Other, the liberal order significantly contributed to fascism, informing many of its far reaching manifestations... Fascism was an organic product of developments *largely* (that is to say: not *entirely*) from within

liberal society and ideology. It was an extreme attempt at solving the crisis of liberalism, breaking out of its aporia, and saving the bourgeoisie from itself".¹⁰

If fascists were (and are) often critical of liberalism, he explains, it was not on account of its economics, its capitalism. It was, rather, the nice face of liberalism, the political liberalism of human rights and democratic liberties, which irritated them. The fascists' main criticism was that liberalism was *too nice*, too weak, too eroded by its own "democratic" posturing, to effectively see off the threat posed by "the masses", by socialism, communism or anarchism, to the status quo.

Landa marshals an impressive range of voices from the liberal and fascist traditions to demonstrate just how much they have in common.

He points, for example, to the 17th century English liberal philosopher John Locke, who justified the use of violence to protect sacrosanct "property", endorsed child labour from the age of three, wished to criminalise beggars and vagabonds and wrote of the need to bring the masses to "obedience", adding: "The greatest part cannot know, and therefore they must believe".¹¹

Landa also examines the work of Vilfredo Pareto (1848-1923), a liberal economist who had an enormous influence on Benito Mussolini and

on Italian Fascism in general. Pareto was committed to an unfettered capitalism, arguing that market forces arose from the “strength of life”.¹²

The notion that there was something socialist about fascism can be traced back to the fascists themselves, notably with the term “national socialism”.

But the fascists, like the liberals, had no qualms about using deceit to advance their cause and Landa argues that their “socialism” was deliberately misleading from the very start, a kind of “redwashing” or branding of their pro-capitalist agenda to make it acceptable to the public and, at the same time, to undermine genuine socialism.

He notes: “Capitalism had scarce little popular appeal after the First World War and amidst protracted world economic crisis. A much better prospect for supporters of capitalism lay in feigning to embrace socialism, so as to infiltrate it inside an ideological and political Trojan horse and defeat it from within”.¹³

Today’s received wisdom that there was something “anti-capitalist” about historical fascism is false, and swallows fascist propaganda at face value.

Nazism in power was right-wing, extremely right-wing! It was so far from being socialist or anti-capitalist that it won the support of some of

the most prominent German industrialists, such as Alfred and Gustav Krupp, Kurt Schröder, Frantz Thyssen and Albert Vögler¹⁴ and had good relationships with the likes of IBM and Coca-Cola.

The mere fact of state intervention in the economy is no indicator of socialistic intent, says Landa. The important question that we need to ask is “on *whose side* and for *whose benefit* did the fascists intervene in the economy?”¹⁵

The answer is that they did so for the benefit of the capitalists. As historian John Weiss notes: “Hitler used tax relief policies, for example, to push production by heavy industry to a maximum”.¹⁶

This was not a state intervention from the left, but from the *right*, stresses Landa, intended “to boost the economic and political interests of capitalism”.¹⁷

Adolf Hitler was a great enthusiast for private property and free enterprise. He regarded economic competition between individuals, the “play of free forces”, as being essential for a nation’s health. Only this way could the “aristocratic principle of nature” assure that the fittest persons, “superior individuals”, would prevail.¹⁸

And, like other economic liberals, the Nazi dictator believed that political liberalism had to be ditched in order to allow capitalism to

maintain control, declaring in a speech to industrialists: “It is impossible to sustain market-economy in a period of democracy”.¹⁹

Hitler’s warmongering economic expansionism was greatly inspired by the example of the liberal-capitalist British Empire. He enthused in *Mein Kampf*: “No nation has more carefully prepared its economic conquest with the sword with greater brutality and defended it later on more ruthlessly than the British.... England always possessed the armament that she needed. She always fought with the weapons that were required for success”.²⁰

He praised Britain for the “great work-camps for all sorts of parasites”²¹ it had built in South Africa and later, of course, made his own deadly use of the model.

Concludes Landa: “Rather than seeing Hitler’s system as a departure from the way of the West, it makes more sense to conceive of Nazism as a fanatic, die-hard attempt to pursue the logic of Western 19th century capitalism to its utmost conclusion, to go all the way, rejecting the contemptuous compromises of the bourgeoisie with socialism”.²²

4. Fake “lessons from history”

After the defeat of historical fascism, the baton of The Big Lie was passed back into the hands of

mainstream liberalism.

Post-war liberalism was, of course, happy to use the modern sophisticated propaganda techniques developed by fascism for its own purposes, not least in commercial advertising campaigns.

But it went a step further by using the example of fascism, and indeed the lies propagated by fascism about its own agenda, as additional weapons in its endless war to conceal the truth about capitalist “democracy” and to vilify opponents of its system.

Some liberals have been candid enough to acknowledge that fascism in fact sought to defend the economic system, the “civilization”, to which they are themselves committed.

Ludwig von Mises, for instance, wrote: “It cannot be denied that Fascism and similar movements aiming at the establishment of dictatorships are full of the best intentions and that their intervention has, for the moment, saved European civilization. The merit that Fascism has thereby won for itself will live on eternally for history. But... fascism was an emergency makeshift. To view it as something more would be a fatal error”.²³

Another liberal, F.A. Hayek, was expressing much the same sentiment when he declared in a press interview in Chile: “Personally I prefer a liberal dictator to democratic government lacking

liberalism”.²⁴

However, in general, the strong connection between economic liberalism and fascism has been carefully concealed from public view and the lies which fascism told about itself have been recycled and served up again to the public in order to repackage its historical significance according to the requirements of the liberal system.

Landa explains: “Following the debacle of European fascism, its liberal pedigree became a source of embarrassment. The need, on the part of intellectuals endorsing the liberal order, was to absolve liberalism of any historical complicity with fascism, by delineating an alternative genealogy, that would construe fascism as a non-liberal or even anti-liberal force”.²⁵

The aim of these intellectuals was “to conflate Nazism and Communism as the twin evils of ‘totalitarianism’, equally the foes of the liberal West”, says Landa.²⁶

The fascists’ ideological belief in competition, property, entrepreneurship and their crushing of the trade unions at the behest of the capitalist bosses was all consigned to the Orwellian memory hole: “Nothing of that was allowed to confuse and deter the reader from seeing liberalism as a defenseless victim of fascist aggression”.²⁷

Indeed, says Landa, several historians took

fascism's own propaganda at face value by accepting that it was "neither right nor left" and "in fact in its original impulse much *more indebted to the left*".²⁸

Fascism has even been presented as the result of "too much" democracy, that is to say the bad, "populist", kind of democracy which overflows the safe limits placed around it by sensible liberalism.

Historian George Mosse, for instance, has insisted, incredibly enough, that "the French Revolution stood at the beginning of a democratization of politics which climaxed in twentieth-century fascism".²⁹

Comments Landa: "Between the lines, at least, there is a lesson implied in such readings of history: if democracy we must have, then let us take care that it be influenced as little as possible by the masses, and guided as far as possible by wise and responsible people. The best remedy to the pitfalls of democracy involves the curbing of its populist dimension, the guaranteeing of a democracy of quality standing on a solid liberal base rather than a shaky populist one".³⁰

In other words, the grim heritage of fascism, a movement which evolved as a response to the threat of democracy, is transformed into a warning from history of the dangers of allowing democracy to go too far... Again we observe the sophisticated forms of deception which are

inherent to liberalism.

We see exactly the same process in play regarding fascism's supposed links to nature-based philosophy. The lies told by the Nazis when selling their particular brand of industrial capitalism to nature-loving German voters are dusted off and wheeled out again decades later.

This time they are used to discredit and disqualify deep green and organic political ideas by linking them to fascism.

Janet Biehl and Peter Staudenmaier, for instance, have used the construct of a Nazi ideology supposedly based on "nature mysticism", "a return to the land" and "organicist holism" to point accusingly at "a chilling currency within contemporary ecological discourse".³¹

But while Nazi rhetoric and ideology were partly shaped by such ideas, they were forced to distort them beyond recognition to make them compatible with their own racist, statist, industrial and hierarchical politics.

Their supposed love of nature was as fake as their socialism and Hitler openly scoffed at those who took an interest in the idea of an organic community, or *Gemeinschaft*, from below.

From the fascist perspective, community was impossible without the state and its police, "for it was through force alone that community was created and preserved", he insisted.³²

Individual supporters who naively took green or holistic ideas seriously were quickly pushed aside as the real Nazism prevailed: it was all about efficiency and *Technik*, industrial growth and the machine-state.

For an in-depth exploration of this issue, we refer readers to the 2018 article *Bringing down the fascist machine*, (see page 1).³³

The important point to note is that the Nazis' lies about their own movement have been kept alive and used again in a different context.

First time around, they served to disguise the industrial capitalist agenda behind fascism by using a facade of socialism and love of nature.

Second time around, they are being used to protect industrial capitalism from its radical critics by using a "fascist" smear based on the fascists' own facade!

5. A spectacle of lies

Western liberal society since the Second World War has generally plunged deeper than ever into deceit.

After 1945, liberal capitalism focused its efforts on opposing Soviet communism and the threat posed by anti-capitalism. And in doing so, it did not hesitate to immediately renew its anti-left alliance with fascism!

For instance, when the US and UK set up

the anti-communist “stay-behind” Gladio network in 1945, they were quick to recruit former Nazis including “Butcher of Lyons” Klaus Barbie and Hitler’s spy chief Reinhard Gehlen.

Fascist veterans of the Spanish Civil War, militants from Mussolini’s last-stand Salo republic and other right-wing extremists were also welcomed on board.³⁴

As well as using Nazi personnel (notably scientists) to build the post-war West, the liberal-capitalist system also adapted other fascist techniques for its own purposes.

The Allies’ wartime propaganda, deceitful enough to inspire George Orwell to base his Ministry of Truth on his experiences at the BBC in London, continued into the Cold War and co-opted the myth-making Nazi style of propaganda to paint capitalism as “the free world” bravely defending freedom and democracy.

The scope, scale and sophistication of this capitalist propaganda, merging corporate and state interests, was such that it became increasingly difficult to deconstruct and understand.

There were so many layers of blatant deceit, so many false assumptions and outrageous distortions, that modern liberal society came across as one huge lie.

Guy Debord, writing in 1967, described this contemporary liberal-capitalist world as the

spectacle, “the superficial reign of images”.³⁵ He wrote: “The spectacle is the moment when the commodity has achieved the total occupation of social life”.³⁶

It was enormously difficult to break out of this capitalist mind-prison, because opposition to its basic premises could not be adequately expressed and communicated through the language it made available in its culture.

Debord explained, in a 1992 follow-up to his original book, that even a critic of the spectacle was forced to speak its language, “for it is the only one he is familiar with; the one in which he learned to speak. No doubt he would like to be regarded as an enemy of its rhetoric; but he will use its syntax. This is one of the most important aspects of spectacular domination’s success”.³⁷

There is a clear parallel here with the words of Orwell’s fictional apologist for the Big Brother spectacle who boasts: “Don’t you see that the whole aim of Newspeak is to narrow the range of thought? In the end we shall make thought-crime literally impossible, because there will be no words in which to express it”.³⁸

The fact that Orwell was depicting an imaginary totalitarian society, while Debord was describing a very real liberal capitalist one, hints at the way in which fascism and liberalism gradually reconverged in the decades following the Second World War.

We have already described how liberalism was built on deceit, how its key concepts like “progress” and “democracy” are there to cloak its real nature.

We have also seen how it has used a fake interpretation of fascism, initially created by fascists, to discredit anti-fascist criticism of liberal capitalism.

It is worth mentioning a few more contemporary examples of the sophisticated fibbing which lies at the heart of liberal rule.

Narrative control. The spectacle normally likes to keep up the appearance of being “open” and “democratic”, so tends to avoid actually banning or overtly controlling sources of news and information. Behind the scenes, however, everything is tightly sewn up. This has long been the case with journalism, publishing and academia, but the information-control process took a big step forward with the development of Wikipedia. Ostensibly a “an open collaboration project by a community of volunteer editors”, and containing vast amounts of genuinely useful information, this is constantly policed, censored and altered by agents of the system (in a cleverly concealed way, in keeping with standard liberal practice) so as to lower the reputation of its enemies and enhance that of its supporters. The “Philip Cross” controversy is very illuminating in this respect.³⁹

Strategic character assassination. If a liberal system does not want to expose its authoritarian nature, it cannot be seen to unfairly persecute its political enemies. It therefore prepares the ground for any such attacks by smearing their reputation, particularly among those who might be expected to rally to the defence of the victim. The prime contemporary example of this is the case of Wikileaks founder Julian Assange. As Nils Melzer, UN Special Rapporteur on Torture pointed out in a German TV documentary: “Of course it is much easier to make an example of someone and to violate all their human rights when it is a person nobody likes.... we absorb it all through the media”.⁴⁰

False labelling. Unlike overt authoritarians or fascists, ostensibly freedom-loving liberals cannot be honest about their reasons for victimising or vilifying opponents. They will not publicly condemn opponents of imperialist wars as “traitors” or “reds” or “the enemy within”, even though that may be the thinking behind closed doors. Instead imperialist liberals will try to give themselves the moral high ground and even place themselves to the “left” of their critics by labelling them apologists for foreign states which they have already packaged as “bad” or “evil”.

Thus anti-war dissidents become “apologists

for Putin”, “Assadists” or “campists”. This approach even extends to the judicial realm, with Assange magically transformed from being a whistleblower exposing war crimes (whom liberals ought theoretically to support) into being a practitioner of alleged “espionage”. The hypocrisy in his case is so blatant that it risks permanently damaging the system’s precious illusions. Melzer commented: “If investigative journalism is classified as espionage and can be incriminated around the world, then censorship and tyranny will follow. A murderous system is being created before our very eyes”.⁴¹ And Craig Murray added: “If a single day at Woolwich Crown Court does not convince you the existence of liberal democracy is now a lie, then your mind must be very closed indeed”.⁴²

“Anti-semitism”. A recent development in false labelling has been the massive extension of the term “anti-semitism”. Not only has this been misused⁴³ to criminalise criticism of the Israeli state and to silence Palestinian voices, but it has also been deployed to disallow anti-capitalism, on the absurd basis that an anti-capitalist condemnation of the “one per cent” of the rich elite is somehow inevitably a disguised attack on the Jewish minority. If you talk about bankers and financiers running the world, controlling the media, and cheerleading for war, it is argued, you are really blaming Jewish people or, at the

very least, falling into the hands of those who do.⁴⁴ As Daniel Finn crucially pointed out in a 2018 article in *Jacobin* magazine, insinuations of anti-semitism can thus be used, not merely to defame critics of Israel, but “to discredit any radical critique of capitalism or imperialism in the modern world”.⁴⁵

Note that the cleverness of this kind of liberal smearing involves the contamination of the target by means of the accusation alone. Any attempt to dispute the grounds on which this accusation is made will be deliberately interpreted as belittling the significance of the original, and very real, problem. Someone who says the application of “anti-semitism” to anti-capitalism is exaggerated will be treated as if they had said that the threat of anti-semitism as a whole was exaggerated. In the same way, someone who challenges the misuse of climate change concerns to promote a capitalist agenda risks being accused of “climate denial”. Criticism of the capitalist system is ruthlessly shut down, using the gaslighting language of liberalism to paint the victims of its sly censorship as the actual “offenders”.

“Conspiracy theories”. The favourite liberal put-down of anyone investigating the crimes and deceit of its system is to dismiss them as a “conspiracy theorist”. The approach was pioneered in the US by Richard Hofstadter in the

1960s⁴⁶ and has been used with great success by the liberal system to contaminate and discredit exposure of its crimes. The automatic cry of “conspiracy theorist!” now appears to have dispelled, even in “social justice”⁴⁷ or “anarchist”⁴⁸ circles, any need to actually read and assess the information involved. The work of researching, collating and presenting detailed and sourced information exposing wrongdoing by the rich and powerful seems today to be regarded by some so-called radicals as, in itself, reprehensible and dangerous. Needless to say, any suggestion that this conditioned response is itself part of a process of manipulation and control will be regarded as further confirmation of the original thought-crime!

Fake dissidents. The biggest lie peddled by the liberal system is that it is democratic, whereas it in fact only tolerates a “democracy” which keeps its structures of control and exploitation intact. Because it has the unlimited resources of the capitalist system at its disposal, and has built structures to hide its activities from public scrutiny, it can allow itself to flood everywhere and everything with its representatives, even milieux that are ostensibly hostile to its politics. It makes little difference whether the individuals concerned are paid directly by the state-corporate complex or indirectly via compromised organisations (including by outside

funding), or indeed whether they work for free, having been duped by compromised structures into promoting the system's views. The bottom line is that the world of "dissent" or "opposition" is riddled with people ultimately acting on behalf of the liberal-capitalist system.

There are no end of fake-left and fake-green journalists and organisers working within a mutually self-reinforcing network of NGOs, campaign groups, publishing houses and other sundry ventures. Where independent groups opposing the system do exist, they are often quickly infiltrated and taken over. Political parties and movements are, needless to say, heavily targeted to ensure there are no nasty outbreaks of real democracy. The ongoing Spycops⁴⁹ scandal in the UK has revealed that British police infiltrated more than 1,000 groups in recent decades. But the issue goes much deeper (*into territory declared "out of bounds" by the "conspiracy theory" narrative constructed by the system itself!*). State agents in political movements are not just there to monitor activity, but to channel it in directions favourable to the system's interests. Sometimes this might mean simply steering groups away from challenging the core of capitalist power. At other times people can be manipulated into actively promoting capitalist interests – as with the system's attempt to use the climate movement to launch

its “Fourth Industrial Revolution” reboot of the capitalist economy. For more on this see the extensive online Climate Capitalists library.⁵⁰

“Beyond politics”. Liberals like to present themselves as being “moderate” and so close to “the centre” that they are essentially non-political – or “beyond politics” as some like to put it.⁵¹ They paper over the cracks in their exploitative capitalist society by claiming “we are all in it together” and urge us to cast aside divisive ideology that disturbs the social peace. But “professing no ideology is an ideology in itself”, as Robin Ramsay has remarked.⁵² The ideology of being “non-political” reinforces the liberal narrative that their capitalist system represents normality, that there is no need for deep analysis that might lead to radical change in the system, merely the obligation to moderately manage it and tweak it as necessary to ensure its continuation. When they need a vague impression of “radicality” to spice up their tired political line, or to disguise its evolution into a more hardline neoliberal form, they market a supposed “novelty”. This repackaging of the same old capitalism as something “new” worked splendidly for Tony Blair in 1997 and Emmanuel Macron in 2017 but not at all for Change UK in 2019.⁵³

6. Case study: Macronist France

If we want to understand where the liberal-capitalist system is today, it is well worth taking a look at France. The election of Emmanuel Macron as president was a triumph of neoliberalism, the long-awaited opportunity for the dismantling of the social structures which the French had still stubbornly hung on to, decades after Thatcher did away with them in the UK.

But, less than two years after his election success, an unprecedented revolt shook the country. The Gilets Jaunes movement broke free from the restraints on revolt carefully policed by compromised trade unions and political parties, and unleashed a massive popular uprising against the Macronist system. A year later this converged with opposition to Macron's neoliberal pension "reforms" to result in an extraordinarily broad rejection of his agenda. For more information see the Winter Oak collection of articles on the Gilets Jaunes.⁵⁴

As one would expect from the history of liberalism, the response of the state was twofold. Firstly, there was a physical repression of the protest movement using the full array of modern police weaponry – tear gas, water cannon, grenades – along with traditional boots and batons.

Secondly, there was a non-stop barrage of media propaganda against the Gilets Jaunes. This went beyond the usual condemnation of “violent protesters” and the laughable underestimation of crowd numbers aimed at undermining morale and momentum. The liberal intellectual elite were wheeled out to explain that the Gilets Jaunes were a bunch of reactionaries, even fascists.

When the explicitly anti-fascist presence on the demos made that hard to swallow, they were depicted as “red-browns” – the tired old liberal trope of fascism being closely related to socialism, anarchism and communism, rather than being the emergency means by which liberals defend capitalism from those same threats to their domination. Even the “anti-semitism” slur was wheeled out to try and discredit the anti-neoliberal uprising.

But perhaps what was most notable was the tone in which these attacks on the Gilets Jaunes were expressed. This was the voice of the Paris bourgeoisie and, in their fear at what was happening, they forgot to hide the accent of class contempt in their anti-GJ diatribes.

These protesters were just scum, ignorant hicks from the provinces, uncouth and unwashed peasant rabble flooding into the glittering citadel of Privilege-sur-Seine. A massive social and cultural divide in France, which had obviously

been there all along, was suddenly there for all to see, in broad daylight. The effects of this revelation are likely to be of historical significance and already there has been a flood of commentary around the subject.

Philosopher Frédéric Lordon, for example, has recently stated that the arrogance of the liberal capitalist system has now reached a point where there is no longer any point in trying to force it to reform or compromise, as was possible during its previous softer phase. Lordon concludes that revolutionary insurrection is therefore now the only possible way forward.⁵⁵

A 2019 book by left-wing journalist François Bégaudeau is of particular relevance to our argument here, because it plunges deep into the assumptions and mindset behind liberal hypocrisy.

Histoire de ta Bêtise, ‘The Story of Your Stupidity’, is addressed to an archetypal Parisian bourgeois liberal. These, he makes clear, are the people who brought Macron to power: “The Macron vote was the most purely bourgeois in the history of your republic”.⁵⁶

Although they might paint themselves as being of the “left”, their class status meant they would always essentially be conservative. “What is it that you want to conserve? Yourself. A bourgeois is someone who possesses, who has something to lose, who has more to lose than to

gain from the destruction of the existing order”.⁵⁷

Liberals thus only criticise capitalism on the basis of reforming it, making it more acceptable or inclusive, better adapted to current circumstances. “Blind to the structure, you say that capitalism should not be eradicated, but amended. You say that it’s finance and not capitalism that must urgently be reined in. But the banks weren’t invented in 2008. Capitalism has always been financial”.⁵⁸

For that reason, the “environmentalism” adopted by liberals will only ever be superficial and can never address the root of the problem: “Your ecological transition will not escape the framework of growth and accumulation. Your disruptions will create no rupture with finance”.⁵⁹

Bégaudeau describes how the liberals’ main bugbear is what they call “populism”, the fake category which lumps in the radical left with the far right. Liberals try to smear all of those designated “populist” as intrinsically racist because of their working class status – as if the upper classes were exempt from this or as if their capitalist system did not perpetuate racism on a murderous global scale.

Of course, notes Bégaudeau, it is no coincidence that this great threat to liberalism comes from a term designating the people. “What is the definition of the people in your personal

dictionary? That which threatens you. Threatens your place”.⁶⁰

He adds: “Hostility to populism is the presentable mask of what Jacques Rancière calls your hatred of democracy, along with your holy terror at the thought of the beggars bursting into your lofty sphere. You like the proles in the same way as racists like Africans: back home where they belong”.⁶¹

Bégaudeau also points out the propaganda techniques used by liberals to smear and silence their opponents, without breaking the “democratic” spell by appearing overtly authoritarian.

