

CHAPTER IV

THE RUTHLESS ENEMY

Like all advocates of social change the agitator finds the enemy responsible for his followers' sufferings. But while in other movements defeat of the enemy is a means to an end (a new society or a reformed society of one sort or another), in agitation it is an end in itself. The enemy is conceived of not as a group that stands in the way of achieving a certain objective, but as a super-oppressor, a quasi-biological archdevil of absolute evil and destructiveness. He is irreconcilable, an alien body in society which has no useful productive function. Not even in theory is he amenable to persuasion. There is no bridge which the enemy can cross for repentance. He is there—forever, evil for the sake of evil.

The agitator finds the raw material for such a portrait in the existing stereotypes of hostility. His targets are innumerable. After naming them as the "communists," "the Nazis, the Fascists and the Japs," "the (so-called) Friends of Democracy," "the Internationalists," "The New Deal Bureaucrats," "Walter Winchell," and "Communist and pro-Communist journals," he remarks that "The above list does not include all of our enemies. We could name one hundred more classifications of foes, but the ones listed indicate the type of opposition we face. **WE ARE PROUD OF OUR ENEMIES. IT IS AN HONOR TO BE HATED BY SUCH PERSONS AND ORGANIZATIONS.**"¹ However, the agitator makes an effort to integrate the diffuse hostilities of his audience into a definite image, which we shall now try to define.

For purposes of analysis, the agitator's portrait of the enemy is divided into three parts: the political appearance, the psychological substratum, and the pseudo-reality reference, the Jew. Chapters IV, V and VI discuss each of these versions.

THEME 6: THE REDS

The agitator makes use of all the familiar antiradical stereotypes. He speaks of the "beast of Bolshevism, the desecrator of the divine, the killer of Christians";² and warns his audience that

Like a Bubonic plague, Bolshevism moves across the face of the earth, burning churches, slaughtering the ministers of God, ridiculing the things we hold sacred, referring to religion as the opiate of the people, breeding discontent. . . .³

Yet the agitator's position as one who wishes to produce the impression of being the most vocal enemy of revolution is not without ambiguity. For the radicals are not merely his enemies, they are also his competitors. Like them he aims at enlisting mass support, and like them he promises, not the partial palliatives of the reformist, but a definitive solution of the problems that harass his audience.

The agitator must therefore establish the inferiority and unreliability of his radical rivals, while simultaneously reassuring the earth's mighty that the passion aroused by his invective will not be turned against them. That is why his denunciations of communism are so virulent: he must show that he hates the enemies of private property more than do its wealthiest exponents.

Whenever he can the agitator uses the language and ideas of what is currently respectable to show that he is a loyal and trustworthy citizen. No better example of this can be seen than in the way he seizes on the prevalent fear of communism to twist it for his own purposes. Many of his statements about the "reds" are indistinguishable from what a bona fide conservative, or even liberal, might say about communism. But when they are examined in the context of the agitator's total output, they are seen as utilized by him in a unique approach. This approach is marked by three features.

1. *For the agitator, the revolution may come tomorrow:* He never discusses or analyzes the particular stage of development at which the radical movement may be at any given time; he makes no effort to distinguish between various kinds of radical movements, revolutionary or reformist, extreme or mild; he does not differentiate between the different tactics used by these radical movements. All are lumped together into an undifferentiated revolutionary threat. This threat is not located in any specific movement or event or possible development; it is simply reduced to the danger of immediate revolutionary violence. His imagery of communism is drawn from civil war situations—violent seizure of power by armed minorities amidst an orgy of blood and violence. In fact, the revolution may happen any minute:

Only hope is for Congress to awaken in time. Present Judeo-Red inspired-directed-financed strikes are part of Bolshevik revolutionary technique to

sabotage our economy and facilitate *Reign of Terror* co-incident with outbreak of World War III.⁴

The agitator's concept of communism is infinitely extendable. Adopting the air of someone "in the know," the agitator tells his listeners that groups holding actual political or economic power are linked to communism. At the same time its threat is used to satisfy a craving for fantastic and gruesome stories. The agitator suggests a principle of systematization for an almost paranoiac state of mind: "Confusion out of mouths of columnists, ambassadors, bishops, courts, politicians, yet same RED THREAD tying all together . . ."⁵

The extent of this danger can be seen when it is realized that "with Communists drinking tea in the White House and 2,850 of them on the payroll of the United States . . . the time has come for America to wake up and act."⁶ Under such circumstances, suggests the agitator, it seems almost impossible to expect the government to act and no other way is available but the spontaneous rising of the people.

