

# From the Totalitar Market to the Totalian Empire

FRANZ J. HINKELAMMERT

I would like to use this opportunity\* to try and illuminate some striking characteristics of the imperial world system we live in today. It concerns, especially, fundamental characteristics of a new political movement (a "mass conservatism") born in the USA during the seventies and which, in 1980, with president Reagan, took over the USA government. From there this movement spread out fast to large parts of the Western world.

This development has been accompanied by boundless chauvinism and new myths of violence and war that are without comparison since the twenties and thirties, and find fertile soil in the frustrations of a lost war. They unite with an extreme anti-interventionist neo-liberalism, that needs arbitrary violence for its total market policy which cannot be imposed without it. The economic interests together with the situation of frustration lead to a myth of rearmament, linking the unimpeded economic liberalism and the rearmament to a new utopia of peace and a new millenial messianism, in which the mysticism of the Millenium is injected precisely by the Christian fundamentalism that has developed in the USA over the last century. For this messianism, the USA as an imperial center, are a center of power that divides the world in friend and enemy and acts accordingly.

Thus grows a power which is deducted in a new sense from the possession of nuclear arms. Nuclear arms stop creating a nuclear stalemate once a nuclear power succeeds in making believe that it is prepared to use such arms and thus is prepared to collective suicide. As long as the rest of humankind is not of the same attitude, it will be in a complete

\* Presented at the Seminar of liberation theology in the West European context in Agapé (Prati, Italy) Sept. 6—13, 1986

dependency. He who, in a situation of nuclear stalemate shows a convincing preparedness to collective suicide, gains in a certain sense absolute power. Some will submit in order to share in this absolute power, while others will step back, avoiding thus to give rise to or trigger off a catastrophe.

Political reason — as in the end any form of social reason — resides in the refusal of collective suicide. He who puts on collective suicide and summons a new “Götterdämmerung” (known in the USA today under the name Armageddon), destroys the basis of political reason, replaces nuclear stalemate by nuclear roulette and builds his power on irrationality and arbitrariness.

I would like to enlighten this new situation starting from an analysis of neo-liberalism economic ideology.

### 1. THE TOTAL MARKET AS A SOCIAL TECHNIQUE

Neo-liberalism perceiving the market as a total market, unchained dynamics that do slumber in every liberalism but are not normally in act. In 17th century liberalism, market and reality confront each other, in such a way that economic crises destroying or perturbing the realm of satisfaction of needs can be corrected by proper market reforms or, if necessary, by state intervention.

The ever reappearing economic crises caused a long history of economic interventions that were meant to correct the market, although the market automatism itself was never doubted. This reformism was pushed forward during the Keynes period. Contemporary neoliberalism however takes the idea of market automatism seriously, in an entirely dogmatic way. Thus, it changes at the same time the starting point of the market ideology. It suddenly states that economic crises aren't consequences of the market automatism that should be cured with market corrections and interventions, but that these crises are the result — from the failure to impose the market automatism as such. One shouldn't correct the market any longer in the name of reality and to save the realm of satisfaction of needs, but should adapt reality to the necessities imposed by the market. If one wishes to make reality more perfect, one is to reinforce the market automatism. The market is a perfect institution, one must allow it to rule totally and completely. The salvation of the world (from poverty, unemployment, environment destruction, underdevelopment) does not reside in solving these problems, but in a reinforcement of the market mechanism at the cost of a solution to these problems. The needs will have to suit the market, the market should not follow the needs. It is not the market who needs correction, but the reality. That is where the apology of the market leads to: Woe Reality!

Inside the market ideology the call for more market becomes the promise of fewer economic crises, of solving problems like poverty, unemployment and environment. To submerging concrete problems there is always only one, monotonously repeated answer: more market.