One of these is the “conspiracy theory” label, which liberals use “like a pesticide”⁶² against genuinely radical opponents. Anything from revelations about government ministers’ private links to the nuclear industry or Big Pharma to discussion of post-WWII US interference in European politics is written off as nothing but “conspiracy theory”, says Bégaudeau.

“You hold your nose. Anti-americanism is conspiracy theory. You don’t want to hear about the payback from the Marshall Plan”.⁶³

He likewise draws attention to the supposedly “non-political” position often adopted by liberals. We might add that there is nothing new about this. Debord and his fellow Situationists refer in one analysis to a revolutionary of the

1871 Paris Commune “who, when a suspect bourgeois insisted that he had never had anything to do with politics, replied, ‘That’s precisely why I’m going to kill you!’”⁶⁴

Bégaudeau says the bourgeois-liberal aversion to anything they deem “political” or “ideological” comes from the fact that they are not so much interested in politics as in economics.

“You are a centrist, but you don’t call yourself that. A shopkeeper doesn’t express political views, because he might lose some custom as a result. You don’t call yourself a centrist, but a moderate”.⁶⁵

From this so-called “moderate” positioning, says Bégaudeau, comes the liberal habit of condemning the “extremism” of their opponents, as if there was something inherently wrong – excessive or unbalanced – about taking a definite position. They talk a lot about the need for “nuance” and insist that things aren’t so simple, that everything “isn’t black and white”.⁶⁶

But, once again, this is sheer hypocrisy and cant, as liberals themselves never hesitate to take definite positions on issues close to their heart. It is only “extreme” opposition to their capitalist system that they consider out of bounds. “You can’t imagine going beyond the capitalist system, in other words the subversion of the social relationships which make you rich.

You will not see off the branch on which you are sitting”.⁶⁷

In a magnificent confirmation of his analysis, and of ours in this article, Bégaudeau was fired from *Transfuge*, the journal for which he had written since its launch, by editor Vincent Jaury, because of his book. Jaury complained of Bégaudeau’s alarming “radicalisation” and claimed that *Histoire de ta bêtise* amounted to “a red-brown drift, a fascist impulse”. (68)

So, once again, we see the two faces of the liberal tyranny. On the one hand it sacks a journalist for challenging its system and its deceit. On the other hand it tars the offending heretic with the worst associations available from its bag of hypocritical smears.

7. Conclusions

Liberalism has for many centuries been a convenient disguise for the rule of money, the concentration of power and wealth in the hands of a small but very dominant elite. The disguise is convenient because it lulls the population into a false sense of complacency or pessimism.

“We live in a democracy, so if things don’t change it is maybe because people don’t want them to”, some conclude. “Maybe essentially, for all its faults, the capitalist world really is the only possible one and the best we can do is to

tinker with the detail to make it as nice as possible. After all, the alternatives are all so much worse!”

If today it has become possible to see through the liberal lies, it is no doubt because the “nice” face of the system is rapidly disappearing as it faces the possibility of collapse. It is racking up its techniques of overt repression – from surveillance to political persecution, from blatant censorship to draconian seizures of “emergency” powers – without paying as much attention to its image as it used to. It doesn’t seem to care any more.

Writes Landa: “Liberalism, in the form of neo-liberalism, has shaken itself out of its democratic stupor, to regain its former, elitist vigour”.⁶⁹

How would we label the current regimes in France, Chile, Brazil, Bolivia, Israel or India? Neoliberal? Neoconservative? Or what? To quote *The Acorn* from January 2020: “Neoliberalism is coming out of the closet and revealing itself to be a 21st century form of fascism”.⁷⁰

So what does that this mean for the opposition to capitalism – the real opposition that is, rather than the controlled variety?

In some ways, of course, the explicitly authoritarian drift of the system makes it easier to identify for what it is.

But, at the same time, if we are to defeat the

liberal tyranny on a long-term basis, we need to grasp not only its inherent violence, but the way in which its web of deceit hides that violence and projects it on to its enemies.

Opponents of liberalism and the capitalism it protects therefore need to spread awareness of the various points explored above, such as that:

** Work, property and “The Economy” are all concepts designed to enforce participation in the capitalist system, which serves to further enrich the rich.*

** The use of the term “progress” to describe the intensification of industrial capitalism is deceitful, being deliberately conflated with the idea of social progress in order to depict opposition as “reactionary”.*

** Liberal democracy is a lie. It is carefully constructed to prevent any actual threat to capitalist wealth and property. At times of crisis, when the usual defences are failing, liberals will jettison the democratic facade and resort to sheer violence.*

** Words like “freedom” and “liberation” are purposefully misused by liberals so as to hide the reality of their militarist mercantile imperialism.*

** Fascism was not left-wing, anti-capitalist or green. Liberalism is not a bulwark against fascism. Liberals hide their ideological proximity to historical fascism and use the “fascist” label to attack opponents of their authoritarian capitalist system.*

** Liberal capitalists have created a toolbox of smears to discredit and disqualify their opponents, including “populism”, “extremism” and their all-purpose “conspiracy theory” accusation. Anti-capitalists should not fall for this manipulation or use the language of our oppressors.*

We authentic radicals need, in fact, to roll back all the layers of liberal-compromised fake radicalism that have accumulated over the centuries in order to rediscover the age-old revolutionary Cause that inspired Gerrard Winstanley and the other radicals of the English Revolution.

We need, like them, to declare loudly and proudly our opposition to the tyranny of wealth, to the feudal-turned-mercantile society which steals our land and keeps us in chains for the profit of the rich.

We need to pick up from where our rebel ancestors left off, to continue to fight for their vision of a society free of classes, of property, law,

authority and exploitation, a society in which all of us are recognised as equally-loved children of nature.

As Winstanley declared: “The poorest man hath as true a title and just right to the land as the richest man. True freedom lies in the free enjoyment of the earth”.⁷¹

1. Gerrard Winstanley, *The True Levellers Standard Advanced* (1649).
2. A.L. Morton, *A People's History of England* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1995), p. 217.
3. Christopher Hill, *The Century of Revolution 1603-1714* (London: Sphere, 1969), p. 263.
4. Ferdinand Tönnies, *Community and Society: Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft*, trad. Charles P. Loomis (New York: Dover Publications, 2002), p. 202.
5. Georges Lapierre, *être ouragans: écrits de la dissidence* (Montreuil: L'insomniaque, 2015), p. 206.
6. Lapierre, *être ouragans*, p. 381.
7. Lapierre, *être ouragans*, p. 392.
8. Ishay Landa, *The Apprentice's Sorcerer: Liberal Tradition and Fascism* (Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2012).
9. Tönnies, p. 202.
10. Landa, p. 9.
11. John Locke, *The Reasonableness of Christianity As Delivered in the Scriptures* (London, 1824), p. 146, cit. Landa p. 27.
12. Landa, p. 46.
13. Landa p. 70.

14. Landa, pp. 117-18.
15. Landa, p. 72.
16. John Weiss, *The Fascist Tradition. Radical Right-Wing Extremism in Modern Europe* (New York: Harper & Row, 1967), p. 105, cit. Landa, p. 72.
17. Landa, p. 72.
18. Henry Ashby Turner, *German Big Business and the Rise of Hitler* (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), p. 76, cit. Landa, p. 77.
19. Adolf Hitler, speech, cit. Landa, p. 81.
20. Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf* (New York: Reynal & Hitchcock, 1941), p. 188-89, cit. Landa, p. 88-89.
21. Edouard Calic, *Ohne Maske. Hitler-Breitung Geheimsprache 1931* (Frankfurt am Main: Societäts-Verlag, 1968), p. 109, cit. Landa, p. 93.
22. Landa, p. 92.
23. Ludwig von Mises, *Liberalism in the Classical Tradition* (San Francisco: Cobden Press, 2002), p. 51, cit. Landa, p. 237.
24. F.A. Hayek, Interview in *El Mercurio*, Chile, 1981, cit. Landa, p. 238.
25. Landa, p. 115.
26. Landa, pp. 115-16.
27. Landa, p. 116.
28. Landa, p. 187.
29. George Mosse, 'Fascism and the French Revolution', *Journal of Contemporary History* 31 (1989), p. 20, cit. Landa, p. 221.
30. Landa, p. 222.
31. Janet Biehl & Peter Staudenmaier, *Ecofascism: Lessons from the German Experience*, <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/janet-biehl-and-peter-staudenmaier-ecofascism-lessons-from-the->

german-experience

32. Henry Picker, *Hitlers Tischgespräche im Führerhauptquartier* (Munich: Propyläen, 2003), p. 233, cit. Landa, p. 83.

33. 'Bringing down the fascist machine'. <https://orgrad.wordpress.com/articles/bringing-down-the-fascist-machine/>

34. Paul Cudeneq, 'The Politics of Fear: Terrorism and State Control', *Antibodies, Anarchangels and other essays* (Sussex: Winter Oak, 2013), pp.73-98.

35. Guy Debord, *La société du spectacle* (Paris: Gallimard, 1992), p. 152.

36. Debord, *La société du spectacle*, p. 25.

37. Guy Debord, *Commentaires sur la société du spectacle* (Paris: Gallimard, 1992), p. 38.

38. George Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (New York: Signet, 1950), pp. 52-53.

39. <https://wikipedia.fivefilters.org/>.

40. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pgw6FoFPhjo>.

41. <https://www.republik.ch/2020/01/31/nils-melzer-about-wikileaks-founder-julian-assange>.

42.

<https://www.craigmurray.org.uk/archives/2020/02/you-r-man-in-the-public-gallery-assange-hearing-day-1>.

43. <https://www.timesofisrael.com/the-scholar-who-wrote-the-definition-of-anti-semitism-says-its-been-subverted>.

44. See 'Bringing down the fascist machine'.

45. Daniel Finn, <https://www.jacobinmag.com/2018/04/jeremy-corbyn-antisemitism-labour-party>.

46. <https://winteroak.org.uk/2016/01/11/the-acorn-20/#4>.

47. <https://twitter.com/WinterOakPress/status/123278>

- 9997474000897.
48. https://twitter.com/Freedom_Paper/status/1214139344925200384.
49. <https://policespiesoutoflives.org.uk>.
50. <https://winteroak.org.uk/climate-capitalists>.
51. <https://rebellion.earth/event/beyond-politics-parliament-square>.
52. <https://winteroakextra.wordpress.com/2016/01/19/quote-for-the-day-january-19>.
53. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Change_UK.
54. <https://winteroak.org.uk/the-gilets-jaunes>.
55. <https://blogs.mediapart.fr/jean-marc-b/blog/241119/f-london-une-seule-solution-insurrection-revolutionaire>.
56. François Bégaudeau, *Histoire de ta bêtise* (Paris: Pauvert, 2019), p. 38.
57. Bégaudeau, p. 44.
58. Bégaudeau, p. 160.
59. Bégaudeau, p. 44.
60. Bégaudeau, p. 33.
61. Bégaudeau, p. 34.
62. Bégaudeau, pp.28-29.
63. Ibid.
64. Guy Debord, Attila Kotányi & Raoul Vaneigem, *Theses on the Paris Commune* (1962). <https://www.cddc.vt.edu/sionline/si/commune.html>.
65. Bégaudeau, p. 174.
66. Bégaudeau, p. 183.
67. Bégaudeau, p. 182.
68. <https://begaudeau.info/2019/03/24/ta-betise-sans-fin>.
69. Landa, pp. 174-75.
70. <https://winteroak.org.uk/2020/01/21/the-acorn->

54/#4.

71. Gerrard Winstanley, *The Law of Freedom* (1652).

WE DON'T WANT YOUR FASCIST FUTURE!

March 29, 2020

We don't want your "new normal".

We don't want the "smart" fascist future you have been trying to sell us for so long and which you are now trying to force upon us with lies, fear and all your infrastructures of control.

We don't want to be little submissive cogs in your machineries of greed and exploitation.

We don't want to be told how to live and what to think.

We don't want to be locked up indoors at your majesties' pleasure, only allowed out of our cells to labour for your profit.

We don't want to be distanced, isolated and alienated.

We don't want to be the individually-wrapped slices of human flesh on which you gorge.

We didn't want your first industrial revolution – when you threw us off our land and caged us in your dark satanic mills – and we certainly don't want your fourth.

We don't want to be cut off from the living world and confined to your sterile fake reality.

We don't want to be policed and preached at by your drones and robots.

We don't have to ask your permission to enjoy the world in which we belong – we will do so whenever, however and with whomever we choose.

We are not prepared to be patronised, humiliated or microchipped.

We refuse to plug ourselves meekly into the matrix of your total control.

We want you to bear in mind that you do not own us, that you cannot buy us and you will never control us.

We want you to know that we are free and will remain so unto the grave.

We want you to realise that when our time comes, we will make you pay for what you are doing to us.

And we want to remind you that there are very many more of us than of you.

RECLAIMING THE REVOLUTIONARY WISDOM OF THE PAST

April 22, 2020

Revolutionaries and radicals look bravely to the future, but are also often inspired by the past.

We look back to historical moments of revolt, to traditional ways of living or to long-lost ancient wisdom.

However, our inspiration from the past is of the same nature as our vision for the future, in that it remains fully subservient to our own inner value system.

We reject elements from an otherwise appreciated past which we would rather not include in our revolutionary future.

This is not complicated and yet it seems difficult for some in left-wing and anarchist circles to grasp.

Finding value in tradition and in past eras is sometimes dismissed out of hand as “reactionary”, “nostalgic” or “backward looking”. In Orwellian terms, it is regarded as loathsome “oldthink”.

There is a very intelligent discussion of this

issue in a book about Guy Debord and the Situationists published in France a few years ago.¹

Author Patrick Marcolini talks about the way in which elements of this influential revolutionary movement, such as its innovative *détournement* of images, have now been totally recuperated by the capitalist system.

He suggests that the Situationists' mistake was to have relied on cultural references from within the very capitalist modernity they sought to oppose.

To paraphrase Debord's own words, the Situationists could be said to have essentially followed the language of the spectacle and used its syntax.²

By embracing modernity and rejecting tradition, they effectively reinforced the contemporary capitalist narrative.

Marcolini writes: "If you want to oppose capitalism, it would be more coherent to defend that which resists capitalism, that which still lies outside of it, that which has not yet been caught up in its machineries".³

This means that revolutionaries have to become "*conservateurs*", says Marcolini – a term which has nothing to do with right-wing and capitalist "conservatism".

"The task of the ontological *conservateur* is thus to defend community, in other words the

autonomous forms of collective life and grassroots culture, and to reclaim the soil in which this can grow: the everyday activities and know-how which assure self-sufficiency and thus independence from all central power and all alienating technology”.⁴

Marcolini quotes Pier Paolo Pasolini in declaring that to connect with a past long buried under the dead weight of industrial capitalist civilization, we have to “seize from the traditionalists the monopoly of Tradition”.⁵

He goes on to explain that our aim is still revolution, however the revolution we must seek is “not the founding of something new, but the bringing into being and the rebuilding of something which has always been present”.⁶

This time Marcolini is citing Martin Buber, one of the organic radical inspirations, who was describing the idea of revolution as put forward by another organic thinker, his friend Gustav Landauer.

A critique of modernity fuelled by an interest in aspects of the past is present in the thinking of all the writers featured on the Organic Radicals website, not least, of course, Debord.

As Marcolini points out, in his later years Debord drifted further and further from the pro-modern positions which sometimes characterised the Situationist International and “came to criticise not only capitalism and the state, but

modernity itself".⁷

A critique of current society which does not challenge the whole reality of that society – a technocratic industrial capitalist reality – will always be built on sand.

If we are ever to successfully resist and bring down this ecocidal system, we will need to be inspired by thinking which has its roots outside that system, which existed before that system took hold of our lives and our minds.

We need to reclaim the past, reclaim traditional ways of thinking and living, in order to inform our collective future.

We look to the past to see what we have lost – what has been stolen from us by the modern capitalist world.

We look to the past not in order to slavishly imitate it or to attempt an impossible “return” to it, but so as to understand it, to appraise it, to take from it all that pleases, empowers and inspires us.

1. Patrick Marcolini, *Le mouvement situationniste: une histoire intellectuelle* (Paris: L’Echappée, 2012).
2. Guy Debord, *Commentaires sur la société du spectacle* (Paris: Gallimard, 1992), p. 38.
3. Marcolini, p. 328.
4. Ibid.
5. Pier Paolo Pasolini, ‘Une force du passé’, in *Via Nuove No 42*, October 18 1962, cit. Marcolini, p. 328.

6. Martin Buber, *Utopie et socialisme*, trad. P. Corset et F. Giraud (Paris: Aubier-Montaigne, 1977), p. 84, cit. Marcolini p. 330.

7. Marcolini, p. 301.

RESIST THE FOURTH INDUSTRIAL REPRESSION!

April 25, 2020

The First Industrial Repression saw us thrown off the land, forced into crowded towns and cities, used as human fodder for the dark satanic mills of the new steam-powered capitalist world.

The Second Industrial Repression electrified the rule of The Machine. New generations were born who had never tasted freedom. Their lives and their thinking were increasingly dominated by the rhythms of industrial mass production.

The Third Industrial Repression heralded the arrival of computers and robots. Human beings were now expected to meekly conform to these automated norms and functions.

And now we face the onset of the Fourth Industrial Repression (4IR), the most deathly repression of them all.

The 4IR wants to own, control and profit from everything that exists in this world.

Its Internet of Things aims to create a matrix of total connectivity, of which it is the owner.

You, your home, your family, your friends, your relationships and your activities will all belong to the 4IR.

Its technocrats regard you as nothing more than another piece of disposable fleshware, one unit among millions, just another figure on its global balance sheet of exploitation.

The 4IR will track you and always know where you are, whom you are with, what you are doing.

It demands your total obedience. You can have no values, ideals or dreams of your own, only the ones authorised by the system.

Disobedient units are unproductive units.

The 4IR will know how to spot you, if you even so much as consider stepping out of line. Its predictive policing will quickly identify you as an anti-social element, a pre-criminal, a thought criminal.

It will send out its robots and its drones to neutralise you and protect the safe functioning of the matrix.

Digital identity systems. Militarised 5G. Neuro-technological brain enhancements. Genetic editing.

Cybersecurity Macht Frei!

The 4IR will not tolerate any irresponsible words or behaviour that present a threat to health and safety, to law and order, to resilience and prosperity.

Submission. Sycophancy. Slavery. We're all in it together, citizen!

The 4IR wants to scare us into its devouring jaws by pointing to impending disaster and claiming that nobody can save us but itself.

It shows us the misery and disease inflicted by the First, Second and Third Industrial Repressions and insists that the “solution” is a fourth dose of the same deadly industrial poison.

The intelligence of the 4IR is entirely artificial and its dead robot brain cannot smell what we smell, feel what we feel, love what we love.

It coldly ignores the timeless and vital value of people, animals, trees, plants and the whole organic reality of which these form part.

Instead it sees just raw material for its own profit.

It thirsts above all for data, endless floods of data to be collected, processed, sold and transformed into the wealth which buys its total control.

The Fourth Industrial Repression wants to replace everything true and authentic with its replicas, with a reality not so much virtual as entirely fake.

And yet its forked robotic tongue tells us that this phoney reality is in fact an “enhanced” or “augmented” one.

The 4IR wants to abolish the lives we have known. It wants to microchip us, lock us up in

little cages, and force-feed us chemical food substitutes, laced with feel-good soma.

It cannot tolerate the idea that we might enjoy anything for free, such as sunshine, fresh air and the wild outdoors.

It craves a total monopoly of our experience. Cut off from the real world, from authenticity and liberty, we will have no choice but to buy and consume the poisonous ersatz reality it has carefully manufactured.

The 4IR, like all the other repressions before it, is built on our separation from one another, the destruction of our communities and the undermining of our solidarities.

“Social distancing” is the prerequisite for its seizure of complete power.

The 4IR wants us all to be on our own, online and in line.

The 4IR empties everything of meaning, particularly words. It says “sustainable” when it means ecocidal. It says “development” when it means destruction. It says “basic universal income” when it means slavery.

When the 4IR talks about “social impact investing” it really means it wants to turn human beings into lucrative investment opportunities.

Human capital. Human cattle.

When the 4IR talks about “a new deal for nature” it really means it wants to privatise the

whole living world so as to make the billionaire class even richer than it already is.

When the 4IR demands “biosecurity”, it means the security of its own systems of control against the threat from biological reality. From nature, from life, from us!

The 4IR thinks it is so smart. Its glossy propaganda promises us smart mobility in a smart economy, smart living and smart governance for the smart people of tomorrow.

The smart money is on the 4IR project. The smart money of the smart-arse smart set. Smart is the new smug.

The 4IR employs huge armies of professional liars and gullible fools to spread its propaganda and scream abuse at all who dare challenge its fearmongering falsehoods.

The 4IR is a death cult which dreams of wiping out everything that is natural, everything that is wild, everything that is free.

Resist the Fourth Industrial Repression!

Fight the 4IR!

ANARCHISTS AGAINST FREEDOM!

April 26, 2020

A number of rather strange criticisms have come flying my way over the last few weeks.

For the moment I am going to address just one of them – the one which strikes me as the most serious.

I had always been under the fond impression that freedom was an untouchable cornerstone of the anarchist worldview. The word certainly features a lot in anarchist literature and culture!

However, it turns out that sometimes freedom is not a good thing at all, according to certain comrades with whom I have been exchanging views.

Their issue was with the concept of individual freedom, which they even insisted on writing in inverted commas to make their distaste for the term quite clear.

The first objection that sprung into their minds was that individual freedom was part of the language of Donald Trump and gun-toting libertarians in the USA.

This meant, according to the usual fashion-

able anti-logic, that anyone who believed in individual freedom was therefore dangerously contaminated with the ideologies of the American capitalist right.

Putting this absurdity aside, there is a serious point lurking in there, in that it is true that individual freedom is cited by capitalists in defence of their world of exploitation and inequality.

The anarchist concept of freedom necessarily also involves a collective aspect, recognising that the freedom of the individual depends on the freedom of the society of which she or he is a part.

There is also the issue of responsibility, in that anarchists do not expect individuals to pursue their freedom at the expense of others, but to feel their responsibility to the greater whole.

As one anarchist writer has put it: “Real freedom and real responsibility are so intertwined and interdependent in their meaning as to be almost inseparable”.

The fact that this anarchist was me (in my 2015 book *Forms of Freedom*) should hint strongly that I am not in fact advocating the me-first kind of freedom touted by capitalist libertarians.

But this is how it apparently seemed to my critics, purely because of my opposition to the

global police-state lockdown of our basic freedoms imposed on the back of the coronavirus panic.

From their point of view, it was irresponsible to complain about loss of individual freedom (sorry, “individual freedom”) when the greater good of the community, the need to protect ourselves and others from contagion, was at stake.

I disagree with this on two levels.

In the specific context of what is happening today, I do not accept that the virus is a threat that justifies the authoritarian clamp-down on our lives that has been rolled out, as I have already stated.

Therefore, the freedom of the individual is not trumped by an overriding social responsibility to accept what is basically a state of martial law.

