

Aristocide under Fuehrers and Commissars

NATHANIEL WEYL

THE MAIN PROPOSITIONS I shall advance are that the Nazi and Communist systems engage in the deliberate slaughter of the most intelligent, competent and creative elements in society to an extent unprecedented in history; that this is due, not to such "accidental" factors as the emergence of paranoid leaders, but is inherent in the totalitarian systems; that the genetic havoc thus inflicted on mankind is in excess of that due to any other historic calamity, and that that damage is irreversible.

By *aristocide*, I mean, not the slaughter of the artificial aristocracies of pedigree and status, but the extermination of what Thomas Jefferson called "the natural aristocracy among men," grounded on "virtue and talents," and constituting "the most precious gift of nature for the instruction, the trusts, and government of society." The preservation and promotion of this elite, Jefferson believed, was of such cardinal importance that one might say that "that form of government is the best, which provides the most effectually for a pure selection of these natural aristoi into the offices of government."¹

Man's evolutionary advance and progressive mastery over both competitive fauna and his inanimate habitat can be attributed primarily to the growth of his mental

powers. In historic eras, the superior reproduction, greater life-span and comparative immunity from common causes of premature death of the creative and intelligent members of society furthered this process.

Intelligence by itself is not enough to make men or peoples fit for leadership. It may be mated with evil character and one recalls Weldon's comment concerning Francis Bacon that "surely, never so many parts and so base and abject a spirit tenanted together in any one earthen cottage as in this man." Intelligence may be bookishly severed from practicality and its possessor may be endowed with such irritating and repulsive traits that he never acquires the opportunity to put his brains to productive employment.

A great deal of comparatively recent psychological and statistical analysis has shown, however, that intelligence tends to be strongly correlated positively with those traits of leadership, will, sensitivity, altruism, tolerance, integrity, and purity of purpose that men and women of good will in civilized countries have usually esteemed. The genius-monster is happily an exception, such a conspicuous one that his rare presence makes a deep impression.

The natural aristocracy, moreover, embraces more qualities than mere problem-

solving ability. When Jefferson wrote of "virtue and talents," what he had in mind was a broader spectrum of intelligence and character than would emerge a century later as IQ. If intelligence in the narrower sense is stressed in the pages that follow, the reason is simply that IQ is measurable, whereas such cognate psychic qualities as creativity, aesthetic discrimination and integrity of character can merely be approximated in crude fashion.

Throughout history, epidemics and even pandemics of aristocide have occasionally made their appearance. Some of these calamities have been caused by impersonal forces. In other instances, the causal agents of the slaughter do not seem to have been driven by any conscious desire to exterminate intellectual elites.

The Mongol invasions of Europe and the Middle East were probably the most devastating example of aristocide in the history of pre-Marxian man. Total annihilation of the inhabitants of those cities which refused to surrender on demand was aristocidal because the wealth, capacity and intelligence of the afflicted civilizations was concentrated, perhaps even more than now, in the urban centers. The effect on human life can be measured by the minarets of human skulls which such monsters as Timur i Leng left behind as their legacy. Some of the Transoxanian cities thus razed have vanished even from the memory of man.

The aristocidal effect of the activities of Genghis Khan and his successors was to blight the entire civilization of the lands between the Caspian and the Karakoram. According to one authority, the Mongol experience kept Russia in such cultural darkness that she was never able to experience the Renaissance.² In Karl Marx's not unbiased opinion, the Mongol holocaust imprinted a permanent and indelible pattern of slavishness upon the Slavic peoples.³

Yet the purpose of these Mongol warlords, insofar as it can be ascertained, was not to exterminate the intelligentsia, but rather to lay waste cities which seemed to them useless, as indeed they were within

the limited perspectives of the transhumance and nomadism of the Mongol way of life.

Movements of Planned Aristocide

Aristocide on a vast scale is largely a modern phenomenon and an inherent component of the revolutionary seizure and consolidation of power by totalitarian regimes. Whether or not it ceases once a certain stage of power consolidation and economic progress has been attained remains an open question.