But reality doesn't submit at all to the market automatism and its ideology. More market means more and deeper economic crises. When only subjected to the rules of the market the crises get stronger, and resistance grows. But the ideology of market automatism reacts aggressively and encapsulates in itself. From the existence of crises and resistance it can only conclude that there is just not enough market and will proceed in radicalizing market policy. One sinks pretty soon into the most complete tautology and the crises created by the market automatism become proofs of the fact that there is not enough market. While crises deepen, one decides in favour of still more market and so crises deepen even further. But the dogmatism of the market automatism pushed to the level of tautology, is absolute and therefore proceeds still more radically on its aggressive road. This creates resistance. But this resistance, be it from trade-unions, environmental organisations or political groups, can only be interpreted as irrational and malicious. In the eyes of the market ideologists it is beyond doubt that the market is a perfect institution, whose potentials can only be disclosed, leaving to it a free way by. Resistance appears to them as pure arbitrariness, as behaviour without any rationality, as lust of power or as utopian (directed against the obvious reality of the market). Something like that is expressed by Milton FRIEDMAN in the following way: "One of the main causes of resistance to a free economy is exactly the fact that it fulfills its task so well. It gives the people what they want, and not what a small group wants them to have. Behind most arguments against the free market a lack of faith in freedom is hidden" (M. Friedman: *Kapitalismus und Freiheit*, Frankfurt/Main, 1984, p. 36).

However, it is poverty, unemployment and environment problems, the threat of war that lead to resistance. The market doesn't fulfill its task here at all. Neoliberalism however can only see in its opponents a lack of faith in the market and an irrational resistance. For the neoliberal believes (or pretends to) that only more market can solve the problems. Consequently he grows more and more aggressive when he encounters a lack of such a faith.

This aggressiveness is bluntly without boundaries. One can't transform the market into an exclusive socialising mechanism, as there always remain activities that are not controlled by the market. This gives way to the opinion that these remaining, not market-controlled elements, are to blame for the malfunctioning of the market automatism. Because it will never function and it will never control everything, the aggressive solution of more market becomes the endless moving principle of capitalist society,

explaining all crises by stating that there isn't enough capitalism and orienting all crise-solving actions towards an enlargement of capitalism. The mechanism makes itself invulnerable, elusive.

The ideology of anti-interventionism, derived of what has been said, is also an endless process, boundless dynamics. The goal is nothing, the process is everything. That is the real motto. It concerns the total market politics that seek to spread the market to all levels of life. The subject is reduced to its market functions, limiting all social relationships to market relationships.

Now it may be possible to deny reality but this doesn't imply that reality can therefore be kept, from existing. One can oppose interventions but that doesn't mean yet that through anti-interventionism the interventions in market automatism do disappear. It seems much more so, that to the extent one suppresses a certain direction of interventions other directions of interventions impose themselves. The interventions do not lessen because of anti-interventionism, they just change their structure and probably become more frequent. In Chile anti-interventionism led to a greater part of the banking system being put under state supervision that had been the case under the Unidad Popular. Anti-interventionism creates such crises that unintentional interventions intensify as a direct result of its action. The systematic interventionism of organized capitalism is replaced by a greater unintended interventionism of a now purposely disorganized capitalism. This new interventionism is therefore anti-social, unsystematic and arbitrary, and is to a greater extent than before dependent on the existence of a police state. The effort of finding a final solution through shock politics only creates greater disorder than existed beforehand. Instead of making consistent the systematic interventionism of organized capitalism through a global plan, an unsystematical anti-interventionism is put in its place. Interventionism, however, is showing no tendency to disappearing at all.

The crisis of the so called offer-oriented economic policy, that came to light when Stockman resigned, is a proof for this fact. He failed because of his wholly wrong belief that anti-interventionism leads to fewer interventions. He published afterwards a book that showed he hadn't even understood this in retrospect ("*The Triumph of Politics*"). As the title of this book shows, he accuses the monster Politics of all guilt, and so the market automatism floats over reality as a perfect society, having nothing to do with the catastrophies it causes.

In this way the market ends up as the very model of perfection. Its imperfections are just imaginary and a witness of powers disturbing market automatism. Finally any imperfection of the market is explained by evil-minded resistance against the market. The market is good and is consequently experienced as a *societas perfecta* unable to show its perfection completely since it is restricted by irrational and evil-minded

resistance. This market automatism idea is thus an utopia of a perfect institution. Economic theory says the theoretical model of this market automatism to be the model of perfect competition.

