

[yourdailyshakespeare.com](https://www.yourdailyshakespeare.com)

The Bottom of the Barrel - Your Daily Shakespeare

Posted on

20–25 minutes



By and large, for an ideology to take root among a people or a nation it is necessary to transform the individual into the mass man. For masses are – before in time and now often in the impalpable ether – what crowds are in space. Namely a large quantity of people unable to express their human qualities – for members of masses are not connected to each other either as individuals or as parts of a community. In fact they are only linked through some impersonal, abstract, crystallizing and often de-humanizing factor.

With crowds it can be, for example, a sports match, a huge sale, a

morbid murder. With masses it is the drumming repetition of the same thing by the same media. Media – in turn – today overwhelmingly funded and overwhelmingly owned by historically old and yet modernized clever masters of the human mind and apostles of the thought-unique.

In essence, we can agree that **masses are those who love they know not why, and hate upon no better ground (1)**, ever ready to accept the master's line even when **the verity of it is in strong suspicion (2)**.

That said, thanks to the imposed and aforementioned 'thought unique' he who does not agree with the US funded Ukrainian coup-d'etat of 2014, with the 8-year bombardment of the Donbass, with the open and openly Nazis nature of the current regime and army, with the banning of the Russian language, with the essential shutting down of the Ukrainian church and the imprisonment of some of its pastors... etc., this individual is variously defined as a 'Putin's Stooge', and nostalgically, at least in France, as a 'collaborator,' more familiarly a 'collabo'.

'Collabo' is a term coined to dishonor those Frenchmen who had acquiesced to live acquiescently within the Vichy regime of Marshal Petain during WW2. After France's crushing defeat of 1940, Petain had come to terms with Hitler – and the ensuing regime got its name from its capital Vichy, a lovely town in the very lovely French region of Auvergne. It should be added, though easily forgotten, that Marshal Petain had been a hero of WW1, acclaimed as a national hero for having stopped the Germans at Verdun and having assumed command of the French forces in 1917. Which is why he was exiled but not killed after WW2.

I will return shortly to the analysis of who is a ‘collaborator’ and why, but I cannot resist relating an observation made in Paris, years ago, when France still held some independence from the cultural and political hegemony by the exceptional nation – exercised via the ‘collaboration’ within the European Union and, of course, NATO.

Among the large promotional posters attached to the walls of the metro stations, I remember one, featuring the large, beautiful view of a hilly, tranquil, bucolic, green and peaceful countryside, including a few very relaxed cows. The script on the poster said in English, “Auvergne, our Natural Resources.”

At the time, the thought-unique had not, as yet, driven France into the current extreme, self-defeating and demeaning position of subservience to the arrogant part of America, in just about all domains of life and endeavor. The poster was seemingly intended as a mild satire towards a culture that values nothing unless it represents a monetary return on investments.

For a description of the difference between the ‘arrogant’ and the ‘human’ part of America, please refer to my article “A Tale of Two Cultures.”

Returning to Ukraine, in the whole business, as most know, there are some metaphorical elephants in the metaphorical living room, even if, by convention, they are assumed to be invisible.

For in much of the Western world, whoever questions, however mildly and with supporting evidence, the narrative of an event actually inaugurated and named in New York in 1972, (over 30 years after its actual occurrence) this person, thanks to the democratic western values, including ‘freedom of expression’ can

easily end up in jail.

Those condemned for this reason have been many. Emblematic is Ms. Ursula Haverbeck, who, being in no way a Hitler apologist, only questioned some of the questionable assertions related to the never-ending campaign launched, as mentioned, in 1972. For this she was jailed in Germany when she was 93-year young.

The whole thing is equally extraordinary and relevant to the issue dealt with here, considering that, in Ukraine, all know and witness a systematic re-interpretation of history, an inversion of values, a revolution in words and a reversal of meanings.

The American mastermind of the 'Maidan Revolution', the two ensuing Ukrainian presidents and some of the ministers are chosen people. While the most active and notorious personalities of the Ukrainian army (setting aside the mercenaries) are incontrovertibly Nazis. Even the main avenue in Kiev has been re-named 'Bandera Avenue,' in honor of Hitler's collaborator and most popular partner of the Germans in Ukraine during WW2.

The 'sponsor' of the current president is equally chosen-people material, whose fiber and temper would not recommend themselves even to the most forgiving evaluator. (I wrote an article about him in May 2019, titled "The Bottom of the Barrel" <https://thesaker.is/?s=The+bottom+of+the+barrel>).