The impoverishment of the human gene pool caused by modern aristocidal movements may, but does not necessarily, lead to an irreversible spiral of societal self-destruction. Each purge of brain leads to a further coarsening and brutalization of the population, to an increase in its credulity and to loss of critical facilities. A power base for cruder, more mediocre and more unscrupulous leaders is provided. This leadership is generally adept at imposing myths and absurdities on the masses, convincing the latter of its own infallibility, and finding scapegoats—spies, wreckers, enemy agents—so that purges and executions of the innocent serve to explain away its own failures and to satisfy the envy and resentment of the mob. As societies are progressively deprived of their intelligent and conscientious elements, a more and more spiritless residue remains, one which proves increasingly pliant to the demands of the dictatorship.

Thus far, the modern world has experienced three totalitarian systems with inbuilt aristocidal drives: Nazi Germany, Soviet Russia under Lenin and Stalin, and the People's Republic of China.

Other than the obvious point that the Nazi mania was race-oriented and the Communist mania class-oriented, there are other significant points of difference. While both Communists and Nazis were conspirators against the state and the established order, the latter preserved closer links with the dominant establishment. Its seizure of power did not involve total war against the

former ruling classes and their expropriation and extermination. Nazi control was exercised through existing corporate institutions upon which state power was superimposed. Hence, the Nazis failed to develop a total monolithic state to the same extent as the Communists. In his admirable biography of Stalin, Ulam points out that the Soviet dictator wielded more absolute and total power in peacetime than his German counterpart did in wartime.⁴

The significance of these differences cannot be appraised objectively because the Nazi system was shattered at a time when its revolutionary momentum had by no means ceased. In his introduction to *Hitler's Secret Conversations 1941-1944*, Trevor-Roper points out that the Fuehrer planned future purges and blood baths perhaps as extensive as those of his Georgian rival. He revealed that once the Jews had been exterminated, "the old European aristocracies, the 'upper class *maffia*' of frivolous cosmopolitan reactionaries—the same people who had corrupted German diplomacy for so long and who still sabotaged the Duce in Italy—would be liquidated; the Churches . . . would be extirpated; and, at the first report of a mutiny in the Reich, 'the whole anti-social rabble, a few hundred thousand men' conveniently kept in concentration camps for the purpose; would be led out to execution."⁵ Perhaps the difference between Nazi and Soviet aristocidal programs was not so much extent, as order of procedure.

Another possible difference is that Nazi genocide and aristocide were carried out in terms of a specific plan for the so-called European New Order and to that extent may have had finite limits. By contrast, the Soviet cycle of extermination was predicated on Stalin's bizarre thesis that, as the Soviet Union comes closer and closer to socialism, the class struggle becomes sharper and more intense. This was a formula which opened the door to permanent aristocide.

The contrast, however, is not as sharp as it may appear to be *prima facie*. Where the

Nazis programmed total extermination—as in the cases of the Jews and the Gypsies—the planned holocausts obviously had their limits. The case was different, however, where the plan involved the reduction of entire peoples and races to the status of helots and uneducated slave laborers. Hitler's program for the Slavs involved the total destruction of their educated class and the genocide of their actual and potential elites. Had he won World War II and imposed this plan, permanent aristocide in Eastern Europe would have been inevitable. As able, bright and altruistic men and women emerged from the truncated body of the Slavic peoples, the Nazi program would have required that they be identified, tracked down and physically destroyed. As we know from the Irish experience under the Tudors and Stuarts, the planned decapitation of an entire people in order to leave behind a sodden mass of peasantry and unskilled laborers implies a continuing reign of terror, stretching across the centuries.

The final difference is that both the Soviet and the Chinese Communists waged class war in the countryside, exterminating the more hard-working and capable peasants and thus stultifying a major breeding ground for new intellectual elites. The Nazis abstained from this particular folly.

Dimensions of Nazi and Communist Genocide

The sheer magnitude of the genocide and aristocide perpetrated by Nazi and Communist regimes differentiates this phenomenon from anything comparable which occurred in the past. The nearest approaches to these enormities are the religious wars within Christendom, both during the later centuries of the Roman Empire in the West and during the age of the Reformation, the persecution of witches in Europe, and of heretics and Albigenses under the Inquisition.

