SEMINAR TEXTS FOR

INTRODUCTION TO THE HISTORY OF IDEAS (EU1003)

(Junior Freshman)

Dr Edward ARNOLD
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Count A. de GOBINEAU, *The Inequality of Human Races* (1853-55) ........... 2

2. Karl PEARSON, *National life from the Standpoint of Science* (1900) .... 6

3. Edouard DRUMONT, Antisemitism as nationalism: *Jewish France*, (1886) ................................................................. 14


5. Maurice BARRÈS, Integral Nationalism: *The Nancy Programme*, (1898) ......................................................................................................................... 28

6. Adolf HITLER and Nazism *Mein Kampf* (1924) ................................ 32
   (a) The Bigger the Lie, the Better .................................................................. 32
   (b) The Jewish Peril ..................................................................................... 33
   (c) The Master Race ................................................................................... 34
   (d) Alfred ROSENBERG: Aryan Culture ..................................................... 35

7. Benito MUSSOLINI (1935) ........................................................................ 36
   (a) *The Doctrine of Fascism* .................................................................... 36
   (b) Fascism, War, Dictatorship .................................................................... 38

8. Karl MARX and Friedrich ENGELS ............................................................ 43
   (a) *The Communist Manifesto* (1848) .................................................. 43
   (b) On Philosophy (1845) .............................................................. 50
   (c) The Economic Interpretation of History (1859) ............................... 50
   (d) The Dialectic Method (1873) .......................................................... 51

9. Eduard BERNSTEIN - *Evolutionary Socialism* and revisionism (1899) .... 52

BIBLIOGRAPHY .......................................................................................... 56
The Fin-de-Siècle Mood ............................................................................... 56
Antisemitism and nationalism .................................................................... 56
Nazism, Hitler and European Fascisms ..................................................... 57
Marxism and Marxist revisionism ............................................................... 58

LECTURE SCHEDULE .................................................................................. 59

[...] RECAPITULATION; THE RESPECTIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE THREE GREAT RACES; THE SUPERIORITY OF THE WHITE TYPE, AND, WITHIN THIS TYPE, OF THE ARYAN FAMILY

I have shown the unique place in the organic world occupied by the human species, the profound physical, as well as moral, differences separating it from all other kinds of living creatures. Considering it by itself, I have been able to distinguish, on physiological grounds alone, three great and clearly marked types, the black, the yellow, and the white. However uncertain the aims of physiology may be, however meagre its resources, however defective its methods, it can proceed thus far with absolute certainty.

The negroid variety is the lowest, and stands at the foot of the ladder. The animal character, that appears in the shape of the pelvis, is stamped on the negro from birth, and foreshadows his destiny. His intellect will always move within a very narrow circle. He is not however a mere brute, for behind his low receding brow, in the middle of his skull, we can see signs of a powerful energy, however crude its objects. If his mental faculties are dull or even non-existent, he often has an intensity of desire, and so of will, which may be called terrible. Many of his senses, especially taste and smell, are developed to an extent unknown to the other two races. *

The very strength of his sensations is the most striking proof of his inferiority. All food is good in his eyes, nothing disgusts or repels him. What he desires is to eat, to eat furiously, and to excess; no carrion is too revolting to be swallowed by him. It is the same with odours; his inordinate desires are satisfied with all, however coarse or even horrible. To these qualities may be added an instability and capriciousness of feeling, that cannot be tied down to any single object, and which, so far as he is concerned, do away with all distinctions of good and evil. We might even say that the violence with which he pursues the object that has aroused his senses and inflamed his desires is a guarantee of the desires being soon satisfied and the object forgotten. Finally, he is equally careless of his own life and that of others: he kills willingly, for the sake of killing; and this human machine, in whom it is so easy to arouse emotion, shows, in face of suffering, either a monstrous indifference or a cowardice that seeks a voluntary refuge in death.

The yellow race is the exact opposite of this type. The skull points forward, not backward. The forehead is wide and bony, often high and projecting. The shape of the face is triangular, the nose and chin showing none of the coarse protuberances that mark the negro. There is further a general proneness to obesity, which, though not confined to the yellow type, is found there more frequently than in the others. The yellow man has little physical energy, and is inclined to apathy; he commits none of the strange excesses so common among negroes. His desires are feeble, his will-power rather obstinate than violent; his longing for material pleasures, though constant, is kept within bounds. A rare glutton by nature, he shows far more discrimination in his choice of food. He tends to mediocrity in everything; he understands easily enough anything not too deep or sublime. He has a love of utility and a respect for order, and knows the value of a certain amount of freedom. He is practical, in the narrowest sense of the word. He does not dream or theorise; he invents little, but can appreciate and take over what is useful to him. His whole desire is to live in the easiest and most comfortable way possible. The yellow races are thus clearly superior to the black. Every founder of a civilisation would wish the backbone of his society, his middle class, to consist of such men. But no civilised society

* "Taste and smell in the negro are as powerful as they are undiscriminating. He eats everything, and odours which are revolting to us are pleasant to him" (Pruner).

(Author's note)
could be created by them; they could not supply its nerve-force, or set in motion the 
springs of beauty and action.

We come now to the white peoples. These are gifted with reflective energy, or rather 
with an energetic intelligence. They have a feeling for utility, but in a sense far wider and 
higher, more courageous and ideal, than the yellow races; a perseverance that takes 
account of obstacles and ultimately finds a means of overcoming them; a greater physical 
power, an extraordinary instinct for order, not merely as a guarantee of peace and 
tranquillity, but as an indispensable means of self-preservation. At the same time, they 
have a remarkable, and even extreme, love of liberty, and are openly hostile to the 
formalism under which the Chinese are glad to vegetate, as well as to the strict 
despotism which is the only way of governing the negro.

The white races are, further, distinguished by an extraordinary attachment to life. They 
know better how to use it, and so, as it would seem, set a greater price on it; both in their 
own persons and those of others, they are more sparing of life. When they are cruel, they 
are conscious of their cruelty; it is very doubtful whether such a consciousness exists in 
the negro. At the same time, they have discovered reasons why they should surrender 
this busy life of theirs, that is so precious to them. The principal motive is honour, which 
under various names has played an enormous part in the ideas of the race from the 
beginning. I need hardly add that the word honour, together with all the civilising 
influences connoted by it, is unknown to both the yellow and the black man.

On the other hand, the immense superiority of the white peoples in the whole field of 
the intellect is balanced by an inferiority in the intensity of their sensations. In the world of 
the senses, the white man is far less gifted than the others, and so is less tempted and 
less absorbed by considerations of the body, although in physical structure he is far the 
most vigorous.

Such are the three constituent elements of the human race.

I call them secondary types, as I think myself obliged to omit all discussion of the 
Adamite man. From the combination, by intermarriage, of the varieties of these types 
come the tertiary groups. The quaternary formations are produced by the union of one of 
these tertiary types, or of a pure-blooded tribe, with another group taken from one of the 
two foreign species. Below these categories others have appeared—and still appear. 
Some of these are very strongly characterised, and form new and distinct points of 
departure, coming as they do from races that have been completely fused. Others are 
complete, and ill-ordered, and, one might even say, anti-social, since their elements, 
being too numerous, too disparate, or too barbarous, have had neither the time nor the 
opportunity for combining to any fruitful purpose. No limits, except the horror excited by 
the possibility of infinite intermixture, can be assigned to the number of these hybrid and 
chequered races that make up the whole of mankind.

It would be unjust to assert that every mixture is bad and harmful. If the three great 
types had remained strictly separate, the supremacy would no doubt have always been in 
the hands of the finest of the white races, and the yellow and black varieties would have 
crawled for ever at the feet of the lowest of the whites. Such a state is so far ideal, since it 
has never been beheld in history; and we can imagine it only by recognising the 
undisputed superiority of those groups of the white races which have remained the 
purest.

It would not have been all gain. The superiority of the white race would have been 
clearly shown, but it would have been bought at the price of certain advantages which 
have followed the mixture of blood. Although these are far from counterbalancing the 
defects they have brought in their train, yet they are sometimes to be commended. 
Artistic genius, which is equally foreign to each of the three great types, arose only after 
the intermarriage of white and black. Again, in the Malayan variety, a human family was

* Martius observes that the European is superior to the coloured man in the pressure of the 
nervous fluid (Reise in Brasilien, vol. i, p. 259). (Author's note)
produced from the yellow and black races that had more intelligence than either of its ancestors.

Finally, from the union of white and yellow, certain intermediary peoples have sprung, who are superior to the purely Finnish tribes as well as to the negroes.

I do not deny that these are good results. The world of art and great literature that comes from the mixture of blood, the improvement and ennoblement of inferior races—all these are wonders for which we must needs be thankful. The small have been raised. Unfortunately, the great have been lowered by the same process; and this is an evil that nothing can balance or repair. Since I am putting together the advantages of racial mixtures, I will also add that to them is due the refinement of manners and beliefs, and especially the tempering of passion and desire. But these are merely transitory benefits, and if I recognise that the mulatto, who may become a lawyer, a doctor, or a business man, is worth more than his negro grandfather, who was absolutely savage, and fit for nothing, I must also confess that the Brahmans of primitive India, the heroes of the Iliad and the Shahnameh, the warriors of Scandinavia—the glorious shades of noble races that have disappeared—give us a higher and more brilliant idea of humanity, and were more active, intelligent, and trusty instruments of civilisation and grandeur than the peoples, hybrid a hundred times over, of the present day. And the blood even of these was no longer pure.

However it has come about, the human races, as we find them in history, are complex; and one of the chief consequences has been to throw into disorder most of the primitive characteristics of each type. The good as well as the bad qualities are seen to diminish in intensity with repeated intermixture of blood; but they also scatter and separate off from each other, and are often mutually opposed. The white race originally possessed the monopoly of beauty, intelligence, and strength. By its union with other varieties, hybrids were created, which were beautiful without strength, strong without intelligence, or, if intelligent, both weak and ugly. Further, when the quantity of white blood was increased to an indefinite amount by successive infusions, and not by a single admixture, it no longer carried with it its natural advantages, and often merely increased the confusion already existing in the racial elements. Its strength, in fact, seemed to be its only remaining quality, and even its strength served only to promote disorder. The apparent anomaly is easily explained. Each stage of a perfect mixture produces a new type from diverse elements, and develops special faculties. As soon as further elements are added, the vast difficulty of harmonising the whole creates a state of anarchy. The more this increases, the more do even the best and richest of the new contributions diminish in value, and by their mere presence add fuel to an evil which they cannot abate. If mixtures of blood are, to a certain extent, beneficial to the mass of mankind, if they raise and ennable it, this is merely at the expense of mankind itself, which is stunted, abased, enervated, and humiliated in the persons of its noblest sons. Even if we admit that it is better to turn a myriad of degraded beings into mediocre men than to preserve the race of princes whose blood is adulterated and impoverished by being made to suffer this dishonourable change, yet there is still the unfortunate fact that the change does not stop here; for when the mediocre men are once created at the expense of the greater, they combine with other mediocrities, and from such unions, which grow ever more and more degraded, is born a confusion which, like that of Babel, ends in utter impotence, and leads societies down to the abyss of nothingness whence no power on earth can rescue them.

Such is the lesson of history. It shows us that all civilisations derive from the white race, that none can exist without its help, and that a society is great and brilliant only so far as it preserves the blood of the noble group that created it, provided that this group itself belongs to the most illustrious branch of our species.

Of the multitude of peoples which live or have lived on the earth, ten alone have risen to the position of complete societies. The remainder have gravitated round these more or less independently, like planets round their suns. If there is any element of life in these ten civilisations that is not due to the impulse of the white races, any seed of death that
does not come from the inferior stocks that mingled with them, then the whole theory on which this book rests is false. On the other hand, if the facts are as I say, then we have an irrefrangible proof of the nobility of our own species. Only the actual details can set the final seal of truth on my system, and they alone can show with sufficient exactness the full implications of my main thesis, that peoples degenerate only in consequence of the various admixtures of blood which they undergo; that their degeneration corresponds exactly to the quantity and quality of the new blood, and that the rudest possible shock to the vitality of a civilisation is given when the ruling elements in a society and those developed by racial change have become so numerous that they are clearly moving away from the homogeneity necessary to their life, and it therefore becomes impossible for them to be brought into harmony and so acquire the common instincts and interests, the common logic of existence, which is the sole justification for any social bond whatever. There is no greater curse than such disorder, for however bad it may have made the present state of things, it promises still worse for the future.

NOTE.—The "ten civilisations" mentioned in the last paragraph are as follows. They are fully discussed in the subsequent books of the "Inequality of Races," of which the present volume forms the first.

I. The Indian civilisation, which reached its highest point round the Indian Ocean, and in the north and east of the Indian Continent, south-east of the Brahmaputra. It arose from a branch of a white people, the Aryans.

II. The Egyptians, round whom collected the Ethiopians, the Nubians, and a few smaller peoples to the west of the oasis of Ammon. This society was created by an Aryan colony from India, that settled in the upper valley of the Nile.

III. The Assyrians, with whom may be classed the Jews, the Phœnicians, the Lydians, the Carthaginians, and the Hymiarites. They owed their civilising qualities to the great white invasions which may be grouped under the name of the descendants of Shem and Ham. The Zoroastrian Iranians who ruled part of Central Asia under the names of Medes, Persians, and Bactrians, were a branch of the Aryan family.

IV. The Greeks, who came from the same Aryan stock, as modified by Semitic elements.

V. The Chinese civilisation, arising from a cause similar to that operating in Egypt. An Aryan colony from India brought the light of civilisation to China also. Instead however of becoming mixed with black peoples, as on the Nile, the colony became absorbed in Malay and yellow races, and was reinforced, from the north-west, by a fair number of white elements, equally Aryan but no longer Hindu.

VI. The ancient civilisation of the Italian peninsula, the cradle of Roman culture. This was produced by a mixture of Celts, Iberians, Aryans, and Semites.

VII. The Germanic races, which in the fifth century transformed the Western mind. These were Aryans.

VIII.-X. The three civilisations of America, the Alleghanian, the Mexican, and the Peruvian.

Of the first seven civilisations, which are those of the Old World, six belong, at least in part, to the Aryan race, and the seventh, that of Assyria, owes to this race the Iranian Renaissance, which is, historically, its best title to fame. Almost the whole of the Continent of Europe is inhabited at the present time by groups of which the basis is white, but in which the non-Aryan elements are the most numerous. There is no true civilisation, among the European peoples, where the Aryan branch is not predominant.

In the above list no negro race is seen as the initiator of a civilisation. Only when it is mixed with some other can it even be initiated into one.

Similarly, no spontaneous civilisation is to be found among the yellow races; and when the Aryan blood is exhausted stagnation supervenes. [...]

Trinity College, University of Dublin
Introduction to the History of Ideas (JF)
2. Karl PEARSON ¹, National life from the Standpoint of Science (1900) ²

[...] Every nation is an agglomeration of good and bad elements, and each new generation is born from but a relatively small portion of the whole. The greatness of a nation depends on the dominant fertility of its fitter stocks, and fluctuates with the extent of this dominance. Love of ease, a mistaken sense of duty, insidious new social habits, may tamper with the preponderating fertility of the fitter and more capable racial constitutents before we have realised their effects. Some only of these things can be touched by the legislator; in the aggregate they are subject alone to social feeling and to an enlightened national pride. Is it possible to arouse a consciousness in the folk that the parentage of the next generation is not a personal but a national problem?—that a nation which has ceased to insure that its better elements have a dominant fertility has destroyed itself far more effectually than its foes could ever hope to destroy it in the battlefield? [...] ³

From the standpoint of science there are two questions we can, or, rather, we must, ask. First: What, from the scientific standpoint, is the function of a nation? What part from the natural history aspect does the national organisation play in the universal struggle for existence? And, secondly, What has science to tell us of the best methods of fitting the nation for its task? [...] ³

Now, if you have once realised the force of heredity, you will see in natural selection—the choice of the physically, and mentally fitter to be the parents of the next generation—a most munificent provision for the progress of all forms of life. Nurture and education may immensely aid the social machine, but they must be repeated generation by generation; they will not in themselves reduce the tendency to the production of bad stock. Conscious or unconscious selection can alone bring that about.

What I have said about bad stock seems to me to hold for the lower races of man. How many centuries, how many thousand of years, have the Kaffir or the negro held large districts in Africa undisturbed by the white man? Yet their intertribal struggles have not yet produced a civilisation in the least comparable with the Aryan. Educate and nurture them as you will, I do not believe that you will succeed in modifying the stock. History shows me one way, and one way only, in which a high state of civilisation has been produced, namely, the struggle of race with race, and the survival of the physically and mentally fitter race. If you want to know whether the lower races of man can evolve a higher type, I fear the only course is to leave them to fight it out among themselves, and even then the struggle for existence between individual and individual, between tribe and tribe, may not be supported by that physical selection due to a particular climate on which probably so much of the Aryan's success depended.

If you bring the white man into contact with the black, you too often suspend the very process of natural selection on which the evolution of a higher type depends. You get superior and inferior races living on the same soil, and that coexistence is demoralising for both. They naturally sink into the position of master and servant, if not admittedly or covertly into that of slave-owner and slave. Frequently they intercross, and if the bad stock be raised the good is lowered. Even in the case of Eurasians, of whom I have met mentally and physically fine specimens, I have felt how much better they would have been had they been pure Asiatics or pure Europeans. Thus it comes about that when the struggle for existence between races is suspended, the solution of great problems may be unnaturally postponed; instead of the slow, stern processes of evolution, cataclysmal

---

¹ FRS, Professor of Applied Mathematics at University College, London.
² Lecture delivered to the members of the Literary and Philosophical Society on November 19th, 1900.
solutions are prepared for the future. Such problems in suspense, it appears to me,- are to be found in the negro population of the Southern States of America, in the large admixture of Indian blood in some of the South American races, but, above all, in the Kaffir factor in South Africa.

You may possibly think that I am straying from my subject, but I want to justify natural selection to you. I want you to see selection as something which renders the inexorable law of heredity a source of progress which produces the good through suffering, an infinitely greater good which far outbalances the very obvious pain and evil. Let us suppose the alternative were possible. Let us suppose we could prevent the white man, if we liked, from going to lands of which the agricultural and mineral resources are not worked to the full; then I should say a thousand times better for him that he should not go than that he should settle down and live alongside the inferior race. The only healthy alternative is that he should go and completely drive out the inferior race. That is practically what the white man has done in North America. We sometimes forget the light that chapter of history throws on more recent experiences. Some 250 years ago there was a man who fought in our country against taxation without representation, and another man who did not mind going to prison for the sake of his religious opinions. As Englishmen we are proud of them both, but we sometimes forget that they were both considerable capitalists for their age, and started chartered companies in another continent. Well, a good deal went on in the plantations they founded, if not with their knowledge, with that at least of their servants and of their successors, which would shock us all at the present day. But I venture to say that no man calmly judging will wish either that the whites had never gone to America, or would desire that whites and Red Indians were to day living alongside each other as negro and white in the Southern States, as Kaffir and European in South Africa, still less that they had mixed their blood as Spaniard and Indian in South America. The civilisation of the white man is a civilisation dependent upon free white labour, and when that element of stability is removed it will collapse like those of Greece and Rome. I venture to assert, then, that the struggle for existence between white and red man, painful and even terrible as it was in its details, has given us a good far outbalancing its immediate evil. In place of the red man, contributing practically nothing to the work and thought of the world, we have a great nation, mistress of many arts, and able, with its youthful imagination and fresh, untrammelled impulses, to contribute much to the common stock of civilised man. Against that we have only to put the romantic sympathy for the Red Indian generated by the novels of Cooper and the poems of Longfellow, and then—see how little it weighs in the balance!

