

Ominous Parallels #1

THE HOUR OF THE TIME

Tape No. 538: "The Ominous Parallels - #1"

Tuesday, January 31, 1995

Here is the theory. Quote:

"It is thus necessary that the individual should finally come to realize that his own ego is of no importance in comparison with the existence of his nation."

And "nation" can be read "people", "race", "church", "folk". You can substitute any of those words for "nation", as you will see.

And because I interrupted, I will back up and start again and continue it all the way through the quote. Quote:

"It is thus necessary that the individual should finally come to realize that his own ego is of no importance in comparison with the existence of his nation; that the position of the individual ego is conditioned solely by the interests of the nation as a whole; that, above all, the unity of a nation's spirit and will are worth far more than the freedom of the spirit and will of an individual.

"The state of mind which subordinates the interest of the ego to the conservation of the community is really the first premise for every truly human culture. The basic attitude from which such activity arises, we call--to distinguish it from egoism and selfishness--idealism. By this, we understand only the individual's capacity to make sacrifices for the community for his fellow men."

These statements were made in our century, ladies and gentlemen, by the leader of a major western nation. His countrymen regarded his view point as uncontroversial. His political program implemented it faithfully.

The statements, dear listeners, were made by Adolf Hitler.

He was explaining the moral philosophy of Naziism, which is, at its heart, nothing more or less than socialism--just one step above communism and, by all definitions, a couple of steps below a republic. That's measured on the scale of right to left, going from total control to total absence of control. Nazis are on the left.

You see, the Nazis were not a tribe of prehistoric savages. Their crimes, ladies and gentlemen, were the official legal acts and policies of modern Germany: an educated, industrialized, civilized, western European nation; a nation renowned throughout the world for the lustre of its intellectual and cultural achievements.

By reason of its long line of artists and thinkers, Germany has been called, quote:

"...the land of poets and philosophers..."

End quote. And make no mistake about it: their contribution to civilization has been great. But its education offered the country no protection against the Sergeant Malls <sp?> in its ranks.

The German university students, you see, were among the earliest groups to back Hitler. The intellectuals, as they always are, were among his regime's most ardent supporters. And you find that today in the United States on every college campus across this country.

Professors with distinguished academic credentials, eager to pronounce their benediction on the Fuhrer's cause, put their scholarship to work full-time. They turned out a library of admiring volumes, adorned with obscure allusions to the learned references, veiled in mysticism, and a perverted spirituality.

The Nazis did not gain power, ladies and gentlemen, against the country's wishes. It didn't happen that way. In this respect, there was absolutely no gulf between the intellectuals and the people.

The Nazi Party was elected to office by the freely-cast ballots of millions of German voters, including men on every single social,

economic, and educational level.

In the national election of July 1932, the Nazis obtained 37% of the vote, and a plurality of seats in the Reichstag.

On January the 30th, 1933, in full accordance with the country's legal and constitutional principles, Hitler was appointed Chancellor.

And only five weeks later, in the last and semi-free election of the pre-totalitarian period, the Nazis obtained 17 million votes, which was a full 44% of the total.

The voters were aware of the Nazi ideology. Nazi literature, including statements of their plans for the future, papered the country. They could be found everywhere, blowing with the wind in the gutters, tacked upon fences, pasted upon walls all during the last years of the Weimar Republic.

"Mein Kampf" alone sold more than 200,000 copies between 1925 and 1932.

The essence of the political system, ladies and gentlemen, which Hitler intended to establish in Germany was very clear. It was no mystery to anyone.

In 1933, when Hitler did establish the system that he had promised, he did not find it necessary to forbid foreign travel until World War II. And those Germans who wished to flee the country could do so with little, if any, problem. The overwhelming majority did not flee. They were satisfied to remain.

You see, the system which Hitler established, the social reality which so many Germans were so eager to embrace, or so willing to endure--for it must have been one or the other--the politics which began in a theory and ended in the concentration camps was very simply the Total State.

The term from which the adjective "totalitarian" derives was, in fact, coined by Hitler's mentor, Mussolini.

