

Francis Parker Yockey

THE  
ENEMY  
OF EUROPE

1981

---

Liberty Bell Publications

*Translated by*

THOMAS FRANCIS

*from the German translation of Yockey's  
lost original.*

First Paperback Printing

November 1981

Reprinted with corrections

November 1985

Republished

August 2003

ISBN 0-942094-00-2

Copyright © 1981

by Thomas Francis

All rights reserved. No part of this book, except brief excerpts for the purpose of review, may be reproduced in any form without written permission by the publisher.

Liberty Bell Publications

P.O. Box 890

York, SC 29745


*Printed in the United States of America*

TO THE MEMORY OF  
THE FOUNDER OF THE FRANCIS PARKER YOCKEY  
SOCIETY

**LOUIS T. BYERS**


AN ARYAN OF THE ARYANS  
WHO ALSO FOUGHT A GOOD FIGHT TO ITS TRAGIC  
END

22 OCTOBER 1981



Hitherto unpublished photograph taken at about the time he finished  
IMPERIUM in 1948 and began work on its sequel,  
*The Enemy of Europe*

**FRANCIS PARKER YOCKEY**



Francis Parker Yockey (1917-1960) on his way to the prison in which he would be found dead, reportedly a suicide.



## C O N T E N T S

Introductory Note .....	1
<i><b>THE MORPHOLOGY OF THE SECOND WORLD WAR</b></i>	
The First Interbellum-Period 1919-1930 .....	4
The Liquidation of English Sovereignty .....	8
Origins of the War .....	11
Stronger Power-Currents in the Age of Absolute Politics ...	17
<i><b>THE METAPOLITICS OF THE WAR</b></i>	
The Three Aspects of the War .....	24
Results of the War .....	29
The Power-Problems of the War .....	32
<i><b>THE MORPHOLOGY OF THE THIRD WORLD WAR</b></i>	
The American Occupation of Europe .....	36
The Demise of the Western Nations .....	40
The Inner Enemy of Europe .....	48
The Outer Enemies of Europe .....	55
<i><b>THE POLITICS OF EUROPE</b></i>	
The Definition of Enemy .....	62
The Power-Problems of the Second Interbellum-Period ...	66
The American Power-Accumulation .....	68
The Concert of Bolshevism .....	73
The Political Enemy of Europe .....	87



## *INTRODUCTORY NOTE*

These thoughts were intended to form part of my book *IMPERIUM*, but for personal reasons that was not possible. They owe their present incarnation to the fact that many of those to whom that work was really addressed were unable to draw offhand the necessary conclusions. In this treatise, as in *IMPERIUM*, there is nothing personal, and thus, here as there, I refrain from entering the debate over political tactics. Such matters are better discussed orally.

Organic Laws constitute the vernacular of Politics. With *IMPERIUM*, my aim was to present those laws so that everybody who somehow identified his personal destiny, as it were, with the Destiny of Europe could draw his own conclusions from the basic principles and select his own tactics. Some people misunderstood this possibility to such an extent that they regarded the presentation of these Organic Laws as just another contribution to the usual politico-theoretical discussion. Therefore the Organic Laws are more fully elaborated here in that they are applied to the world situation of the moment, to help provide the worthiest minds with a clearer insight into it and to unmask the Enemy of Europe.

Politics, History, Life, Destiny heed no system. Yet if Europeans would take an active part in the world power-struggle, now, more than ever before, they must put their politics on an intellectual basis, for no physical force whatever is available to them. They must outwit the enemy at every turn, outplay him, until, years later, they will eventually be in a position to dictate conditions and compel fulfilment of them. The Organic Laws are presented here in the form of an intellectual exercise from which may be evolved a method of evaluating events, possibilities, decisions. A grammar that proves inadequate can be revised, but every branch of thought advances only when it has a grammar at its disposal.

This treatise was written from beginning to end in the year 1948. Only two passages, on Japan and on Russia, have undergone revision. The latter of the two, as can be readily perceived, was modified when in the past year, 1952, Russia gave its politics a new orientation. Both passages contain not a word that *IMPERIUM*, composed in 1947, does not also

contain. Each day it is reconfirmed that Japan emerged from the Second World War victorious, as was noted in IMPERIUM. Russia's break with Jewry marks the beginning of the end of Bolshevism. It is called forth by the true, religious Russia, which abhors politics and technics, and which has been dominated by Petrinism and Moscovite Bolshevism alike. Of course, this break was only a beginning, but the final, inner collapse of Bolshevism is unavoidable. The possibility-indeed, I must say, the inevitability-of the destruction of Bolshevism by the true Russia is posited in IMPERIUM.

The Enemy of Europe is complete in itself, and its thesis in regard to the nature of America is true without qualification. Having lived for several decades in America, I have seen with my own eyes the distorted development of that country since the Revolution of 1933. For the most part, the resistance to the progressive distortion of America is merely passive-the resistance which any material whatever opposes to that which is acting upon it. Where the resistance is active-and the dimensions of such resistance are scanty-it finds little support, since idealism and heroism do not flourish in an atmosphere wherein economics is the ruling spirit.

Europe can attach no hopes to this resistance in America. For practical political purposes, the "White America" which still existed in its strength in the 1920's has today ceased to exist. Whether that submerged spirit will rise again in some remote future is unforeseeable. In any case, Europe cannot allow itself the luxury of dreaming that a revolution in America by the pro-European elements will lead to Europe's Liberation.

Europeans are familiar with America's propaganda for export, but less familiar with its internal propaganda. This propaganda utterly dwarfs, in its scale as well as its effect, anything Europeans can readily imagine. The Washington regime's leading internal thesis-which has not changed since 1933-is that Americans must be "tolerant" of the alien elements (which now number roughly 50% of the population), since, after all, these aliens are "brothers." "Brotherhood" is glorified on all public occasions, by all public officials, is taught in the schools and preached in the churches, which have been coordinated into the master-plan of the Culturally-alien Washington regime. Newspapers, books, magazines, radio,

television, films-all vomit forth the same "Brotherhood." The "Brotherhood" propaganda is a ghastly caricature of the Christian idea of the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man, but there is no religious intent to the propaganda. Its sole purpose is to destroy whatever exclusiveness, national feelings, or racial instincts may still remain in the American population after twenty years of national leprosy. The result of the "tolerance" and "brotherhood" campaign is that the alien enjoys a superior position in America-he can demand to be "tolerated." The American can demand nothing. The tragic fact is that the attenuation of the national instincts has proceeded so far that one cannot envisage how a Nationalist Revolution would be even possible in America.

So long as America was dominated by men of stocks from Culture-European soil, America was a European colony, even though sometimes vocally rebellious. But the America that has been distorted by the Revolution of 1933 is lost to Europe. Let no European dream of help or cooperation from that quarter.

What has occurred in the world since the publication of IMPERIUM, how the inner development of Europe has progressed, makes it clearer than ever that the world-outlook and heroic ethic manifested here are the only thing that yet offers Europe a hope of fulfilling its mighty Destiny.

### ***THE FIRST INTERBELLUM-PERIOD 1919-1930***

All wars are in some way related to politics, and the aim of Politics is to obtain power. If a state emerges from a war with less power at its disposal than it had at the beginning of the war, then it has lost the war. Whose troops return from the battlefield and whose troops lie dead on it does not matter: military victory may involve real, political victory, or it may not. Incidents outside the military arena can transform a mere military victory into an actual political defeat.

Thus it happened that the chief losers in the First World War were England and Germany. The chief victor was Japan; it won no military victory, of course, for the simple reason that it had not actively participated in the conflict. Russia, directly after its revolutionary transformation, found itself in a position that gave it an enormous increase of power, since Germany and the Austro-Hungarian Empire had been eliminated as European Great Powers. America was a political victor, but, lacking political experience and a leader-stratum, it was completely unable to consolidate its new power-position; hence it had to abandon most of its winnings.

Germany's losses are obvious: loss of twenty percent of its territory, complete loss of its foreign credits and its colonial empire, loss of the greater part of its rolling stock and its mineral wealth, loss of its prestige-it was robbed of everything under the Versailles dictate.

But England had to resign itself to even greater losses. To America it completely lost its influence in the Western Hemisphere and, just as completely, its former supremacy at sea; to Russia it had to surrender its position in Central Asia; to Japan and America its power-position in the Pacific; and to the coloured world-revolution its international prestige. The War undermined the British Empire, and more particularly, it thoroughly undermined the British Raj. Led by revolutionaries like Gandhi, the subject peoples of India began to take matters into their own hands. Soon the White rulers discovered that their voice had lost its authority. They saw themselves forced to negotiate at every moment with the active, awakened, native population, and, both personally and officially, they had to learn to behave with great circumspection. Similar things

occurred among the subjugated peoples of Europe's other colonial powers. Everywhere in the Coloured World the White European lost power and prestige. In this manner, not only did the two leading European states, England and Germany, lose the War, but so did the entire Western Culture, although that organism, in toto, had not participated militarily in it. Neutral Holland thus suffered a political defeat in the War, proving once again that political defeat does not depend on military defeat.

In the case of France, political and military victory coincided. Before the War, France was the weakest of the Great Powers; in the 1920's, it was the master of Europe. Indeed, it felt itself able once more to play the role of Napoleon, the opposition vis-d-vis England, and during the transitory political hegemony of France over continental Europe the diplomatic struggle between France and England was the most dynamic on earth.

The temporary supremacy of France during the Interbellum-Period shows the nature of power. Ultimately, power depends upon inner qualities. Mere possession of fleets, weapons, and masses of troops cannot provide a safeguard for power. Such things are only appurtenances of power, and possession of them is not its source. Within the political world, power is constantly in motion. There are strong but shallow currents of power which can temporarily work against the deeper, truer, farther-aiming power-currents. France was, in regard to its military, industrial and natural resources, to all appearances absolutely secure in Europe for the immediate future. In 1923, ignoring England's protests, it undertook a military invasion of Germany. At that time, two German thinkers were discussing the European situation. When the one expressed his opinion that within a decade Germany would again be the centre-of-gravity in European politics, the other, who was a "realist," rudely broke off the conversation. Hermann Keyserling was "realist" enough to recognise "reality"-any banker's apprentice can do that-, but Spengler was thinking of the source of power in Europe, of the Destiny of the Western Civilisation.

During the 1930's, French mastery over Europe dwindled away like a morning mist. There was no great crisis at that time, no epochal war. The very fact of the European Revolution of 1933 dissolved French

hegemony without a struggle, without a trace of hostilities. France's position was due solely to material factors, to simple control of the apparatus of power. The inner qualities of the regime that had this power at its disposal were not equal to asserting and preserving it. This regime was the bearer of no World-Hypothesis, no Idea, no Ethic. Its dynamism was a crude desire for mastery: it utterly lacked the feeling of a superpersonal Mission, lacked a world-outlook, a European Hypothesis. When it was confronted with the European Revolution of 1933, its power simply evaporated. Bayonets can give one neither a good conscience nor the Inner Imperative to rule. The vassals defected, and France suddenly found itself in the position of a vassal vis-a-vis England. The choice of its lord and master was the last formal act testifying to the political existence of France as a nation.

A nation is simply an Idea, not a mass of people, not even the form into which that mass has been shaped. This form is the expression of the Idea, and the Idea is primary. Before the Idea there is no nation; when the Idea has fulfilled itself, the nation has disappeared for ever. It matters not whether custom, form, nomenclature, diplomacy, and the material apparatus of power remain to convince yesterday-romantics that the nation survives. The Holy Roman Empire survived as a form until 1806, but as a political fact it had ceased to exist with the decay of the power of the Hohenstaufens after the battle at Legnano in 1176. However, in Politics, facts, not claims, not names, nor legalistic fictions are normative. In religious times, in an age of faith, men may again use in the realm of Politics words that have long ceased to describe facts. But in this Age of Absolute Politics, political fictions have lost their charm for stronger minds, no less than their effectiveness.

The death of a nation is a Ponderable, an event that must come to expression, and its When can be foreseen with sufficient accuracy to be made the basis of long-range policy. A nation shows that it is dying when it ceases to believe in its Mission and its superiority. It begins to hate everything new and everything that would drive it forward. It looks about, and seeks to make defensive preparations in every direction. No longer does it strive to enlarge, but is content merely to maintain, its power-position. *To preserve power, however, one must continually increase it.* A nation need not die

tumultuously in a great military defeat. As a rule, nations die quite peacefully, sinking deeper and deeper into sterile conservatism and shrinking back more and more from great decisions.

## *THE LIQUIDATION OF ENGLISH SOVEREIGNTY*

English policy was senile already at the beginning of Joseph Chamberlain's career in government. Even his grand idea of English-German-American world-hegemony, though still a forceful, virile, aggressive policy, was basically static: behind it lay the age-old dream of bringing History finally to a close. After Chamberlain's time, English policy became completely toothless, and names like Grey, Lloyd-George, MacDonald, and Baldwin show the depths of the descent into national oblivion, when compared with names from more youthful days: Walpole, Pitt, Castlereagh, Canning, Gladstone. The great Empire Builders were eager for every large conquest; their dim successors indulged in lamentations over the status quo, expending their feeble energies on protecting it from young and virile "aggressors." These pallbearers of the Empire tried to build a wall against History by describing Politics in terms of Law: The status quo is "legal," every change therein, however, is "illegal." Political dynamism is "illegal." Power-relationships must be continued as they were at the time of the Versailles dictate. After Versailles, England no longer had the national-political energy to increase its power; hence everybody was to be morally prohibited from doing so, and this moral coercion was codified in sacred "treaties," which were signed on the muzzles of cannon. To maintain England's political supremacy was "moral" and "legal"-respect for "international morality and the sanctity of treaties" it was called. "Observing international law," "orderly procedure in international relations," and similar political absurdities were promulgated. This was not the first time that one engaged in politics in order to put politics in legalistic wrappings. The politician who resorts to law and morality to disguise his power-position is suffering from a bad political conscience, and the politician or the state with a bad conscience is decadent. Ascendent politics is not afraid of being politics. Decadent politics passes itself off as religion, law, morality, science-in short, as anything other than Politics.

Of course, England's attempt to impose its form on the world by the simple trick of employing legalistic jargon was completely futile. Only the English population was deceived thereby, just as later with the propaganda about the invulnerability of Singapore. But on the power-currents of the world, which reflect the development of

superpersonal organisms, the jargon had no effect whatsoever.

From the original standpoint of regarding the status quo as inviolable only insofar as the English power-position was concerned, one went on to that of regarding the status quo everywhere as sacrosanct. Thus English policy, in complete distortion of English interests, was made to support the Serbian, Roumanian, and Bohemian states against the power-currents that were destined to destroy those artificial political structures.

The cost of a distorted policy must be set high. The state with a distorted policy can gain no accretion of power; thus even its military and diplomatic victories are defeats. During the third decade of the 20th century, England gradually handed over its sovereignty to America in order to continue pursuing its distorted policy, a policy devoted to the world-wide preservation of the status quo. Naturally, such an unpleasant fact was not admitted by the representatives of a certain mentality, and-naturally again-those who bore the responsibility for the transfer of power shied away from defining the new relationship precisely; for had they done so, the whole policy would have been spoilt. Nevertheless, when Baldwin announced in 1936 that he would not deploy the English fleet without consulting America beforehand, he informed the entire political world in unmistakable terms that the end of English independence had come, that English sovereignty had passed over to America. Independence means being able to act alone. Sovereignty means being answerable to nobody except oneself. Neither Independence nor Sovereignty was characteristic of the English government that started the Second World War with its declaration of war on Germany in September, 1939.

When a nation loses its sovereignty, any foreign peoples and territories it controls pass, of organic necessity, into the sphere of influence of powers that are sovereign. Thus Denmark, for example, as a result of the Second World War, was absorbed into the American world-system. This occurred quite automatically; it was simply a process of the Organic law of the Political Plenum,\* which ordains that a power-vacuum in the

\*Cf. IMPERIUM, p. 190 ff.

political world is an impossibility.

A state is not to be regarded as a power unless it can make decisions alone. Units like Switzerland are artificial structures whose *raison d'être* is to serve as buffers for the adjacent powers, and thus owe their existence to the mutual jealousy of those powers. They are anomalies that can exist only so long as their territory has no particular strategic value for the surrounding Great Powers. During the 19th century, Switzerland was exactly the opposite of a power-vacuum. It was the point-of-convergence for the powers surrounding it and was likewise penetrated by the power-currents surrounding them. The statecraft of the Swiss "politician" consisted in abstaining from all politics and in dodging all decisions. As soon as Switzerland ceased, in 1945, to be the convergence-point for the bordering powers, that very moment it became an American vassalage, without hopes, wishes, fears, or even official recognition of its status. Throughout the 19th century, the Netherlands was only an English bridgehead on the continent, first against France (until about 1865), then against Prussia-Germany. The Netherlands had no sovereignty, and its military forces stood at England's disposal, very tactless though it would have been to speak about this in England or its protectorate.

The simple, terrifying truth is that, through the diplomacy of its leaders, beginning with Lloyd George, England lost its independence, parted with its established mode of political conduct, and passed into the same vassal-like relation vis-a-vis America into which, say, Holland or Norway had passed vis-d-vis England in the 19th century. It is utterly pointless to connect the national demise of England with the complete fecklessness of parliamentary government in the Age of Absolute Politics, to attempt to construct a causal relationship out of it. For nations have a certain time-span before them, and their political phase also has an organically predetermined rhythmic course. Material factors have nothing to do with the greater movements of the power-currents within the political world. The merely ephemeral supremacy of France in the 1920's, based solely upon material factors, is the best example of this in recent times.

## ***ORIGINS OF THE WAR***

To understand the origins and the morphology of the Second World War, it is necessary to grasp the fact that England passed into the American sphere of influence not after, but before, the War. In 1942, a member of Parliament stated that it appeared to him as though England had the choice of becoming an eastern outpost of America or a Western outpost of Germany. His statement did not cover all the possibilities, and was imprecise, but it was at least based on the political fact that England's independence and sovereignty had ceased to exist.

English independence began to dwindle away from the moment in History when English policy sought to preserve rather than to enlarge the overseas Empire. Inwardly, this point was reached when England's Conservatism, which had formerly meant respect for the Past, shifted to hostility towards the Future. The establishment of American hegemony over the Island could be proved by citing documents, diplomatic agreements, overseas telephone conversations, and the like. But such things, indispensable as they are to the historian, the journalist, and the armchair politician, are all quite unimportant from a larger point of view. For the great, indisputable facts of politics themselves show sufficiently the underlying power-currents. Neither power nor its movements can be concealed. What are those facts?

The aim of Politics is to obtain power. As we have seen, an elderly organism aims expressly at maintaining the present circumference of its power, although the precondition for maintaining power is the acquisition of more power. From the actual nature of Politics (and accordingly one could also say, from the nature of superpersonal organisms and the human beings in their service), it is evident that a political unit must not recklessly enter upon a war that cannot increase its power. To the entire world it was obvious that England could not have increased its power through a war against Germany.

