

Stalin and Hitler: Twin Brothers or Mortal Enemies?

Domenico
Losurdo

Abstract:

Starting from the category “totalitarianism” mainstream ideology considers Hitler and Stalin as twin brothers. On the contrary, during the struggle for his country’s independence, starting in this case from the category “colonialism”, Gandhi considered Churchill as the twin brother of Hitler: the goal of the latter was to build the “German Indies” in Eastern Europe and in Soviet Russia in particular. Which of the two categories can help us understand the twentieth century better? Nowadays renowned historians agree on characterising the war between the Third Reich and the Soviet Union as the greatest colonial war in world history. We can say that Hitler and Stalin were both “totalitarian” but we are not allowed to forget that the former, while continuing and further radicalising the Western colonial tradition, strived to subjugate and even enslave the “inferior races” in Eastern Europe, and that this attempt was vanquished by the fierce resistance of the country ruled by the latter. In this sense Stalin was not the twin brother but the mortal foe of Hitler. The rout in Stalingrad of Hitler’s project to build the “German Indies” in Eastern Europe was the beginning of the decline of the British Indies too and of the world colonial system in general.

Keywords:

Totalitarianism, Colonialism, German Indies, World War II, British Indies

1. *Historical Events and Theoretical Categories*

When philosophers investigate historical events, they try to discuss at the same time the categories with which historical events are reconstructed and described. Today one understands under the category of “totalitarianism” (the terrorist dictatorship of single political parties and the personality cult) Stalin and Hitler as extreme embodiments of this scourge, as two monsters that have traits so similar that one thinks of a pair of twins. Not for nothing – as one argues – both have been united for nearly two years by a disgraceful pact. Indeed this pact was followed by a merciless war, but two twins waged it, even though they were quite contentious.

Is this an obligatory conclusion? Let us turn away from Europe for a moment. Gandhi was also convinced that Hitler had some sort of twin brother. But this was not Stalin, who, still in September 1946, was considered by the Indian leader to be a “great man” at the top of a “great people.”¹ No, Hitler’s twin brother was ultimately Churchill, at least judging from two interviews that Gandhi had given in April 1941 and April 1946 respectively: “I assert that in India we have Hitlerian rule, however disguised it may be in softer terms.” And further: “Hitler was Great

.....
1 Tendulkar 1990, p.210

Britain's sin.' Hitler is only an answer to British imperialism."²

Maybe the first of the two explanations is the one, which is the most suggestive. It took place at a time, in which the non-aggression treaty between Germany and the Soviet Union was still in effect: The Indian leader of the independence movement does not seem to take umbrage at it. In the anti-colonial movement the people's front politics encountered the greatest difficulties. The reason for this is explained by an important Afro-American historian from Trinidad, enthusiastic admirer of Trotsky, namely C.L.R. James, who even in 1962 describes the development of another advocate of the cause of black emancipation, also from Trinidad, as follows: "Once in America he became an active Communist. He was moved to Moscow to head their Negro department of propaganda and organization. In that post he became the best known and most trusted of agitators for African independence. In 1935, seeking alliances, the Kremlin separated Britain and France as, democratic imperialisms' from Germany and Japan, making the, Fascist imperialisms' the main target of Russian and Communist propaganda. This reduced activity for African emancipation to a farce: Germany and Japan had no colonies in Africa. Padmore broke instantly with the Kremlin."³

Stalin was not criticized and condemned as Hitler's twin brother, but because he refused to recognize in the latter the twin brother of the leaders of British and French imperialism. For important personalities of the anti-colonial movement it was not easy to understand that in the meantime the Third Reich took the lead of the colonial (and enslaving) counter-revolution: The usual debate about the non-aggression treaty suffers clearly from Euro-centrism.

As disputable as it may be to put Churchill into a proximity with Hitler, as Gandhi does (and other proponents of the anti-colonial movement did more indirectly), it is nonetheless understandable: Did Hitler not declare several times to build German India in Eastern Europe? And did Churchill not promise to defend British India at whatever cost? In fact, in 1942 the British Prime Minister had to suppress the movement of independence, "took extreme means, like the use of the air force, to take the mass of protestors under machine gun fire."⁴ The ideology that lies at the ground of this repression is especially suggestive. Let us hear from Churchill: "I hate Indians. They are a beastly people with a beastly religion"; fortunately an unprecedented number of "white soldiers" ensures the maintenance of order. The task is to confront a race "protected by their mere pullulation [rapid breeding] from the doom that

2 Gandhi 1969-2001, Vol. 80, p. 200 (*Answers to Questions*, 25. April 1941) and vol. 86, p. 223 (Interview with Ralph Coniston in April 1945).