"The state must have absolute power over every man and over every sphere

of human activity..."

the Nazis declared. And I quote:

"The authority of the Fuhrer is not limited by checks and controls, by special autonomous bodies, or individual rights; but it is free and independent, all inclusive, and unlimited."

End quote. That statement was made by Ernst Huber <sp?>, an official Party spokesman, in 1933. And he went on to say:

"The concept of personal liberties of the individual, as opposed to the authority of the state, had to disappear. It is not to be reconciled with the principle of the nationalistic Reich...."

said Huber to a country which listened and nodded. And he went on, quote:

"There are no personal liberties of the individual which fall outside of the realm of the state, and which must be respected by the state. The constitution of the nationalistic Reich is therefore not based upon a system of in-born and inalienable rights of the individual."

End quote. Now, folks, if the term "statism" designates a concentration of power in the state at the expense of individual liberty, then Naziism, in politics, was definitely a form of statism.

In principle, it did not represent a new approach to government, for it was a continuation of the political absolutism--the absolute monarchies, the oligarchies, the theocracies, the random tyrannies, the racism--which has characterized most of human history.

Now, many writers, dear listeners, have noted many similarities between America today and Germany before Hitler. And I have brought this to your attention on many occasions during "The Hour of the Time".

These same writers have then shrugged off their own observations. They've succumbed to the notion--spread by today's intellectuals who have bought into socialism hook, line, and sinker--that it is bad

history to compare two different countries.

[laughter] And this notion--itself a symptom of our current crisis--means that there are not principles governing human action, and that it is bad history to learn from history. And that, I can assure you, we have never learned to do; for history goes in cycles and repeats itself over and over and over again throughout the ages.

The similarities, however, cannot be shrugged off. The crisis is real. You see, the crisis is the fact that our country, the United States of America--the freest, the most productive, and until recently the most moral country in the world, is now moving in Hitler's direction.

America is moving, ladies and gentlemen, toward a Nazi form of totalitarianism.

It has been doing this for decades. It has been doing it so gradually, by default and, for the most part, unknowingly, but it is doing this systematically, and without any significant opposition.

In every cultural area from science and education to art, religion, to politics and economics, the trend is now unmistakable.

There are differences between America and the Weimar Republic. You see, our future, as far as one can judge, is still indeterminate. There is a chance. In fact, the great--the great question mark of uncertainty hangs over the head of every citizen almost every day.

But the current trend will not be checked unless we grasp in terms of essentials the ominous parallels between the two countries, and above all, the basic cause behind those parallels.

You see, if we are to avoid a fate like that of Germany, we must find out what made such a fate possible. We must find out what, at the very root, is required to turn a country--Germany or any other--into a Nazi dictatorship, and then we must uproot that root, if it can be done.

We have to look for something deeper than practical conditions, something that dictates man's view of what constitutes the practical.

You see, in an advanced, civilized country, a handful of men were able to gain for their criminal schemes, the enthusiastic backing of literally millions of decent, educated, law-abiding citizens. And just what is the factor that made this possible?

You see, criminal groups and schemes have existed throughout history in every country. Someone is scheming in your town right this moment. They've been able to succeed only in certain periods.

You see, there mere presence of these groups is not sufficient to account for their victory. Something made so many Germans so vulnerable to a take-over. Something armed the criminals and disarmed the country.

Does that sound familiar? It should. It should ring bells all over your house, all over the room you are sitting in.

Observe, in this connection, that the Nazis correctly regarded the power of propaganda as an indispensable tool. They could not have won the support of the German masses but for the systematic preaching of a complex array of theories, doctrines, opinions, notions, beliefs, mysticism. And not one of their central beliefs was ever original, as are none of those being bandied about today original.

They found those beliefs wide-spread and waiting in the culture, and they seized upon them and broadcast them at top volume, thrusting them with an intensity back into the streets of Germany. And the men in the streets heard, and recognized, and sympathized with this propaganda, and they embraced those beliefs, and then they voted for their exponents.

The Germans, ladies and gentlemen, would not have recognized or embraced those beliefs in the nineteenth century when the west was still being influenced by the remnants of the Age of Reason and the Enlightenment, when the doctrines of the Rights of Man and the autonomy of the individual were paramount.