A war that a political unit is not capable of pushing through to victory on its own cannot increase the power of that unit. The term "political unit" is used here in the strict sense, of course, and means a unit that possesses true sovereignty and thus has the ability to decide on its own initiative the

War-Peace question; therefore this term cannot be applied to areas like Brazil and Canada. If allies are indispensable-not merely practicable and useful-for bringing the war to a victorious conclusion, then these allies will be the real power-beneficiaries of a successful war. The term “allies” describes only other, real political, units which can make the War-Peace decision on their own initiative; and here, too, areas like Colombia and South Africa are excluded. Obviously, not even with the remnants of its Empire and with its dependencies, France and Poland, could England have defeated Germany. It must be assumed that what was known to the entire world was also known to official circles in London. Nevertheless, in September, 1939, England began a war against Germany.

After the American declaration of war in December, 1941, it was officially admitted in England that the primary goal of pre-war English diplomacy had consisted in winning American military aid. What was not admitted, but was just as notoriously certain at the time, was that England’s war-declaration had been made, first, with complete and unlimited confidence in America’s assistance in every form; second, to carry out a policy that had been set in Washington and that in no way meant the continuance of English national policy.

It does not matter who begot the miscarriage called “collective security”- a mixture of legalism, naïveté, stupidity, envy, and senility. The fact is certain that only two powers in the world benefited from this policy: Russia and America. The government in London did not willingly favour Russia, but it worked, with full awareness of what it was doing, under pressure from the Washington regime, exactly according to its instructions.

The salient point here is that this fact, although satisfactorily proved by war memoirs, confessions, documents, and such, is manifest in the great decisions themselves. By way of example: If a power enters a war that it cannot win militarily, and that would not cause any power to accrue to it even if it did win a military victory, it requires no searching through history books to know that “power” is not acting in its own interests. In other words, it is a protectorate. From the standpoint of the Washington regime, the remnants of the English State were useful as a means of entangling America in a war against

Germany, according to the 1916 formula, and the English Island was valuable as an “unsinkable aircraft carrier” - in the words of the American General Staff-, likewise as a conduit for men and materiel.

In these events, the relationship of England to America did not differ essentially from that of, say, Poland or Serbia. The Washington regime had England just as much at its disposal as it did Poland and Serbia. Only the strong power in a coalition can be said to have allies; the others merely are allies. In 1948, the post-War French government officially appealed to America as the “ally of France.” This appeal requires no explanation. History consists of the ridiculous as well as the sublime.

A state that needs allies can never obtain them; it can become the ally of another, more powerful state, and fight for the increase of that power, but the state that needs to ally is the subordinate one. An alliance is never the sentimental grouping of a club, dripping with friendship, that the journalists are wont to make it out to be. On the contrary, every alliance has as its basis Protection and Obedience.\* Taken strictly, Washington and Moscow had no alliance during the Second World War, since the relationship showed obedience, to be sure, on the part of the Washington regime without protection (which is a corollary of authority) on the part of Russia. In a Protection-Obedience relationship, the protectorate is within the sphere of influence of the Protector, and therefore must obey it. However, America’s self-robbery on behalf of the Russian war-effort was thoroughly voluntary, even though it was in complete opposition to America’s national interests.

Two degrees of political stupidity are to be found in diplomacy. The first is short-range: lack of political skill, inability to carry on any negotiations successfully and to recognise short-term advantages. The second is long-range: lack of political far-sightedness, ignorance of deeper power-currents and the Ponderables of the Becoming. These two kinds of political stupidity stand in the same relation to each other as the Military stands to the Political. The Military is the weapon and the servant of the Political. Only disaster can come of military thought dominating political thought. “Win the War!”

\*Cf. IMPERIUM, p. 194, ff.

can never be an expression of Politics, for Politics is concerned with identifying the power-currents, choosing the Enemy, and weighing in relation to the national interest all happenings, inner and outer, according to how the war develops. To elevate the slogan "Win the War!" to the rank of policy, as America did during the Second World War, is the equivalent of saying that there is nothing political about the war. Military thought is simply not political thought. The permanent ambition of all military thought is to win a military victory; the corresponding ambition of all political thought is to win more power. That may or may not be implicit in a policy that seems to desire military victory at whatever cost, for one can probably adduce just as many historical examples of political and military victory occurring separately as of both coinciding neutrally. Likewise, if short-range political thinking constantly prevails over the long-range in the policy decisions of a state, the only possible result is that state's political extinction. No matter how skillfully executed its political manoeuvres, if a state has ignored the larger power-currents in puzzling out its policy, it will suffer a political defeat.

All these explanations and definitions apply only to real political units, for the microscopic destinies of such dwarfish "states" as San Marino, Monaco, and Belgium are completely determined by the Destinies of the true political units, the Great Powers, as the diplomatic concert of the 19th century liked to call them.

The Polish officials of 1939 were politically stupid in the first sense. Their country encircled by two Great Powers that had just concluded a non-aggression pact, they nonetheless chose to enter upon a war that would mean for it direct, permanent political extinction in the least desirable form: occupation and partition. Actually, it is pure charity to call the political dealings of those officials stupidity instead of treason, for shortly after the beginning of the War, they disappeared, going abroad to live on the capital they were able to amass owing to their policy. Treason and political stupidity are closely related to each other. In The Proclamation of London it is stated: "Treason is nothing but incapacity when it becomes resolute." As used here, the word "treason" refers to treasonous conduct on the part of individuals. An individual may be able to better his personal-economic circumstances through an act of treason,

but no group, no class, no organic stratum within a country is ever able to better the power-position of the country through a large-scale act of treason. In this sense, all treason is political stupidity.

The English officials of 1939 were politically stupid in the second sense in that they completely failed to identify the larger power-currents and likewise totally lacked statesmanlike feeling for the Definition of Enemy: The Enemy is the state that one can defeat and thereby gain more power. \* Thus military victory over an opponent whose defeat proves so costly that one must take in the bargain a greater loss of power elsewhere must be called political defeat.

These English officials approached diplomatic preparations for the Second World War according to the old tried and true methods. They attempted to isolate Germany, concluding wherever possible war-alliances with Germany's neighbours (the "Peace Front"). They counted on American aid, trusting in the Washington regime's assurances that it would be able to lead America to war-despite the geopolitical position of America, despite the unanimous opposition of the American people, despite the conflict between intervention and the national interests of America, and finally, despite the fundamental spiritual indifference of Americans towards even a victorious war against Europe.

The question they failed to ask was: What is the final political aim? Or in other words: How will England's power be increased through a victorious American war against Germany? Had they asked this question, it would have been obvious to them that, since England could not win this war alone, any extension of power derived from a defeat of Germany would be for the benefit of America, or some other power. The result of their failure to ask this question was England's total defeat.

The suicide-policy of the English regime in 1939-it was continued throughout the War-has various roots, and the ultimate explanation of it will keep scholars and archivists busy. The essential facts are already well-known. First, political stupidity alone is not to blame: Some members of the

\*Cf. IMPERIUM, p. 137 ff.

government consciously and deliberately pursued a policy that was not pro-English, only anti-German. Second, some members of this regime were not officially part of the government, indeed, not even part of the English organism. Third, and most importantly, with Joseph Chamberlain the rich political tradition of England had been laid to rest. The succeeding statesmen were of lesser calibre; class-warriors, like Lloyd George and MacDonald; pure egotists, capable of representing any alien interest, like Churchill and Eden; even obsessed psychopaths, like Duff Cooper. Thomas Hardy did well to introduce the Spirit of Irony into his Napoleonic drama, *The Dynasts*, in which the paradoxical and the ironic make up the favourite conversation of Clio. How ridiculous in retrospect now seem the efforts of those officials in London during the period from 1939 to 1941: They sought to drag America into the War! In reality, the War was from beginning to end a creation of the Washington regime. If it ended in victory, victory could mean only an increase in power for that regime, or some other political unit, but in no case for England. The English nation was impressed into the War as a vassal that had been made to believe it was acting independently, and it emerged from the War with every characteristic of a colony. Only the definitive, legalistic formulation was wanting. Those at the head of the London regime who were honest, if also stupid, schemed to use America for their purposes. And precisely because of their scheming, they were used to forward the ambitions of the Washington regime

## ***STRONGER POWER-CURRENTS IN THE AGE OF ABSOLUTE POLITICS***

Before the First World War, the most comprehensive single power-current in the world was the movement of power out of Europe to the colonial areas—to America, to the Far East, to the Near East, to Africa. Power is spiritual in origin. That can mean only that Europe, seen from without, from Asia, Africa, and the Americas—was in spiritual decline. England was the nation that was then custodian of the Destiny of Europe. Other European powers had far-flung possessions and interests in the world, but none other than England could boast of a World Empire. To the outer world England was the West. However, the English national Idea had been completely fulfilled in the course of the 19th century; the English nation, as distinct from the English People, was too used up and too worn out to bear the burden of the Destiny of Europe. This fact could not be concealed, and so the scales of power between the West and the Outer Forces tipped over more in favour of the Outer Forces.

Thus it was England's political weakness that ignited the Asiatic masses' anti-European will-to-annihilation. In 1900, the English Empire, including the seas on which England was indisputably supreme, covered 17/20ths of the surface of the earth. To maintain this structure in that form the entire political strength of Europe would have been needed. Joseph Chamberlain's project of an Anglo-German partnership was based upon this insight. Other political minds that had the art of empathising correctly apprehended the power-current at the time, and the whole world was familiar with the expression Kaiser Wilhelm II coined for these stirrings: The Yellow Peril. The great fact of the "Yellow Peril" dominated the political world-picture before the First World War.

Within Europe, the great power-current went from England to Germany. The lesser powers France and Austria were both in the process of dissolution, and both passed into vassalage: Austria to Germany, France to England. But already England had entered the organically inevitable stage in which power moves according to the laws of centrifugal force. Power-currents moved from England to the strongest outlying powers, to Russia in Central Asia, to Japan in China and the Pacific, and to America in the Western Hemisphere. To Germany, Japan, and

America, England gradually lost its position in world commerce, and on the seas it had to yield to the same three political units.

The metapolitical explanation for the intra-European power-current from England to Germany is simple. The decline and inevitable demise of the English Nation-Idea was part of the development of the Western Culture from the first phase of Civilisation, the Age of Economics, to the second phase, the Age of Absolute Politics. It was Destiny that England, the nation with the state-less articulation, to which the Ideas of predestination and laissez-faire had been given, to which they were instinctive, to which expansion meant a business-like plundering of the conquered territory with as little political disintegration in it as possible, was the guardian of the Western Civilisation during the 19th century. Likewise it was Destiny, and not chance, that the coming to an end of that age of liberalism, parliamentarism, economics, laissez-faire, and trade-imperialism also meant the coming to an end of England's power. The new age, the Age of Absolute Politics, in which Politics rules unconditionally over every aspect of life in the Western Civilisation, demands a different type of nation, a different Internationale,\* a different Universal-Hypothesis to fulfil the Cultural Mission of the 20th century and the centuries to come. The Prussian-German nation is that one of the Western nations whose national Idea thoroughly corresponds to the Cultural Imperative in this Age of Absolute Politics. For the solution of its tasks this Age demands the old Roman virtues: a soldierly ethos and honour-feeling, political-organisatory talent, firmness, conscientiousness, devotion to duty, will-to-power instead of will-to-plunder. Since the Prussian Idea agrees with the Spirit of the Age, power flows organically, naturally, irresistibly to the focus of this Idea.

That a general war would break out, all statesmen and political thinkers were agreed; only its form was not foreseen, nor could it have been. The natural form corresponding to the power-problems posed by the power-currents-would have been England and Germany versus Russia and Japan. Since England and Germany belonged to the same Culture and had a common Destiny, as they always shall, any war between these two states had to benefit powers outside Europe to so great an extent that

\*Cf. IMPERIUM, p. 198 ff.

neither one of them could have profited from it, and that quite independent of which won a military victory and which suffered a military defeat. Therefore, it was in the interest of each of the two, for its own well-being no less than that of the Western Culture, to undertake power-struggles only against extra-European forces.

After the War erupted into a false form, viz., into a form that in no way corresponded to the power-problems posed by the power-currents, the outward movement of power from Europe vastly accelerated.\* The European Raj in India was undermined; Japan was freed from all fetters to Europe, and left with America as its sole power-rival. America became the ruling power at sea, despite the Five-Power-Naval Treaty of 1921, under which it scuttled 750,000 tons of new shipping. That folly hardly changed anything, simply because of America's increased ability to build ships, which may be ascribed to the War, and because of the powerful spiritual impetus of the War, because of America's awakening from its century of isolation, an isolation comparable to that of a silkworm in its cocoon. After the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 and the consolidation of the Asiatic Moscow regime, Russia entered the political world as its most secure power. In Europe, France inherited the continental hegemony that England had striven to take from Germany.

Germany lost power, true; however England lost even more. It shared in a local, military victory as part of a world-coalition and paid for it with a general, political defeat. With results, England had applied the great fundamental of strategy precisely in reverse: it employed all its strength on inconsequential points while reserving as little of it as possible for the decisive point. Vis-d-vis the Coloured-Asiatic world, England was still the custodian of the Destiny of Europe, to be sure, now more enfeebled than ever, a pale shadow of the Imperialist England at the time of the Silver Jubilee of 1887. England no longer had the feeling of a Mission, no longer felt itself called upon to rule-one no longer spoke of an Empire, but of "Mandates"-, it no longer believed in itself. Even domestically England was in moral and material chaos. The War had resulted in the New Age, with its new values, and the discarding of much that was formerly

\*Cf. IMPERIUM, p.565 ff.

significant, and the old Idea of parliamentarism and laissez-faire was ineffectual in this bewildering new state of affairs. A superpersonal Idea that has fulfilled itself can evolve no further. In a healthy, organic evolution, England would have adopted the new superpersonal Idea, the new Hypothesis, and been absorbed into the new Internationale, but the catastrophic form of the First World War prevented the normal evolution. The West was not represented before the world by a powerful, firm alliance of England and Germany, militarily and politically victorious over Russia and Japan, but by a superannuated English Capitalism.

Had the War assumed the organic form, an English-German coalition against the rising Asiatic menace, it would have ended in a European victory and brought the whole planet under the influence of Europe. But in the form events took, the West lost so much of the 17/20ths of the surface of the earth it had controlled that only about 4/20ths remained subject to it.

And so the two great power-currents continued unabated, the centrifugal current from Europe to the Outer Forces and the centripetal current from England to Germany.

Power in embryonic spiritual form streamed from England to Germany. All Europe looked increasingly to the Prussian Ethos for guidance. This idea gained irresistibly in moral force, strength of its Inner Imperative, and Cultural prestige. Within Europe, another, lesser power-current flowed, from France to Italy, this time actual political power. The source of this current was the Genius of a single man, Mussolini. He effected the transformation of Italy by infusing it with the Prussian-German Socialist Ethos. Since the petty-nationalism of the 19th century had not yet been overcome in Italy, as elsewhere, Mussolini was forced to associate his new State-building Ethos with the name of Imperial Rome. Italy and the entire Western Civilisation have no inward connexion with Imperial Rome, nor did it stand in any relation to them. Therefore, it may not be amiss if the true inspiration of his Genius is mentioned here. Mussolini himself designated Nietzsche and Sorel as the two teachers who had inspired him. Both were opponents of laissez-faire, both were anti-parliamentary, anti-liberal, anti-democratic; both had strong authoritarian leanings.

The centrifugal power-current from Europe outwards flowed more strongly to Japan, Russia, and America. Weak heads in England looked disconsolately to the American colony, symbolised in its spiritual endowments by its politically moronic leaders, like Wilson, Lansing, and Harding, and hoped for spiritual leadership and material support from it. That kept on even after Americans demonstrated loudly and clearly that they were quite indifferent to European politics, as their Congress showed when it refused to ratify the Treaty of Versailles and thereby rejected membership for America in the League of Nations. In consequence of the longing for American domination on the part of a certain group of Europeans-especially numerous and influential on the Island-, the totally altered American leadership that resulted from the American Revolution of 1933 found an open road to the financial-diplomatic conquest of France, England, and the Netherlands. Thenceforth America intervened in all intra-European affairs, always with the intention of promoting the same negative policy, meaning “collective security,” which can be called both anti-German and pro-Bolshevist.

Here are outlined the epochal events of the Interbellum Period  
**1919-1939:**

**1919**

**Versailles dictate;** French hegemony established in Europe.  
Spengler's work *Preussentum and Sozialismus* appears.

**1921**

Mussolini emerges in History; the first open revolt in Europe of Socialism against Capitalism, of Authority against Money, of Faith against Criticism, of Discipline against Laissez-faire, of Duty-Consciousness against the ideology of “happiness,” of Hierarchy against Equality, of the Will-to-Power against the Will-to-Plunder.

**1923**

France invades Germany; high point of France's power in its domination of continental Europe.

## 1931

Collapse of the international financial structure of Capitalism; economic catastrophe resulting therefrom; economic depression throughout the Western Civilisation.

Japan successfully raises its claim to power-monopoly in the Far East with its annexation of Manchuria.

## 1933:

On 30th January: The **European Revolution**. Revolt of the Spirit of Authority against Money, of Socialism against Capitalism; overthrow of the 1918 pseudo-victory of Capitalism.

The **American Revolution of 1933**.\* Assumption of power by the Jewish entity. Lasting transformation of American policy through abandonment of nationalistic isolationism and the introduction of an internationalist policy. Formation of the Jewish-American Symbiosis begins.

End of French hegemony over Europe.

## 1936:

**Four-Power Pact**: England, France, Germany, and Italy forever renounce waging war among themselves; the first collective attempt to form an organically determined European Imperium.

**August-September**: America successfully intervenes to prevent the ratification of the Four-Power Pact, to abort the European Imperium and to make possible a second World War-this in order to destroy the power of Europe and to forestall the rise throughout the world of Authoritarian Socialism to the detriment of Finance Capitalism.

This is the year in which the English Prime Minister Baldwin made his statement about the dependence of England and France on America.

\*Cf. IMPERIUM, p. 993 ff.

### 1938:

**Munich Agreement** for the pacification of Europe. The Four Powers act together to end Czech domination over Germans, Slovaks, Hungarians, and Ruthenians. Last of the great European efforts to overcome petty-statism and to establish a provisional European Imperium without an intra-European war.

American meddling in England succeeds in annulling the mutual English-German renunciation of war and forces a reorientation of English policy towards setting up a warfront against Germany.

### 1939

Formation of the “peace front,” a war-alliance of the Americanised England against Germany as diplomatic preparation for the Second World War.

**September:** Final success of the American policy. Outbreak of the English War against Socialism and the Reawakening of Authority.

### 1941

Attack on Russia by the provisional European Imperium. The War gains a second aspect.