Equally notable are the multi-billion \$\$ 'donations' of arms to Ukraine by Giuseppe Biden. And even Bankman Fried – notorious hero of the recent close-to-a-billion \$\$ ruinous Ponzi scheme – has allegedly contributed 60 million \$\$ to the regime. While he has equally been hailed as a great co-religionist, great friend and great supporter of the current Ukrainian president.

Let's now return to the issue of who is or isn't a 'collaborator', or 'collabo' and if so, of whom, beginning with the lexicon.

'Collaboration' is a word of easy etymological determination. It derives from Latin, meaning 'to work together'. Historically, 'collaboration' referred to the medieval meaning of "shared possessions acquired through work by a married couple."

However, in France, during the German occupation in WW2, it assumed the significance of 'cooperating with the enemy'. And as if to ensure that the new WW2 meaning could not be confused with the original, the term 'collaborator' was shrunk into the shorter and disparaging-sounding word 'collabo'.

The lexical metamorphosis began on October 24, 1940 when, in the little town of Montoire, a meeting was held at the railway station between Adolf Hitler and Marshall Petain, president of France. A historical photo shows Petain shaking Hitler's hand.

A transcription of the actual conversation is not available, but six days later, Petain, in a radio speech delivered while sitting by his fireplace, gave the French a status report on the situation. It is during this broadcast that he used the term 'collaboration,' in a significantly historical paragraph:

"It is a matter of honor, in order to maintain French unity, a unity spanning ten centuries – and in the context of a constructive *new European Order* – that today I have begun on a path of *collaboration*" (with Germany).

One important consideration. As a matter of principle and action, 'collaboration' was an integral foundation of Petain's philosophy, in relation to the '*new European order*' spoken-of in his radio address. Meaningfully, Petain's words 'new European order' are

omitted from French history texts in schools, referring to that period and event. Why? Because, in the sanctioned interpretation of history, it was/is important to emphasize Petain's submission (to Germany) rather than collaboration. Which, more objectively, at least in my view, should have been called 'modus vivendi' – a sentence whose flavor of neutrality and antiquity, would better represent the condition when people who declared a war on an enemy and lost it, attempt to survive in objectively critical circumstances.

Still, given the aftermath of WW2 and the strongly promoted implementation of the European Union, Petain's '*new European order*' returned a few years later under a new flag and – we may add – with a vengeance.

Ever since, implicitly, explicitly, officially and unofficially the 'new European order' has been imposed, not to say forced-upon the seemingly complacent, compliant, beguiled, gullible, undisturbed and unruffled Europeans.

Furthermore, given that the tale of history cannot be told without (often) strategic and convenient omissions, a curious reader may be interested in another remarkably curious piece of news, usually (or strategically) omitted.

One important protagonist in the establishment of the current European Union was Walter Hallstein, a jurist most close to Hitler during the regime. Hallstein had accompanied Hitler in his state visit to Mussolini in Italy and had established the framework of the notorious 'axe' Hitler-Mussolini. Later he set up the legal framework for the 'new European order', now renamed 'European Union', including the structure of what would become the 'Treaty of

Rome' of 1957. Equally, Walter Hallstein became the first president of the CEE Commission (Commission Economique pour l'Europe). In other words he was a pedigreed Nazi, though he successfully managed to hide it. So much so that I would wager that most of my 25 readers don't know it.

While assigning NO value judgment to this historical truth, there is a connecting point or common denominator between Petain's 'collaboration in the context of a 'new European order' and the 'collaboration' in the context of Walter Hallstein even-newer European order. In both cases that connection, or context, or common denominator is submission.

It is because France was invaded that Petain did 'collaborate.' And apart from any related value judgment, who declared war on whom in WW2? It may be historically uncomfortable, yet it wasn't Hitler but France who declared war on Germany, and so did England on the 3rd of September 1939, one month and a half before the mentioned interview at Montaire.

