

(Continued from page 10)

artist or scientist has been able thus far to win over and lead masses or, if so, to keep them in the realm of the life interests.

In contradistinction to liberalism, which represents the superficial character layer, and to genuine revolution, which represents the deepest layer, fascism represents essentially the second character layer, that of the secondary impulses.

At the time when this book was originally written, fascism was generally regarded a "political party" which, like any other "social group," was an organized representation of a "political idea." According to this concept, the fascist party "introduced" fascism by force or by "political manoeuvre."

Contrary to this concept, my medical experience with individuals from all kinds of social strata, races, nationalities and religions showed me that "fascism" is only the politically organized expression of the average human character structure, a character structure which has nothing to do with this or that race, nation or party but which is general and international. In this characterological sense, "fascism" is the basic emotional attitude of man in authoritarian society, with its machine civilization and its mechanistic-mystical view of life.

It is the mechanistic-mystical character of man in our times which creates fascist parties, and not vice versa.

### Fallacious Reasoning

Even today, as a result of fallacious political thinking, fascism is still being considered a specific national characteristic of the Germans or the Japanese. The stubborn persistence of this fallacy is due to the fear of recognizing the truth: fascism is an international phenomenon which permeates all organizations of human society in all nations. This conclusion is confirmed by the international events of the past 15 years.

From the first fallacy all other misinterpretations follow logically. To the detriment of genuine endeavors for freedom, fascism is still regarded as the dictatorship of a small reactionary clique. My character-analytic experience, however, shows that there is today not a single individual who does not have the elements of fascist feeling and thinking in his structure. Fascism as a political movement differs from other reactionary parties in that it is supported and championed by masses of people. I am fully conscious of the responsibility involved in such statements. I could only wish, in the interest of this battered world, that the working masses had an equal realization of their responsibility

for fascism.

One has to distinguish ordinary militarism from fascism. Germany under the Kaiser was militaristic, but not fascist.

Since fascism, always and everywhere, appears as a movement which is supported by the masses of people, it also displays all the traits and contradictions present in the average character structure: Fascism is not, as is generally believed, a purely reactionary movement; rather, it is a mixture of rebellious emotions and reactionary social ideas.

If, by being revolutionary, one means rational rebellion against intolerable social conditions, if, by being radical, one means "going to the root of things," then the rational will to improve them, then fascism is never revolutionary. True, it may have the aspect of revolutionary emotions. But one would not call that physician revolutionary who proceeds against a disease with violent cursing but the other who quietly, courageously and conscientiously studies and fights the causes of the disease. Fascist rebelliousness always occurs where fear of the truth turns a revolutionary emotion into illusions.

### Racism

In its pure form, fascism is the sum total of all irrational reactions of the average human character. To the narrow-minded sociologist who lacks the courage to recognize the enormous role played by the irrational in human history, the fascist race theory appears as nothing but an imperialistic interest or even a mere "prejudice." The violence and the ubiquity of these "race prejudices" show their origin from the irrational part of the human character. The race theory is not creation of fascism. No: fascism is a creation of race hatred and its politically organized expression. Correspondingly, there is a German, Italian, Spanish, Anglo-Saxon, Jewish and Arabian fascism. The race ideology is a true biopathic character symptom of the organically impotent individual.

The sadistic perverse character of the race ideology is also seen in the attitude toward religion. Fascism, we are told, is the arch-enemy of religion, and a regression to paganism. On the contrary, fascism is the extreme expression of religious mysticism. As such it appears in a specific social form. Fascism is based on that religiosity which stems from sexual perversion; it changes the masochistic character of the old patriarchal religions into a sadistic religion. It takes religion out of the other-world philosophy of suffering and places it in the sadistic

murder in this world.

### Fascist Mentality

Fascist mentality is the mentality of the subjugated "little man" who craves authority and rebels against it at the same time. It is not by accident that all fascist dictators stem from the milieu of the little reactionary man. The captains of industry and the feudal militarist make use of this social fact for their own purposes. A mechanistic authoritarian civilization only reaps, in the form of fascism, from the little, suppressed man what for hundreds of years it has sown in the masses of little, suppressed individuals in the form of mysticism, top-sergeant mentality and automatism. This little man has only too well learned the way of the big man and now gives it back, enlarged and distorted. The Fascist is the top-sergeant type in the vast army of our sick civilization. One cannot with impunity beat the tom-tom of high politics before the little man. The little top-sergeant has outdone the imperialistic general in everything: in martial music, in goose-stepping, in giving orders and obeying them, in the deadly fear of thinking, in diplomacy, strategy and tactics, in uninformed strutting and in medals. In all these things a Kaiser Wilhelm appears as a poor bungler compared with Hitler. When a "proletarian" general covers his chest with medals, on both sides, and from the shoulders to the belt, he demonstrates the little man trying to outdo the "real" great general.

One must have thoroughly studied the character of the suppressed little man and must have learned to see things as they take place behind the facade, if one is to understand the forces on which fascism is based.

In the rebellion of the masses of abused people against the empty niceties of a false liberalism (I do not mean genuine liberalism and genuine tolerance) the character layer of the secondary impulses was expressed.