**November:** The Washington regime presents its war-ultimatum to Japan as a means of provoking a Japanese attack that would facilitate the intervention of America in the European War against the wishes of the American populace.

**December:** Japan responds militarily to the ultimatum, whereby the Washington regime knows in advance the time and place of the attack. Complete destruction of the American fleet at Pearl Harbor by Japan-this because the Washington regime deliberately delays every defensive measure. America declares war on Europe; Europe becomes the chief enemy and is designated the main front The War expands into and shows itself from a third aspect.

### ***THE THREE ASPECTS OF THE WAR***

In this Age of Absolute Politics, Culture provides the motivation for Great Wars. From 1000 to 1500 A.D., the inner-Politics of Europe was determined by fealty. The motivation for the intra-European power-struggles during the centuries up to the Congress of Vienna was religious and dynastic; during the 19th century, it was nationalistic and economic. After 1900, the whole planet became increasingly active politically. The decline of England's power awakened in the Coloured World the illusion that the entire Western Culture found itself in a state of decreasing power. That was false indeed, but the outbreak of the First World War and the world-wide verdict against Western Power and Western prestige seemed to confirm this misconception. Since the scale of political activity has become planetary, only two spiritual possibilities for a conflict remain: first, the Western Idea of world-rule (and for over two centuries, directly or indirectly, the West actually did rule the greater part of the world); and, second, the Outer Revolt, which is simply the negation of this Western Idea. Manifestations of the Western world-empire Idea were: the British Empire, and all other European overseas-empires; the Americans' conquest of their continent, American imperialism in the Pacific; Germany's enduring desire for expansion into the Slavic areas and its pushing back of the eastern frontier of the Western Culture during the millennium 1000-2000. Manifestations of the Outer Revolt were: the Chinese Opium War against England; the Indian Mutinies of 1857 and 1947; the Zulu Wars; the Mexican revolt against Maximilian, the Mexican revolution of 1910; the Chinese revolution of 1911; the Philippine insurrections against Spain and the latter Philippine uprisings against America, 1900-1946; the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917; the Japanese War Against the West, 1941-1945.

Thus the power-front is seen to be based on Culture as the dominant spiritual front in world politics, and all other politics, be it primitive, local, or personal, is overshadowed by this tremendous disjunction.\* On the planet there is only one High Culture in the process of fulfilment, the Western Culture. Outside that Culture, there are only remnants of dead Cultures, whose peoples have once again become primitive, fellaheen, like

\*Cf. IMPERIUM, p. 234 ff.

the Chinese, Hindu, and Islamic; savages, like the African and American aborigines; barbarians, like the Russians and certain tribes in Central Asia. All peoples living outside the West have perforce taken over many Western customs and characteristics, since the uniquely powerful imperialism of the West lays claim to the whole earth, and its performance has forced the people of the world to acknowledge the undeniable intellectual and material superiority of Europe. This does not mean, however, that “Westernisation” can ever be anything other than superficial. When the Western Culture says Yes to its Imperialistic urge, it naturally calls forth a reaction among those who do not belong to it. Their organic response is an equally passionate No. When they take up Western methods, it is only to use them against the West: If spears cannot defeat Whites, let us learn how to build factories and produce machines!

From a Cultural standpoint, the Second World War consisted of three organically separable wars. The first of these was an intra-Cultural war: England versus Germany. In the terminology of Ideas, it was a war of Capitalism versus Socialism. But as these two great outlooks have an organic relation to each other, it was actually a struggle between the Past and the Future, for Capitalism belongs to the Past, Authoritarian Ethical Socialism to the Future. Since the Past can never overcome the fact of the Future, except in semblance, this intra-Cultural war had only two possible results: Victory of the Idea of Ethical Socialism or Chaos within the entire Western organism.

The second of these wars began with the attack by the provisional European Imperium on Russia, the leader of the Outer Revolt against Western world-rule. The natural, organic form of this war would have been Europe with all its colonies—America, South Africa, Australia, Argentina, et al. against Russia and the other Asiatic powers. Thus it would have ended in the political destruction of the Asiatic powers, including Russia, and in the establishment of Western world-rule in a stricter, more absolute form than the Western Empire, let us say, of 1900.

The third of these wars was related to the second: the American war against Japan, like the European war against Russia, was a war of the West against the Outer Revolt. In this war, America’s role was that of a Western colony, and its victory over Japan was

also a victory for Europe, just as a victory of Europe over Russia would have been a victory also for America.

The first, the intra-European war, very quickly lost the character of such, since England's total war-effort was brought ever more under the direction of the Washington regime, and England, likewise its remaining overseas possessions, was occupied by American troops. Thereby the Washington regime wanted to ensure that England would not attempt to bail out of the War. With the American occupation of England and the remnants of its Empire, the intra-European war of England versus Germany ended. From then on, there were two organically dissociated wars: Europe versus the American-Russian coalition and Japan versus America. Wherever the English military forces fought on, it was only for the extension of Russian or American power, for now there was no longer an English political unit whose power could be extended by a victory.

Thus America became involved in all three organically dissociated wars. Its participation in the Second World War was a struggle for the victory of the West, in regard to Japan, and simultaneously for the defeat of the West, in regard to Russia. America fought for an Asiatic victory and against an Asiatic victory.

The outcome of the second organically dissociated war, that of the European Imperium versus Russia, was complicated by America's policy vis-d-vis Russia. At the beginning of the War, Russia was prepared to conclude peace with Europe, but the Washington regime, in accordance with its purely negative, anti-American policy of defeating Authoritarian Socialist Europe at any cost, even that of national suicide, promised to give economic support to Russia's entire war-effort, so long as it would stay in the War, promised to share with it in a Russian-American world-condominium in the post-War period. America's conduct vis-d-vis Russia has never had its like in world-history. During the War, America deprived its own armed forces of huge masses of war materiel, which it delivered to Russia without charge and without any terms of repayment. America supplied Russia with: 14,795 aircraft, 7,056 tanks, 51,503 jeeps, 35,170 motorcycles, 8,071 tractors, 375,883

lorries; other machinery valued at 1,078 million dollars; 107 million yards of cotton products and 62 million yards of woolen products. (This listing is incomplete and does not include ships, foodstuffs, railway materiel, etc.) At American orders huge quantities of armaments and other vital equipment were withdrawn from the English Army and delivered to Russia, including 5,031 tanks and 6,778 aircraft. Deliveries of raw materials reached the value of 39,000,000 pounds. The American viceroy in England, Churchill, confessed in his memoirs that one of his diplomatic problems lay in persuading the Russians to accept these gifts without suspicion and with good will. Throughout the War, the Communist underground movements the whole world over received from North America weapons, munitions, explosives, clothing, medicines, foodstuffs, and financial support-this in Europe, in Serbia, and in the Far East, especially Celebes, Sumatra, Indochina, and China.

It is clear-once again from the simple Organic Laws of Politics-that the Washington regime in no way pursued an American policy. A nationalist policy can never be negative. When a nation's policy becomes negative, something has prevailed over the national interest. All during the War, American propaganda was governed by a single great imperative: Destroy Germany! In the background was the weak echo: Destroy Japan! The propaganda left no doubt, however, about the relative importance of these two negatives.

Without America's intervention as the all-sacrificing lackey of Russia, the war of Europe versus Russia could have ended in two ways: political destruction of Russia by Europe, or negotiated peace. After the American war-entry, the second possibility was eliminated. In its main aspect, the Second World War was no longer a war of Europe against Russia, but a fortiori a war of America against Europe, and this war had only one possible outcome; political destruction of Europe. The innumerable Russian troops fought practically under the same command as the troops of America and its satellites. Faced with this coalition of powers, the European Imperium had no choice but to sue for peace. The American formula of "unconditional surrender" made that impossible, however.

The third of the organically dissociated wars, Japan versus America, had three possible results: political destruction of

Japan, negotiated peace, or expulsion of the American power from the Pacific. A political destruction of America was, and is, impossible, owing to America's geographic breadth and position. Only America's overseas-empire, in the Mediterranean, in Africa, in the Persian Gulf, in the Pacific, and in the Caribbean can be destroyed, not however the American political basis, autarkic and inaccessible as it is to large armies from another continent.

## ***RESULTS OF THE WAR***

After the American occupation of England, there was no longer a war between England and Germany, for the ability to wage war against an enemy of one's own choosing is the mark of a sovereign power, and England's sovereignty had ceased to exist.\* But there was still a spiritual-ethical "war" between the English idea of Capitalism and the Prussian-German idea of Ethical Socialism. Since, in this Age of Absolute Politics, Politics takes unto itself every aspect of Life, this spiritual-ethical conflict had to be decided by the politico-military conflict. Thus the 19th century idea of Capitalism won a pseudo-victory over the 20th century Idea of Ethical Socialism, and that meant Chaos throughout the Western Civilisation. The Past cannot win an enduring victory over the Future. The later Stuarts and Bourbons learnt that, so did Metternich. It is an old lesson that must ever be learnt anew.

In its spiritual ethical aspect, the War, since it did not destroy Europe, came to its sole possible result: It weakened the Idea of Capitalism and, in the same tempo, strengthened the Idea of Socialism, by giving Socialism a victory at least in the field of Technics. After the War, the only possible way of governing and maintaining order in every Western country was through complete political regulation of economic life, in other words, through the application of Socialist techniques. Everywhere laissez-faire is dead, both nationally and internationally, except in the very highest economic sphere, that of bank and bourse. For the time being, that domain is spared state-intervention, simply because it is where the governments are chosen. Behind the parliamentary puppets stands the Master of Money.

The second war, that of the provisional European Imperium against Russia, yielded military and political victory to Russia. That politico-military victory, based on American aid, given with a largesse unique in world-history, made the Russian Empire into the world's foremost power, owing to its geopolitical position and to the poor quality of its only remaining opponent, notwithstanding that this opponent dominated a greater part of the planet than it did.

\*Cf. IMPERIUM, p. 183 ff.

England's pseudo-victory was owing solely to the Washington regime's policy of sacrificing American and European interests to Russian interests. It is a fact of great importance that the Washington regime quite consciously and deliberately created the present Russian Empire as an instrument of its absolute anti-German, anti-European policy.

The third war, that of America versus Japan, was, from a Cultural standpoint, a war of Western Civilisation against the Outer Revolt. To superficial observers, its outcome seemed to be political annihilation of Japan. Yet this war ended in a negotiated peace. The most important fact about Japanese history, society, and politics is that Japan contains a nation bearing stratum, a level of the population that feels itself charged with an organic Mission. America did nothing to weaken this stratum's feeling of a Mission. Through peace negotiations, the Japanese nation, state, aristocracy, and other institutions were preserved; the Japanese Army was disbanded honourably, and the Emperor, the Japanese national Idea, suffered no Oriental loss-of-face. An American army occupied the Island, and even the commander of that army spoke openly on behalf of an early termination of the occupation. This war resulted in a military and psychological victory for America, and at least for the moment, the West reasserted itself in a part of the world where it had been in retreat for 75 years. At the time, however, in *IMPERIUM*, I called Japan a political victor of the Second World War because its outer Mission, the expulsion of the West from Asia, had been accomplished, and its inner independence, though temporarily suspended, had not been really abolished.\* The Washington regime, which had but little interest in the matter of Japan, permitted its occupation forces considerable autonomy. The leaders of those forces had no idea at all of the types of power and of the overcurrents of power in the world. Their notion of exploiting the victory was on a journalistic plane. They regarded the main effort of the occupation not as political but as moral. In all seriousness, this leadership wanted to "educate" the Japanese nation, as though it were a child, and teach it "democracy."

\*Cf. *IMPERIUM*, p. 587 ff.

The extent to which the military victory of America over Japan was also a political victory over Japan for the entire Western Civilisation is thus very slight indeed. regime's policy of reconstructing Japan undermined the greatest part of the victory. Its surrender of China and Manchuria to Russia, the leader of the Outer Revolt against Western Civilisation, undermined it even further. The last remaining step, the restoration of Japanese sovereignty, is only a matter of time, for here the initiative lies with Japan. So long as the Japanese monarchy and the Japanese nation-bearing stratum, with its feeling of a Mission, survive unimpaired, a revival of Japanese sovereignty, Japanese militarism, and the Japanese Empire against America is certain.

The Outer Revolt against the West was only locally contained by America's military victory over Japan. In other parts of the Far East, the revolts were successful. The Chinese, Malays, Indonesians, and the primitive denizens of the Philippines expelled their Western masters.

In the metapolitical sense, the Western Civilisation lost the War against Japan, despite the local, purely military victory of the Americans.

## ***THE POWER PROBLEMS OF THE WAR***

The two great power-currents in the world before the Second World War were the centrifugal flow of power from the Western organism to the Outer Forces (especially away from the Continental European nations, since the obsolescence of the English national Idea led to the power-current England-America), and, then, the centripetal flow of the attributes that alone make power vital and lasting, from England to Prussia-Germany.

To set forth these two power-currents as power problems - from the European standpoint -, the first problem was: How is European world-hegemony to be restored? And the second was: How is Europe to be imbued with Ethical Socialism, the only viable world-outlook and nation-building force in this Age of Absolute Politics?

These two problems were the actual issues of the Second World War. Men and governments cannot create power-problems; rather, these arise when superpersonal organisms collide with existing power-currents. Both lie far beyond any human control. In navigating the seas, one can sail with the currents, or try to sail against them, but one cannot produce new currents. Thus it is with the Organic: The possibilities are given, and are not subject to alteration or dispute. One can either accept an organic possibility, or abandon oneself to disappointment, disease, and chaos. If a possibility is frustrated long enough, it will one day no longer be there to accept, for the Organic always has a duration of existence.

The more important of the two power-problems in determining the form of the War was the first: The European Imperium voluntarily decided to give the problem of Europe's world-position precedence over that of Europe's internal constitution. It was hoped that solution of the latter problem could be postponed until a time when it could be resolved more easily and without endangering the European world-position. This decision not to occupy the English Island was the personal decision of the Hero who was custodian of the Destiny of Europe during the Second World War. From the time of that decision on, from June, 1941, the European Imperium's invasion of Asiatic Russia was the real war. Europe expended its energy mainly on winning that war, wherein a victory would

have secured the Destiny of the European Culture for the coming century.

Now the War could not take its natural course, that corresponding to the organic power-problems, viz., England and Germany versus Russia and Japan, with America and the other colonies either neutral or allied to Europe. Instead, it was forced by the Washington regime into a distorted form: England and the European colonies attacked Europe from behind while it was struggling for its Cultural-political-economic-social-military-technical survival.

Since the form of the War was unnatural, having stood in no relation to the organic power-problem posed by the powercurrents, its results were unnatural, too. As the Organic Laws of Politics show, such a distortion as the Second World War can result only from the intrusion of a Culturally-alien group into the political affairs of the host-organism. The Second World War was the most monstrous manifestation of Culture-distortion in the history of High Culture.

The Culturally-alien group that conjured up the War could symbolize its triumph over the West through the infamous “tribunal” at Nuremberg, a year after the War, but its victory was as unnatural as the War itself. Nor can a Culturally-alien group occupy any kind of lasting political position within the host-organism. It summons forth its own opposition, Cultural antibodies, through which its power will eventually be dissolved. Power, to be perfect, must be openly exercised; however, a Culturally-alien group can hold power only so long as it works through others, through individuals, organisations, classes, governments, and groups of every sort that it manipulates to direct their forces temporarily into its own channels.

Likewise, Russia’s ascendancy as a result of the War is unnatural. It does not bring organic actualities to expression, but contradicts them. Europe possesses the true sources of power, which are spiritual-ethical; the Russian Empire is only a formless grouping of barbaric tribes with a purely negative mission. In this, its Imperial Age, Europe is simply not ripe for a long domination by barbarians.

\*Cf. IMPERIUM, p. 535 ff.

Thus it was a war of spent energies and lost power, of territory lost and cities destroyed, a waste of life, wealth, effort - a waste everywhere but in the realm of Heroism and the Spirit. In the spiritual domain, the great process of forming the Imperium continued unrelentingly, and one saw the curious spectacle of the Washington regime's puppets, the Churchill's, taking up the aim of the Hero they had helped Washington and Moscow to destroy. They began to talk about the "unification of Europe." A few months before they hated the Europe that had been united - indissolubly united through blood spilt on the tundras and steppes, in the forests of Russia, and to destroy it they were prepared to betray their European Fatherlands and their own souls. After the War, the hottest-headed of the puppets shrieked in horror, in the style of his war-incitements, that Asia now stood at the Elbe. When the frontier was at the Volga and in the Caucasus, he did everything in his power, little as that was, to bring this frontier into the middle of Europe.

The Heroic world stands infinitely above the economic-technical disjunction utile-inutile. Nor is the military test of "victory" valid in the realm of Heroism. It was Cromwell who inspired generations of leaders long after his death and subsequent disgrace, not the later Stuarts who had caused his body to be dismembered by wild horses. It was Napoleon who inspired a whole century of leaders after him, not Louis XVIII, nor Metternich, nor Talleyrand. About 1840, Napoleon triumphed, he whose name one could praise in Europe twenty years before only at one's peril. Napoleon's Idea conquered the spiritual-political realm, his personality the Heroic realm. Who would reproach him now with the fact of the lost battles of Leipzig and Waterloo?

So it shall be with the Hero of the Second World War. He represented a new ethical type that will inspire and inwardly form all coming leaders of significance of the West. The bewailing of his "mistakes" after the Second World War was simply contemptible. Every journalist and every braggart knows better than the great man - they would not have made this mistake or that. Indeed, they would never have been in the place to do anything at all!

Heroism is and can never be wasted. So long as men survive a Hero, they will be influenced by him and his legend. He lives on

in spirit, and continues to act upon the world of facts and deeds.

## ***THE AMERICAN OCCUPATION OF EUROPE***

After the Second World War, the opponents of the Hero of that War were still dominated by his compelling personality. Either they took up his ideas and declared them their own, or they continued to fight against him. Of a new Idea, independent of that Hero, there was not a trace. This can be explained by the issues in world politics being yet the same as those of the Second World War, for the War solved no power-problems, having neither followed nor changed an organic power-current.

During the War, some Europeans entertained the comfortable illusion that the Washington regime was hostile only to certain states in Europe, certain Culture-peoples in Europe, certain ideas in Europe. Nevertheless, the Washington regime's real enemy was Europe, which means, above all, the Culture-bearing stratum of Europe, that invisible stratum of the population that by virtue of its sensitivity to Cultural Imperatives is the custodian of the Destiny of the Western Civilisation, and will remain so, too, until the end of Western history. This stratum of approximately 250,000 souls is distributed throughout Europe, but, naturally, it is concentrated primarily in Germany, which can be attributed to the organic fact that the Prussian-German nation is destined to actualise the European Imperium. Since this stratum is invisible - who could have looked at Rembrandt, Goethe, Napoleon, Bismarck in the cradle, and seen what they were to become? - the Washington regime began its post-War task of liquidating this stratum by attempting to kill all of those who had already proved themselves an elite.