But America is but one case in which we have to mark a masterful human progress following an inter-racial struggle. The Australian nation is another case of great civilisation supplanting a lower race unable to work to the full the land and its resources. Further back in history you find the same tale with almost every European nation. Sometimes when the conquering race is not too diverse in civilisation and in type of energy there is an amalgamation of races, as when Norman and Anglo-Saxon ultimately blended; at other times the inferior race is driven out before the superior, as the Celt drove out the Iberian. The struggle means suffering, intense suffering, while it is in progress; but that struggle and that suffering have been the stages by which the white man has reached his present stage of development, and they account for the fact that he no longer lives in caves and feeds on roots and nuts. This dependence of progress on the survival of the fitter race, terribly black as it may seem to some of you, gives the struggle for existence its redeeming features; it is the fiery crucible out of which comes the finer metal. You may hope for a time when the sword shall be turned into the ploughshare, when American and German and English traders shall no longer compete in the markets of the world for their raw material and for their food supply, when the white man and the dark shall share the soil between them, and each till it as he lists. But, believe me, when that day comes mankind will no longer progress; there will be nothing to check the fertility of inferior stock; the relentless law of heredity will not be controlled and guided by natural selection. Man will stagnate; and unless he ceases to multiply, the catastrophe will come again; famine
and pestilence, as we see them in the East, physical selection instead of the struggle of race against race, will do the work more relentlessly, and, to judge from India and China, far less efficiently than of old.

Let us face this question of increasing population boldly. We cannot escape it. Sooner or later it must and will make itself felt in every progressive nation; for what I have said of the struggle of race against race makes itself again felt within every community. A nation like the French can largely limit the number of its offspring, but how shall we be sure that these offspring are from the better and not from the inferior stock? If they come equally from both stocks and there be no wastage, then the nation has ceased to progress; it stagnates. I feel sure that a certain amount of wastage is almost necessary for a progressive nation; you want definite evidence that the inferior stocks are not able to multiply at will, that a certain standard of physique and brains are needful to a man if he wishes to settle and have a family. 4 [...] From the standpoint of the nation we want to inculcate a feeling of shame in the parents of a weakling, whether it be mentally or physically unfit. We want parents to grasp that they have given birth to a new citizen, and that this involves, on the one hand, a duty towards the community in respect of his breed and nurture, and a claim, on the other hand, of the parents or the State that the latter shall make the conditions of life favourable to the rearing of healthy, mentally vigorous men and women. Bear in mind that one quarter only of the married people of this country—say, a sixth to an eighth of the adult population—produce 50 per cent. of the next generation. You will then see how essential it is for the maintenance of a physically and mentally fit race that this one-sixth to one-eighth of our population should be drawn from the best and not the worst stocks. A nation that begins to tamper with its fertility may unconsciously have changed its national characteristics before two generations have passed.

You will see that my view—and I think it may be called the scientific view of a nation—is that of an organised whole, kept up to a high pitch of internal efficiency by insuring that its numbers are substantially recruited from the better stocks, and kept up to a high pitch of external efficiency by contest, chiefly by way of war with inferior races, and with equal races by the struggle for trade-routes and for the sources of raw material and of food supply. This is the natural history view of mankind, and I do not think you can in its main features subvert it. Some of you may refuse to acknowledge it, but you cannot really study history and refuse to see its force. Some of you may realise it, and then despair of life; you may say: Let us cease to struggle; let us leave the lands of the world to the races that cannot profit by them to the full; let us cease to compete in the markets of the world. Well, we could do it, if we were a small nation living on the produce of its own soil, and a soil so worthless that no other race envied it and sought to appropriate it. We should cease to advance; but then we should naturally give up progress as a good which comes through suffering. I say it is possible for a small rural community to stand apart from the world-contest and to stagnate, if no more powerful nation wants its possessions.

But are we such a community? Is it not a fact that the daily bread of our millions of workers depends on their having somebody to work for? that if we give up the contest for trade-routes and for free markets and for waste lands, we indirectly give up our food-supply? Is it not a fact that our strength depends on these and upon our colonies, and that our colonies have been won by the ejection of inferior races, and are maintained against equal races only by respect for the present power of our empire? If war or competition lessen the China trade, if a bad harvest or a flood check the import of Egyptian or American cotton, it is the Lancashire operative who feels the pinch. The day when we cease to hold our own among the nations will be the day of catastrophe for our workers at

4 Ibid., p. 28.
home. We could return to the condition of medieval England, to the condition of Norway or Denmark, but only by a process of intense selection, reducing our millions in a manner which the imagination refuses to contemplate. Being as we are, we cannot give up the struggle, and the moment dearth of ability, the want of brains and physique in the right place, leads to serious defeat, our catastrophe will come. That is the vision which depressed thoughtful men at the beginning of this year; that is the dread which must be ever in the mind of the true statesman when he seeks, on the one hand? to curb the rash venture which may overstrain our power, and on the other hand, to maintain our right to work the unutilised resources of earth, be they in Africa or in Asia.

Struggle of race against race, and of man against man—if this be the scientific view of life, the basis of human progress—how have human love and sympathy come to play such a great part in the world? Here, again, I think science has something to say, although the earlier interpreters of evolution rather obscured it. They painted evolution as the survival of the fittest individual, and spoke of his struggle against his fellows.

But this is not the only form of selection at work; it is often quite the least effective phase of the contest. Consciously or unconsciously, one type of life is fighting against its physical environment. The safety of a gregarious animal—and man is essentially such—depends upon the intensity with which the social instinct has been developed. The stability of a race depends entirely on the extent to which the social feelings have got a real hold on it. The race which allows the physically or mentally stronger Tom to make the existence of the somewhat inferior Jack impossible will never succeed when it comes into contest with a second race. Jack has no interests in common with Tom; the oppressed will hardly get worse terms from a new master. That is why no strong and permanent civilisation can be built upon slave labour, why an inferior race doing menial labour for a superior race can give no stable community; that is why we shall never have a healthy social state in South Africa until the white man replaces the dark in the fields and in the mines, and the Kaffir is pushed back towards the equator. The nation organised for the struggle must be a homogeneous whole, not a mixture of superior and inferior races. For this reason every new land we colonise with white men is a source of strength; every land of coloured men we simply rule may be needful as a source of food and mineral wealth, but it is not an element of stability in our community, and must ever be regarded with grave anxiety by our statesmen.

This need for homogeneity in a nation may be pushed further. We must not have class differences and wealth differences and education differences so great within the community that we lose the sense of common interest, and feel only the pressure of the struggle of man against man. No tribe of men can work together unless the tribal interest dominates the personal and individual interest at all points where they come into conflict. The struggle among primitive men of tribe against tribe evolved the social instinct. The tribe with the greater social feeling survived; we have to thank the struggle for existence for first making man gregarious, and then intensifying, stage by stage, the social feeling. Such is the scientific account of the origin of our social instincts; and if you come to analyse it, such is the origin of what we term morality; morality is only the developed form of the tribal habit, the custom of acting in a certain way towards our fellows, upon which the very safety of the tribe originally depended. Philosophies may be invented, the supersensuous appealed to, in order to increase the sanctions on social or moral conduct; but the natural history of morality begins with the kin-group, spreads to the tribe, to the nation, to allied races, and ultimately to inferior races and lower types of life, but ever with decreasing intensity. The demands upon the spirit of self-sacrifice which can be made by our kin, by our countrymen, by Europeans, by Chinamen, by Negroes and by Kaffirs, by animals, may not be clearly defined; but, on the average, they admit of rough graduation, and we find in practice, whatever be our fine philosophies, that the instinct to self-sacrifice wanes as we go down in the scale.

The man who tells us that he feels to all men alike, that he has no sense of kinship, that he has no patriotic sentiment, that he loves the Kaffir as he loves his brother,
probably deceiving himself. If he is not, then all we can say is that a nation of such men, or even a nation with a large minority of such men, will not stand for many generations; it cannot survive in the struggle of the nations, it cannot be a factor in the contest upon which human progress ultimately depends. The national spirit is not a thing to be ashamed of, as the educated man seems occasionally to hold. If that spirit be the mere excrescence of the music-hall, or an ignorant assertion of superiority to the foreigner, it may be ridiculous, it may even be nationally dangerous; but if the national spirit takes the form of a strong feeling of the importance of organising the nation as a whole, of making its social and economic conditions such that it is able to do its work in the world and meet its fellows without hesitation in the field and in the market, then it seems to me a wholly good spirit—indeed, one of the highest forms of social, that is, moral instinct.

So far from our having too much of this spirit of patriotism, I doubt if we have anything like enough of it. We wait to improve the condition of some class of workers until they themselves cry out or even rebel against their economic condition. We do not better their state because we perceive its relation to the strength and stability of the nation as a whole. Too often it is done as the outcome of a blind class war. The coal-owners, the miners, the manufacturers, the mill-hands, the landlords, the farmers, the agricultural labourers, struggle by fair means, and occasionally by foul, against each other, and, in doing so, against the nation at large, and our statesmen as a rule look on. That was the correct attitude from the standpoint of the old political economy. It is not the correct attitude from the standpoint of science; for science realises that the nation is an organised whole, in continual struggle with its competitors. You cannot get a strong and effective nation if many of its stomachs are half fed and many of its brains untrained. We, as a nation, cannot survive in the struggle for existence if we allow class distinctions to permanently endow the brainless and to push them into posts of national responsibility. The true statesman has to limit the internal struggle of the community in order to make it stronger for the external struggle. We must reward ability, we must pay for brains, we must give larger advantage to physique; but we must not do this at a rate which renders the lot of the mediocre a wholly unhappy one. We must foster exceptional brains and physique for national purposes; but, however useful prize cattle may be, they are not bred for their own sake, but as a step towards the improvement of the whole herd. [...

The dearth of brains and the dearth of physique are the worst misfortunes that can befall a nation, and yet how many of our rulers realise that brains and physique are not things scattered at random among the population, which they can lay their hands on whenever they need them? Our legislators get wonderfully excited over laws relating to horses and cattle; they devote money and time to breeding purposes, and realise the strength of the laws of inheritance when they endow national studs and give prizes to encourage the maintenance of good stock, or when again they work for the establishment of selected herds. But which of them has considered domestic legislation from the natural history standpoint? What statesman has remembered that in the character of the national fertility of to-day is written the strength or weakness of the nation tomorrow? I fear we leave these things to chance, or to the caprice of individual selfishness. As long as the social conditions were such that the weak within the community were not protected by the State; as long as there was no restriction on the fertility of the better stocks, we might in a rough-and-ready manner trust that our population would be recruited from its fitter members. But with the social movements of the present day, the reduction in infantile mortality, principally of the inferior stocks, the reduction in the birth-rate, principally of the superior stocks, science may well call the attention of our rulers to a possible famine—a day when we shall want brains and want physique, and shall not find the necessary reserve of them.

Where are the young men in the political world who can stir even a small section of the community to united action? [...] 5

Where are the younger civil servants to replace our dying proconsuls, the men to whom the nation can commit with a feeling of security and confidence the future problems of South Africa itself? Where are the new writers to whom the nation listens as it did to Carlyle, Ruskin, and Browning? or for whose books it eagerly waits as it did for those of Thackeray and George Eliot? Where are the leaders of science who will make the epoch that Darwin and Huxley made in biology, or Faraday and Clerk Maxwell in physics? There may be steady average ability, but where is the fire of genius, the spirit of enthusiasm, which creates the leader of men either in thought or action? [...] the unchangeable law of heredity shows us only too clearly the chief source of the evil: we have multiplied from the inferior, and not from the superior stocks.

[...] We find that the law of the survival of the fitter is true of mankind, but that the struggle is that of the gregarious animal. A community not knit together by strong social instincts, by sympathy between man and man, and class and class cannot face the external contest, the competition with other nations, by peace or by war, for the raw material of production and for its food supply. This struggle of tribe with tribe, and nation with nation, may have its mournful side; but we see as a result of it the gradual progress of mankind to higher intellectual and physical efficiency. It is idle to condemn it; we can only see that it exists and recognise what we have gained by it—civilisation and social sympathy. But while the statesman has to watch this external struggle, to see that the nation is really an organised whole, not a loose agglomeration of hostile groups of men seeking primarily their own profit and pleasure at the national expense; while he has to check the internal struggle of man with man, he must be very cautious that the nation is not silently rotting at its core. He must insure that the fertility of the inferior stocks is checked, and that of the superior stocks encouraged; he must regard with suspicion anything that tempts the physically and mentally fitter men and women to remain childless. He must see to it that a reserve of brain and muscle is pushed down into occupations which have little apparent need of them, or forced into new lands—even at the expense of inferior races. For upon this reserve we shall surely have to fall back in times of crisis—and such crises will come in our lifetime, to judge by economic and political history, which may far surpass in magnitude even that of this year. Shortly, the statesman has to hold the balance between the strong social feelings upon which are based the external success of the nation and the crude natural check to the unlimited multiplication of the unfit upon which the internal soundness of the nation depends. That is the great lesson we must learn from natural selection and the law of inheritance as applied to human communities. [...] 6

If we consider the general birth-rate of this country, we find that since 1877 it has been steadily declining. Some of this decline is due to lessened infant mortality and increasing longevity, but a part of it to actually decreased fertility.

We might hope, however, that if fewer beings come into the world, they are, at least, born of the healthier, saner, and thriftier classes. The very reverse is the case. The birth-rate of the better type of working man has been falling off more rapidly than the birth-rate of the nation as a whole. [...] Let us compare this state of things with the increase of lunacy in the population at large. Lunacy is one of the things which we may quite definitely accept as an inherited character. The stock in the community in which it is prevalent has been freely reproducing itself. If we try to attribute the increase to the "thranged" state of modern life, we have only to consider the rapid increase of imbecile children. [...] The percentage of the mentally defective among the pauper population is also increasing rapidly. This spread of the degenerate is not due to harder modern conditions of life, for these conditions are substantially better than they were 50 or 100 years ago. It is due to two facts:
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6 Ibid., pp. 56-62.
I. That the action of natural selection has been largely suspended; the physically and mentally unfit are now tended and provided for in a manner quite unknown 100 years ago.

2. The relative fertility of the fit and unfit in the community has changed widely since 1877. A hundred years ago you hung a rogue if you caught him. Nowadays you provide him with soup-kitchens and night-shelters up and down the country, and leave him to propagate his kind at will.

To cite an often-quoted German case: one woman, a thief, a drunkard, and a tramp, had 709 traceable descendants; of these 106 were illegitimate, 142 tramps and beggars, and 64 lived on charity; 181 of her female descendants were women of ill-fame. Of the total tribe 7 were murderers and 76 convicts; and altogether, in 75 years in trials, almshouses and prisons, the tribe cost a quarter of a million in money to the State. It would have been better for society if this woman had been at once removed from it. Criminality is as much inherited as any other psychical character, and to allow it scope to reproduce itself is more anti-social than the old custom of giving it short shrift.

I do not think that there can be the least doubt that with the great extension of charities—whether for food or for medical assistance—we have tended more and more to check the action of natural selection within the community.

But the lessened restraint on the fertility of the unfit would be of small effect if it had not been accompanied by the relatively more restrained fertility of the fit. The unthrifty increase and multiply, and make the struggle harder for the thrifty, the conscientious, and the able, who have to provide not only for their own offspring, but for the offspring of the unfit in the next generation.

I would therefore emphasise the view that much of the current feeling with regard to early marriage and good-sized families is demonstrably immoral, and is opposed to social welfare in that it must lead to the degeneration of the society in which it is current.

Our present knowledge of heredity shows us that the average man is a product of his ancestors in health, in intellect, and in honesty. Hence all social conduct should be directed, on this point to insuring that the minority, who in any case provide the next generation, is formed from the best stock in the community. The fertility of the unhealthy, of the mentally defective, of the dishonest, should be checked by custom and legislation in every way; while that of the healthy, sane, and conscientious should, on the other hand, be in every way encouraged.

If we consider first individual conduct, we see need for a revision of current social feeling with regard to ancestral history. Both man and woman ought to know the tale of their past; the faults, physical and mental, of ancestors and other relations ought not to be hidden away; and the need of a new and rational pride in ancestry should be inculcated.

The celibacy of the individual who comes of faulty stock should be recognised in social conduct, and social condemnation should follow marriage into a tainted stock or the marriage of any members of such stock. But such restraint of bad stock must also be accompanied among the educated by a change of feeling as to the conduct of the healthy, able, and generally fit stock [...] the fertility of the unthrifty, of the mentally defective, and of the criminal classes, cannot be influenced [...] and it is relatively larger than that of the better stock.

Now, I do not advocate any return to the hanging of rogues, nor would I propose to cease medically assisting the physically and mentally unfit; but I would, both by social opinion and by legislative action, limit in every way their multiplication. Society is bound to provide for the criminal, the tramp, the congenital pauper, and the imbecile born in its midst, yet, while undertaking this duty, it should insure that, so far from increasing in numbers, their stock should diminish. It is easy to see a variety of ways in which some effect could be given to this idea.

Why should the habitual criminal be allowed back into the community to propagate his kind in the intervals between his prison periods? We ought to expatriate all confirmed criminals (our Empire is wide enough to provide a corner for them); for the one thing which does seem to upset the predictions we can base on the laws of inheritance is the influence of a complete change of environment on the constitutional characters. Let us
send our criminals to a subtropical climate. Lastly, we come to the congenital pauper and the insane. Here I think again society would be justified in refusing to allow them to pass in and out of workhouses and asylums. The cure of the insane is idle in the sense that their offspring will no longer be of tainted stock.

All these points are only illustrations of what a strong public opinion might achieve. Once recognise that physical and psychical characters are inherited, and current social feeling on the subject of the unhealthy, the mentally defective and criminal stocks must be immensely modified. The stability of the nation depends essentially on the fitter stock being given sensibly greater fertility than the unfit stock.

As things stand at present, neglecting the laws of inheritance, we are slipping down an incline with increasing speed. A sense of responsibility and of desire for comfort and leisure is leading to an ever diminishing birth-rate of the folk with mens sana in corpore sano, and we have, on the other hand, provided unlimited medical comforts and housing for the physically unfit and for the rogue. Whether knowledge of what is going on can possibly bring about a change of feeling I cannot say. If it does not, and we leave the fertile, but unfit, one-sixth to reproduce one-half the next generation, our nation will soon cease to be a world power.

The problem is simple in the extreme. We have two groups in the community—one parasitic to the other. The latter thinks of to-morrow and is childless, the former takes no thought and multiplies. It can only end as the case so often ends—the parasite will kill its host, and so end the tale for both alike. [...] 7

---

7 Ibid., pp. 100-106.
3. Edouard DRUMONT, (1844-1917), Antisemitism as nationalism:

*La France Juive* (Jewish France) 8

[...] From the outset of this study, we must try to analyse this singular, vivacious and unique individual, the Jew. At first glance, the task seems to be easy. No other human type has such a strikingly distinctive physiognomy, or retained the characteristics of his first incarnation with greater authenticity. The difficulty is that our own preconceptions prevent us from understanding and describing the Jew truthfully; our own point of view is totally different from his.

The common man says the Jew is cowardly, but the lesson of eighteen centuries of persecution borne with incredible powers of endurance is that even if the Jew does not have the spirit of a fighter, the way he resists is courage indeed. And when certain rich men, who used to be held in high esteem, can be seen to work for a government which goes against all their beliefs, can we seriously consider as cowardly a people who have been prepared to suffer every indignity rather than renounce their faith?

"The Jew makes a cult of money". This is an assertion of an obvious fact, but for most people expressing this feeling it is bombast. There are great lords and pious women, and people who frequent Sainte-Astilde and Saint-Thomas d'Aquin who after church exchange profuse salamis with one of the Rothschilds who considers the Christ they adore as the basest of impostors. Who obliges them to go there? Has the Amphitryon which attracts them an outstanding mind? Is he a brilliant conversationalist? Has he rendered services to France? In no way. He is a foreigner, a reticent, capricious German who is often rude to the aristocratic guests that he is vain enough to invite to his house.