In discussing the unprecedented magnitude of genocide in the Soviet Union, the dissident Marxist-Leninist historian Roy Medvedev observes that some tens of thou-

sands were killed by the Oprichnina of Ivan the Terrible; some 17,000 human beings were guillotined after trial during the Reign of Terror and perhaps the same number were killed without trial, while Tomás de Torquemada is said to have burned 10,220 heretics and sentenced 97,321 to lesser punishments.

In contrast to these paltry achievements in mass murder, the Nazis killed between 4.2 million and 6 million Jews and may have inflicted genocidal death on as many non-Jews, if we include in the total the Slavic prisoners of war and slave-laborers who perished of hunger, overwork and neglect and the million inhabitants of Leningrad who died in the siege of that city.⁶

If the Nazi holocaust occasioned from 8 to 12 million genocidal deaths in addition to the even greater military mortality of World War II, the necrology of Russian communism is equally gruesome. Robert Conquest estimates that at least 20 million and possibly 30 million Soviet citizens were slaughtered by the Stalin regime between 1936 and 1950 in the course of collectivization and in the purges.⁷ Extending the coverage both backward and forward in time would substantially increase these totals.

In the case of Communist China, information is more fragmentary and less reliable. Professor Richard L. Walker, Director of the Institute of International Studies at the University of South Carolina, placed the human cost of communism in China at from 34.3 million to 63.8 million lives. Eliminating military casualties from these estimates would reduce them to approximately 30 million and 55 million.⁸ This is in general agreement with the assertion by Radio Moscow on April 7, 1969:

In the course of ten years, more than 25 million people in China were exterminated. More than 25 million people! And to be more precise: 2.8 million from 1949 to 1952; 3.6 million from 1953 to 1957; 6.7 million from 1958 to 1960; and 13.3 million Chinese were savagely assassinated from 1961 to 1965.

According to the Soviet figures, Chinese genocide was not attributable to the conquest and consolidation of power, but reached its maximum 15 years after the victory. The Maoist regime allegedly killed less than a million Chinese annually during its first three years of power, but managed to slaughter over 2.5 million yearly during 1961-65. Radio Moscow noted that "during 1960 alone, Mao Tse-tung's government exterminated more Chinese than were killed during the entire war against Japan."⁹

The American estimate admittedly has a large margin of error and the Soviet estimates were drawn up for purposes of political warfare. Even so, the conclusion seems inescapable that the communist rulers of Russia and China share the unenviable distinction of having butchered more of their subjects than any other rulers in history.

The Extermination of the Jews

The Jewish population of Europe and their descendants form a major component of the world's intellectual elite. Among the reasons for this assertion are the facts that the IQ's of Western Jews are considerably higher than those of the peoples among whom they live and that their contributions to the scientific, aesthetic and managerial elites are utterly disproportionate to their numbers.¹⁰

Arthur R. Jensen estimates that American Jews score on average about nine points higher than white American non-Jews on intelligence tests. To those unfamiliar with the nature of the IQ frequency distribution, this may seem an inconsequential difference. Actually, however, a population with an average IQ that is nine points higher than that of another may produce proportionately almost four times as many people with IQ's over 130 and about twenty-three times as many with IQ's of 145 and over.¹¹

The impact of what may seem to be a rather small difference of intelligence in favor of the Jews has accordingly had an enormous impact on Western civilization. Using the data in George Sarton's monumental history of ancient and medieval sci-

ence, Stefan Possony and I found that about fifteen percent of Europe's intellectually significant scientists and philosophers during the first fourteen centuries of the Christian era were Jews.¹² This contribution is quite remarkable when one considers how small the Jewish communities were and the conditions of misery, insecurity and persecution under which they existed.