2. *He blurs the specific nature of the communist threat by identifying it with general forebodings of impending doom:* Behind communism are "international outfits" and whether they plan a revolution or a world union, the same force is at work: "Certain international outfits attempting to rob us of our national sovereignty, promote us into supergovernment, or make us part of an international Communist revolution, or take us back into the British Empire."⁷

The agitator blurs the distinction between communism and other ideologies distasteful to him by denying the very reality of communism: "There is no 'Communism' in the world and none is intended now or at any time in the future. It is a vast dupery. . . ."⁸ It is as though "front" organizations are the dupes of communism and communism itself is also a "front" for something else. This stigmatization of communism as a kind of dupery divests it of any ideological significance and extends its meaning to the point where it is completely vague. For the agitator such an extension is a powerful device: it enables him to suggest that communism is merely a label to conceal sordid activities . . . and that consequently anyone whom the agitator considers sordid may be called a communist.

3. *He associates the communists with the Jews:* "Those who support . . . Communism will not escape our opposition even though they seek sanctuary under the banner of their advertised race or religion and cry aloud that they are the objects of unjust attack."⁹

The identification of the communist with the Jew is well known, but the use to which this identification is put by the agitator is not. When the agitator describes communists as Jews, he transforms them from a group of people who might presumably be converted to his side into a group forever irreconcilable.

He also introduces the connotation that the enemy is weak. To fight Stalin may be a formidable job; but once his advisers are identified as those Jews who "seek sanctuary under the banner of their race or religion," they are easy prey. The very fact that they complain of being "the objects of unjust attacks" shows this to be true. In this way the communist bogey is tremendously inflated only to be debunked, and the fears whipped up by references to its power unmasked as ridiculous. The communist leadership is entirely Jewish: "Who Are the Leaders in Communism—JEWS? Can you name even one Irishman, Dutchman, Italian, Greek, or a German who are big Communist leaders?"¹⁰

And for this very reason communism is weak:

The weak point of the Communist Party lies in its almost 100% Jewish leadership. There are a few 'Gentile-fronts'—Foster, Browder, etc.—but from Comintern Representative down to local leader practically all authority and responsibility is in the hands of the Jews.¹¹

The communist who had been portrayed as a wolf turns out in the end to be a disguised Jewish sheep who must be mercilessly punished by the other sheep as a means of exorcising their fears.

THEME 7: THE PLUTOCRATS

The agitator denounces both the radicals and those who are denounced by the radicals. It might be supposed that the primary purpose of his attacks on the wealthy is to reassure his followers of his radicalism. But closer scrutiny of agitational texts shows this purpose to be only an incidental part of a wider scheme.

Superficially such attacks remind the audience of liberal and populist polemics against big business monopolies. In their private lives these financiers engage in terrible debauchery (cf. pp. 27-29); in their public lives they are conspirators gratifying their lust for power. They cause war—"no one who is without an understanding of money and banking can have the slightest knowledge of what this European war is about. . . ."¹² They "have been waxing fat on the money of sucker stock-

holders."¹³ This country is divided between "the billionaire bankers and their crowd on one side and the bulk of the American people on the other."¹⁴

Hence it might appear as if the agitator adopts the ideas and language of the communists. In explaining the causes of the recent war, he seems to echo their declaration that it was provoked by imperialism:

The battle of Singapore is a battle for Kuhn, Loeb and Company and J. P. Morgan Company. . . . Hundreds of thousands of American and English boys, possibly, will sacrifice their lives to save Malaya—and incidentally to preserve the investments from which profits are wrenched from the natives of Malaya to swell the purses of international bankers. . . .¹⁵

But this debunking is only preparatory to a subtle, almost imperceptible twist: the attention of the audience is concentrated, not on capitalism, but on the bankers.