What brings these representatives of the nobility under this roof? Respect for money. How are they occupied there? They kneel before the golden calf.

The remark made about the Duke of La Rochefoucault Bisaccia is also true of the Duke of Aumale. When he arrives, looking humble, to pay his respects to Rothschild who calls him "the old sergeant-major", one cannot avoid the conclusion that by not staying at home in comfort to re-read the glorious history of his race, the descendant of the Condé is admitting that earning a lot of money in more or less honest speculation is equivalent to winning the battle of Rocroi; after all, one only visits one's equals, and he calls on these people.

At heart, all those people who despise money are quite happy when people who have plenty are prepared to share the fruits of it with them. After their fall from grace they are the first to poke a little fun at themselves.

"Do you want to see how blood speaks?" a French duke once asked his friends. He had married a Rothschild from Frankfurt in spite of his mother's tears. He called his little son, pulled a golden louis from his pocket and showed it to him. The child's eyes lit up. "You see," continued the duke, "the semitic instinct reveals itself straight away."

Let us now leave aside these commonplaces. Let us see how a more attentive and serious examination will reveal the essential features distinguishing Jews from other men and let us begin by an ethnographical, physiological and psychological comparison of the Semite and the Aryan. They represent two distinct races which are irremediably hostile to each other, whose antagonism has filled the world in the past and will disturb it even more in the future.

The generic term Aryan comes from a Sanskrit word meaning noble, illustrious and high-minded, and is commonly applied to the superior branch of the white race, the Indo-European family which had its cradle in the vast plains of Iran. The Aryan race spread out across the world in successive waves of migration [the Greeks and Romans] had as their frontier the shores of the Hellespont and the Mediterranean but the Celts, the Ario-Slavs

---

and the Ario-Germans headed west, went round the Caspian Sea and crossed the Danube.

To quote from Littre:

"All the evidence points to the fact that the Romans were Aryans. The Latin they spoke is clear proof of this. It was a complete surprise when Latin and Greek were authoritatively shown to be related and were classed with Persian and Sanskrit as members of one and the same family.

The Christians of Western Europe are the direct descendants of the Romans, and by virtue of this, they are seized of all the rights of their progenitors. But that is not all: when their credentials are examined in the light of linguistic science, then Christians are seen to be Aryans in their own right. The Italians are Latins, and as such are obviously Aryans. So too are the Celts of Gaul and Albion: Celtic is a dialect of a language spoken by many tribes, some of which were dispersed to the far ends of the West. It was from one of these emigrant tribes that Germany took its language, and hence can be called Aryan like the others. The only doubtful case is that of Spain. Its people are Iberians who are not indebted to the Aryans either for their language or their race. However the government of Rome, by dint of long occupation and their superior civilisation, obliged them to speak Latin, and, in spite of early divergences, it is no longer possible to separate Iberians from the Gauls and the Italians, who are all brothers by education."

It can be seen thus that all the nations of Europe are very closely linked to the Aryan race, from which have sprung all the great civilisations.

The Semitic race consists of diverse purities, the Aramaic, the Hebrews and the Arab, which seem to have come originally from the plains of Mesopotamia. Doubtless Tyre, Sidon and Carthage did for a time achieve a high degree of commercial prosperity. Later on, the Arab Empire knew a fleeting glory, but nothing about those ephemeral states was comparable to the fertile; durable civilisations of Greece and Rome, and the admirable Christian society of the Middle Ages.

The Aryan or Indo-European race is the only one to uphold the principles of justice, to experience freedom and to value beauty.

M. Gellion-Danglar states in *The Semites and Semitism*:

"The Semitic civilisations, however brilliant they might appear, are only vain images, more or less coarse parodies, painted cardboard pictures which some people are gullible enough to take as works of marble and bronze. In these artificial societies, whims and pleasure are everything; the word "justice" had been prostituted as a cover for them, and means nothing. The bizarre and the monstrous are what they consider beautiful and superabundance has banished taste and decency from their art. The Semite is not suitable for civilisation and the sedentary life. In his tent in the desert he has his beauty, and his own grandeur. He leads his own life. He is in harmony with the rest of humanity. Elsewhere he is out of place: all his qualities disappear, his vices show their face. The Semite, a man of prey in the Arabian sands, not without a certain heroism, becomes in society a man of vile intrigues."

Ever since the dawn of history the Aryan has been at odds with the Semite. Ilion was a completely Semitic town, and the Trojan war was particularly momentous because it was a duel between two races. This conflict has continued over the ages, and it was almost invariably the Semite who sparked off a clash, only to be repulsed.

In fact the Semite has dreamt constantly, obsessively of reducing the Aryan into a state of slavery, and tying him to the land. He tried to achieve this through war. Littré, with his customary clarity, has revealed the true nature of the great invasions which almost gave the Semite world hegemony. Hannibal was very near to it when he camped outside..."
the walls of Rome. Abd ar-Rahman 10 conquered Spain, went as far north as Poitiers, with some grounds for hoping Europe would be his. The ruins of Carthage, and the bones of Saracens which the plough sometimes throws up in the fields of Charles Martel's triumph, are testimony to the lesson such presumption had to learn.

Today the Semites believe their victory is certain. It is no longer the Carthaginian or the Saracen, who is in the vanguard, it is the Jew—he has replaced violence with cunning. Dangerous invasion has given way to silent, progressive and slow encroachment. The noisy armed of hordes have been replaced by single individuals, gradually forming little groups, advancing sporadically, unobtrusively occupying all the jobs, from the lowest of all to the highest in the land. Instead of making a frontal assault, the Semites have attacked Europe from behind. They have outflanked it. In the country round Vilna, the Vagina Judaeorum, a succession of exoduses were organised, Germany was occupied, the Vosges Mountains were crossed and France conquered.

No violence has been used, and I dwell on this point, but there has been a sort of gentle take-over, an insinuating process of hunting the indigenous people from their houses and jobs, of gently stripping them first of their property, then of their traditions and customs, and finally of their religion. I believe this last element will prove to be a stumbling-block.

The two races are doomed to come into conflict, because of both their qualities and their shortcomings. The Semite is mercantile, covetous, scheming, subtle and cunning. The Aryan is enthusiastic, heroic, chivalrous, disinterested, ever frank and trusting to the point of naïvely. The Semite is earth-bound with scarcely any concern for the life here after; the Aryan is a child of heaven who is constantly preoccupied by higher aspirations. One lives in the world of reality, the other in the world of the ideal.

The Semite is a businessman by instinct; he is a born trader, dealing in everything imaginable, seizing every opportunity to get the better of the next man. The Aryan on the other hand is a peasant, a poet, a monk and, above all, a soldier. On the battlefield he is really in his element, he happily affronts danger and braves death. The Semite has no creative ability, whereas the Aryan is an inventor. Not a single invention has been the work of the Semite. He exploits, organises and produces whatever the creative Aryan has invented, and, needless to say, keeps the profits for himself.

The Aryan is an adventurer, and discovered America. The Semite then had an admirable opportunity to leave Europe behind and escape persecution, and, in so doing, to show he was capable of doing something on his own, but he waited until all the pioneer exploration had been accomplished, until the land was under cultivation, before going off to get rich at the expense of others.

To sum up, anything which takes man on to unfamiliar paths, anything which involves an effort to extend man's knowledge of this earthly sphere, is quite beyond the Semite, and above all, the Jew. He can live only at the common expense, within a society which he did not help build. What is unfortunate for the Semite -and this crucial observation should be remembered in my memory that he always goes just a little bit too far for the Aryan.

The Aryan is a good-natured giant. He is happy when the needs of his romantic imagination are satisfied by the recital of one of the old legends. He is not amused by such stories as the Semitic Thousand and One Nights, which singers find hoards of treasure, or fishermen throw their nets into the sea and draw them in full of diamonds. For him to be moved, he needs to be able to see a noble figure standing out from the backcloth of fantasy, like Parsifal meeting a thousand dangers in his quest of the Holy Grail, his cup filled with the blood of God.

The Aryan has remained as ingenuous as he was in the Middle Ages, swooning over the chansons de geste, or the adventures of Garin le Lorrain, Olivier de Béthune or
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10 The first Emir of Cordoba, whose intention of further European conquest was frustrated by Charlemagne; the battle of Roncevalles took place during his emirate (778)
Gilbert de Roussillon ¹¹, who, after refusing to marry a daughter of a sultan, ran through five thousand infidels with a single blow from his lance. The legend of 1789 is listened to attentively, as though it was the account of a cycle from the days of chivalry. The editors of the République Française ¹² might almost make him believe that members of the Government of National Defence, mounted on fiery steeds like knights of old, had braved the most terrible dangers in order to win the battle for a Morgan loan ¹³. And while the Aryan takes a naive interest in such acts of valour, nothing is easier than to deprive him of his purse or even to remove his books, on the pretext that they might impede his advance on the path of progress.

The Aryan, I repeat, will allow anything to be done to him; only he must not be unduly provoked. He can be stripped of all his possessions, and then suddenly fly into a rage over a cherished trifle, such as a rose. Then he jerks out of his stupor, understands the situation at once, seizes the sword which was collecting dust in a corner, lashes out and inflicts a terrible vengeance on the Semite who was exploiting, pillaging and tricking him, but who will bear the marks of this punishment for three centuries.

Moreover this in no way surprises the Semite. He is by nature an oppressor and is familiar with punishment. There is almost a certain satisfaction in things returning to normal. He disappears, fades into the mist, digs his heels in somewhere, and plots how to start all over again in a few centuries' time. By contrast, when he is at peace and happy, he experiences what a witty member of the Académie called "la nostalgie du san-benito".

The Semite, though shrewd and nimble-witted, is in fact of limited intelligence. He has no foresight, he cannot see beyond the end of his hooked nose, and is unable to grasp any of the subtleties which give life its meaning ¹⁴ [...] It is the Semite's faults which are responsible for the natural antipathy between him and the Aryan continuing over the centuries. If you want to understand the Middle Ages, take a look at what is happening in our own country at the present day. France, thanks to the principles of 1789 which the Jews had cleverly exploited, was disintegrating. Jews had taken control of the public purse, and invaded all sectors except the army. The representatives of the old families of the aristocracy and the bourgeoisie were split into two classes: one led a life of pleasure, had Jewish mistresses who corrupted or ruined them, and Jewish horse merchants and usurers who were in league with the girls; the other was drawn by the attraction the Aryan race feels for the Hindu nirvana, the paradise of Odin; they took little interest in contemporary developments, were lost in ecstasy; they barely had a foothold in real life. If the Jews had been patient for a little longer, they would have been near their aim. One of the few really wise men of their race, Jules Simon ¹⁵, a disciple of Philo, a representative of the Jewish school of Alexandria, was to give them good advice: occupy the earth quietly and leave the Aryans to emigrate to heaven.

¹¹ Legendary heroes of the chansons de geste. Garin le Lorrain is the hero and name of one of the series of chansons de geste, La Geste du Lorrain, dealing with the warfare of two rival families of Lorraine. Olivier de Béthune is one of the heroes of the Geste du roi (Charlemagne) and of the Geste de Garin de Monglane.

¹² The newspaper founded, inter alia, by Gambetta to assure the victory of republican ideas. Stopped publication in 1914.

¹³ A scathing reference to the American financier J. Pierpoint Morgan (1837-1913); the implication is that, for Gambetta, the Jew, persuading Morgan to lend money is the equivalent of the deeds of the legendary heroes

¹⁴ La France Juive, pp1-14.

¹⁵ Jules Simon (1814-96), professor of philosophy at the Sorbonne, politician of the left centre and Minister of Education in Gambetta's Government of National Defence; anti-Boulangist, publishing in 1889 Souviens-toi du Deux-Decembre, 'Remember the Second of December” a reference to the coup d'état of Napoleon III on December 2nd, 1851.
However, the Jews never wanted to listen to such counsel. They preferred the Semite Gambetta 16 to the Semite Simon. Under the pretence that this charlatan had made the French swallow the most incredible humbug, they supported, financed and upheld him. They believed he was going to rid them of the Christ they hated as much as on the day of his crucifixion. The Freemasons contributed, the Jewish newspapers inflamed general opinion, gold was squandered, and large sums were paid to police commissioners, who right until the last moment had refused to cooperate in any crime.

What did happen? Exactly what was described earlier. The Aryan, provoked, worried, his innate feelings of nobility and honour wounded, felt the blood rush to his head when he saw helpless old men being dragged from their rooms by thugs. He needed a little time for reflection to gather his thoughts and collect himself.

“But what is the guiding principle behind these acts?” he asked. “The principle of liberty,” the newspapers of Porgès, Reinach, Dreyfus, Eugene Mayer, Camille Sée and Naquet answered in chorus. “What does this principle consist of?”

“Of this: a Jew leaves Hamburg, Frankfurt or Vilna, or anywhere else for that matter, amasses a few million at the expense of the goym 17 and then he is universally accepted, and his house inviolable, because he would naturally never be called upon to explain his actions in a court of law. A native-born Frenchman, on the other hand, or, to use Saint-Simon's term, a natural Frenchman, divests himself of all his possessions, to give to the poor; he walks barefoot, and lives in a cramped, whitewashed room which Rothschild's servant's servant would object to; he is outside the law and can be thrown into the street like a dog.”

Once the Aryan had woken from his slumber, he judged, not incorrectly, that since his tolerance, of which so much had been made over the past century, had been interpreted in this way, it would be preferable to start giving blows rather than just receiving them; he felt it was high time to wrest the country from such testy masters. “Since your rough monk's habit gets in the way of your frock-coat, we will replace them with yellow rags, old Semite.” This was the conclusion his meditations led him to. The first anti-semitic, or, to be more precise, anti-Jewish committee, was set up at this period.

The French experience is similar to what has taken place in Germany. The Jews helped the Kulturkampf 18 as much as they could, and strove with all their energy to harass the Catholics. The Kulturkampf is over and the anti-semitic war is just beginning.

A perusal of the entire book would reveal that the same thing has happened in almost identical circumstances in all ages and in all countries. It appears that the Jew is in reality obeying an irresistible impulse. The idea of conforming to other people's habits, traditions and religions never occurs to him. You are the ones who have to submit to the Jew, adapt to his customs, and suppress everything he dislikes. None the less, they are quite happy to accept anything from this society of the past which flatters their vanity. They are grotesquely hasty in seeking for the military titles "baron" and "count", which are about as suitable for these manipulators of money as a woman's hat is for a monkey. Even the most abject speculator or nut and bolt merchant with close or distant ties with Israel is at least a knight of the Légion d'honneur. But there his condescension is at an end: any of our customs which shocks him must go.

The Jew's right to oppress other people is rooted in his religion; for him it is an article of faith; it is proclaimed in every line of the Bible and the Talmud. The Psalms of David (Psalm 2): “I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of
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16 Leon Gambetta (1838-82), organiser of the resistance to Prussia after the military defeat in 1870, and a leader of the republican left in the Third Republic. Famous for the remark: ‘Clericalism - there is the enemy.’

17 The non-Jews.

18 The attack by Bismarck and the German Empire on Roman Catholic influence on German life and politics.
the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel".

Deuteronomy vii: "And the Lord thy God will put out those nations before thee little by little: thou mayest not consume them at once, lest the beasts of the field increase upon thee. And he shall deliver their kings into thine hand, and thou shalt destroy their name from under heaven there shall no man be able to stand before thee, until thou have destroyed them."

Against the Christian, the Gentile, the goy (singular goy, plural goym), all means are good. In their connection the Talmud contains some assertions which our deputies, who are so touchy on theological matters, would do well not to bring up in parliament; otherwise they might be refused service in the Jewish banks where they draw their salaries.

One can and one must kill the best of the goym. The money of the goym devolves from the Jew. Thus it is permitted to rob them and deceive them. The social evolution itself of the Jew is totally different from ours. The typical Aryan family lives in civilisation and the Romans gens which became the feudal family. For many generations the life force, the genius, lies dormant, and then the tree whose roots sink into the earth brings to the summit an illustrious man who seems to represent all the qualities of his fellow men. This predestined being sometimes takes a century to develop, but from the most humble origins springs forth a figure who is complete, charming and valiant, a hero and a scholar; in the pages of our history many such men can be found.

With the Semitic race, matters are different. In the orient, a camel-driver, a water-carrier or a barber is singled out by his sovereign. He suddenly becomes a pasha, a vizier, the prince's right-hand man, like, for instance, Mustapha-ben-Ismaïl who found his way into the Bardo by selling cakes and who, to borrow M. Dauphin the Attorney General's ribald comment, "was of service to his master day and night". As a result our government, dishonest as we know it to be, rewarded him with the cross of grand officer of the Légion d'honneur.

It is the same with the Jew. Apart from the priestly class, which constitutes a real aristocracy, there is no nobility. There are no illustrious families; some transmit credit from father to son, there is never a legacy of glory. In less than twenty years, if he strikes lucky, the Jew achieves his full development. He is born at the bottom of a ghetto, his first venture brings him in a few sous, he sets up in Paris, obtains a decoration thanks to the mediation of some Dreyfus or other, buys a baronetcy, introduces himself boldly to a wide circle, and acts as though he has always been rich. His transformation is more or less instantaneous; this does not surprise him in the least, and he has absolutely no timidity. Take a Russian Jew, with his filthy thouloupe, and his corkscrew curls and carriage, and after a month's bathing, he will take his seat in a box at the opera with the aplomb of a Stern or a Gunzburg.

By contrast take a good French building contractor, who has amassed his wealth honourably. He will always have a slightly unnatural, awkward air about him, and will shun the more elegant circles. His son, born in better circumstances and initiated into the refinements of life, will be quite different. The grandson, if the family continues to rise and remain honest and Christian, will be a true gentleman: he will possess a subtlety of thought and a nobility of feeling which the yid will never have.

On the other hand, though the Jew may achieve aplomb straight away, he never achieves distinction. With the exception of a few Portuguese Jews who, when young, have beautiful eyes, and when old, a certain oriental majesty, you will never find in them the kind of calm, leisured, courteous dignity which makes it easy to recognise an authentic French lord, a pure-bred Frenchman, wherever he may be and even though his coat may be frayed. The Jew is insolent and never proud. He can never rise above the basic level of life, which admittedly he achieves very easily. The Rothschilds, in spite of their billions, look like hawkers of second-hand clothes; their wives, with all the diamonds of Golconda, will always look like haberdashers, dressed up not for Sunday, but for the Sabbath.
Vis-à-vis the Christian, the Jew will always lack the chief attraction of social relations, equality. The Jew —and pay close attention to this observation— will never be the equal of a man of the Christian race. He either grovels at your feet, or crushes you under his heel; he is either on top or beneath, never beside [...] There is a further reason for Jews not being suited for intercourse where gain is not the sole motive, and that is their uniformity; there is a total absence of the refined culture and free-ranging intellect which are essential as the spice of all conversation. One seldom hears from them the brilliant, imaginative theories, the sharp insights or the amusing paradoxes with which some talkers sprinkle their discourse. If such ideas did ever occur to the Jew he would take good care not to waste them on his friends, he would try to make money out of them. But the reality is otherwise: he lives off other people. He plays a single tune, and the most lengthy conversation never presents any surprises.

