

# Considerations on the connections between race, politics, economics, and genocide<sup>1</sup>

GUILLERMO LEVY

The objectives of this study are, first, to compare the genocide carried out under Nazism with the mass killings which were rationalized by the Doctrine of National Security the US government devised, and second, to examine a question widely discussed in Argentina and throughout Latin America, namely, is it appropriate to apply the term “genocide” to neoliberal policies, within the framework of what has been called for quite some time “genocide by omission?”<sup>2</sup>

## **Inside/Outside**

The concepts of “inside” and “outside” are central to this discussion. In Nazism and under the National Security Doctrine, as in most neoliberal polices, those in power use borders to demarcate distinctions. In order to exterminate an “other,” that other must first be placed outside, geographically, but also politically, socially, and symbolically. The inside is safe, while the outside is always threatening.

This designation is not new. Those in the Greek and Roman worlds considered barbarism to be “outside” societal norms. In Europe during the Middle Ages there were many constructions of outsides and insides, but it was the Catholic Church that most strongly and broadly demarcated the lines between “our own” and “the enemy,” as they pitted Catholics against Jews, Catholics against Arabs (Muslims), and Catholics against Protestants.

First in league with the Church, then later as its own entity, the state has become the great equalizer. On the one hand, states can promote the equality of all human beings, without distinctions. This can take the form of legal equality which states confer by granting citizenship. Similarly, in capitalist societies equality can be enacted through the market when this is the only institution legitimate enough for all members of societies to embrace. In legal or economic systems, the only way to lose rights is to be expelled which is a breach of the social contract. In

such systems, it is not blood or ethnic origins which place one outside, but rather it is an attitude, a going against the general will.<sup>3</sup>

At the same time, however, once modern science entered cultures, the concept of race—and particularly the introduction of biological understandings and analyses of social relationships—allowed people to categorize human beings in new ways. As many nations built on concepts arising from the French Revolution, societies began to divide human beings into nation-races, each with its own characteristics, and to designate some races as superior and others as inferior. Once these categories permeated people's mindsets, they help to explain more and more human behavior within the frame of the concept of race.<sup>4</sup>

This application of science and biology to explain human hierarchies and social behavior has been used to legitimize the extermination of conquered populations in Africa, Asia, and Oceania, since the second half of the nineteenth century. Since then it has provided an explanation for behavior considered “asocial” within the territory.<sup>5</sup>

In keeping with two-dimensional, insider–outsider racial categorizations, the victorious bourgeoisie in modernity has constructed two paradigms, Freedom and Order, which function in sometimes complementary, sometimes mutually exclusive ways. As positivism shapes social sciences, its practitioners trade methods of analysis with the natural sciences, and the language of these two disciplines begins to overlap around a central concern: ORDER. This positivist tradition articulates the conception of society as a body, and of groups within a society as organs, each performing a function in a hierarchy. In this view, groups designated as inferior come to be seen as diseased organs or cells that must be extirpated.

In Argentina governments used the term “communist” to refer to groups engaging in anti-establishment practices, and promoted the view that these actions were signs or results of diseases only certain types of people—rebellious ones—contracted. In 1902 the Law of Residence was passed, which allowed the expulsion of foreigners who participated in any form of resistance against the state. At that time serious consideration was given to the possibility of “sterilizing” anarchists, expressing the already entrenched conviction that anarchism was a hereditary disease.<sup>6</sup>

Theories of race drove the colonial conquest of Latin America in the middle and late nineteenth century. All of Western civilization shared, to a greater or lesser extent, the assumption that races outside Europe were inferior “others,” and that it was part of the natural order that they should be annihilated. Since these others were viewed as existing outside any legal or social contract, there was no guilt associated with their extermination. Science provided a justification for this in language which was predominant at the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century, and which, from our vantage point of the present, seems to be limited to the space-time of Nazism.

Nazis often promoted the concept that contracts could only mediate relationships among equals (insiders). Contracts, Nazis claimed, did bind insider Aryans to other insider Aryans, but could not bind them to members of racially

inferior groups, since members of these groups (Jews and others) were inherently unable to live by contracts. One can find language to this effect in documents and speeches from that period in Europe, the United States, and also the Europeanized cities of Latin America.