Moreover, because the virus has been massively exaggerated as cover for a totalitarian-financial grab of power and wealth, the true social responsibility lies in the opposite direction.

From my point of view, the freedom of the individual to seek out a quiet life by just going along with all this, by keeping his or her head down, is overridden by the responsibility to speak out, to challenge the propaganda, to alert society to what is happening and to urge people to resist.

Obviously from my critics' stance, this is not a valid argument, because they are starting from the assumption that the virus is as real and as deadly as we have been constantly told by the authorities and their media.

This, in itself, is deeply problematic. What happened to "question everything?" It is not possible to build a critique of oppression without being prepared to challenge the assumptions used to justify that oppression.

The anarchist argument about collective responsibility, when transplanted into the soil of deceit, grows upside-down.

The logic that should require people to act for the common good is reversed and serves to instead condemn those who are acting for the common good and trying to expose the fraud.

The second level of my disagreement with these critics concerns their ideological interpretation of responsibility and freedom.

Here, I find that their thinking strays a very long way from the anarchist outlook.

I did, in fact, deal with all this in *Forms of Freedom*. It's now available as a free pdf on the Winter Oak site (as are all my other books) and to understand my position in more depth, I recommend having a look.

This passage on responsibility is particularly relevant:

"Part of the confusion surrounding the term

responsibility arises from the manner in which it is abused to suit certain purposes. It is often conflated with the notion of *conformity* or *obedience* not to the interests of the collectivity, but to an entity which is passing itself off as representing those interests”.

By this I meant the state, of course, as I went on to explain: the entity which tells people that their responsibility to obey orders overrules their individual freedom.

I pointed out in the book that this responsibility to obey the law is never imagined as emerging from an individual’s own judgement – hence the perceived irresponsibility of ‘taking the law into your own hands’ – but is seen as required in the interests of a collective good defined from above rather than below.

Whether that law is good or bad is irrelevant: “The important point is that the responsibility in question is seen as something that must be accepted regardless of one’s free conscience, rather than as the result of it.

“There is an important conflict here between fake and real responsibility, between imposed and free responsibility, between responsibility dictated from the outside and responsibility assumed from the inside of the individual.

“Ultimately, those who propose an imposed responsibility do so because they are afraid of the real responsibility which emerges from within.

“An *imposed* responsibility can be invoked to demand obedience to arbitrary rules constructed for the selfish interests of a minority which maintains control of stolen wealth through the violence of authority in all its forms.

“A *real* responsibility could well lead individuals, or communities, to challenge those arbitrary rules and the phoney morality built up around them”.

Anyone who champions a duty of collective responsibility which involves suppressing individual freedom is not invoking real responsibility, but the imposed kind.

“The individual is part of the collectivity and the collectivity is made up of individuals. *They are the same living thing with the same interests at heart*”.

Freedom and responsibility are two aspects of the same thing and so are the individual and the collectivity.

The collectivity needs individuals to be free, because without that freedom the social organism would be dead.

“It is important for the collectivity that individuals are free to live according to the subtlest demands of their nature, for only in that way can the collectivity also live according to the subtlest demands of its nature.

“A collectivity cannot be free unless the individuals who make it up are all free. An

individual cannot be free unless they are living in a collectivity which is free, that is to say in which all individuals are free”.

To turn our backs on the symbiotic relationship between individual and collective interests is to turn our backs on anarchism.

It is, in fact, to adopt a way of thinking shared by liberalism and fascism, which are not at all the opposites which they might appear, as I explain elsewhere.

Both these systems of control (the first more subtle than the second) are based on lies. They twist the truth, even reverse the meanings of words in order to impose their own agenda, as George Orwell so perfectly showed us in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*.

Liberalism and fascism both use a language which suggests the full participation of the population in the workings of society, which even appears to involve a kind of symbiosis like the one referred to above.

Liberals label this involvement “democracy” and have, until now at least, gone to great lengths to maintain this illusion, which is the principal justification for the legitimacy of their system.

But it’s just a sham, of course. It always has been. The game is rigged in so many ways and on so many levels.

Fascists don’t like the term “democracy” and

prefer to talk about “the nation”, which is supposedly the incorporation of the collective interests of the people.

Sometimes they have even stolen the language of the social organism to give the impression that there is something natural about their system.

But the social organism, for fascists, can never be a living entity of free individuals acting according to their own consciences, as it is for anarchists.

Their imagined organism is more like a robot, under the total control of the fascist state.

The reality behind the liberals’ fake democracy and the fascists’ fake organism is one and the same – a ruling elite which only pretends to be acting in the interests of everyone.

A contempt for the “masses”, for the “mob”, for the “great unwashed”, the “*Untermensch*” is shared by both systems because they are elitist and authoritarian.

They are systems which impose the control of the ruling class over the people.

From the perspective of the ruling class, the idea that we could run our own lives and our own societies without their structures of control is a dangerous one.

That is why they talk fearfully about “descending into anarchy”. Their worst nightmare is that their slaves might break free.

This is why they often depict human nature as selfish, greedy and violent – thus needing the firm hand of the liberal/fascist state to keep it under control.

This is why they sometimes prefer to say that there is no such thing as human nature at all, thus rejecting the empowering anarchist idea that we are all born with the natural capacity or tendency to live co-operatively and more or less harmoniously.

It is a primary assumption of liberalism/fascism that we cannot be trusted to make our own decisions, that we are basically irresponsible and in need of control and “protection” from our wise and benevolent leaders.

To keep us safe. From each other.

So why is this living freedom, sourced from the individual-collective symbiosis, not recognised by all anarchists today?

Why do they regurgitate the liberal/fascist lie that individual freedom and the collective good are incompatible?

The problem, for me, is that too many anarchists are today entirely trapped within what I called “the inherent thought-restriction of the dominant system”.

This stifling contemporary newthink completely negates the timeless human wisdom from which anarchist philosophy emerged.

It sees human beings as programmable and malleable machines. Artificiality triumphs over authenticity. Any talk of social organism is seen as reactionary or borderline fascist (a typical inversion).

The notion of essence is dismissed out of hand, the idea of innateness can provoke panic attacks, meaning is regarded as meaningless, nature as reactionary, ethics as a construction, quality as an illusion.

There is no truth or reality. Two plus two can equal five if it suits the *liedeology*.

“Any way of thinking outside this ever-narrowing framework becomes impossible in a *post-natural, post-human, post-authentic* intellectual climate that effectively constitutes a complete *paralysis* of the collective human mind”, as I wrote.

Contemporary newthink is binary, one-dimensional. It does not understand multi-dimensional thinking and cannot embrace creative paradox.

It can only ever see individual freedom and collective responsibility as opposites.

It is incapable of even hearing, let alone understanding, oldthink arguments that soar above its empty and flattened-out dogmas.

In short, people are attaching the anarchist label, and a sort of shallow parody of anarchist ideology, to something which is not anarchism at

all.

This pseudo-anarchist thinking has not grown from anarchist philosophy and therefore can never be anything but a replica anarchism, a zombie anarchism which appears to be the real thing but lacks the anarchist soul.

This fake anarchism is the sworn enemy of true anarchism. By stealing the body of anarchism, it banishes real anarchism from the world.

Whenever real anarchism does emerge, this zombie anarchism points an accusatory finger at it and declares it to be dangerous.

This is anti-anarchism, upside-down anarchism, inverted anarchism.

I have been going on about all this for years. Sometimes I have wondered if it is as important as all that, whether I could not just accept some philosophical differences with comrades in the interests of working and campaigning together.

But now that anarchists are getting angry with me for believing in freedom, I can see very clearly what was worrying me all along.

THE REBELS WILL RETURN

April 29, 2020

I have always been proud to be an anarchist.

I am proud to have found my way to anarchism some 30 years ago, proud to have learned all I could about anarchism, to have put anarchism into practice, to have met existing anarchists, to have led others towards anarchism, to have written and talked so much about anarchism.

I have lived anarchism and I know that I will die an anarchist.

That is why it pains me to have had to say that there are today some fundamental problems at the very heart of the anarchist movement, problems which reach deep into the very way it thinks and feels.

It saddens me to have had to point out that what presents itself to the outside world as anarchism is often nothing but the empty shell of anarchism, a zombie anarchism, still stumbling ahead with black flag held aloft, but cruelly robbed of its soul.

Needless to say there are plenty of anar-

chists around the world who are true to the essence of the idea, some of whom have let me know that they share my concerns.

But I have got a horrible feeling that these authentic anarchists are, these days, very much in the minority.

My first inkling that all was not well with anarchism, and indeed the wider social movement to which it belongs, came nearly 19 years ago.

Up until that moment, everything had been going swimmingly well for me. I was inspired and delighted by the seemingly unstoppable tide of the global anti-capitalist revolt of which I formed a tiny part.

I should say here that I wasn't at the great battles of Seattle, Prague or Genoa, although I was in the City of London on June 18, 1999, and at the subsequent Mayday events.

But missing out on all the "summit hopping" didn't make me any less enthusiastic about the great revolution that seemed to be approaching.

My comrades and I made sure the inhabitants of our home town were well aware of what was happening across the world, via leaflets, bulletins, posters, meetings, protests and squatted infoshops.

I am sure I was still feeling as motivated as ever on September 11 2001, as a group of us travelled to London Docklands to protest against

the DSEI arms fair.

The demo ground to a halt when news started coming in of the attacks on the Twin Towers in New York and people rushed to the pub to watch TV.

We didn't, of course, understand the implications of what had happened and initially welcomed it as another sign of the impending collapse of the evil empire.

The actual effect of 9/11 on our struggle only became clear to me a few weeks later when I was attending a meeting in the nearby city whose thriving anarchist scene was, to me and my friends, a constant source of inspiration.

Someone who had been very much part of the pink-and-silver-samba-bloc Zeitgeist of the uprising told me that she wouldn't be doing that any more. It didn't seem right, after the terrorist attack, to continue our carnival-cum-war against the USA and its world of capitalism.

I was completely taken aback by this comment. I simply couldn't imagine how anyone – anyone on my side! – could have come to that decision.

Stop fighting against everything that was bad in the world because something else bad had happened, something that wasn't our fault, that was nothing to do with us, that had no bearing on the reasons or the aims of our struggle?

My disappointment resonates now across the

years, vibrating with the brave new world of 2020...

Fortunately, this wasn't the end of the movement to which I had attached myself. It morphed seamlessly into the radical wing of the anti-war movement in 2002 and 2003.

The demos were less fun-based now, maybe, but the energy was very much still in evidence, together with a firmness of ethical conviction that was well able to withstand the weapons of mass deception unleashed by Blair, Campbell and Bush.

It wasn't just anarchists who didn't believe their lies, of course. Millions of people rejected their message of fear and took to the streets to say so.

The authorities hadn't quite perfected their narrative projection in those days. They hadn't properly closed down all the possibilities of dissent. But that still didn't stop them from going ahead with the invasion of Iraq!

Another moment of disappointment for me came in the summer of 2005 during the anti-G8 mobilisation in Scotland, one which was strangely similar to that of 2001.

Once again our protests came to a halt, this time because of the 7/7 carnage down in London.

Once again something bad had happened somewhere else, something that wasn't our fault, that was nothing to do with us, that had no

bearing on the reasons or the aims of our protest.

Some people were saying we should call off the planned demos. Why? Why would we want to do that?

I recall that we broke down into *barrio* meetings to discuss what to do. Our group was certainly in favour of carrying on the mobilisation and I heard later that the same was true of others.

But, somehow or other, the non-leaders at the Stirling convergence space deemed that the democratic decision had been taken to throw in the towel. Their de-escalation team went into action to defuse all that inconvenient anarchist rage.

They must have diligently continued their work everywhere afterwards, because from that point on, there seemed to be decreasing levels of anger, and indeed, energy, in the UK movement.

The very idea of physically opposing global capitalist summits, which had so inspired me in the past, was now considered hopelessly old hat.

The 2013 Stop The G8 campaign was largely snubbed by what was left of the anarchist movement in the country and the London mobilisation would have been a total flop without the enthusiastic participation of European comrades.

Since then, the movement and its attitudes seem to have become progressively drained of the

coherent and powerful worldview which drew me to anarchism as a young man in search of political and philosophical truth.

Every couple of years, a new fashionable obsession seems to have taken a grip, speaking a language I do not know in order to express views which are completely alien to me.

Noam Chomsky has spoken about the “incomprehensible gibberish that comes out of left-wing intellectual movements”, which he described as “just impossible to understand”.¹

There are two obvious consequences to this relentless advance of the anarchist scene into an intellectual and political dead-end.

Firstly, the people it recruits will be those who are prepared to uncritically conform to its one-dimensional newthink, who are willing to surrender their own independence of thought and swallow what Chomsky called “the latest version of post-modern this and that”.

It now turns out, at this historical moment, that these are exactly the kind of people who are eager to accept whatever version of the truth is presented to them by authority figures.

They are also the kind of people who are eager to condemn and ostracise any old-fashioned anarchists who have the audacity to think for themselves.

I have noticed that, inevitably I suppose, they do so using the same reflexes and language

with which they try to impose their dogma on their comrades.

The whole world becomes a “safer space” when they insist that you should not question martial-law lockdown because you could put others at risk.

When you point out that the virus is mainly killing those who are already sick or old, they declare that you are “ablist” and use their familiar shaming and accusatory tone in order to imply that drawing attention to the relatively low mortality rate is the same thing as welcoming the deaths of those who have sadly succumbed.

Someone saw fit to slip into his argument against my condemnation of the clampdown the fact that I am “white”, which apparently means my views on absolutely everything are hopelessly polluted by privilege and can happily be ignored by all left-thinking citizens. (He is also “white”, by the way).

The guilt-by-association smearing is pushed to the extreme. Whatever view you share which is critical of the panic and the global police state it has spawned turns out to be illegitimate because the person who expressed it is a believer in the wrong kind of freedom, or is an “anti-vaxxer”, or uses language or arguments that sound suspiciously alt-right, or has otherwise not earned the blue tick of ideological purity.

Their greatest magical weapon is, of course, the term “conspiracy theorist”. No sooner is it brandished, than all need to refute fact or engage logically is dispelled in a great puff of newthink smoke.

The argument has been won without even the need to address it!

The other side of the coin, the corollary to the take-over of the movement by zombie-anarchists, is the question of what has happened to all the born anarchists.

Chomsky’s comments came in the context of his concern that young people would be turned away from anarchism by the cult-like ideological fixations that are today so dominant.

It’s not even just the young. There are people of all ages who learn a little bit about anarchism, would like to find out more with a view to getting involved and so dip their toes into the water by turning up at an anarchist venue or event.

If they run a mile and never come back, what happens to them? And what happens to those who never even get that far, who get one faint whiff of the stifling intellectual claustrophobia via the internet and realise there is no place for them in that self-righteous and puritan little world?

I think they are still out there. They may or may not think of themselves as anarchists. They may use other labels or none at all. We don’t

have to give ourselves labels.

But they are still anarchists, natural anarchists, the rebels who would have formed a strong and healthy anti-capitalist movement if it had not been sabotaged from within by the zombies.

They are the anarchists who would have stood up, in anger and *en masse*, against the coronavirus *coup d'état*.

These natural anarchists will keep emerging in each generation, because a love of freedom and truth is part of what it means to be human.

They may emerge and rise up now, straight away, in the face of this unprecedented global power grab.

Or it may happen later, when they have had a chance to reorientate themselves and find each other.

But we can be sure that sooner or later they will cast off their muzzles, unplug their chains and try to smash to pieces the slave-system which has stolen everything from them.

Because, after all, as Gustav Landauer² put it, anarchy is life. Where there's life there's anarchy. Where there's anarchy there's hope.

1. Noam Chomsky, 'Anarchism, Intellectuals and the State', *Chomsky on Anarchism*, ed. by Barry Pateman (Edinburgh, Oakland and West Virginia: AK Press, 2005), p.217.

2. Gustav Landauer, *Revolution and Other Writings: A Political Reader*, ed. and trans. by Gabriel Kuhn (Oakland: PM Press, 2010), p. 74.

MONEY, LIES AND POWER

May 21, 2020

We all know that money is what makes this commercial world go round.

The cult of money has swept away the traditional ethical codes of humankind and become the sole indicator of “value”.

If something makes money, it is good. If it doesn't, it is useless. If someone accumulates money, by whatever means, they are “successful”. If they don't, they are a “failure”.

But we also all know that money is not real. It consists of nothing more than pieces of paper, or electronic figures, which are universally agreed to represent something.

For most of us, money is the whip that keeps us in line. Because we need it in order to survive, we are forced to spend the best decades of our lives working for money.

Most work does not directly give us what we need or want. It is merely a means to another means, a way of earning money so we can buy various goods and services.

The vast majority of people use money to pay

for food and drink, shelter, clothing, leisure activities and whatever little luxuries are affordable in the part of the world in which they live.

What about the really “successful” people, though, the people who have accumulated unimaginably vast amounts of money, at the expense of the rest of us? What does money do for them?

It provides them with their lavish lifestyles of course – all their mansions and private jets and designer clothes and furniture and cars and plastic surgery. Money can buy people too, whether to work for their interests, massage their egos or satisfy their sexual desires.

But most of all, and most worryingly for the rest of us, it brings them power.

Lies are another important part of their domination.

There is the lie that they “deserve” their wealth because they are somehow better than the rest of us – a total inversion of the truth since the obsessive pursuit of money speaks only of ruthless and sociopathic greed.

There is the lie that all of this is somehow normal, that it is right and proper that a tiny elite are sitting smugly at the top of a pyramid of global exploitation which sees those at the bottom condemned to lives of abject misery.

And there is the lie that this world of theirs

is “democratic”, that we have the freedom to collectively determine the way we live.

Anyone who is the slightest bit awake will have noticed that today this last lie is looking hollower than ever.

With the totalitarian measures being introduced on the back of the Covid panic, it looks as if the ruling class have decided to finally ditch the pretence of “liberal democracy” and its illusion of freedom.

As Frank Zappa warned: “The illusion of freedom will continue as long as it’s profitable to continue the illusion. At the point where the illusion becomes too expensive to maintain, they will just take down the scenery, they will pull back the curtains, they will move the tables and chairs out of the way and you will see the brick wall at the back of the theater”.

I am beginning to wonder if money will be the next illusion that is ditched by the ruling class.

This is not going to happen quite yet, of course. The Covid crisis promises to be a bonanza for the richest of the rich, who will be greedily hoovering up all the wealth previously in the hands of small-scale businesses and individuals, as well as ramping up their relentless robbery of the working classes.

Not only will the ultrarich benefit from “emergency” spending by the world’s govern-

ments, but their banking branch will be happily harvesting the interest on the debts run up to pay for it all.

And, of course, there is all the Fourth Industrial Revolution technology in which they have invested, which will now be forced on us under the pretext of public health, and the planned monetisation of everything alive through the so-called “New Deal for Nature”.

But, as we have seen, money is just a means to an end. It is the key to the door of power and, after a few more years of what we are seeing now, the ultrarich and their vitaphobic death-cult will have all the power that they crave.

This would no longer have to be gained by *buying* anything, whether resources, land, infrastructure, institutions or people, because the elite would already own them.

All they would have to do is to *maintain* that power, by using all the totalitarian techniques of surveillance and control that are currently being rolled out at such an alarming speed.

George Orwell’s *Nineteen Eighty-Four* merits regular re-reading and every time I do so, my eyes are opened to a new level of this extraordinarily prophetic warning.

During the torture session towards the end of the book, O’Brien asks Winston Smith why he thinks the Big Brother regime wants power.

Smith starts by telling O’Brien the lie he

thinks his torturer wants to hear, that the Party is ruling people for their own good because “you believe that human beings are not fit to govern themselves”.

He receives a hefty electric shock for this mistake and O'Brien puts him straight, explaining: “The Party seeks power entirely for its own sake. We are not interested in the good of others; we are interested solely in power”.

He adds: “We know that no one ever seizes power with the intention of relinquishing it. Power is not a means; it is an end... The object of persecution is persecution. The object of torture is torture. The object of power is power”.

For centuries now, the ruling class have been stealing everything from us. They have thrown us off our land, destroyed our communities and our cultures, deprived us of our precious days of living by forcing us to work for their fake money just to survive. They have stolen our very sense of who we are, our connection to nature, to each other, to our own bodies.

And now, in 2020, they are trying to take this a step further. Just look at everything happening on the back of the Covid hysteria!

People are being forced to wear masks, symbolising their silent submission to authority, are told they now have to be bound in electronic chains and be injected with whatever toxic substances our rulers see fit.

We are not allowed to go outside unless Big Brother says so, not allowed to socialise with our friends, not allowed to ask any questions or express any dissent.

We are being stripped of our dignity, our freedom, our privacy, our autonomy, of everything that makes us human.

This is psychotic megalomania, deliberate humiliation, sadistic mistreatment amounting to torture, carried out on a global scale. We are being whipped and beaten and pissed upon, while our ruling class prison guards laugh in our faces.

And why? Because the ultrarich have utter contempt for us and want to lock us permanently down into a condition of cowed slavery.

That, for them, is the ultimate power-trip, the ultimate confirmation that they are “successful” and “superior” to us. The object of power is power. The object of domination is domination.

They have obviously calculated that they can get away with this, that their wealth, power and lies are now so all-conquering, and the majority of humankind so supine, gutless and malleable, that they will simply be able to trample all over us, for ever.

It is up to us to prove them wrong.

FASCISM, NEWNORMALISM AND THE LEFT

July 26, 2020

Sometimes secondhand books can come into our possession in ways that make it quite clear they need us to read them.

Such was the case with *Le fascisme italien* by Pierre Milza and Serge Berstein,¹ which reached me by means of a random sequence of events including a friend moving flat, an unexpected traffic jam and a small public park on the outskirts of Paris.

It did not disappoint and, as I am about to explain in more detail, helped me to see a number of crucial issues more clearly.

Firstly, it confirmed that, despite constant claims to the contrary, fascism was not at all anti-capitalist, but extremely pro-capitalist.

Secondly, it presented interesting parallels with the Coronavirus-linked totalitarian mindset so dominant in 2020, which I am calling ‘newnormalism’.

Thirdly, it sparked some wider reflection on my part about the participation of most of the

left in this 21st century authoritarianism and how that relates to my own anti-fascist position.

FASCISM AND CAPITALISM

It is well known, I think, that Benito Mussolini, the fascist dictator, began his political career on the left and, when he started building a movement immediately after the First World War, the initial programme that attracted support was left-wing, with anarchist influences.

However, as Milza and Berstein make abundantly clear, this prototype fascism was quickly and drastically ditched as Mussolini realised the only way he was going to gain the power he craved was with the support of capitalists and big landowners.

Much much later, at the end of the Second World War, in a desperate last-ditch attempt to rally the Italian people behind them in the face of defeat, the hardcore fascist Saló republic rediscovered their socialist side, but it was all hopelessly too late.

Having lived through the fascist *ventennio* (20 years), the population were not going to fall for any more redwashing attempts or superficial anti-bourgeois posturing. They had seen clearly that fascism in power defended the interests of Capital, rather than the people.