Passing to more modern times, Possony and I found that between 1901 and 1962 inclusive Jews produced sixteen percent of the Nobel laureates in physics, chemistry, physiology and medicine. The Jewish contribution worked out to an estimated 203 Nobel scientists per 100 million of population as compared with 76 for Germany-Austria, 15 for Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia, and 5 for the U.S.S.R.¹³

Using a method which I call name-frequency analysis, I found in 1966 that American Jews were 263 percent overrepresented (in terms of statistical expectation) in the student bodies of representative colleges and universities, 365 percent overrepresented in Ivy League colleges, and 339 percent overrepresented in 1962 Phi Beta Kappa awards. Jewish overrepresentation was 478 percent in psychiatry, 308 percent among medical specialists, 299 percent in dentistry, 283 percent in mathematics, 263 percent in law and 231 percent in medicine. In eight rosters of contemporary literature and writing, the Jews were 108 percent overrepresented and led all other ethnic and national groups by a wide margin. Among plastic artists, Jewish overrepresentation was 89 percent and in music it was higher. More than twice as many Jews as would be expected statistically were listed in *Poor's Register of Directors and Executives, U.S. and Canada, 1963*.¹⁴ Jewish professionals consistently earned more than their non-Jewish counterparts, even when the influence of urbanization was eliminated.¹⁵ However, in engineering, politics, the military and the social elite, the Jewish presence was below the national average.

All in all, superior Jewish intelligence is

thus matched by a comparable superiority in creativity and leadership ability. Hence, the destruction of European Jewry by Hitler (and the attempted destruction of Soviet Jewry by Stalin) were not merely monstrous crimes of genocide, but acts of aristocide and attempted aristocide without parallel in history. At the highest levels of intellectual achievement, as represented by Nobel laureates in science, one might say roughly that the annihilation of Jewry destroyed about one fourth of the potential scientific genius of Western Europe and perhaps over half of that of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.¹⁶

Did Stalin Plan to Exterminate the Russian Jews?

Between 4.2 million and 6.0 million European Jews perished in the Nazi holocaust.¹⁷ Of those who survived on the continent, the great majority lived in the Soviet Union. The 1959 Soviet census reported a Jewish population of 2,269,000, mostly in Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev and Odessa. The urbanization of Russian Jewry and the requirement that Jews be identified as such on their internal passports made it comparatively simple to round them up and deport them.

While Hitler's attitude toward Roosevelt and Churchill was one of unmitigated loathing, he was ambivalent toward Stalin, so much so that one wonders whether, during the period of their pact, the two dictators discussed a joint program to make Europe *judenrein*. Hitler's anti-Semitic obsession suggests that his attitude toward Stalin may have been compounded of contempt for him as a Slav and respect for him as a fellow Jew-hater. During the time of his seemingly irresistible advance into Russia, Hitler assured Field Marshal Erhard Milch that Stalin would be well treated when captured. Speer recalled Hitler's observing in a jesting tone of voice that it might be best after victory over Russia, to entrust the administration of the country to Stalin (under German hegemony, of course) since he was the best imaginable man to handle the Russians.¹⁸ Hitler ordered that Stalin's son be

given especially good treatment as a German prisoner of war.

When the Third Reich faced imminent annihilation, Speer recalls that Hitler ignored a military recommendation that fighter planes be transferred from the West, where they were accomplishing nothing, to the Russian front. "Did Hitler think that his real enemy lay in the West?" Speer ruminated. "Did he feel solidarity with, let alone sympathy for, Stalin's regime?"¹⁹

In his introduction to Hitler's table conversations, Trevor-Roper points out that, with all his hatred and contempt for "Jewish Bolshevism,"

[Hitler] never lost his admiration for that other barbarian of genius, "the crafty Caucasian," whom he saw as his only worthy enemy, "a tremendous personality," "a beast, but a beast on the grand scale," "half beast, half giant"—nor indeed for the communist *credo* and method, an ideology as powerful as his own. . . . The people can rot for all he cares. . . . He made use of the Jews to eliminate the intelligentsia of the Ukraine, and then exported the Jews by trainloads to Siberia.²⁰

The anti-Jewish activities which Stalin fomented in the postwar period culminated in the so-called Doctors' Plot. Toward the close of 1952, leading Kremlin physicians, almost all of them Jews, were arrested on trumped-up charges of plotting to poison the heads of the Soviet government. This marked the launching of an anti-Semitic campaign of unprecedented proportions in which university departments, laboratories and hospitals lost as many as half of their staffs, books by Jews were removed from the forthcoming lists of publishers, and Jews were beaten up.²¹ What was Stalin's underlying purpose? Deportation to remote areas of Siberia where most of the Jews would perish? Or outright extermination in accordance with the Nazi model?