Whereas the Aryan race counts an infinite variety of organisations and temperaments, a Jew always resembles any other Jew; he does not have a variety of gifts, but one single aptitude, which is used for everything: this is the Thebouna, the practical subtlety so highly praised in the Moschlim, the marvellous, unanalysable gift which is the same for the politician as for the courtier and which serves him admirably in life 19 [...] The truth is that the Jew is incapable of rising above a certain level. The Semites have no mark of genius of the stature of Dante, Shakespeare, Bossuet, Victor Hugo, Raphael, Michelangelo or Newton, and it is difficult to imagine how they could. The genius is almost always unrecognised and persecuted, a superior being who gives something to humanity; now the very essence of the Jew is that he does not give anything. It is not surprising that what they cherish is a talent for which there is a ready market. Their Corneille is Adolphe d’Ennery 20, their Raphael Worms. In art they have created no original, powerful or touching statues, no masterpieces. The criterion is whether the work will sell; the sublime is commissioned to order, a false sublime of course. They prefer to concentrate on the real, as it enables them both to get rich by flattering the coarse appetites of the masses, and to serve their cause by making a mockery of the enthusiasm, the pious memories and the august traditions of the people who are the source of their wealth 21 [...] The Jesuit is the exact opposite of the Jew. Ignatius Loyola is a pure Aryan. The hero of the siege of Pamplona, knight of the Holy Virgin, is the last of the Paladins. There is something of the Don Quixote about this saint, a very modern one, of course, who went to Paris late in life, to sit on the benches of the university, and though he was the personification of the movement which was spreading across the world, when henceforth the pen would play the role played in the past by the sword. It is certain that Disraeli knew the Jews better than the Jesuits, and the English statesman is worth consulting In Endymion Disraeli considers the occult diplomacy which, over the previous century, had turned the world upside down.

“Nowadays the Semites exercise a vast influence over the world of business through their smallest but most original wing, the Jews. There is no other race which is blest with such tenacity and organising ability. With these gifts they have acquired an unprecedented empire of property and unlimited credit. As you advance through life and become experienced, Jews will block your path everywhere. They infiltrated our secret diplomacy a long time ago, and almost control it; within a quarter of a century, they will claim their share of government openly. Now there are races whose men and corporations, each man in their own particular way, must enter into the calculations of statesmen”.

It is easy to appreciate that Jews who are not distinguished by their costume are all the more effective because they are less visible. In the civil service, in diplomacy, in the

19 La France Juive, pp16-27.
20 Adolphe d’Ennery (1811-99), playwright with a remarkable capacity for the dramatic portrayal of intrigue, and who is widely believed to have plagiarised many of his plots.
offices of conservative newspapers, even in the priest's cassock, they live unsuspected. The Jewish army thus disposes of three regiments: firstly, the true Jews, the notorious Jews as they are called in the Archives, who officially venerate Abraham and Jacob, and are satisfied with claiming the chance to make their fortune while remaining faithful to their God. Secondly, the Jews disguised as free-thinkers (like Gambetta, Dreyfus and Raynal) who conceal the fact that they are Jews, and persecute Christians in the name of the glorious principles of tolerance and the sacred rights of liberty. Thirdly, the conservative Jews who pretend to be Christians but whom the closest links unite with the first two classes, and who pass to their friends any secrets which might be useful. In these circumstances the incredible success of the Jew, however improbable it may appear, and the unheard-of way he multiplies, are easily comprehensible.

The strength of the Jews lies in their solidarity. They all feel a common bond with one another, as is proclaimed in the Alliance Israelite whose emblem is two hands clasped together beneath a halo. This principle is strictly observed from one end of the universe to the other in a truly touching manner. It is obvious what advantages, from the human point of view, this principle of solidarity gives the Jew over the Christian, who esteems charity and to whom any feeling of solidarity is foreign. Believe me, no one could admire more than I do the sublime flower which Christianity has set in the human heart, indefatigable, inexhaustible, ardent charity, which always gives, gives unceasingly, which gives not money alone, but the heart itself, time and understanding. What I would like to indicate in this work, which is one of rigorous analysis, is the difference between the solidarity of the Jew and the charity of the Christian. Christians welcome every disaster with open arms; they answer every appeal, but they do not club together. As they are accustomed to feeling at home, which is most natural in a country belonging to them, they never even consider the idea of forming serried ranks in order to resist the Jews.

It is thus only to be expected that the Jew strikes in one place at a time. One day it is a merchant whose capital is coveted by the Jew: Israeli traders agree quietly to reduce him to bankruptcy. The next day it is an irritating writer whom the Jews reduce to despair and push into drunkenness or madness. Another time it is a noble lord, with a beautiful name, who treated a baron of doubtful origins somewhat brusquely at the races: it is arranged for the unfortunate man to acquire a Jewish mistress, a broker affiliated to the band recommends all advantageous investment, sometimes the victim is led on by an initial gain, but in the end he finds himself both misused and shamed. If the merchant, the writer and the lord had pooled their interests and united, they would have escaped, they would have joined in each other's defence. They would all have brought mutual help, but, and I repeat it, they succumb without seeing one another, without even suspecting who their real enemy was. Thanks to their solidarity, everything which happens to a Jew, even in the most remote corner of the desert, takes on the dimensions of an event. The Jew has indeed an incomparable way of squeaking; as they were told, "Croak and multiply, sons of Abraham without number." 22

The term mother country, as we use it, has no meaning for the Jew. The Jew—and here I am borrowing the forceful expression of the Alliance Israelite- is an inexorable universalist. I do not see how the Jews can be reproached for thinking in these terms. What does "country" mean? Land of one's fathers. The feeling of the mother country is engraved in the heart as names carved on a tree, which each passing year hollows and deepens into the bark as the tree grows older, so that the tree and the name become one. Patriots cannot be improvised; it is in the blood and the bones. The Semite is perpetually nomadic; can he experience such durable impressions? It is certainly possible to change country, as some Italians did when Catherine de Medici arrived in France, and as the French Protestants did at the time of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. But for these transplantations to succeed the moral soil must be more or less the same in the
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new country as in the old, and beneath the surface humus there must be a Christian foundation.

Moreover the first condition of adopting a new country is to give up the old. Now the Jew has a home which he will never renounce, Jerusalem, the holy, mysterious city. Jerusalem, triumphant or persecuted, joyful or sad, is a bond uniting all its children, who say each year at Roch Haschallah, “Next year in Jerusalem.” Outside Jerusalem, any country, whether it is France, Germany or England, is simply a dwelling-place, much like anywhere else, a social agglomeration in which he can live well; it may even be profitable for him to serve the interests of that country for a while, but he participates only as a free associate, a temporary member.

Here I must examine a point which I have already raised and which I shall have to revert to later, and this is the incontestable degeneration of the French spirit, a partial softening which can be seen in a vague sympathy resulting in people liking everyone, and at the same time in an envious note which makes us detest our fellows. This is the case of a number of insane people who disinherit their children and shower civilities on foreigners. If our fellow citizens' brains were functioning in their regular, normal manner, as in their fathers' time, they would quickly appreciate that the Jew can have no possible motive for being a patriot. Reflect for a moment and ask yourself why a Raynal, a Bischoffsheim or a Leven should be attached to the France of the crusades, of Bouvines, Marignan, Fontenoy, St Louis, Henry IV and Louis XIV. By virtue of its traditions, beliefs and memories, this France is an absolute negation of the Jewish character itself. This France, when it was not actually burning Jews, stubbornly closed its gate to them, covered them with scorn, and used their name as the cruelest of insults.

I am aware that the Jews believe a new France was born in the September massacres, that its old glories were purified by the blood flowing from the heads of old men and women, that the Revolution was, to adopt the Jew Salvador's expression, “a new Sinai”. These words are sonorous but quite meaningless. A country remains as if was when it was born, just as a growing child retains its early nature. France, Germany and England will never be mother countries for the Jews, who are quite right in my opinion not to feel at home anywhere and to follow a distinct, characteristic policy in every latitude, namely the Jewish policy.

Our ancestors, who were sensible people, knew this perfectly well, and defended themselves. Let us do the same, if there is still time, and not be surprised by anything; Victor Hugo, who had to entrust his grandchildren to the care of a Jew, should be the only one to indulge in the indignant tirades against Deutz. Again, Jews must not be judged by our standards. It is indisputable that every Jew betrays his employer. Cavour said of his secretary, the Jew Artom: “This man is invaluable to us in publicising what I have to say: I don't know how he goes about it, but after I have uttered only a word he has twisted it before he has even left my office.” And Prince Bismarck is quoted as saying, “Why else should God have created the Jew, if they were not to be spies?” From these facts, which it would be simple to multiply an infinite number of times, it is apparent that what we are dealing with is not an isolated case which would prove nothing against a community, but with the special calling of a particular race, the vocation of Abraham. Do such acts constitute spying or treachery for the Jew? Not in the least. It is not their mother country that they are betraying; they are merely making capital out of diplomacy and politics. The real traitors to their country are the native-born people who allow foreigners to interfere with matters that are not their business. Not content with making Oppert de Blowitz, a German by birth and a second-hand Englishman, an officer of the Légion d'honneur, the republican ministers take him into their confidence and hand over military secrets; this is despicable. But what right would you have to prevent a Jew who was
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vacillating between two countries from passing their information to whichever country paid better?

It is thus extremely difficult to study the criminality of the Jew. As the excellent Crémieux says, the intention is paramount. The evil which Jews perpetrate, terrible, unfathomable, unknown evil, falls into the category of crimes committed for reasons of state. To assassinate, ruin and despoil Christians counts as a crime which is pleasing to God. As Eisenmenger explains in his Judaïsme dévoilé (“Jewry Unmasked”), that is what they call a Korban. 25 [...] 

In Prussia, the proportion of lunatics is much higher among Israelites than among Christians. Whereas there are 24.1 per 10 000 Protestants, and 23.7 for the same number of Catholics, per 10 000 Jews there are 38.9. In Italy the ratio is one lunatic per 384 Jews and one per 778 Catholics. Dr Charcot made the most bizarre revelations about Russian Jews, and these are the only ones that can be discussed, because the others take great care to conceal their diseases behind their palace doors.

The Archives Israéliites, while taking note of this terrible state of affairs, state that there is no need to comment upon it, and that it increases, if that were possible, the pity people feel for the unfortunate Israelites of Russia. Yes, indeed, let us hope all the Jews who are mentally sick will be treated. But why should they inflict the troubles of their own mind on peoples who were living quietly and happily so long as the Jewish race was not actively interfering with their way of life. With Hertzen in Russia, Karl Marx and Lassalle in Germany, everywhere one looks, there is, as in France, a Jew preaching communism or socialism, and demanding that the wealth of the old inhabitants be shared, while their co-religionists arrive barefoot, make their fortune, and do not show the least inclination to share anything 26 [...] 

The Jews are always well-informed about what is going on, in the world of facts, and in the world of ideas. They are therefore very concerned about the anti-semitic movement which has been spreading over the whole of Europe. Their fury was unimaginable when L’Anti-Sémite, a gallant little newspaper, very modern and well versed in financial jobbery, was launched in Paris. Whenever people think it has vanished, it reappears on the stalls.

To put it bluntly, the Jews have a vague premonition of what is coming to them. They went through a period of delirious pride between 1870 and 1879. The Jew Wolff used to write in the National-Zeitung, “What joy to be born in such an age!”, “Es ist eine Lust zu leben!”, while on the banks of the Spree the Laskers, Bleichroeders and Hansemanns were skinning the Prussians, who were intoxicated by the laurels they had won, of their millions. “What joy indeed!” the cosmopolitan band in France echoed, when they saw that the squares, money, hotels, carriages of the nobility, hunts, boxes at the opera, everything was theirs, and the good people’s reaction was merely sincere comments on the “new classes”. They have moderated their tone a little now, and they recognise that concerted action is being taken by Christians everywhere, and that this could be stronger than the universal Israelite alliance.

The Jew is essentially a sad man. If he becomes rich, he is insolent but remains lugubrious; he is morosely arrogant, with the tristis arrogantia of Pallus in Tacitus. Hypochondria, only one of the manifestations of neurosis, is the only present they have made to France which was formerly cheerful and blithe, blooming with robust, healthy gaiety. “The Jew is sombre,” said Shaftesbury in his Characteristics. It is a strong adjective, and his comment is deeper than would first appear. It is a mistake to believe the Jew enjoys himself with his fellows, even a mistake to believe that he loves them. Christians do not concert their activities, but they love one another, and enjoy being in company. Jews, on the other hand, support each other till their dying day, but they do not feel for their fellows, in fact they detest them, and when business does not bring them
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together, they avoid each other like the plague. They are scarcely more content in the company of Christians: if someone praises Christ, they at once feel sick; a little joke about Judas produces a sickly laugh, but quite puts them out. Fundamentally, the inscription which one can read on the walls of Italian ghettos is still applicable: *Ne populo regni coelestis hoeredi usus cum exhoerede sit.* May the people which inherits the kingdom of heaven have nothing to do with those who are excluded.

There is occasionally a sly smile to be detected when they think of how they have tricked the Christians. Indeed the allegorical representation of the Jew is the fox: the *Meschabot Schualim* ("Tales of the Fox") is the first book the young Hebrew child meets. As an adult, he is happy to underline how he has got the better of the Aryan. For example, Bleichroeder organised the Tunisian campaign, which cost France a number of lives and a lot of money, and resulted in the rupture of the Italian alliance, and then he goes on to ridicule his victim by getting an ignominious minister to appoint him commander of the *Légion d'honneur*.

These moods of evil joy can sometimes give way to more naive pleasures. But, you will retort, how on earth can a Jew be naive? Well, he does have a childish side to him. This representation of civilisation in its most advanced, refined and morbid form, has the williness, and at the same time the naive vanity, of the savage. When his success brings him a little cheap publicity, his mouth gapes open with pleasure, just as an African's eyes and teeth light up when he has a trinket or a shred of gaudy material in his hands.

There is one feeling which these corrupt, puffed up people still possess, and that is hatred, of the Church, of priests and above all of monks. On reflection, this hatred appears quite natural. If a man is born intelligent and rich, with a name that rings differently from all the noble Gerolsteins, and renounces everything in order to become just like the poor, does not such an act deny and suppress everything the Jew stands for, namely money? Is not the monk's vow of poverty a permanent mockery of the Jew's vow of wealth? The woman who prefers a frieze garment, who does not want servants dressed in silk and lace, is not she, in spite of the gentleness of her angelic physiognomy, a living and perpetual insult to the Jew, who is quite incapable, with all his money, of buying what this indigent possesses, faith, hope and charity? She is quite indifferent to death, and a coffin, even one in whitewood, does not frighten her.

Simon Lockroy insults the monks and says they should be chased out of their cells. Dreyfus suggests that our honest Republicans should deprive the Sisters of Charity of the bread which keeps starvation at bay. Nevertheless they will never be stripped of the crucifix they wear round their necks; it is in copper, and the Jewish barons like only whatever bears the stamp of the mint. The very fact that such sublime virtues, such indifference to everything material, and such proud self-denial can exist reacts on the Jew like a thorn in a crude sybarite's bed; he thinks he is master over all things, yet he cannot influence these souls. Another useful source when considering the mentality of the Jew is Renan. This portrait of the modern Jew in *L'Ecclesiaste* is priceless. In his work one can detect that the artist has a mysterious sympathy for Judas: when the truth is a little stark, he softens the blow; a comment which would wound is followed by a complimentary adjective. He admires this parasite, "who quickly left dynastic prejudice behind him, knows how to get the best out of a world he did not make, and to harvest the fruits of a field he did not plough, to replace the idler by whom he is persecuted and to make himself indispensable to the foolish man who scorns him".

"You would think that it was for him that Clovis and his Franks struck such mighty blows with their swords, that the race of the Capets shaped policy over a thousand years, and that Philip Augustus was victorious at Bouvines and Condé at Rocroi. Vanity of vanities! The best way to obtain the joys of this earth is to proclaim that they are vain. We
have all known these worldly-wise men, who are not distracted by any supernatural
cimmeras, who would surrender every dream of another world for a single hour of the
realities of this one. He is strongly opposed to injustice, but is as undemocratic as
possible. He is both flexible and proud in wielding his power. His delicate skin his nervous
sensitivity and the impression he gives of being someone who does not indulge in tiring
work make him an aristocrat; his low opinion of the bravery of the warrior and an age-old
feeling of being an underdog, which his distinction cannot eradicate, make him a
bourgeois. His faith in the kingdom of God shook the world, but now he believes only in
wealth. This is because wealth is indeed his true reward. He knows how to work and to
enjoy. Nothing in the annals of chivalry would make him prefer hard-won glory to his
luxurious home; no stoic asceticism will induce him to abandon his prey for obscurity. To
his mind, everything life has to offer is terrestrial. He has come to the perfect truth: to
enjoy the fruits of his labour in peace, surrounded by works of a delicate art and the
images of a pleasure which has been exhausted. This is a surprising confirmation of the
philosophy of vanity. Go and trouble the world, put God to death on the cross, endure
every torture, burn your country three or four times, insult all the tyrants, smash all the
idols, and end up dying of a disease of the spinal cord in a comfortable hotel off the
Champs-Élysées, regretting that life was so short and pleasure so elusive. Vanity of
vanities!

No, dilettante, it was not so that a Jew should die of a spinal disease in a hotel off the
Champs-Élysées that Clovis fought at Tolbiac and Philip Augustus at Bouvines. If our
fathers were courageous, if they fell on the battlefield, it was so that there should be a
France just as there is an England and a Germany, so that our children should pray as
their fathers prayed, with their faith as a staff in life. The Semites, those restless people,
were happy to destroy the foundation of the old society, and to use the money they
extorted from it to found a new one. They have created a social problem, and it will be
solved at their expense- The property which they have wrongfully acquired will be
distributed to all those who take part in the great struggle which is getting under way, just
as, in days gone by, land and fiefs were distributed to the most valiant.

In Germany, in Russia, in Austria-Hungary, in Rumania, and in France itself where the
movement is still dormant, the nobility, the middle classes, and intelligent workers, in a
word everyone with a Christian background —often without being practising Christians—
are in agreement on this point: the Universal Anti-Semitic Alliance has been created, and
the Universal Israelite Alliance will not prevail against it. The committees may be more
active in some countries than others, propaganda may be more or less protracted, but
before the end of this century there will be yet another repetition of the following sequence
of events: the Jew takes advantage of the divisions he has created, and his cunning
makes him master of the whole country; he attempts to transform the ideas, the customs
and traditional beliefs of the country, and, as a result of his provocation and insolence,
people who hated one another are reconciled overnight and set upon the Jew with
prodigious determination. My own role is merely to announce modestly the curious events
which will shortly take place. It is possible that I may die, insulted, defamed and
misunderstood, without witnessing the things which I have predicted so confidently, but I
do not think so. It is really of small importance, because I shall have done my duty and
accomplished my task. Everything in the future will confirm my forecasts.

Bossuet wrote, "Events are prepared, fostered and realised by different causes. The
true science of history lies in observing what were the hidden factors which paved the way
for great changes, and the important circumstances which brought them about." [...] 27

The following work is devoted to an account of the characteristics of crowds. The whole of the common characteristics with which heredity endows the individuals of a race constitute the genius of the race. When, however, a certain number of these individuals are gathered together in a crowd for purposes of action, observation proves that, from the mere fact of their being assembled, there result certain new psychological characteristics, which are added to the racial characteristics and differ from them at times to a very considerable degree. Organised crowds have always played an important part in the life of peoples, but this part has never been of such moment as at present. The substitution of the unconscious action of crowds for the conscious activity of individuals is one of the principal characteristics of the present age. […]

It is only by obtaining some sort of insight into the psychology of crowds that it can be understood how slight is the action upon them of laws and institutions, how powerless they are to hold any opinions other than those which are imposed upon them, and that it is not with rules based on theories of pure equity that they are to be led, but by seeking what produces an impression on them and what seduces them. […]

What constitutes a crowd from the psychological point of view? A numerically strong agglomeration of individuals does not suffice to form a crowd

Special characteristics of psychological crowds: The turning in a fixed direction of the ideas and sentiments of individuals composing such a crowd, and the disappearance of their personality.