3 James 1963, p. 310 (Addition of 1963 to the original edition of 1938).

4 Torri 2000, p. 598.

is;" Marshall Arthur Harris, protagonist of the area bombings in Germany, was well advised "to send some of his surplus bombers to destroy them."⁵

Let us return from Asia to Europe. On the 23rd of July 1944 Alcide de Gasperi, the Catholic leader who was about to become the prime minister in the Italy liberated from fascism, gave a speech where he emphatically proclaimed:

"When I see how Hitler and Mussolini prosecuted human beings because of their race and invented this frightening anti-Jewish legislation we know, and when I see at the same time how the Russians composed of 160 races seek a fusion of these races, when I see these efforts to unify human society, let me say: this is Christian, this is eminently universalist in the sense of Catholicism."⁶

The starting point formed in this case the category of racism, a scourge, which had found its grossest expression in Mussolini's Italy and in Hitler-Germany. Well, what was the counterpart to all this? Due to an already mentioned reason it could not have been Churchill's Great Britain. But also not the United States, where – at least where the South is concerned – *White Supremacy* reigned. Concerning this regime, an important US-American historian (George M. Fredrickson) has recently written: "The effort to guarantee 'race purity' in the American South anticipated aspects of the official Nazi persecution of the Jews in the 1930s;" when one also considers the law according to which in the South of the United States one drop of impure blood was enough to be excluded from the white community, one has to conclude: "the Nazi definition of a Jew was never so stringent as 'the one drop rule' that prevailed in the categorization of Negroes in race-purity laws of the American South."⁷ It thus cannot surprise us that De Gasperi saw in the Soviet Union the true great antagonist of Hitler-Germany. The twin brothers, of whom the category of totalitarianism speaks, appear on the scene according to the categories of racism and colonialism as mortal enemies.

2. "The Greatest Colonial War in History"

Which category should we thus use? Let us give the word to the personalities in question. When Hitler addressed the industrialists of Dusseldorf (and Germany) on the 27th January 1932 and won their support for taking power, he explained his conception of history and politics in the following manner. In the whole course of the 19th century the "white peoples" achieved an uncontested domination, and this as conclusion of a process that had begun with the conquering of America and developed

5 In Mukerjee 2010, p. 78 and pp. 246-47).

6 De Gasperi 1956, p. 15-16.

7 Fredrickson 2002, p. 2 and p. 124.

under the sign of the “absolute, inborn feeling of dominion of the white race.” Bolshevism, by putting the colonial system up for discussion and leading to and worsening the “confusion of the European white thinking,” brings a deadly danger to civilization. If one wants to confront this thread, one has to reinforce the “conviction of the supremacy and therewith the right of the white race” and one has to unconditionally defend the “master’s position of the white race over the rest of the world,” even with “most brutal ruthlessness”: An “extraordinary brutal master’s right” is needed. It is beyond doubt: Hitler presents his candidature for leadership in one of the most important countries in Europe by behaving as a pioneer of *White Supremacy*, which he wanted to defend world-wide.

The appeal of defending and mobilizing of the white race had found a great echo in Germany in World War I and especially afterwards. The recourse of the *entente* and particularly of France’s colored troops had caused scandal and indignation. Additionally, these colored were represented in the occupation troops in the Rhineland and had raped German women: This was the inexorable revenge of the victors, that attempted in any way to humiliate the defeated enemy and the even sought to contaminate his blood to achieve its ‘mullatization.’ In any case the black threat does not only lie in the south of the United States, where the Ku-Klux Clan is very vigilant, but also in Germany (and Europe): In this way, back then a broad public argued in Germany. And this ideological climate strongly influenced the formation of the Nazi-top leaders.