In Argentina during those years, the discussion was about replacing indigenous American races—who were ostensibly not able to contribute to progress—with European races, preferably Nordic ones. Once again, the border between “civilization and barbarism”<sup>7</sup> was reinforced, and genocide as a feature of colonialism, taking place outside Europe,<sup>8</sup> brought about the death of between 50 and 60 million people.

### Nazism

The racial discourse of Nazism merges the concept of race with the concept of the nation, as it proposes that the borders of the state or nation are now racial borders, the *Lebensraum*, a space vital for the development of the Germanic race. Enzo Traverso states that Nazis transferred to Europe what the Europeans had already been doing in Africa,<sup>9</sup> applying to Slavs, Jews, and Gypsies the idea that some people were sub-human. It was impossible, Nazis claimed, for these groups to coexist with “true” Germans within the same borders. At that point, the African racial paradigm that enabled the dehumanization of the other now became European as well. This change occurred in spite of the fact that German Jews had been viewed as equals as late as 1933.

In this regard, Nazism represented a break with the egalitarianism of the French Revolution. But was this rupture genuinely profound, or did the new racial divisions appear to be more radical than they were because they were being introduced in Europe itself, not only in colonized regions where they were already common place and systematized?

Nazism brought about a crucial, unprecedented reversal. Whereas in colonial genocides the enemy was designated as “external”—language which colonial powers in Africa took from eugenics, which proposed sterilization of “outsider” women to eradicate “lives which do not deserve to be lived”—Nazis adapted the phrasing to justify the extermination of “races which do not deserve to live.” The racialized other, who was “external” before, now became an “internal” enemy, since he lived among “us,” was seen to dominate “us,” and even *contaminated* “us” with his existence. Therefore, in this case, the extermination was “internal,” but was perpetrated against an Other who could not help being seen as “external.”

Nazis combined technologies used in the colonial genocides with technologies designed to destroy social relationships among those designated as enemies. We should distinguish between Nazi techniques of extermination and Nazi racial-national conceptions, while acknowledging that techniques are not abstract, but rather are concrete expressions which bear out conceptions. The technologies the Nazis used, and the existing conditions which enabled them, are consistent with the social logic of extermination. If they were not, the society would not

have allowed these methods to be used. In this regard, Nazi methods did not represent a transformation, but rather an evolved or more radical use of then-current military, scientific, productive, and administrative technologies. Nazi techniques, then, did not represent a paradigmatic or epistemological rupture, but rather were located in an ongoing historical continuum.

Neither the technologies, nor the attribution of physical, mental, or behavioral characteristics to a race, nor the conquest and the extermination in racial terms, were Nazi innovations. What was indeed an innovation, what did represent an advance beyond existing conceptions, was the merging of race with politics, not as an excuse, but as a category. With the emergence of the ethnic-political category *Judeo-Bolshevik*, race alone was no longer seen to determine “diseased” behaviors; instead, the political affiliation or orientation now became constituent of an inherently diseased, subhuman racial category.<sup>10</sup> *Neither the racial nor the political element was an accessory*. The project of extermination was simultaneously racial and political.

### **The Doctrine of National Security**

Unlike the Nazi genocide, in the genocides carried out under the Doctrine of National Security developed by the US government, the racial element, when it appears, is an accessory. The political element asserts total hegemony. Extermination that is justified solely in political terms is secular, not religiously based. It is not discriminating, and is more effective because it is not tied to unproductive categories. It is pragmatic, destroying only what it knows it needs to destroy; the means-ends rationality is much more direct.

The logic of politically based genocide rests on destroying the “social relation of resistance.” Bodies are no longer the central target; the target is the social relationship that these bodies express and reproduce.<sup>11</sup> By the term “unproductive categories” I mean the following: the racism of the Nazis could work, at a certain moment, as an epistemological obstacle to their political project. The elimination or expulsion of Jewish physicists in order to build a team of Aryan physicists jeopardized, according to Jeffrey Herff,<sup>12</sup> the possibility of Germany building the atomic bomb. We might also add that the final obsession to kill all the Jews when the war was almost over jeopardized Nazi political and military objectives.