The crowd is always dominated by considerations of which it is unconscious: the disappearance of brain activity and the predominance of medullar activity [leads to] the lowering of the intelligence and the complete transformation of the sentiments. The transformed sentiments may be better or worse than those of the individuals of which the crowd is composed. A crowd is as easily heroic as criminal. In its ordinary sense the word "crowd" means a gathering of individuals of whatever nationality, profession, or sex, and whatever be the chances that have brought them together. From the psychological point of view the expression "crowd" assumes quite a different signification. Under certain given circumstances, and only under those circumstances, an agglomeration of men presents new characteristics very different from those of the individuals composing it. The sentiments and ideas of all the persons in the gathering take one and the same direction, and their conscious personality vanishes. A collective mind is formed, doubtless transitory, but presenting very clearly defined characteristics. The gathering has thus become what, in the absence of a better expression, I will call an organised crowd, or, if the term is considered preferable, a psychological crowd. It forms a single being, and is subjected to the LAW OF THE MENTAL UNITY OF CROWDS. It is evident that it is not by the mere fact of a number of individuals finding themselves accidentally side by side that they acquire the character of an organised crowd. A thousand individuals accidentally gathered in a public place without any determined object in no way constitute a crowd from the psychological point of view. To acquire the special characteristics of such a crowd, the influence is necessary of certain predisposing causes of which we shall have to determine the nature. […]

The most striking peculiarity presented by a psychological crowd is the following: Whoever be the individuals that compose it, however like or unlike be their mode of life, their occupations, their character, or their intelligence, the fact that they have been transformed into a crowd puts them in possession of a sort of collective mind which makes them feel, think, and act in a manner quite different from that in which each individual of them would feel, think, and act were he in a state of isolation. There are certain ideas and feelings which do not come into being, or do not transform themselves
into acts except in the case of individuals forming a crowd. The psychological crowd is a provisional being formed of heterogeneous elements, which for a moment are combined, exactly as the cells which constitute a living body form by their reunion a new being which displays characteristics very different from those possessed by each of the cells singly. Contrary to an opinion which one is astonished to find coming from the pen of so acute a philosopher as Herbert Spencer, in the aggregate which constitutes a crowd there is in no sort a summing-up of or an average struck between its elements. What really takes place is a combination followed by the creation of new characteristics, just as in chemistry certain elements, when brought into contact—bases and acids, for example—combine to form a new body possessing properties quite different from those of the bodies that have served to form it. […]

Different causes determine the appearance of these characteristics peculiar to crowds, and not possessed by isolated individuals. The first is that the individual forming part of a crowd acquires, solely from numerical considerations, a sentiment of invincible power which allows him to yield to instincts which, had he been alone, he would perforce have kept under restraint. He will be the less disposed to check himself from the consideration that, a crowd being anonymous, and in consequence irresponsible, the sentiment of responsibility which always controls individuals disappears entirely. The second cause, which is contagion, also intervenes to determine the manifestation in crowds of their special characteristics, and at the same time the trend they are to take. Contagion is a phenomenon of which it is easy to establish the presence, but that it is not easy to explain. It must be classed among those phenomena of a hypnotic order, which we shall shortly study. In a crowd every sentiment and act is contagious, and contagious to such a degree that an individual readily sacrifices his personal interest to the collective interest. This is an aptitude very contrary to his nature, and of which a man is scarcely capable, except when he makes part of a crowd. A third cause, and by far the most important, determines in the individuals of a crowd special characteristics which are quite contrary at times to those presented by the isolated individual. I allude to that suggestibility of which, moreover, the contagion mentioned above is neither more nor less than an effect. To understand this phenomenon it is necessary to bear in mind certain recent physiological discoveries.

We know to-day that by various processes an individual may be brought into such a condition that, having entirely lost his conscious personality, he obeys all the suggestions of the operator who has deprived him of it, and commits acts in utter contradiction with his character and habits. The most careful observations seem to prove that an individual immerged for some length of time in a crowd in action soon finds himself--either in consequence of the magnetic influence given out by the crowd, or from some other cause of which we are ignorant--in a special state, which much resembles the state of fascination in which the hypnotised individual finds himself in the hands of the hypnotiser. The activity of the brain being paralysed in the case of the hypnotised subject, the latter becomes the slave of all the unconscious activities of his spinal cord, which the hypnotiser directs at will. The conscious personality has entirely vanished; will and discernment are lost. All feelings and thoughts are bent in the direction determined by the hypnotiser. Such also is approximately the state of the individual forming part of a psychological crowd. He is no longer conscious of his acts. In his case, as in the case of the hypnotised subject, at the same time that certain faculties are destroyed, others may be brought to a high degree of exaltation. Under the influence of a suggestion, he will undertake the accomplishment of certain acts with irresistible impetuosity. This impetuosity is the more irresistible in the case of crowds than in that of the hypnotised subject, from the fact that, the suggestion being the same for all the individuals of the crowd, it gains in strength by reciprocity. The individuals in the crowd who might possess a personality sufficiently strong to resist the suggestion are too few in number to struggle against the current. At the utmost, they may be able to attempt a diversion by
means of different suggestions. It is in this way, for instance, that a happy expression, an
image opportunely evoked, have occasionally deterred crowds from the most bloodthirsty
acts. We see, then, that the disappearance of the conscious personality, the
predominance of the unconscious personality, the turning by means of suggestion and
contagion of feelings and ideas in an identical direction, the tendency to immediately
transform the suggested ideas into acts; these, we see, are the principal characteristics of
the individual forming part of a crowd. He is no longer himself, but has become an
automaton who has ceased to be guided by his will. […]

5. Maurice BARRÈS, Integral Nationalism: The Nancy Programme, (1898)

[...] ELECTORS,
The nationalist and social ideas which we brought to a joint triumph for the first time in
1889, had at that time alarmed certain minds because of the popularity of General
Boulanger. Today, whether because they seem to be more matured, or whether
circumstances now justify them more, they attract many adherents even among the
antagonists of the previous campaign, disabused by a party which has done nothing since
we left it with a free field.

The "Nationalist Socialist Republican Committee of Meurthe-et-Moselle" and a large
number of independent electors have asked me to take up again the electoral battle.
To a policy having for its aim only animosities to satisfy, and for its driving force only
lust for power, I come anew to oppose those national and social ideas which already you
have acclaimed and which you will not today repudiate.

I. We are Nationalists

In the top ranks of society, in the heart of the provinces, in the moral and in the
material sphere, in commerce, industry, and agriculture, even in the shipyards where they
are competing with French workers, foreigners are poisoning us like parasites.

One vital principle that should underlie the new French policy is to protect all its
nationals against this invasion, and to beware of that brand of socialism that is so
cosmopolitan, or rather so German, that it would weaken the country's defenses.

The Jewish problem is linked to the national problem. The Jews were assimilated to
the native French by the Revolution, but have retained their peculiar characteristics and
now, instead of being persecuted as they once were, are themselves the overlords. We
believe in complete freedom of conscience; what is more, we should consider it highly
dangerous to allow the Jews the chance of invoking (and so to appear to be defending)
the principles of civil liberty promulgated by the Revolution. But they violate these
principles by characteristically isolated behaviour, by monopolies, speculation, and
cosmopolitanism. There is, moreover, in the army, the magistracy, the ministries, in all
branches of the administration, a far higher proportion of them than their numbers justify.
They have been appointed prefects, judges, treasurers, officers—because they have
money, which corrupts. We ought to destroy this dangerous disproportion, without even
changing the law, by insisting on greater fairness on the part of those who govern, and so
gain more consideration for our real nationals, the children of Gaul and not of Judea.

But the most urgent need is to make the process of naturalisation more difficult. It is
by this loophole that the worst Jews and many second-rate Frenchmen have slipped in.
Statistics show that 90 per cent of foreigners do not become naturalised until they
have evaded active army service. We should insist that military service is a condition of
nationality. What is more, a naturalised person (except those from Alsace-Lorraine)
should be allowed just private rights, while only his descendants should be assimilated to
French-born citizens and enjoy political rights.
The opportunist policy over the last twenty years has favoured Jews, foreigners, cosmopolitans. The reason given by those who committed this criminal mistake was that these aliens would introduce a vigorous element into France. Fine elements these—Reinach, Cornelius Herz, Alfred Dreyfus, and the like—who have almost brought us to decay! This is the real position: French society does need vigorous new elements, it is true, but they can be found within that society, by encouraging the least privileged, the poorest, by raising their standard of living and improving their vocational training.

So nationalism leads inevitably to socialism. We define socialism as "the material and moral improvement of the largest and poorest classes."

It has taken some centuries for the French nation to give political security to its members. It must now protect them against that economic insecurity that prevails at all levels.

Let us define this insecurity.

II. We demand protection against economic insecurity

**Insecurity of the worker**—The elderly worker has not enough to eat. Even if he is able-bodied, he runs the risk of unemployment. Wages are kept low by foreign competition. Mechanisation means that he is crowded into factories, subjected to military discipline under the arbitrary rule of the boss. In some districts he is reduced by certain economic organisations to real slavery.

He cannot get out. For one thing, you do not take your native earth with you on the soles of your boots, and for many of them exile is heartbreak. Again, materially speaking, if he goes, he and his family will probably starve to death for he will have no savings. Besides, where could he find work?

**Insecurity of the small trader**—The small trader has the same economic insecurity as the worker. They are interdependent. It is, in fact, the lower working class, black-coated and manual workers, who keep the small trader going, for the middle classes go to the big stores. The small trader helps the black-coated or manual worker to survive periods of unemployment by allowing credit. But the credit that the worker gets from the small trader—baker, butcher, grocer, or landlord—lays him open to ruin if unemployment is prolonged or too frequent.

Another cause of insecurity is that prime costs for small industrialists and tradespeople fluctuate arbitrarily, at the bidding of speculators.

We should note in passing that these traders and industrialists did not gain from the lowering of the bank rate. They still pay 8 per cent (6 per cent for three months with four renewals that cost 1/2 per cent, making 8 per cent in all). Without going so far as a State bank, which could be held to ransom in wartime, we should like to have seen commerce profit by the renewal of the charter of the Bank of France. But the Government and the financial feudality thought otherwise.

**Insecurity of the farmer**—The price of wheat no longer depends solely on the French harvest. At one time the producer used to get compensation for a poor harvest in the higher prices charged to the consumer. Nowadays these prices depend on the harvests of India and the United States.

They have begun to remedy this situation by protection, which is basically a socialist measure, intervention by the State in the natural course of events. (Just as the same circumstances are sweeping away parties, like a flood tide!)

We are in full agreement with the major aspects of protection. It aims at guaranteeing a minimum price to the producer. But the big middlemen absorb the profits with their fluctuations and speculative manoeuvres, which should be opposed with terrorist severity....

**Insecurity of the bourgeoisie**—The bourgeoisie is menaced by the international finance feudality, which turns financial securities into bits of paper.
I will not go back as far as Panama—I could find ten examples in the last twelve months. Take this one. The price of gold mines launched on the French market was raised to the point where their total value reached about 1.8 billion francs. Today they are worth no more than 615 million. This means that in less than two years national savings worth 1.2 billion was lost on securities held by small French investors.

No investigation followed.

ELECTORS

It is for the defence of the ideas that I have just explained that I propose for your approbation the following Program:

I. MEASURES TO BE TAKEN TO ENSURE THE UNION

OF ALL FRENCHMEN

Against foreign produce: the work of protectionism must be maintained; Against the foreign worker who, being dispensed from military service, draws every year a billion in wages from France and causes poverty and destitution, through unemployment, among the families of French workers. In particular public works, financed from taxes, must be carried out by national workers;

Against the international financial feudality which, through its joint-stock association, eliminates the worker from the country and replaces him by undercutting with foreign workers, paralyses the action of protective measures taken in support of agriculture and industry, organises monopoly and speculation in the basic essentials, falsifies prices, sending them up and down, and in the end ruins the real producers of wealth—our farmers, our traders, our workers;

Against the naturalised foreigner, who claims to play a role in politics and to whom we would allow only private rights, reserving political rights for his descendants. This is the best way to get at the Jew, whose invasion of State functions the executive power would otherwise have to restrict.

II. INSTITUTION OF A SUPERANNUATION FUND for workers organised by the State.

The duties which must be levied on foreign workers and the customs duties levied on basic essential goods must be specifically allotted to this superannuation fund in order to simplify somewhat these taxes where strictly no levy should be imposed.

The matter of superannuation funds is one of the most important to settle for the sake of social peace. It is urgent. It forces itself upon us. But it is complicated by a grave financial problem which has to be solved. I shall give this all my attention and care. I declare myself in favour of the principle. I shall accept any solution likely to produce the quickest and most lasting results.

III. REFORM OF TAXATION TO PROMOTE DEMOCRATIC JUSTICE aiming at lowering taxes on consumer goods and charges which hit the small growers. The land tax is charged on an estimated income which often does not exist, on the basis of assessments which no longer correspond to reality. The tax on consumer goods is infinitely heavier on the poor than on the rich.

IV. ORGANISATION OF AGRICULTURAL CREDIT, WHICH COULD INCLUDE THE FUNDS OF THE SAVINGS BANKS, today drained away from the whole province in order to BE CENTRALISED and riskily used for the purchase of stocks.

V. FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION. THIS IMPLIES EXTENSION OF THE CIVIL PERSONALITY OF THE TRADE UNIONS IN SUCH A WAY THAT WHETHER AGRICULTURAL OR INDUSTRIAL UNIONS, THEY CAN USE THE POWER OF CREDIT, BECOME ASSOCIATIONS OF PRODUCERS and own the premises and working tools needed in industrial, commercial, or agricultural production.
VI. EXTENSION OF THE INDEPENDENT FREEDOMS AND THE CIVIL PERSONALITY OF THE COMMUNES, SO as to permit them to achieve in part certain kinds of social progress—always provided they do not infringe the rights of the State.

VII. DEVELOPMENT OF PUBLIC EDUCATION IN THE DIRECTION OF OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING in order to allow all national aptitudes, all forms of intelligence to be developed. VIII. REVISION OF THE CONSTITUTION with the aim of giving universal suffrage its full and complete sovereignty, particularly by means of the municipal referendum.

ELECTORS,
It is useful that, in this region of Lorraine, where day by day they become more numerous, the workers in factories and in the fields should be able to express their wishes; it would be dangerous to suppress them into silence, as the old opportunists wished to do.

This program of the "National Socialist Republican Committee"—what generous and just mind would wish to misunderstand it?—corresponds to the needs of our population; IT IS IN TUNE WITH THE SPECIAL SPIRIT OF OUR LORRAINE and of our frontier.

Articles IV, V, VI, VIII, which concern decentralisation, strongly indicate the direction of our demands in our region, where the "School of Nancy" matches public feeling.

In all our Articles, as anyone can see who examines them in the light of our preliminary arguments, the path of the future is prepared, and at the same time immediate interests are guaranteed. I undertake to defend them with every means at my disposal, at the same time as I place myself completely at the service of the special interests of my compatriots.

Maurice Barrès
6. Adolf HITLER and Nazism

(a) The Bigger the Lie, the Better

[...] Like the woman, whose psychic state is determined less by grounds of abstract reason than by an indefinable emotional longing for a force which will complement her nature, and who, consequently, would rather bow to a strong man than dominate a weakling, likewise the masses love a commander more than a petitioner and feel inwardly more satisfied by a doctrine, tolerating no other beside itself, than by the granting of liberalistic freedom with which, as a rule, they can do little, and are prone to feel that they have been abandoned. they are equally unaware of their shameless spiritual terrorisation and the hideous abuse of their human freedom, for they absolutely fail to suspect the inner insanity of the whole doctrine. All they see is the ruthless force and brutality of its calculated manifestations, to which they always submit in the end. [...] 

[...] All propaganda must be popular and its intellectual level must be adjusted to the most limited intelligence among those it is addressed to. Consequently, the greater the mass it is intended to reach, the lower its purely intellectual level will have to be. But if, as in propaganda for sticking out a war, the aim is to influence a whole people, we must avoid excessive intellectual demands on our public, and too much caution cannot be exerted in this direction.

The more modest its intellectual ballast, the more exclusively it takes into consideration the emotions of the masses, the more effective it will be. And this is the best proof of the soundness or unsoundness of a propaganda campaign, and not success in pleasing a few scholars or young aesthetes.

The art of propaganda lies in understanding the emotional ideas of the great masses and finding, through a psychologically correct form, the way to the attention and thence to the heart of the broad masses. The fact that our bright boys do not understand this merely shows how mentally lazy and conceited they are.

Once we understand how necessary it is for propaganda to be adjusted to the broad mass, the following rule results:

It is a mistake to make propaganda many-sided, like scientific instruction, for instance. The receptivity of the great masses is very limited, their intelligence is small, but their power of forgetting is enormous. In consequence of these facts, all effective propaganda must be limited to a very few points and must harp on these in slogans until the last member of the public understands what you want him to understand by your slogan. As soon as you sacrifice this slogan and try to be many-sided, the effect will piddle away, for the crowd can neither digest nor retain the material offered. In this way the result is weakened and in the end entirely cancelled out. [...] 

[...] The magnitude of a lie always contains a certain factor of credibility, since the great masses of the people in the very bottom of their hearts tend to be corrupted rather than consciously and purposely evil, and that, therefore, in view of the primitive simplicity of their minds, they more easily fall a victim to a big lie than to a little one, since they themselves lie in little things, but would be ashamed of lies that were too big. Such a falsehood will never enter their heads, and they will not be able to believe in the possibility of such monstrous effrontery and infamous misrepresentation in others; yes, even when enlightened on the subject, they will long doubt and waver, and continue to accept at least one of these causes as true. Therefore, something of even the most insolent lie will always remain and stick—a fact which all the great lie-virtuosi and Icing-clubs in this world know only too well and also make the most treacherous use of. [...] 

(b) The Jewish Peril

[...] Slowly fear of the Marxist weapon of Jewry descends like a nightmare on the mind and soul of decent people.

They begin to tremble before the terrible enemy and thus have become his final victim.

The Jew's domination in the state seems so assured that now not only can he call himself a Jew again, but he ruthlessly admits his ultimate national and political designs. A section of his race openly owns itself to be a foreign people, yet even here they lie. For while the Zionists try to make the rest of the world believe that the national consciousness of the Jew finds its satisfaction in the creation of a Palestinian state, the Jews again slyly dupe the dumb Goyim. It doesn't even enter their heads to build up a Jewish state in Palestine for the purpose of living there; all they want is a central organisation for their international world swindle, endowed with its own sovereign rights and removed from the intervention of other states: a haven for convicted scoundrels and a university for budding crooks.

It is a sign of their rising confidence and sense of security that at a time when one section is still playing the German, Frenchman, or Englishman, the other with open effrontery comes out as the Jewish race.

How close they see approaching victory can be seen by the hideous aspect which their relations with the members of other peoples takes on.

With satanic joy in his face, the black-haired Jewish youth lurks in wait for the unsuspecting girl whom he defiles with his blood, thus stealing her from her people. With every means he tries to destroy the racial foundations of the people he has set out to subjugate. Just as he himself systematically ruins women and girls, he does not shrink back from pulling down the blood barriers for others, even on a large scale. It was and it is Jews who bring the Negroes into the Rhine land, always with the same secret thought and clear aim of ruining the hated white race by the necessarily resulting bastardisation, throwing it down from its cultural and political height, and himself rising to be its master.

For a racially pure people which is conscious of its blood can never be enslaved by the Jew. In this world he will forever be master over bastards and bastards alone.

And so he tries systematically to lower the racial level by a continuous poisoning of individuals.

And in politics he begins to replace the idea of democracy by the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In the organised mass of Marxism he has found the weapon which lets him dispense with democracy and in its stead allows him to subjugate and govern the peoples with a dictatorial and brutal fist.

He works systematically for revolutionisation in a twofold sense: economic and political.

Around peoples who offer too violent a resistance to attack from within he weaves a net of enemies, thanks to his international influence, incites them to war, and finally, if necessary, plants the flag of revolution on the very battlefields.

In economics he undermines the states until the social enterprises which have become unprofitable are taken from the state and subjected to his financial control.