On the 14th of June 1922 Heinrich Himmler participated in a mass protest in Munich that was organized by the “Deutsche Notbund gegen die Schwarze Schmach”⁸, which – as a local newspaper reported “the occupation of the Rhineland by coloreds as a bestially conceived crime that aims to crush us as a race and finally destroy us.”⁹ In his diary Himmler noted: “Quite a lot of people. All shouted: ‘Revenge’ Very impressive. But I’ve already taken part in more enjoyable and more exciting events of this kind.”¹⁰ Luckily England was unfamiliar with France’s race irresponsibility. This is what Alfred Rosenberg thought, who advocated the “Federation of the two white peoples” or better of the three white peoples as such, if one examines the struggle against the “Negroization” on a global level and if one also thinks, apart from Germany and Great Britain, of the USA. Even at the end of 1942 – the Third Reich and Japan are side by side at war – Hitler, instead of being pleased about the successes of his alliance partners of yellow race, laments “the heavy losses which the white man has to suffer in eastern

8 *Trans.* German Emergency League against the Disgrace of the Blacks.

9 Longerich 2008, p. 66/Longerich 2012, p. 51

10 Ibid.

Asia”: This is reported in a diary entry of Joseph Goebbels, who for his part denounces Churchill as “the actual gravedigger of the English Empire.”¹¹

The white race already had to be defended in Europe. Its main enemy was the Soviet Union, which incited the “lower” races to rebellion and that meanwhile itself belonged to the colonial world. The conception was quite widespread in Germany back then: After the takeover by the Bolsheviks – Oswald Spengler wrote in 1933 – Russia had dropped the “‘white’ mask’ to again” become “an Asian, ‘Mongolian’ superpower,” now an integral part of the “complete colored population of the earth” and filled with hatred against “white humanity.”¹² The heavy threat was at the same time a great opportunity: In front of the white race and of Germany an immense colonial space had opened up. It was a sort of Far West. Already “Mein Kampf” extolled the “incredible inner force” of the American role model of colonial expansion, a role model that one has to imitate to build a territorially compact Reich in Middle and Eastern Europe.¹³ Later, after the unleashing of the project Barbarossa, Hitler compared several times his war against the “indigenous people” of Eastern Europe with the “Indian war,” with the “Indian battles in North America”: In both cases the “stronger race” will “be victorious.”¹⁴ In his secret speeches that were not intended for the public, Himmler also declared in a particularly explicit manner a further aspect of the colonial program of the Third Reich: One unconditionally needs “foreign race slaves,” in front of whom the “master race” never loses its “masterness”¹⁵ und with which it never should mix. “If we do not fill up our camps with slaves – in this room I say things very explicitly and clearly – with working slaves, who regardless of any loss, build our cities, our villages, our farms,” the program of colonialization and Germanization of the conquered soil in Eastern Europe cannot be realized.¹⁶

At the end: The “indigenous” of Eastern Europe were on one side the redskins, who need to be deprived of their soil, deported and decimated; on the other they were the blacks who were destined to be working as slaves in the service of the master race, while the Jews, that were equated with the Bolsheviks as responsible for the incitement of the lower races must be annihilated.

11 Goebbels 1992, pp. 1747-48.

12 Spengler 1933, p. 150.

13 Hitler 1939, pp. 153-54.

14 Hitler 1980, p. 377 and p. 334 (Conversations of the 30th August of 1942 and of 8th August of 1942).

15 *Trans.* Herrentum,

16 Himmler 1974, p. 156 and p. 159.

Of course, this conception of predestined victims who was in first line the Soviet Union could not be shared. It is interesting to note that Stalin already between February and October 1917 called attention to the fact that Russia tired of the endless war is at risk of transforming into “a colony of England, America and France”¹⁷: The *entente* by trying in any way to realize the continuation of war acted in Russia as if it were in “Central Africa.”¹⁸ The Bolshevik Revolution was also necessary to stave off this danger. After October, Stalin saw in the Soviet power the pioneer for “the conversion of Russia from a colony into an independent and free country.”¹⁹

Hitler had from the very beginning planned to take up again the colonial tradition and to implement it in Eastern Europe and especially in Russia, ‘savaged’ by the victory of Bolshevism; on the other side from the beginning Stalin called his country to face the danger of colonial subjugation and interpreted precisely from this point of view the Bolshevik Revolution.