But by the twentieth century, such doctrines and the convictions on which they depended were no longer paramount. Germany was ideologically ripe for Hitler, just as the United States of America is

ripe for whatever messiah has the charisma and the political savvy to step up on the throne.

The intellectual groundwork had been prepared. The country's ideas, a certain special category of ideas, were ready--born deep within the Mysteries.

There is a science whose subject matter is that category of ideas. And today, in our colleges, this science has sunk to the lowest point in its history.

Its teachers have declared that it has no questions to ask, no method to follow, and no answers to offer. And as a result, it is disappearing.

It is losing its identity, its intelligibility, its students, and the last vestiges of its once noble reputation.

It is the science of asking questions--something I have tried to instil in each and every one of you every single night of this broadcast for the last two-and-three-quarter years.

No one among the intellectuals of today, or the general public, would even suspect any longer that this science could be relevant to human life or action.

Yet, it is practiced amongst an elite group behind the closed doors of the Lodges of the Mysteries.

And this science, ladies and gentlemen--and make no mistake about it--this science determines the destiny of nations and the course of history.

It is the source of a nation's frame of reference and code of values, the root of a people's character and culture, the fundamental cause shaping men's choices and decisions in every single crucial area of their lives.

It is the science which directs men to embrace this world, or to seek out some other that is said to transcend it, which directs them to

reason or superstition, to the pursuit of happiness or of self-sacrifice, to production or starvation, to freedom or to slavery, to life or even to death.

It is the science, ladies and gentlemen, which made the difference between the east and the west, between the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, between the Founding Fathers of the new continent and the Adolf Hitlers of the old.

It is the science which had to be destroyed if the catastrophes of our time were to become possible.

And that science is philosophy.

Philosophy is the study of the nature of existence, of knowledge, and of values. And values translates into ethics and morals.

The branch of philosophy that studies existence is metaphysics, and you have been taught to laugh at it. Metaphysics identifies the nature of the universe as a whole. It tells men what kind of world they live in, and whether there is a supernatural dimension beyond it, or nothing at all. It tells men whether they live in a world of solid entities, natural laws, absolute facts, or in a world of illusory fragments, unpredictable miracles, and ceaseless flux. It tells men whether the things that they perceive by their senses and mind form a comprehensible reality with which they can deal, or some kind of unreal appearance which leaves them staring and helpless.

The branch, ladies and gentlemen, of philosophy that studies knowledge is epistemology, and epistemology identifies the proper means of acquiring knowledge. You see, it tells men what mental processes to employ as methods of cognition and which to reject as invalid or deceptive. You see, above all, epistemology tells men whether reason is their faculty of gaining knowledge, and if so, how it works; or whether there is a means of knowledge other than reason, such as faith, or the instinct of society, or the feelings of the dictator, or--as Mr. Klerken put it--listening to the blood.

The branch of philosophy that studies values is ethics or morality,

which rests on both the above branches on a view of the world in which man acts and of man's nature, including his means of knowledge; for ethics defines a code of values to guide human actions. It tells men the proper purpose of man's life and the means of achieving it. It provides the standard by which men are to judge good and evil, right and wrong, the desirable and the undesirable. Ethics tells a man, for instance, to pursue his own fulfilment, or to sacrifice himself for the sake of something else, such as God, or his neighbour, or his nation, or his race.

The branch of philosophy that applies ethics to social questions is politics which studies the nature of social systems and the proper functions of government.

And this is probably the first time that many of you have ever known that.

Politics is not the start, but the product of a philosophic system, and if that system is absent, politics is chaotic.

By their nature, political questions cannot be raised or judged except on the basis of some view of existence, of values, and of man's proper means of knowledge.

Since men cannot live or act without some kind of basic guidance, the issues of philosophy in some form necessarily affect every man and every social group and class.

Most men, however, do not consider such issues in explicit terms. They absorb their ideas implicitly, eclectically, and with many contradictions from the cultural atmosphere around them, building into their souls without identifying it, the various ideological vibrations emanating from school, and church, and arts, and media, and much more.