In the political field he refuses the state the means for its self-preservation, destroys the foundations of all national self-maintenance and defence, destroys faith in the leadership, scoffs at its history and past, and drags everything that is truly great into the gutter.

Culturally he contaminates art, literature, the theatre, makes a mockery of natural feeling, overthrows all concepts of beauty and sublimity, of the noble and the good, and instead drags men down into the sphere of his own base nature.

Religion is ridiculed, ethics and morality represented as outmoded, until the last props of a nation in its struggle for existence in this world have fallen.
Now begins the great last revolution. In gaining political power the Jew casts off the few cloaks that he still wears. The democratic people's Jew becomes the blood-Jew and tyrant over peoples. In a few years he tries to exterminate the national intelligentsia and by robbing the peoples of their natural intellectual leadership makes them ripe for the slave's lot of permanent subjugation.

The most frightful example of this kind is offered by Russia, where he killed or starved about thirty million people with positively fanatical savagery, in part amid inhuman tortures, in order to give a gang of Jewish journalists and stock exchange bandits domination over a great people.

The end is not only the end of the freedom of the peoples oppressed by the Jew, but also the end of this parasite upon the nations. After the death of his victim, the vampire sooner or later dies too. [...] 

(A. Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, vol. 1, ch. 11, pp. 294-6)

(c) The Master Race

[...] In opposition to [Marxism] the folkish philosophy finds the importance of mankind in its basic racial elements. In the state it sees on principle only a means to an end and constructs its end as the preservation of the racial existence of man. Thus, it by no means believes in an equality of the races, but along with their difference it recognises their higher or lesser value and feels itself obligated, through the knowledge, to promote the victory of the better and stronger, and demand the subordination of the inferior and weaker in accordance with the eternal will that dominates this universe. Thus, in principle, it serves the basic aristocratic idea of Nature and believes in the validity of this law down to the last individual. It sees not only the different value of the races, but also the different value of individuals. From the mass it extracts the importance of the individual personality, and thus, in contrast to disorganising Marxism, it has an organising effect. It believes in the necessity of an idealisation of humanity, in which alone it sees the premise for the existence of humanity. But it cannot grant the right to existence even to an ethical idea if this idea represents a danger for the racial life of the bearers of a higher ethics; for in a bastardised and niggerised world all the concepts of the humanly beautiful and sublime, as well as all ideas of an idealised future of our humanity, would be lost forever.

Human culture and civilisation on this continent are inseparably bound up with the presence of the Aryan. If he dies out or declines, the dark veils of an age without culture will again descend on this globe.

The undermining of the existence of human culture by the destruction of its bearer seems in the eyes of a folkish philosophy the most execrable crime. Anyone who dares to lay hands on the highest image of the Lord commits sacrilege against the benevolent creator of this miracle and contributes to the expulsion from paradise.

And so the folkish philosophy of life corresponds to the innermost will of Nature, since it restores that free play of forces which must lead to a continuous mutual higher breeding, until at last the best of humanity, having achieved possession of this earth, will have a free path for activity in domains which will lie partly above it and partly outside it.

We all sense that in the distant future humanity must be faced by problems which only a highest race, become master people and supported by the means and possibilities of an entire globe, will be equipped to overcome.

It is self-evident that so general a statement of the meaningful content of a folkish philosophy can be interpreted in thousands of ways. And actually we find hardly a one of our newer political formations which does not base itself in one way or another on this world view. And, by its very existence in the face of the many others, it shows the difference of its conceptions. And so the Marxist world view, led by a unified top organisation, is opposed by a hodgepodge of views which even as ideas are not very impressive in face of the solid, hostile front. Victories are not gained by such feeble weapons! Not until the international world view—politically led by organised Marxism—is
confronted by a folkish world view, organised and led with equal unity, will success, supposing the fighting energy to be equal on both sides, fall to the side of eternal truth.

A philosophy can only be organisationally comprehended on the basis of a definite formulation of that philosophy, and what dogmas represent for religious faith, party principles are for a political party in the making. Hence an instrument must be created for the folkish world view which enables it to fight, just as the Marxist party organisation creates a free path for internationalism. This is the goal pursued by the National Socialist German Workers' Party. [...]


(d) Alfred ROSENBERG: Aryan Culture

Today, a new belief is arising: the Mythus of the blood; the belief that the godly essence of man itself is to be defended through the blood; that belief which embodies the clearest knowledge that the Nordic race represents that Mysterium which has overthrown and replaced the old sacraments.

Spanning history from the present, the many-faceted character of Nordic creative strength lies stretched out before us. Aryan India bequeathed to the world a metaphysic whose depths have yet to be plumbed, even today. The Aryan Persian composed for us the religious myths from which we still draw sustenance. Doric Hellas dreamed of a beauty, which, as we see it in completed form before us, will never be further developed. Italian Rome illustrates for us an example of formal state loyalty; how a threatened human community must organize and defend itself. And German Europe bequeathed to the world the radiant ideal of humanity, as exemplified in its teaching that character value must be the foundation of all morality, and in its paean to the highest value of the Nordic being—to the idea of freedom of conscience and of honour. All military and scholarly struggles revolve around this ideal and if, in the great struggle to come, this idea is not victorious, all the West and its blood will perish, as India and Hellas once did, vanishing into eternity in chaos.

In recognising that Europe and all its creative products result from character, we have uncovered the underlying theme of European religion, German scholarship and even Nordic art. To become inwardly conscious of this fact, to experience it with the full beat of an heroic heart, is to prepare the way for rebirth. This recognition is the foundation for a new Weltanschauung, a new-yet-old theory of state, the Mythus of that new life-feeling which, alone, will give us the strength to overthrow the presumptuous domination of subhumans and to create a unique civilisation which will penetrate into all areas of life.

[...] Each race has its soul, each soul its race—its own unique inner and outer architectonic shape, its characteristic form of appearance and characteristic expression of life style, and unique relationships between the strengths of will and reason. Each race cultivates, as its fixed goal, only one high ideal. If this should be transformed or overthrown by another system of allegiance or by an overpowering intrusion of foreign blood and foreign ideas, the external consequence of this inner metamorphosis is chaos, designated as epochs of catastrophe. [...]

7. Benito MUSSOLINI

(a) The Doctrine of Fascism

Fascism is a religious conception in which man is seen in his immanent relationship with a superior law and with an objective Will that transcends the particular individual and raises him to conscious membership of a spiritual society. Whoever has seen in the religious politics of the Fascist regime nothing but mere opportunism has not understood that Fascism besides being a system of government is also, and above all, a system of thought.

Fascism is an historical conception, in which man is what he is only in so far as he works with the spiritual process in which he finds himself, in the family or social group, in the nation and in the history in which all nations collaborate. From this follows the great value of tradition, in memories, in language, in customs, in the standards of social life. Outside history man is nothing. Consequently Fascism is opposed to all the individualistic abstractions of a materialistic nature like those of the eighteenth century; and it is opposed to all Jacobin utopias and innovations. It does not consider that 'happiness' is possible upon earth, as it appeared to be in the desire of the economic literature of the eighteenth century, and hence it rejects all teleological theories according to which mankind would reach a definitive stabilised condition at a certain period in history. This implies putting oneself outside history and life, which is a continual change and coming to be. Politically, Fascism wishes to be a realistic doctrine; practically, it aspires to solve only the problems which arise historically of themselves and that of themselves find or suggest their own solution. To act among men, as to act in the natural world, it is necessary to enter into the process of reality and to master the already operating forces.

Against individualism, the Fascist conception is for the State; and it is for the individual in so far as he coincides with the State, which is the conscience and universal will of man in his historical existence. It is opposed to classical Liberalism, which arose from the necessity of reacting against absolutism, and which brought its historical purpose to an end when the State was transformed into the conscience and will of the people. Liberalism denied the State in the interests of the particular individual; Fascism reaffirms the State as the true reality of the individual. And if liberty is to be the attribute of the real man, and not of that abstract puppet envisaged by individualistic Liberalism, Fascism is for liberty. And for the only liberty which can be a real thing, the liberty of the State and of the individual within the State. Therefore, for the Fascist, everything is in the State, and nothing human or spiritual exists, much less has value, outside the State. In this sense Fascism is totalitarian, and the Fascist State, the synthesis and unity of all values, interprets, develops and gives strength to the whole life of the people.

Outside the State there can be neither individuals nor groups (political parties, associations, syndicates, classes). Therefore Fascism is opposed to Socialism, which confines the movement of history within the class struggle and ignores the unity of classes established in one economic and moral reality in the State; and analogously it is opposed to class syndicalism. Fascism recognises the real exigencies for which the socialist and syndicalist movement arose, but while recognising them wishes to bring them under the control of the State and give them a purpose within the corporative system of interests reconciled within the unity of the State.

Individuals form classes according to the similarity of their interests, they form syndicates according to differentiated economic activities within these interests; but they form first, and above all, the State, which is not to be thought of numerically as the sum-total of individuals forming the majority of a nation. And consequently Fascism is opposed to Democracy, which equates the nation to the majority, lowering it to the level of that

---

majority; nevertheless it is the purest form of democracy if the nation is conceived as it 
should be, qualitatively and not quantitatively, as the most powerful idea (most powerful 
because most moral, most coherent, most true) which acts within the nation as the 
conscience and the will of a few, even of One, which ideal tends to become active within 
the conscience and the will of all—that is to say, of all those who rightly constitute a nation 
by reason of nature, history or race, and have set out upon the same line of development 
and spiritual formation as one conscience and one sole will. Not a race, nor a 
geographically determined region, but as a community historically perpetuating itself, a 
multitude unified by a single idea, which is the will to existence and to power: 
consciousness of itself, personality.

This higher personality is truly the nation in so far as it is the State. It is not the nation 
that generates the State, as according to the old naturalistic concept which served as the 
basis of the political theories of the national States of the nineteenth century. Rather the 
nation is created by the State, which gives to the people, conscious of its own moral unity, 
a will and therefore an effective existence [...]

Such a conception of life makes Fascism the precise negation of that doctrine which 
formed the basis of the so-called Scientific or Marxian Socialism: the doctrine of historical 
Materialism, according to which the history of human civilisations can be explained only 
as the struggle of interest between the different social groups and as arising out of 
change in the means and instruments of production. That economic improvements— 
discoveries of raw materials, new methods of work, scientific inventions—should have an 
importance of their own, no one denies, but that they should suffice to explain human 
history to the exclusion of all other factors is absurd: Fascism believes, now and always, 
in holiness and in heroism, that is in acts in which no economic motive—remote or 
immediate—plays a part. With this negation of historical materialism, according to which 
men would be only by-products of history, who appear and disappear on the surface of 
the waves while in the depths the real directive forces are at work, there is also denied 
the immutable and irreparable 'class struggle' which is the natural product of this 
economic conception of history, and above all it is denied that the class struggle can be the 
primary agent of social changes. Socialism, being thus wounded in these two primary 
tenets of its doctrine, nothing of it is left save the sentimental aspiration—old as 
humanity—towards a social order in which the sufferings and the pains of the humblest 
folk could be alleviated. But here Fascism rejects the concept of an economic 'happiness' 
which would be realised socialistically and almost automatically at a given moment of 
economic evolution by assuring to all a maximum prosperity. Fascism denies the 
possibility of the materialistic conception of 'happiness' and leaves it to the economists of 
the first half of the eighteenth century; it denies, that is, the equation of prosperity with 
happiness, which would transform men into animals with one sole preoccupation: that of 
being well-fed and fat, degraded in consequence to a merely physical existence.

After Socialism, Fascism attacks the whole complex of democratic ideologies and 
rejects them both in their theoretical premises and in their applications or practical 
manifestations. Fascism denies that the majority, through the mere fact of being a 
majority, can rule human societies; it denies that this majority can govern by means of a 
periodical consultation; it affirms the irremediable, fruitful and beneficent inequality of 
men, who cannot be levelled by such a mechanical and extrinsic fact as universal 
suffrage. By democratic regimes we mean those in which from time to time the people is 
given the illusion of being sovereign, while true effective sovereignty lies in other, perhaps 
irresponsible and secret, forces. Democracy is a regime without a king, but with very 
many kings, perhaps more exclusive, tyrannical and violent than one king even though a 
tyrant[...]

But the Fascist repudiations of Socialism, Democracy, Liberalism must not make one 
think that Fascism wishes to make the world return to what it was before 1789, the year 
which has been indicated as the year of the beginning of the liberal-democratic age. One 
does not go backwards. The Fascist doctrine has not chosen De Maistre as its prophet. 
Monarchical absolutism is a thing of the past and so also is every theocracy. So also
feudal privileges and division into impenetrable and isolated castes have had their day. The theory of Fascist authority has nothing to do with the police State. A party that governs a nation in a totalitarian way is a new fact in history. References and comparisons are not possible. Fascism takes over from the ruins of Liberal Socialistic democratic doctrines those elements which still have a living value. It preserves those that can be called the established facts of history, it rejects all the rest, that is to say the idea of a doctrine which holds good for all times and all peoples. If it is admitted that the nineteenth century has been the century of Socialism, Liberalism and Democracy, it does not follow that the twentieth must also be the century of Liberalism, Socialism and Democracy. Political doctrines pass; peoples remain. It is to be expected that this century may be that of authority, a century of the 'Right', a Fascist century. If the nineteenth was the century of the individual (Liberalism means individualism) it may be expected that this one may be the century of 'collectivism' and therefore the century of the State. That a new doctrine should use the still vital elements of other doctrines is perfectly logical. No doctrine is born quite new, shining, never before seen. No doctrine can boast of an absolute 'originality'. It is bound, even if only historically, to other doctrines that have been, and to develop into other doctrines that will be. Thus the scientific socialism of Marx is bound to the Utopian Socialism of the Fouriers, the Owens and the Saint-Simons; thus the Liberalism of the nineteenth century is connected with the whole 'Enlightenment' of the eighteenth century. Thus the doctrines of democracy are bound to the Encyclopedie. Every doctrine tends to direct the activity of men towards a determined objective; but the activity of man reacts upon the doctrine, transforms it, adapts it to new necessities or transcends it. The doctrine itself, therefore must be, not words, but an act of life. Hence, the pragmatic veins in Fascism, its will to power, its will to be, its attitude in the face of the fact of 'violence' and of its own courage [...] (B. MUSSOLINI, The Doctrine of Fascism, in M. Oakeshott, The Social and Political Doctrines of Contemporary Europe, pp. 165-7, 170-2, Cambridge University Press 1939.)

(b) Fascism, War, Dictatorship

Fascism combats the whole complex system of democratic ideology, and repudiates it, whether in its theoretical premises or in its practical application. Fascism denies that the majority, by the simple fact that it is a majority, can direct human society; it denies that numbers alone can govern by means of a periodical consultation, and it affirms the immutable, beneficial, and fruitful inequality of mankind, which can never be permanently levelled through the mere operation of a mechanical process such as universal suffrage. The democratic regime may be defined as from time to time giving the people the illusion of sovereignty, while the real effective sovereignty lies in the hands of other concealed and irresponsible forces. Democracy is a regime nominally without a king, but it is ruled by many kings—more absolute, tyrannical, and ruinous than one sole king, even though a tyrant. This explains why Fascism, having first in 1922 (for reasons of expediency) assumed an attitude tending towards republicanism, renounced this point of view before the march to Rome, being convinced that the question of political form is not today of prime importance, and after having studied the examples of monarchies and republics past and present reached the conclusion that monarchy or republicanism are not to be judged, as it were, by an absolute standard; but that they represent forms in which the evolution—political, historical, traditional, or psychological—of a particular country has expressed itself. Fascism supersedes the antithesis monarchy or republicanism, while democracy still tarries beneath the domination of this idea, forever pointing out the insufficiency of the first and forever the praising of the second as the perfect regime. Today, it can be seen that there are republics innately reactionary and absolutist, and also monarchies which incorporate the most ardent social and political hopes of the future.
"Reason and science," says Renan (one of the inspired pre-Fascists) in his philosophical meditations, "are products of humanity, but to expect reason as a direct product of the people and a direct result of their action is to deceive oneself by a chimera. It is not necessary for the existence of reason that everybody should understand it. And in any case, if such a decimation of truth were necessary, it could not be achieved in a low-class democracy, which seems as though it must of its very nature extinguish any kind of noble training. The principle that society exists solely through the well-being and the personal liberty of all the individuals of which it is composed does not appear to be conformable to the plans of nature, in whose workings the race alone seems to be taken into consideration, and the individual sacrificed to it. It is greatly to be feared that the last stage of such a conception of democracy (though I must hasten to point out that the term 'democracy' may be interpreted in various ways) would end in a condition of society in which a degenerate herd would have no other preoccupation but the satisfaction of the lowest desires of common men." Thus Renan. Fascism denies, in democracy, the absurd conventional untruth of political equality dressed out in the garb of collective irresponsibility, and the myth of "happiness" and indefinite progress. But, if democracy may be conceived in diverse forms—that is to say, taking democracy to mean a state of society in which the populace are not reduced to impotence in the State—Fascism may write itself down as "an organized, centralised, and authoritative democracy."

Fascism has taken up an attitude of complete opposition to the doctrines of Liberalism, both in the political field and the field of economics. There should be no undue exaggeration (simply with the object of immediate success in controversy) of the importance of Liberalism in the last century, nor should what was but one among many theories which appeared in that period be put forward as a religion for humanity for all time, present and to come. Liberalism only flourished for half a century. It was born in 1830 in reaction against the Holy Alliance, which had been formed with the object of diverting the destinies of Europe back to the period before 1789— and the highest point of its success was the year 1848, when even Pius IX was a Liberal. Immediately after that date it began to decay, for if the year 1848 was a year of light and hope, the following year, 1849, was a year of darkness and tragedy. The Republic of Rome was dealt a mortal blow by a sister republic—that of France—and in the same year Marx launched the gospel of the Socialist religion, the famous Communist Manifesto. In 1851 Napoleon III carried out his far from Liberal coup d'état and reigned in France until 1870, when he was deposed by a popular movement as the consequence of a military defeat which must be counted as one of the most decisive in history. The victor was Bismarck, who knew nothing of the religion of liberty, or the prophets by which that faith was revealed. And it is symptomatic that such a highly civilised people as the Germans were completely ignorant of the religion of liberty during the whole of the nineteenth century. It was nothing but a parenthesis, represented by that body which has been called "The ridiculous Parliament of Frankfort," which lasted only for a short period. Germany attained her national unity quite outside the doctrines of Liberalism—a doctrine which seems entirely foreign to the German mind, a mind essentially monarchic—while Liberalism is the logical and, indeed, historical forerunner of anarchy. The stages in the achievement of German unity are the three wars of '64, '66, and '70, which were guided by such "Liberals" as Von Moltke and Bismarck. As for Italian unity, its debt to Liberalism is completely inferior in contrast to that which it owes to the work of Mazzini and Garibaldi, who were not Liberals. Had it not been for the intervention of the anti-Liberal Napoleon, we should not have gained Lombardy; and without the help of the again anti-Liberal Bismarck at Sadowa and Sedan it is very probable that we should never have gained the province of Venice in '66, or been able to enter Rome in '70. From 1870 to 1914 a period began during which even the very high priests of the religion themselves had to recognize the gathering twilight of their faith—defeated as it was by the decadence of literature and atavism in practice—that is to say, Nationalism, Futurism, Fascism. The era of Liberalism, after having accumulated an infinity of Gordian knots, tried to untie them in the slaughter of the World War—and never has any religion demanded of votaries such a monstrous sacrifice. Perhaps the Liberal
Gods were athirst for blood? But now, today, the Liberal faith must shut the doors of its deserted temples, deserted because the peoples of the world realize that its worship—agnostic in the field of economics and indifferent in the field of politics and morals—will lead, as it has already led, to certain ruin. In addition to this, let it be pointed out that all the political hopes of the present day are anti-Liberal, and it is therefore supremely ridiculous to try to classify this sole creed as outside the judgement of history, as though history were a hunting ground reserved for the professors of Liberalism—as though Liberalism were the final unalterable verdict of civilisation.