For all his articulation of spontaneous motives of anger, the agitator is remarkably consistent in avoiding any specific references to giant trusts in manufacture, transportation, and public utilities. But the agitator does attack the leading industries of communication; he seems to feel that they are his most immediate competitors.* When he does occasionally mention industrial enterprises, such as "mining facilities," he hastens to add that these are controlled by a "few international financiers" who insist on "laying down their own rules of production."¹⁷ When enumerating his targets, he places "special interest, feudal lords, slave owners and imperialists" beside "international bankers," but he always manages to suggest that the main enemy is the "system of finance":

They want an imperialistic combination which will exploit the whole world, its natural resources and its people, and ultimately make of all people imperialistic slaves to be taxed and killed in battle, at will, for the preservation of their system of finance and imperialistic greed.¹⁸

In sermonizing thus against "Mammon," the agitator seems to be exploiting traditional associations: Christ casting the money changers from the Temple. But his real motives are modern, even ultra-modern, and he seems quite aware of this. He indicates this when he says:

Let us be realists and recognize that our destiny is confined to our America. It is not woven with the destinies of the empires abroad. By fighting for them we are fighting for neither peace nor democracy, but for the perpetuation of

* "You go to double feature shows and what you see is propaganda. About the only time you ever get any real meat is when you hear Gerald Smith."¹⁶

an obsolete financial slavery operated and controlled by the Sassoons, the Montefiores, the Rothschilds, the Samuels . . .¹⁹

The key word in this quotation is "obsolete." Using the old populist image of the banker who manipulates gold, the agitator seems quite oblivious of the fact that in recent decades bank and industrial capital have merged into gigantic combines, but in fact he encourages the ruling powers to weed out from their ranks useless survivals of earlier decades: domination must be streamlined to be strengthened. The banker, here as almost everywhere else in agitation, identified with the Jew, is the symbol of outmoded methods of indirect domination. He is also an attractive target for his audience, which tends to seek personifications of the anonymous causes of financial loss.

The agitator is here following that stereotype which identifies economic power with financial power. Now that the banker or financier, an habitual object of hatred, has lost much of the power he had in the nineteenth century, this hatred can be more openly expressed. When the Nazis distinguished between productive and predatory capital, which they stigmatized as Jewish, they effectively exploited the distinction between economic and financial power.

To the audience the financier is especially hateful because he seems to enjoy life and luxury without holding, as does the industrialist, any actual commanding power. The omnipotent banker seems also to be identified with—to be, in fact, an enlarged symbol of—the middleman who, in the eyes of the audience, is often held responsible for economic processes that actually occur in the sphere of production. The middleman, like the banker, is thought of as particularly predatory, while the industrialist is conceived of as the apostle of initiative, ingenuity and efficiency.

As though worried that his audience might misunderstand his intentions and extend his attack on the bankers to the groups he wishes to spare, the agitator hastens to add that "if the time has arrived for us to issue a democratic disclaimer against international banking, we will not accept in its stead international Communism."²⁰ In fact, he is opposed to capitalism only because he wants to destroy communism, which "can not be eliminated until capitalism with its usurious money system is removed, lock, stock and barrel, from our social lives."²¹ Here again the phrase "with its usurious money system" indicates how strategically obsolete his characterization of capitalism is.

On an agitational plane, he is committed to a fight on two fronts:

against communism and against "usurious" capitalism. He avoids the strategic drawbacks of such a fight by a bold imaginative construction—the identification of communism with capitalism. The exponents of revolution are equated with the exponents of plutocratic exploitation. At the same time, the agitator shows how much he hates the capitalists when he calls them communists. That there are obvious logical objections to the notion of a capitalistic group plotting the destruction of the system from which its profits are derived, does not bother the agitator. He has several theories ready at hand to explain this phenomenon.