The authors trace this story back to 1910,

when the Italian Nationalist Association was founded with “the support of certain business circles, in particular that of heavy industry”,² who had a very obvious direct vested interest in promoting the nationalist call for Italian participation in the approaching war in Europe.

It was Mussolini’s sudden support for Italy going to war (on the Allied side) that led to him being thrown out of the socialist party, the PSI, splitting from others on the left. This left him ideally placed to benefit from capitalist funding, though it is not clear whether his conversion to the war cause was actually motivated by this consideration.

It is known that Mussolini received money from the French government and from pro-war businessmen like Filippo Naldi.

The first fascist general assembly in 1919 took place in a hall in Milan lent by a group of wealthy capitalists.

Fascism benefited greatly from the ruling classes’ fear of a Bolshevik-style revolution in Italy, with post-war waves of strikes and a rural movement which reclaimed land from rich property owners.

Explain the authors: “The fear born in the world of the country landowners as a result of the land occupation movement greatly outlived the phenomenon itself and helped pushed them into the arms of fascism, through fear of a

challenge to property rights”.³

Business organisations such as *Confagricoltura* and *Confindustria* were set up to defend capitalism. Fascism was happy to win favour by providing them with foot soldiers, *squadristi*, who physically attacked trade unionists and leftists in a wave of “preventative counter-revolution”.⁴

This, say Milza and Berstein, represented fascism’s big break and funds started to roll in from business, banks and big landowners.

Moreover, the fascists started receiving the support of local authorities, the army and the police in their fight against leftist ‘subversion’. They were the system’s emergency weapon against the threat of revolution.

“Prefects, magistrates and officers of the Carabinieri let the fascists carry on and assured them of impunity. The moment that the State started to crumble, the bourgeoisie, so frightened by the popular uprising of 1919-20, lent their support to fascism’s reactionary violence”.⁵

In November 1920, for instance, violent fascist squads descended on Bologna, where the radical left had gained control of the local council. There were nine deaths and more than 100 injuries.

Elsewhere, in the next couple of years, they smashed up trade union and co-operative HQs and attacked working-class districts, wielding

clubs and revolvers to force strikers back to work.

By now the fascists had stopped pretending to be left-wing and were openly singing the praises of capitalism and economic liberalism.⁶

“Mussolini himself set before the future party a manifesto which no longer owed anything to the leftist tendencies of 1919. In the economic realm it was absolute liberalism, with the State indulging in no intervention or nationalisation, or any fiscal measures deemed ‘populist’. On the political and social side, a strong State was to be created, capable of imposing the ban on strikes in the public sector”.⁷

This was authoritarian capitalism, meant to please “the big money interests from whom Mussolini was now seeking political and financial backing”.⁸

As the future dictator said himself: “We are liberal economically, but we will never be so politically”.⁹ This was a question of sacrificing political liberalism in the interests of economic liberalism, aka capitalism.¹⁰

Once the fascists were in power, the clamp-down on opposition was ruthless. Strikes were banned and workers found themselves defenceless against their bosses.

Fascist economic policies were all in the interests of the ruling class. When finance minister Alberto De Stefani reformed the tax

system in 1923 this “was above all to the profit of the rich”.¹¹

He offered tax breaks for foreign investors, did away with the “red tape” of bodies controlling food prices and rents, ended state funding for co-operatives and halted land reforms which threatened the interests of rich landowners.

After 1925, in the face of economic crisis, the pure economic liberalism of the Manchester School went out of the window, in favour of state intervention.

But this was intervention in the interests of business and Capital, not in the interests of the Italian people whom fascism mendaciously claimed to represent!

‘Development’ was at the forefront of fascist plans, as is the case with all industrial capitalists. More land was cultivated and an infrastructure of roads, new towns and industrial estates was built.

“A vast programme of public works was undertaken, carried out by private firms, who were offered lucrative contracts by the State. Electrification of the rail system began, with the construction of tunnels on the Rome-Naples and Bologna-Florence lines. A massive roadbuilding programme was entrusted to ANAS (*Azienda Nazionale Autonoma delle Strade*), created in 1928, which oversaw the showcase construction of big toll motorways, the first in Europe”.¹²

This was nothing other than a bailing-out of the capitalist economy by the pro-business fascist state, for which the cost would ultimately have to be borne by the public.

Ring any bells in 2020?

Banks were also treated to fascist largesse, notably BCI, saved by the Italian state with a massive influx of money.

The authors note: “There was neither socialisation nor nationalisation. The State became capitalist; it guaranteed the property of most of the shareholders and their future dividends. The only socialisation was that of the losses, assumed by the public purse”.¹³

In 1931, Mussolini even set up a body, *L'Istituto mobiliare italiano*, with the role of helping businesses in financial trouble, declaring that this was “a means of energetically driving the Italian economy towards its corporative phase, which is to say a system which fundamentally respects private property and initiative, but ties them tightly to the State, which alone can protect, control and nourish them”.¹⁴

But the emphasis was very much on the big businesses and financiers allied with the fascist regime. Economic crisis saw numerous small and medium-sized firms go to the wall or gobbled up by big companies, as the fascist state aided this concentration of wealth into ever-fewer hands.¹⁵

“As for the working classes,” add Milza and

Berstein, “they paid the price for this alliance, with unemployment, reduced wages and higher cost of living”.¹⁶

Fascist corporatism, with its officially-approved phoney trade unions, was supposed to bring together workers and bosses in the interests of the nation, but did nothing of the sort: “It allowed big industry and financial groups to use the State’s arbitration and power of coercion to reinforce their positions and impose their law on their employees”.¹⁷

“Far from being destroyed by fascism as the first proto-fascist manifesto suggested, Italian capitalism found in it a defender which managed to save it from revolution or collapse and went on to reinforce its structures and its means of action”.¹⁸

It was not for nothing that the bankers of J.P. Morgan boosted the fascist regime with a \$100m loan¹⁹ between 1925 and 1927 or that Winston Churchill praised, during a 1927 visit, Mussolini’s success in defending Italy from what he termed international subversion. He meant the radical left.²⁰

FASCISM AND NEWNORMALISM

Already, in the above account of Milza and Berstein’s work, there are some striking parallels with society a hundred years after the fascists

seized power in Italy, in particular regarding the way in which a pro-capitalist regime will use the power of the State not to control big business, but to rescue it from collapse, defend its wealth and impose its interests on the people.

But the similarities become still more alarming when we consider the ideological framing of the fascist mission.

Everything was to be “new” under fascism. A new creed for a new Italian people in a new Italy. The old days were gone for good and nothing would ever be the same again. Mussolini’s dictatorship was the New Normal.

The regime tried to change the date to symbolise this complete rupture, insisting that party members stopped thinking in terms of the 1920s or 1930s and instead spoke of Year 8 or 10 of the fascist New Order.²¹

It also tried to abolish handshakes – not because they might spread disease but because they represented the decadent old world that had been left behind. Socially-distanced fascist salutes were preferred.²²

It hoped that a fascist future would be carried forward by a new brainwashed generation, building a cult of youth and a structure of youth organisations which aimed to foster “obedience and fanatical attachment to the regime”.²³

Fascism differed from other pro-capitalist

and authoritarian regimes in that it aimed to reshape, to reinvent, everything about society.

Milza and Berstein stress “its totalitarian character, in other words the way in which it tried to direct and control every aspect of every individual’s activity and thinking”.²⁴

These early 20th century fascists, like the newnormalists today, were obsessed with “remodelling the social body and transforming it radically”.²⁵

Mussolini dreamed of “the fascisation of the spirit, complete transformation of society and the creation of a new man... with a radically new conception of the world”.²⁶

It is when we look at what this new fascist existence would actually involve that we can begin to understand the agenda behind this early experiment in behavioural change.

The authors explain: “It was about reducing all Italians to the same model, that of the fascist man. This ‘new’ man was not to be defined by ideas, actions, faith or social utility but by a ‘style’, the fascist custom, taken straight from futurist raptures. Speed, dynamism, efficiency and decisiveness were its main components”.²⁷

Futurism, one of the great inspirations for Italian fascism, was the ideology of industrialism, of the man-machine, of the surrender of all that was human and natural to the giant cogs and turbines of technological progress.

20th century industrial capitalism needed a new kind of human being – a regimented, automated human being – to fit in with its brave new world and the unimaginable profits and power that could roll off its factory conveyor belts.

Inconveniently, actual human beings – reactionaries, oldthinkers, enemies of progress – did not seem to want to remould themselves to suit the requirements of capitalist machinery, so compulsion was required.

“Only a strong power could impose on the masses the sacrifices necessary for the accumulation of capital”,²⁸ note Milza and Bernstein and, indeed, one of the great successes of the fascist period in Italy was “the acceleration of the working rhythm”.²⁹

Mussolini wanted to “modernise” Italians in the way that Margaret Thatcher modernised British people in the 1980s or in which Emmanuel Macron has been trying to modernise the French with his own brand of neoliberal authoritarianism.

And today there is a global attempt to modernise us all in order to suit the requirements of 21st century capitalism and its nightmarish Fourth Industrial Repression.

We are to be reduced to fearful, isolated, obedient and dependent cattle owned and exploited by a ruthless and truthless financial

elite.

Once again, we have not been shuffling fast enough towards the abyss on our own, so “strong power” has been activated, on the back of the Coronavirus hysteria, to shove us deeper into the jaws of the life-consuming industrial beast.

The propagandistic language, hysterical mass brainwashing and police-state coercion used by the newnormalists for their “Great Reset” are straight out of Mussolini’s hundred-year-old handbook.

NEWNORMALISM AND THE LEFT

There is at least one significant difference between the fascist period and today’s newnormalism and that concerns the left.

As we have seen, Mussolini came to power on the back of attacking the left, earning him the gratitude of a ruling class scared by the prospect of revolution. Once in power, he did all he could to destroy it, with most left-wing radicals fleeing Italy or ending up in jail.

Indeed, my reading Milza and Berstein’s book led to a conversation with a woman whose grandfather, a left-wing activist in Italy, had been forced to escape the fascist regime and settle in France.

Today, however, there is a resounding silence from most of the left in the face of the

newnormalist totalitarian coup.

Many of them, even some self-described anarchists, are enthusiastic supporters of the fascistic “lockdown” and compulsory mask-wearing. They regard support for the system and its framing of reality as socially responsible and therefore “left-wing”. Anyone who challenges the system is irresponsible and therefore “right-wing”.

How on earth has this happened? How can it be that the left – theoretically anti-capitalist and anti-fascist – finds itself marching in step with totalitarian capitalist newnormalism?

Putting aside the possible factors of sheer gullibility and deceitful bad faith, I can see two reasons for this total ethical and ideological collapse.

The first is the way that much left-wing thinking has drifted away from direct opposition to capitalism. The beginning of this was, I think, the failure to understand that industrialism is nothing other than capitalism and that technological progress is not the same thing as social or human progress.

The left has therefore evolved within the framework of industrial capitalism, essentially accepting its basic premises. As a result, the left often has nothing more to propose than a reform of capitalism, or its relabelling.

Increasingly it has been sidetracked into

defending the right of various minorities to be fully accepted within capitalist society.

Nothing wrong with that in itself, but it does not tackle the central injustice of the full-spectrum rule of a tiny elite class and the ways in which this central injustice is hidden from view and excluded from the realm of political discussion. Indeed, it helps to hide it still further from view.

Neither does it challenge the domination of industrialism and often reinforces its myth of “progress”.

The second reason concerns human nature. It has become widely accepted on the left that there is no innate human nature, that our minds are born as blank slates and, like machines, we are “programmed” by family and society to become who we are.

In fact, this misunderstanding arises from the broader failure to understand that human beings are part of nature, which is a planet-sized collective organism (see my book *Nature, Essence and Anarchy*).

Denying the existence of human nature effectively involves denying us all our primary freedom – to be who we are.

It automatically justifies outside imposition on each individual, and indeed community, in order to ensure that we are all “programmed” the right way.

This attitude can begin with a relatively harmless over-emphasis on formal top-down education (rather than allowing people to discover and think for themselves), but ends up with an insistence on controlling and policing every aspect of everyone's lives.

Both these factors in fact stem from the contamination of left-wing thinking by liberal ideas. Liberalism is, of course, the philosophy of capitalism. Economic liberalism was, as we have seen, a central pillar of historical fascism.

So it should come as no surprise that a strong liberal influence on left-wing thinking should result in it siding with the capitalist fascism of newnormalism.

Left-liberals have taken on board the ruling class's elitist belief that the mass of people are incapable of thinking or acting properly without strict supervision and training.

Total freedom, for them as for our rulers, is thus a frightening concept, one which has to be permanently penned in with qualifications and restrictions.

In this they are adopting the opposite ideological position to that of classical anarchism (real anarchism) and organic radicalism.

The mainstay of this current of thinking, to which I associate myself, is that human (and animal) nature is innately co-operative and that it is only the domination and exploitation

imposed on us for many centuries that has forced people into an unhealthy condition of narrow individual selfishness combined with pathological dependence on authority.

For real anarchists, the smashing of the chains of tyranny would release humankind to live in the way it was always meant to live, to fulfil its true potential.

The idea is that human society would arise organically from human nature, and our belonging to the Earth, that we would create a society that suits who we are.

The opposite point of view says that there is no innate tendency towards mutual aid and social co-operation, indeed no innate tendency towards anything at all.

It says that human nature is entirely malleable and should therefore be forced to adapt to whatever way of living is deemed necessary by those in charge of society.

For Victorian industrialists in England and 20th century fascists in Italy, this meant forcing complex and multi-dimensional human beings into the square hole of industrial servitude.

For today's big business transhumanists and newnormalists, this means forcing living human beings to adapt to the demands of their sinister and dehumanised "smart" totalitarian world.

From my point of view, a very clear divide has opened up here. On one side of this are those

of us who are motivated by a love of life, of people and of nature and who seek to bring about a future in which all of this can thrive.

On the other side are those who are motivated by the vision of a certain future system, the end result perhaps of hundreds of years of industrial so-called progress, and who see life, people and nature as subservient to that.

If human nature doesn't fit with their system and their way of thinking, that human nature has to be changed by whatever means necessary.

To me, this mindset is extremely noxious. It is a kind of sterile hygienism, an attitude which regards everything "bio" as a hazard, anything natural as dangerous and imperfect, in contrast to the artificial symmetry and cleanliness of its machine-based futuristic dream.

I have previously labelled this ideology "vitaphobic", meaning that it amounts to nothing less than a hatred of life itself.

It comes as no surprise to realise that historical fascism was part of this vitaphobic trend. It is harder to accept that the same is also true of much of the contemporary left, including groups and people I was, until recently, happy to work with.

These kind of leftists invariably and inevitably feel the need to dismiss anyone who does not entirely share their dogma as being "right-wing"

or “fascist”.

But, in fact, here my opposition to their vitaphobic ideology comes from the very same place as my opposition to fascist vitaphobia.

This does not mean that they are themselves “fascists”, which was a specific historical phenomenon, but that, in 2020, they have aligned themselves with a life-hating ideological trend of which historical fascism was also part.

This is why I am every bit as much opposed to vitaphobic newnormalist leftists as I am to fascists and consider their ideology equally dangerous to the future of humankind and our Mother Earth.

1. Pierre Milza and Serge Berstein, *Le fascisme italien 1919-1945* (Paris: Editions de Seuil, 1980). All subsequent notes refer to this work.

2. p. 30.

3. p. 68.

4. p. 71.

5. p. 110.

6. p. 104.

7. pp. 110-11.

8. p. 111.

9. Benito Mussolini, cit. p. 113.

10. p. 119.

11. p. 223.

12. p. 232.

13. p. 245.

14. Mussolini, cit. p. 246.

15. p. 247.
16. p. 248.
17. p. 283.
18. p. 276.
19. p 228.
20. p. 316.
21. p. 194.
22. p.213.
23. p. 203.
24. p. 198.
25. p. 275.
26. p. 198.
27. p. 212.
28. p 414.
29. p. 283.

THE GREAT BATTLE FOR THE FUTURE

August 18, 2020

A nightmare totalitarian industrial world, in which everything living is being poisoned to death and in which dehumanised people are subjected to full-spectrum physical and psychological control by slave-masters they never dare question.

So here is where modernity and its self-mythologising cult of “progress” was leading us... Who’d have thought it, eh?

The warnings have been there, of course, whether from science fiction writers and filmmakers (*They Live!*, *The Terminator*, *Equals...*), musicians or the dozens of thinkers featured on the Organic Radicals website.

They warned us where this would end up if we didn’t do something, but we collectively spurned their advice and here we are, on the very brink of a long-term and probably fatal dystopia.

The important question now is how we are going to get out of this global hi-tech concentra-

tion camp.

Part of the answer is that we need to keep alive, and spread as widely as possible, a vision of how the world *could* be, of another way of living which is utterly different from the sterile and robotic hell currently lined up for us and those who will come after.

It is very much part of the ruling elite's propaganda to insist that their future is the *only* future, that no other possibility even exists.

They are always keen to dismiss the idea of a different society as totally fanciful, empty-headed or even positively dangerous, removing us from the protective bliss of the prison they have built around us.

This lie is reinforced in people's minds by the way that the other, possible, world is increasingly distant from contemporary reality.

It is hard to imagine a transition from where we are today (let alone where we are heading) to where many of us would like to be.

It is particularly hard, even impossible, if you go along with the ruling elite's deliberate confusion of the passing of time with the strengthening of their industrial profit-system.

If you see "the future" as necessarily an extension of the path that has brought us from the past to the present, then their version seems inevitable. It is therefore crucial to break free from this idea of some kind of predestined vector

taking us towards a hyper-industrial destiny.

Industrial capitalist development was never the only possible form which human society could have taken over the last few centuries. The shape our present has taken is not due to the passing of time but to very specific processes and actions which have occurred.

If we want to reconnect with the “other world” in our hearts, and understand why it seems so unattainable, we would therefore do well to look back at how we landed up on the disastrous path of industrialised tyranny.

A key period to analyse is the Middle Ages, when capitalism first started to take over our lives.

Silvia Federici makes some very interesting observations on this period in her book *Caliban and the Witch*.¹

She rejects the conventional wisdom that a “transition to capitalism” occurred as some kind of natural social evolution.

Instead, she points out that the power of the ruling elite was being threatened by the growing confidence of the 99%, who were increasingly rebelling against authority and servitude.

With the outright slavery of the Roman Empire left behind, these medieval rebels saw ahead of them a better future, one based on social justice, freedom and local autonomy.

They were on the path leading towards the

light, towards genuine social progress rather than to the fake “progress” of technological sophistication and profusion.

But this didn’t go down well with the ruling class, who feared that their power and privilege would be lost for ever.

Instead of escaping from slavery into freedom, our ancestors therefore found themselves engaged in a Great Battle for the Future with the dark forces of tyranny.

This battle raged for centuries all over Europe and in the parts of the world colonised and occupied by the dominant system.

In England the most famous uprising was the peasants’ revolt of 1381, during which radical preacher John Ball told his contemporaries that the time had come when they could “cast off the yoke they have borne so long and win the freedom they have always yearned for”.²

But there were plenty of others, such as the Kett’s Rebellion of 1549 in which the rebels seized control of Norwich, then the second biggest city in the country.

The 17th century radicals of the English Revolution, such as Gerrard Winstanley, represent perhaps the last flowering of this wave of revolt.

The Great Battle for the Future was even fiercer on continental Europe. As Federici points out, the uprisings of the Cathars in France and

the Anabaptists in Germany were not just about isolated local grievances but represented an ideological and metaphysical challenge to the world of authority, power and property.³

Federici argues that capitalism was in fact the reaction of the ruling elite against their potential loss of control.

She writes: “Capitalism was the counter-revolution that destroyed the possibilities that had emerged from the anti-feudal struggle – possibilities which, if realized, might have spared us the immense destruction of lives and the natural environment that has marked the advance of capitalist relations worldwide. This much must be stressed, for the belief that capitalism ‘evolved’ from feudalism and represents a higher form of social life has not yet been dispelled”.⁴

There is a strange echo here with the 20th century, when fascism emerged at a moment when the ruling elite (by this stage firmly capitalist) again faced the threat of popular insurrection.

The parallel even extends to the way in which the medieval bourgeoisie, often depicted as leading the radical onslaught against feudal power, sought common cause with their supposed enemies in the nobility in order to stamp out popular revolt.

This same bourgeoisie, which by the 20th

century liked to think of itself as “liberal”, was likewise happy to see the boot of fascism keep the rabble in their place.

Capitalism – the new form taken by malevolent ruling-class domination – subjugated our ancestors by cutting them off from their sources of subsistence and autonomy.

Food could no longer be freely gathered or hunted, rivers could no longer be fished, wood for fuel could no longer be picked up in the privatised forests.

People were forced into the money system, forced to earn “wages” just to live, forced into factories and workhouses, reduced to craven dependency on the capitalist system.

Federici describes the period as one of “relentless class struggle” in which “the medieval village was the theater of daily warfare”.⁵

“Everywhere masses of people resisted the destruction of their former ways of existence, fighting against land privatization, the abolition of customary rights, the imposition of new taxes, wage-dependence, and the continuous presence of armies in their neighbourhoods, which was so hated that people rushed to close the gates of their towns to prevent soldiers from settling among them”.⁶

In order to impose the New Normal of capitalism on the unwilling people, the power elite used what Federici terms “social enclo-

sure”,⁷ a precursor of today’s “social distancing”.

She writes: “In pursuit of social discipline, an attack was launched against all forms of collective sociality and sexuality including sports, games, dances, ale-wakes, festivals, and other group-rituals that had been a source of bonding and solidarity among workers”.⁸

“Taverns were closed, along with public baths. Nakedness was penalized, as were many other ‘unproductive’ forms of sexuality and sociality. It was forbidden to drink, swear, curse”.⁹

In another striking parallel with the 2020s (and indeed the 1920s/1930s) the rich elite tried to create “a new type of individual”¹⁰ – a servile, malleable and thus profitable type.

To this end it set out to separate us from our bodies and from our very sense of who we are.

“According to Max Weber, the reform of the body is at the core of the bourgeois ethic because capitalism makes acquisition ‘the ultimate purpose of life,’ instead of treating it as a means for the satisfaction of our needs; thus it requires that we forfeit all spontaneous enjoyment of life. Capitalism also attempts to overcome our ‘natural state,’ by breaking the barriers of nature and by lengthening the working day beyond the limits set by the sun, the seasonal cycles, and the body itself, as constituted in pre-industrial society”.¹¹

The communal cohesion traditionally woven by, and among, women was specifically targeted by the ruling class in their efforts to disempower and enslave the common people, says Federici.

This took the form of the notorious fear-mongering over “witches”, resulting in the murder of untold numbers of innocent women: “The witch-hunt destroyed a whole world of female practices, collective relations and systems of knowledge that had been the foundation of women’s power in pre-capitalist Europe, and the condition for their resistance in the struggle against feudalism”.¹²

She adds: “The witch-hunt deepened the divisions between women and men, teaching men to fear the power of women, and destroyed a universe of practices, beliefs, and social subjects whose existence was incompatible with the capitalist work discipline”.¹³

The witch hunts were thus part of the general philosophical war being waged by industrial capitalism on any way of thinking not flattened and reduced to the pitiful level of its own limited, sterile and life-hating slave-dogma.