A cultural atmosphere is not a primary. It is created ultimately by a handful of men, by those whose life work it is to deal with, originate, and propagate fundamental ideas.

For the great majority of men, the influence of philosophy is indirect and unrecognised. But you must understand that it is real.

The root causes of Naziism lies in a power that most people ignore, disparage, and underestimate. The cause is not the events hailed or cursed in headlines and street rallies, but the esoteric writings of the professors who decades or centuries earlier laid the foundation for those events.

The symbol of the cause is not the munitions plants, or the union halls, or bank vaults of Germany or any other country--but its ivory towers, its universities, its Lodge buildings. What came out of the towers in this regard is only coils of obscure, virtually indecipherable jargon, but that jargon is fatal.

Make no mistake.

It is fatal.

And America is heading down that road now.

"The Nazi camps..."

notes a writer in the "New York Times":

"...were conceived, built, and often administered by Ph.D.s--doctors of philosophy."

Now, what had those Ph.D.s been taught to think in their schools and universities, and where, dear listeners, did such ideas come from?

It took centuries--literally centuries--and a brain-stopping chain of falsehoods to bring an entire people to the state of Hitler worship--for that's exactly what it was.

Modern German culture, including its Nazi climax, is the result of a complex development in the history of philosophy involving dozens of figures stretching back to the beginnings of western thought.

The very same figures whom I have revealed to you on this broadcast helped to shape every western nation--all of them.

But in other countries, to varying extents, the results were mixed because there was also an opposite influence, or an antidote, at work.

In Germany, by the turn of our century, the cultural atmosphere was unmixed. The traces of the antidote had long, long since disappeared, and the intellectual establishment was monolithic.

Now, if we were to view the west's philosophic development in terms of essentials, there are three fateful turning points which stand out--three major philosophers who, above all others, are responsible for generating the disease of collectivism and transmitting it to the dictators of our century.

Whether it's collectivism within a nation, collectivism within a race, collectivism within the world, it is the same, and it emanates from the same source.

Whether you call it socialism, communism, or hippy-ism makes no difference. It is the same.

Whether it is a Nazi, a fellow-traveller, or a socialist, or just someone living down on the commune, it is all the same, and it comes from the same source.

These three--these three men--these three philosophers (for that is exactly what they were) are responsible for the most part for the situation wherein we find ourselves.

The three are Plato, Kant, and Hegel. And the antidote to them is Aristotle.

When's the last time you heard the name Aristotle?

Plato, dear listeners, is the father of collectivism in the west. He's the first thinker to formulate a systematic view of reality with a collectivist politics as its culmination.

You see, in essence, Plato's metaphysics holds that the universe consists of two opposed dimensions which are true reality--a perfect, immutable, supernatural realm, non-material, non-spacial, non-temporal, non-perceivable--and the material world in which we live.

The material world, Plato holds, is only an imperfect appearance of true reality, a semi-real reflection or a projection of it. Because Plato's metaphysics hold that reality is thus fundamentally spiritual or non-material in nature, he describes it technically in philosophy as idealism.

So, his reality is idealism--which most of us who strive for idealism found cannot be reached--and rejects the world around us--which we perceive as reality--as non-reality.

The content of true reality, according to Plato, is a set of universals or forms; in effect, a set of disembodied abstractions representing that which is in common among various groups of particulars in this world. And because of this, for Plato, abstractions are supernatural existence. They are non-material entities in another dimension, independent of man's mind, and of any of their material embodiments.

The forms, Plato tells us repeatedly, are what is really real. The particulars, they subsume. The concretes that make up this world, are not. They have only a shadowy, dreamlike, half-reality.

And I can see you shaking your head. This can't be true, you say. No one would pay any attention to this gobbledy-gook, but I can assure you, they do. It is the heart and soul of the religion taught in the Freemasonic Lodges. And if you've listened to our series on the Mysteries, you already know that.

Momentous conclusions about man are implicit in this metaphysics, and were later made explicit by a long line of Platonists.

