

## Strasserism Answers

On anti-semitism:

In terms of anti-semitism the Strasserite wing felt that 'Jewish financial capitalism' was one of the core problems with Germany. I would personally suggest it was a bigger factor to cohesion in the time of the Strasser brothers due to the conditions of the post-war period.

Today with the Autonome Nationalisten there tends not to be an overt anti-semitism in the overall movement. What you will see for the most part is anti-Israel attitudes but these revolve around the issue of Israel as an imperialist state in regards to Palestine. Despite this there are still noted examples of racism and antisemitism it just isn't as pronounced as it once was.

By strategy do you mean utilizing anti-semitism to mobilize a movement with anti-capitalist objectives?

If so I would say that anti-semitism may not be a method for modern cohesion it was perfect for the national socialists due to the historical relations between the Jews and the Germans along with the popular feelings in Germany after the war. In general it is much easier to rally people behind a great and alien other. You can point and say 'capitalists/Jews/Turks/the church/Muslims/African Americans caused whatever problem while saying the group you are with is free of corruption you accuse the other of having. It gives the group you are trying to mobilize a physical target to be in opposition with and to combat against. It easily turns the philosophical or political discussion into a physical struggle.

An example I can think off the top of my head is the liberal/conservative divide in America. All of my fanatical political friends I have known (who weren't outside the two parties) did everything they could to combat 'liberals' or 'fascists'(few ever mean real fascists mind you). They never really seem to ask why they are doing it other than the other group is hold America back.

Is turning people against a group for political means ethical? I would personally say yes just as I would agree with Sorel that violence is justified to achieve political goals. However as a leftist I would say doing it along racial lines is counter productive and unethical and must only be done along class lines. I believe Strasserism would fit in this category as well. Only Strasserism mixes the class division with the racial due to the perceived 'Jewishness' of financial capitalism and Marxism.

To your point on policy issues:

The Strasserite movement failed to get their ideology implemented due to Hitler siding with the conservatives in Germany. So what we have to go off of is the rhetoric and writings of the Strasser brothers. Still One of the big differences I can think off the top of my head is that is that the Strassers wrote in terms of the economy

Strasserism to my understanding still desired a strong centralized state which I think the Bolsheviks could agree with. However how this would be organized tends to depend on what you are reading. In some places it is described as installing a corporative system (I believe the 14 Theses talks about this) and in some other cases there is a jump entirely away from any form of capital and going for payment in kind. To go off the "Thoughts about the Tasks of the Future" Gregor went in depth about Achievement being more important than Dividends and Work more than Property and so on. Here he spoke about profit sharing but that the economy should not be built for profit but instead for the needs of the people.

There was also a belief in some documents that the economic system would be built around guilds or cooperatives. In other cases the economy would be run by state enterprises.

Aside from being ideologically opposed I would say that they might have been structured along similar lines. For instance before the Night of the Long Knives Ernst Rohm had advocated replacing the army with the Sturmabteilung to create an army of the party similar to the Red Army.