The foundation of Fascism is the conception of the State, its character, its duty, and its aim. Fascism conceives of the State as an absolute, in comparison with which all individuals or groups are relative, only to be conceived of in their relation to the State. The conception of the Liberal State is not that of a directing force, guiding the play and development, both material and spiritual, of a collective body, but merely a force limited to the function of recording results; on the other hand, the Fascist State is itself conscious, and has itself a will and a personality—thus it may be called the "ethic" State. In 1929, at the first five-yearly assembly of the Fascist regime, I said:

"For us Fascists, the State is not merely a guardian, preoccupied solely with the duty of assuring the personal safety of the citizens; nor is it an organization with purely material aims, such as to guarantee a certain level of well-being and peaceful conditions of life; for a mere council of administration would be sufficient to realize such objects. Nor is it a purely political creation divorced from all contact with the complex material reality which makes up the life of the individual and the life of the people as a whole. The State, as conceived of and as created by Fascism, is a spiritual and moral fact in itself, since its political, juridical, and economic organization of the nation is a concrete thing: and such an organization must be in its origins and development a manifestation of the spirit. The State is the guarantor of security both internal and external, but it is also the custodian and transmitter of the spirit of the people, as it has grown up through the centuries in language, in custom, and in faith. And the State is not only a living reality of the present, it is also linked with the past and above all with the future, and thus transcending the brief limits of individual life, it represents the immanent spirit of the nation. The forms in which States express themselves may change, but the necessity for such forms is eternal. It is the State which educates its citizens in civic virtue, gives them a consciousness of their mission and welds them into unity; harmonising their various interests through justice, and transmitting to future generations the mental conquests of science, of art, of law and the solidarity of humanity. It leads men from primitive tribal life to that highest expression of human power which is Empire: it links up through the centuries the names of those of its members who have died for its existence and to obedience to its laws, it holds up the memory of the leaders who have increased its territory and the geniuses who have illumined it with glory as an example to be followed by future generations. When the conception of the State declines, and disunifying and centrifugal tendencies prevail, whether of individuals or of particular groups, the nations where such phenomena appear are in the decline."

From 1929 until today, evolution, both political and economic, has everywhere gone to prove the validity of these doctrinal promises. Of such gigantic importance is the State. Is it the force which alone can provide a solution to the dramatic contradictions of capitalism, and that state of affairs which we call the shade of Jules Simon, who in the dawn of Liberalism proclaimed that, "The State must labour to make itself unnecessary, and prepare the way for its own dismissal?" Or of McCulloch, who, in the second half of the last century, affirmed that the State must guard against the danger of governing too much? What would the Englishman, Bentham, say today to the continual and inevitably invoked intervention of the State in the sphere of economics, while according to his theories industry should ask no more of the State than to be left in peace? Or the German, Humboldt, according to whom the "lazy" State should be considered the best? Is it true that the second wave of Liberal economists were less extreme than the first, and Adam Smith himself opened the door—if only very cautiously—which leads to State
intervention in the economic field: but whoever says Liberalism implies individualism, and whoever says Fascism implies the State. Yet the Fascist State is unique, and an original creation. It is not reactionary, but revolutionary, in that it anticipates the solution of the universal political problems which elsewhere have to be settled in the political field by the rivalry of parties, the excessive power of the parliamentary regime and the irresponsibility of political assemblies; while it meets the problems of the economic field by a system of syndicalism which is continually increasing in importance, as much in the sphere of labour as of industry; and in the moral field enforces order, discipline, and obedience to that which is the determined moral code of the country. Fascism desires the State to be a strong and organic body, at the same time reposing upon broad and popular support.

The Fascist State has drawn into itself even the economic activities of the nation, and, through the corporative social and educational institutions created by it, its influence reaches every aspect of the national life and includes, framed in their respective organisations, all the political, economic and spiritual forces of the nation. A State which reposes upon the support of millions of individuals who recognize its authority, are continually conscious of its power and are ready at once to serve it, is not the old tyrannical State of the medieval lord nor has it anything in common with the absolute governments either before or after 1789. The individual in the Fascist State is not annulled but rather multiplied, just in the same way that a soldier in a regiment is not diminished but rather increased by the number of his comrades. The Fascist State organises the nation, but leaves a sufficient margin of liberty to the individual; the latter is deprived of all useless and possibly harmful freedom, but retains what is essential; the deciding power in this question cannot be the individual, but the State alone.

Above all, Fascism, in so far as it considers the future and the development of humanity quite apart from political considerations of the moment, believes neither in the possibility nor the utility of perpetual peace. It thus repudiates the doctrine of Pacifism—born of a renunciation of the struggle and an act of cowardice in the face of sacrifice. War alone brings up to its highest tension all human energy and puts the stamp of nobility upon the peoples who have the courage to meet it. All other trials are substitutes, which never really put men into the position where they have to make the great decision—the alternative of life or death. Thus a doctrine which is founded upon this harmful postulate of peace is hostile to Fascism. And thus hostile to the spirit of Fascism, though accepted for what use they can be in dealing with particular situations, are all the international leagues and societies which, as history will show, can be scattered to the winds when once strong national feeling is aroused by any motive—sentimental, ideal, or practical. This anti-pacifist spirit is carried by Fascism even into the life of the individual; the proud motto of the Squadrista, "Me ne Frego," written on the bandage of the wound, is an act of philosophy not only stoic, the summary of a doctrine not only political—it is the education to combat, the acceptance of the risks which combat implies, and a new way of life for Italy. Thus the Fascist accepts life and loves it, knowing nothing of and despising suicide: he rather conceives of life as duty and struggle and conquest, life which should be high and full, lived for oneself, but above all for others—those who are at hand and those who are far distant, contemporaries, and those who will come after.

The "demographic" policy of the regime is the result of the above premises. The Fascist, too, loves in actual fact his neighbour, but this "neighbour" is not merely a vague and undefined concept, this love for one's neighbour puts no obstacle in the way of necessary educational severity, and still less to differentiation of status and to physical distance. Fascism repudiates any universal embrace, and in order to live worthily in the community of civilised peoples watches its contemporaries with vigilant eyes, takes good note of their state of mind and, in the changing trend of their interests, does not allow itself to be deceived by temporary and fallacious appearances.

The Fascist State is an embodied will to power and government: the Roman tradition is here an ideal of force in action. According to Fascism, government is not so much a thing to be expressed in territorial or military terms as in terms of morality and the spirit. It must be thought of as an empire—that is to say, a nation which directly or indirectly rules
other nations, without the need for conquering a single square yard of territory. For Fascism, the growth of empire, that is to say the expansion of the nation, is an essential manifestation of vitality, and its opposite a sign of decadence. Peoples which are rising, or rising again after a period of decadence, are always imperialist; any renunciation is a sign of decay and of death. Fascism is the doctrine best adapted to represent the tendencies and the aspirations of a people, like the people of Italy, who are rising again after many centuries of abasement and foreign servitude. But empire demands discipline, the coordination of all forces and a deeply felt sense of duty and sacrifice: this fact explains many aspects of the practical working of the regime, the character of many forces in the State, and the necessarily severe measures which must be taken against those who would oppose this spontaneous and inevitable movement of Italy in the twentieth century, and would oppose it by recalling the outworn ideology of the nineteenth century—repudiated wheresoever there has been the courage to undertake great experiments of social and political transformation; for never before has the nation stood more in need of authority, of direction, and of order. If every age has its own characteristic doctrine, there are a thousand signs which point to Fascism as the characteristic doctrine of our time. For if a doctrine must be a living thing, this is proved by the fact that Fascism has created a living faith which is very powerful in the minds of men, is demonstrated by those who have suffered and died for it.

Fascism has henceforth in the world the universality of all those doctrines which, in realising themselves, have represented a stage in the history of the human spirit.

[...]

8. Karl MARX and Friedrich ENGELS

(a) The Communist Manifesto 

A spectre is haunting Europe—the spectre of Communism. All the powers of old Europe have entered into a holy alliance to exorcise this spectre: Pope and Tsar, Metternich and Guizot, French Radicals and German police-spies.

Where is the party in opposition that has not been decried as communistic by its opponents in power? Where is the Opposition that has not hurled back the branding reproach of Communism, against the more advanced opposition parties, as well as against its reactionary adversaries?

Two things result from this fact:
1. Communism is already acknowledged by all European powers to be itself a power.
2. It is high time that Communists should openly, in the face of the whole world, publish their views, their aims, their tendencies, and meet this nursery tale of the spectre of Communism with a manifesto of the party itself.

To this end, Communists of various nationalities have assembled in London, and sketched the following manifesto, to be published in the English, French, German, Italian, Flemish and Danish languages:

1: BOURGEOIS AND PROLETARIANS

The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles.

Freeman and slave, patrician and plebeian, lord and serf, guild-master and journeyman, in a word, oppressor and oppressed, stood in constant opposition to one another, carried on an uninterrupted, now hidden, now open fight, a fight that each time ended, either in a revolutionary reconstitution of society at large, or in the common ruin of the contending classes.

In the earlier epochs of history, we find almost everywhere a complicated arrangement of society into various orders, a manifold gradation of social rank. In ancient Rome we have patricians, knights, plebeians, slaves; in the Middle Ages, feudal lords, vassals, guild-masters, journeymen, apprentices, serfs; in almost all of these classes, again, subordinate gradations.

The modern bourgeois society that has sprouted from the ruins of feudal society has not done away with class antagonisms. It has but established new classes, new conditions of oppression, new forms of struggle in place of the old ones.

Our epoch, the epoch of the bourgeoisie, possesses, however, this distinctive feature: it has simplified the class antagonisms. Society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other—bourgeoisie and proletariat.

From the serfs of the Middle Ages sprang the chartered burghers of the earliest towns. From these burgesses the first elements of the bourgeoisie were developed.

The discovery of America, the rounding of the Cape, opened up fresh ground for the rising bourgeoisie. The East-Indian and Chinese markets, the colonisation of America, trade with the colonies, the increase in the means of exchange and in commodities generally, gave to commerce, to navigation, to industry, an impulse never before known, and thereby, to the revolutionary element in the tottering feudal society, a rapid development.

The feudal system of industry, in which industrial production was monopolised by closed guilds, now no longer sufficed for the growing wants of the new markets. The manufacturing system took its place. The guild masters were pushed aside by the

---

manufacturing middle class; division of labour between the different corporate guilds vanished in the face of division of labour in each single workshop.

Meantime the markets kept ever growing, the demand ever rising. Even manufacture no longer sufficed. Thereupon, steam and machinery revolutionised industrial production. The place of manufacture was taken by the giant, modern industry, the place of the industrial middle class, by industrial millionaires, the leaders of whole industrial armies, the modern bourgeois.

Modern industry has established the world market, for which the discovery of America paved the way. This market has given an immense development to commerce, to navigation, to communication by land. This development has, in its turn, reacted on the extension of industry; and in proportion as industry, commerce, navigation, railways extended, in the same proportion the bourgeoisie developed, increased its capital, and pushed into the background every class handed down from the Middle Ages.

We see, therefore, how the modern bourgeoisie is itself the product of a long course of development, of a series of revolutions in the modes of production and of exchange.

Each step in the development of the bourgeoisie was accompanied by a corresponding political advance of that class. An oppressed class under the sway of the feudal nobility, an armed and self-governing association in the mediaeval commune; here independent urban republic (as in Italy and Germany); there taxable "third estate" of the monarchy (as in France); afterwards, in the period of manufacture proper, serving either the semi-feudal or the absolute monarchy as a counterpoise against the nobility, and, in fact, corner stone of the great monarchies in general, the bourgeoisie has at last, since the establishment of Modern Industry and of the world market, conquered for itself, in the modern representative State, exclusive political sway.

The executive of the modern State is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie.

The bourgeoisie, historically, has played a most revolutionary part.

The bourgeoisie, wherever it has got the upper hand, has put an end to all feudal, patriarchal, idyllic relations. It has pitilessly torn asunder the motley feudal ties that bound man to his "natural superiors," and has left no other nexus between man and man than naked self-interest, than callous "cash payment." It has drowned the most heavenly ecstasies of religious fervour, of chivalrous enthusiasm, of philistine sentimentalism, in the icy water of egotistical calculation. It has resolved personal worth into exchange value, and in place of the numberless indefeasible chartered freedoms, has set up that single, unconscionable freedom—Free Trade. In one word, for exploitation, veiled by religious and political illusions, it has substituted naked, shameless, direct, brutal exploitation.

The bourgeoisie has stripped of its halo every occupation hitherto honoured and looked up to with reverent awe. It has converted the physician, the lawyer, the priest, the poet, the man of science, into its paid wage-labourers.

The bourgeoisie has torn away from the family its sentimental veil, and has reduced the family relation to a mere money relation.

The bourgeoisie has disclosed how it came to pass that the brutal display of vigour in the Middle Ages, which reactionaries so much admire, found its fitting complement in the most slothful indolence. It has been the first to show what man's activity can bring about. It has accomplished wonders far surpassing Egyptian pyramids, Roman aqueducts, and Gothic cathedrals; it has conducted expeditions that put in the shade all former Exoduses of nations and crusades.

The bourgeoisie cannot exist without constantly revolutionising the instruments of production, and thereby the relations of production, and with them the whole relations of society. Conservation of the old modes of production in unaltered form, was, on the contrary, the first condition of existence for all earlier industrial classes. Constant revolutionising of production, uninterrupted disturbance of all social conditions, everlasting uncertainty and agitation distinguished the bourgeois epoch from all earlier ones. All fixed, fast-frozen relations, with their train of ancient and venerable prejudices and opinions, are
swept away, all new-formed ones become antiquated before they can ossify. All that is
solid melts into air, all that is holy is profaned, and man is at last compelled to face with
sober senses his real conditions of life and his relations with his kind.

The need of a constantly expanding market for its products chases the bourgeoisie
over the whole surface of the globe. It must nestle everywhere, settle everywhere,
establish connections everywhere.

The bourgeoisie has through its exploitation of the world market given a cosmopolitan
character to production and consumption in every country. To the great chagrin of
reactionaries, it has drawn from under the feet of industry the national ground on which it
stood. All old-established national industries have been destroyed or are daily being
destroyed. They are dislodged by new industries, whose introduction becomes a life and
death question for all civilised nations, by industries that no longer work up indigenous
raw material, but raw material drawn from the remotest zones; industries whose products
are consumed, not only at home, but in every quarter of the globe. In place of the old
wants, satisfied by the production of the country, we find new wants, requiring for their
satisfaction the products of distant lands and climes. In place of the old local and national
seclusion and self-sufficiency, we have intercourse in every direction, universal inter
dependence of nations. And as in material, so also in intellectual production. The
intellectual creations of individual nations become common property. National one-
sidedness and narrow-mindedness become more and more impossible, and from the
numerous national and local literatures there arises a world literature.

The bourgeoisie, by the rapid improvement of all instruments of production, by the
immensely facilitated means of communication, draws all, even the most barbarian,
nations into civilisation. The cheap prices of its commodities are the heavy artillery with
which it batters down all Chinese walls, with which it forces the barbarians’ intensely
obstinate hatred of foreigners to capitulate. It compels all nations, on pain of extinction, to
adopt the bourgeois modes of production; it compels them to introduce what it calls
civilisation into their midst, i.e., to become bourgeois themselves. In one word, it creates a
world after its own image.

The bourgeoisie has subjected the country to the rule of the towns. It has created
enormous cities, has greatly increased the urban population as compared with the rural,
and has thus rescued a considerable part of the population from the idiocy of rural life.
Just as it has made the country dependent on the towns, so it has made barbarian and
semi-barbarian countries dependent on the civilised ones, nations of peasants on nations
of bourgeois, the East on the West.

The bourgeoisie keeps more and more doing away with the scattered state of the
population, of the means of production, and of property. It has agglomerated population,
centralised means of production, and has concentrated property in a few hands. The
necessary consequence of this was political centralisation. Independent, or but loosely
connected provinces, with separate interests, laws, governments and systems of taxation,
became lumped together into one nation, with one government, one code of laws, one
national class interest, one frontier and one customs tariff.

The bourgeoisie, during its rule of scarce one hundred years, has created more
massive and more colossal productive forces than have all preceding generations
together. Subjection of nature’s forces to man, machinery, application of chemistry to
industry and agriculture, steam-navigation, railways, electric telegraphs, clearing of whole
continents for cultivation, canalisation of rivers, whole populations conjured out of the
ground—what earlier century had even a presentiment that such productive forces
slumbered in the lap of social labour?

We see then; the means of production and of exchange, on whose foundation the
bourgeoisie built itself up, were generated in feudal society. At a certain stage in the
development of these means of production and of exchange, the conditions under which
feudal society produced and exchanged, the feudal organisation of agriculture and
manufacturing industry, in one word, the feudal relations of property became no longer
compatible with the already developed productive forces; they became so many fetters. They had to be burst asunder; they were burst asunder.

Into their place stepped free competition, accompanied by a social and political constitution adapted to it, and by the economical and political sway of the bourgeois class.

A similar movement is going on before our own eyes. Modern bourgeois society with its relations of production, of exchange and of property, a society that has conjured up such gigantic means of production and of exchange, is like the sorcerer who is no longer able to control the powers of the nether world whom he has called up by his spells. For many a decade past the history of industry and commerce is but the history of the revolt of modern productive forces against modern conditions of production, against the property relations that are the conditions for the existence of the bourgeoisie and of its rule. It is enough to mention the commercial crises that by their periodical return put the existence of the entire bourgeois society on its trial, each time more threateningly. In these crises a great part not only of the existing products, but also of the previously created productive forces, are periodically destroyed. In these crises there breaks out an epidemic that, in all earlier epochs, would have seemed an absurdity—the epidemic of over-production. Society suddenly finds itself put back into a state of momentary barbarism; it appears as if a famine, a universal war of devastation had cut off the supply of every means of subsistence; industry and commerce seem to be destroyed. And why? Because there is too much civilisation, too much means of subsistence, too much industry, too much commerce. The productive forces at the disposal of society no longer tend to further the development of the conditions of bourgeois property; on the contrary, they have become too powerful for these conditions, by which they are fettered, and so soon as they overcome these fetters, they bring disorder into the whole of bourgeois society, endanger the existence of bourgeois property. The conditions of bourgeois society are too narrow to comprise the wealth created by them. And how does the bourgeoisie get over these crises? On the one hand by enforced destruction of a mass of productive forces; on the other, by the conquest of new markets, and by the more thorough exploitation of the old ones. That is to say, by paving the way for more extensive and more destructive crises, and by diminishing the means whereby crises are prevented.

The weapons with which the bourgeoisie felled feudalism to the ground are now turned against the bourgeoisie itself.

But not only has the bourgeoisie forged the weapons that bring death to itself; it has also called into existence the men who are to wield those weapons—the modern working class—the proletarians.

In proportion as the bourgeoisie, i.e., capital, is developed, in the same proportion is the proletariat, the modern working class, developed—a class of labourers, who live only so long as they find work, and who find work only so long as their labour increases capital. These labourers, who must sell themselves piecemeal, are a commodity, like every other article of commerce, and are consequently exposed to all the vicissitudes of competition, to all the fluctuations of the market.