Even if without any straightforward idea, Stalin began to recognize the essential characteristics of the millennium that had just commenced. On the wave of the October Revolution Lenin hoped that the exclusive or the main object of the 20th century will be the battle between capitalism on the one side and socialism / communism on the other: The colonial world was in the meantime completely occupied by the capitalist powers and each new partition followed the initiative of the defeated or ‘disadvantaged’ countries would lead to a new World War and would represent a further step in the direction of the definitive destruction of the capitalist system: The conquest of the new socialist order is immediately on the order of the day. But Hitler made an unexpected move: He recognized in Eastern Europe and especially in Soviet Russia the still free colonial space which is at the disposal of the German Reich yet to be erected. Similarly behaved the Japanese empire that invaded China and fascist Italy that (with the exception of Ethiopia) aimed at the Balkans and Greece. Stalin started to realize that the 20th century would be marked, in opposition to all expectations, by a clash between colonialism and anti-colonialism (supported and promoted by the communist movement) in Europe.

In our time it has rightly been emphasized: “Hitler’s War for Lebensraum was the greatest colonial war in history.”²⁰ A colonial war that was first unleashed against Poland. The instructions of the Führer on the evening before the aggression are telling: The “elimination of the

17 Stalin 1917.

18 Stalin 1917a.

19 Stalin 1920.

20 Olusoga, Erichsen 2011, p. 327.

vital forces” of the Polish people is necessary; “brutal action” is called for, without being inhibited by “empathy”; “the stronger has the right.” Similar are the directives that later the project Barbarossa gives: After its incarceration the political commissioners, the cadres of the Red Army, of the Soviet State and of the Communist Party must be immediately exterminated; in the East one has to take extreme and “tough” measures and the German officers and soldiers should overcome their reservations and moral scruples. For leading back peoples of an old culture to the situation of the redskins (to be expropriated and decimated) and of the blacks (to be enslaved) “all representatives of Polish intelligence are to be killed;” the same treatment is, of course, what the Russian and Soviet intelligence must be subjected to; “this sounds harsh, but this is the law of life.”²¹ This is how one can explain the fate of the catholic clergy, of the communist cadres in the USSR and in both situations of the Jews, which were well represented in the intellectual layers and were suspicious of inspiring and supporting Bolshevism. Hitler succeeded to play out Poland against the Soviet Union, but he foresaw the same fate for both; even if on a windy and tragic path the war of national resistance of the Polish people and the great patriotic battle are finally related to one another. The turning point of the “greatest colonial war in history” is Stalingrad. If Hitler was the proponent of the colonial counter-revolution, Stalin was the proponent of anti-colonial revolution that in a completely unexpected way found its center in Europe.

3. *Stalin, Hitler and the National Minorities*

Does the definition of Stalin that I have just presented stand in contrast to the politics that he had pursued concerning the national minorities in the Soviet Union? It is beyond any doubt that there is no space for the right of recession in Stalin’s conception. As is confirmed by the conversation with Dimitrov on the 7th November of 1937: “Anyone that launches an attack on the socialist state with his deeds or thoughts will be annihilated without mercy.”²² Even thoughts are punished: This is an extraordinarily effective but completely involuntary definition of totalitarianism!

On the other side, Stalin welcomes and supports the cultural rebirth of the national minorities of Eastern Europe that have been suppressed for so long. Telling are the observations that he made on the X. party congress of the Russian Communist Party in 1921: “About fifty years ago all Hungarian towns bore a German character; now they have become Magyarised”; also the “Byelorussians” experience an “awakening.” This is a phenomenon that is supposed to capture the whole

21 Hitler 1965, see the speeches from the 22th of August 1939, from the 28th of September 1940 and from the 30th March and 8th November 1941.

22 Dimitroff 2000, p. 162.

of Europe: From the “German city” that it was Riga will not become a “Lettish city”; the cities of the Ukraine will “inevitably be Ukrainianised” and will make the previously dominating Russian element secondary. And constantly Stalin polemicizes against the “assimilators,” be it the “Turkish assimilators,” the “Prussian-German Germanisators” or the “Tsarist-Russian Russificators.” This position is therefore particularly important because it is linked to a theoretical elaboration of universal character. In the polemics against Kautsky, Stalin underlines that socialism does not at all signify the vanishing of national languages and particularities but leads to their further development and evolvement. Each “policy of assimilation” was therefore to be condemned to be “anti-popular” and “counter-revolutionary”: It is particularly “fatal,” because it does not comprehend “the colossal power of stability possessed by nations;”²³ if one seeks “declaring war on national culture” one is “an advocate of colonization.”²⁴ As dramatic as the discrepancy between the policy statements and the concretely practiced politics may be, these statements are never nothing and cannot be nothing in a political regime in which the education and the ideological mobilization of functionaries and activists of the party and the mass indoctrination played a very relevant role.