One cannot make the Fascist harmless if, according to the politics of the day, one looks for him only in the German or Italian, or the American or the Chinese; if one does not look for him in oneself; if one does not know the social institutions which hatch him every day. One can beat fascism only if one meets it objectively and practically, with a well-grounded knowledge of the life processes. One cannot equal it in politics, in diplomacy or strutting. But it has no answer to practical questions of living, for it sees everything only in the mirror of ideology or in the form of the state uniform. When

one hears a fascist character of whatever hue preach about the "honor of man" or about the "salvation of the sacred family and the race" (instead of the society of working individuals), if he lets out a stream of empty slogans, one only has to ask him this:

"What are you doing to feed the nation, without plundering or killing other nations? What do you, as a physician, do against the chronic diseases, or as an educator for the happiness of children, or as an economist for the elimination of poverty, or as a social worker for the mothers of too many children, or as a builder for more hygienic living conditions? Give us a concrete, practical answer or shut up!"

### Vanquishing Fascism

Clearly, international fascism will never be vanquished by political manoeuvres. It can only be vanquished by the natural organization of work, love and knowledge on an international scale.

As yet, work, love and knowledge have not the power to determine human existence. More than that, these great forces of the positive life principle are not even conscious of their strength, their indispensability and their decisive role in the determination of human existence. For this reason, human society, even after the military defeat of party fascism, continues to hover at the brink of the abyss. The downfall of our civilization is inevitable if those who work, and the natural scientists in all branches of life (not death), and those who give and receive natural love, do not become conscious, in time, of their gigantic responsibility.

Will human and social freedom, will self-regulation of our lives and that of our children come about peacefully or by force? Nobody can tell. But those who know the living function in the animal, in the newborn or in the true worker, be he a mechanic, a researcher or an artist, cease to think in those terms created by party systems. The living function cannot "seize power by force," for it would not know what to do with power. Does that mean that life will forever be at the mercy of political gangsterdom, that the politicians will forever suck its blood? No, it would be wrong to draw this conclusion.

As a physician, I have to treat diseases, as a researcher I have to disclose unknown facts in nature. If, now, a political wind-bag were to try to force me to leave my patients and my microscope, I would not let myself be disturbed but would, if necessary, throw him out. Whether or not I have to use force in order to protect my work on the living function against intruders does not depend on me or my work but on the intruders' degree of impertinence. Let us assume that all those who do work on the living function were able to recognize the political wind-bag in time. They would act in the same way. Perhaps this over-simplified example gives a partial answer to the question as to how the living functions, sooner or later, will defend itself against its intruders and destroyers.

Irresponsible student hurts only himself. An irresponsible university cripples ALL of its members. Hopefully the university will realize WHY its students are irresponsible, and will grow in the process.

Mike Droulhet  
Dept. of Philosophy



## Call Me Irresponsible

Since I have been charged with irresponsibility (aligning myself with the actions of the Berated (sic) Press I feel that I must try to see of what it is I am guilty.

Part of being human is responding to society. This is inescapable. Men are able to respond because society provides them with means of self-fulfillment. These means are traditions, customs, mores, habits, organizations, functions, communities, and so on. When the means of individual and social growth no longer function as such, i.e. when men can no longer respond meaningfully to them, then the individuals within that society become unable to respond. They become irresponsible.

Conversely, society itself (i.e. the managers and overseers thereof) is irresponsible when it is unable to respond to the needs and desires of those who make up that society. Then it is the duty of its members to reconstruct, either wholly or in part, that society which has become irresponsible, sterile, stagnant and outworn.

Being desiring, needing organisms, however, men find that they are able to change their environment so they may once again respond positively to it. By attempting to change their society, they

are acting as responsible human beings.

In setting these melodies to the rhythm of the university, the song rings out fairly clearly.

To whom and for whom is the university responsible? Presuming this pile of buildings to be FOR something and for someone, we may advance the subtle thesis that the university exists for the growth and development of its inhabitants, and is therefore responsible to THEM. It owes no allegiance to the community, alumni, contributors, favorite sons, favorite companies, brokers, outside interests, or alien concerns of any sort. If the university, (administrators, staff, faculty, and students), cannot supply positive conditions of mutual and self-growth, then it is irresponsible.

What of the students? and their responsibility? They respond to each other, to the faculty, and to the administration, and are able to respond PROVIDED THE CONDITIONS SERVE THEM MEANINGFULLY. Meaningfulness for a student, however, indicates that there are conditions for inquiry and experimentation, suspension of judgment, and laboratories of idea-testing through which they may learn to educate themselves sometime BEFORE their four-year sentence is up.

Should some function or organ of the university NOT be a positive condition wherein he may fulfill his desire to learn and his need to grow, THEN THE STUDENT IS INDEED IRRESPONSIBLE, for he cannot then respond to himself through his environment. In this sense I am guilty of irresponsibility as charged.

So we may ask, now, some questions? Does the University of Hartford allow us to inquire, search, test, experiment and challenge regarding the responsibility of our environment? Does it allow us IN EVERY ASPECT AND ON EVERY LEVEL to test and challenge the meaningfulness and relevance of our total environment, its traditions, customs, mores, habits, organizations, functions, communities, and so on? Does it allow us open dialogue in our testing and inquiring? Is there ANYTHING it will not allow us to speak about or look at? Does the University of Hartford hold its outside interests to be more sacred than its inside interests?

The events of last week seem to suggest that something is rotten in the UoHoff. I would also suggest that the University of Hartford has demonstrated gross irresponsibility toward its students, because of which the students themselves must become irresponsible and remain so, until the environment is changed. An