In the genocides carried out under the Doctrine of National Security, on the other hand, there were no epistemological ties; there was no illogical, counterproductive discrimination. It was precisely in that sense that it could be much more efficient. In Nazism there was a rationality of means but a high level of irrationality of ends; in the Doctrine of National Security there was a rationality both of means and ends.

In the counterrevolutionary genocides in Latin America within the framework of the Doctrine of National Security, the leap—from colonial racial borders to ideological borders—placed politics at the center, and political decisions generated the labeling of people that it required in order to justify their extermination. People were now targeted based on their ideological choices, their places within

the economic structure, and/or their community and labor relations, but not on their race or nationality.

Genocidal campaigns were no longer about eliminating people who were seen as condemned because of their biological origins. People's racial and national origin diminished in significance, though it was still a factor in targeting in Central America, where the fight against counterrevolutionaries has been associated with the crushing of the historical autonomy of the aboriginal populations—though less so in the Southern Cone. But while biology remained a factor, it was only an accessory. *One's place inside or outside the border was no longer determined by one's being, but by one's actions.*<sup>13</sup>

This new genocide was secular, not mainly racist (except somewhat in Central America); it was inserted within the framework of the free world. Its leaders were, on many occasions, pro-Western leaders who condemned fascism and racism and who embraced the free market. The so-called fight against communism involved the total repression of practices that subverted the capitalist order, and also the repression of groups which performed the practices. Politics were not explained in racial terms; politics came to be seen as a choice, the choice of free people who chose between “good” (total state power) and “evil” (subversion).

Another dimension the Doctrine of National Security introduced that represented new historical moment in the evolution of genocides was the fact that the fight against the agency and initiatives of the “other” was not specifically aimed against particular groups (as is the case of Jews, Gypsies, or homosexuals in Nazism). It was not even aimed against the agency of “subversive groups.” Rather, it was aimed against the possibility that these groups may have had of achieving political agency and power for members of the whole society. Therefore, the engineering of the genocide was aimed towards the whole society. It did not focus on destroying what the group *was* but, rather, on what the group *could achieve*.

The new problem appeared with the emergence of the revolution, with the jeopardizing of the bourgeois order by the proletariat. With the repression of the revolutionary working class, both the paradigm of the contract and the paradigm of the biologization begin to function. On the one hand, from a legal point of view, the need to maintain social order became a premise for progress; on the other hand, worker rebellion came to be explained within the paradigm of biologization. Communism and anarchism were therefore explained as diseases carried by certain types of people.<sup>14</sup>

In this case, there does seem to be a paradigmatic change: killing the diseased person is no longer enough to eradicate the disease. The task is much bigger. It is not only about extirpating the tumor. Social relationships are not eradicated by ending the life of the “diseased person,” of the enemy. Genocide becomes a task for engineers rather than for doctors, involving restructuring society, modifying power relations, changing the pattern of capital accumulation and distribution, and eliminating and reconfiguring identities. It is also about redesigning society and its future on new terms. As the Argentine repressor “Colores” told a kidnapped person in the concentration camp which operated in the School of Mechanics of

the Navy, “We are working now for the next twenty years.” That is, we might infer, “The target does not end with you.”

This kind of power seeks to strategically annihilate not the being *in itself*, but the being *as a carrier of a practice*. In that regard, the body—the annihilation of that body—makes sense to the extent that it helps to eliminate a practice of the social body which is now the target, and no longer only the individual bodies of those who perform the practice. The two logics—extirpation of the diseased part and global reorganization of the social relationships—were both operative in the Nazi camps and in the Doctrine of National Security, but what I seek to determine is which of the logics is predominant in each case. The engineers are the great technicians of the Nazi genocide, but the realm of medicine and “doctors” provide the logic. In Latin America on the other hand, and especially in Argentina, the strategists carrying out the Doctrine of National Security were “engineers.” There were “tumor” metaphors in the discourse surrounding the Doctrine, but they were effectively subordinated in the material practice.