It is the theoretical expression of a perfect institution utopia. It is however not seen at all as a utopia. The more the market ideologist ideologizes tautologically about market automatism, all the more he feels as a realist and sees all who disagree with him as utopians.

The market seems to be the basic principle of all realism, and when faith in it becomes unqualified, the more the product of this ideology seems to be unquestionable. Thus the market represents virtually the perfection that must be actualized. Perfection is inherent to the market and must be brought out annihilating all resistance against market automatism. The aggressive spreading of the market and the destruction or decisive weakening of all groups possibly producing resistance, becomes the object of the "social technique". The latter has the double dimension of structural politics and police repression.

## 2. SOCIAL DEMONOLOGY AND WORLD CONSPIRACY

Transforming market automatism into a tautology and an endless process of spreading commercial relationships, provides the market with the character of a total market. This total market indeed belongs to a fictitious world deducted from the automatism of the real market. Where this fiction becomes a social technique however, it is made a new super-imposed reality, forced upon the realm of the satisfaction of needs.

Because resistance against the total market seems to be the cause of all problems in the concrete reality, a sectarian principle arises which leads to a Manichean and dualist view of the whole world. Perfection is incarnated in the world by the perfect market institution, but cannot be actualized as it is hindered by resistance from evil-minded people. The institution must therefore, in the name of its absolute perfection, be imposed mercilessly.

It leads to thinking: either they or we, chaos or order, devil or God. Powers of evil are at work, seeking to destroy the absolute perfection potentially present in the market. The market automatism's *societas perfecta* is rendered imperfect by evil powers. But because the market can't ever be the cause of crises or resistance, there just isn't any rational cause for crises or resistance. Pure evil-mindedness does explain their existence. The more the market is imperfect, the more the powers of evil show their might.

The market being a world market, this perception of the world leads to the thesis of world conspiracy against the market's perfect society. This world conspiracy is seen as the Empire of evil or of terrorism having

a world centre named Kremlin. Behind this visible centre of the world-conspiracy appears Lucifer, pretending to be a bearer of light but spreading only darkness. The market ideology thus becomes political theology originating from this demonology.

Neoliberal market ideology emancipates itself completely from reality, thus only being able to react aggressively against everything that could give way to the satisfaction of needs at the cost of the market. It is principally, and first of all, anti-interventionist. It loathes pseudo self-healing powers of the market in whose name it attacks every concrete project of solving any crisis, denouncing it as utopian. It is anti-terrorist because it can only see terrorism as a result of interventionism or utopianism.

This ideology interpretes interventionism, utopianism and terrorism as derived from communism which in its turn is seen as the centre of the world conspiracy against the *societas perfecta* of market automatism. Market ideology is deprived of all concrete contenance. As it emancipate from reality, it has nothing to say concerning reality. To all upcoming problems it has only one answer dogmatically deducted from its principles: always more market. It can therefore not even say what it is. As a name for this nothingness it uses the word freedom. But the contents of this word is just the sum of all the refusals pronounced in the name of the market. Freedom is there where communism is not. It is just the sum of all necessary and sufficient conditions for the market to become total and free from the constraints of reality.

The fact however that reality tries to make itself present under the form of needs to be satisfied, is experienced as the present existence of the empire of evil, creating a world conspiracy against market automatism as an existing perfection in the world. The whole society must therefore be mobilized against this empire of evil, although it is not possible to destroy it entirely.

The world conspiracy is just the mythical common denominator for this struggle against the empire of evil. This conspiracy is the centre of all the negative in the world and behind which hides the devil. In a speech to the USA Congress in which Reagan was asking for 100 million dollars for the contras in Nicaragua, he said: "No, there doesn't seem to be any criminal act in which the Sandinist do not take part; this is a regime beyond law" ("*Barricada*", Managua 19/3/86).