In one of them, communism is represented as a tool of financial interests that aim to establish fascism:

Communism—Special bait dangled before a large segment of the population that has been frustrated economically by international bankers but which, nevertheless, is promoted by international bankers to create a revolutionary background for the establishment of the Servile State, i.e., Fascism or Nazism.²²

A variant theory is that communism and capitalism are both weapons in the hands of a third party: "Unrepentant capitalism and conniving Communism—the right and left hands of internationalist imperialism—have littered our fair land with un-American activities."²³

But the agitator's preferred method of establishing the connection between capitalism and communism is by suggesting that "atheistic Communism" was "originally spawned in Jewish capitalism and Jewish intellectualism."²⁴ The most striking formulation of this theory traces all modern isms back to a common Jewish ancestor:

One must remove the causes to get rid of recurring effects . . . we are concerned with liquidating the causes which created the concept of Hitlerism in the minds of men. These causes run back from Stalin to Lenin; from Lenin to Marx; from Marx to the Rothschilds; from the Rothschilds to the Bank of England; from the Bank of England to the pack of usurers who transubstantiated a vice into a virtue in the sixteenth century. . . .²⁵

Here we see the essential purposes of the amalgamation of communism and capitalism: by being thrown together, they cancel each other's ideological and functional characteristics and can be made to appear a tool of a racial enemy—the Jew. Furthermore the joint disavowal of "unrepentant" capitalism and communism suggests the possibility of a third system to replace them:

An objective analysis shows that the German people could not have hoped to free their homes, churches, schools and institutions from the Red menace,

without also breaking through the web of Jewish Capitalism which had been created around them. Necessity is the mother of Invention, so they established an economic system peculiarly their own, divorced from the international Jewish banking fraternity. *This fact sent a chill over the internationalists.*²⁶

It is perhaps this very incongruity, amounting almost to uncanniness, of the idea of the Communist Banker that attracts the audience as a simple explanation of bewildering real situations. The agitator's attack on the banker who enjoys life seems to play up to the audience's resentments of the banker's enjoyments of the "forbidden fruit." And since the agitator's articulation of malaise contains a strong undercurrent of appeals to violence, the destruction of the Communist Banker seems, in anticipation at least, great fun to his audience.

The uncanniness of this combination of bankers and communists suggests a psychoanalytical interpretation. The banker who enjoys the forbidden fruit and preaches abstinence to others, who rolls in gold while he wants others to be thrifty, is a father image, object of ambivalent Oedipal emotions. The unnatural "marriage" of banker and communist seems "natural" to the unconscious, which in a sense considers every marriage forbidden because the mother grants the father sexual rights denied to the child. In this case, the marriage is particularly scandalous. The agitator's theory of communism "spawned" by capitalism or of the Jew who begets both, suggests that their marriage is incestuous. The banker and communist who enjoy one another and deprive the helpless child in the name of the incest taboo are hypocrites of the worst sort.

In the process of agitation, the attachment to the father becomes diverted to the agitator himself functioning as a substitute father image who reminds his listeners of the incestuous marriage and confirms the scandalousness of incestuous relationships. At the same time he mobilizes resentment against both parents who deny sexual gratification to the follower and force him to look for it elsewhere—in a community of "brothers." These psychoanalytical connotations of the image of the communist banker are in accord with its political function of suggesting the inevitability of a fascist solution: psychoanalytically fascism has been viewed as a revolt of the "brothers" against parental authority.

We may then sum up agitation material on the theme of the Plutocrat in the following propositions:

When the agitator attacks capitalism, he rails, not against social institution, but a group of evil individuals.

These individuals he identifies as manipulative financiers, thereby ap-

pealing to the political emotions of an outlived era, usually the populist era in which the banker was seen as the great enemy.

By identifying the banker as the enemy and by restricting his denunciations to finance, the agitator leaves free from attack the crucial area of modern capitalist production.