Explains Federici: “This is how we must read the attack against witchcraft and against that magical view of the world which, despite the efforts of the Church, had continued to prevail on a popular level through the Middle Ages. At the basis of magic was an animistic conception of

nature that did not admit to any separation between matter and spirit, and thus imagined the cosmos as a *living organism*, populated by occult forces, where every element was in ‘sympathetic’ relation with the rest”.¹⁴

The primary tool used by the ultra-rich minority to oppress the majority was, of course, the state.

Far from representing some kind of benign collective self-interest, as some absurdly persist in maintaining, the modern state emerged in the 14th century “as the only agency capable of confronting a working class that was regionally unified, armed and no longer confined in its demands to the political economy of the manor”.¹⁵

Whether claiming to be fighting “heresy”, “witchcraft” or disorder, the ruling elite deployed all the violence and propaganda of its inquisitions, wars and laws to bring the population to heel. And, as we all know to our cost, it won that Great Battle for the Future.

But because its sociopathic greed knows no end, because its “growth” is based on ever-increasing profit for the ultra-rich, it can never stop treading us further and further into the toxic industrial dust of its total control.

Today we have reached another key moment in history, when the ruling elite – under the feeble pretext of combatting a flu virus – hopes to

essentially return us to the slave status we escaped a thousand years ago.

All its liberal pretence at “democracy” is going out of the window as the brutal reality of elite power becomes clear to those who have eyes to see.

There will be resistance, you can be sure of that, even if the advance disabling of certain potential sources of dissent means it may take a while for rebels to regroup and find their common voice.

Those of us who do resist will be embarking on another Great Battle for the Future.

We will be fighting for the same world of freedom and humanity and closeness to nature which inspired our ancestors hundreds of years ago.

Moreover, awareness of this historical context will be key to the way we resist.

We can never go back to the past but we can refer back to it and take our sense of direction from it.

It is clear that our defeat in the last Great Battle for the Future (and many subsequent struggles) saw us shunted down the wrong path, away from the bright future of which we dreamed and deeper and deeper into the gloom of enslavement.

We will not be able to reach our lost future by continuing along this path as it can only take

us further and further from our desired destination.

The key realisation here is that industrialism, including all its technology and infrastructure, is simply an aspect of capitalism, of the slavery imposed upon us hundreds of years ago when we looked set to break free from the domination of the ruling elite.

Industrialism is not neutral. It is not something that can be turned around and used for our good. It is the prison in which we are locked.

The newnormalist technological tyranny currently being unleashed will hopefully make this inconvenient truth more evident and widely understood.

However, the underlying problem does not lie in industrialism's excesses but in its very essence and *raison d'être*, as a means of control and exploitation.

We will not find the better future of which we dream in a world still polluted by factories, airports, motorways, pipelines, pylons, refineries and power stations.

The long-term happiness and self-fulfilment of humankind will not arrive via internet connections, phone networks and electricity supplies, but from their absence.

We need to destroy the whole industrial capitalist machine at the same time as we shake off this latest notching-up of repression,

otherwise it will all just happen again and we will never be free.

Our victory in this 21st century Great Battle for the Future has got to be final and conclusive.

1. Silvia Federici, *Caliban and the Witch* (Brooklyn: Autonomedia, 2004).
2. Peter Marshall, *Demanding the Impossible: A History of Anarchism* (London: Fontana, 1993), p. 91.
3. See also Paul Cudenec, *The Stifled Soul of Humankind* (Sussex, Winter Oak Press, 2014).
4. Federici, pp. 21-22.
5. Federici, p. 26.
6. Federici, p. 82.
7. Federici, p. 84.
8. Federici, p. 83.
9. Federici, p. 137.
10. Federici, p. 135.
11. Ibid.
12. Federici, p. 103.
13. Federici, p. 165.
14. Federici, pp. 141-42.
15. Federici, p. 84.

KLAUS SCHWAB AND HIS GREAT FASCIST RESET

October 5, 2020

Born in Ravensburg in 1938, Klaus Schwab is a child of Adolf Hitler's Germany, a police-state regime built on fear and violence, on brainwashing and control, on propaganda and lies, on industrialism and eugenics, on dehumanisation and "disinfection", on a chilling and grandiose vision of a "new order" that would last a thousand years.

Schwab seems to have dedicated his life to reinventing that nightmare and to trying to turn it into a reality not just for Germany but for the whole world.

Worse still, as his own words confirm time and time again, his technocratic fascist vision is also a twisted transhumanist one, which will merge humans with machines in "curious mixes of digital-and-analog life", which will infect our bodies with "Smart Dust" and in which the police will apparently be able to read our brains.

And, as we will see, he and his accomplices are using the Covid-19 crisis to bypass

democratic accountability, to override opposition, to accelerate their agenda and to impose it on the rest of humankind against our will in what he terms a “Great Reset”.

Schwab is not, of course, a Nazi in the classic sense, being neither a nationalist nor an anti-semitic, as testified by the \$1 million Dan David Prize he was awarded by Israel in 2004.

But 21st century fascism has found different political forms through which to continue its core project of reshaping humanity to suit capitalism through blatantly authoritarian means.

This new fascism is today being advanced in the guise of global governance, biosecurity, the “New Normal”, the “New Deal for Nature” and the “Fourth Industrial Revolution”.

Schwab, the octogenarian founder and executive chairman of the World Economic Forum, sits at the centre of this matrix like a spider on a giant web.

The original fascist project, in Italy and Germany, was all about a merger of state and business.

While communism envisages the take-over of business and industry by the government, which – theoretically! – acts in the interests of the people, fascism was all about using the state to protect and advance the interests of the wealthy elite.

Schwab was continuing this approach in a

denazified post-WW2 context, when in 1971 he founded the European Management Forum, which held annual meetings at Davos in Switzerland.

Here he promoted his ideology of “stakeholder” capitalism in which businesses were brought into closer co-operation with government.

“Stakeholder capitalism” is described by *Forbes* business magazine [January 5, 2020] as “the notion that a firm focuses on meeting the needs of all its stakeholders: customers, employees, partners, the community, and society as a whole”.

Even in the context of a particular business, it is invariably an empty label. As the *Forbes* article notes, it actually only means that “firms can go on privately shoveling money to their shareholders and executives, while maintaining a public front of exquisite social sensitivity and exemplary altruism”.

But in a general social context, the stakeholder concept is even more nefarious, discarding any idea of democracy, rule by the people, in favour of rule by corporate interests.

Society is no longer regarded as a living community but as a business, whose profitability is the sole valid aim of human activity.

Schwab set out this agenda back in 1971, in his book *Moderne Unternehmensführung im*

Maschinenbau (Modern Enterprise Management in Mechanical Engineering), where his use of the term “stakeholders” (*die Interessenten*) effectively redefined human beings not as citizens, free individuals or members of communities, but as secondary participants in a massive commercial enterprise.

The aim of each and every person’s life was “to achieve long-term growth and prosperity” for this enterprise – in other words, to protect and increase the wealth of the capitalist elite.

This all became even clearer in 1987, when Schwab renamed his European Management Forum the World Economic Forum.

The WEF describes itself on its own website as “the global platform for public-private cooperation”, with admirers describing how it creates “partnerships between businessmen, politicians, intellectuals and other leaders of society to ‘define, discuss and advance key issues on the global agenda.’”

The “partnerships” which the WEF creates are aimed at replacing democracy with a global leadership of hand-picked and unelected individuals whose duty is not to serve the public, but to impose the rule of the 1% on that public with as little interference from the rest of us as possible.

In the books Schwab writes for public consumption, he expresses himself in the two-faced

clichés of corporate spin and greenwashing.

The same empty terms are dished up time and time again. In *Shaping the Future of the Fourth Industrial Revolution: A Guide to Building a Better World*, Schwab talks of “the inclusion of stakeholders and the distribution of benefits” and of “sustainable and inclusive partnerships” which will lead us all to an “inclusive, sustainable and prosperous future”!¹

Behind this bluster, the real motivation driving his “stakeholder capitalism”, which he was still relentlessly promoting at the WEF’s 2020 Davos conference, is profit and exploitation.

For instance, in his 2016 book *The Fourth Industrial Revolution*, Schwab writes about the Uberisation of work and the consequent advantages for companies, particularly fast-growing start-ups in the digital economy: “As human cloud platforms classify workers as self-employed, they are – for the moment – free of the requirement to pay minimum wages, employer taxes and social benefits”.²

The same capitalist callousness shines through in his attitude towards people nearing the end of their working lives and in need of a well-deserved rest: “Aging is an economic challenge because unless retirement ages are drastically increased so that older members of society can continue to contribute to the workforce (an economic imperative that has

many economic benefits), the working-age population falls at the same time as the percentage of dependent elders increases”.³

Everything in this world is reduced to economic challenges, economic imperatives and economic benefits for the ruling capitalist class.

The myth of Progress has long been used by the 1% to persuade people to accept the technologies designed to exploit and control us and Schwab plays on this when he declares that “the Fourth Industrial Revolution represents a significant source of hope for continuing the climb in human development that has resulted in dramatic increases in quality of life for billions of people since 1800”.⁴

He enthuses: “While it may not feel momentous to those of us experiencing a series of small but significant adjustments to life on a daily basis, it is not a minor change – the Fourth Industrial Revolution is a new chapter in human development, on a par with the first, second and third Industrial Revolutions, and once again driven by the increasing availability and interaction of a set of extraordinary technologies”.⁵

But he is well aware that technology is not ideologically neutral, as some like to claim.

Technologies and societies shape each other, he says. “After all, technologies are tied up in how we know things, how we make decisions,

and how we think about ourselves and each other. They are connected to our identities, worldviews and potential futures. From nuclear technologies to the space race, smartphones, social media, cars, medicine and infrastructure – the meaning of technologies makes them political. Even the concept of a ‘developed’ nation implicitly rests on the adoption of technologies and what they mean for us, economically and socially”.⁶

Technology, for the capitalists behind it, has never been about social good but purely about profit, and Schwab makes it quite clear that the same remains true of his Fourth Industrial Revolution.

He explains: “Fourth Industrial Revolution technologies are truly disruptive – they upend existing ways of sensing, calculating, organizing, acting and delivering. They represent entirely new ways of creating value for organizations and citizens”.⁷

In case the meaning of “creating value” was not clear, he gives some examples: “Drones represent a new type of cost-cutting employee working among us and performing jobs that once involved real people”⁸ and “the use of ever-smarter algorithms is rapidly extending employee productivity – for example, in the use of chat bots to augment (and, increasingly, replace) ‘live chat’ support for customer

interactions”.⁹

Schwab goes into some detail about the cost-cutting, profit-boosting marvels of his brave new world in *The Fourth Industrial Revolution*.

He explains: “Sooner than most anticipate, the work of professions as different as lawyers, financial analysts, doctors, journalists, accountants, insurance underwriters or librarians may be partly or completely automated...”

“The technology is progressing so fast that Kristian Hammond, cofounder of Narrative Science, a company specializing in automated narrative generation, forecasts that by the mid-2020s, 90% of news could be generated by an algorithm, most of it without any kind of human intervention (apart from the design of the algorithm, of course)”.¹⁰

It is this economic imperative that informs Schwab’s enthusiasm for “a revolution that is fundamentally changing the way we live, work, and relate to one another”.¹¹

Schwab waxes lyrical about the 4IR, which he insists is “unlike anything humankind has experienced before”.¹²

He gushes: “Consider the unlimited possibilities of having billions of people connected by mobile devices, giving rise to unprecedented processing power, storage capabilities and knowledge access. Or think about the staggering

confluence of emerging technology breakthroughs, covering wide-ranging fields such as artificial intelligence (AI), robotics, the internet of things (IoT), autonomous vehicles, 3D printing, nanotechnology, biotechnology, materials science, energy storage and quantum computing, to name a few. Many of these innovations are in their infancy, but they are already reaching an inflection point in their development as they build on and amplify each other in a fusion of technologies across the physical, digital and biological worlds”.¹³

He also looks forward to more online education, involving “the use of virtual and augmented reality” to “dramatically improve educational outcomes”,¹⁴ to sensors “installed in homes, clothes and accessories, cities, transport and energy networks”¹⁵ and to smart cities, with their all-important “data platforms”.¹⁶

“All things will be smart and connected to the internet”, says Schwab, and this will extend to animals, as “sensors wired in cattle can communicate to each other through a mobile phone network”.¹⁷

He loves the idea of “smart cell factories” which could enable “the accelerated generation of vaccines”¹⁸ and “big-data technologies”.¹⁹

These, he assures us, will “deliver new and innovative ways to service citizens and customers”²⁰ and we will have to stop objecting to

businesses profiting from harnessing and selling information about every aspect of our personal lives.

“Establishing trust in the data and algorithms used to make decisions will be vital,” insists Schwab. “Citizen concerns over privacy and establishing accountability in business and legal structures will require adjustments in thinking”.²¹

At the end of the day it is clear that all this technological excitement revolves purely around profit, or “value” as Schwab prefers to term it in his 21st century corporate newspeak.

Thus blockchain technology will be fantastic and provoke “an explosion in tradable assets, as all kinds of value exchange can be hosted on the blockchain”.²²

The use of distributed ledger technology, adds Schwab, “could be the driving force behind massive flows of value in digital products and services, providing secure digital identities that can make new markets accessible to anyone connected to the internet”.²³

In general, the interest of the 4IR for the ruling business elite is that it will “create entirely new sources of value”²⁴ and “give rise to ecosystems of value creation that are impossible to imagine with a mindset stuck in the third Industrial Revolution”.²⁵

The technologies of the 4IR, rolled out via

5G, pose unprecedented threats to our freedom, as Schwab concedes: “The tools of the fourth industrial revolution enable new forms of surveillance and other means of control that run counter to healthy, open societies”.²⁶

But this does not stop him presenting them in a positive light, as when he declares that “public crime is likely to decrease due to the convergence of sensors, cameras, AI and facial recognition software”.²⁷

He describes with some relish how these technologies “can intrude into the hitherto private space of our minds, reading our thoughts and influencing our behavior”.²⁸

Schwab predicts: “As capabilities in this area improve, the temptation for law enforcement agencies and courts to use techniques to determine the likelihood of criminal activity, assess guilt or even possibly retrieve memories directly from people’s brains will increase. Even crossing a national border might one day involve a detailed brain scan to assess an individual’s security risk”.²⁹

There are times when the WEF chief gets carried away by his passion for a sci-fi future in which “long-distance human space travel and nuclear fusion are commonplace”³⁰ and in which “the next trending business model” might involve someone “trading access to his or her thoughts for the time-saving option of typing a social

media post by thought alone”.³¹

Talk of “space tourism” under the title “The Fourth Industrial Revolution and the final frontier”³² is almost funny, as is his suggestion that “a world full of drones offers a world full of possibilities”.³³

But the further the reader progresses into the world depicted in Schwab’s books, the less of a laughing matter it all seems.

The truth is that this highly influential figure, at the centre of the new global order currently being established, is an out-and-out transhumanist who dreams of an end to natural healthy human life and community.

Schwab repeats this message time and time again, as if to be sure we have been duly warned.

“The mind-boggling innovations triggered by the fourth industrial revolution, from biotechnology to AI, are redefining what it means to be human,”³⁴ he writes.

“The future will challenge our understanding of what it means to be human, from both a biological and a social standpoint”.³⁵

“Already, advances in neurotechnologies and biotechnologies are forcing us to question what it means to be human”.³⁶

He spells it out in more detail in *Shaping the Future of the Fourth Industrial Revolution*: “Fourth Industrial Revolution technologies will not stop at becoming part of the physical world

around us – they will become part of us. Indeed, some of us already feel that our smartphones have become an extension of ourselves. Today’s external devices – from wearable computers to virtual reality headsets – will almost certainly become implantable in our bodies and brains. Exoskeletons and prosthetics will increase our physical power, while advances in neurotechnology enhance our cognitive abilities. We will become better able to manipulate our own genes, and those of our children. These developments raise profound questions: Where do we draw the line between human and machine? What does it mean to be human?”³⁷

A whole section of this book is devoted to the theme “Altering the Human Being”. Here he drools over “the ability of new technologies to literally become part of us” and invokes a cyborg future involving “curious mixes of digital-and-analog life that will redefine our very natures”.³⁸

He writes: “These technologies will operate within our own biology and change how we interface with the world. They are capable of crossing the boundaries of body and mind, enhancing our physical abilities, and even having a lasting impact on life itself”.³⁹

No violation seems to go too far for Schwab, who dreams of “active implantable microchips that break the skin barrier of our bodies”, “smart tattoos”, “biological computing” and “custom-

designed organisms”.⁴⁰

He is delighted to report that “sensors, memory switches and circuits can be encoded in common human gut bacteria”,⁴¹ that “Smart Dust, arrays of full computers with antennas, each much smaller than a grain of sand, can now organize themselves inside the body” and that “implanted devices will likely also help to communicate thoughts normally expressed verbally through a ‘built-in’ smartphone, and potentially unexpressed thoughts or moods by reading brain waves and other signals”.⁴²

“Synthetic biology” is on the horizon in Schwab’s 4IR world, giving the technocratic capitalist rulers of the world “the ability to customize organisms by writing DNA”.⁴³

The idea of neurotechnologies, in which humans will have fully artificial memories implanted in the brain, is enough to make some of us feel faintly sick, as is “the prospect of connecting our brains to VR through cortical modems, implants or nanobots”.⁴⁴

It is of little comfort to learn that this is all – of course! – in the greater interests of capitalist profiteering since it “heralds new industries and systems for value creation” and “represents an opportunity to create entire new systems of value in the Fourth Industrial Revolution”.⁴⁵

And what about “the bioprinting of organic tissues”⁴⁶ or the suggestion that “animals could

potentially be engineered to produce pharmaceuticals and other forms of treatment”?⁴⁷

Ethical objections, anyone?

It's all evidently good for Schwab, who is happy to announce: “The day when cows are engineered to produce in its [sic] milk a blood-clotting element, which hemophiliacs lack, is not far off. Researchers have already started to engineer the genomes of pigs with the goal of growing organs suitable for human transplantation”.⁴⁸

It gets even more disturbing. Ever since the sinister eugenics programme of the Nazi Germany into which Schwab was born, this science has been deemed beyond the pale by human society.

But now, however, he evidently feels eugenics is due a revival, announcing with regard to genetic editing: “That it is now far easier to manipulate with precision the human genome within viable embryos means that we are likely to see the advent of designer babies in the future who possess particular traits or who are resistant to a specific disease”.⁴⁹

In the notorious 2002 transhumanist treatise *I, Cyborg*, Kevin Warwick predicts: “Humans will be able to evolve by harnessing the super-intelligence and extra abilities offered by the machines of the future, by joining with them. All this points to the development of a new human

species, known in the science-fiction world as ‘cyborgs’. It doesn’t mean that everyone has to become a cyborg. If you are happy with your state as a human then so be it, you can remain as you are. But be warned – just as we humans split from our chimpanzee cousins years ago, so cyborgs will split from humans. Those who remain as humans are likely to become a subspecies. They will, effectively, be the chimpanzees of the future”.⁵⁰

Schwab seems to be hinting at the same future of a “superior” enhanced artificial transhuman elite separating from the natural-born rabble, in this particularly damning passage from *The Fourth Industrial Revolution*: “We are at the threshold of a radical systemic change that requires human beings to adapt continuously. As a result, we may witness an increasing degree of polarization in the world, marked by those who embrace change versus those who resist it. This gives rise to an inequality that goes beyond the societal one described earlier. This ontological inequality will separate those who adapt from those who resist – the material winners and losers in all senses of the words. The winners may even benefit from some form of radical human improvement generated by certain segments of the fourth industrial revolution (such as genetic engineering) from which the losers will be deprived. This

risks creating class conflicts and other clashes unlike anything we have seen before”.⁵¹

Schwab was already talking about a great “transformation” back in 2016⁵² and is clearly determined to do everything in his not inconsiderable power to bring about his eugenics-inspired transhumanist world of artifice, surveillance, control and exponential profit.

But, as revealed by his reference above to “class conflicts”, he is clearly worried by the possibility of “societal resistance”⁵³ and how to advance “if technologies receive a great deal of resistance from the public”.⁵⁴

Schwab’s annual WEF shindigs at Davos have long been met by anti-capitalist protests and, despite the current paralysis of the radical left, he is well aware of the possibility of renewed and perhaps broader opposition to his project, with the risk of “resentment, fear and political backlash”.⁵⁵

In his most recent book he provides a historical context, noting that “antiglobalization was strong in the run-up to 1914 and up to 1918, then less so during the 1920s, but it reignited in the 1930s as a result of the Great Depression”.⁵⁶

He notes that in the early 2000s “the political and societal backlash against globalization relentlessly gained strength”,⁵⁷ says that “social unrest” has been widespread across the world in the past two years, citing the Gilets Jaunes in

France among other movements, and invokes the “sombre scenario” that “the same could happen again”.⁵⁸

So how is an honest technocrat supposed to roll out his preferred future for the world without the agreement of the global public? How can Schwab and his billionaire friends impose their favoured society on the rest of us?

One answer is relentless brainwashing propaganda churned out by the mass media and academia owned by the 1% elite – what they like to call “a narrative”.

For Schwab, the reluctance of the majority of humankind to leap aboard his 4IR express reflects the tragedy that “the world lacks a consistent, positive and common narrative that outlines the opportunities and challenges of the fourth industrial revolution, a narrative that is essential if we are to empower a diverse set of individuals and communities and avoid a popular backlash against the fundamental changes under way”.⁵⁹

He adds: “It is, therefore, critical that we invest attention and energy in multistakeholder cooperation across academic, social, political, national and industry boundaries. These interactions and collaborations are needed to create positive, common and hope-filled narratives, enabling individuals and groups from all parts of the world to participate in, and

benefit from, the ongoing transformations”.⁶⁰

One of these “narratives” whitewashes the reasons for which 4IR technology needs to be installed everywhere in the world as soon as possible.

Schwab is frustrated that “more than half of the world’s population – around 3.9 billion people – still cannot access the internet”,⁶¹ with 85% of the population of developing countries remaining offline and therefore out of reach, as compared to 22% in the developed world.

The actual aim of the 4IR is to exploit these populations for profit via global techno-imperialism, but of course that cannot be stated in the propaganda “narrative” required to sell the plan.

Instead, their mission has to be presented, as Schwab himself does, as a bid to “develop technologies and systems that serve to distribute economic and social values such as income, opportunity and liberty to all stakeholders”.⁶²

He piously postures as a guardian of woke liberal values, declaring: “Thinking inclusively goes beyond thinking about poverty or marginalized communities simply as an aberration – something that we can solve. It forces us to realize that ‘our privileges are located on the same map as their suffering’. It moves beyond income and entitlements, though these remain important. Instead, the inclusion of

stakeholders and the distribution of benefits expand freedoms for all”.⁶³

The same technique, of a fake “narrative” designed to fool good-thinking citizens into supporting an imperialist capitalist scheme, has been used extensively with regard to climate change.