The enemy turns into its evil itself, its incarnation on earth. Because of his being the absolute evil, nothing has to be proven against him. He is guilty without proof. If it would become clear he hasn't committed a certain crime, then it is a fact he had been able to do it. Had he been consequent, he even should have done it. Hadn't he done it yet, than this proves him to be a hypocrite or a coward. So there is no injustice in suspecting him of a crime he has nothing to do with. When forging evidence, there is no falsification as one only presumes to have happened what the

opponent following his heart would have done anyway. The opponent is the incarnation of the enemy against which one does not need arguments. He becomes a non-person absolutely without value.

### 3. SECULARIZED AND APOCALYPTIC ANTI-UTOPIA

The market automatism, represented as total market is utopian because the market is seen as a perfect institution. It is a utopia, however, not being perceived as such because it is identified with reality. Admitting this is therefore realism or pragmatism. This realism opposes to all utopiae, considering as such all notions of freedom or solidarity which put the market into doubt. The total market ideology presents itself therefore as anti-utopian. And it actually is, concerning all utopiae or utopian horizons representing a concrete freedom or solidarity. As especially socialist utopiae do so, the total market ideology is anti-utopian when they are concerned. Thus anti-utopia and anti-messianism are its basic features as long as utopian projections of the solutions to concrete problems are dealt with.

From this anti-utopia the total market ideology derives utopian consequences. It develops a utopia whose realization lies as a promise in the destruction of all utopiae. To destroy utopian movements and images appears as the way of realizing utopia. From the fierce anti-utopism of this ideology follows the utopian promise of a new world. The basic thesis is: he who destroys utopia, realizes it.

This utopian horizon of the anti-utopia becomes clear from the fact that the total market is presented as *societas perfecta*, as perfect competition. The analogies one chooses for this market-society betray the so-called market-realism as illusionary utopism. Reagan refers to this aggressive total market society as "a shining city on the mountain", this esoteric language meaning nothing less than the new Jerusalem or the Millenium. Likewise Reagan announces US-society as an "eternal light", as "Dome of freedom" and as a "lighthouse" for all eternity. This is how market automatism's *societas perfecta* becomes its utopian appearance, lighting more and more as the world conspiracy of the empire of evil grows darker. To arrive at the brilliant triumph of this utopia, all one has to do is destroy the utopists that build the empire of evil. An aggressive anti-utopian utopia is concerned whose realization will result from the destruction of all the world's utopists.

So, the road leading to this utopia lies not in a guarantee of peace and a human development in solidarity. On the contrary, struggle must be guaranteed and solidarity destroyed, so that humanity will find itself. It is the empire of evil that seeks peace and development in solidarity for humankind. To live is to fight. Freedom is freedom to fight. Struggle is

the life principle of society. So he who refuses to fight, refuses the very life principle of humanity. One will have to fight to secure this principle of life, which is struggle. Utopia threatens this struggle and therefore a total war against this utopia is imperative. When winning, struggle, restored as humankind's life foundation, will produce a new world which will be celebrated as the advent of utopia.

Total market ideology is nothing more than the liberal form of this ideology of struggle. It is the ideology of the struggle fought in the battlefield of the market and being the life principle of the market. This struggle must be protected against the interventionists to make it able to bear fruit. "More market" is therefore its motto. Fighting utopia here too is a fight conducted in order to be able to struggle. As opponents appear both utopia and humanism, whose destruction will again be celebrated as a recovery of the humane, i.e. respect for struggle.

Destroying utopia to let man be man, abolish humanism to free the humane, that is the way offered by this utopia grounded on anti-utopia.

But this anti-utopian utopia not only celebrates what is. It also provides a basis for a total-market process having an endless dimension into the future. This market society isn't just a "lighting city on the mountain", it is also the endless process through which the market becomes more and more total. It isn't only the presence of a utopian principle but also the affirmation of a utopian future with endless perspectives.

This utopian future has two faces. On the one hand, this utopia stems from a manipulated socialist utopia, now linked with capitalist production relations. This implies a few modifications in which important notions of hope from the socialist tradition are being absorbed. This can be shown from Reagan's speech to youth at Hambach (7/5/85). He observes the relations of production as follows: "... to become part of a new movement of progress in the era of enterprise. Small firms will create most of the new employment in the future".