The agitator reconciles his denunciations of communism and capitalism by constructing the "communist banker"—the Jew, who utilizes both communism and "usurious" capitalism for his own ends.

THEME 8: THE CORRUPT GOVERNMENT

When the agitator criticizes the government, he behaves like any other spokesman for a party out of office. But he differs from the reformer in the verbal violence of his attacks. And unlike the revolutionary, he limits his denunciations to the personnel of the government; he does not attack its basic structure.

The New Deal proved to be a particularly convenient target for the agitator. By denouncing governmental agencies, he could pose as an enemy of regimentation:

Those men who are sent to Washington to protect the welfare of their friends and neighbors, to follow the orders of the common masses for whom they have agreed to be servants, then fail to work for the welfare of their friends and neighbors, and to carry out their orders, should be punished as all traitors and breakers of faith should be punished.²⁷

The agitator hints that he cannot expose the "vast bloc of lawless usurpers" who "have moved into positions of power . . ."²⁸ as vigorously as he would wish. "You know today we cannot use free speech in America . . . A man gets up here to talk Americanism and they have a hundred lights on him . . . Sure, an American can't talk today . . ."²⁹ But the agitator is able to talk boldly about not surrendering "my Americanism to Samuel Dickstein or anyone else"³⁰ precisely because he knows that a liberal-minded administration will continue to grant him the opportunity to voice his opinions.

When the Nazis denounced the German Republic for its inability to cope with economic problems and its failure to break the *diktat* of Versailles, they benefited from a condition of acute crisis in which the breakdown of liberal government had become apparent to the masses. Much the same thing was true of the situation in which the Italian Fascists seized power. In both countries, moreover, there had been powerful socialist movements which for several decades had persuaded masses of

people, especially the workers, that the governments were not "theirs" but were instruments of their exploiters. Both the Nazis and the Fascists capitalized on this general suspicion of established government by derailing the attitudes of "class consciousness" off the socialist tracks.

The American situation is somewhat different. Here there is no long-established antigovernmental or anticapitalist tradition which the agitator can exploit. The influence of the various radical groups in America is and has been negligible; and even the populist rebellion, whose tradition the agitator tries at many points to utilize, was mainly against specific abuses of various financial groupings, rather than against the government as such. In America there is no prevalent feeling among the masses that the government is not "theirs." Whatever complaints the bulk of the American people may have are formulated in terms of remedying a specific situation ("bureaucrats," "the trusts," "anti-labor Congressmen," "socialistic New Dealers"). Such complaints do not, however, comprise a rejection of the social or political status quo.

For the agitator this is a very considerable handicap and as a result he must exercise a certain amount of care in the way he denounces the government. He stresses that Washington is the arena of a perpetual struggle for power between the forces of disintegration and national unity: "Washington is full of tricksters with whom it is very difficult for some of our most patriotic representatives to cope."⁸¹

Portraying the administration as influenced by agents of financial interests, the agitator suggests that it only pretends to represent the people as a whole: "The President, thereupon, appointed a committee to investigate the rubber situation, headed by Bernard Baruch, who for years has been known as a 'Wall Street fixer.' Someone has well said—Why should we appoint the Devil to investigate Hell?"⁸²

But no matter how severe his denunciations of individual members of the government, he praises the nation's "capable executives" or "foremost business executives and managers" and urges them to "resist the aggressions of political bureaucrats."^{82a} He suggests that the social forces which hold actual economic power in this country do not exercise the influence they should, while the influence of the "tyrannical bureaucrats" in the government is "out of all proportion to the influence they exert among the people."⁸³

The agitator is interested in suggesting, however, that at least as now practiced, representative government in this country is a sham, and that the actual rulers are secret groups. In this respect he benefits from a widespread present-day feeling that major decisions do not originate with the

elected representatives, but with lobbies catering to special interests. The audience may thus feel that he is revealing the true state of affairs by naming the groups he dislikes as the manipulators of the government. "We have a set of bureaucrats in power in Washington who are working for certain foreign monopolies and certain banking interests when they should be working for the people of the United States."³⁴ He confirms suspicions that "big financiers get tips of contracts before they are given out by the government, enabling them to buy stocks."³⁵

The administration is accused of aiming at the confiscation of all privately owned property and the agitator is "amazed at the lack of courage exhibited in America by its foremost business executives and managers to resist the aggressions of political bureaucrats and revolutionists in Washington."³⁶

Such seemingly trivial remarks serve in effect to glorify the direct rule of economic power groups at the expense of representative government.