Schwab is a great fan of Greta Thunberg, of course, who had barely stood up from the pavement after her one-girl protest in Stockholm before being whisked off to address the WEF at Davos.

He is also a supporter of the proposed global New Deal for Nature, particularly via Voice for the Planet, which was launched at the WEF in Davos in 2019 by the Global Shapers, a youth-grooming organisation created by Schwab in 2011 and aptly described by investigative journalist Cory Morningstar as “a grotesque display of corporate malfeasance disguised as good”. [www.wrongkindofgreen.org]

In his 2020 book, Schwab actually lays out the way that fake “youth activism” is being used to advance his capitalist aims.

He writes, in a remarkably frank passage: “Youth activism is increasing worldwide, being revolutionized by social media that increases mobilization to an extent that would have been impossible before. It takes many different forms, ranging from non-institutionalized political

participation to demonstrations and protests, and addresses issues as diverse as climate change, economic reforms, gender equality and LGBTQ rights. The young generation is firmly at the vanguard of social change. There is little doubt that it will be the catalyst for change and a source of critical momentum for the Great Reset”.⁶⁴

In fact, of course, the ultra-industrial future proposed by Schwab is anything other than green. It’s not nature he’s interested in, but “natural capital” and “incentivizing investment in green and social frontier markets”.⁶⁵

Pollution means profit and environmental crisis is just another business opportunity, as he details in *The Fourth Industrial Revolution*: “In this revolutionary new industrial system, carbon dioxide turns from a greenhouse pollutant into an asset, and the economics of carbon capture and storage move from being cost as well as pollution sinks to becoming profitable carbon-capture and use-production facilities. Even more important, it will help companies, governments and citizens become more aware of and engaged with strategies to actively regenerate natural capital, allowing intelligent and regenerative uses of natural capital to guide sustainable production and consumption and give space for biodiversity to recover in threatened areas”.⁶⁶

Schwab’s “solutions” to the heart-breaking

damage inflicted on our natural world by industrial capitalism involve more of the same poison, except worse.

Geoengineering is one of his favourites: “Proposals include installing giant mirrors in the stratosphere to deflect the sun’s rays, chemically seeding the atmosphere to increase rainfall and the deployment of large machines to remove carbon dioxide from the air”.⁶⁷

And he adds: “New approaches are currently being imagined through the combination of Fourth Industrial Revolution technologies, such as nanoparticles and other advanced materials”.⁶⁸

Like all the businesses and pro-capitalist NGOs backing the horrendous New Deal for Nature, Schwab is utterly and profoundly ungreen.

For him, the “ultimate possibility” of “clean” and “sustainable” energy includes nuclear fusion⁶⁹ and he looks forward to the day when satellites will “blanket the planet with communications pathways that could help connect the more than 4 billion people still lacking online access”.⁷⁰

Schwab also very much regrets all that red tape preventing the unhindered onward march of GM food, warning that “global food security will only be achieved, however, if regulations on genetically modified foods are adapted to reflect

the reality that gene editing offers a precise, efficient and safe method of improving crops”.⁷¹

The new order envisaged by Schwab will embrace the entire world and so global governance is required in order to impose it, as he repeatedly states.

His preferred future “will only come about through improved global governance”⁷² he insists. “Some form of effective global governance”⁷³ is needed.

The problem we have today is that of a possible “global order deficit”,⁷⁴ he claims, adding improbably that the World Health Organization “is saddled with limited and dwindling resources”.⁷⁵

What he is really saying is that his 4IR/great reset society will only function if imposed simultaneously everywhere on the planet, otherwise “we will become paralysed in our attempts to address and respond to global challenges”.⁷⁶

He admits: “In a nutshell, global governance is at the nexus of all these other issues”.⁷⁷

This all-englobing empire very much frowns on the idea of any particular population democratically deciding to take another path. These “risk becoming isolated from global norms, putting these nations at risk of becoming the laggards of the new digital economy”,⁷⁸ warns Schwab.

Any sense of autonomy and grassroots belonging is regarded as a threat from Schwab's imperialist perspective and is due to be eradicated under the 4IR.

He writes: "Individuals used to identify their lives most closely with a place, an ethnic group, a particular culture or even a language. The advent of online engagement and increased exposure to ideas from other cultures means that identities are now more fungible than previously... Thanks to the combination of historical migration patterns and low-cost connectivity, family structures are being redefined".⁷⁹

Genuine democracy essentially falls into the same category for Schwab. He knows that most people will not willingly go along with plans to destroy their lives and enslave them to a global techno-fascist system of exploitation, so giving them a say in the matter is simply not an option.

This is why the "stakeholder" concept has been so important for Schwab's project. As discussed above, this is the negation of democracy, with its emphasis instead on "reaching out across stakeholder groups for solution building".⁸⁰

If the public, the people, are included in this process it is only at a superficial level. The agenda has already been pre-supposed and the decisions pre-made behind the scenes.

Schwab effectively admits as much when he

writes: “We must re-establish a dialogue among all stakeholders to ensure mutual understanding that further builds a culture of trust among regulators, non-governmental organizations, professionals and scientists. The public must also be considered, because it must participate in the democratic shaping of biotechnological developments that affect society, individuals and cultures”.⁸¹

So the public must “also” be considered, as an afterthought. Not even directly consulted, just “considered”! And the role of the people, the *demos*, will merely be to “participate” in the “shaping” of biotechnological developments. The possibility of the public actually rejecting the very idea of biotechnological developments has been entirely removed, thanks to the deliberately in-built assumptions of the stakeholder formula.

The same message is implied in the heading of Schwab’s conclusion to *Shaping the Future of the Fourth Industrial Revolution*: “What You Can Do to Shape the Fourth Industrial Revolution”.⁸² The techno-tyranny cannot be challenged or stopped, merely “shaped”.

Schwab uses the term “systems leadership” to describe the profoundly anti-democratic way in which the 1% imposes its agenda on us all, without giving us the chance to say ‘no’.

He writes: “Systems leadership is about cultivating a shared vision for change – working

together with all stakeholders of global society – and then acting on it to change how the system delivers its benefits, and to whom. Systems leadership requires action from all stakeholders, including individuals, business executives, social influencers and policy-makers”.⁸³

He refers to this full-spectrum top-down control as “the system management of human existence”⁸⁴ although others might prefer the term “totalitarianism”.

One of the distinguishing features of historical fascism in Italy and Germany was its impatience with the inconvenient restraints imposed on the ruling class (“the Nation” in fascist language) by democracy and political liberalism.

All of this had to be swept out of the way to allow a Blitzkrieg of accelerated “modernisation”.

We see the same spirit resurging in Schwab’s calls for “agile governance” in which he claims that “the pace of technological development and a number of characteristics of technologies render previous policy-making cycles and processes inadequate”.⁸⁵

He writes: “The idea of reforming governance models to cope with new technologies is not new, but the urgency of doing so is far greater in light of the power of today’s emerging technologies... the concept of agile governance seeks to match the nimbleness, fluidity, flexibility and

adaptiveness of the technologies themselves and the private-sector actors adopting them”.⁸⁶

The phrase “reforming governance models to cope with new technologies” really gives the game away here. As under fascism, social structures must be reinvented so as to accommodate the requirements of capitalism and its profit-increasing technologies.

Schwab explains that his “agile governance” would involve creating so-called policy labs – “protected spaces within government with an explicit mandate to experiment with new methods of policy development by using agile principles” – and “encouraging collaborations between governments and businesses to create ‘developtory sandboxes’ and ‘experimental testbeds’ to develop regulations using iterative, cross-sectoral and flexible approaches”.⁸⁷

For Schwab, the role of the state is to advance capitalist aims, not to hold them up to any form of scrutiny. While he is all in favour of the state’s role in enabling a corporate take-over of our lives, he is less keen about its regulatory function, which might slow down the inflow of profit into private hands, and so he envisages “the development of ecosystems of private regulators, competing in markets”.⁸⁸

In his 2018 book, Schwab discusses the problem of pesky regulations and how best to “overcome these limits” in the context of data

and privacy.

He comes up with the suggestion of “public-private data-sharing agreements that ‘break glass in case of emergency’. These come into play only under pre-agreed emergency circumstances (such as a pandemic) and can help reduce delays and improve the coordination of first responders, temporarily allowing data sharing that would be illegal under normal circumstances”.⁸⁹

Funnily enough, two years later there was indeed a “pandemic” and these “pre-agreed emergency circumstances” became a reality.

This shouldn’t have been too much of a surprise for Schwab, since his WEF had co-hosted the infamous Event 201 conference in October 2019, which modelled a fictional coronavirus pandemic.

And he wasted little time in bringing out a new book, *Covid-19: The Great Reset*, co-authored with Thierry Malleret, who runs something called the *Monthly Barometer*, “a succinct predictive analysis provided to private investors, global CEOs and opinion- and decision-makers”.⁹⁰

Published in July 2020, the book sets out to advance “conjectures and ideas about what the post-pandemic world might, and perhaps should, look like”.⁹¹

Schwab and Malleret admit that Covid-19 is “one of the least deadly pandemics the world has

experienced over the last 2000 years”, adding that “the consequences of COVID-19 in terms of health and mortality will be mild compared to previous pandemics”.⁹²

They add: “It does not constitute an existential threat, or a shock that will leave its imprint on the world’s population for decades”.⁹³

Yet, incredibly, this “mild” illness is simultaneously presented as the excuse for unprecedented social change under the banner of “The Great Reset”!

And although they explicitly declare that Covid-19 does not constitute a major “shock”, the authors repeatedly deploy the same term to describe the broader impact of the crisis.

Schwab and Malleret place Covid-19 in a long tradition of events which have facilitated sudden and significant changes to our societies.

They specifically invoke the Second World War: “World War II was the quintessential transformational war, triggering not only fundamental changes to the global order and the global economy, but also entailing radical shifts in social attitudes and beliefs that eventually paved the way for radically new policies and social contract provisions (like women joining the workforce before becoming voters). There are obviously fundamental dissimilarities between a pandemic and a war (that we will consider in some detail in the following pages), but the

magnitude of their transformative power is comparable. Both have the potential to be a transformative crisis of previously unimaginable proportions”.⁹⁴

They also join many contemporary “conspiracy theorists” in making a direct comparison between Covid-19 and 9/11: “This is what happened after the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001. All around the world, new security measures like employing widespread cameras, requiring electronic ID cards and logging employees or visitors in and out became the norm. At that time, these measures were deemed extreme, but today they are used everywhere and considered ‘normal’”.⁹⁵

When any tyrant declares the right to rule over a population without taking their views into account, they like to justify their dictatorship with the claim that they are morally entitled to do so because they are “enlightened”.

The same is true of the Covid-fuelled tyranny of Schwab’s great reset, which the book categorises as “enlightened leadership”, adding: “Some leaders and decision-makers who were already at the forefront of the fight against climate change may want to take advantage of the shock inflicted by the pandemic to implement long-lasting and wider environmental changes. They will, in effect, make ‘good use’ of the pandemic by not letting the crisis go to waste”.⁹⁶

The global capitalist ruling elite have certainly been doing their best to “take advantage of the shock inflicted by the panic”, assuring us all since the very earliest days of the outbreak that, for some unfathomable reason, nothing in our lives could ever be the same again.

Schwab and Malleret are, inevitably, enthusiastic in their use of the New Normal framing, despite their admission that the virus was only ever “mild”.

“It is our defining moment”, they crow. “Many things will change forever”. “A new world will emerge”. “The societal upheaval unleashed by COVID-19 will last for years, and possibly generations”. “Many of us are pondering when things will return to normal. The short response is: never”.⁹⁷

They even go as far as proposing a new historical separation between “the pre-pandemic era” and “the post-pandemic world”.⁹⁸

They write: “Radical changes of such consequence are coming that some pundits have referred to a ‘before coronavirus’ (BC) and ‘after coronavirus’ (AC) era. We will continue to be surprised by both the rapidity and unexpected nature of these changes – as they conflate with each other, they will provoke second-, third-, fourth- and more-order consequences, cascading effects and unforeseen outcomes. In so doing, they will shape a ‘new normal’ radically different

from the one we will be progressively leaving behind. Many of our beliefs and assumptions about what the world could or should look like will be shattered in the process”.⁹⁹

Back in 2016, Schwab was looking ahead to “new ways of using technology to change behavior”¹⁰⁰ and predicting: “The scale and breadth of the unfolding technological revolution will usher in economic, social and cultural changes of such phenomenal proportions that they are almost impossible to envisage”.¹⁰¹

One way in which he had hoped his technocratic agenda would be advanced was, as we have noted, through the phoney “solutions” to climate change proposed by fake green capitalists.

Under the title “environmental reset”, Schwab and Malleret state: “At first glance, the pandemic and the environment might seem to be only distantly related cousins; but they are much closer and more intertwined than we think”.¹⁰²

One of the connections is that both the climate and virus “crises” have been used by the WEF and their like to push their agenda of global governance. As Schwab and his co-author put it, “they are global in nature and therefore can only be properly addressed in a globally coordinated fashion”.¹⁰³

Another link is the way that the “the post-pandemic economy” and “the green economy”¹⁰⁴

involve massive profits for largely the same sectors of big business.

Covid-19 has evidently been great news for those capitalists hoping to cash in on environmental destruction, with Schwab and Malleret reporting: “The conviction that ESG strategies benefited from the pandemic and are most likely to benefit further is corroborated by various surveys and reports. Early data shows that the sustainability sector outperformed conventional funds during the first quarter of 2020”.¹⁰⁵

The capitalist sharks of the so-called “sustainability sector” are rubbing their hands together with glee at the prospect of all the money they stand to make from the Covid-pretextured great fascist reset, in which the state is instrumentalised to fund their hypocritical profiteering.

Note Schwab and Malleret: “The key to crowding private capital into new sources of nature-positive economic value will be to shift key policy levers and public finance incentives as part of a wider economic reset”.¹⁰⁶

“A policy paper prepared by Systemiq in collaboration with the World Economic Forum estimates that building the nature-positive economy could represent more than \$10 trillion per year by 2030... Resetting the environment should not be seen as a cost, but rather as an investment that will generate economic activity

and employment opportunities”.¹⁰⁷

Given the intertwining of climate and Covid crises set out by Schwab, we might speculate that the original plan was to push through the New Normal reset on the back of the climate crisis.

But evidently, all that publicity for Greta Thunberg and big business-backed Extinction Rebellion did not whip up enough public panic to justify such measures.

Covid-19 serves Schwab’s purposes perfectly, as the immediate urgency it presents allows the whole process to be speeded up and rushed through without due scrutiny.

“This crucial difference between the respective time-horizons of a pandemic and that of climate change and nature loss means that a pandemic risk requires immediate action that will be followed by a rapid result, while climate change and nature loss also require immediate action, but the result (or ‘future reward’, in the jargon of economists) will only follow with a certain time lag”.¹⁰⁸

For Schwab and his friends, Covid-19 is the great accelerator of everything they have been wanting to foist upon us for years.

As he and Malleret say: “The pandemic is clearly exacerbating and accelerating geopolitical trends that were already apparent before the crisis erupted”.¹⁰⁹

“The pandemic will mark a turning point by accelerating this transition. It has crystallized the issue and made a return to the pre-pandemic status quo impossible”.¹¹⁰

They can barely conceal their delight at the direction society is now taking: “The pandemic will accelerate innovation even more, catalysing technological changes already under way (comparable to the exacerbation effect it has had on other underlying global and domestic issues) and ‘turbocharging’ any digital business or the digital dimension of any business”.¹¹¹

“With the pandemic, the ‘digital transformation’ that so many analysts have been referring to for years, without being exactly sure what it meant, has found its catalyst. One major effect of confinement will be the expansion and progression of the digital world in a decisive and often permanent manner.

“In April 2020, several tech leaders observed how quickly and radically the necessities created by the health crisis had precipitated the adoption of a wide range of technologies. In the space of just one month, it appeared that many companies in terms of tech take-up fast-forwarded by several years”.¹¹²

Fate is obviously smiling on Klaus Schwab as this Covid-19 crisis has, happily, succeeded in advancing pretty much every aspect of the agenda he has been promoting over the decades.

Thus he and Malleret report with satisfaction that “the pandemic will fast-forward the adoption of automation in the workplace and the introduction of more robots in our personal and professional lives”.¹¹³

Lockdowns across the world have, needless to say, provided a big financial boost to those businesses offering online shopping.

The authors recount: “Consumers need products and, if they can’t shop, they will inevitably resort to purchasing them online. As the habit kicks in, people who had never shopped online before will become comfortable with doing so, while people who were part-time online shoppers before will presumably rely on it more. This was made evident during the lockdowns. In the US, Amazon and Walmart hired a combined 250,000 workers to keep up with the increase in demand and built massive infrastructure to deliver online. This accelerating growth of e-commerce means that the giants of the online retail industry are likely to emerge from the crisis even stronger than they were in the pre-pandemic era”.¹¹⁴

They add: “As more and diverse things and services are brought to us via our mobiles and computers, companies in sectors as disparate as e-commerce, contactless operations, digital content, robots and drone deliveries (to name just a few) will thrive. It is not by accident that firms

like Alibaba, Amazon, Netflix or Zoom emerged as ‘winners’ from the lockdowns”.¹¹⁵

By way of corollary, we might suggest that it is “not by accident” that governments which have been captured and controlled by big business, thanks to the likes of the WEF, have imposed a “new reality” under which big businesses are the “winners”...

The Covid-inspired good news never stops for all the business sectors which stand to benefit from the Fourth Industrial Repression.

“The pandemic may prove to be a boon for online education,” Schwab and Malleret report. “In Asia, the shift to online education has been particularly notable, with a sharp increase in students’ digital enrolments, much higher valuation for online education businesses and more capital available for ‘ed-tech’ start-ups... In the summer of 2020, the direction of the trend seems clear: the world of education, like for so many other industries, will become partly virtual”.¹¹⁶

Online sports have also taken off: “For a while, social distancing may constrain the practice of certain sports, which will in turn benefit the ever-more powerful expansion of e-sports. Tech and digital are never far away!”¹¹⁷

There is similar news from the banking sector: “Online banking interactions have risen to 90 percent during the crisis, from 10 percent,

with no drop-off in quality and an increase in compliance”.¹¹⁸

The Covid-inspired move into online activity obviously benefits Big Tech, who are making enormous profits out of the crisis, as the authors describe: “The combined market value of the leading tech companies hit record after record during the lockdowns, even rising back above levels before the outbreak started... this phenomenon is unlikely to abate any time soon, quite the opposite”.¹¹⁹

But it is also good news for all the businesses involved, who no longer have to pay human beings to work for them. Automation is, and has always been, about saving costs and thus boosting profits for the capitalist elite.

The culture of the fascist New Normal will also provide lucrative spin-off benefits for particular business sectors, such as the packaging industry, explain Schwab and Malleret.

“The pandemic will certainly heighten our focus on hygiene. A new obsession with cleanliness will particularly entail the creation of new forms of packaging. We will be encouraged not to touch the products we buy. Simple pleasures like smelling a melon or squeezing a fruit will be frowned upon and may even become a thing of the past”.¹²⁰

The authors also describe what sounds very

much like a technocratic profit-related agenda behind the “social distancing” which has been such a key element of the Covid “reset”.

They write: “In one form or another, social- and physical-distancing measures are likely to persist after the pandemic itself subsides, justifying the decision in many companies from different industries to accelerate automation. After a while, the enduring concerns about technological unemployment will recede as societies emphasize the need to restructure the workplace in a way that minimizes close human contact. Indeed, automation technologies are particularly well suited to a world in which human beings can’t get too close to each other or are willing to reduce their interactions. Our lingering and possibly lasting fear of being infected with a virus (COVID-19 or another) will thus speed the relentless march of automation, particularly in the fields most susceptible to automation”.¹²¹

As previously mentioned, Schwab has long been frustrated by all those tiresome regulations which stop capitalists from making as much money as they would like to, by focusing on economically irrelevant concerns such as the safety and well being of human beings.

But – hooray! – the Covid crisis has provided the perfect excuse for doing away with great swathes of these outmoded impediments to

prosperity and growth.

One area in which meddlesome red tape is being abandoned is health. Why would any right-minded stakeholder imagine that any particular obligation for care and diligence should be allowed to impinge on the profitability of this particular business sector?

Schwab and Malleret are overjoyed to note that telemedicine will “benefit considerably” from the Covid emergency: “The necessity to address the pandemic with any means available (plus, during the outbreak, the need to protect health workers by allowing them to work remotely) removed some of the regulatory and legislative impediments related to the adoption of telemedicine”.¹²²

The ditching of regulations is a general phenomenon under the New Normal global regime, as Schwab and Malleret relate: “To date governments have often slowed the pace of adoption of new technologies by lengthy ponderings about what the best regulatory framework should look like but, as the example of telemedicine and drone delivery is now showing, a dramatic acceleration forced by necessity is possible. During the lockdowns, a quasi-global relaxation of regulations that had previously hampered progress in domains where the technology had been available for years suddenly happened because there was no better

or other choice available. What was until recently unthinkable suddenly became possible... New regulations will stay in place”.¹²³

They add: “The current imperative to propel, no matter what, the ‘contactless economy’ and the subsequent willingness of regulators to speed it up means that there are no holds barred”.¹²⁴

“No holds barred”. Make no mistake: this is the language adopted by capitalism when it abandons its pretence at liberal democracy and switches into full-on fascist mode.

It is clear from Schwab and Malleret’s work that a fascistic merging of state and business, to the advantage of the latter, underpins their great reset.

Phenomenal sums of money have been transferred from the public purse into the bulging pockets of the 1% since the very start of the Covid crisis, as they acknowledge: “In April 2020, just as the pandemic began to engulf the world, governments across the globe had announced stimulus programmes amounting to several trillion dollars, as if eight or nine Marshall Plans had been put into place almost simultaneously”.¹²⁵

They continue: “COVID-19 has rewritten many of the rules of the game between the public and private sectors... The benevolent (or otherwise) greater intrusion of governments in the life of companies and the conduct of their

business will be country- and industry-dependent, therefore taking many different guises”.¹²⁶

“Measures that would have seemed inconceivable prior to the pandemic may well become standard around the world as governments try to prevent the economic recession from turning into a catastrophic depression.

“Increasingly, there will be calls for government to act as a ‘payer of last resort’ to prevent or stem the spate of mass layoffs and business destruction triggered by the pandemic. All these changes are altering the rules of the economic and monetary policy ‘game’.”¹²⁷

Schwab and his fellow author welcome the prospect of increased state powers being used to prop up big business profiteering.

They write: “One of the great lessons of the past five centuries in Europe and America is this: acute crises contribute to boosting the power of the state. It’s always been the case and there is no reason why it should be different with the COVID-19 pandemic”.¹²⁸

And they add: “Looking to the future, governments will most likely, but with different degrees of intensity, decide that it’s in the best interest of society to rewrite some of the rules of the game and permanently increase their role”.¹²⁹

The idea of rewriting the rules of the game is, again, very reminiscent of fascist language, as

of course is the idea of permanently increasing the role of the state in helping the private sector.