Then he evokes the shining future that must be built against tyranny: "... They can follow their dreams right up to the stars. And we who live in this great cathedral of freedom, should never forget: we will see a shining future before us, we will watch rising the new pinnacle of freedom. We can even foresee the end of tyranny if only we believe in our greatest power: our courage, our value, our unlimited capability of love".

Then follows a description of the future, using phrases that stem almost wordly from Bebel or Trotsky:

„We shall turn the exceptional into something for all days — that's the way freedom works. And the mysteries of the future do not only belong to us here in Europe and America, but to all people in all places, of all times. Future is waiting for your creative minds. From your ranks may grow a new Bach, a new Beethoven, a new Goethe or a new Otto Hahn for the good of the future of Germany".



Bebel had said: "Future generations will... without effort realize projects that have lingered since long in the heads of the most clever people, without their being able to succeed".

And Trotsky: "The common human being will rise to the level of Aristotle, Goethe, Marx. And beyond this mountain ridge even new tops will arise".

To this utopia, called by him the "true revolution of peace in freedom", Reagan ties in the technical progress utopia as well as the utopia of a peace resulting from an unbound arms race. And see what he proclaims as a law of history:

"History is not on the side of those who manipulate the meaning of words like revolution, freedom and peace. History is far more on the side of those who fight for a true revolution of peace in freedom for all the world".

This manipulation of socialist utopia adapting it to capitalist relations of production and especially legitimating the existing US-system, has a somewhat longer history. Preparations were undertaken especially by Zbigniew Brzezinski who in his book *"Ideology and Power in Soviet Politics"* (New York 1962), pointed out the importance of the image of itself given by communism for soviet system stability and already hinted at the lack of such ideological perspectives for the future in the USA. In a later book Brzezinski tries to construct such utopia for the US-system (*"Between two ages. America's role in the technotronic era"* 1970).

Brzezinski's solution was very mechanistic and artificial. In Reagan is shown how one has proceeded, transforming the socialist utopia for one's own purposes.

We are dealing here with a secular utopia whose rationalist origin is unmistakable even when it is transformed into its opposite. It is important first of all in the circles of the New Right in the USA, stemming directly from neo-liberalism. To a certain extent it serves to contradict the general cultural pessimism originating from environmental problems and the consequent criticism of technological progress. But it certainly isn't this utopia that produces a mass basis for the New Right, to which Reagan belongs, or to "mass conservatism".

This mass basis comes from a little known Christian fundamentalism, mainly Protestant, as it developed in the USA. This tradition recalls the anti-semitic literature of the first half of this century in Europe, both in its primitivism and its strong anti-semitism. Although pro-Israel it is anti-jewish. The basic elements of the image of the empire of evil's world conspiracy, stem from this fundamentalist tradition, integrating perfectly in the total market ideology stemming from neo-liberalism.

This fundamentalist tradition was born in relation to a purely privately perceived religiosity. In the seventies it became an explicit political theology, under the prevailing influence of Jerry FALWELL and

George OTIS who act rather as Rasputin-like figures at president Reagan's Court.

From the coincidence of this fundamentalist movement and neo-liberalism grows today's US New Right. Bridging the gap between them is the extreme anti-interventionism, shared by both from their separate traditions. An entirely equivalent role with both has anti-utopism. In fundamentalism, all elements attacked by neo-liberalism because of its hate of interventionism are interpreted as the works of the Anti-Christ. Especially socialism, but also any reformism as well as a United Europe, the United Nations and all pacifism, all trade-unionist activities, all these are seen as heralds or works of the Anti-Christ emerging from the empire of the Beast. Contrarily to the rationalist rests of secular, manipulated, US-utopia this fundamentalist view of history is absolutely pessimistic. In their thinking the empire of evil is the strongest and leads to the absolute catastrophe of humanity. Although the good stand up, the activity of evil leads to the final slaughter, named Armageddon, a kind of "Götterdämmerung".