Since individual men are merely particular instances of the universal man, they are not ultimately real. What is real about men is only the form which they share in common and reflect.

To common sense, there appear to be many separate individual men, each independent of the others, each fully real in his own right. But to Platonism--to Platonism--this is a deception, you see.

All the seemingly individual men are really the same one form in various reflections or manifestations of itself. Thus, all men ultimately comprise one unity and no earthly man is an autonomous entity. Just as if a man were reflected in a multi-faceted mirror, the many reflections would not be autonomous entities. And the whole is God.

Thus, the concept that man, if he perfects himself through the teachings of the Mysteries behind the Lodge doors, will himself become God.

This is the promise of Lucifer, of Satan in the Garden of Eden.

But remember, to these men, that is only a metaphor, a tale explaining the unexplainable.

Now, what follows in regard to human action, according to Plato, is a life of self-sacrificial service. When men gather in society, says Plato, the unit of reality and the standard of value is the community as a whole.

Whatever community you belong to, whether it is a racial community, a community within a nation, the world as community--as is being touted now in the universities--the environment as your community, a religious organization: it makes no difference. This applies in any case where a community exists and where the life is considered to be a self-sacrificial service to that community.

Each man, therefore, according to this philosophy, must strive as far as he can to wipe out his individuality, his personal desires, his ambitions, and everything else, and merge himself into the community, becoming one with it, and living only to serve its welfare.

On this view, the collective is not an aggregate, but an entity.

You see, society--the state--is regarded as a living organism. This is

the so-called "organic theory of the state", and the individual becomes merely a cell of this organism's body, with no more rights or privileges than belong to any other such cell.

"The first and highest form of the state, and of the government, and of the law..."

Plato writes:

"...is a condition in which the private and individual is all together banished from life. And things which are by nature private, such as eyes, and ears, and hands, have become common, and in some way see, and hear, and act in common, and all men express praise and blame, and feel joy and sorrow, on the same occasions. And whatever laws there are, unite the city to the utmost."

End quote. As for those individualistic terms: "mine" and "not mine", "another's" and "not another's", "yours" and "mine", and "hers" and "his"--the best ordered state will be the one in which the largest number of persons use these terms in the same sense; and which, accordingly, most nearly resembles a single person.

Ladies and gentlemen, he is describing Communism in its purest form--a dialectic which has never in history appeared in its purest form, even though some have tried to bring it into the world; for the old human failings always get in the way.

The advocacy of the omnipotent state follows from the above as a matter of course.

The function and authority of the state, according to Plato, should be unlimited. The state should indoctrinate the citizens with government-approved ideas in government-run schools, censor all art and literature and philosophy, assign men their vocations as they come of age, regulate their economic, and in certain cases even their sexual activities--as was done in Nazi Germany. The program of government domination of the individual is thoroughly worked out.

In Plato's "Republic and Laws", one can read the details which are the

first blueprint of the totalitarian ideal--an ideal which has already taken firm root, and its branches are spreading throughout this country, and indeed, throughout the world.

The blueprint includes the view that the state should be ruled by a special elite--the philosophers. Their title to absolute power, Plato explains, is their special wisdom: a council of wise men, a wisdom which derives from their insight into true reality, and especially into its supreme governing principle, the so-called "form of the good". And without a grasp of this form, according to Plato, no man can understand the universe, or even how to conduct his own life.

But to grasp this crucial principle, Plato continues--and here you can just begin to see the relevance of epistemology to politics--the mind is inadequate.

The form of the good, you see, cannot be known by the use of reason. It cannot be reached by a process of logic, according to Plato. It transcends human concepts and human language. It cannot be defined, described, or discussed.

It can be grasped, but only after years of an ascetic preparation--only by an ineffable mystic experience, a kind of sudden incommunicable revelation or intuition which is reserved to the philosophical elite.

The mass of men, by contrast, are entangled in the personal concerns of this life--sheeple, if you will. They are enslaved to the lower world revealed to them by their senses. They only work because they need money to buy some booze, to have a party, and get laid. They are incapable of achieving mystic contact with a supernatural principle. They are fit only to obey orders.