Indeed, it is worth comparing Schwab's position on this issue with that of Italian fascist dictator Benito Mussolini, who responded to economic crisis in 1931 by launching a special emergency body, *L'Istituto mobiliare italiano*, to aid businesses.

He declared this was "a means of energetically driving the Italian economy towards its corporative phase, which is to say a system which fundamentally respects private property and initiative, but ties them tightly to the State, which alone can protect, control and nourish them".¹³⁰

Suspicious about the fascistic nature of Schwab's great reset are confirmed, of course, by the police-state measures that have been rolled out across the world to ensure compliance with "emergency" Covid measures.

The sheer brute force that never lies far beneath the surface of the capitalist system becomes increasingly visible when it enters its fascist stage and this is very much in evidence in Schwab and Malleret's book.

The word "force" is deployed time and time again in the context of Covid-19.

Sometimes this is in a business context, as with the statements that "COVID-19 has forced all the banks to accelerate a digital transforma-

tion that is now here to stay” or that “the micro reset will force every company in every industry to experiment new ways of doing business, working and operating”.¹³¹

But sometimes it is applied directly to human beings, or “consumers” as Schwab and his ilk prefer to think of us.

“During the lockdowns, many consumers previously reluctant to rely too heavily on digital applications and services were forced to change their habits almost overnight: watching movies online instead of going to the cinema, having meals delivered instead of going out to restaurants, talking to friends remotely instead of meeting them in the flesh, talking to colleagues on a screen instead of chit-chatting at the coffee machine, exercising online instead of going to the gym, and so on...

“Many of the tech behaviours that we were forced to adopt during confinement will through familiarity become more natural. As social and physical distancing persist, relying more on digital platforms to communicate, or work, or seek advice, or order something will, little by little, gain ground on formerly ingrained habits”.¹³²

Under a fascist system, individuals are not offered the choice as to whether they want to comply with its demands or not, as Schwab and Malleret make quite clear regarding so-called

contact-tracing: “No voluntary contact-tracing app will work if people are unwilling to provide their own personal data to the governmental agency that monitors the system; if any individual refuses to download the app (and therefore to withhold information about a possible infection, movements and contacts), everyone will be adversely affected”.¹³³

This, they reflect, is another great advantage of the Covid crisis over the environmental one which might have been used to impose their New Normal: “While for a pandemic, a majority of citizens will tend to agree with the necessity to impose coercive measures, they will resist constraining policies in the case of environmental risks where the evidence can be disputed”.¹³⁴

These “coercive measures”, which we are all expected to go along with, will of course involve unimaginable levels of fascistic surveillance of our lives, particularly in our role as wage slaves.

Write Schwab and Malleret: “The corporate move will be towards greater surveillance; for better or for worse, companies will be watching and sometimes recording what their workforce does. The trend could take many different forms, from measuring body temperatures with thermal cameras to monitoring via an app how employees comply with social distancing”.¹³⁵

Coercive measures of one kind or another are also likely to be used to force people to take

the Covid vaccines currently being lined up.

Schwab is deeply connected to that world, being on a “first-name basis” with Bill Gates and having been hailed by Big Pharma mainstay Henry McKinnell, chairman and CEO of Pfizer Inc, as “a person truly dedicated to a truly noble cause”.¹³⁶

So it is not surprising that he insists, with Malleret, that “a full return to ‘normal’ cannot be envisaged before a vaccine is available”.¹³⁷

He adds: “The next hurdle is the political challenge of vaccinating enough people worldwide (we are collectively as strong as the weakest link) with a high enough compliance rate despite the rise of anti-vaxxers”.¹³⁸

“Anti-vaxxers” thus join Schwab’s list of threats to his project, along with anti-globalization and anti-capitalist protesters, Gilets Jaunes and all those engaged in “class conflicts”, “societal resistance” and “political backlash”.

The majority of the world’s population have already been excluded from decision-making processes by the lack of democracy which Schwab wants to accentuate through his stakeholderist corporate domination, his “agile governance”, his totalitarian “system management of human existence”.

But how does he envisage dealing with the “sombre scenario” of people rising up against his

great newnormalist reset and his transhumanist Fourth Industrial Revolution?

What degree of “force” and “coercive measures” would he be prepared to accept in order to ensure the dawning of his technocratic new age?

The question is a chilling one, but we should also bear in mind the historical example of the 20th century regime into which Schwab was born.

Hitler’s new Nazi normal was meant to last for a thousand years, but came crashing down 988 years ahead of target.

Just because Hitler said, with all the confidence of power, that his Reich would last for a millennium, this didn’t mean that it was so.

Just because Klaus Schwab and Thierry Malleret and their friends say that we are now entering the Fourth Industrial Revolution and our world will be changed for ever, this doesn’t mean that it is so.

We don’t have to accept their New Normal. We don’t have to go along with their fearmongering. We don’t have to take their vaccines. We don’t have to let them implant us with smartphones or edit our DNA. We don’t have to walk, muzzled and submissive, straight into their transhumanist hell.

We can denounce their lies! Expose their agenda! Refuse their narrative! Reject their toxic ideology! Resist their fascism!

Klaus Schwab is not a god, but a human being. Just one elderly man. And those he works with, the global capitalist elite, are few in number. Their aims are not the aims of the vast majority of humankind. Their transhumanist vision is repulsive to nearly everyone outside of their little circle and they do not have consent for the technocratic dictatorship they are trying to impose on us.

That, after all, is why they have had to go to such lengths to force it upon us under the false flag of fighting a virus. They understood that without the “emergency” justification, we were never going to go along with their warped scheme.

They are scared of our potential power because they know that if we stand up, we will defeat them. We can bring their project crashing down before it has even properly started.

We are the people, we are the 99%, and together we can grab back our freedom from the deadly jaws of the fascist machine!

1. Klaus Schwab with Nicholas Davis, *Shaping the Future of the Fourth Industrial Revolution: A Guide to Building a Better World* (Geneva: WEF, 2018), e-book. 20%, 19%, 3%
2. Klaus Schwab, *The Fourth Industrial Revolution* (Geneva: WEF, 2016), e-book. 28%
3. Schwab, *The Fourth Industrial Revolution*. 18%

4. Schwab, *Shaping the Future of the Fourth Industrial Revolution*. 3%
5. Ibid. 3%
6. Ibid. 13%
7. Ibid. 1%
8. Ibid. 54%
9. Ibid. 9%
10. Schwab, *The Fourth Industrial Revolution*. 22%, 24%
11. Ibid. 3%
12. Ibid. 3%
13. Ibid. 3%
14. Schwab, *Shaping the Future of the Fourth Industrial Revolution*. 20%
15. Schwab, *The Fourth Industrial Revolution*. 12%
16. Ibid. 79%
17. Ibid. 76%
18. Schwab, *Shaping the Future of the Fourth Industrial Revolution*. 56%
19. Schwab, *The Fourth Industrial Revolution*. 79%
20. Ibid. 79%
21. Ibid. 80%
22. Ibid. 85%
23. Schwab, *Shaping the Future of the Fourth Industrial Revolution*. 6%
24. Ibid. 8%
25. Ibid. 9%
26. Schwab, *The Fourth Industrial Revolution*. 56%
27. Schwab, *Shaping the Future of the Fourth Industrial Revolution*. 35%
28. Ibid. 6%
29. Ibid. 61%
30. Ibid. 49%

31. Ibid. 59%
32. Ibid. 74-75%
33. Ibid. 54%
34. Schwab, *The Fourth Industrial Revolution*. 57%
35. Schwab, *Shaping the Future of the Fourth Industrial Revolution*. 55%
36. Ibid. 2%
37. Ibid. 9%
38. Ibid. 27%
39. Ibid. 27%
40. Schwab, *Shaping the Future of the Fourth Industrial Revolution*, 30%, Schwab, *The Fourth Industrial Revolution*, 68%, Schwab, *Shaping the Future of the Fourth Industrial Revolution*. 30%, 30%
41. Schwab, *Shaping the Future of the Fourth Industrial Revolution*. 30%
42. Schwab, *The Fourth Industrial Revolution*. 68%.
43. Ibid. 8%, 14%
44. Schwab, *Shaping the Future of the Fourth Industrial Revolution*. 63%
45. Ibid. 59%
46. Ibid. 51%
47. Schwab, *The Fourth Industrial Revolution*. 14%
48. Ibid. 14%
49. Ibid. 15%
50. Kevin Warwick, *I, Cyborg* (London: Century, 2002), p. 4. See also Paul Cudeneq, *Nature, Essence and Anarchy* (Sussex: Winter Oak, 2016).
51. Schwab, *The Fourth Industrial Revolution*. 57%
52. Ibid. 3%
53. Schwab, *Shaping the Future of the Fourth Industrial Revolution*. 17%
54. Ibid. 17%

55. Ibid. 24%
56. Klaus Schwab, Thierry Malleret, *Covid-19: The Great Reset* (Geneva: WEF, 2020), e-book. Edition 1.0. 39%
57. Ibid. 37%
58. Ibid. 30%, 39%
59. Schwab, *The Fourth Industrial Revolution*. 7%
60. Ibid. 5%
61. Schwab, *Shaping the Future of the Fourth Industrial Revolution*. 20%
62. Ibid. 20%
63. Ibid. 20%
64. Schwab, Malleret, *Covid-19: The Great Reset*. 36%
65. Ibid. 54%, 22%
66. Schwab, *The Fourth Industrial Revolution*. 39%
67. Schwab, *Shaping the Future of the Fourth Industrial Revolution*. 71%
68. Ibid. 72%
69. Ibid. 69%
70. Ibid. 75%
71. Ibid. 56%
72. Schwab, Malleret, *Covid-19: The Great Reset*. 40%
73. Ibid. 40%
74. Ibid. 37%
75. Ibid. 42%
76. Ibid. 41%
77. Ibid. 41%
78. Schwab, *The Fourth Industrial Revolution*. 44%
79. Ibid. 48%
80. Schwab, *Shaping the Future of the Fourth Industrial Revolution*. 84%
81. Ibid. 57%
82. Ibid. 78%

83. Ibid. 79%
84. Ibid. 60%
85. Ibid. 82%
86. Ibid. 82%
87. Ibid. 82%
88. Ibid. 82%
89. Ibid. 83%
90. Schwab, Malleret, *Covid-19: The Great Reset*. 1%
91. Ibid. 1%
92. Ibid. 89%
93. Ibid. 90%
94. Ibid. 5%
95. Ibid. 60%
96. Ibid. 52%
97. Ibid. 2%, 26%, 2%
98. Ibid. 89%, 90%
99. Ibid. 3%
100. Schwab, *The Fourth Industrial Revolution*. 3%
101. Ibid. 17%
102. Schwab, Malleret, *Covid-19: The Great Reset*. 48%
103. Ibid. 48%
104. Ibid. 21%
105. Ibid. 67%
106. Ibid. 54%
107. Ibid. 54%
108. Ibid. 48%
109. Ibid. 36%
110. Ibid. 34%
111. Ibid. 55%
112. Ibid. 55%
113. Ibid. 57%
114. Ibid. 64%

115. Ibid. 63%
116. Ibid. 73%
117. Ibid. 74%
118. Ibid. 64%
119. Ibid. 73%
120. Ibid. 71%
121. Ibid. 55%
122. Ibid. 64%
123. Ibid. 56%
124. Ibid. 56%
125. Ibid. 32%
126. Ibid. 65%
127. Ibid. 23%
128. Ibid. 31%
129. Ibid. 33%
130. Benito Mussolini, cit. Pierre Milza and Serge Berstein, *Le fascisme italien 1919-1945* (Paris: Editions de Seuil, 1980), p. 246.
131. Schwab, Malleret, *Covid-19: The Great Reset*. 75%, 76%
132. Ibid. 55%
133. Ibid. 59%
134. Ibid. 49%
135. Ibid. 59%
136. *Hindustan Times*, January 28, 2006.
137. Schwab, Malleret, *Covid-19: The Great Reset*. 16%
138. Ibid. 16%

DISMANTLING TYRANNY

December 14, 2020

The only good thing to have come out of recent nightmarish months is that a lot of people have had to think seriously about the way they see the world.

I have not been exempt from this phenomenon, of course, and have been forced by circumstance into serious bouts of ideological soul-searching, but am delighted to report that, as 2020 draws to an end, I remain attached to the same principles with which I began the year!

What has changed, though, is that I now feel the need to provide certain additional explanations to my overall viewpoint which I would not have previously considered necessary.

Take, for example, my position with regard to the nation-state. I have been outspoken in my condemnation of nation-states and nationalism in my writing, but the global fascist coup has reminded me that a different perspective exists.

This says that truly independent nation-states, free from the chains imposed by all those globalist institutions from the World Bank and

the IMF to the United Nations and the World Health Organization, would not have succumbed so meekly to the global capitalist putsch.

I can concede that the resurgence of anti-globalist national sovereignty, in the Global South as well as in Europe and the USA, might well be the best short-term bet for seeing off this horrific attempt to permanently enslave humankind in a techno-fascist world dictatorship.

However – and I would emphasise that word! – it is crucial to remember that nation-states were very early forms of centralised authority imposed on free human communities and that the nation-state is the tool with which the exploiting class has long kept us in line.

The weary old mantra of “we’re all in this together” is the language of nationalism, in which the supposed common “national” interest of the serf and the billionaire, and their shared hatred of “foreigners”, is supposed to override any sense of social injustice on the part of the former.

The nation-state, with its fake “democracy”, its “legitimate authority”, its controlled media narratives, its public figures, its academic institutions, its police and its monopoly on violence, is the very real and immediate means by which we are oppressed.

Globalism may be the prison, but the nation-

state is both the cell in which we are held and the prison guard standing outside.

If we ever want to taste real freedom, we will have to decentralise power completely, to the community level.

Unless we dismantle the national level of tyranny as well as the global one, everything will remain in place for the same thing to happen all over again.

A second issue I have been contemplating has been the issue of private property. My past criticism has been levelled at the system of private property (particularly land ownership) rather than at individuals who own their own home or farm.

In this society, we have no choice as to whether we want to participate in the system of private property. If we are not home-owners then we are home-renters. It is no better to be ripped off by a landlord than by a building society. People get by as they can.

When I first saw the World Economic Forum propaganda proposing a future in which we “own nothing”, my blood ran cold for a moment. Had I had been inadvertently promoting their agenda through my criticism of private property?

No, because the globalists’ vision is, like everything else they come out with, a lie. They certainly want the vast majority of human beings to own nothing, but that is because they want to

own everything themselves – including those selfsame human beings!

Their “own nothing” option in fact represents the next step in the domination of private property, rather than its reversal. They want to consolidate the power of their own ultra-rich ruling class to the extent that the rest of us are left with nothing at all.

It is important to note that it is only through the development of private property as we have hitherto known it, that they have been able to reach this point.

Over many centuries, the ruling class has used its property to create wealth, used its wealth to acquire property and power, used its power to protect and increase its property and wealth.

Our overlords may have thrown us a few crumbs from the table as a sop to keep us quiet – convincing us that we too were part of their “property-owning democracy” – but it was always only a matter of time before they would try to push the thing a step further and grab everything for themselves.

Again, if we were able to pull back from the brink of this global totalitarian coup, there would be no point in returning to the pre-Covid status quo, as all the conditions would remain in place for the global ruling elite to try the same thing again, a few years down the road, using a

different trick.

We need to prevent property from being used as a form of power and exploitation over others and develop organic form of communal democracy and co-operative ownership which cannot be hijacked by greedy tyrants.

I do not want to see land or homes owned either by billionaire capitalists or by the state, but by people, in ways that suit them best, on the most decentralised local level possible, in a spirit of sharing, caring and mutual aid.

The third issue I want to address here is that of business. I hate the “business” ethos which was notoriously instilled in the UK under Margaret Thatcher. Greed is good. Anyone who makes money (off other people) is a hero and the rest of us are all losers.

So it was strange to find myself sympathising with the plight of smaller businesses in the face of the lockdowns.

Strange, but perfectly explicable when I looked at it more closely.

As with the previous two thorny issues, what we are seeing today is the massive amplification of the “business” principle which I oppose, not its negation.

The Great Fascist Reset is, after all, being promoted by a business organisation, the World Economic Forum, and all the bias built in to the so-called “sustainability” agendas of the EU, the

UN and so forth concerns prioritising the ongoing growth and expansion of business “stakeholders”.

The version of “business” sold to the little people by the global financial mafia was nothing but a gesture, a carrot dangled in front of them to persuade them to consent to the marvellous capitalist system and to stand with the billionaires against any “freedom-hating” left wingers who wanted a fairer distribution of wealth.

Now, that little game has outlived its usefulness and the people who thought they were living the free-market dream will find themselves herded into the same electronic concentration camps as the rest of us, as the slave-masters move to seize complete economic and social control.

The seeds for this have been there all along, from the moment that our societies started moving away from old-fashioned community values and towards the worship of money above all else.

In the words of the German sociologist Ferdinand Tönnies (1855-1936), this was the historic transition from *Gemeinschaft* (traditional community) to *Gesellschaft* (modern commercial society).

The French radical Georges Lapierre talks about the dominating “cosmovision” of a society based entirely on money: “In a mercantile society

we are all merchants, our heads are filled with the thoughts of big capitalist merchants, we all think about money”.

If there is a Great Awakening from the Great Reset, there is no point in falling back into the money-thinking that has progressively corrupted our world for the last 500 years or more.

Just because things are worse now, with the Covid coup, than they were a year ago, or ten years ago, does not mean that we should aim to return to that previous step of the process.

I keep thinking of the apocryphal story of the man who fell from the top of a skyscraper and, as he passed each floor on the way down, was heard declaring “so far so good!”

While it may have been better to have been alive in 1960 or 1980 or 2000 than in 2020, rewinding to any of those stages would only condemn us to live through the same thing again, as we plummet towards the current calamity.

Instead, we need to go back to the point before we fell off the edge and take a different civilizational direction.

We need to rediscover what it means to be truly human, to cherish value over price, communal belonging over personal self-interest, honour above wealth.

We need to look deep inside ourselves and search out and nurture everything that makes us

noble, authentic, generous and kind.

We need to remember that we are animals, that we are part of nature, part of the living cosmos and that respect for everything around us is essential for our happiness and survival.

That ancient human wisdom is still there, even though it has long been marginalised and spat upon by the same venal parasite class which is currently trying to steal everything from us and turn us into their slaves.

Our task is to find it, to drink it in deeply and then to share it as the health-giving elixir of a free and natural future for all of humankind.

IMPACTOR ALERT!

March 16, 2021

Warning! Warning! Friends, citizens, fellow human beings! Rouse yourselves!

The Impactors are coming and they want to steal from us everything we have, everything we are and everything we could one day become.

This is no time to cower indoors, shocked and awed into spellbound submission by their satanic Spectacle. While the emergency sirens wail and the tear gas of panic chokes and blinds the citizenry, the dark cohorts are fast advancing deep into our lives.

Come down into the streets! Help build our barricades and be prepared to offer up everything in defence of our freedom!

The Impactors are coming but they are not coming as they did once before, clad in boots of brutality and bearing banners of hate.

This time they are sneaking up in disguise, wrapped in the multi-coloured plastic packaging of pseudo-niceness.

They assure us that they are here to do good, to help the needy, to build back better, to save

the planet.

But it is all just lies, lies, lies!

This “niceness” is their Trojan Horse, their secret weapon of mass manipulation, with which they hope to reach inside your heart in order to rip it out.

Make no mistake: they have been planning this for years. They have used their ill-gotten gold to buy the souls of thousands, to ensure that their loyal placemen occupy every post of significance in every relevant organisation and institution.

Watch how all these impactuary minions crawl muzzled on their knees and prostrate themselves before the false gods of sustainable servitude!

Listen how they all repeat the same unholy mantras of submission, obedience and silence!

And the Impactors’ army of eager little robot-impactivists, hired to quench the flames of authentic revolt, scurry around to reinforce their masters’ message and blast vitriol on those who refuse to bow to Power.

“Impactivate! Impactivate!” they scream mechanically. “Wrongthink is the enemy of progress! All enemies of progress will be impactivated!”

Let us be clear about this! The Impactors are not here to “save the world” or to “do good”.

Inversion of truth is an integral part of their

demonic essence and their plan. Their real aims are the exact opposite of what their weaponised narrative pretends.

The Evil Impactorship wants to own and control us, our bodies and every moment of our lives. It wants to own and control every square inch of our world.

And through this ownership and control it aims to exploit, to suck dry, to feed itself fatter and fatter on the flesh of humankind and our Mother Earth until there is nothing left.

But wait! Perhaps I am going too fast? I forget that some of you don't know what this is all about, haven't been paying attention to the important voices warning of us of what is happening.

Have you heard about the plan to save the rule of the elite by finding new raw materials, new "products", from which it can keep increasing its vast wealth and maintain its cancerous and disastrous growth?

Do you understand that, as capital seeks "sustainability" by expanding into the virtual world, it wants to turn us all into investable commodities?

You will be aware that for decades now, all across the world, "austerity" has meant that public bodies have been starved of money with which, under the current system, they are supposed to provide services to the public, while

giant corporations have found clever ways of not contributing to that social pot.

States have therefore been forced to borrow more and more money – from the very financial networks which have created austerity – and to go begging for cash from this same “private sector” in other ways.

But there is a cost to pay, of course! When the mendacious Money Men claim they are helping the state and therefore the people, in truth they are merely helping themselves, via the state, at the expense of the people!

Students of history will recall that this “partnership” between the public and the private, this merger of state and big business, was the economic basis of fascism.

Have you read about Klaus Schwab, about Michael Bloomberg, about Ronald McCohen, the Clown Prince of fast-food neo-feudalism, and his plan for pay-for-success slavery?

A big friend of war criminal Tony Blair, Cohen has been busy building up a new structure through which Big Money can suck away the lifeblood of society. This is “impact capitalism”, the new venture capital for the 2020s.

The idea is that because states can no longer afford to look after people in the way they promise, private businesses can step in to provide money up front to “solve” certain specific problems.

This injection of cash is not a gift, of course, even if the narcissists involved like to label themselves “philanthropists”. It is an investment.

When the “solution” is achieved, they will recoup their cash, plus their own slice of the money that they have “saved” the state through their intervention.

Maybe this, in itself, does not shock you. But there are a number of complications, three of which I will now explain.

Complication Number One is that the “success” for which the Impactors are rewarded has to be “measurable”. Calculation lies at the core of their scheme: the reduction of all life to a series of statistics on a financial dashboard.

These vampires might calculate the profit potential of an unborn baby girl. How much will this child cost the state? What is her social status, racial origin, state of health, likely career path?

Once the number-crunching algorithms have come up with an answer, the Impactors can set out to reduce this cost to the state, which will allow them to claim a return from their investment.

But how can they track all this? How can anyone know how the child is advancing, what kind of social relationships she is enjoying, what she is eating and how her body is doing?

Total surveillance is required and total surveillance means the internet, powered by 5G or 6G. If the infant is constantly plugged into the matrix, interacting with artificial intelligence, diligently entering data about herself into the machine, then the Impactors have the evidence they need of how she is advancing. Or not.