But right in this catastrophe resides hope. The worse it gets, the better. For in the final slaughter Christ will return. "Christ is coming" is a hope ever growing as things grow worse. Christ is coming to install the Millenium, reserved for the good having stood up against the Anti-Christ. The interventionists on the other hand end up in hell for all eternity. However, the good are the bearers of the Millenium, here and now already. The more this tends to be political, the more one speaks of "nuclear armageddon". To have to accept and bear this, is interpreted as the "sacrificial mission" of the USA. Thus nuclear war itself becomes the true hope, the intermediate stage to the Millenium. Reagan as well as Weinberger share these visions to a great extent (see "Le Monde Diplomatique" Déc 85 p. 20/21, an article by Konrad Ege).

The underlying law of history here becomes absolutely metaphysical and deterministic. This future of catastrophe is looked upon as totally unchangeable, as an eternal decision of God condensed once and for all in the biblical prophecies.

The descriptions of the Millenium found are nothing else than visions of a wholly achieved total market.

This is the whole utopian world of the US New Right. It has something for everyone. But it always has, as a central element, the destruction of utopia as an intermediate step to utopia. In this way the manipulated socialist utopia and the likewise manipulated hope for the Millenium provide the New Right with the shining counterpart of the empire of evil. So if Reagan calls the USA "shining city on the mountain", thus equating it with the Millenium, then this has a totally different meaning from what such a comparison would have meant in the 19th century.

#### 4. SOCIAL SURGERY: A CANCER IS TAKEN OUT

The social technique of the total market's *societas perfecta*, the consequent production of a world conspiracy by the empire of evil and its counterpart the shining of the millennial anti-utopia, change any opponent in pure irrationality and denies him/her any value. He/She is thereupon diagnosed as filth or disease.

This process of moral destruction of opponents follows a certain scheme emanating from the general negative stance in today's bourgeois thinking. Every claim of its own values is deducted from the negation of the so-called opponent. The higher one values oneself, the less one values the opponent. And because one proclaims oneself to have absolute value, the opponent ends as a non-value.

All this is primarily built on three main negations. The negation of utopism, the negation of statism and interventionism, and the negation of terrorism. Real or imaginary problems actually existing in all these areas must be solved by doing exactly the contrary. But the more consequently one does the contrary, the surer is the reproduction of the problems on an unbelievably radicalized level. One doesn't solve them at all, one reinforces them.

Thus, when one wants to solve the problems of utopian action, one creates a completely irrational anti-utopian utopia, threatening all remaining certainties and blocking every road to any rational solution. One wants to fight terrorism creating however a terrorism that is quantitatively and qualitatively much more threatening than the one fought in the beginning. That is why one declares to wish to put an end once and for all to terrorism.

See, for instance, Reagan's comment on the Beirut murder of hostages after the air-raid on Libya: "This shows again that we should do something to bring terrorism to a halt once and for good" (*El Pais* 18/4/86). The more one tries to do this 'for good' the more one will have to become terrorist. Just like anti-utopian utopia grew, grows now an anti-terrorist terrorism surpassing everything terrorism could have done.

The third "anti" is directly against the state and its interventionism. Here too it becomes an active negation. The state must grow into an absolute state to be able to do away with interventionism. Out of anti-statism thus grows an absolute state. F. A. HAYEK for instance says: "When a government falls and there are no acknowledged rules, it is necessary to create rules in order to say what can be done and what can't. And under these circumstances it is practically unavoidable that someone gains total power. An absolute power that should be used precisely to avoid any absolute power in the future or to restraint its field of activity" (Interview, Santiago, Chile, *Mercurio* 12/4/81).

Thus are proposed absolute utopism to overcome utopia, absolute ter-

rorism to do away with terrorism for good, an absolute state to prohibit any future absolute state, absolute armament to prevent the danger of all weapons. These are totalitarian dialectics already being put into practice in the past. No problem is solved, all problems are being radicalized until nihilism. This way completely unimpeded and endless dynamics are created because these active negations reproduce their very reasons of existence. These totalitarian dynamics of power can eventually outgrow their own point of departure, the total market, just like revolution devours its own breed. These dynamics then lose the apparent pragmatism they started with, become selfless and thus capable to unlimited radicalism.