Herod sought to kill the Christ Child by slaughtering all male infants in Bethlehem of two years and under. To the invaders it did not seem feasible to take over this technique in its entirety. Yet they believed that if they extinguished the elite of the past they would ipso facto prevent the formation of a new elite, that of the Future. Hence they proceeded with a monstrous Black Mass of scaffold-trials, unique in History, that were intended to kill off everybody whose war-service in a particular field had been of outstanding merit. These Black Masses, variously called "Entnazifizierung," "epuration," and the like, in various countries, were performed in all parts of Europe at behest of the Washington regime. Even in such countries as

Sweden and Switzerland, which had not participated in the War, the Washington regime had certain people hunted down, “tried,” and killed. By these methods, thousands of the best minds were liquidated. But that was still not enough. Huge masses of human beings had to be butchered. In a certain way, at least, Herod’s method had to be applied.

Accordingly, “laws” were devised for ex post facto application: Everyone who in the past believed in the establishment of a European Imperium, and worked for it, was a “criminal.” The “penalty” for this “crime” of obeying the Historical Imperative of our Age could not be simple imprisonment for a definite term; that would be impossible. Murder millions by steel and by cord? No, millions of individuals had to be ruined for the rest of their lives.

Hundreds of thousands of French, Walloon, Flemish, Dutch, Danish, and Norwegian soldiers returned home after years of battle against Asiatic Russia and found themselves accused of “treason” and condemned to death or sentenced to years of imprisonment in concentration camps. (In Belgium alone, the Americans incarcerated 400,000 from a population of 8 million.) For under the Neuordnung of the Washington regime, the struggle of Europeans for the survival and power of Europe was designated “treason.” Thus an American colonel, acting as a “judge” in a “war-crimes trial,” told a European soldier who had carried out the orders of his superior officers: “You could have deserted! “

After being released from the overflowing concentration camps, the “criminals” were robbed of every possession, sentenced to heavy fines, deprived of all civil rights, which made it nearly impossible for them to earn their livelihood, and forbidden to perform any but the meanest sorts of labour.

The American High Command fiercely pursued a policy that brought about a uniform impoverishment of the Europeans to whom it contemptuously referred as “the indigenous population.” Years after the War, the High Command deliberately blew up European factories, or dismantled and shipped them to Asiatic Russia; chopped down giant forests in Germany that had provided timber years before Columbus discovered America; confiscated large sections of European cities and forbade

Europeans to enter them; drove from their homes, cruelly and unexpectedly, hundreds of thousands of European families so as to make room for those of the occupation soldiers of America and her satellite-regimes; set a daily ration of 1,000 calories for adults, which corresponds to only one third of the amount needed to sustain human life; forbade its occupation soldiers to give or sell Europeans food and clothing, even to speak to them. And, finally, it proclaimed to Europe that the Americans had come as a Herrenvolk, possessed of great understanding for political realities and morality, to liberate “Europeans” and “educate” them up to True Democracy.

Although the American occupation used the slogan “democracy,” it did not make even a pretence of introducing 19th century democratic forms. The press, political parties, every kind of gathering, every move - everything required a “Licence.” This was the substitution of a negative, mechanical Führerprinzip for the natural, organic Authoritarian State founded upon the inwardly imperative principles of Ethical Socialism, which is the destined state-form of Europe in this Age of Absolute Politics. This was the tyranny of capitalist liberalism, using the mere methods of the European state-form without understanding their spiritual content. The “freedom of speech” America brought to Europe by conquest is best shown through the example of Bevin, the English Foreign Secretary. In 1948, he spoke publicly of “financial servitude to Wall Street,” and within one day, was forced to beg its pardon in public.

The American occupation brought into the open a whole stratum of the European population that had hitherto never been recognised as a unit. In Germany the expression “der Deutsche Michel” has long been current. It pertains to the type with anti-national instincts, an enthusiast for talk instead of action, likewise for anti-social individualism, laissez-faire, and parliamentarism, a person who cringes to aliens, a natural, instinctive, organic, traitor. This stratum of the German population worked systematically but quite instinctively, in two World Wars, for a victory of the enemy. Like the Culturebearing stratum, the Michel-type is distributed Europe-wide. In every European country, America has an inner-America, the Michel-stratum, as an advertisement for its political success, and pseudo-Europeans it uses to implement its policies locally. Such Europeans are called “churchills,” after the best known member

of their species.

Finally, the American occupation of Europe demonstrated irrefutably that England's policy of "isolation" from the rest of Europe, from the European family of nations to which it belongs, was a grotesque anachronism in the 20th century, the Age of Absolute Politics, of the struggle for control of the planet, wherein only Great Powers with a large geographic basis can take part, not tiny islands situated close to the Continent. In the Age of Economics and Nationalism, the policy of Isolation, likewise the "Balance of Power" idea, was justified. Much that was right, correct, natural, and justified in the 19th century is in the 20th century merely past history. In that century, it was possible for England alone to conquer and hold in check India. In this century, that no longer lies within the realm of possibility. In that century, sea-power could be employed decisively. In this century, sea-power is no longer decisive, since the entire hinterland is politically active.

It was tragic that England held so long to the isolation doctrine, for that made possible Washington's policy of a second fratricidal war. The isolation-idea thus contributed its part to the loss of Europe's world-hegemony. However, this idea survives today only in the sclerotic brains of Culturally-backward old men. What is decisive is the fact of England's passing, together with all other European countries and peoples, into the common status of subjection to America, not the feigning of unimpaired English sovereignty by a certain stratum left over from the past. England's community of Destiny with the rest of Europe is now patent to everybody in the world, is everywhere binding, and can be denied neither in the individual nor for one moment.

### ***THE DEMISE OF THE WESTERN NATIONS***

In one of its results, the Second World War showed the entire world that the Age of Nationalism is forever past. Precisely those nations whose enmities had reached such fantastic proportions in that Age ceased to exist as political units. There is no relation of cause and effect here, for the Nation-Ideas have a certain life-span, just as every aspect of a Culture's existence, and every Western nation died when it was organically its turn. The last phase of a Nation-Idea is its political one.\*

The oldest of the Western nations, the first to have attained the political phase of its development, was Spain. Its great period began with the unification of Aragon and Castile and reached its summit with the world-ascendancy of Charles V. The last act of Spanish history was the revolt against Napoleon, and even then the resistance was more primitive and racial than national. After that period, Spain no longer played an independent role in Western history, though, of course, it retained a common Destiny with the Western Culture, and was conscious of it. France entered its political phase in the time of Richelieu and appeared in Western history as a spiritually independent people until the turn of the century. The last affirmative act of this nation manifested itself in 1914 at the Marne. Austria was a Great Power from the time of Charles V until 1900, although in the course of the 19th century it became less and less sure of itself. The linguistic form of the Nation-Idea in the Western Culture, which dominated that century, weakened the Austrian Idea to the point where Austria's last independent political act - the ultimatum to Serbia in June, 1914 - was dictated more by pride than politics.

England's political history as a nation extends from Cromwell to Joseph Chamberlain. Before Cromwell, there was no WorldIdea in England, and after Chamberlain, an Idea no longer existed, could no longer exist, for national extinction, like every other organic phenomenon, is irreversible. Between 1600 and 1900, England's power increased to the extent that in 1900 it controlled by its fleets and armies 17/20ths of the surface of the earth. Spiritually, the entire Western Civilisation - particularly from 1750 onwards - was Anglicised. The

\*Cf. IMPERIUM, pp. 328353.

thought- and action-systems of 19th century were English: Marxism arose on the basis of English capitalist economics; Darwinism reflects the English individualistic-competitive world-outlook; Materialism, Legalism, Capitalism, Social-Ethics - all are of English provenance, and they were the foundations of the 19th century.

The Boer War occurred at the turning-point. At that time, wrote the Englishman Christopher Sykes, England suddenly became the most hated country in Europe. All at once, the spiritual centre-of-gravity shifted: Darwinism succumbed to the Mutation Theory of de Vries, the class-warfare of Marx to the organic State-Socialism of Bismarck, social-ethics to Political Ethics, Sensualist philosophy to the idealist, laissez-faire to state-intervention in the economy, Liberalism to the precursors of the Reawakening of Authority, pacifism to the reassertion of martial virtues, and daydreams of an eternal peace were shattered in the global arena of the Age of Absolute Politics.

This was the end of the intellectual-spiritual Anglicisation of Europe - but not of America, for colonies have their own organic rhythm, as the History of High Culture shows, and all colonies are perforce Culturally-retarded. And it was the beginning of the new Nation-Idea of the West: the entire Culture itself constituted as a Nation, i.e., as an Imperium.

As nations, Germany and Italy were destined by the advent of the new Age, namely that of Absolute Politics, to be stifled before they had yet lived through the mature political phase of their existence. Unlike France, Spain, Austria, and England, however, these two nations are inwardly alive, i.e., their Nation-Idea, their National Mission, is not fulfilled.

Spain fulfilled itself before the Age of Nationalism, France and Austria during that Age, England and the Age of Nationalism unfolded concurrently, and Germany and Italy must fulfil themselves after the Age of Nationalism. Thus these two nations will not fulfil themselves in a nationalistic form in the old sense of the word. They will fulfil themselves as the custodians of the Destiny of all Europe, and the new Nation-Idea of Culture-as-Nation will be the instrument of their fulfillment

As political units, of course, Germany and Italy are dead. It lies beyond all possibility that one or the other could ever

regain its sovereignty except as part of a sovereign Europe. Both stand in the shadow of America and Russia, which falls over all Europe. However, the German and Italian peoples possess the instincts that alone guarantee a role in History. The three great instincts upon which all power is based are: the absolute will to self-preservation, to procreation, and to increasing power. The first and last instincts directly describe superpersonal organisms, the second only indirectly through the human beings that compose the body of the higher organism. A nation that welcomes foreign troops is no longer fit to live - such a thing is rendered impossible by the absolute instinct for self-preservation, which excludes submission to any other organism, whether "friend" or "foe." A nation in numerical decline is moribund: the size of the population is the result of the National Mission. A nation that no longer strives for power and possessions is dying, and the actual renunciation of power - even by traitorous churchills - means the nation is dead, for a living nation simply does not surrender its power.

The great nation-forming Ethic in this stage of European history is the Prussian-German Idea of Ethical Socialism. Only this living, wordless Idea can banish the overshadowing extraEuropean powers, form the European Imperium, and lead the West to the fulfillment of its World-Mission. Imbued with the new Ethic and free of petty-statist 19th century nationalism, the European nations will climb out of the abyss as a unity, or they will never climb out at all.

Germany is the only surviving nation of Europe that contains formative possibilities, and so it has become identical with the West. Since the Destiny of Europe is at once that of the Imperium, which can take only an Authoritarian Socialist form, Prussia-Germany is the custodian of the Destiny of all Europe. This is an organic fact, and it is wholly independent of human logic or wishes. Destiny is at work in what exists, not what disgruntled old men wish existed.

This relationship of Germany to Europe was confirmed by the Second World War. While the War continued, there was power based in Europe. The very moment the European phase of the War ceased, there was no longer any power in Europe, all power-decisions being made in Washington and Moscow or with their permission.

The German resistance to the American Russian invasion was no 19th century nationalism, since the whole Culture-bearing stratum in Europe took part in this struggle and troops for the battles came not only from German-speaking territories, but voluntarily from every other part of Europe as well.

Words that in the 19th century described Nation-Ideas, describe in the 20th century only geographic areas. Today the words German, Spanish, English, Italian, French describe only languages and territories, but no longer peoples, nations, political units or superpersonal Ideas. Since a mysterious force inheres in the words when they are used polemically, a policy for European Liberation that would attain success will not use the geographic and linguistic words, England, France, Italy, Spain, Germany in a political sense, but will use the word Europe alone.

The advance of History has destroyed the old significance of these words, and a dynamic policy needs its own terminology. Today 19th century nationalists are the instruments of the occupying forces, which follow the old maxim: Divide et impera. What European would dare speak openly in favour of the American occupation of Europe? What European would declare himself against Europe's organic Unification, against its resurrection as a sovereign unit of Culture-State-Nation-PeopleRace?

Using the old appellations of nationality, one can say without paradoxical intent that in the 20th century an Englishman, an Italian, a Spaniard is a German. In this century, it is of scant importance what language a European speaks and in what geographic area he was brought up. Of importance only is the spirituality that permeates his inner life. Europe's churchills and toynbees prove that it is possible for Americans to be born and raised in Europe. The example of Mussolini shows that an ethical Prussian can be born and raised in the Romagna, and the examples of Ezra Pound, William Joyce, Robert Best, Douglas Chandler, and others show that Europeans can be born or raised in America.

In this century the idea of vertical race is dead. We can now view race only in horizontal terms-the race one feels in oneself is everything, the

anatomic-geographic group to which one belongs means nothing.\* In this stage of our Cultural development, the principle of individuality reasserts itself, as it asserted itself in the earliest days of the Gothic. During the dark age of Materialism, it was believed that heredity and environment were everything; with the decline of Materialism the human Soul regains its former dignity. Everyone must now openly admit that the engrafting of the outworn nonsense of the vertical race notion onto the glorious European Resurgence of Authority brought about by the European Revolution of 1933 was an enormous tragedy - all the more so since the coupling of these two ideas was in no way necessary or even logical.

In the Classical Culture, any man who was ethically equal to the Inner Imperative of Roman spirituality could rightly say: "Cuius Romanus sum. " In this, our Western Culture is somewhat akin to the Classical. Our touchstone of comradeship and belonging is spiritual-ethical, not the old one of birth-place, cephalic-index, eye-colour. In the 20th century, the century of elective affinities, materialistic tests are pure stupidity.

One last word on the relation of Germany to Europe. The adoption of the German formative-ethic of Authoritarian Socialism by all Europe means, of course, the automatic disappearance of Germany as a petty-state. The Anglicising of Europe in the 19th century did not mean the Europeanising of England, for the 19th century was the age of petty-nationalism. However, with the coming to an end of that age, the ethical Germanisation of Europe is simultaneously the Europeanisation of Germany. In Germany, as elsewhere, petty-statism is dead. Europe will have a Prussian-ethical Future, or none at all. Either Authoritarian Socialism will win its victory and liberate Europe from its enemies, or else Europe will be reduced permanently to Chinese conditions. Either Europe will unite in this Ethical Idea, or it will ever remain a collection of provinces over which the Outer Forces will wage their wars of plunder.

The test of rationality is completely invalid in History; the test in that field is organic possibility. As to Politics, Europe has but one organic possibility, the Imperium, and but one Ethic, Authoritarian Socialism. The nations are dead, for Europe is born.\*\*

\* Cf. IMPERIUM, pp. 273-316.

\*\* Cf. IMPERIUM, p. 58 ff., 110 ff., 613 ff.

What names this mighty Imperium will bear in History, what language its people will speak, where its capital will be - these are secondary questions for us in the middle of the 20th century, and no one alive today will decide them. All that matters now is that unless Europe forms itself into an indivisible national-political entity by dint of its nation-building Ethic of Authoritarian Socialism, the Europe of 2050 will be essentially the same as that of 1950, viz., a museum to be looted by barbarians; a historical curiosity for sight-seers from the colonies; an odd assortment of operetta-states; a reservoir of human material standing at the disposal of Washington and Moscow; a loan-market for New York financiers; a great beggars' colony, bowing and scraping before the American tourists.

In the face of Europe's terrifying position between the Second and Third World Wars, the old differences between the remnants of the old Nation-Ideas collapse into nothing. Every man of significance in our times is History-oriented, for one cannot profoundly understand our times, their Inner Imperative and Mission, unless one ponders deeply the meaning of Leibnitz' aphorism: *Le present est charge du phase et gros de Pavenir*. In his inner life, Western man now cannot take sides in the bygone struggles between Wallenstein and Gustavus Adolphus, Olivares and the Cortes, Richelieu and the Fronde, Stuarts and Parliament, Bourbons and Habsburgs, Church and State, England and Spain, Italy and Austria. Today the loftier European identifies himself with both sides in these titanic struggles, with the totality of our precious Western History, for that History is his own spiritual biography written before him in large letters. He, too, had his Gothic, Reformation, Enlightenment, and rationalist-revolutionary phase - his youthful religiosity and crusades, his Democratic-Liberal-Communist phase; and now, in his fullest maturity, he has entered, spiritually and materially, the Age of Absolute Politics, in which the struggle is planetary and its motive Cultural. That means not 19th century petty-states and nations, but that only the Culture-State-Nation -Imperium can take part in it.

With its successes and failures, its "flaws" and brilliancy, its advances and retreats, Western History describes ourselves. Even with the first World War, we are still able to experience inwardly what both sides felt. But with the Second World War,

the higher type of European experiences only one side, for that War was in its main aspect a war of the West against Asia, and all men of the West who, knowing that, sided against the European Imperium were traitors to the West, inner enemies of their own Culture. In 1914, it was England versus Germany, but in 1939 this was no longer the case. By 1939, the England of Walpole and North, Canning and Gladstone, Kitchener and Joseph Chamberlain was dead and buried. Replacing it was the "England" of Eden and Churchill, Cooper and Belisha - not even a recognisable caricature of the youthful England of the Independents. These were no far-sighted Empire Builders with unerring power-calculations, but only liquidators of the Empire, American agents, greeters of the "valiant Red Army." As their enemy they named the European Culture, the organism of which England is a vital part and with which it will always share a common Destiny. Every English statesman of the old tradition would have recognised the growth of events during the third decade of the 20th century from a European to a global scale. But these wretched epigoni with their boundless jealousy and muddled instincts closed their eyes to it and sold the English Island to the Washington regime for a little pseudo-power and the fleeting glory of a suicidal "victory."

In this historical orientation, the Westerner of the higher type, who alone has Cultural value and significance, regards events in which the West was pitted against the Outer Forces with a completely subjective eye. Thus he sees in the Crusades, for example, only one side of the question - I am speaking here not of any ethical, religious, moral, aesthetic, or other such questions, of course, but solely of the organic question of identity. He is for Charles XII against the Russians, for England against the Indian Mutiny, against the Zulus, and against China in the Opium War; for the Teutonic Knights against the Slav at Tannenberg; for Maximilian against Juarez; for the American Colonists in the Alamo against Santa Ana; for Napoleon against Russia; for Mussolini against the negroes of Abyssinia; for the Hero and his Army against Russia in 1941-1945. In these events, it was left only to chance which of the Western nationalities fought the Barbarian. The victory of any Western nation over an outer military force, whether Chinese, Hindu, Zulu, Islamic, was a victory for all Europe and its colonies. Any European who gloats over the defeat of a Western nation brands himself politically and Culturally feeble-minded. For what

distinction does the Barbarian make between the Western nations? During the Second World War, the Japanese called the Germans “friendly enemies” and the English “hostile enemies.” To Jewry all men of the West are “goyim;” to Islam they are “giaours” and “Franks,” and in Persia during the First World War Wal~mus had the greatest difficulty in making clear to the tribal chieftains why the two “Frankish” powers were fighting each other. For a European to emphasise any trifling differences between the Western nations today is stupidity, if not treason.