After pointing out that it is almost impossible to learn the truth about anything

in the Soviet Union, Aleksandr I. Solzhenitsyn writes:

But, according to Moscow rumors, Stalin's plan was thus: At the beginning of March (1953), the doctor-murderers were to be hanged in Red Square. The aroused patriots, spurred on naturally by instructors, were to rush into an anti-Jewish pogrom. At this point, the Government—and here Stalin's character can be divined, can it not?—would intervene generously to save the Jews from the wrath of the people, and that same night would remove them from Moscow to the Far East and Siberia—where barracks had already been prepared for them.²²

Stalin's ultimate purpose may have been even more sinister. Sensational light was cast on this matter by Avraham Shifrin, formerly one of the chief legal advisors to the Soviet Ministry of Defense, who was arrested in 1953 and sentenced to ten years imprisonment in Siberia.

From prisoners he met at the Tayshet labor camp, Shifrin learned that they had been sent to the Baikal area in 1952, at the height of the anti-Jewish fury, to build a two-mile railroad spur from the Trans-Siberian to the edge of a cliff which rose several hundred feet from Lake Baikal. Working overtime seven days a week for three months until the spur was completed, the prisoners were promised ten days off their sentences for every day of work on the project.

Since the spur had no visible economic justification, prisoners asked their MVD guards why it was being built. The latter replied:

Stalin wanted the railroad completed in a hurry because he planned to announce the forcible deportation of all Soviet Jews to the already aborted "Jewish Republic" of Birobidjan. But, under the Stalin plan, the Jews would never get as far as Birobidjan. The railway spur was being built so that the Jews could

be liquidated without the trouble of building crematoria. [Lake Baikal at the point was many thousands of feet deep.]”²³

Shifrin was skeptical about the story. However, in 1966-67, he was able to visit the place. Everything was as the prisoners had described it except that the railroad spur was now overgrown with weeds and the rails were badly rusted.

Was this in fact Stalin's plan? I have seen neither corroborative nor contrary evidence. Fear of the dictator was so overwhelming that he could have carried out his program without open opposition despite the fact that three members of the Politburo—Andreyev, Molotov and Voroshilov—had Jewish wives. Providentially, these anti-Jewish plans were frustrated by Stalin's death in March 1953.

The aristocidal impact of Stalin's plan, whether of genocide or of the sort of mass deportation which had in the past involved almost total casualties, would have been comparable to the genetic wound which Hitler's Final Solution inflicted on mankind, except for the fact that only about half as many victims were available for sacrifice.

What Were the Motivating Forces?

The main motivation for political anti-Semitism of a virulent sort, as I have suggested elsewhere, is envy of superior intelligence, wealth, status and power.²⁴ This envy is normally directed against the upper classes as a whole, against the leadership of society, against the Establishment, against all that stands higher than the dull level of mediocrity.

If this envy and hatred are directed with especial savagery and intensity against the Jews, one reason is that they are weaker and more vulnerable than other components of the leadership of society. They are not generally part of the aristocracy; lack deep roots in the history and traditions of their countries; profess a different religion from the majority; may speak a different lan-

guage; are sometimes distinctive in appearance, and are likely to be either immigrants or the children of immigrants.

In the modern world, Jew-hatred is seldom politically significant in normal times in free, advanced and successful societies where the scope of envy is limited. In backward countries and in totalitarian systems, where the causes of frustration and envy are more powerful, anti-Semitism often becomes a powerful social and political force.

In the particular case of the Soviet Union, anti-Semitism has always been latent. It characterized, not merely Stalin's outlook, but that of Khrushchev and other communist leaders. However, it is only under Stalin that it reached genocidal intensity. Are we dealing with an accident of character or with an historic phenomenon that has deeper causes?

Stalin's particular character and background may have caused the aborted attempt to destroy the Jewish population of the Soviet Union.²⁵ But the aristocide, which was such a salient feature of the Soviet state for at least the first thirty-five years of its existence, was inherent in its character, and genocidal anti-Semitism is fundamentally merely one form of aristocide.