Under the Doctrine of National Security, anyone could be subversive. Not only did the de-racialization of the enemy “democratize” the negative otherness, but also the ambiguity of the term “subversive” turned it into an amorphous label, not only a racial label, and thereby it became more threatening for the society as a whole.<sup>15</sup> Social relationships are more difficult to stereotype, categorize, or clearly define within groups; at least their categorization into clearly defined groups is unproductive. A statement made by an important liberal political leader of Argentina illustrates this. The leader spoke on a TV program in early 1990 about his participation in almost every *coup d'état* in Argentina since 1955, saying, “In 1955 we believed that the problem was Perón, so we took him out, but by 1976 we already knew that the problem was the working class.” This statement shows that repressive leaders are fully aware that their task is to eradicate particular social relationships.

Demarcations based on biology are clear. For Nazis, it was only a matter of determining which people were Jews due to their ancestry. The definition of subversive based on the concept of ideological borders, on the other hand, is much more ambiguous. And such ambiguity enables those in power to define it according to their needs. The ideological borders the Doctrine of National Security created were not fixed or visible; they separated neighbors one from another; they even divided individuals within themselves. According to the Doctrine’s logic, a guerrilla militant could be subversive; a union leader could be subversive; a person working in a neighborhood soup kitchen could be subversive. The Doctrine gave those in power the flexibility to define and demarcate differently in each country and each situation, more broadly or in a more limited way, depending on their goals at the time.

### **Neoliberalism and genocide**

In Argentina there is a direct and specific connection between the restructuring of social relationships accomplished by genocide, and changes in the structures of

capital accumulation. The genocides in Latin America between the 1970s and 1980s are generally considered to be the foundation of the neoliberal policies of the 1980s, which became more profound with the fall of European communism in the 1990s.

The Doctrine of National Security put in place import substitutions, financial valuation, and deindustrialization, in a country in which the working class went from having more than 50 percent of the GDP in 1974, to 30 percent after the first year of the dictatorship.<sup>16</sup>

My definition of “neoliberalism” operates on two levels. On the first level, which is structural and general, I view it as a policy by which the powerful concentrated capital in order to solve the crisis of the regulatory and welfare state during the 1970s. In an international economic context in which markets were opening up, a series of policies on the national level included a restructuring of the capital gains rate. This went hand in hand with a reduction in state expenses, with privatizations, and with a reduction in the political and social influence the working class was able to exert on government. Its effects were to concentrate capital, which in turn concentrated power, to cause working conditions to deteriorate, to regressively redistribute income, and to enforce social exclusion.<sup>17</sup>

The second level of my definition is specific, defining neoliberalism as a force which both implies and expresses the destruction of a series of social political and cultural resistance mediations. The power of the working class is a mediation or resistance, and so are a culture of solidarity, a progressive tax structure, and popular social and political movements. These mediations resist the power of capital to impose its logic of accumulation on the entire society. They resist the commodification, or mercantilization, of social relationships and of life.

The destructions of mediations and resistances, which the genocides of the 1970s in Latin America brought about, gave enormous power to capital, so that money as a form came to predominate the culture, and mercantilization became the project of all social relationships. According to the worldview, where these conditions have been imposed, neoliberal policies have been “successfully” implemented.

It is possible to understand neoliberalism narrowly, as merely a series of measures, but in reality its measures are not its the central agenda. Neoliberalism aims, at its core, to concentrate the enormous power of capital, mercantilize social relationships, and annihilate existing and newly arising opposition. Though discussions about neoliberal policies usually address Latin America in general, in reality each country in the region is so different that it is pointless to make such generalizations. In Argentina for example, genocide was the first stage leading to financial valuation, which neoliberal approaches later consolidated. This was not the case in Brazil, however. There a dictatorship opened the door to increased levels of industrialization. Also, not all the countries privatized state-owned companies as the neoliberal recipe mandated. Pinochet, who imposed market reforms with great violence, never privatized copper for example, of which Chile is the first exporter in the world. Furthermore, impoverishment in one country has not been as widespread or severe as in others; it is therefore a

mistake to assert mechanically that in the 1980s and 1990s the Latin American population as a whole became impoverished compared to the 1960s and 1970s.<sup>18</sup>