And again the contrast to Hitler becomes apparent. He also starts from assuming the Slavization and “De-Germanisation” in Eastern Europe. But for him this is a process that must and can be thrown back with all means. It is not sufficient to counter the linguistic and cultural assimilation that in reality represents “the beginning of bastardization” and therefore of an “annihilation of Germanic elements,” “the annihilation of precisely the properties that enabled the conquering people to be once victorious.”²⁵ One has to Germanize the soil without ever Germanizing the people. This is only possible if one follows a very precise model: Beyond the Atlantic the white race has spread to the West by Americanizing the soil but certainly not the redskins: In this way the USA remained a “Nordic-Germanic state” without descending into an “international people’s porridge.”²⁶ The same model has to be followed by Germany in Eastern Europe.

4. *The Role of Geography and of Geopolitics*

Where the attitude toward the national question is concerned, the contrast between Soviet Russia and the Third Reich is confirmed. One reaches entirely different conclusions if we however concentrate on

.....
23 Stalin 1921.

24 Stalin 1927.

25 Hitler, 1939, p. 82 and pp. 428-29.

26 Hitler, 1961, p. 131-32.

the practice of government of the two regimes, which we can certainly compare on the basis of the category of totalitarianism. And yet it would be misleading to interpret the terror, the brutality, even the demand to control thoughts in a psychopathological way.

One should not forget the doctrine of method that was unfolded by a classic of Liberalism. In the year 1787 Alexander Hamilton declared, on eve of the passage of a new federal constitution, that the limitation of power and the introduction of the rule of law in two states with insular characters (Great Britain and the USA), that are protected by the sea against any threat of enemy powers, has been successful. If the project of a federation would have failed and if on its ruins there were to stand out the contours of a system of states, which resembled that, that one could find on the European continent, then even in America there would have been phenomena like that of the standing army, of the strong central power and even of absolutism. “Thus, we should, in little time, see established in every part of this country the same engines of despotism which have been the scourge of the Old World.”²⁷ According to Hamilton one should firstly have geographic and geopolitical camps in mind to explain the remaining or vanishing of liberal institutions.

If we investigate the great historical crises, we see that they all – even if to a different extent – led to a concentration of power in the hands of one, more or less autocratic personality: The first English Revolution ended with the personal power of Cromwell, the French Revolution first led to the power of Robespierre and then later first and foremost of the power of Napoleon, the result of the revolution of the black slaves of San Domingo was the military dictatorship first of Toussaint Louverture and then of Dessalines; the French Revolution of 1848 led to the personal power of Louis Napoleon, or of Napoleon the Third. The category of totalitarianism is of use in an analytic comparison of practices of governance that in more or less acute situations of crises are applied. But if one forgets the formal character of this category and if one absolutizes it, the twin brothers risk becoming too big and too heterogeneous a family.

What concerns the 20th century, there were numerous crises in the time between the first and the second World War that led to erecting a one-man dictatorship. On a closer look, this is even the fate of nearly all countries of Continental Europe. Leaving aside the countries with ‘Island-status’ that Hamilton mentioned. Yet, although these had a liberal tradition in the background and enjoyed a particularly favorable geographic and geopolitical situation, they also had a tendency of concentration of power, of reinforcing the executive power over the legislative power, of limiting the rule of law: In the USA, a writ of execution by Franklin Delano Roosevelt’s was enough to incarcerate

.....
27 Hamilton 1987.

the US-American citizens of Japanese origin. This means that the investigation on which the category of totalitarianism is grounded touches even the most inconspicuous countries.