Any historical consideration fails in its objective of clarification if it is not extracted from the web of intertwining events and – at least temporarily – considered as an independent fact. I am referring here to Hitler's 'Lebensraum' (living space), a German rendering of American President Polk's 19th century notion of America's 'manifest destiny' (see more about this later)

And why did France and England declare war on Germany? Because from the middle of the 1930s Germany had risen in power, aiming at agglomerating German-speaking countries, so as to redress the unfortunate and objectively despicable decisions taken at the end of WW1. When the map of Europe was re-drawn,

creating new countries that contained a conspicuous proportion of Germans in speech and culture – notably Austria, created after the dismemberment of the millenarian Austro-Hungarian empire, and the Sudeten, the Western part of the new Republic of Czechoslovakia. A German survivor from the Sudeten, emigrated from Germany to Portland after WW2, used to recount harrowing episodes of mistreatment of the Germans by the Czecks after the Checks took over the Sudeten. Treating people as pawns and tokens is usually unadvisable. Even in our historical yesterday, the Czecks and the Slovaks found that they were not the same, or same enough to be part of the same state.

After Germany united with Austria in 1938 the Western powers became worried. They grumbled but accepted the fait-accompli at the famous Munich conference. Henceforth the West split among those in favor and those against the Munich agreement.

Missing, in the German reunification, was the ‘Danzig corridor’ earlier given to Poland. This practically split Prussia (the historical heart of modern Germany) from Germany proper.

On paper Danzig was the item of contention, apart from other German strategies. planned or pending. Poland refused to yield and Germany attacked Poland. Now England and France declared war on Germany.

It is currently fashionable, in certain quarters, to equate Putin with Hitler, but the comparison is not tenable. Russia does not harbor designs to invade other countries. The opposite is true. A map of Russia, produced after the end of the USSR by a US ‘think-tank’ features European Russia split into 4 independent states under US ‘protection’. While Russian Asia is up for grabs because it is ‘too

big' according to that poor imitation of a human, Victoria Nuland (Nudelman) who, Shakespeareanly speaking, **is not worth the dust that the rude wind blows in her face** (3)

In fact, after 1991 and the tumultuous dissolution of the USSR, in purely technical and historical terms NATO has assumed Hitler's role. That is, the US has not ceased to erode and nibble at the geographical and strategic space protecting Russia. Which was accomplished by incorporating the Eastern States into NATO, also using the only slightly more chaste instrument of the 'European Union'. The whole conducted in platitudinous breach of agreements and justified by the ridiculous claim that nothing in writing existed as a reference.

Therefore, watching the world from Russia's point of view it is easy to see that all that Russia won in Europe after her enormous sacrifices in WW2, had been shattered

Historically the situation is the mirror image of Europe in 1938-39, as seen by England and France. Wherefrom it follows that today's Ukraine is yesterday's Poland.

Besides, Ukraine is an integral part of Russia, of her people and history since 1654 and the Treaty of Perejeslav. Removing Ukraine from Russia (please refer to my article "America and Russia – Tale of Two Cultures) almost equates to removing Paris from France, Tuscany from Italy or Athens from Greece.

From Moscow's point of view the situation is dangerous. Recent events show that the US destroyed Iraq and Libya nor has given up on Syria, all on behalf of an artificial, apartheid state that cannot be named. For they – Iraq, Libya and Syria – were the only countries upholding the rights of the Palestinians (along with Iran).

After the US-funded, South-American-style Maidan revolution in 2014, the threat against Russia became obvious and the damage direct – quite apart from the curious and extraordinary alliance of the resurrected Ukrainian Nazis with the new Ukrainian government, made up by members of the chosen people.

Returning to historical analogies, Russia's action equates to what England and France did in 1939. Who would, today, dare to hold that England and France were wrong in declaring war on Hitler?

Yet at the time, the perception was quite different, starting with Petain and his 'collaborationists'. Before the battle of Stalingrad, (1943), many in France held that Germany had not attacked France or England. Therefore why declare war on Germany?

In summary, those who compare Putin with Hitler should remember that it is exactly what England and France did to Germany. With a significant difference, England and France declared war on Germany to defend the Poles. Russia launched her military operation to defend the Russians. Quite apart from the remarkable admixture of a Nazi-inspired army and the post-Maidan Jewish government.

Besides, to be a collaborationist implies agreeing, conniving and cooperating with an enemy present in the territory. But Russia does not impose her rule on France or England, or anywhere else for that matter. Therefore those who accuse of collaborationism the dissenters on the American-NATO line on Russia are either not serious, or more likely in bad faith. How can one be a collaborationist with a country that does not occupy or plan to occupy the country of the collaborationists?

Instead, dominating England, France and Europe at large is the

exceptional nation. To quote verbatim from a Biden's statement, (Nov 24, 20) "America is back and ready to lead the world." Where 'being back' meant a sharp break from the 'America first' inspired foreign policy of Donald Trump.