This process, creating absolute radicalism through active negation, is at the same time leading to complete devaluation of opponents. The total market's social technique thus becomes a cleaning operation and a social surgery. The claim of the absolute value of the life of some people doesn't lead to the claim for the value of the life of all people but to the claim for the non-value of the life of the others.

In Central America this non-value of opponents campaign is being directed primarily against Nicaragua, the campaign against Libya serving as a bridge. It all started back in 1984/85 with anti-drugs propaganda, steadily pretending the Sandinist Nicaraguan government to be the trade-center for narcotics in Latin America.

Most radio and television networks repeated several times a day the following text: "A narcotics vendor is a human garbage – denounce him!"

In the course of 85 one stopped relating to the opponents as human garbage, replacing it more and more by "a cancer". This still is the most used reference.

George Shultz for instance called Nicaragua "a cancer right here in our continent, trying to spread by a variety of means" (*La Nacion*, San Jose, Costa-Rica 28/2/86). Later he declared: "Nicaragua is the cancer and we must get rid of it" (*La Nacion* 15/4/86). Italy's Christian Democratic party president Flaminio PICCOLI joined him: "The sandinist regime is an evil cancer showing a fatal necessity to export its revolution" (*La Nacion*, 22/3/86). Elliot Abrams, Undersecretary of State for inter-american affairs, added that it was worse to be a Communist than to be "a bandit or a criminal" (*La Nacion* 20/12/85).

As for Khaddafi, George Bush said him to be a "rabid dog" (*La Nacion* 10/4/86) and Reagan used the same expression. Shortly before the air-raid on Libya Bush announced a "surgical operation" in Libya (*La Nacion* 14/4/86). In his speech to the Congress following a vote against a 100 million dollar help for the contras Reagan presented himself as a prime cancer surgeon. He spoke of the danger that "the evil cancer in Managua" was about to become a "lethal threat for the entire New World". He also evoked the tragedy "that might happen if one would

allow this "cancer" to evolve. He called for "bringing democracy to this country and taking out Communist danger by the roots". If you do that, he says, you will have the following America: "We will leave behind a safe America, a free America, we will leave it as an everlasting lighthouse for humanity, as an eternal light to all nations". (In Central America the full text was published only in Managua, *Barricada* 19/3/86).

After the air-raid on Libya, Reagan said Nicaragua to be on the verge of becoming a second Libya (*La Nacion* 23/4/86). But one will not allow that, because this "equals acts of war against the Northamerican people" (*La Nacion* 23/4/86).

In totalitarian language this means nothing less than announcing an identical treatment for Nicaragua as the one suffered by Libya. Behind all threats however stands the anti-utopian utopia, promising the light that comes from the destruction of the darkness.

But the empire of evil is everywhere, Libya is everywhere, so is Nicaragua and so is Cuba. They all share a Lord who leads a world conspiracy. The world conspiracy is directed against the "shining city on the mountain", against the "lighthouse for humanity", against the "eternal light for all nations". All of this being the USA, the national interests of the USA are threatened everywhere.

Threatened points according to the USA government are: the Panama Canal, the Suez Canal, the strait of Singapore, Cape of Good Hope, the Belt, the Dardanel, Gibraltar, Philippines and lots of others. The world conspiracy is nothing else but a projection serving as a pretext to install a national security dictatorship around the world. What they want is this dictatorship, and the world conspiracy is just a fictive and mythical reason. A mirror battle is going on, in which a warrior is fighting in the name of his mirror image against others who are equally real but are seen as cancers.

This threatening national security world-dictatorship is defended with the same arguments of earlier national dictatorships of the same kind. Anti-utopism, anti-terrorism and anti-statism always used to be the mirror images motivating anti-utopian utopia, anti-terrorist terrorism and anti-statist statism. And always the suppression of human rights and the negation of human values have been motivated by the cancer analogy. In Indonesia '65, Chile '73, Argentina, Uruguay, Guatemala, the same method was always used. Always one declared that a cancer must be taken out. But now this has been announced as world level politics, one tries to impose a world dictatorship of national security.