This is the Platonic philosophy.

Such, ladies and gentlemen, in its essentials, is the view of reality, of man, and of the state, which one of the most influential philosophers of all time infused into the stream of western culture.

It has served ever since as the basic theoretical foundation by

reference to which aspiring and actual dictators--both ancient and modern--have sought to justify their political systems.

Some of those dictators never read or even heard of Plato, I can assure you, but absorbed his kind of ideas indirectly, at home, in church, in the streets, in the prisons, or from the gutter. Some, however, did go back to the source.

"Plato..."

notes Walter Kaufmann <sp?>, and I quote:

"...was widely read in German schools under the Nazis, and special editions were prepared for Greek classes in the Gymnasium, gathering together allegedly fascist passages, instead of compiling a list of the many similar contributions to the Plato literature. It may suffice to mention that Dr. Hans F. K. Gunther <sp?>, from whom the Nazis admittedly received their racial theories, also devoted an entire book to Plato."

End quote. And as to Alfred Rosenberg <sp?>, Hitler's official ideologist, and a Jew, he celebrates Plato as one who wanted, in the end, to save his people on a racial basis, through a forcible constitution, dictatorial in every detail.

Now, if mankind has not perished from such constitutions, if it has not collapsed permanently into the swamp of statism, but has fought its way up through tortured centuries of brief rises and long, drawn-out falls--like a man fighting paralysis by the power of an inexhaustible vitality--it is only because that power has been provided by a giant whose philosophic system is, on virtually every fundamental issue, the opposite of Plato's.

And that great spokesman for man, and for this earth, is and has always been Aristotle.

You see, Aristotle is the champion of this world, the champion of nature as against the supernaturalism of Plato.

Denying Plato's world of forms, Aristotle maintains that there is only

one reality: the world of particulars in which we live, the world men perceive by means of their physical senses.

Universals, he holds, are just aspects of existing entities isolated in thought by a process of selective attention. They have no existence apart from particulars. Reality is comprised not of Platonic abstractions, but of concrete individual entities, each with a definite nature, each obeying the laws inherent in its nature.

Aristotle's universe is the universe of science. The physical world, in his view, is not a shadowy projection controlled by some divine dimension, but an autonomous, self-sufficient realm. It's an orderly, intelligible, natural realm open to the mind of man.

And in such a universe, ladies and gentlemen, knowledge cannot be acquired by special revelations from another dimension. There is no place for ineffable institutions of the beyond. He repudiates the mystical elements in Plato's epistemology.

Aristotle is the father of logic and the champion of reason as man's only means of knowledge.

Knowledge, he holds, must be based on, and derived from, the data of sense experience. It must be formulated in terms of objectivity, defined concepts. It must be validated by a process of logic.

You see, for Plato, the good life is essentially one of renunciation and selflessness, a life that is not a life. Man should flee from the pleasures of this world in the name of fidelity to a higher dimension, just as he should negate his own individuality in the name of union with the collective.

And in that kind of a world, liberty does not exist. There are no Creator-endowed rights for man, nor protection of those rights.

But for Aristotle, the good life is one of personal self-fulfilment. Man should enjoy the values of this world. He should use his mind to the fullest. Each man should work to achieve his own happiness here on earth. And in the process, he should be conscious of his own value.

"Pride..."

writes Aristotle:

"...a rational pride in oneself, and in one's moral character is, when it is earned, the crown of the virtues."

And we will continue tomorrow night, ladies and gentlemen, for this is important that you understand what is happening and where it is coming from.

And if you haven't been to a university in a long time, I suggest you go and sit in on some of these classes. You will hear what I have relayed to you tonight, being taught to your children over and over and over again, in almost every classroom that they inhabit.

This broadcast tonight was brought to you from a book entitled, "The Ominous Parallels" by Leonard Peikoff <sp?>. It's a brilliant study, ladies and gentlemen, of America today, and the ominous parallels with the utter chaos of pre-Hitler Germany.

Good night, and God bless you all. And God save this Republic.

Copyright © 1997 Harvest Trust. All rights reserved.

Revised: August 25, 1998.