Militarily speaking it is difficult to argue that Europe is NOT under US occupation. DeGaulle himself detected and denounced the overpowering, constraining and conditioning presence of the US in France – which led him to exit NATO and impose the closing of the US bases in France in 1966.

Later President Mitterand echoed the same sentiments and policies. Whereas the current French president Macron appears but a reserivist of the exceptional nation.

Therefore the label of 'Putin's collaborator' assigned to dissenters is absurd. The real collaborator is he who is hand and glove with those who dominate and impose their geo-political choices in Europe at large.

Besides, nowhere, in Russia's history or known archives, will be found a document declaring or theorizing that Russia should conquer Europe or the world. Hence it cannot be argued that if Putin takes Ukraine, he will then conquer Poland, Germany, France etc

Such theory, if it existed, would have manifested itself since long, and comparing the Russian Federation with the Soviet regime is absurd. The USSR was the embodiment of Marxist theories applied to world revolution. Nor it is antisemitic to remember that members of the chosen people made up 95% of the first Politburo.

Besides, on the 200th anniversary of Karl Marx' birth (April 30, 2018) the New York Times – the official opinion of America –

whose ownership, ever since 1895 is politely left unsaid, and yet unbroken and undisputed – published a conspicuous article titled, “Happy Birthday, Karl Marx. You Were Right!”

But returning to the main point, Russia, under Putin, has attempted to reestablish the security that the nation had before its dissolution.

In Asia all that Russia wants is that the ex-USSR countries do not become a threat. There was a hint of another Maidan two years ago in Kazakhstan, fortunately dispelled in time. Interested readers may refer to my related video (<https://youtu.be/whXvQ765t-M>)

Most of us agree that the sovereignty of a country does not imply the right of being a threat to her neighbors.

Besides, there are no extant text, present or past, theorizing or suggesting that Russia should dominate the universe, or at least entire continents and countries at large. Something equivalent to Kagan’s (Victoria Nuland’s husband), “Plan for a New American Century.”

In comparison, though the fact is not usually explained or discussed in schools, on December 2, 1823, the fifth president of the United States James Monroe, established his ‘Monroe doctrine,’ whereby North and South America should exist under total control of the United States.

The doctrine did not imply isolationism. Rather it implied preventing any intervention or participation by European countries into the affairs of the American continent. That is, the scope of the doctrine was not isolationism but interdiction of any other state or country from having anything to do with the Americas.

Another relevant historical date is December 2, 1845 when the

10th president of the United States, James Polk pronounced a speech containing the words 'manifest destiny', referring to a quasi-supernatural license granted to the United States for dominating all lands from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

At the time, the hub of the United States was in the East, and the Western expansion was still in progress. Much of the center and the whole west were Mexican lands: California, Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Nevada. While lands north of Oregon belonged to Britain.

Henceforth, the US would fight Mexico in the South and antagonize Britain in the North to secure 'full spectrum dominance' in those lands, because the gods had said so.

The history of Texas deserves a brief mention. Mexico had invited American settlers to Mexico, which they did. But in 1829 Mexico abolished slavery, which Texas was not yet ready to do away with. The settlers rebelled, Texas became independent, and they retained slavery until the 1860s and the Civil War.

Yet, the spirit of independence (leaving the Union) has still its largest appeal in Texas. Showing that history counts and that traditions don't die quickly.

In the end, President Polk managed to secure the largest territorial expansion and extension of the United States ever. Yet Polk's 'manifest destiny' never died and still informs and inspires current US international policy, as all can see.

Terms other than 'manifest destiny' may apply: 'indispensable nation', 'exceptional nation'. They are but cosmetic variations on the theme. For in our current society of the spectacle trifle is king

rather than meaning. And trifles always require an exuberance of ornament, as provided by commercial media.

For the building which has no strength can be valued only for the showiness of its decorations. The pebble must be masked with care, which hopes to be valued as a diamond; and words can be cleverly labored when they are intended to numb the mind and to replace nothingness.

Besides, expecting a change of mind or heart from current Western politicians is naïve. Theirs is a life of little work and much luxury. And when a position teems with such pleasant consequences, who can without regret confess it to be false? Furthermore, in the current US political landscape, arrogance seems recommended as the supply of every defect and the ornament of every (supposed) excellence. Alternatively, those who are unable to add nothing to truth, hope for eminence from the heresies of paradox, as in the case of the “Putin Collaborators”.

References:

1. Comedy of Errors
2. Winter’s Tale
3. King Lear