Yet Anglophobia, the mode of yesterday, is back in style again; Germanophobia has been transformed by the Outer Forces of Washington and Moscow into a veritable hate-religion for the masses. In this direction lies the Sinoisation of Europe.

Treasonous propaganda in Europe between the Second and Third World Wars has its origin with the Outer Enemies of Europe. Spreading it is taken care of by the Inner Enemy of Europe.

## ***THE INNER ENEMY OF EUROPE***

An inner enemy is more dangerous than an outer one, because while he seems to belong, he is actually a kind of alien.

The Inner Enemy of Europe is at once a stratum of the population, a world-outlook, and a Culture-illness. The Michelstratum is Europe's Inner Enemy, the stratum that commits treason organically and instinctively. Its world-outlook is that of the past Age of Nationalism, Economics, Democracy, Capitalism. Because it looks backward and resists the Imperative of the Future with pathological intensity, this stratum is the embodiment of the Culture-disease called Culture-retardation.\*

An inner enemy is dangerous in two respects: first, because of his own activity, and, second, because of his usefulness to the outer enemy. During the Second World War, the European Michel consciously worked for the defeat of Europe and the victory of the American-Russian coalition. Examples of this conduct were Churchill and Attlee in England, Badoglio and Mauggeri in Italy, Halder, Hassel, and Goerdeler in Germany, the Communists in France, the Netherlands, Spain, and Scandinavia. Without this organic, professional treason on the part of the European Michel, the Outer Forces could never have defeated Europe. After the War, the American occupation of Europe and the despoliation of Europe were made possible only by the Michel-stratum, which hired itself out to the enemy to establish vassal-governments, churchill-regimes, in every province of Europe. During this period between the Second and Third World Wars, the Michel as an American agent is more dangerous than he would otherwise be in himself. The reason for this is the advance of History since the 19th century has rendered his world-outlook completely useless to him, even for purposes of sabotage, while to the Americans it is still useful as a means of control over Europe. Thus the Culture-disease of Culture-retardation remains in the body of Europe only because of the American occupation.

If "capitalism" is understood not simply as an economic technique, but, above all, as a spiritual-ethical principle, we may

\* Cf. IMPERIUM, p. 410 ff.

designate the world-outlook of the Michel as Capitalism. In the 20th century, Capitalism is inwardly dead, both in the broader sense of a Cultural-ethical world-outlook and as an economic technique. The fact that it is dead is shown every time its representatives approach some new problem in the world of facts. Their solutions are uniformly rigid and in every case misfire, even when the problem is purely economic. After the Second World War, the English government that called itself “socialist” decided to “nationalise” the railways. The sole possible *raison d’être* for nationalisation of the railways lay in reducing costs for the ultimate consumer, thus granting a sort of general rebate. But there resulted a doubling of all fares and a continuation of the separate identity of the lines, even to the point of competitive advertising. The programme remained in existence only for the sake of the principle of nationalisation. All other “nationalisation” schemes that originated with this capitalistic, class-war inciting Marxist regime ended similarly.

The singularly unhappy career of the capitalist system was continued throughout Europe after the Second World War, to be sure, because of intervention coming from the Cultureperiphery. Unhesitatingly, the Washington regime employed the resources of the North American continent to shore up the tottering system. Thus it is only the extra-European power of the Washington regime that subjects Europe to the negative world-outlook and outworn economic system of capitalism. A European revolt against capitalism is ipso facto a revolt against America. A Socialist Europe, founded on the principle of the sovereign, organically articulated State, would be an independent Europe and master of its own economy. This economy would not be established for reasons of class-war, nor for the purpose of realising any rigid, abstract ideas. On the contrary, it would be an economy that overcomes the economic problems of Europe in the spirit of the 20th century, and, indeed, in their sole possible way of solution: the State as organism and its economy as part of an organic totality to which all private and class interests are subordinate.

Before the First World War, the European power-monopoly, the monopoly of trade and technics, secured all requisite markets for the products of Europe, and with these products Europe paid for the raw and other materials it ordered from abroad. The First World War undermined this system in that,

for its duration, it deprived the overseas consumers of European merchandise, and thus gave them the stimulus to construct factories of their own. After the War, the capitalist international economy was never again able to solve its problems, not even through extensive state-intervention in the form of protective tariffs, and the like. This development was concluded by the Second World War. The old system passed away.

The only solution for the economic problems of Europe consists in the most intensive possible rationalisation of all existing possessions and in the acquisition of new resources for the European economy. Naturally, America insists that Europe keep the capitalist system. A Socialist Europe does not need America, whereas a capitalist Europe is a beggars' colony of America.

In the basic world-outlook of both the American population and the ruling economic caste the world is still the object of plunder. America is not interested in forming and organising the world, but in creating the widest possible opportunities for financial-economic penetration of other countries. It is driven even to military conquest to attain this goal securely. Again, this is 19th century motivation, and its corrosive, pathological revival in our Age is a symptom of Culture-retardation.\*

To the finance-capitalist politico-military thought is merely a tool, albeit that it may seem to predominate at times. It is a dangerous weapon. The possibility is ever present that a political general might like to rule the roost. The political general is the nightmare of the finance-capitalist, and therein lies the explanation for the inferior businessman-type and feeble-minded liberals that make up the American generalcy. All officers of strong will and superior intellect are weeded out before they attain to the rank of general; and in 1941 the Army regulations were so revised that automatic promotion to general - which had been the rule in the American Army since its beginnings in the 18th century - was eliminated, and promotion to that rank made dependent on "service," i.e., subservience to the Washington regime, or in other words, on the lack of any earnest will and strong instincts.

\* Cf. IMPERIUM, p. 517 ff.

To recapitulate everything: the Inner Enemy of Europe may be described in three ways:

1. With regard to his Culture-biological value.
2. With regard to which stratum embodies him.
3. With regard to his conception of the world.

1. The Inner Enemy is the bearer of Culture-retardation.
2. The Inner Enemy is the Michel-stratum; his leaders are the churchills.
3. The Inner Enemy is Capitalism, whereby the word is used in its total meaning of a Cultural-spiritual-ethical-economic principle.

In contrast to the foregoing, the true European spirit may be likewise sketched:

1. It is Culture-health, i.e., the actualisation of the Inner Imperative, accepting the challenge of the Future.
2. It is in the charge of the Culture-bearing stratum, the highest elite of the population, which stratum comprises no more than circa 250,000 souls.
3. It is the grand Idea of Imperialism, the world-outlook that is suited to the coming European Imperium of CultureState-Nation-People-Race-Society.

For the purpose of demonstrating with the utmost clarity the elements of the two world-outlooks in this period of Western History between the Second and Third World Wars, a paradigm is appended:

### *Imperialism*

Faith  
Primacy of the Spirit  
Idealism  
Will-to-Power  
World as object of organisation  
Rank as social distinction  
Society as organism  
  
Fulfilment of Duty

### *Capitalism*

Rationalism  
Materialism  
Sensualism  
Will-to-Riches  
World as object of plunder  
  
Wealth as social distinction  
Society as a collection of individuals  
“Pursuit of happiness”

***Ascendant instincts:***

1. Absolute Western self-preservation
2. Absolute will to biological fertility
3. Absolute will to increase power

Hierarchy  
Discipline  
Authority  
The superpersonal organism as  
*State*

Aristocracy  
Society as an organic unity  
Sexual polarity  
Europe as Imperium  
Europe as Nation  
Europe as Fatherland  
Order  
Stability

Responsibility, all public  
power exercised and administered openly

Resurgence of Authority

Ideal of Chivalry, faith in oneself

Respect for the political enemy

***Decadent instincts:***

1. Acquiescence to the Outer Revolt
2. Race-suicide, birth control, Puritanism, Bohemianism
3. Surrender of the World-hegemony of the West

Equality  
Freedom, ethical laissez-faire  
Parliamentarianism  
The superpersonal organism as  
*society*

Plutocracy  
Class-war  
Feminism  
Petty-statism  
Chauvinism  
Petty-nationalism  
Freedom  
Constant motion, business-cycles

Irresponsibility, anonymity,  
public power in the hands of  
private persons, finance capitalists,  
labour-dictators

Communism, Democracy  
Liberalism

Separation of Word and Deed,  
systematic hypocrisy

Replacement of respect by  
hatred, "war-crimes trials,"  
ideals as a substitute for  
Honour on the battlefield

Cultivation of soldierly virtues	Cult of bourgeois virtues, the derision of soldierly virtues
Eroticism as legitimate source of joy and fertility	Eroticism as vice, the cult of immorality, general spread of clandestine and illegal prostitution, an Erotic without consequences
Affirmation of War and Conquest	Pacifism, preparation of the coloured populations for “self-government,” the “right of self-determination”
Separate status of Culturealien	Equality with the Culturealien, the “melting pot”
Western Man as an individual human being, completely different from primitive non-Western humans, Western Man in the service of a great Mission: the fulfilment of the European Culture	Rousseau: Man as Savage Darwin: Man as Animal Marx: Man as economic creature Freud: Man as sexual creature Science-as-Religion: Man as Machine, capable of limitless existence, “Victory over disease,” etc.
Art practiced in conformity with the Cultural task	“L’art pour l’art”
Politico-military expansion	Financial-military-economic expansion

From a cursory glance at the list of examples it is obvious that the reigning forces of Culture-retardation make use of the ideas and instincts of Imperialism whenever and wherever they find it necessary and possible. For instance, they subordinate Art to Politics. They have set up a new, inverted hierarchy in which the American and the Michel are the patricians and the true European is the plebeian. They preach “democracy” while

ruthlessly imposing their will on the masses and pressuring them in so-called elections; they deny the rightness of the Idea of Conquest while occupying Europe with their troops and forcing its people to take on heavy political, military, and economic burdens in the interest of the extra-European powers, and so on.

This is the Age of Absolute Politics, and everyone who acts in this Age, acts in its spirit, whether he knows it or not, whether he wishes it or not. If he reflects, makes use of, values that run counter to his stated political beliefs and aims, then he is either hopelessly stupid or is pursuing some other goal than the fulfilment of the Destiny of Europe - the formation of the Western Imperium in the spirit of Ethical Socialism.

There are two designs here: the first is the design of the European Michel, who seeks only his own advantage (the churchills) or that of his class (the finance-capitalist class; the proletarian usufructuaries of the looting of the body of Europe). The second design is that of the Cultural-outsider, the total alien, who in his boundless rancour directs a political will-to-annihilation against the West, who negates its Inner Imperative, who would strangle its Destiny and divert it from the Future. Geographically, he may act from outside the Western Culture, or inside, in the form of Culture-distortion. In each case, it is his spirituality that clinches the matter, and the Culture-distorter is one of the Outer Enemies of Europe.

## ***THE OUTER ENEMIES OF EUROPE***

When used in Politics, the word enemy has a meaning completely different from what it has when used in regard to Culture or private life. In private life, we call him our enemy who bears us ill will. Applied to world politics, this definition is meaningless, for no state bears ill will in any private sense. That is true even in those cases in which a political unit is animated by a purely negative will, and would express it politically. For the form-world of Politics itself conditions all political activity and transforms its whole content into power activity. However, Politics seldom does supply its own motivation - that is to be sought in another realm.

The motivation of the global power-struggle in our Age of Absolute Politics lies in Culture. On the planet there is only one High Culture in the process of fulfilment, the Western Culture, and as a spiritual front it naturally assumes the following form: the West against the Outer Revolt. The spiritual motivation of the politics of all outer forces whatever is the will-to-annihilate the Western Culture. In a power-struggle between Europe and any outer force, each contestant will, however, strive for power, that means control over the other. The motivation of the contestants will become apparent only after a power-decision in the struggle. Thus it is obvious that the West does not have the desire to destroy the peoples, territories, resources, and low cultures of the outer forces, whereas these outer forces most emphatically wish to destroy the peoples, landscape, resources, and the High Culture of Europe, as the Russian-American occupation of Europe after the Second World War demonstrated.

In the purely spiritual sense, then, Europe has but one "enemy," the Outer Revolt against the World Hegemony of the West. From this great, fundamental fact we know that the Outer Revolt will provide Europe with political enemies so long as the Age of Absolute Politics lasts. A European victory in the struggle for the planet will not extinguish the Outer Revolt as a spiritual front; it will simply prevent it from again rising to the level of political intensity.

At present, this spiritual front is divided into two political units: Russia and America-Jewry. Culturally, it is anomalous

that America and one of the outer enemies of Europe are interdependent, for America belongs by its origin and fate to the Western Culture. All the same, it must now be counted among the enemies of Europe, since ethically and politically it is dominated by the Culture-alien Jewish entity of Church-State-Nation-Society-Race. Just how this domination came about is of less concern to Europe than the fact of it. The objective events of world-history since 1933 show that in not one instance has America pursued an American nationalist policy, but exclusively a policy in the interests of the Jewish entity.

In order to bring the metapolitical realities of this period between the Second and Third World Wars into clearer focus, each of the Outer Enemies of Europe must be examined separately.

America is, and shall always be, a colony of the Western Culture. A colonial spirituality determines the fate of colonies. So it has been with every previous Culture. When on the Home-soil the parent-Culture becomes extinct, everywhere the colonies perish. Population-streams may continue in primitive form; landscapes, of course, remain, but they are desolate and tyrannise the human beings that just yesterday dominated them; edifices may yet stand, but their symbolism is no longer understood. A colony is linked by a mystical bond, as though by a spiritual umbilical cord, to the parent organism, a bond just as inexplicable and just as real as the one that binds the Culture to the soil on which it was born. A colony thus shares a common history with the parent-organism, and its life reflects - with a natural and organic retardation - the development of the Culture. In the case of America, this retardation generally corresponds to the life-duration of one generation. This lagging behind is not the same thing as Culture-retardation, for it is natural and unavoidable. Still, that tardiness is serviceable to the Culturally-parasitic group which is now contriving to prevent the American colony from reflecting the development of its parent-organism. This pathological design is unattainable, of course, but any such deviation from Culture-health must have enormous effects on the host before the parasite is expelled.

The Jewish entity is a Cultural form-world of its own stamp, and can therefore *never* be assimilated by the Western Culture.\*

\* Cf. IMPERIUM, p. 376 ff.

Since this entity finds itself inside the West - geographically speaking - and since it must seek its political actualisation, it necessarily influences Western politics in the direction of its own interests. Though it be of alien origin, it must not appear alien; its politics must be regarded as though it were legitimate politics, and not the alien politics it is. The Western ideology of the 18th and 19th centuries was admirably suited to the political needs of the Jewish entity, but with the passing away of that ideology and the birth of the Age of Absolute Politics, the preconditions for the successful political activity of the Jewish entity on European soil completely vanished. The fictive constructs of "Liberte, Egalite, Fraternite" have entirely died out in Europe; hence the political history of the Jews, as quasi-members of the Western nations, has also ended. Even so, the colonial tardiness in Cultural development and the disease of Culture-retardation make it possible for Jewry to retain its uncontested domination over the American people.

In this period of history, America and Jewry form a Symbiosis. The head of the organism is the Jewish entity, the body is America.

The problem of the existence-duration of this Symbiosis is of only secondary importance to Europe. No one predicted the French Revolution in regard to its time or its form. No one predicted the Russian Revolution of 1917, or the European Revolution of 1933, or the American Revolutions of 1775 and 1933. No one can in any way presage the time or the form of a Third Revolution in America which will take the power away from the Jewish entity and place it in the hands of a new American ruling-stratum.\* That Revolution is an organic possibility - indeed, even more: it is an organic Unavoidable. But since the time of its outbreak is still an Imponderable, the possibility of such a Revolution can play no role in the formation of Europe's policy, for a policy cannot be based upon Imponderables, though it must be flexible enough to adapt itself when they emerge from the realm of the Unforeseen. When the Revolution starts, it will bring in America a re-awareness of European politics and a re-evaluation of Europe's meaning.

\* Cf. IMPERIUM, p. 549 ff.

The Symbiosis of America and Jewry in this moment of history between the Second and Third World Wars is decisive not only for America, but also for Jewry. During the centuries of its “dispersion,” the Jewish entity never attained to the position of absolute sovereign over the fate of a Western host-people. But now it has come to that, and Jewry has identified itself for political purposes with America before all the world. In that Jewry became the overlord of America, it lost the most important of its other possessions and bases. Before the Jewish hegemony over America, the height of Jewish power was in Bolshevik Russia. In 1945, the superficial observer might have gained the impression that the total political power of the planet was being gradually collected into one political unit. That was in fact the aim of the Jewish leadership, and the means of creating the “world government” was to be the resurrected “League of Nations.”

As has already been shown in *IMPERIUM*,\* a world-state is an organic impossibility, and likewise a logical one. State is a political term, and political power results from polarity. A state is thus a unit of opposition. Although in theory a world-state would not have an opposition, if one were founded, it would at that very instant split into two or more political units. These would develop along regional, cultural, class, or economic lines - even along the lines dictated by a dominant political figure. Ignoring the concrete example of failure afforded by the “League of Nations” after the First World War, the Jewish-American Symbiosis attempted through its “United Nations” to create a power-monopoly for itself.

One great obstacle was present: Russia. It had been hoped, even taken for granted, that Russia would remain sufficiently under the control of the Jewish entity to collaborate in the scheme and, together with America, formally surrender its legal sovereignty to the “United Nations.” But the rise of the American-Jewish Symbiosis undermined the position of the fragment of the Jewish “diaspora” in Russia. So long as Jewry acted alone, it was politically effective in Russia. The worldwide identification of Jewry with America aroused Russian nationalism, with the result that the Culture-alien Jewish entity of Church-State-Nation-Society-Race lost its status as a member, so to speak, of the

\* Cf. *IMPERIUM*, p. 166 f; 170 f.

Russian national structure and was re-classified as a foreign element, thus losing completely its political effectiveness inside Russia.

As we have seen, the sole great spiritual-Cultural “enemy” Europe has is the Outer Revolt, against the West, the great No to the Western World-Mission, and this spiritual-Cultural front is divided into two political units, of which Russia is the second. Between the First and the Second World Wars, Russia was generally acknowledged to be the leader of the Outer Revolt, but in the Russo-Japanese War, 1904-1906, it was vice versa. At that time, Russia figured as a Western power against the Outer Revolt, which was led by Japan as the only sovereign power outside the Western Culture. In between lies the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917.