When one considers communist aristocide in its more general form—and without reference to anti-Semitism—it is obvious that Marxism requires the liquidation of the ruling class and that it involves the destruction of the state apparatus root and branch, to be replaced by a new state bureaucracy of revolutionary origin. But that does not explain the purges which have become such a conspicuous hallmark of the consolidation and exercise of communist power in both the Soviet Union and China. There may, nevertheless, be an inner logic which at least partially explains this process. Communist society needs the sort of subject who can accept regimentation and authority without questioning it. The individualists—and, therefore, the intellectually superior elements—are security risks, except for that fraction which is to-

tally committed to the regime. The political need for a psychic *tabula rasa* upon which the hand of authority can write whatever it pleases is stressed in Mao's aphorisms and underlies the Pavlovian bent of Soviet psychology and the rule of Lysenko's egalitarian and environmentalist fantasies in Soviet genetics.

A contributory factor may be the need to find scapegoats whenever communist regimes fail to meet their declared goals. Where the excuse is not an internal enemy, it may be the surviving remnant of a non-conforming elite, the dissent of which is equated to treason.

Perhaps the primary reason for the prolongation of aristocide in totalitarian systems is that the latter assign to the state or party the central role in life. Morality is totally subordinated to political expediency and the latter is seen as the march of world history and human destiny. Any and all crimes are justified if they serve the chiliastic concept of history.

Thus, the actors on the political stage are men and women without moral restraint or inhibition. Schooled in illegal conspiracy, they know how to conceal their true beliefs and plans. Since both persecutors and persecuted within the revolutionary camp imagine they are serving some vast eschatological purpose, the political game can seldom be reduced to human dimensions. Dissident Bolshevik or Nazi leaders cannot usually be bought off with ambassadorships or government contracts like their bourgeois counterparts. The ideological stakes of politics are so high that it must seem to every faction that the only safe disposal of the opposition is vertical deportation.

Finally, the successive epidemics of genocide and aristocide on that vast and unprecedented scale so characteristic of the Nazi and Communist exercise of power entail a progressive moral corruption and debasement of the governing apparatus.

In the Bolshevik case, the Old Guard had for the most part lived safely in Switzerland. They had ordered crimes committed, but had not committed them personally.

They were people concerned primarily with dogma and doctrine, more skilled in debate than in organization. They were largely Jewish intellectuals; they had not suffered much in prison; they had talked ruthless violence, but had not inflicted it.

As their nightmare state became a reality, the machinery of terror and genocide grew until a large part of the business of the state came to be genocide and aristocide—including in this rubric the vast empire of the MVD; the bureaucracy became an increasingly criminal organization, and those who floated to the top were men of smaller mental and moral horizons than their predecessors. They were people skilled in persecution, conformity and survival.

The fact that a man of the coarseness, intellectual limitations, cruelty, suspicion and viciousness of Stalin triumphed over all his opponents, consolidated in his hands a personal power greater than that ever wielded by any other human being and, having done all this, convinced a large part of mankind—not only in the U.S.S.R., but in the free world as well—that he was the greatest genius in history—all this remains a perhaps insoluble historic enigma.

But surely part of the answer is that the doctrines of aristocide, when put into practice on an enormous scale, transformed the state and party apparatus into instruments of tyranny of the sort which would inevitably choose a Stalin over a more civilized and human figure. The permanent purge (to paraphrase Trotsky's doctrine) invigorates totalitarian systems. It brings the riff-raff, the scoundrels, the sadists and the fanatical idealists to the top. It reintroduces omnipresent fear. It prevents the evolution of a more normal society in which status and power flow toward ability and accomplishment.

The countervailing development is the advance of industry, technology, science and education so that new elites move up and gradually acquire power. These are, for the most part, men and women who were not trained in the underground of

subversive organizations, who are not consumed with envy and hatred of their intellectual superiors, who are hopefully less interested in world revolution than in building a powerful modern society. However, working within the limitation of totalitarianism, they face the contradiction that they need to enlarge freedom to make progress, yet this freedom threatens the system itself.

Perhaps communist systems reach a stage of development in which quantitative change becomes qualitative, as Hegel put it, and aristocice vanishes. Thus far, this is merely a hope.

But even should this prove to be the case, the damage already done is irreversible. The aristocice inflicted on Slavic Europe by Nazis and Bolsheviks has probably de-

stroyed much of its genetic potential for highly creative work. Theoretically, this could be offset in time if the brightest minds bred more exuberantly than the stupid ones or if a controlled system of artificial eugenic insemination were introduced, but neither prospect is realistic either in the Soviet World or in the West.