The agitator can play on the inchoate suspicions of his audience that vague impersonal and irresistible powers determine the destiny of the nation. He fans the traditional American distrust of bureaucracy and centralization and interprets the New Deal's attempts to regulate big business as the first steps in the establishment of a dictatorship:

. . . Roosevelt State Capitalism is not to be pursued under constitutional forms. The wealth is *not* to be supervised by capable executives of the people who have created it individually, that high and low may profit. These Americans, victims of Reaction in government, are simply to relinquish their massed increments into the hands of a perpetual political oligarchy whose fiat is to be unalterable and whose omnipotence is sacrosanct.³⁷

Such criticism directed against individuals who supposedly insinuate themselves into high posts, can have wide popular appeal: the listener is free to apply the stigma of vicious abuse of power to every official who is for any reason whatever an object of his resentment. The agitator's attacks further a pre-existing ambivalent attitude toward institutionalized authority. Officials are pilloried while at the same time respect for authority is maintained by the eulogy of established institutions.

THEME 9: THE FOREIGNER

In the agitator's portrait of the enemy, foreignness is a prominent trait. The plutocrat or banker is "international"; the administration is dominated by "international monopolies." Since foreign encirclement would hardly seem a plausible danger to America, the agitator warns against

the dangers of foreign entanglements. And he finds a replica of the Nazi motif of living space in the immigrant population. He denounces plans to let new immigrants enter this country:

Once landed on our shores, they would immediately start muscling Americans out of their jobs and their businesses. These "pioneers" would not develop new farms, mines, and enterprises, as did our forefathers. They haven't the intestinal stamina to pioneer; they would take, by their gold-usury-squeeze methods, what has been built by Americans.³⁸

In the above portrait of the alien, he seems to be a dangerous competitor, a predatory element associated with "international" bankers. But he is simultaneously associated with communism:

From the four corners of this earth, foreigners came to our country to monopolize our resources. They are wolves in sheep's clothing, wise in the ways of propaganda and crime . . . the countries across the seas have sent crafty propagandists, who are destroying everything through subversive agitation.³⁹

As against this banker-communist foreigner, the agitator evokes the image of the "good old days" when aliens with "their foreign isms were not busy working among the American people."⁴⁰ The alien is thus connected with the disturbing aspects of contemporary life, while the nostalgic image of the "good old days" suggests a pristine and uncontaminated era of security.

But overshadowing such immediate political implications is the agitator's stress on the foreigner's intrinsic differences from the native. Because he is endowed with immutable characteristics, the foreigner is essentially unassimilable. Aliens are not only responsible for "atheism, mental and moral decay, vulgarity, communism, imperialism . . . intolerance, snobbery, treason, treachery, dishonesty,"⁴¹ but they bring with them asocial characteristics which no amount of exposure to clean American air can purge:

When he [the foreigner] comes to America or grows up in America, he carries the cheating, double dealing, ugly spirit of some Asiatics and Europeans in his heart and nourishes that ugly spirit by reflecting it in his social, political, fraternal and business affairs.⁴²

While stressing how much of a danger aliens are because they "cleverly" divide "the American people . . . into groups,"⁴³ the agitator identifies them with Jews, a device which reassures those among his listeners who may themselves be among the millions of foreign-born or descendants of foreign-born that he intends no harm against them. The concept of the

foreigner is narrowed down to those who "inevitably bear a characteristic racial stamp."⁴⁴ The agitator declares that "we don't care whether you come from Italy or Czechoslovakia . . . from Ireland or Wyoming. . . . Are you Christian and are you Aryan?"⁴⁵