The Bolshevik Revolution was more than political; it was Cultural. Power was transferred from the Westernised elements in the church, state, army, aristocracy, and intelligentsia to a group basing itself upon the instinctively nihilistic stratum of the Russian peasant masses. The primitive Russian Soul, unsure of itself, had been forced by the Romanovs and the powerful inroads of German culture in Russia to submit to Westernisation. Consequently, there arose in Russia a dreadful tension of polarity between the two Souls, the Western and the proto-Russian. Dostoevsky’s *The Possessed* depicts how it fermented nihilistically beneath the surface. It was this underground Russia that, led by the Jewish entity, broke away in 1917 from the West. By 1923, the civil wars had ended, and Western culture was for the time banished from Russia. A community of destiny with Asia and its revolt against the West, rather than with a Europe whose form-world it had just expelled from Russian soil, more nearly answered the expectations of the new Russia.

The Russian Soul is too virile ever to be strangled by something alien. Hence the Jewish entity, despite the dominant position to which it had attained with the Revolution of 1917, was incapable of maintaining its unconditional rule. The expulsion of Trotsky in 1928 marks the downward turning point for Jewry in Russia.

And yet the Bolshevik Revolution did not eliminate the polar tension

within the Russian Soul. So long as the Russian Soul, chaotic and full of longing, animated by a strong will yet of weak resolve, exists within the sphere of influence of a Western organism that is conscious of its World-Mission, there will remain in Russia a powerful urge towards reunion with the West. The European Revolution of 1933 found an echo in Russia, and when the European armies entered Bolshevist territory in 1941, they were hailed everywhere there as "liberators." Marshal Vlasov could have raised armies of millions and affiliated them with the European military forces, but, unfortunately, the European Command did not make use of such aid until it was too late. The possibility indeed exists that a second monstrous upheaval - with a pro-Western Cultural aim - will overthrow the Bolshevist regime. This possibility might be realised either through a renewed Western invasion or through the appearance of a new Peter the Great. It is a further Imponderable. Today Europe must reckon with Russia as part of the Outer Revolt against its World-Mission.

Since there are only two political powers in the world, the world situation can assume only the form of preparation for war between them: America-Jewry versus Russia.

If Bolshevism is understood as the urge to destroy the Western Culture, then these two extra-European powers form an anti-Cultural Interregnum in Western History, the Concert of Bolshevism. Both powers are formless and personal; neither is the expression of a superpersonal Soul, a higher Destiny, an organically necessary Imperative to a World-Mission. The Outer Forces, whatever the extent to which they have Western technics at their disposal, whatever Western customs they practise, whatever superficial display of literary connexions with the West they make, are, in fact, to be classed in the same category with the formless powers of Tamerlane and Genghis Khan, Sun Yat-sen and Kemal Ataturk, Lobengula and the Mahdi. Europe is still the bearer of a World-Idea, a great World-Hypothesis; it still has an inward necessity to view the world in a particular fashion, an Ethic whereby it conducts itself towards it in a particular fashion and reconstructs it in a particular fashion. For the single, all-encompassing reason of this total difference between Europe, on the one hand, and the formless extra-European powers on the other, Europe can have at bottom no interest in the projected Third World War within

the Concert of Bolshevism per se. Nor would it make any difference in this if the War broke out in 1960 or 1975.

Nevertheless, Europe is linked politically to the projected Third World War, and it must exploit every possibility in the diplomatic preparations for that war to push through its Liberation. Europe must recall its Destiny and its WorldMission. It must assess the differences between the two powers in the Concert of Bolshevism, and adapt itself so that it will profit from their changing fortunes in the events to come. Europe must form its policy.

### *THE DEFINITION OF ENEMY*

As we have seen, the word “enemy” has a different meaning when applied to Culture, private life, Politics. In the Cultural sense, Europe has only one “enemy,” and that is the Outer Revolt against the World-Mission of the West. It embraces all primitive populations, even in those cases in which they live geographically within the Western Culture, as in North and South America, and includes all fellah-populations now inhabiting areas where High Cultures once fulfilled themselves, for example, the Islamic, Hindu, and Chinese populations. Likewise it embraces populations in whose areas a High Culture has never existed, for example, the barbaric Russians and Mongols, the savages of Africa, South East Asia, and the Pacific islands. The Jewish entity comes from the Magian Culture and will always belong to it spiritually, that Magian Culture which during its life-span gave rise to the Arabian, Persian, Nestorian, and Parsic peoples, among others. While some of these entities may have lost individuals to the West, alien units cannot be assimilated by the West in their entirety. Superpersonal realities on both sides forbid it. It is an organic impossibility. The worldwide Cultural front against the West is divided into two political units, Russia and America-Jewry, and the word enemy is used quite differently in Politics.

Politics means so living life that its possibilities are exhausted. In the course of events, Politics divides its world into political friends and political enemies. Before Politics undertakes this division, all outer units are potential enemies, and it is the task of Politics to select one or more units as enemies, then, if possible, to win the other units as friends.

The choice of enemy is the most important decision in the entire realm of activity called Politics. The mighty English Empire, which dominated the world for more than a century, foundered on its simple but profound mistake of choosing the wrong enemy in two World Wars. The whole adroit ancillary diplomacy, the total war-effort, and the military victory itself did not succeed in preventing the disappearance of the greatest Empire in history and the destruction of England’s own sovereignty. The English homeland was not even spared the ultimate humiliation of occupation by foreign troops, and, what is more, these troops came from its erstwhile colony. The formulation of policy is esoteric, and this is proved by the

selfsame example: Notwithstanding the collapse and disappearance of the English Empire, notwithstanding the reduction of England itself to the status of an “unsinkable aircraft carrier” for foreign air-forces, the Culture-retarding stratum and the broad masses were successfully persuaded by foreign propaganda that a great “victory” had somehow been won for England.

Political blunders can be made at two levels: at the highest level, where the enemy is determined and friends can be obtained, or at the lowest, where the policy based thereupon is carried out. The word error, in the strict sense, can be used in Politics only with regard to the future. Thus one must reproach England for choosing Germany as its enemy in the Second World War when it was obvious that its choice was an error. The great von Moltke defined strategy as “the art of making one less error than your adversary.” This definition can be likewise applied to Politics. Considered in retrospect, Life is a fabric of errors. No one can foresee the Future.

Politics is concrete; it is the art of the possible, not of the desirable, not of the moral, not of what is worthy of aspiration. Politics is an art, and it is the grandest of all arts, since its material is human life and its completed work the blossoming of a superpersonal Destiny. When a work of art is executed by an inferior, an imitator, an academic, the result is a piece of bungling. The indispensable gift of the politician is the gift of vision; after it comes finesse in political activity. Without prior vision, the whole fateful proceeding comes to naught.

A statesman comes nearest to the gift of vision when he is aware of his own strength of will and that of his people and perceives the power-currents of the political world. A steady adherence to both of these fundamentals will preserve him from the far-reaching error of choosing the wrong enemy. It is tantamount to waging war against oneself. In the Second World War, England sacrificed both the remnants of its Empire and its own independence for the benefit of America and Russia. There are still people who would deny this fact, but only facts are positive, not the sclerotic opinions of half-blind dotards.

The Political Genius is a superlative artist, and thus free of all negativity in his creations. To his task he brings no hatred, no malice, no envy,

nor any will-to-destruction that does not serve his will-to-power and will-to-creation. He is incapable of pursuing a policy that is basically “anti”-oriented, for example, a policy that has the slogan “Win the War!” as its “war-aim.” Such slogans may have certain propaganda value for the policy of a political Genius, but only the shamelessly hate-filled reactionary of the Churchill sort makes a policy of his hatred and asserts that “victory” at the cost of self-destruction is something worth seeking. Naturally, the political Genius removes from his path all forces opposing him, so far as he can; but this “anti”-tactic he employs for the sake of increasing his power, not from jealousy, prejudice, hatred, or mere dislike.

The problem of choosing an enemy is the same for Europe today, i.e., for the Culture-bearing stratum, as it would be for us if Europe were constituted as an actual political unit. Today Europe is an area and a People. If it pursues the right policy, tomorrow it will be a power - by virtue of its Inner Imperative alone, which proceeds from the unfulfilled Destiny of the Western Civilisation. The fact that Europe has a World-Mission guarantees that it will play a role in the centuries to come. Whether this role will be an active one, or merely passive, will become evident in our decades, and will be determined by the policy of the European Culture-bearing stratum.

The choice of an enemy is not arbitrary: We can designate a political unit as enemy only if, first, we can overcome that unit, and, second, by overcoming it gain power. Clearly, in this second Interbellum-Period Europe cannot overcome any power militarily because there does not and cannot exist a European military force as long as Europe is not constituted as a sovereign state. Any military force directly or indirectly under the command of the Washington regime cannot be called a “European military force.” The nationality of an army is that of its political leadership, not of its common soldiers or its officer-corps. In these circumstances, Europe is compelled to win power by spiritual-intellectual means. It must extract power from one or both of the Outer Forces, Russia and America-Jewry. That one of these two units from which Europe can draw true political power, viz., unlimited control over its own land and people, is the political enemy. It cannot be emphasised enough that the enemy-definition does not entail, from the European standpoint, any judgement of especially bad ethical,

moral, aesthetic, or cultural qualities on the part of the enemy. Culturally, aesthetically, morally, ethically, there is no choosing between Russia and America-Jewry. Yet, politically, Europe is compelled to distinguish between them, by its organic necessity to translate its Inner Imperative into action. It would be impossible for Europe to play a passive role in History, even if it wished, or it were wiser to do so. While Life advances, there is no standing still.

The Definition of Enemy is a problem that must be solved in the total historical frame-of-reference of our Epoch. Thereby the power-currents of the century, the power-problems resulting therefrom, and the relative danger for Europe must be considered.

## ***THE POWER-PROBLEMS OF THE SECOND INTERBELLUM PERIOD***

Owing to the false form of the first two World Wars and to the presence of a Culture-disease in the Western Civilisation, the power-problems in this period between the Second and the Third World Wars are the same ones that have confronted Europe for half a century, but now intensified to the highest possible degree.

In the year 1914, the power-problems were the following: how to preserve Europe's world-hegemony and how to make possible the conversion of Europe from an accumulation of petty-states with the hand-me-down world-outlook of a nationalist-capitalistic parliamentarism to the determined shape of Europe for the 20th century, viz., an Authoritarian Socialist structure of Culture-Nation-People-Race, the Imperium of the West. The form of the First World War, shaped by Culture-retarders like Grey, prevented a natural, organic solution of this power problem.

Between the First and Second World Wars, important steps were taken within Europe for the organic solution of the second problem, the transition of the 20th century phase of the European organism into the world of reality. Hardly anything was done for the solution of the first problem, owing to the precarious world situation at that time, although the Italian Abyssinian War did bring a general increase in power for Europe.

But this organic move forward was halted by the meddling of America-Jewry in intra-European affairs, and, as we have seen, this meddling brought about, in the same sterile form as the First World War, the tragedy of the Second World War. About 1939, the power-problems consisted in the re-establishment of the world-hegemony that had been almost entirely destroyed by the First World War, and in the completion of the halfactualised Imperium of Europe. The Second World War, occasioned by the extra-European, non-Western force of America-Jewry and by the churchills of France and England, once again thwarted the organic solution of these two problems.

As a result of the Second World War, it can be seen that the

power-problems are essentially the same two. Only their order of precedence has changed, so that now the problems are, first, the Liberation of Europe from extra-European rule, for the entirety of Europe is ruled from alien capitals; and, second, the fulfilment of Europe's World-Mission, i.e., the reconquest of its world-hegemony and the establishment of its World Empire.

Every power-problem contains a disjunction between the distribution of spiritual power-sources, on the one hand, and the distribution of acknowledged power and its attributes on the other. The spiritual power-source - the possession of a World-Mission, a calling, a mighty, positive Inner Imperative, and a nation-forming ethic - are found concentrated almost entirely in Europe. The spiritual resources that exist outside Europe, in Russia, America-Jewry, and Japan, are merely a reflex of the European - a European Will that is inspired there by Europe. In actuality, the Outer Forces are seeking to realise the World-Mission of Europe, even though they lack the Inner Imperative to it. Their motivation is completely negative. Thereby is explained the circumstance that the immense concentration of power in the Washington and Moscow regimes has brought no Order to the world, that both regimes perpetuate the Chaos left over in the 20th century from the 19th century. Only Europe can give back to this chaotic world the Principle of Order.

### ***THE AMERICAN POWERACCUMULATION***

The American power-accumulation can be called an “empire” only in a loose, transferred sense. Within the Symbiosis America-Jewry, neither the Jewish entity nor the subordinate American element thinks in terms of American Imperialism. Thus the American head-of-state specifically declared to the populace that no people on earth was in any sense subject to America, that America’s “defense” of other peoples did not entitle it to demand reciprocity from them, and, moreover, that under no circumstances would America “dominate” another people. What is of particular significance in this is the anti-imperialist ideology, not the fact that all these principles are completely disregarded in the political conduct of America-Jewry. The intention here is to prevent the rise of American Imperialist thinking, for that would run counter to the anti-nationalist policy of the dominant part of the Symbiosis. But if the Imperialist urge within the American people were of deep, imperative force, and pregnant with the Future, it could not be suppressed, and the power-accumulation that the Washington regime at present administers would be organised into an American Empire.

However, a true American Empire that is hierarchically organised and politically administered will never be, since it is not among the formative possibilities of the American character. Now, a nation cannot arise by happenstance - a people, yes - but a nation is the outflowing of a High Culture.\* Though America can never belong to any other Culture than the Western, in American life Western culture is only a veneer. Its inward influence on the American population was too slight, for example, to have prevented the invasion of Culturally-alien units. There is no American Idea, no American nation, no American ruling-stratum - three ways of expressing the same thing. To be sure, there is an American People, whose members are in fact characterised by an individual imperialism, which is instinctive, racial, economic. But this individual imperialism can never lift itself to political heights. The true American People is a unit based upon matriarchy. By its own choice, it leads a cocoon-like life within a closed system. The soul of this People is too oriented to the feminine pole of existence, and it

Cf. IMPERIUM, p. 328 ff., p. 334 ff., p. 398 ff.

therefore cherishes peace, comfort, security, in short, the values of individual life. War, conquest, adventure, the creation of form and order in the world - these do not interest the American People. Empire-building demands sacrifices; yet, for sacrifices to be made, and not just sacrificial victims slaughtered, there must be an Idea.

The American power-accumulation arose without sacrifices through America's chance intervention at two decisive moments in world affairs. In the First World War, America's sole war-aim - according to the public and private utterances of all leading Americans who were in favour of intervention in that War - was to defeat "German tyranny." As was shown in the analysis of Politics in IMPERIUM, to have the defeat of an arbitrarily chosen enemy as a "war-aim" is to have no war-aim at all. Thus America had no political aim in that War. The role England played in America's entry into the War is not important here. Important only is the stock of ideas that were played out to set the American People in motion. In the Second World War, America's internal propaganda was exclusively non-political. Again, the chief "war-aim" was to "defeat Germany," and the one attempt to display a positive "war-aim" was a series of negative proposals - all of them reflecting the feminine values of a matriarchy - to free the world of hunger, fear, etc. The psychological orientation of the American People prevents American governments in peacetime from clearly expressing a demand for war. In wartime, it is obligatory to speak only of "peace." "Victory" is supposed to bring only "peace," and not an extension of power. Above all, the purpose of victory is not an American Empire. After the extinction of the Federalist Party in 1828, no political grouping in America publicly advocated the creation of an American Empire. The average type of party-politician ensures, however, that every public man would advocate political imperialism were the idea popular.

The American power-accumulation in this epoch between the Second and Third World Wars has arisen without sacrifice. Had sacrifice been necessary for it, then it would not have arisen.\*

Before 1914, America controlled only a small section of the world-surface: the North American Continent, Central America below

\* Cf. IMPERIUM, p. 472 ff., p. 482 ff.

Mexico, small areas of northern South America. Not even the Caribbean Sea could be called American, since European bases were numerous there and the American fleet was inferior in number to more than one European fleet. In the First World War, 10,000,000 men lost their lives on the battlefield. Of this total sum America's tribute amounted to 120,000; for this slight toll in blood, America acquired sufficient new territories and bases, obtained enough power for itself at sea, to have 1/5th of the earth's surface under its control: North America, the whole of Central America, including Mexico, the entire Caribbean, much of South America, and half the Pacific. After the War, in accordance with the feminine-matriarchal orientation of the American People, the greater part of these power-acquisitions was abandoned - this occurred through the Washington Naval Treaty of 1921, under which America obligated itself to sink half its fleet without demanding the equivalent from England or Japan. Yet the fact remains: America acquired a power-area that was four times larger than its original with the vanishingly small blood-toll of 120,000.

By 1939, America had gained control, *pari passu* with the steady decline of England's power, of 1/5 of the earth-surface. At the end of the Second World War, America controlled 18/20ths of it. That is the largest power-accumulation ever to come about in the entire history of High-Cultures. The total number of dead of all belligerent states amounted to approximately 15 million. America's portion of this loss was 250,000. In the Second World War, then, America acquired control of more than half the world without its having to make a blood sacrifice worth mentioning in connexion with such an operation.

Not even such unparalleled political successes fill the soul of the American People with satisfaction. America, as a People, is organic, and will forever remain isolationist. Isolationism is the only American characteristic that can be called "nationalism." The American soul does not delight at all in this world power. It finds in it no reason for pride. When in 1947 the Washington regime calmly handed over China to Russia, that is, the focus of America's quarter of the world's power, Americans took no notice. The diplomatic intermediary in the transfer was publicly honoured and draped with medals. Only a few years after the War, ships were taken from the American fleet and delivered to

Japan en masse to Serve as the basis of a new Japanese navy. No American nationalist protested, for in America there are no nationalists, only victimised isolationists.

It is a strange phenomenon, and History will deal with it as with so many other transient paradoxes, that between the Second and Third World Wars American troops were stationed all along the perimeter of the political world, viz., the northeast quadrant of the planet, and this wide dispersion of American armed forces did not involve any kind of national exultation for Americans. The reason for that is Americans are primarily economics-oriented. The Masculine Principle is to realise higher ideas through art, warfare, Politics. Nothing could be further from the American ideal than that. The Feminine Principle is to nourish and preserve life - that is the American ideal. Americans therefore do not delight in an “empire” that continually lays claim to their wealth and constantly demands a reduction in their standard-of-living. In its traditional isolation, America needed no armies, garrisons, subventions to foreign countries, and Great Wars. The superficial politisation of America has brought the American People economic injuries, and thus confirmed it in its isolation.

The American casualty lists in the first two World Wars, slight as they were numerically, hit the American People in a sensitive spot. No mother rejoices in the death of her children, and matriarchy informs the American soul. Americans do not love their victories, whereas the deaths they count bitterly. Long before American intervention in each of the two World Wars, there was already a de facto state-of-war between America and European or Asiatic belligerents. In each case, the possession of numerous “allies” provided Americans with a certain solace. In the Second World War, long lists of American allies were published, and considered effective propaganda even though few of the “allies” were still power-factors or even existed. Indeed, with the alternative: war now with allies, or war later, standing alone, America can be forced into a war. The old European proverb: Viel’ Feind, viel’ Ehr finds no resonance in matriarchal America.