Thus, Soviet Russia will probably remain a genetically crippled society, ruled by mediocrities, contributing only minimally to the great creative innovations of mankind, and advancing by borrowing ideas and processes from more gifted peoples and by concentrating the best intellectual resources it has on those areas—mainly modern weaponry—which the dictatorship considers all-important.

¹Thomas Jefferson to John Adams, Monticello, May 28, 1813.

²T. Peisker, "The Asiatic Background," Chapter XII (A), *Cambridge Medieval History* (New York: Macmillan, 1924).

³Karl Marx, *Secret Diplomatic History of the 19th Century*, quoted by Robert Payne, *Marx* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1968), pp. 310-11.

⁴Adam B. Ulam, *Stalin* (New York: Viking Press, 1973).

⁵H. R. Trevor-Roper, ed., *Hitler's Secret Conversations 1941-1944* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Young, 1953), p. xix.

⁶The borderline between genocide and military casualties is not always easy to trace. Thus, Leningrad was a logical military objective. However, the total annihilation of Moscow, Leningrad and Warsaw was part of Hitler's vast plan for the decapitation of all Slavs capable of leadership or instruction so as to leave behind an undifferentiated mass of unskilled laborers under German control. With this in mind, he ordered that the capitulation of Leningrad be refused and that Russian refugees approaching German lines be turned back by fire. Alexander Werthe, *Russia at War 1941-1945* (New York: Dutton, 1964), pp. 297, 307-08.

⁷Robert Conquest, *The Great Terror* (New York: Macmillan, 1968), pp. 526-35.

⁸Richard L. Walker, "The Human Cost of Communism in China," Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, 92nd Congress, 1st Session, 1971, pp. 13-14, 16. ⁹*Ibid.*, p. 14.

¹⁰This generalization probably does not apply to Jews of African or Asiatic origin. A 1961 study

of kindergarten and first and second grade school-children in Israel showed that Oriental Jews averaged ten points below their European counterparts and that this difference increased until the age of fourteen. M. Smilansky and L. Adar, eds., *Schooling in Israel* (Paris: UNESCO, 1961), pp. 6, 10. Part of the reason for this lag may be ethnic. Blood-group investigations by the world authority A. E. Mourant suggest that the Jews of Yemen and the rural Jews of Morocco are not ethnically Jewish, but are in the main descendants of Arab and Berber converts to Judaism. Elizabeth Goldschmidt, ed., *The Genetics of Migrant and Isolate Populations* (Baltimore: William and Wilkins, 1963), pp. 256-63.

¹¹This is based on comparative areas under the normal curve of error at the arithmetic mean plus two and three standard deviations respectively. Sir Julian Huxley, "Eugenics in Evolutionary Perspective," *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine*, Vol. VI, No. 2 (Winter 1963), pp. 163-166.

¹²George Sarton, *An Introduction to the History of Science* (Washington: Carnegie Institute of Washington, 1927-1947).

¹³Nathaniel Weyl and Stefan Possony, *The Geography of Intellect* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1963), p. 143.

¹⁴Nathaniel Weyl, *The Creative Elite in America* (Washington: Public Affairs Press, 1966), pp. 27, 42, 91-105.

¹⁵Ernest Havemann and Patricia Salter West, *They Went to College* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1952), pp. 187-189.

¹⁶The causes of Jewish intellectual preeminence are in dispute. In several books, I have advanced the hypothesis that the basic underlying factor

was that the Jewish people engaged in an enormous and unprecedented experiment in selective breeding for intelligence over about two thousand years. Universal male education winnowed out the dull and mediocre, advancing the most brilliant minds to the high-status occupations of rabbis and scholars. The latter were eagerly sought as sons-in-law by merchant families, were encouraged to marry young, and were under a religious command to be fruitful and multiply. Since they married well, their children were better fed, housed and cared for than the average of the ghetti and their death rate was probably considerably lower. See Weyl and Possony, *The Geography of Intellect*, op. cit., pp. 97-99, 113-116; Weyl, *The Creative Elite in America*, op. cit., pp. 151-193, and Nathaniel Weyl *The Jew in American Politics* (New Rochelle: Arlington House, 1968), pp. 1-20, 172-188.