If she is out playing with her friends in the park, or sitting dreamily in her bedroom surrounded by dolls and picture books, she is off-grid and providing no data. She is a waste of space and time. An unprofitable investment.

The Impactors want to push this further and further to get more and more profit. They want sensors in our bodies, in our minds even, to Hoover up every conceivable piece of data about us.

They want to be able to create a digital twin of each and every one of us, a fake version of us reduced to the dead binary code which is the empty foundation of their life-hating cult of exploitation and accumulation.

And because they see us as their possessions, their slaves, they think they have the right to control us and cage us so that they can exploit us to the maximum.

They want to herd us into smart cities, strap us with wearable technology, monitor and control our every movement and interaction.

The Impactors' twisted vision is of a world of

geofencing and e-carceration, of facial recognition and predictive policing, of biometric data and sensor networks, of behavioural insights and eugenics, of nudging and shaping, of the internet of things and the internet of bodies.

These twisted elite psychopaths want us coded, counted and controlled, regarded as digital assets on a blockchain ledger, deprived of our natural health and dependent on constant updates from the Big Pharma machine.

They want us locked down permanently in a global police state, a digitalised new world order dressed up as some kind of progressive paradise.

We will be nothing but virtual livestock, forced by poverty and powerlessness to submit to their workforce pathways, their retraining and lifelong learning, racing to the bottom of the slavery-slope of a globally-outsourced remote-labour marketplace.

Complication Number Two is a useful spin-off from Complication Number One – useful, that is, from the perspective of the Evil Empire itself!

Impactor “success” is only measured by data on a dashboard. It does not necessarily have anything to do with real life, but is merely a pseudo-success resulting from the narrow criteria which have been set up to measure “outcome”.

The “solutions” that fake green businesses

have long been trying to sell us for climate change are no solutions at all. They are products disguised as solutions.

The business sharks peddling these “solutions” simply don’t care that they will only make things worse by unleashing a new spiral of industrialism, extraction, expansion and thus destruction.

They don’t care because they can see no further than their immediate pecuniary self-interest. They don’t care because they have none of the higher values that make us truly human, only a low and narrow craving for more and more wealth and power.

The same is true of the “solutions” proposed on the social level by the Impact-vultures. A green tick on a screen is not a problem solved. A few digital hurdles apparently overcome does not mean that the person-product’s life has been improved in any meaningful way.

The underlying problems not only remain, but deepen in severity. Elites getting richer off the impact scam will mean everyone else getting poorer. Wellbeing and mental health are not going to be improved by forcing people into a digital panopticon.

Impact “social philanthropy” is a business based on a new economic model. A deceptive business that does not really want to eliminate poverty and misery but to mine them endlessly.

It has a vested interest in the continuation of a wide range of problems for which it can sell its “solutions”, which in reality are just sleights of hand, deceptive devices designed to make money from a lucrative global market of managed poverty and surveillance.

Broken people and broken lives spell endless profits for the impact parasites.

Complication Number Three is that the money made from these deals by the Impactors is only the tip of the iceberg.

As Alison McDowell has long been at pains to tell us, we are looking here at “fascism rolled out by hedge funds”.

The vampires’ really big money will come from speculating on the financial products they have created from our lives.

As dispossessed people become increasingly dependent on the state, the Impactors will take advantage of this to pitch each of us as a debt product, creating securitised markets in privatised welfare.

These massive new equity markets for hedge funds will see your personal circumstances packaged and traded as liquid assets like bundles of mortgages, with some financial vultures gambling on you achieving your outcomes and others against.

These markets have to be real-time so that the global investors can bet on them and that

means your life has to be led online. If you are offline you are not providing data for their gambling game and they cannot make money from you.

Stay at home! Stay online! Save capitalism!

In order to make money from this new speculative game, in which you and I, our children and our grandchildren, are the counters, the Impactors have first got to set it up.

The rules of the game have been set out by the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals, whose apparent worthiness is just another layer of deceit in the Impactors' phoney world.

Certain goals are officially labelled "good", meaning that public authorities are encouraged and even obliged to pour funds into achieving them and that the impact businesses profiting from this are treated as having a special holier-than-thou status that might, for instance, liberate them from the inconvenient need to pay tax.

And, again, it is here that the impactivist brigade step in to prop up the lies and confirm that "good" as defined by the Impactors really is "good" as seen from all perspectives, even from the left flank of the system.

Oh yes! They like to paint themselves as latter-day saints, as enlightened do-gooders, all those con-artists, crooks and charlatans conspiring to mislead and enslave us!

And how will the Impactors create the infrastructure of the game from which they will profit? By forcing their prisoners to build their own prison! Education of the traditional kind is so out-of-date. Training is what the young need now, in the shiny New Normal. Training to code the impacterist machine.

Play our game. It's just a game. Lose yourself, your reality and your future in our game.

When we have successfully helped create the structure of their Fourth Industrial Revolution transhumanist hell, we will be replaced by robots and algorithms.

And this marvellous world will be poisoned and pillaged to the point of no return.

Unless, of course...

Unless, together, we see through the Impactors' lies!

Unless, together, we refuse to comply and conform!

Unless, together, we tell them we will neither build nor play their game!

Unless, together, we are willing to fight to the death for the sake of life!

This article was inspired by, and almost entirely sourced from, the groundbreaking research and analysis of Alison McDowell of wrenchinthegears.com

TEN THINGS WE HAVE LEARNED DURING THE COVID COUP

May 5, 2021

One potential positive from the whole Covid-19 debacle is that we have learned an incredible amount about the society in which we live. This will be crucial if we manage to stave off a descent into a nightmare future of techno-fascist slavery.

We will have a new understanding of what our world has become and what we would like it to be in the decades and centuries to come. And “we” means we. While the majority have apparently learnt nothing at all from what has happened, they will eventually catch up.

There is no way that knowledge gained by a wide-awake 15% or 20% of the population will not end up being shared by almost everyone. Once the truth is out, it tends to stay out. As H.R. Haldeman so wisely put it, “you can’t put the toothpaste back in the tube”.

Here are *Ten Things We Have Learned During the Covid Coup*:

1. Our political system is hopelessly corrupt. Virtually all politicians are hopelessly corrupt. No political party can be trusted. They all can be, and have been, bought.
2. Democracy is a sham. It has been a sham for a very long time. There will never be any real democracy when money and power amount to the same thing.
3. The system will stop at nothing to hold on to its power and, if possible, increase its levels of control and exploitation. It has no scruples. No lie is too outrageous, no hypocrisy too nauseating, no human sacrifice too great.
4. So-called radical movements are usually nothing of the sort. From whatever direction they claim to attack the system, they are just pretending to do so and serve to channel discontent in directions which are harmless to the power clique and even useful to its agendas.
5. Any “dissident” voice you have ever heard of through corporate media is probably a fake. The system does not hand out free publicity to its actual enemies.
6. Most people in our society are cowards. They will jettison all the fine values and principles which they have been loudly boasting about all their lives merely to avoid the slightest chance of public criticism, inconvenience or even minor financial loss.
7. The mainstream media is nothing but a

propaganda machine for the system and those journalists who work for it have sold their sorry souls, placing their (often minimal) writing skills entirely at the disposition of Power.

8. Police are not servants of the public but servants of a powerful and extremely wealthy minority which seeks to control and exploit the public for its own narrow and greedy interests.

9. Scientists cannot be trusted. They will use the hypnotic power of their white coats and authoritative status for the benefit of whoever funds their work and lifestyle. He who pays the piper calls the tune.

10. Progress is a misleading illusion. The “progress” of increasing automisation and industrialisation does not go hand in hand with a progress in the quality of human life, but in fact will “progressively” reduce it to the point of complete extinction.

FASCISM: THREE BRIEF INSIGHTS

June 10, 2021

I seem to have spent a lot of time over the last few years reading and writing about fascism, rather than about the positive ideas which inspire me.

I have felt obliged to do so because of our society's worrying general blindness concerning what fascism was, historically, and what it has evolved into today.

It seems apparent to me that this state of affairs has not come about by accident. The new breed of fascists, who currently hold the reins of power almost everywhere, have worked hard for decades to brew up this fog of confusion.

Our culture has taught us not only to hate and fear fascism, particularly its German incarnation, but also to regard it as very much "other" to our contemporary military-economic complex, even as its complete opposite.

The current system is a global one, while fascists were focused on the national level, so how could there possibly be any similarity between the two approaches?

“Enterprise” and “prosperity” are the watchwords of our society, whereas the Nazis were “socialist”, we are told. (*Look at the name of their party! It must be true! Are you suggesting they actually lied to the German working class in order to come to power?*)

Nazis defined people according to race in order to exclude them from their society, while today’s Great Reset progressives define people according to race in the interests of “equity”, “inclusivity” and “social impact”. Quite the opposite, surely?

The fascists imposed mass conformity and obedience whereas our democratic societies nurture proud individuality and free thinking... don’t they?

In short, we need to seriously reappraise our received knowledge about the historical significance of fascism and its relation to society in the 2020s.

As a small contribution to that process, I would like to share here Three Brief Insights which I have gained from some recent reading.

First insight

The *Wandervögel* of the *Jugendbewegung* in late 19th and early 20th century Germany have been much maligned.

These outdoors-loving, free-wandering

youngsters formed an important anti-industrial movement, a powerful counterculture which rejected the emptiness of the corrupted modern world and sought to renew awareness of our organic human belonging to nature.

This was a significant cultural uprising, a rebellion against the extinction of life and happiness which was being ruthlessly inflicted by the money-making machineries of greed and profit.

However, not only was this blossoming of hope crushed and buried in the slaughter of the First World War, but it has subsequently been deliberately smeared by those who fear another great wave of rejection of the industrial slave-system that has stolen our joy and our future.

A certain brand of propaganda likes to insist that the *Wandervögel* represented “the beginnings of the Hitler Youth”,¹ that they were involved in a “shift from nature worship to Führer worship”,² that they “significantly paved the way to dictatorship”³ or even that they were “responsible for the flight and expulsion of the Jews”.⁴

The outright deceit involved in these accounts came home to me when I was reading Gershom Scholem’s account of his friendship with Walter Benjamin.

Here he reveals that Benjamin, when he first came across him, was a leading light in this

Wandervögel movement.⁵

Benjamin, who subsequently became known for his unusual combination of Jewish mysticism and Marxist analysis, never abandoned the *Jugendbewegung* critique of so-called “progress”.

He based his personal philosophy on the importance of myth and tradition and insisted that while a return to the past was not physically possible, we could still take a detour via the past in order to find the path to a future of our choice.

Benjamin was far from being the only Jewish or “left-wing” member of the *Wandervögel*, which was a phenomenon much broader than the usual narrow and misleading political categories.

Their revolt did not *lead to* Nazism, as the propagandists claim, but was *co-opted and distorted* by the Nazis to serve their own nefarious ends.

As John de Graaf has pointed out: “Hitler formed an alternative youth movement which won adherents because it copied the trappings and rhetoric of the earlier counterculture, while adding a strong dose of Nazi discipline and ideology”.⁶

There is a familiar ring to this, for anyone who has been closely observing the fake-green movement which has been manufactured to promote the Great Fascist Reset and its Fourth Industrial Reich – or indeed the fake-left movement which serves the same manipulative

master.

Fascist environmentalism was about as genuine as that of today's phoney bright greens. It was factory-produced *ersatz* environmentalism.

The autobahn-building, machinery-obsessed, modernising Nazis loved nature in the same way that the UK's Conservative Party wants to "conserve" traditional ways of living, that the Labour Party really represents the interests of "labourers", that US Democrats are actually "democratic" or that the Soviet Union was a genuine union of local revolutionary councils ("soviets").

All of this is just "narrative", spin, marketing, lies. Everything this cynical industrial system throws at us is fake. Its "politics", its "news", its "culture", its "science", its "crises", its "solutions" and, of course, the "history" with which it justifies its ongoing control and blinds us to the desirability and possibility of breaking free from its life-destroying grip.

Second insight

Reinhard Höhn was a leading character in the world of business management during the "miracle" economic recovery in West Germany in the decades after the second world war.

In 1953 he became head of the *Deutsche Volkswirtschaftliche Gesellschaft*, an industrial

think-tank aiming to maximise economic growth through efficient management.

Johann Chapoutot explains that “in the context of the Marshall Plan and triumphant atlanticism”,⁷ this project was all about training American-style managers in the style of the Harvard Business School.

From 1956, Höhn ran the *Akademie für Führungskräfte* (Management Academy) at Bad Harzburg, which welcomed executives from thousands of firms including Aldi, BMW, Hoechst, Bayer, Telefunken, Esso, Krupp, Thyssen, Opel, Ford, Colgate, Hewlett-Packard...⁸

Is it a surprise to learn that just a few years previously Höhn had been a prominent Nazi, a protégé of Heinrich Himmler, a shining light of the SS who finished the war with the rank of *SS-Oberführer*?⁹

As Chapoutot points out in his 2020 book *Libres d'Obéir: le management du nazisme à aujourd'hui*, there was no breach in his personal continuity: “Like Klaus Barbie and so many others, Professor Dr Höhn pulls off this redeployment without changing: after the war he becomes what he has always been”.¹⁰

And what was Höhn, both before and after 1945? A “technocrat intellectual”¹¹ replies Chapoutot. A right-wing social darwinist, a proponent of public-private partnerships merging

the state with big business,¹² a man obsessed with *Führung* (leadership)¹³ and the fanatic desire for success at all costs.

This is not just about Höhn. Justus Beyer, a leading Nazi who ended the war as *Obersturmbannführer*, taught alongside him in the 1970s.¹⁴

And one of the pillars of the Bad Harzburg training school was Professor Dr Franz-Alfred Six. In 1941, Six led a Nazi commando operation in Russia, under SS General Arthur Nebe, and was subsequently found guilty of crimes against humanity at Nuremberg.

Despite a 20-year sentence handed out in 1948, he was free again in 1952. Like many Nazis, Six joined the “liberal” *Freie Demokratische Partei* (FDP), then landed a job as marketing director for Porsche and started teaching at Höhn’s academy.¹⁵

The implications are broader still, of course. These personal stories merely illustrate the deep thematic continuity between the social aims of Hitler’s Germany and those of post-WW2 “liberal democracy”.

Chapoutot shows that contemporary management thinking, while it already existed in the 1930s, was greatly formed by the Nazi period, with the Fourth Reich’s ideology central to the theory and practice of post-war management.

This thinking regards people as nothing but raw materials, as “human resources” to be

ruthlessly exploited.

The fake “freedom” that Höhn’s academy proposed for its business leaders, as the title of Chapoutot’s book points out, meant being “free to obey”, to practise what Klaus Schwab calls “agile governance” and to push for efficiency and productivity above all human considerations, which are not regarded as important by the cold techno-fascist mind.

Describing this nazi-industrial “reification” of humanity, Chapoutot writes: “It transforms each person into a thing (*res*), an object, which must be useful in order to have the right to live and exist. The Germanic individual becomes a tool, a raw material (*Menschenmaterial*) and a factor – a factor of production, of growth, of prosperity”.¹⁶

This outlook has no time for the idle or the ill, for anyone who cannot show themselves to be *leistungsfähig* – productive and profitable. Any such anti-social misfits and refuseniks face social exclusion and even the concentration camps.

There is nothing “socialist” about this right-wing social darwinist position, of course, and Chapoutot describes this part of the “National Socialist” brand as “a semantic trap”¹⁷ aimed at luring natural left-wingers into the nationalist fold.

He concludes: “In pushing destruction of nature and exploitation of the ‘life force’ to whole

new levels, the Nazis can be seen as a distorted and revealing image of a modernity gone mad – served by illusions (the ‘final victory’ or the ‘return to growth’) and by lies (‘freedom’, ‘autonomy’) cleverly crafted by management thinkers like Reinhard Höhn”. (18)

Third insight

It has now been 45 years since the publication of Antony C. Sutton’s classic book, *Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler*.

His revelations, showing how the Nazis were funded through the back door by international chemicals, electricity, automobile, steel, telecommunications, oil and coal businesses, and the shady financiers behind them, have become familiar to many people over the intervening decades, so I won’t recount them all as if they were breaking news.

However, much of what he sets out seems even more important today, in the face of Klaus Schwab’s Great Fascist Reset.

Sutton’s concluding lines, for instance, have lost none of their relevance since he penned them in 1976.

He writes: “Periodic crises and wars are used to whip up support for other plunder-reward cycles which in effect tighten the noose around our individual liberties.

“And of course we have hordes of academic sponges, amoral businessmen, and just plain hangers-on, to act as non-productive recipients for the plunder.

“Stop the circle of plunder and immoral reward and elitist structures collapse. But not until a majority finds the moral courage and the internal fortitude to reject the something-for-nothing con game and replace it by voluntary associations, voluntary communes, or local rule and decentralized societies, will the killing and the plunder cease”.¹⁹

The overall finding in Sutton’s book, for which he provides detailed evidence, is that behind the Nazi New Normal Order lay “a provable pattern of subsidy and political manipulation”²⁰ carried out by a power elite which “has its own objectives, which are inconsistent with those of the public at large”.²¹

Hitler’s project appealed to these networks because “it is in the pecuniary interests of the international bankers to centralize political power”,²² he explains. The whole thing was about “control of the State by private business interests”.²³

“There was a linked sequence of major events; the financial contribution from prominent bankers and industrialists to the 1933 election, burning of the Reichstag, abrogation of constitutional rights, and subsequent seizure of

power by the Nazi Party”,²⁴ states Sutton.

He quotes Carroll Quigley, from his 1966 book *Tragedy and Hope*, when he describes the plan as being “nothing less than to create a world system of financial control, in private hands, able to dominate the political system of each country and the economy of the world as a whole”.²⁵

The profitability of this parasitical global enterprise came at a price of course: the tens of millions of lives lost or ruined by the consequences of its greed, not least the “meaningless, meandering no-win wars” which have “no other major purpose but to generate multibillion-dollar armaments contracts”.²⁶

It was interesting to see that Sutton highlights the key role played by J.P. Morgan in promoting fascism in Germany. As I have previously described, the same was true in Italy, where the American financiers boosted Mussolini’s regime with a \$100m loan between 1925 and 1927.²⁷

Today the firm, now known as JPMorgan Chase & Co, is involved in impact capitalism²⁸ and is a partner of the World Economic Forum.

It is worth noting, in the light of all the current talk about a Green New Deal and a New Deal for Nature, that Sutton condemns President Franklin D Roosevelt’s original New Deal as a “fascist plan” and says that “both Hitler’s New Order and Roosevelt’s New Deal were backed by

the same industrialists and in content were quite similar – ie, they were both plans for a corporate state”.²⁹

Also very striking is what Sutton describes as “the central role of IG Farben in Hitler’s coup d’état”.³⁰ He says the chemicals business, which manufactured the Zyklon B gas used in the concentration camps, wielded “extraordinary political and economic power and influence within the Hitlerian Nazi state” and amounted, effectively, to “a state within a state”.³¹

One of its former executives, Dr George von Schnitzler, even declared that “IG is largely responsible for Hitler’s policy”.³²

Sutton writes: “The Berlin NW7 office of IG Farben was the key Nazi overseas espionage center... The so-called statistics department of NW7 (known as VOWI) was created in 1929 and evolved into the economic intelligence arm of the Wehrmacht [army].

“At the outbreak of war in 1939 VOWI employees were ordered into the Wehrmacht but in fact continued to perform the same work as when nominally under IG Farben.

“One of the more prominent of these Farben intelligence workers in NW7 was Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands, who joined Farben in the early 1930s after completion of an 18-month period of service in the black-uniformed SS”.³³

Bernhard went on to become founder-president of the WWF, notorious for throwing indigenous people off their land on behalf of its big business friends under the false green flag of “conservation” and today very prominent in the industrial-financial lobby calling for a New Deal for Nature.

He chaired the Steering Committee of the Bilderberg Group, of which WEF boss Klaus Schwab was a fellow member.

Bernhard was also honorary sponsor of Schwab’s third European Management Symposium at Davos in 1973, when the body which was to become the World Economic Forum first adopted a more overtly political stance, by agreeing a document which became known as “the Davos manifesto”.

This was originally entitled a “Code of Ethics”, but maybe even its hard-headed business promoters drew the line at a label flaunting quite that degree of hypocrisy.

The real agenda behind this manifesto (and indeed behind the WEF/UN buzzword “sustainability”) is summed up in its last point: “It is important to ensure the long-term existence of the enterprise. The long-term existence cannot be ensured without sufficient profitability”.³⁴

1. tinyurl.com/v4vt5h9j
2. tinyurl.com/4csd7c2e
3. tinyurl.com/3eajfxw6
4. tinyurl.com/myb2yetuf
5. Gershom Scholem, *Walter Benjamin Histoire d'une amitié*, trans. by Paul Kessler (Paris: Presses Pocket, 1989), p.11
6. tinyurl.com/bamc7kzj
7. Johann Chapoutot, *Libres d'Obéir: le management du nazisme à aujourd'hui* (Paris: Gallimard, 2020), p. 87.
8. Chapoutot, p. 90.
9. Chapoutot, p.82.
10. Chapoutot, p. 83.
11. Chapoutot, pp. 77-78.
12. Chapoutot, p. 117.
13. Chapoutot, p. 113.
14. Chapoutot, p. 88.
15. Chapoutot, p. 89.
16. Chapoutot, pp. 65-66.
17. Chapoutot, p. 71.
18. Chapoutot, p. 141.
19. Antony C Sutton, *Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler* (Sudbury: Bloomfield Books, 1976), p. 177.
20. Sutton, p. 166.
21. Sutton, p. 172.
22. Sutton, p. 173.
23. Sutton, p. 55.
24. Sutton, p. 108.
25. Carroll Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966), p. 324, cit. Sutton, p. 27.
26. Sutton, p. 175.

27. Pierre Milza and Serge Berstein, *Le fascisme italien 1919-1945* (Paris Editions de Seuil, 1980), p. 228.
28. See 'Ronald Cohen, impact capitalism and the Great Reset'. winteroak.org.uk/2021/01/27/ronald-cohen-impact-capitalism-and-the-great-reset
29. Sutton, p. 121.
30. Sutton, p. 163.
31. Sutton, p. 33.
32. Sutton, p. 42.
33. Sutton, pp. 37-39.
34. tinyurl.com/4ey6cs3n,

Also by Paul Cudenec

NON-FICTION

The Anarchist Revelation: Being What We're Meant to Be (2013)

Antibodies, Anarchangels and Other Essays (2013)

The Stifled Soul of Humankind (2014)

Forms of Freedom (2015)

Nature, Essence and Anarchy (2016)

The Green One (2017)

FICTION

The Fakir of Florence: A Novel in Three Layers (2016)

No Such Place as Asha: An Extremist Novel (2019)

Enemies of the Modern World: A Triptych of Novellas (2021)

Full details of all these titles are available on the Winter Oak website at www.winteroak.org.uk, along with the regular information bulletin *The Acorn*. To get in touch with Winter Oak please email winteroak@greenmail.net or follow [@winteroakpress](https://twitter.com/winteroakpress) on Twitter.