This American character-trait is a Ponderable of which Europe must take account in shaping its policy. In the American mind (and likewise in the policy-decisions of the Culturally-alien Washington regime), Europe

is the basis of every war-plan against Russia. This Ponderable might be used by Europe in either one or the other of two ways, as will be shown later. Moreover, Europe's Culture-bearing stratum must keep in mind that it does not matter at this time whether America, as a People, can regain its independence and sovereignty or whether it will remain simply the instrumental part of the Symbiosis America-Jewry. For political purposes, America and Jewry have become a unit; what name this unit receives is not important.

It remains for us to compare and evaluate from a political standpoint the psychology of the two extra-European powers, America-Jewry and Russia.

## *THE CONCERT OF BOLSHEVISM,*

Neither Russia nor America-Jewry belongs to the Western Civilisation, though America, considered abstractly in and of itself, as it was before the Revolution of 1933, is still a European colonial-people.

Hence there is no Cultural *casus belli* in the coming Third World War between these two powers. They both belong to the Outer Revolt against the world-supremacy of the West, and the collective term for this revolt, which turns, destroying and negating, against the creative affirmation of the Western Destiny, is Bolshevism. Within the Concert of Bolshevism there are, of course, differences as well as similarities. Both must be evaluated.

With both world-powers, the reigning ideology comes from a bygone Western world-outlook. The American ideology of "freedom," "equality," and legalism stems from 18th century Europe, as does its underlying philosophy of materialism. The Russian ideology of Marxism comes from 19th century English Capitalism, of which Marxism is a supplement. In Russia, Marxism is treated as a religion, for the prime characteristic of the Russian soul is its religiosity. Whatever this soul takes seriously, be it even the absurd end-product of Western materialism - Pavlovian reflexology, scientific psychology -, it deals with in a religious way, that is, in a way transcending action. Nowhere in Russian life is there anything that in any way corresponds to the Marxist schema. The Russian soul is not yet politically mature, and Russia continues to use Marxism as a political export article, even though a market for it no longer exists, since the First World War buried the form-world of the 19th century for ever. America-Jewry, which is similarly maladapted to the New Age, exports to Europe the shop-worn ideology of Montesquieu, Constant, Mill, Bentham, and hopes that on this basis it can turn the Destiny of Europe back two centuries.

In America, on the other hand, Marxism is not a theory but a fact. In the realm of facts, Marxism means class-war. America is the classic land of finance-capitalism and trade unions, the two organised groups that systematically plunder the national economy. Not only Marx, but all 19th century theorists were

obsessed with economic doctrines - Malthus, Darwin, Mill, Spencer, Shaw. American life is essentially oriented to economics, and every aspect of Life is simply referred for its justification thereto.

Feminine-matriarchal life is routine; hence American life is routine and technicised. Books instruct the population "How To Win Friends," how social life, family life, sexual life are to be conducted. Yet this uniformisation of life is not perceived as burdensome or ignominious - the American population is entirely passive and feels quite at home in this atmosphere of a nursery. The social instincts predominate over the individual instincts, and every American child is taught from his earliest days that the essence of leading a successful life consists in "getting along with people." There is no other way to realise this ideal than to renounce one's individuality. That is the explanation for the difficulty of kindling any kind of political opposition in America. As soon as a policy secures a foothold and becomes popular, it is right and respectable. Radical or persistent criticism is impossible in America; the term "individualist" is nearly an insult. The extirpation of strong individuality precludes the rise of a true elite, an aristocracy, a ruling-stratum, for these are always based upon strong individuality and the feeling of uniqueness. All feelings of superiority, of higher self-esteem, of uniqueness are educated out of the American while he is still in kindergarten. It is impressed on him that his existence, his problems are exactly like those of everybody else.

An elementary demand of Life, however, is that every group possess a stratified social articulation. America's "elite" for economic, technical, industrial, social purposes is the businessclass, those thirty-thousand technical-managerial brains that permit American life to function. For political purposes, the "elite" is the Jewish entity, which enjoys a monopoly of power in all matters but is especially conspicuous in the direction of foreign affairs. The technical-managerial caste has no sense of carrying out a mission; it does not regard itself as superior in nature, but only as more proficient in intellectual-technical matters. This type of social-technical differentiation resembles that which exists among the social insects, for example, the bees

\* Cf. IMPERIUM, p. 502 ff., p. 524 ff.

and ants.

Russian life is fundamentally barbarian. The barbarian is to be distinguished not only from Culture-men, but from savages, primitives, fellaheen, and decadents as well. Barbarian is a word full of promise, for the barbarian is inwardly in motion. The Germanic tribes that occupied Imperial Rome were barbarians, and from this Germanic stock came, many centuries later, men who wrought the Western Culture. The barbarian is the pre-Cultural form of humanity, just as different from the fellah, the end-product of a Culture, as from the savage, the proto-human type that stands in no relation whatever to a High Culture. The barbarian is strong-willed yet irresolute. He can be readily converted to new doctrines - witness the Russian "conversion" to Marxism -, but the conversion must be superficial, for mere verbiage cannot abolish the difference between Culture-man and barbarian. The barbarian is rough and tough, not keen-witted, full of artifice, and certainly not legalistic and intellectualised. He is the opposite of decadent. He is ruthless and does not shrink back from destroying what others may prize highly.

America's ideology - 18th century materialistic egalitarianism and 19th century capitalism - and Russia's ideology - 19th century proletarian capitalism - are both permeated with the spirit of their respective populations, the American ideology with that of the amalgam of negro-Jewish-Asiatic-Indian-European elements, as modified by the peculiarities of the landscape, the Russian ideology with that of the nomadic tribes of Asia, which are imbued with the enormous impersonality of the Asiatic steppes.

The Culture-man outside the Culture-sphere stands in danger of losing his Cultural-orientation - what the British civil administration in India used to call "going negative." During the expansion of the American population over the vast plains, the American colonial lost well-nigh every contact with Western tradition and Western happenings, and his Western culture was diluted. Only in one part of America was there a successful transplantation of Western culture, in the South, but it was destroyed, for all practical purposes, by the victory of the Yankees in the Secession War, 1861-1865. While the American lost his Western culture, step by step, he became primitive. Had he fought a Culturally-alien world, such as the

Chinese or Hindu, he would have retained his Cultural-orientation in fullest measure, for conflict with the Alien strengthens the Proper. But he fought merely savages and, more often, the landscape itself, the hardships of Nature. In the inward contest between Culture and Landscape, Landscape was largely the victor. Because comfort is one of the main ideals of the American, his vital impetus finds expression primarily in the domain of technics. Unrestrained by tradition, by political or social considerations, he fell head over heels into absolute technical development, and - in technics - he made his the foremost among the Western Colonies. Thus, as a result of his century of stateless expansion, the American succumbed, on the one hand, to the primitivity of his vast and empty continent, while, as a result of the concentration made possible for him by the absence of power-struggles, on the other, he made himself in some respects superior to Europeans. This had as its consequence yet another peculiarity.

The simultaneous presence of primitivity and over-civilisation in the American shaped his relationship to Europe into an unhealthy one. With his strong technical aptitude, he came to regard Europe as inferior; with his primitivity, he failed to comprehend Europe's Cultural Imperative in the 20th century. Hence he offered no resistance when the Culture-distorting regime foisted on America the idea that it had to educate Europe.

This idea could be all the more inculcated since America is by nature feminine-matriarchal and attributes great value to formal education. In America the autodidact will find neither political, academic, professional, nor social recognition. This peculiarity of the American character has been aggravated by the Culturedistorting element, and American schools and universities have been made into scholastic factories that produce uniform biological units. They have eradicated human individuality, so far as that can be attained at all in the human species. All values imparted through this "education," such as comfort, security, and social uniformity, may be found on the purely animal level in man. None appeal to the specifically human level, which is embodied at highest potential by the unique and individualised human being, with his loftier values.

While the American is a Culture-man, *reprimitivised* on the

one side of his being, over-civilised on the other, since he is completely and entirely animated by the ideals of peace, comfort, and security, the Russian is a barbarian, and still wholly primitive. Centuries of Petrism never touched the underground Russia. No matter that it figured as such for centuries, Russia never became a nation of the West. America is a genuine Western colony, though, to be sure, it must now be counted part of the Outer Revolt.

The orientation towards technics is common to both: America is technical by instinct; Russia has become so under compulsion from its leaders, who have only politico-military reasons for embracing technics. In the field of philosophy, America's sole contribution to the Western intellectual heritage was Pragmatism - the doctrine that Truth is "what works." In other words, Truth is not a function of the Soul, but of Nature. Pragmatism is at once a primitive and over-civilised philosophy, primitive, because its position vis-d-vis Truth is devoid of higher culture; over-civilised, because it makes all Truth merely an attribute of Technics. Expressed in terms of the American psychology: "True is what procures me more security, more comfort." In America, obsession with technics is the expression and content of life of the population. It is instinctive, and America naturally seeks to export it to whatever countries its armies and bomber-squadrons have conquered. In Russia, on the other hand, the technics-obsession merely serves political and military ends, and is imposed on the Russian population only through the apparatus of a political dictatorship. The Russian experiences things primarily in a religious way; hence the incredible spectacle of his worshipping a machine.

Russia exhibits the same education-obsession as America: In the words of Lunacharsky: "Education, distributed according to Marxist principles, can make even the most mediocre Oriental intelligent." Once again, a common denominator with America. There, too, "intelligence" is regarded as something that can be acquired, and, moreover, as the only distinction between human beings. Both Russia and America hold that the External forms and conditions the mind. Both emphasise totally environment and experience, negate dogmatically Spirit and Soul. For both the collective man is the ideal and the prevalent type. In both there naturally exists the most extreme intolerance towards anything other than the mass-ideal.

In Russia, the craze for uniformity, including the education mania, is likewise imposed from above to carry out a political programme. The emphasis on the power of environment, the adoration of reflexology, the idolisation of machines, of statistics and percentages, and of economic theories generally - all this is in Russia simply technique, and it is all essentially negative: the Russian peasant-barbarian soul is a religious ferment, and, as such, abhors economic theories, machines, science, and nationalism. The programme of Moscow-Bolshevism represents a means of quashing the hyper-individuality of a people of Pugachevs, Aksakovs, Kropotkins, Nechayevs, Dostoevskys, Rasputins, and Shoptsy. Primarily, Moscow-Bolshevism is a method for politicising the religious-barbarian Russia. That the Moscow regime uses Marxism as an export-article is simply political idiocy, and the possibility constantly exists that it will one day discard it because of its ineffectiveness.

For Europe the following distinction is important: American-Jewish Bolshevism is the instinctive destruction of the West through primitive, anti-Cultural ideas - peace, comfort, security, abolition of individuality -, through over-technicisation, through the imposition of Culture-distortion and Culture-retardation. Russian Bolshevism seeks to attain the destruction of the West in the spirit of pan-Slavic religiosity, i.e., the Russification of all humanity.

Thus American-Jewish Bolshevism poses a real spiritual threat to Europe. In its every aspect, American-Jewish Bolshevism strikes a weak spot in the European organism. Even in Europe there exists a stratum, the Michel-stratum, the inner-America, which is animated by the purely animal American ideal of peace, comfort, security, abolition of individuality. Even in Europe there is an element that would like to replace culture with machinery. Even on Europe Culture-retarding regimes can be imposed, if necessary with American bayonets. Even in Europe Culture-distortion is present: the dictatorship over Europe of the American-Jewish Symbiosis itself. And even in Europe, in the midst of the Age of Absolute Politics, the Cato-type exists: You can watch him babbling, misty-eyed, about democratic ideals while the Barbarian and the Distorter occupy the sacred soil of the West. The 20th century European Cato would rather see the West destroyed than have finally to toss the rubbish of democratic ideals on the scrap heap of history, where the corpse

of Democracy lies stinking and putrescent after a half century of decay.

Russian Bolshevism is simply barbarism, and therefore finds no resonance anywhere in Europe. Even Europe's lowest spiritual stratum, the inner traitor, the Michel-stratum, has nothing whatever in common with the pan-Slavism of barbaric population-streams. Russian religiosity has been temporarily and, from a Cultural standpoint, falsely raised to political intensity as a reflex of the great Western spiritual development, the Resurgence of Authority, the genesis of the Imperium-Idea. Without the Western Culture, there would be no such structure as Russia, only marauding tribes of barbaric horsemen like the Cossacks in Taras Bulba.

Russian Bolshevism is therefore less dangerous to Europe than American-Jewish Bolshevism, for no aspect of its menace corresponds to a weakness in Europe's spiritual armour. Europe actually has an inner America, the Michel-stratum; however, Europe has no inner Russia. Obviously, the so-called Communist Parties are not at all the reliable tools wherewith a Russian occupation of Europe could be built. In fact, the work of these Communist Parties is already done. They were useful instruments of early Bolshevism's foreign policy, especially in the period 1933-1939. During the Second World War, they helped save Russia's existence as a political unit; after the War, they helped create the Russian power-accumulation, extending from Hanover to Hong-Kong, the largest contiguous poweraccumulation in the history of the world. Yet, today, between the Second and Third World Wars, all Communist Parties, including the American, are politically insignificant.

The Communist Parties of the West are simply class-war units, not bearers of barbarism and Russian pan-Slav nationalism. In the 20th century, all are forced to think in terms of facts and not merely words, so far as Politics is concerned, and Russia's connexion with Western class-war rests simply on words. Russia claims to be the bearer of class-war in the West. Nevertheless, during the Second World War the Moscow regime forbade the American Communist Party to engage in class-warfare. Actually, the entire policy of using Marxism as a political export-article is now political stupidity, for Marxism has lost its former rabble-rousing value in the West. The highpoint of class-war in the West

has passed.

In particular, it was the re-orientation of Russian world-policy after the Second World War, the turning against the Jewish entity of Church-State-Nation-People-Race, that sealed the doom of every Communist Party in the West, the one in America included.

The blow that the American-Jewish Symbiosis has dealt the European organism is well-known. The values of this Symbiosis are purely animal, anti-Spiritual, anti-Aristocratic, anti-Cultural, anti-Heroic, anti-Imperialist, and therefore appeal to the worst element in the European population and to the worst in every individual European. In each point of its attack, America-Jewry opposes the values of Capitalism to those of Imperialism, the heroic world-outlook of the Age of Absolute Politics. With the spiritual-ethical values of Capitalism, America-Jewry is planning to kill the Western organism. But since the Past can never destroy the Future, only attempt to thwart it, that means American bayonets imposing the anti-Cultural Interregnum on Europe, and therein lies the possibility that for Europe will follow many decades of degradation, chaos, darkness, stultification, misery, and wasting away.

The effect that a Russian occupation of Europe would have on the Western Culture is not yet equally well-known, and can be determined only by uncovering its organic basis.

The Russian is a barbarian; the European is a Culture-man in his late-Civilisation phase. Before this moment in History, barbarians have violently invaded Culture-areas. In the 16th century B.C., Northern barbarians invaded the Egyptian Culture-petrifact, to enact the chapter of history that is called the "Hyksos"-era. About 1700 B.C., the Kassites conquered and occupied the Babylonian Culture-area, and, around the same time, the Aryans in a barbaric wave from the North flooded into and conquered the Culture of the Indus. Chinese history in its first stirrings is the epic of a barbarian invasion by the Chou. Imperial Rome - even Republican Rome - was invaded more than once by the barbarian Germans and Gauls. In none of these historical instances did the invasion of the barbarians destroy the body of the Culture; in each case the result was finally the absorption of the barbarian elements into the

Culture-body or their expulsion. The barbarian comes to destroy and stays to learn. Spiritually, the barbarian is a tabula rasa. Labile and child-like, he is eager to apply the new doctrines, new life-forms, to which he has been converted. Hence the Romanov Petersburg of the 18th and 19th centuries displayed a higher degree of Western Politesse and social-form than any European capital before it.

The belief that a Russian-barbarian occupation of the whole of Europe would be similar to the Russian occupation of half of Germany after the Second World War is a completely false estimate of the possibilities. A Russian occupation of all Europe would involve an entirely different distribution of forces and a completely different psychological situation. In the first place, the Russian occupation after the Second World War originated as a gift from America. Cynically, Europe's border against Asia, which had been pushed back gradually over a millennium, was restored to its place of 900 years ago. Thus the history, honour, and traditions of thirty generations of Europeans were outraged. The atrocities committed during the first years of the Russian occupation were permitted, encouraged, and even imitated by America. Without American encouragement, Russia would not have been in the position to commit its atrocities. In the second place, Europe was not politically able to intervene to protect 30,000,000 Europeans, for every European country was governed by the churchill-regimes the Americans had appointed, and these puppet-governments greeted barbarian Russia as their "valiant ally" while their members exchanged decorations with those of the Moscow regime.

Russia's occupation of a small part of Europe and its domination over one tenth of the European population after the Second World War were made possible only by the Washington regime, which, in 1945, wanted Europe so divided that the Red Flag would wave over Berlin and Vienna. If the Washington regime, instead of giving Russia simply a small part of Europe, had abandoned to it all of Europe - and that is a possibility contained in the events to come -, the division of forces would be completely different. Instead of AmericaJewry, the whole of Russia, Eastern Europe, and most of Western Europe - under churchill-regimes - ranged against part of Germany, then against 200,000,000 Russians, would be arrayed the total body of the West, 250,000,000 men who are superior to them in intelligence, technical skill, organisational

talent, and will-to-power. If this happens, America will be expelled from Europe, once and for all. Europe will have but a single enemy. That would be a unifying factor such as did not exist from the First Crusade until Lepanto.

A Russian occupation would develop along one or the other of two lines. The first possibility is an endless series of European uprisings against Russia that could result only in the expulsion of the demoralised barbarians. The second possibility would result from Russia's introducing a clever regime and according Europe extensive autonomy and magnanimous treatment. Within a few decades, this Europe would naturally aim at infiltrating horizontally the whole Russian seat of origin, its technical, economic, social, and, finally, military and political life. Instead of the Russification of Europe, as Dostoevsky and Aksakov dreamt of it, would result the Europeanisation of Russia once again, and this time in far stronger degree. This would occur from pure historical necessity, since this is the Age of Absolute Politics and Europe is politically shrewd whereas barbarian Russia is formless and politically inept, fluctuating between senseless vehemence and inner doubt. Not even the most brilliant statesmen in Russia could use this barbarian material to subjugate Europe in this Imperialist stage of its Destiny. An attempt by Russia to integrate Europe into its power-accumulation peacefully would eventually result in the rise of a new Symbiosis: Europe-Russia. Its final form would be that of a European Imperium. An attempt by Russia to chastise and terrorise Europe without the help of America would result in Russia's expulsion from Europe for good, by a Europe whose own dormant barbarian instincts had been thus reawakened.