¹⁷Gerald Reitlinger in his classic *The Final Solution* (New York: Barnes & Co., 1953) gives a minimum estimate of 4.2 and a maximum estimate of 4.6 million. Raul Hilberg in *The Destruction of the European Jews* (Chicago: Quadrangle, 1961) estimated 5.1 million based on SS and German Foreign Office data.

¹⁸Albert Speer, *Inside the Third Reich* (New York: Macmillan, 1970), p. 306. ¹⁹*Ibid*, p. 422.

²⁰*Hitler's Secret Conversations 1941-1944*, pp. xx, 507, 534.

²¹Medvedev, *Let History Judge*, p. 495.

²²Aleksandr I. Solzhenitsyn, *The Gulag Archipelago* (New York: Harper and Row, 1974), p. 92, fn. 48.

²³Summary of Shifron's testimony to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on February 1-2, 1973, *U.S.S.R. Labor Camps*, Hearings, 93rd Congress, 1st Session. According to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1961 edition), Baikal is the deepest lake in the world. The two ranges which enclose its southern shores "have precipitous granite slopes down to the lake and into its depths, with soundings in places of more than 1,400 meters (over 4,500 feet.)"

²⁴Weyl, *The Jew in American Politics*, op. cit., pp. 18-23, 81-83.

²⁵Besides cruelty and viciousness, Medvedev asserts, Stalin had the dominant characteristics of "measureless ambition," involving the thirst for "absolute power and unlimited submission to his will," combined with an "inferiority complex." This contradiction "engendered spiteful envy" and made him wish to destroy old Bolsheviks "who were personally devoted to him, never said anything against him, and carried out all his orders," but were living witnesses to the contradiction between the image of himself he created and the reality, between his real role in history and science and the infallible and omniscient role which legend created. Medvedev, *Let History Judge*, p. 326.

Economic Differences and Inequalities

PETER T. BAUER

DIFFERENCES in income and wealth, both within a country and internationally, especially between developed and less developed countries, will be prominent in political and academic discussions for many years to come. Ideas about the presence, extent, and implications of these differences will serve as bases for important policy decisions: in this area, as elsewhere, ideas have consequences. Yet major issues central to the assessment of the nature and extent of these differences, to the reasons for their emergence, and to the merits of different policies for their reduction or elimination, are very imperfectly recognized even in ostensibly serious discussion. I shall note a number of these issues necessary for sensible discussion or rational policy (rational at least in terms of its ostensible objectives).¹ Although much of my discussion bears both on domestic and on international differences in income and wealth, I shall generally note considerations relevant primarily to domestic issues ahead of those relevant primarily to international differences.

Differences and Inequalities

I shall refer mostly to differences in income and wealth, not to inequalities.² Unlike inequality, difference is a neutral term and does not implicitly prejudice the merits of a situation and the case for changing it. Moreover, inequality is an ambiguous term in that equality on one criterion implies inequality on another criterion. For instance, equality of reward for a given performance leads to the difference of incomes if per-

formance differs; thus, equality in piece rates normally results in inequality in weekly or annual incomes. Again, inequality of income in the same age group means different overall incomes between groups of different age compositions; as we shall see shortly, this consideration is of wide significance. Quite obviously difference and not inequality is the appropriate expression in discussions of differences of income and wealth.

Similarly, it would be more appropriate to speak of the composition or structure of incomes rather than of the distribution of income. Distribution of income is apt to convey the idea of a preexisting income which somehow comes to be allocated unequally, while in fact the income recipients normally generate the incomes pre-tax or pre-subsidy they receive. Moreover, distribution has a technical, statistical meaning (as, for instance, a normal distribution) which differs from the nontechnical use of the term and yet is apt to be confused with it. However, as the distribution of income is the generally used term, I shall also employ it, although I think another term would be more appropriate.

Issues of Concept, Measurement, and Comparison: I

Sensible discussion of differences in income and wealth, whether of domestic or international differences, needs to be conducted on an age-standardized basis. Unless measurement or assessment of these differences relates to identical or closely similar age