One connection, then, between genocides the Doctrine of National Security set in motion, and subsequent neoliberal policies, is that there is a continuity which is not obvious but is *possible*. Both projects set about to destroy social resistances, for fear they might hinder the neoliberal solution to the worldwide economic crisis in Latin America. Each project participated in creating a “condition of possibility” for future genocides, to quote Zygmunt Bauman.<sup>19</sup>

Many, on the other hand, take the strong position that neoliberal policies themselves constitute genocide because they caused death by omission. In this view, policies—including the state’s withdrawal from social contention, its exclusion of groups from social and civic participation, and its giving of power to capital over workers—cause deaths. The cause-and-effect relationship between deaths—for example from malnutrition, from lack of medication or infrastructure, from preventable diseases and workplace accidents—and neoliberal policies is sometimes direct and visible and sometimes not.<sup>20</sup>

I do not find the specifics of neoliberalism and the deaths to which it leads to be a uniquely pernicious form of capitalism. It is true that, in countries such as Argentina for example, which were and then ceased to be welfare states, systematic impoverishment of sectors of the population clearly occurred, and countless deaths resulted. In the 300 years during which capitalism has existed, however, there have been many instances in which the logic of accumulation and expansion of capital—and solutions capitalism finds for its crises—have led to destruction of cultures, of all kinds of humiliations, exterminations, and ultimately of millions of deaths.

In addition, let me restate that the term “neoliberalism” purports to describe a homogeneous reality, but in truth the concrete social, political, and cultural realities of societies are heterogeneous, even if, generally, economic policies are similar. Each society in Latin America is deeply heterogeneous in itself, and each is different from the others. The social movements, political histories, and class relationships in each modify the effects of the general project that neoliberals call “the recipe.”<sup>21</sup> Endless numbers of mediating factors have meant that countries whose governments have had a neoliberal orientation have not been equally transformed.

The categorization of the other as a thing, the transformation of the labor force into merchandise, the deterioration of mediations or resistances to the mercantilization of social relationships—these phenomena may take place. They may even coincide with, or pose no obstacle to, genocidal practices. But . . . *these socio-political structures and mechanisms do not in themselves constitute genocide*. The cold rationality of bureaucracies, or the logic of productivity as an end in itself, are not in themselves genocide practices, but under certain circumstances, they can *intensify*, and *combine with*, genocide.

In closing, I identify three processes which would enable the logic of neoliberal structures and mechanisms to combine with genocide:

- a. The absolute mercantilization of social relationships and mediations.

- b. The hegemonic accumulation of capital so that it prevented cycles of integrative development, destroyed a shared sense of national identity, and expelled majorities to an outside where, without the help of interventions, they were condemned to disappearance.
- c. Genocidal social practices which emerge and become systematized over sustained historical periods.

These three processes are functional, combinable, and can be intensified, but *they are not the same thing as one another*. They may or may not coexist. The most salient and particular characteristic of neoliberalism is the ideological/cultural effects it generates, which it combines with economic transformations, even though the latter have their own specificity.

Hunger and unemployment are among the effects of neoliberal policies. I have already said that, in itself, this is not enough to define neoliberalism's practices as genocidal. But the hegemony of neoliberal discourse and practice produces and intensifies other effects, which are: individualism; the destruction of collective identities, the forming of reconfigured negative identities (such as that of "poor-criminal"), alienation from the struggles of other social subjects; the dehistoricization of social analysis, the virulent loss of memory, even recent memory; the destruction of moral values (which Carlos Menem paradigmatically produced and expressed in Argentina); indifference; the *naturalization* of once intolerable situations; the blaming of all social groups and classes but never of capital; the exaggerating of the value of security; meanness; the "rat race" in which others are always viewed as competitors; the feeling of always being users and customers in every social situation; the making permanent of demand without a corresponding sense of responsibility for the fate of society; and the growing chasm between different social sectors. The list could go on.<sup>22</sup>