We see here an interesting development of the agitator's stereotype of the foreigner: from a specific external political threat to the country's economy, he is transformed into the perennial stranger characterized by irreducible qualities of foreignness. When the agitator arouses fear of communism, resentment against the government, and envy of financiers, he is largely referring to the audience's conscious experience; but when he arouses hostility against the stranger, the agitator seems to be reaching for a deeper layer of the psyche. In the agitational image of the enemy, the foreigner tends to be transformed from a specific dangerous but tangible power into an uncanny, irreconcilable extra- or sub-human being. This role of the foreigner in the agitator's total image of the enemy is explicitly seen in his references to the refugee.

THE REFUGEE. For the agitator, the refugee is the most fearsome version of the foreigner. The very weakness, the very plight of the refugees is an argument against them, since "*they fled from the wrath of the treacherously outraged peoples of those nations, as they may one day flee as well from the wrath of a finally aroused populace in America.*"⁴⁶ The refugee becomes identified with the parasite who seeks dupes to do his dirty work:

A "Refugee" is a member of the male sex who comes boo-hooing to the United States because he's "too cowardly" to fight like "real men" do, in Europe. He would establish himself in business or profession while the "real men" fight for HIS liberty.⁴⁷

The refugee not only refuses to do dirty work, but threatens the economic security of native Americans:

According to the admission of our State Department, 580,000 Refugees had been admitted to the United States up to January, 1944, mostly on temporary permits. These Refugees have swarmed into positions formerly held by American professional men now absent on account of the war and constitute a serious threat of postwar unemployment for native Americans . . .

If there are hungry to be fed abroad, let the spirit of Christ stimulate us to export our surpluses instead of destroying them. It is not necessary or desirable that Refugees be brought to America to be fed.⁴⁸

And the final identification of the refugee with the image of the enemy is made when he is depicted by the agitator as both a plutocrat-banker and a parasite who will end up on the relief rolls:

But it is reliably reported that comparatively few of the Jewish refugees are agriculturists. By far the greater number of them are city dwellers, and small independent merchants—ranging from peddlers to store keepers and bankers. These newcomers, therefore, would not seek colonies in the rural areas but hope to concentrate in our already crowded cities; and since many of them are already penniless, would go on the relief rolls almost upon their arrival.⁴⁹

The agitator endows refugees with characteristics that make them seem distasteful creatures, untouchables whom one avoids as if it were a social commandment to shun them. His picture of the refugee thus becomes a miniature version of the Nazis' notion of the sub-race, and his evidence for such an unflattering portrait ranges from the refugee's alleged spiritual corruption to his most superficial mannerisms of behavior.

Ultimately, the refugee is identified with the ancient figure of the outcast, a man cursed by the gods, an exile who does not deserve a better fate. As such he raises a variety of ambivalent feelings among those who are subject to the agitator's appeal. The refugee seems an ideal model for irreconcilability: he has no home, he is accepted neither where he came from nor where he comes to. The refugee and the outcast become symbols of vague unconscious urges, of the repressed contents of the psyche, which, mankind has learned in the course of its history, must be censured and condemned as the price for social and cultural survival. The outcast serves to exorcise the fears as well as the temptations of self-righteous individuals. The hatred for the refugee seems thus a rejection of one's inner potential of freedom.

We may further develop this hypothesis by examining the implications of the fact that the refugee is called a "beggar."⁵⁰ One reacts ambivalently to the beggar: his humiliation is gratifying on a subconscious level, while at the same time it produces a feeling of conscious guilt. Once this ambivalence is lifted by the agitator's assurance that contempt for the beggar is not only a respectable but a necessary reaction, he can become a legitimate object of fury and spite. His suffering becomes a valid punishment for the fact that he has suffered at all.

The refugee's homelessness becomes the psychological equivalent of the audience's repressed instincts. Such an equation prepares for a release of banned instincts against banned people; a psychological bridge is constructed between the need of a resentment against repression and the resentment against a people without a country. He who has no home does not deserve one.