If Russia should occupy Europe and attempt to imitate the American policy of encouraging petty-statism, to divide and conquer, it would fail utterly. America has been successful in that policy only because of its access to the European Michel-stratum with its lickspittle churchills. The Michel yearns for American capitalism and liberalism, but trembles with abysmal cowardice before Russian barbarism. The Communist Parties would be of slight use to Russia in any attempt to set up puppet-governments on the model of America's churchillregimes. The leadership and membership of these Communist Parties is composed of inferior European types, not of pan-Slavs or religious Russian nationalists.

The barbarian, immature and unversed in the subtleties of the art of Politics, trusts only those who are of his own religion, and the true religion of the Russian is not Marxism, but Russia. The first victims of a Russian occupation of Europe would be the European Communists, who would be liquidated at the slightest suspicion of disloyalty. Their “Communism” stems from books, their pro-Russian sentiments from hatred and envy of their European surroundings, their utopian orthodoxy about Russia comes from a lack of realism and an exaggerated intellectualism. The Russian knout and the Russian revolver would soon teach them what they have not learnt from their books, would shatter their utopian ideals and give their hatred a new focus.

Russia’s effect on petty-statism and petty-nationalism would in no way resemble America’s successful perpetuation of these Culture-pathological phenomena. To carry out its policy in Europe, America needs petty-statism. Not only does it work in the spirit of the principle, divide et impera, it also cannot think outside the narrow framework of it. After the Second World War, the Washington regime, which held absolute power to force its will on enfeebled Europe, announced its policy of a “united Europe.” It then proceeded to Balkanise Europe politically and atomise it socially in unparalleled fashion. Numerous congresses of toothless and infantile old men from the 19th century passed even more numerous resolutions, but the result was continued disunity and chaos. The childish dotards had received permission from Washington to jabber about the “unification” of Europe as much as they liked, but they were not allowed to say a word about the Liberation of Europe. That is why all these congresses led to nothing. For the Unification of Europe and the Liberation of Europe are one and the same process: seen from within, it is Unification; from without, liberation.

The fact that Russia used the fiction of “independent” states in its post-War occupation of Eastern Europe offers no criterion for its policy in the event it should occupy Western Europe, the Europe that is synonymous with the Western Culture. In any case, simply the presence of the barbarian, let alone his policy, would dissolve the Inner Enemy of Europe, the Michelstratum, and thus liberate all creative forces within Europe from the tyranny of the Past.

Without the Michel, without his leaders, namely the churchills, without American bayonets, the distribution of forces would be as follows: the European will-to-power and the European Destiny against the sheer military might of a barbarian horde. The dissolution of the Michel-stratum would automatically destroy petty-statism, for petty-statist ideals and theories are preserved only in Culture-retarding brains. The barbarian, whether he wished it or not, would complete the spiritual unification of Europe by removing the only innerEuropean obstacle to that unity. From the Spiritual to the Political is but one step.

The following would be the results of the two possible kinds of Russian policy, the far-sighted policy of striving to integrate Europe into an enormous Russian Empire, embracing the whole world, and the policy of attempting to rule Europe by terror and violence.

Should Russia aim at a lasting incorporation of Europe into its Empire, it could succeed only if it granted Europe significant concessions. The first of these would have to be administrative autonomy for Europe as a unit, for that is the desire of all Europeans - the Michel-stratum and its leaders, the senile churchills, of course, excepted.

Should Russia attempt to terrorise Europe, it would summon forth in the European People the will to counter-terror. Faced with the barbarian, all Europeans, even the simplest minded liberals, would learn the necessity of inner firmness, of a stern will, the virtues of Command and Obedience, for these alone could force the barbarian to accept demands, or else retreat to his tundras and steppes. All Europeans would realise that not parliamentary babble, class-war, capitalism, and elections, but only Authority, the Will-to-Power, and finally, the military spirit could ever drive out the barbarian. The expulsion of England's army of 40,000 men by a few hundred Irish guerrilla-fighters in the years 1916-1923 would be repeated on a larger scale. In a great, unrelenting War of Liberation, Europe would unite itself, and cast the barbarian back to the distant plains of Asia.

To conclude: Between the two powers in the Concert of Bolshevism that dominates this Second Interbellum-Period,

there are numerous similarities, some profound, others superficial. Neither of the two is an organism with a positive Mission; neither of the two exhibits the inner qualities that alone can found and preserve a world-system; neither of them has or can have an aristocracy; in short, neither of them is the seat of a High Culture. In both the element of Landscape predominates over the cultural component in every stratum of the human material; both make use of an antiquated Western ideology that is completely ineffectual in the world-situation of the Age of Absolute Politics; both have not the faintest inkling of the Imperium-Idea, the necessary fulfilment whereof is the total historical meaning of this Age; both believe it possible to attain a static world-order in which History would have ceased to exist, and this belief makes both dangerously relentless; both believe Europe can be destroyed as a politico-Cultural unit, and degraded to the level of China.

Thus, from the European standpoint, there is in a Cultural sense no choice between these two powers, for both represent fundamental opposites to European Cultural imperatives.

In their political relation to Europe, however, the two extra-European powers widely and fundamentally differ. Owing to the presence of a European inner America, the Washington regime is able to establish or maintain in every European country: Culture-distortion, petty-statism, finance-capitalism, democracy, economic distress, and chaos. Regardless of its intentions, Russia produces a spiritual aversion throughout Europe. If America, deliberately or otherwise, relinquished to Russia the whole of Europe, Russia's occupation would have to be based either on terror or large-scale concessions to procure collaboration. Both occupation policies would end in the domination of Russia by Europe, either through a peaceful inner conquest or a series of Liberation Wars that Europe would wage as a unit against Russia. Barbarian Russia can only awaken Europe's sterner instincts. The American-Jewish Symbiosis, composed of fellah-Jews and American colonials who are at once primitive and over-civilised, appeals to the lowest stratum of Europe and to the lowest stratum in every European, the stratum of animal instincts, laziness, cowardice, avarice, dishonour, and ethical individualism.

America can only divide Europe-no matter what its policy.

Russia can only unite Europe-no matter what its policy.

From their comparative relationships to Europe, it follows quite clearly that a Russian-barbarian domination of all Europe, if such a thing were brought about by American policy-and that is the only way such an event could occur-would be less injurious to the Destiny of Europe than a continuation of the American-Jewish domination, for the barbarian, by his very presence, would dissolve the Inner Enemy of Europe, the Michel-stratum, and unite Europe spiritually.

This brings us to the concrete question of political decisions for Europe. The political question would be: How is power to be enlarged? But since Europe has no power, the question is: How is power to be obtained? There are only two political units in the world; hence the question is simply: From which political unit can Europe wrest away power? Or in other words: Who is the Enemy?

## ***THE POLITICAL ENEMY OF EUROPE***

The armistice that concluded the Second World War left Europe divided between Russia and America-Jewry. Russia received ten per cent of Europe's population, America-Jewry was allotted ninety per cent. By Europe is meant here, of course, the Cultural Europe, viz., Germany, France, England, Italy, Spain, together with tiny provinces like Switzerland, and not the geographic "Europe" that is an historically worthless concept.

The Washington regime naturally seeks to convince its European subjects to identify the interests of America-Jewry with their own and therefore prepare Europe for war against Russia in alliance with it. The propaganda that aims at enlisting Europe's participation in this war has three main points: first, Russia is not a "democracy"; second, it "enslaves" other peoples; third, a Russian occupation of Europe would result in the slaughter of the whole European population or a considerable part thereof.

The first point is politically meaningless, nor is the second point worth taking seriously. To enslave two hundred and fifty million people who are spiritually, ethically, scientifically, technically, militarily, and politically the most highly developed in the world is impossible. So far as Europeans can be enslaved at all, they are already enslaved by America-Jewry. Today the people of Europe work with every possible exertion for the enrichment and aggrandisement of the financiers, industrialbarons, politicians, and generals of North America. Slavery no longer means the rattling of chains, rather shortages of currency and materials, rationing, unemployment, occupation soldiers and their families, puppet-governments, re-armament and military programmes on a gigantic scale.

The third point seeks to frighten Europeans into a war to destroy America-Jewry's sole dynamic opponent, thus placing the masters of New York and Washington in control of the entire world. But again, to kill a considerable part of the European population through short-term violent measures would be impossible. The well-planned and systematically executed starvation of Germany by the American-Jewish occupation during the period 1945-1948 killed approximately

3,000,000 people. That is probably the largest number of people that could have been killed by such methods. Overheated brains that could be persuaded that Europe “killed 6,000,000 Jews” can readily imagine the course a Russian massacre of hundreds of millions of human beings would take. People who believe in such nightmares lack a sense for exaggeration, and their psychology is entirely wanting. No great number of men can be trained to kill, directly and systematically, as a daily performance, from morning till evening, over an extended period, unarmed men, women, and children. Certainly, the mere sporadic killing of the kind involved in every military invasion could never reduce the population of Europe to any great extent.

If a selective killing should be the method in an attempt to behead the European organism, then Russia would be likewise incapable of that. This was the method of the American-Jewish “war-crimes” programme, the most extensive terror in the history of the world. America-Jewry attempted to isolate the elite and string up its members one by one; but there, too, it missed the mark. Russia did not practise any systematic “war-crimes” terror, in spite of encouragement on the part of America-Jewry, since it was more interested in individuals as material for the Future than in settling past accounts according to Mosaic Law. Furthermore, the American Colonials and their exotic leaders understand much better than the barbarian how to go about isolating and exterminating superior individuals, for the inner structure and cohesion of the Western Culture are much less familiar to him and much less understood by him. A profound ignorance of the outside world goes hand in hand with Russian xenophobia.

America-Jewry insists that Russia could overwhelm Europe quite mechanically and automatically—were not American colonial troops here. Yet the fact remains that only America’s intervention in the Second World War prevented Europe from destroying Russia as a political unit. The present Russian power-accumulation was thus created by America-Jewry. Never in the five centuries of Russian history has Russia been able to make way into Europe unless supported by one or more European states. Against Frederick the Great Russia received aid from France, Austria, and Sweden; against Napoleon Russia received aid from England, Austria, Prussia, Sweden, and Spain.

In 1945, Russia penetrated into Germany only with America's assistance. Before American intervention, Europe had hurled the barbarian back across the Volga. Russia is a threat only to a divided Europe; a united Europe could destroy the power of Bolshevist Russia at the moment of its choosing. That Europe has need of America-Jewry to defend itself against Russia is a crass lie.

Only America can grant Russia entry into Europe; this was true in 1945, and will be just as true in 1967 or 1975. There are two ways in which America-Jewry could deliver Europe to a Russian-Bolshevist occupation: by voluntarily making Russia a gift of it, as it did with China in 1947, or by losing a war against Russia from European bases.

In any case, Europe—that means here above all the Culturebearing stratum—will choose its own enemy because the 250,000 men who are mystically charged with fulfilling the Destiny of Europe are by nature inwardly free of Culturallyalien influences. Enemy propaganda, however great its extent may be, cannot frustrate the Destiny of a High Culture, for that Destiny is above mechanism and technics, and propaganda is simply a technique. An enemy occupying Europe can probably round up herds of civilians by means of its puppet-governments and call the result an army, but beyond that it cannot go. An army means, first, morale; second, an officer-corps; third, a high command; and, fourth, the human material of the troops. A herd of civilians conscripted under foreign coercion would possess no morale and have no European officer-corps and European high command. Without these, they would be only an armed mob, and, as such, not a formidable match for the barbarians.

We have seen that it is a deep spiritual need of the matriarchal American People to have many and strong allies in a war; and of the ruling-stratum in America it must be remarked that the rider is always limited to the abilities of his mount. We have also seen that Europe is the basis for America's every war-plan against Russia. Europe may be able to exploit these facts.

To secure the collaboration of Europe in the war it is planning against Russia, America would grant Europe huge concessions—in inner

autonomy, in commerce, in military affairs, and even in administrative unification. But since America has the Michel-stratum at its disposal, and this stratum holds office everywhere in Europe, no demands are put to it. Thus the Washington regime can treat Europeans as something less than peons-peons at least receive a wage. The churchills of every country make no demands lest they disquiet the American bayonets upon which their tenure of office depends. To expect pride and independence from the stratum of professional traitors is simply unrealistic.

The second way in which the American People's spiritual need to have allies might be exploitet would be through an unswerving, voluntary, neutralisation of Europe vis-d-vis the projected war against Russia. Once the Washington regime was forced to accept European neutrality as a fact, it would have to abandon its plans for a European theatre-of-war and evacuate Europe.

Either of these possibilities, if realised, could bring about the Liberation of Europe before the Third World War. The first possibility could be realised only if the Michel-stratum were removed from public life, for the churchills would scarcely place Europe's interests above their class and personal interests, which are protected only by the foreign occupation.

To act creatively in Politics, one must begin with the right choice of enemy. If one selects an enemy from whom one can win no power, the end-result is suicide, as we saw with the self-destruction of the English Empire in the Second World War. Were Europe actually to fight for an enemy, that would be proof that Europe had in fact died, but the continuing mystical relation between the European Culture-bearing stratum and the European population would prevent Europe from doing so. Should the Third World War occur, Europe will participate in it only on its own terms. That is an absolute mystical certainty. Perhaps a herd of hapless conscripts without morale, without European officers and a European high command, can be thrown on the battlefield to fight for an enemy, but that would hardly be European participation worthy of the name.

All this has long since answered the question: Who is the Enemy? The enemy must be a political unit at whose expense

we can gain power. America-Jewry has the power in Europe, and if Europe would win back its sovereignty, it can do so only at the expense of America-Jewry. Politics is concrete, and thus the argument that Russia wishes to conquer Europe has but little force. Perhaps India would like to do that as well, but Europe must reckon on facts and not on threats. America has the power in Europe, and, therefore, America is the Enemy.

Two facts dominate the politics of Europe in this historical period: Europe will never fight for its Enemy; Europe will survive the Third World War and its aftermath, regardless of the new weaponry.

These are metaphysical facts; they possess Destiny value and cannot be removed by human action. They correspond to all life-furthering, life-affirming, power-increasing instincts of the European People, to the superpersonal Destiny of the Western Culture. In view of these facts, the enemy propaganda of the Russian bogey can be called simply idiotic. America-Jewry is the bearer of the Russian menace, today, as in the Second World War. If it brings about a Russian occupation of all Europe, then all Europe will persevere and overcome that happening. Should America be expelled from Europe before the Third World War, the form of the war would be completely different. Instead of America-Jewry versus Russia, it would then be the European Imperium versus Russia, and in that form the war would end in the destruction of Russia as a political unit. For the European Imperium, the result would be external security for the coming centuries. Should America attempt to intervene, as before, this time its efforts would be of no avail, for the European Imperium will naturally include England and Ireland. It was only America's fortuitous possession of those bases that enabled it to stab Europe in the back during the Second World War. From North America or Africa, AmericaJewry could do little or nothing to help Russia.

The Age is mighty and its tasks enormous, but if we hold fast to our honour and pride, harken to our own instincts and the Inner Imperative, we will win the upper hand in every instance. Although the opponents are gigantic, they are formless; behind their patchwork power-accumulations is a spiritual void which, like a vacuum, will draw back their dispersed forces. Neither America-Jewry nor Russia is a structure inwardly adapted to the Age of Absolute Politics. The American People

is matriarchal, isolationist, and interested only in economic matters. When the power-adventures at the antipodes run into too much money or demand real blood-sacrifice, the Washington regime will no longer be able to force it to tread the false path of senseless World Wars. In the World War, Germany lost 739 Generals, whereas America had the death of a single General to mourn. This fact just symbolises the truth that America has enjoyed success without having to pay the price of it. The moment the adventures become too costly, the Washington regime will have to retreat, for even its “victories” mean nothing to the American People. An apolitical people cannot win an enduring political victory; it does not need it, or want it, or even know how it would use the power proceeding from it.

The Russian barbarian does not understand power; he has no knowledge of the meaning of this Age. Neither the halfWesternised Bolsheviks nor the pure-Asiatic masses possess the qualities needed to build an empire. The spiritually unadulterated Russian, whose limitations are binding for the Moscow regime, is religious, hence inward; he is rural and land-hungry, but there is no nobility and no religion in Russia that attend to his material and spiritual cares. Marxism is a collection of dead and sterile phrases, and can no more strongly inspire the Russian than it can the European. Pan-Slav religiosity does not seek an empire; with it an empire cannot be built.

This is the Age of Absolute Politics, and its meaning is the fulfillment of the Destiny of the Western Civilisation: the formation of the European Imperium and the actualisation of its World-Mission. In this Age, a power that would impose its will on the world must be endowed with the inner qualities that alone can establish and maintain a world-system, the qualities of the Spanish Europe in the 16th century, the English Europe in the 18th and 19th centuries, the Prussian Ethical Socialist Europe in the 20th century, which will survive the 21st century. The one, great, all-embracing quality that is absolutely necessary for such a task is the consciousness of a Mission. That cannot come from human resolves; it can come only as the emanation of a superpersonal soul, the organ of a higher Destiny, a Divinity. The American-Jewish and Russian ideas of negative world-conquest are but vague caricatures of the true, Western European Idea of Imperium Mundi, a travesty of

History on the world-stage.

Europe recognises its Cultural enemies and its sole political enemy. Thus it sees the only path it can follow. The basis of Europe's politics is faith in but under no circumstances fear of the Future. If we follow now the path that our instincts, our intelligence, and our Inner Imperative have prescribed, whatever befalls us shall be good. For us there is but one crime, one misdemeanour, and one mistake: that is to be untrue to ourselves and follow alien leaders and hold alien ideals.

Europe also recognises its Inner Enemy: Whosoever pursues another policy than that of a sovereign Europe, whether this be the policy of America-Jewry or Russia, is the Inner Enemy. Petty-statists and petty-nationalists sink to the level of spies and foreign agents. Loyalty to Europe excludes every other political loyalty. No European owes the petty-state of his birth any allegiance whatever, for all these tiny erstwhile-states are now simply anti-European tools in the hands of our Enemy, the Washington regime.

Europe is equal to its historic task. Against the anti-spiritual, anti-heroic "ideals" of America-Jewry, Europe pits its metaphysical ideas, its faith in its Destiny, its ethical principles, its heroism. Fearlessly, Europe falls in for battle, knowing it is armed with the mightiest weapon ever forged by History: the superpersonal Destiny of the European organism. Our European Mission is to create the Culture-State-Nation-Imperium of the West, and thereby we shall perform such deeds, accomplish such works, and so transform our world that our distant posterity, when they behold the remains of our buildings and ramparts, will tell their grandchildren that on the soil of Europe once dwelt a tribe of gods.