5. *"Totalitarianism" and the "All encompassing Autocracy of Race"*

Let us shift our attention from the practice of governance again to the political goals. Even concerning domestic politics Hitler glanced at the USA. "Mein Kampf" and "Hitler's Zweites Buch" repeatedly warn: In Europe not only Soviet Russia that incites all coloured races to stand up against the white supremacy is a sworn enemy of civilization and white domination; one should not forget France, that subjected a country of white race like German the occupation by coloured troops. One also has to direct one's attention to the "bastardization," the "negroization" or the "universal niggerization" that is taking place in France, or more precisely in the "European-African Mulatto-state" that has expanded "from the Rhine to Congo."²⁸ This disgrace is positively countered by the example of "North America" where the "Germanics" have avoided the "blood mixing of Arians with lower peoples" and the "blood disgrace" and remained "racially unmixed and pure," which is why they are now able to dominate the whole continent.²⁹

The regime of 'White Supremacy' dominating in the south of the United States is a model, already for the reactionary culture that later led to Nazism. At a visit in the USA at the end of the 19th century Friedrich Ratzel, a great theoretician of geopolitics, sketches a characteristic picture: When the smoke clouds of ideology, with its fidelity to the principle of "justice," disappear what intrudes is the reality of "racial aristocracy," such as the lynch law against the black, "the repression and destruction of the Indians" and the persecutions that the immigrants from the East are confronted with. In the USA a situation emerged which "avoids the form of slavery, but sticks to the essence of subordination, of social stratification of races." A "reversal" has taken place concerning the beloved illusions of the abolitionists and the advocates of the multi-race democracy of the years of the 'Reconstruction.' All this, Ratzel assumes clear sighted, will have consequences that will be far reaching over the North American republic: "We just stand at the beginning of the repercussions that this reversal will have on Europe and even more so on Asia."

Later, also the vice consul of Austria-Hungary in Chicago points to the counter-revolution taking place in the USA and to its charitable and instructive character. Europe here has a backlog, for here the black from the colonies is welcome as a "delicacy": What a difference to the

28 Hitler 1961, p. 52; Hitler 1939, p. 730.

29 Hitler 1939, pp. 313-14.

behavior of "the American proud of the purity of its race," who avoids the contact with the non-white to which he also counts those in whose veins flows only "a drop of nigger-blood"! Well, "if America can in any way be the teacher of Europe, it is in the nigger and [race] question."

As both of the authors quoted here foresaw, the racist counter-revolution that put an end to the multi-raced democracy of the years of the 'Reconstruction' in the USA, actually traverses the Atlantic. Alfred Rosenberg for example praised the United States as a "wonderful country of the future": By limiting the civil rights to the white and by strengthening on all levels and with all means the 'White Supremacy,' it deserves the merit of having formulated the happy "new race-state-idea": Yes, "the nigger question is at the vanguard of all questions of existence in the USA;" and if one had once abandoned the absurd principle of equality for the blacks, one cannot see why not "the necessary consequences for the Yellow and the Jews" should be drawn.³⁰

This is only on first sight an astonishing explanation. At the beginning of the 20th century, in the years of the formation of the Nazi movement in Germany, the reigning ideology in the Southern States of the USA found its expression in the "White Supremacy Jubilees" where armed persons in uniform defiled, inspired by the "racial creed of Southern people." Here is his formulation: "1. 'Blood will tell.' 2. The white race must dominate. 3. The Teutonic peoples stand for race purity. 4. The Negro is inferior and will remain so. 5. "This is a white man's country". 6. No social equality. 7. No political equality. 8. In matters of civil rights and legal adjustments give the white man, as opposed the colored man, the benefit of the doubt; and under no circumstances interfere with the prestige of the white race. 9. In educational policy let the Negro have the crumbs that fall from the white man's table. 10. Let there be such industrial education of the Negro as will best fit him to serve the white man. [...] 14. Let the lowest white man count for more than the highest Negro. 15. The above statements indicate the leadings of Providence."³¹

Without a doubt we are here led into proximity with Nazism. Especially because in the south of the USA committed to this catechism, who expressly demand "to hell with the Constitution," only to realize in theory and practice the absolute "superiority of the Aryan" and to escape the "HIDEOUS, OMNIOUS, NATIONAL MENACE" of the blacks. Terrorized as he is, "the Negro is doing no harm," some occasional critical voices think and yet, the racist gangs are ready "to kill him and wipe from the face of the earth"; they are decided to erect an "all-absorbing autocracy of race," with the "absolute identification of the

30 Rosenberg 1937, p. 673 and pp. 668-69.

31 In Woodward 2013, p. 350 and pp. 355-56.

stronger race with the very being of the state.”³²

What does more adequately name the Third Reich: The category of “totalitarianism” (that approximates Hitler to Stalin) or the category of an “all-absorbing autocracy of race” (which refers to the regime of ‘White Supremacy’ which reigned in the Southern States of the USA even in the time of Hitler’s taking of power in Germany)? One thing is clear: One cannot understand the Nazi vocabulary adequately if one only looks at Germany. What is the “blood disgrace” of which ‘Mein Kampf’ warns – as we have seen – if not the “miscegenation” that is condemned also by the proponents of ‘White Supremacy’? Even the key term of Nazi-ideology ‘subhuman [Untermensch]’ is a translation of the American ‘Under Man’!