As it concerns a world dictatorship of national security, however it shows some peculiarities related primarily to the fact that the USA is the first military and nuclear power in the world. The more they interpret their politics in terms of myths and thus emancipate themselves away from reality — just like the ideology of the total market —, all the

more they will be prepared to the collective suicide of humankind and thus can give it credibility. The power stemming from here enables the USA to try a world dictatorship. It is an omnipotence, but altogether negative as everything that is founded on negations. The omnipotence of the Creator is the power that creates the world; the omnipotence of these mythologists is able to destroy it. And isn't he who destroys the universe as powerful as he who created it?

## CONCLUSION

We are standing before a nihilistic movement that is apocalyptically motivated and whose roots lie in a readiness to collective suicide.

But there isn't a military solution anymore. That would just be the realization of the (maybe still unconscious) goal of this movement, its so bewished Armageddon. Probably even national liberation wars aren't a solution anymore. These require at least the acknowledgement of political facts. When, after 1917, the Bolcheviks had won, this victory came from an acknowledgement by the Western powers. They could of course have deployed contra's, like the USA did in Nicaragua, to bleed the Soviet Union to death and the civil war would never have ended. The same for Greece after World War II. The partisans lost and Stalin acknowledged this political fact. He too could have deployed contra's to bleed down Greece. But a political fact was acknowledged.

When however the first world power non longer acknowledges political facts but dissolves politics in the idea of realisation of a myth, the facts themselves dissolve. No political facts remain and everything is dissolved by an aggressive myth, in itself being nothing more than a shouting nothing but readily capable of swallowing the world in its precipice.

The solution must be a very elementary one, starting from the opposition activities in the central countries. Arms being there of little help, it will predominantly come down to unarmed civil resistance. That may well mean that for those in the resistance the situation will be similar to that under Diocletian.

But every resistance needs a goal. Before being able to speak of human rights or even of a reality, one must be able to say which humans must be respected. It must be stated anew that no human being is a human garbage, no one a rabid dog or a beast with a human face, that no one is a parasite comparable with fleas or lice and to be treated accordingly, that no one is a cancer in the body of the people needing to be taken away. That is absolutely new within the Western system. When speaking prematurely of human rights, one will overlook that a majority of humankind isn't considered as humans at all and consequently aren't even taken into account when defining the subject of human rights. Of

what use is it to speak of human rights when the most important super-power of our time declares large groups of people to be a cancer and treats them accordingly. It isn't easy to look at the poor, the excluded but also the one who resists as a fellow human being and it has never been. Many declamations for all humankind in fact concern only a part of it, excluding the people considered as non-humans. He who defines many people as cancers, can further easily acknowledge human rights. These cancers just aren't people so these human rights simply don't apply to them. It is easy (and a centuries old European and US tradition) to produce proclamations of human rights with the reservation that not all people actually are human beings. From the declaration defining the America native people as living beings without a soul, to the "Untermensch" and the cancer goes a continuous line in our tradition.

There is a process of emptying human rights from inside, presupposing the declaration of large groups of people to be non-human. This becomes very clear in the limitation of human rights to the liberal human rights showing the tendency of defining the social order of market automatism. The market automatically depriving large groups of people of their living conditions, the excluded always appear as not entirely human. The market acknowledges humanity to some that is unapproachable for others. One can only be human however when provided with proper living conditions. That includes without reservation the material living conditions, of course.

It is the very heart of market-society to make concrete living conditions market-depending, and thus inaccessible for certain people. So it suffices to develop the market to a total one to arrive at all the consequences we have seen.

That, however, means that human rights can only be guaranteed if presupposing all humans to be legitimate subjects of concrete living conditions. This implies a conflict with market society having market automatism as its central control mechanism.

For this reason, victory over market automatism is the necessary condition for organising human life in such a way that it will become possible to acknowledge human rights to all people and to consider and treat them as subjects of these rights. That implies, however, market control through a global plan. Planned interventionism is capable of providing all people with the chance to be integrated economically in society and so to become a concrete subject.

E r r a t u m

Please correct the titel of the article  
by Franz J. H i n k e l a m m e r t on  
p. 33 (and on the cover):

FROM THE TOTAL MARKET TO TOTALITARIAN  
EMPIRE.

Thank you.