Social relationships bearing these particular characteristics, though resisted, do get imposed on our modern societies, and do express a homogeneous neoliberalism which can combine with genocidal practices at a particular historical moment. This set of characteristics in social relations, I maintain, represents the greatest potential neoliberalism contains toward genocide, more so than do unemployment and poverty. After all, when a society's predominant ideology is reflected in violent practices such as those I have described, it may be difficult to propose and execute policies to reverse the transformations of structures which capitalism has brought about in the last few decades in Latin American countries.

The task of fully discussing and understanding neoliberal ideas and ideologies is fundamental, but it is more fundamental to applying our knowledge to concrete practices, to breaking the fetishism of feeling that the world, the state, and politics are ghosts which have a life beyond ourselves, and to begin to admit that we not only are *produced by*, but are simultaneously *producers of* social practices.

Karl Marx said in *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*: "History is made by men, in conditions which they did not choose." Sometimes we criticize those who hear only the first part of the phrase, and accuse them of being *voluntarists*, but we can also make the mistake of hearing only the second part,

and thinking that the only thing which exists is the conditions, and that we are only spectators. As we attend to the complete phrase and acknowledge the intractable dilemmas of our time, we should, above all, make history. The more we do that, hopefully we will be far from forging genocides.

## Notes and References

- 1 Original title in Spanish: Consideraciones acerca de la relación entre raza, política, economía y genocidio.
- 2 The conceptualization of “genocide by omission” or “economic genocide” is significantly widespread based on works by the Argentine Workers’ Union (C.T.A., Central de Trabajadores Argentinos) and on documents of many of the human rights organizations in Argentina which directly consider neoliberalism as a genocide economic policy. Since the middle of the decade of 1990, this connection between neoliberalism and genocide as “genocide by omission” is predominant within the popular and left wing organizations of Argentina. At an international level, it is important to highlight the first advances of authors like Helen Fein or even Israel Charny, and the definition of the process in its English meaning as “genocide by attrition.”
- 3 See J. J. Rosseau, *El Contrato Social*, Sarpe, Madrid, 1985, Book II, Chapter V “The right to live and die.” The only cause of death is that of declaring war against the contract, against the general will. Although the interpretation of this can be broader and subjected to different uses, there is no other use of death on the part of the state than a “subversive” attitude as regards the social contract; absolutely not related with the origin.
- 4 For a history of the emergence of racist thinking and its European variations, see Tzvetan Todorov, ed., *Nosotros y los otros* (México: Siglo XXI, 1991).
- 5 For the Latin American case and its articulation with the European racism, it would be interesting to consult the text by Eugenio Zaffaroni; *Criminología, aproximaciones desde un margen*, Ed. Temis, Bogotá, 1998, where he says, for example, that “. . . we might say that, for Lombroso, humanity is a giant body under transformation whose most evolved and differentiated cells would be the Europeans, and the ones which are most backward, the colonies on the periphery; but that, sometimes, for reasons of biological chance, in the middle of the noblest tissues, there appeared cells which were similar to those of the most backward tissues, which needed to be purged because they attacked the others, damaging the governing function of the superior tissue.”
- 6 For this aspect, see the parliamentary debates as regards the law of Residence in Argentina, 1902. Zaffaroni’s text also provides an interesting perspective as regards the Latin American views: “*In Latin America, several authors have expressed their opinions in favor of sterilization: Pacheco E. Silva and Pedro Pernambuco in Brazil (1936), Julio Altaman in Chile (1936), Pablo Lurus in Mexico (1939).*” In 1927, a scientific event was held in Havana with the curious name of Pan-American Congress of Eugenics and Homiculture, in which several participants proposed the “eugenic sterilization”. In the state of Veracruz a law was passed for the sterilization of criminals in the decade of 1920, but we believe that it was never applied. As years have gone by, it seems that in the contemporary public opinion, sterilization was an evil invention of the national socialism, while today in the name of science they throw up their hands in horror in the face of such sterilization and castration. However, Hitler and Rosemberg did not invent much, they just confined themselves to establishing and practicing the logic corollary of biology racism which had been a scientific delusion of world power for many decades, elevated to justify their hegemonic nationalisms and their ethnocentric prejudices against the colonized “inferior races”, the “impure races” which were disputing the European hegemony itself, and the “degenerates” who were jeopardizing or upsetting the internal hegemony of their own bourgeoisies, all of it under the apparel of an apolitical and objective “aseptic science,” which in no way was restricted to the grossdeutsche Volksgemeinschaft, but it came from the Royal Academy and from other circles, no less “serious” and “learned” Zaffaroni, op cit, p 157.
- 7 For the influence of this thinking in Argentina, see the book by Maristella Svampa; *El Dilema argentino: Civilización o Barbarie* (Buenos Aires: El cielo por asalto, 1994).
- 8 See the book by Enzo Traverso, *La Violencia Nazi, una genealogía europea*, (Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2003), in particular, Chapter 2.
- 9 “*Karl Korsch* (. . .) outlined a historical interpretation of the violence of war which called into question the global dynamics of the Western hemisphere: The novelty of totalitarian politics—he wrote—lies in the fact that Nazis spread among the ‘civilized’ populations of Europe, methods which were previously reserved for aborigines or ‘savages’ who lived in the pseudo civilization” (. . .) “Hannah Arendt states that the European imperialism is an essential stage in the genesis of Nazism. In her opinion, the colonial violence of the nineteenth century was one of the premises of the crimes perpetrated a century later against Europeans and especially against Jews” (. . .) “In other words, Germans did nothing but apply in Poland, the Ukraine, the