This is emphasized in 1930 by Alfred Rosenberg who expresses his admiration for the US-American author Lothrop Stoddard: The latter has to be merited with coining as the first the notion in question that emerges as a subtitle (“The Menace of the Under Man) of his book that appeared in New York in 1922 and three years later in a German translation in Munich (“The Drohung des Untermenschen”).³³ The “Under Man,” respectively the Untermensch is what threatens civilization and to avert this danger one needs an “all-absorbing autocracy of race”! If we start from this rather than from the category of totalitarianism, it suggests itself that it considers not Stalin and Hitler, but rather the white supremacists of the Southern States of the USA and the German Nazis as twin brothers. And Stalin opposes both, who not for nothing is sometimes hailed by Afro-American activists as the “new Lincoln.”³⁴

6. *Two Wars to Restore the Colonialist and Slave Domination*

Certainly the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact must still be explained. The Soviet Union strives not as the first but as the last for an agreement with the Third Reich. But here I as a philosopher that is led from the analysis of political categories to the historical comparison would like to make a different consideration. Nearly one and a half centuries before the war unleashed by Hitler to subject and enslave the peoples of Eastern Europe, there certainly was another great war in another historical context whose aim was the restoration of colonial domination and slavery. It is the campaign commanded by Napoleon and entrusted to his brother-in-law, Charles Leclerc, against San Domingo, the island governed by the leader of the victorious revolution of the black slaves, Toussaint Louverture. Even after the 29th of August 1793, the day on which L.F. Sonthonax, the representative of revolutionary France proclaimed

32 In Woodward 2013, p. 352-53.

33 What concerns Ratzel, the vice consul in Chicago and Stoddard, see Losurdo 2007b, p. 164-65 and pp. 159.

34 Losurdo 2012, chapter 6, § 8.

the abolishment of slavery on the island, Louverture continued to fight alongside with Spain; because he was suspicious of France the black leader he had collaborated for a long time with a slaveholder-country of the Ancien Régime, that waged a war against the Jacobin Republic and the abolitionist power, which in the meantime had established itself in San Domingo. Even in the year 1799, he had, to save the country that he led from economic collapse, begun trade relations with Great Britain that waged a war against France and a possible victory of England would have had quite negative effects on the project of abolitionism.³⁵ And yet, Toussaint Louverture always remains still the great protagonist of the anti-colonial and abolitionist revolutions and the antagonist of Leclerc (and of Napoleon). In spite of the completely transformed historical situation, one and a half centuries later, there is no reason to approach Stalin differently: The tortuosity of the historical processes must not lead us to lose track of the essential.

Even before the French invasion and foreseeing it, Toussaint Louverture enforced a relentless productivist dictatorship and repressed with an iron fist all challenges and attacks on his power; later the arrival of French expedition corps led by Leclerc was the beginning of a war that in the end became a war of extermination on both sides. What should we say about an interpretation of this clash that ranks Louverture and Leclerc under the category of “totalitarianism” to oppose both to the liberal and democratic leadership of the USA? This characterization would on one side be banal: The horror is obvious in a conflict that finally turns into a race war; on the other side it would be extremely distorted: It would place the enemies of slavery and slaveholders on the same level and omit that the slaveholders found inspiration and support in the USA where black slavery lived on very well. The category of totalitarianism does not become more convincing if it is employed as the only criterion of interpretation for a gigantic conflict between anti-colonial revolution and colonial counter-revolution, advocating slavery, which has raged in the first half of the 20th century. It is clear that this is a chapter of history that necessitates deep investigations of all sorts and makes controversial interpretations unavoidable; but there is no reason to still transform two mortal enemies into twin brothers.