- Baltic countries and in Russia, the same principles and methods which France and the United Kingdom had already adopted in Africa and in Asia.” Enzo Traverso, *La violencia Nazi. Una genealogía europea*, op cit, Chapter 2.
- 10 To see one of the many documents as regards the Nazi “invention” of the ethnic-political category, see Himmler’s speech to the troops before the beginning of the campaign against the USSR, quoted in Philippe Burrin, *Hitler y los judíos, génesis de un genocidio*, Ediciones de La Flor, Buenos Aires, 1990. For the use of the category of Judeo-Bolshevik and the analysis of its origin and consequences, see Arno Mayer; *Why did the heavens not darken? The Final Solution in History* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1988).
  - 11 For an in-depth analysis of these issues, see Daniel Feierstein; *Seis estudios sobre genocidio. Análisis de relaciones sociales: otredad, exclusión, exterminio* (Buenos Aires: Eudeba, 2000).
  - 12 See the book by Jeffrey Herf. *El modernismo reaccionario* (Buenos Aires: FCE, 1993).
  - 13 In order to discuss the issue of “being” and “doing” in the construction of the victimized other, it is interesting to see, among others, the article by Daniel Feierstein “*Ser y Hacer: sobre los límites y posibilidades al hablar de genocidio*,” unpublished, kindly provided by the author.
  - 14 As regards the biologization in the explanation of the political action we have an endless number of medical metaphors to define communism and anarchism in terms of carcinogenic cells, or the explanation of political behaviors through the racial origin. For this purpose, see Enzo Traverso, *La violencia Nazi. Una genealogía europea*, op cit, Chapter IV.
  - 15 For this purpose, see Daniel Feierstein “*Hacia el fin de la ilusión de autonomía: las contradicciones de la modernidad y su resolución genocida*,” lecture presented in the First International Meeting for the Analysis of Genocide Social Practices, held at the School of Law of the University of Buenos Aires, between November 10 and 15, 2003.
  - 16 For information on the regressive redistribution of the income which took place since the middle of the decade of 1970, see the book “*Acerca de la naturaleza de la deuda externa*” by Eduardo Basualdo, published by the University of Quilmes, Buenos Aires, 2002, and other works by the Department of Economy of F.L.A.C.S.O. and by the IDEP, belonging to the Argentine Workers’ Union (C.T.A., Central de los Trabajadores Argentinos).
  - 17 For some definitions of neoliberalism see, among others: “*Balance del neoliberalismo: lecciones para la izquierda*” by Perry Anderson, “The progress of policy reform in Latin America” by John Williamson, Institute for International Economics. “*Estado y reforma económica: La iniciación y consolidación de las políticas de mercado*” by Stephan Haggard and Robert Kaufman, published by *Desarrollo Económico*, Issue No 35, “*La ventaja competitiva de las naciones*” by Michael Porter (Buenos Aires: Vergara).
  - 18 From the statistics of the United Nations and from international organizations, we cannot necessarily infer that poverty advanced in all the countries which have been subjected to neoliberal policies in the last two decades in Latin America. There is a level of heterogeneity in each society, in the policies applied, in the resistance to such policies, which is much higher than the one provided by the homogenizing category of “neoliberal policies.”
  - 19 This idea of conditions of possibility confronted with the idea of determination is suggested to me by the work of Zygmunt Bauman, *Modernidad y Holocausto* (Toledo: Sequitur, 1997) when he talks about the role of modernity as a *condition of possibility* of the Nazi genocide. See Chapters 1 and 2.
  - 20 Some official numbers in Argentina in this regard can be the death of 15,000 children under five years of age due to avoidable causes in a country which produces basic food for 300,000,000 people, or the death, according to official statistics, of one person every eight hours in labor accidents, a number which is not only associated with fatalism, but to the disinvestment in the safety of workers.
  - 21 The term “recipe” to define the set of common measures of neoliberal economic policy as a homogeneous response to the crisis of different countries is used by the entire neoliberal school and by the majority of the international organizations.
  - 22 For an analysis of these practices, see Zygmunt Bauman; “*Trabajo, consumismo y nuevos pobres*,” (Barcelona: Gedisa, 2001).

## Bibliography

- Armony, Ariel (1999) *La Argentina, Los Estados Unidos y la cruzada anticomunista en América Central, 1977–1984* (Quilmes: University of Quilmes).
- Basualdo, Eduardo (2002) *Acerca de la naturaleza de la deuda externa* (Quilmas: University of Quilmes).
- Basualdo, Eduardo and Daniel Aspiazú *et al.* (2002) *El proceso de privatización en Argentina* (Quilmas: University of Quilmas).
- Bauman, Zygmunt (1997) *Modernidad y Holocausto* (Toledo: Sequitur).

GUILLERMO LEVY

- Bauman, Zygmunt (2000) *Trabajo, consumismo y nuevos pobres* (Barcelona: Gedisa).
- Burrin, Philippe (1990) *Hitler y los judíos, génesis de un genocidio* (Buenos Aires: Ediciones de La Flor).
- Bierstein, Daniel (2000) *Seis estudios sobre genocidio. Análisis de relaciones sociales: otredad, exclusión, exterminio* (Buenos Aires: Eudeba).
- Feierstein, Daniel (2005) *Genocidio. La administración de la muerte en la modernidad* (Buenos Aires: Eduntref).
- Herf, Jeffrey (1993) *El modernismo reaccionario* (Buenos Aires: FCE).
- Mayer, Arno (1988) *Why did the heavens not darken? The Final Solution in history*, (New York: Pantheon Books).
- Swampa, Maristella (1994) *El Dilema argentino: Civilización o Barbarie* (Buenos Aires: Ediciones El cielo por asalto).
- Todorov, Tzvetan (1991) *Nosotros y los otros* (México: Siglo XXI).
- Traverso, Enzo (2003) *La Violencia Nazi, una genealogía europea* (Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica).
- Traverso, Enzo (2001) *El totalitarismo. Historia de un debate* (Buenos Aires: Eudeba)
- Zaffaroni, Eugenio (1998) *Criminología, aproximaciones desde un margen* (Bogotá: Temis).

Copyright of *Journal of Genocide Research* is the property of Routledge and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.