Translated by Frank Ruda

35 James 1963, S. 104 u. 186.

Bibliography:

- Gasperi, Alcide De 1956, *La democrazia cristiana e il momento politico* (1944), in *Discorsi politici*, ed. by Tommaso Bozza, Rome: Cinque lune.
- Dimitroff, Georgi 2000, *Tagebücher 1933-1943*, Berlin: Aufbau-Verlag.
- Fredrickson, George M. 2002, *Racism: A Short History*, Princeton & Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Gandhi, Mohandas K. 1969-2001, *The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi*, Publications Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, New Delhi (new edition in 100 vol.).
- Goebbels, Joseph 1992, *Tagebücher*, ed. by Ralf Georg Reuth, München Zurich: Piper.
- Hamilton, Alexander, "The Consequences of Hostilities Between the States", on: http://thomas.loc.gov/home/histdox/fed_08.html.
- Himmler, Heinrich 1974, *Geheimreden 1933 bis 1945*, ed. by Bradley F. Smith u. Agnes F. Peterson, Berlin: Propyläen.
- Hitler, Adolf 1939, *Mein Kampf* (1925/27), München: Zentralverlag der NSDAP.
- 1961, *Hitlers Zweites Buch. Ein Dokument aus dem Jahre 1928*, ed. and with a commentary by Gerhard L. Weinberg, Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt.
- 1965, *Reden und Proklamationen 1932-1945* (1962-63), ed. by Max Domarus, Munich: Süddeutscher Verlag.
- 1980, *Monologe im Führerhauptquartier 1941-1944. Die Aufzeichnungen Heinrich Heims*, ed. by Werner Jochmann, Hamburg: Albrecht Knaus.
- James, C. L. R. 1963, *The Black Jacobins. Toussaint Louverture and the San Domingo Revolution*, London: Penguin Books.
- Longerich Peter 2008, *Heinrich Himmler. Biographie*, Siedler, München./Longerich, Peter 2012, *Heinrich Himmler*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Losurdo, Domenico 2007a, *Kampf um die Geschichte. Der historische Revisionismus und seine Mythen – Nolte, Furet und die anderen*, Cologne: PapyRossa.
- 2007b, "White Supremacy" und Konterrevolution, *Die Vereinigten Staaten, das Russland der "Weissen" und das Dritte Reich*, in Christoph J. Bauer et alii (eds.), *Faschismus und soziale Ungleichheit*, Universitätsverlag Rhein-Ruhr, Duisburg, pp. 155-185.
- 2012, *Stalin. Geschichte und Kritik einer schwarzen Legende*, Cologne: PapyRossa.
- Mukerjee, Madhusree 2010, *Churchill's Secret War. The British Empire and the Ravaging of India during World War II*, New York: Basic Books.
- Olusoga, David, & Erichsen, Casper W. 2011, *The Kaiser's Holocaust. Germany's Forgotten Genocide* (2010), London: Faber and Faber.
- Piper, Ernst 2005, *Alfred Rosenberg Hitlers Chefideologe*, Munich: Blessing.

C
R
I
S
I
S
&
C
R
I
T
I
Q
U
E
/

Volume 3 /
Issue 1

- Rosenberg, Alfred 1937, *Der Mythos des 20. Jahrhunderts* (1930), Munich: Hoheneichen.
- Spengler, Oswald 1933, *Jahre der Entscheidung*, Munich: Beck.
- Stalin, Josif V. 1917, „To all the Toilers, to all the Workers and Soldiers of Petrograd“, on: <https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/stalin/works/1917/06/17.htm>.
- 1917a, "Foreigners and the Kornilow Conspiracy", on: <https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/stalin/works/1917/09/12.htm>.
- 1920, "The Military Situation in the South", on: <https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/stalin/works/1920/01/07.htm>.
- 1921, "The Tenth Congress of the R.C.P. (B.)", on: <https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/stalin/works/1921/03/08.htm>.
- 1927, "Speech Delivered on the 1st of August", on: https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/stalin/works/1927/07/29.htm#Speech_Delivered_on_August_5_.
- 1929, "The National Question and Leninism", on: <https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/stalin/works/1929/03/18.htm>.
- Tendulkar, D. G. 1990, *Mahatma. Life of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi*, New Delhi: Publications Division.
- Torri, Michelguglielmo 2000, *Storia dell'India*, Roma-Bari: Laterza.
- Woodward, C. Vann 2013, *Origins of the New South 1877-1913* (1951/1971), Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.

C
R
I
S
I
S
&
C
R
I
T
I
Q
U
E
/

Volume 3 /
Issue 1