Owing to the extensive use of machinery and to division of labour, the work of the proletarians has lost all individual character, and, consequently, all charm for the workman. He becomes an appendage of the machine, and it is only the most simple, most monotonous, and most easily acquired knack, that is required of him. Hence, the cost of production of a workman is restricted, almost entirely, to the means of subsistence that he requires for his maintenance, and for the propagation of his race. But the price of a commodity, and therefore, also of labour, is equal to its cost of production. In proportion, therefore, as the repulsiveness of the work increases, the wage decreases. Nay, more, in proportion as the use of machinery and division of labour increases, in the same proportion the burden of toil also increases, whether by prolongation of the working hours, by increase of the work exacted in a given time, or by increased speed of the machinery, etc.
Modern industry has converted the little workshop of the patriarchal master into the
great factory of the industrial capitalist. Masses of labourers, crowded into the factory, are
organised like soldiers. As privates of the industrial army they are placed under the
command of a perfect hierarchy of officers and sergeants. Not only are they slaves of the
bourgeois class, and of the bourgeois state; they are daily and hourly enslaved by the
machine, by the over-lower, and, above all, by the individual bourgeois manufacturer
himself. The more openly this despotism proclaims gain to be its end and aim, the more
petty, the more hateful and the more embittering it is.

The less the skill and exertion of strength implied in manual labour, in other words, the
more modern industry becomes developed, the more is the labour of men superseded by
that of women. Differences of age and sex have no longer any distinctive social validity
for the working class. All are instruments of labour, more or less expensive to use,
according to their age and sex.

No sooner is the exploitation of the labourer by the manufacturer so far at an end that
he receives his wages in cash than he is set upon by the other portions of the
bourgeoisie, the landlord, the shopkeeper, the pawnbroker, etc. The lower strata of the
middle class—the small tradespeople, shopkeepers, and retired tradesmen generally, the
handicraftsmen and peasants—all these sink gradually into the proletariat, partly because
their diminutive capital does not suffice for the scale on which modern industry is carried
on, and is swamped in the competition with the large capitalists, partly because their
specialised skill is rendered worthless by new methods of production. Thus the proletariat
is recruited from all classes of the population.

The proletariat goes through various stages of development. With its birth begins its
struggle with the bourgeoisie. At first the contest is carried on by individual labourers, then
by the work people of a factory, then by the operatives of one trade, in one locality,
against the individual bourgeois who directly exploits them. They direct their attacks not
against the bourgeois conditions of production, but against the instruments of production
themselves; they destroy imported wares that compete with their labour, they smash to
pieces machinery, they set factories ablaze, they seek to restore by force the vanished
status of the workman of the Middle Ages.

At this stage the labourers still form an incoherent mass scattered over the whole
country, and broken up by their mutual competition. If anywhere they unite to form more
compact bodies, this is not yet the consequence of their own active union, but of the
union of the bourgeoisie, which class, in order to attain its own political ends, is compelled
to set the whole proletariat in motion, and is moreover yet, for a time, able to do so. At
this stage, therefore, the proletarians do not fight their enemies, but the enemies of their
enemies, the remnants of absolute monarchy, the land-owners, the non-industrial
bourgeois, the petty bourgeoisie. Thus the whole historical movement is concentrated in
the hands of the bourgeoisie; every victory so obtained is a victory for the bourgeoisie.

But with the development of industry the proletariat not only increases in number; it
becomes concentrated in greater masses, its strength grows, and it feels that strength
more. The various interests and conditions of life within the ranks of the proletariat are
more and more equalised, in proportion as machinery obliterates all distinctions of labour,
and nearly everywhere reduces wages to the same low level. The growing competition
among the bourgeois, and the resulting commercial crises, make the wages of the
workers ever more fluctuating. The unceasing improvement of machinery, ever more
rapidly developing, makes their livelihood more and more precarious; the collisions
between individual workmen and individual bourgeois take more and more the character
of collisions between two classes. Thereupon the workers begin to form combinations
(trades' unions) against the bourgeois; they club together ill order to keep up the rate of
wages; they found permanent associations in order to make provision beforehand for
these occasional revolts. Here and there the contest breaks out into riots.

Now and then the workers are victorious, but only for a time. The real fruit of their
battles lies, not in the immediate result, but in the ever expanding union of the workers.
This union is helped on by the improved means of communication that are created by
modern industry, and that place the workers of different localities in contact with one another. It was just this contact that was needed to centralise the numerous local struggles, all of the same character, into one national struggle between classes. But every class struggle is a political struggle. And that union, to attain which the burghers of the Middle Ages, with their miserable highways, required centuries, the modern proletarians, thanks to railways, achieve in a few years.

This organisation of the proletarians into a class, and consequently into a political party, is continually being upset again by the competition between the workers themselves. But it ever rises up again, stronger, firmer, mightier. It compels legislative recognition of particular interests of the workers, by taking advantage of the divisions among the bourgeoisie itself. Thus the ten-hours' bill in England was carried.

Altogether, collisions between the classes of the old society further in many ways the course of development of the proletariat. The bourgeoisie finds itself involved in a constant battle. At first with the aristocracy; later on, with those portions of the bourgeoisie itself, whose interests have become antagonistic to the progress of industry; at all times with the bourgeoisie of foreign countries. In all these battles it sees itself compelled to appeal to the proletariat: to ask for its help, and thus to drag it into the political arena. The bourgeoisie itself, therefore, supplies the proletariat with its own elements of political and general education, in other words, it furnishes the proletariat with weapons for fighting the bourgeoisie.

Further, as we have already seen, entire sections of the ruling classes are, by the advance of industry, precipitated into the proletariat, or are at least threatened in their conditions of existence. These also supply the proletariat with fresh elements of enlightenment and progress.

Finally, in times when the class struggle nears the decisive hour, the process of dissolution going on within the ruling class, in fact within the whole range of old society, assumes such a violent, glaring character that a small section of the ruling class cuts itself adrift and joins the revolutionary class, the class that holds the future in its hands. Just as, therefore, at an earlier period, a section of the nobility went over to the bourgeoisie, so now a portion of the bourgeoisie goes over to the proletariat, and, in particular, a portion of the bourgeois ideologists, who have raised themselves to the level of comprehending theoretically the historical movement as a whole.

Of all the classes that stand face to face with the bourgeoisie to-day, the proletariat alone is a really revolutionary class. The other classes decay and finally disappear in the face of modern industry; the proletariat is its special and essential product.

The lower middle class, the small manufacturer, the shopkeeper, the artisan, the peasant, all these fight against the bourgeoisie, to save from extinction their existence as fractions of the middle class. They are therefore not revolutionary but conservative. Nay, more, they are reactionary, for they try to roll back the wheel of history. If by chance they are revolutionary, they are so only in view of their impending transfer into the proletariat; they thus defend not their present, but their future interests; they desert their own standpoint to place themselves at that of the proletariat.

The "dangerous class," the social scum, that passively rotting mass thrown off by the lowest layers of old society, may, here and there, be swept into the movement by a proletarian revolution; its conditions of life, however, prepare it far more for the part of a bribed tool of reactionary intrigue.

In the conditions of the proletariat, those of old society at large are already virtually swamped. The proletarian is without property; his relation to his wife and children has no longer anything in common with the bourgeois family relations; modern industrial labour, modern subjection to capital, the same in England as in France, in America as in Germany, has stripped him of every trace of national character. Law, morality, religion, are to him so many bourgeois prejudices, behind which lurk in ambush just as many bourgeois interests.

All the preceding classes that got the upper hand, sought to fortify their already acquired status by subjecting society at large to their conditions of appropriation. The
proletarians cannot become masters of the productive forces of society, except by abolishing their own previous mode of appropriation, and thereby also every other previous mode of appropriation. They have nothing of their own to secure and to fortify; their mission is to destroy all previous securities for, and insurances of, individual property.

All previous historical movements were movements of minorities, or in the interest of minorities. The proletarian movement is the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority, in the interest of the immense majority. The proletariat, the lowest stratum of our present society, cannot stir, cannot raise itself up, without the whole super incumbent strata of official society being sprung into the air.

Though not in substance, yet in form, the struggle of the proletariat with the bourgeoisie is at first a national struggle. The proletariat of each country must, of course, first of all settle matters with its own bourgeoisie.

In depicting the most general phases of the development of the proletariat, we traced the more or less veiled civil war, raging within existing society, up to the point where that war breaks out into open revolution, and where the violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie lays the foundation for the sway of the proletariat.

Hitherto, every form of society has been based, as we have already seen, on the antagonism of oppressing and oppressed classes. But in order to oppress a class, certain conditions must be assured to it under which it can, at least, continue its slavish existence. The serf, in the period of serfdom, raised himself to membership in the commune, just as the petty bourgeois, under the yoke of feudal absolutism, managed to develop into a bourgeois. The modern labourer, on the contrary, instead of rising with the progress of industry, sinks deeper and deeper below the conditions of existence of his own class. He becomes a pauper, and pauperism develops more rapidly than population and wealth. And here it becomes evident that the bourgeoisie is unfit any longer to be the ruling class in society and to impose its conditions of existence upon society as an overriding law. It is unfit to rule because it is incompetent to assure an existence to its slave within his slavery, because it cannot help letting him sink into such a state, that it has to feed him, instead of being fed by him. Society can no longer live under this bourgeoisie; in other words, its existence is no longer compatible with society.

The essential condition for the existence and for the sway of the bourgeois class is the formation and augmentation of capital; the condition for capital is wage-labour. Wage-labour rests exclusively on competition between the labourers. The advance of industry, whose involuntary promoter is the bourgeoisie, replaces the isolation of the labourers, due to competition, by their revolutionary combination, due to association. The development of modern industry, therefore, cuts from under its feet the very foundation on which the bourgeoisie produces and appropriates products. What the bourgeoisie therefore produces, above all, are its own grave-diggers. Its fall and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable.

The Communists everywhere support every revolutionary movement against the existing social and political order of things.

In all these movements they bring to the front, as the leading question in each, the property question, no matter what its degree of development at the time.

Finally, they labour everywhere for the union and agreement of the democratic parties of all countries.

The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communist revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win.

Working men of all countries, unite!

KARL MARX
(b) On Philosophy

The question whether objective truth can be attributed to human thinking is not a question of theory, but is a practical question. In practice man must prove the truth, i.e., the reality and power, the "this-sidedness" of his thinking. The dispute over the reality or non-reality of thinking which is isolated from practice is a purely scholastic question.

The materialist doctrine that men are products of circumstances and upbringing and that, therefore, changed men are products of other circumstances and changed upbringing, forgets that circumstances are changed precisely by men and that the educator must himself be educated. Hence this doctrine necessarily arrives at dividing society into two parts, of which one towers above society (in Robert Owen, for example).

The coincidence of the changing of circumstances and of human activity can only be conceived and rationally understood as revolutionising practice. Social life is essentially practical. All mysteries which mislead theory to mysticism find their rational solution in human practice and in the comprehension of this practice. The philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways; the point however is to change it.

(c) The Economic Interpretation of History

My investigations led to the conclusion that legal relations as well as forms of State could not be understood from themselves, nor from the so-called general development of the human mind, but, on the contrary, are rooted in the material conditions of life, the aggregate of which Hegel, following the precedent of the English and French of the eighteenth century, grouped under the name of "civil society"; but that the anatomy of civil society is to be found in political economy. My study of the latter, begun in Paris, was continued in Brussels, whither I migrated in consequence of an expulsion order issued by M. Guizot. The general conclusion I arrived at—and once reached, it served as the guiding thread in my studies—can be briefly formulated as follows: In the social production of their means of existence men enter into definite, necessary relations which are independent of their will, productive relationships which correspond to a definite stage of development of their material productive forces. The aggregate of these productive relationships constitutes the economic structure of society, the real basis on which a juridical and political superstructure arises, and to which definite forms of social consciousness correspond. The mode of production of the material means of existence conditions the whole process of social, political and intellectual life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but, on the contrary, it is their social existence that determines their consciousness. At a certain stage of their development the material productive forces of society come into contradiction with the existing productive relationships, or, what is but a legal expression for these, with the property relationships within which they had moved before. From forms of development of the productive forces these relationships are transformed into their fetters. Then an epoch of social revolution opens. With the change in the economic foundation the whole vast superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed. In considering such revolutions it is necessary always to distinguish between the material revolution in the economic conditions of production, which can be determined with scientific accuracy, and the juridical, political, religious, aesthetic or philosophic—in a word, ideological forms wherein men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out. Just as we cannot judge an individual on the basis of his own opinion of himself, so such a revolutionary epoch
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cannot be judged from its own consciousness; but on the contrary this consciousness must be explained from the contradictions of material life, from the existing conflict between social productive forces and productive relationships. A social system never perishes before all the productive forces have developed for which it is wide enough; and new, higher productive relationships never come into being before the material conditions for their existence have been brought to maturity within the womb of the old society itself. Therefore, mankind always sets itself only such problems as it can solve; for when we look closer we will always find that the problem itself only arises when the material conditions for its solution are already present or at least in the process of coming into being. In broad outline, the Asiatic, the ancient, the feudal and the modern bourgeois modes of production can be indicated as progressive epochs in the economic system of society. Bourgeois productive relationships are the last antagonistic form of the social process of production—antagonistic in the sense not of individual antagonism, but of an antagonism rising out of the conditions of the social life of individuals; but the productive forces developing within the womb of bourgeois society at the same time create the material conditions for the solution of this antagonism. With this social system, therefore, the pre-history of human society comes to a close.

(d) The Dialectic Method

My dialectic method is not only different from the Hegelian, but is its direct opposite. To Hegel the life process of the human brain, i.e., the process of thinking, which, under the name of 'the Idea,' he even transforms into an independent subject, is the demiurgos of the real world, and the real world is only the external, phenomenal form of 'the Idea.' With me, on the contrary, the ideal is nothing else than the material world reflected by the human mind and translated into forms of thought [...]

The mystification which dialectic suffers in Hegel's hands by no means prevents him from being the first to prescribe its general form of working in a comprehensive and conscious manner. With him it is standing on its head. It must be turned right side up again if you would discover the rational kernel within the mystical shell.

In its mystified form dialectic became the fashion in Germany because it seemed to transfigure and to glorify the existing state of things. In its rational form it is a scandal and abomination to bourgeoisdom and its doctrinaire professors because it includes in its comprehension and affirmative recognition of the existing state of things, at the same time also, the recognition of the negation of that state, of its inevitable breaking up; because it regards every historically developed social form as in fluid movement, and therefore takes into account its transient nature not less than its momentary existence; because it lets nothing impose upon it, and is in its essence critical and revolutionary.

9. Eduard BERNSTEIN and the Revision of Socialism

Evolutionary Socialism 32.

[...] The present work is substantially devoted to the establishment of ideas which the writer unfolded in a letter to the German Social Democratic Party assembled at Stuttgart from October 3rd to October 8th, 1898.

This letter reads:—

The views laid down by me in the series Problems of Socialism have lately been discussed in Socialist papers and meetings, and a request has been made that the Party of German Social Democrats should state its position in regard to them. In case this happens and the Party agrees to the request, I am induced to make the following explanation.

The vote of an assembly, however significant it may be, naturally cannot disconcert me in my views, which have been gained from an examination of social phenomena. What I wrote in the Neue Zeit is the expression of a conviction from which I do not find myself induced to depart in any important particular.

But it is just as natural that a vote of the party should find me anything but indifferent. And, therefore, it will be understood if I feel the paramount necessity of guarding myself against misconstruction of my conclusions and false deductions from them. As I am prevented from attending the Congress I send this written communication.

It has been maintained in a certain quarter that the practical deductions from my treatises would be the abandonment of the conquest of political power by the proletariat organised politically and economically. That is quite an arbitrary deduction, the accuracy of which I altogether deny.

I set myself against the notion that we have to expect shortly a collapse of the bourgeois economy, and that social democracy should be induced by the prospect of such an imminent, great, social catastrophe to adapt its tactics to that assumption. That I maintain most emphatically.

The adherents of this theory of a catastrophe, base it especially on the conclusions of the Communist Manifesto. This is a mistake in every respect.

The theory which the Communist Manifesto sets forth of the evolution of modern society was correct as far as it characterised the general tendencies of that evolution. But it was mistaken in several special deductions, above all in the estimate of the time the evolution would take. The last has been unreservedly acknowledged by Friedrich Engels, the joint author with Marx of the Manifesto, in his preface to the Class War in France. But it is evident that if social evolution takes a much greater period of time than was assumed, it must also take upon itself forms and lead to forms that were not foreseen and could not be foreseen then.

Social conditions have not developed to such an acute opposition of things and classes as is depicted in the Manifesto. It is not only useless, it is the greatest folly to attempt to conceal this from ourselves. The number of members of the possessing classes is to-day not smaller but larger. The enormous increase of social wealth is not accompanied by a decreasing number of large capitalists but by an increasing number of capitalists of all degrees. The middle classes change their character but they do not disappear from the social scale.

---

The concentration in productive industry is not being accomplished even to day in all its departments with equal thoroughness and at an equal rate. In a great many branches of production it certainly justifies the forecasts of the socialist critic of society; but in other branches it lags even to-day behind them. The process of concentration in agriculture proceeds still more slowly. Trade statistics show an extraordinarily elaborated graduation of enterprises in regard to size. No rung of the ladder is disappearing from it. The significant changes in the inner structure of these enterprises and their inter-relationship cannot do away with this fact.

In all advanced countries we see the privileges of the capitalist bourgeoisie yielding step by step to democratic organisations. Under the influence of this, and driven by the movement of the working classes which is daily becoming stronger, a social reaction has set in against the exploiting tendencies of capital, a counteraction which, although it still proceeds timidly and feebly, yet does exist, and is always drawing more departments of economic life under its influence. Factory legislation, the democratising of local government, and the extension of its area of work, the freeing of trade unions and systems of co-operative trading from legal restrictions, the consideration of standard conditions of labour in the work undertaken by public authorities—all these characterise this phase of the evolution.

But the more the political organisations of modern nations are democratised the more the needs and opportunities of great political catastrophes are diminished. He who holds firmly to the catastrophic theory of evolution must, with all his power, withstand and hinder the evolution described above, which, indeed, the logical defenders of that theory formerly did. But is the conquest of political power by the proletariat simply to be by a political catastrophe? Is it to be the appropriation and utilisation of the power of the State by the proletariat exclusively against the whole nonproletarian world?

He who replies in the affirmative must be reminded of two things. In 1872 Marx and Engels announced in the preface to the new edition of the *Communist Manifesto* that the Paris Commune had exhibited a proof that "the working classes cannot simply take possession of the ready-made State machine and set it in motion for their own aims". And in 1895 Friedrich Engels stated in detail in the preface to *War of the Classes* that the time of political surprises, of the "revolutions of small conscious minorities at the head of unconscious masses" was to-day at an end, that a collision on a large scale with the military would be the means of checking the steady growth of social democracy and of even throwing it back for a time in short, that social democracy would flourish far better by lawful than by unlawful means and by violent revolution. And he points out in conformity with this opinion that the next task of the party should be "to work for an uninterrupted increase of its votes" or to carry on a slow *propaganda of parliamentary activity*.

Thus Engels, who, nevertheless, as his numerical examples show, still somewhat overestimated the rate of process of the evolution! Shall we be told that he abandoned the conquest of political power by the working classes, because he wished to avoid the steady growth of social democracy secured by lawful means being interrupted by a political revolution?

If not, and if one subscribes to his conclusions, one cannot reasonably take any offence if it is declared that for a long time yet the task of social democracy is, instead of speculating on a great economic crash, "to organise the working classes politically and develop them as a democracy and to fight for all reforms in the State which are adapted to raise the working classes and transform the State in the direction of democracy".

That is what I have said in my impugned article and what I still maintain in its full import. As far as concerns the question propounded above it is equivalent to Engel's dictum, for democracy is, at any given time, as much government by the working classes as these are capable of practising according to their intellectual ripeness and the degree
of social development they have attained. Engels, indeed, refers at the place just mentioned to the fact that the Communist Manifesto has "proclaimed the conquest of the democracy as one of the first and important tasks of the fighting proletariat".

In short, Engels is so thoroughly convinced that the tactics based on the presumption of a catastrophe have had their day, that he even considers a revision of them necessary in the Latin countries where tradition is much more favourable to them than in Germany. "If the conditions of war between nations have altered, "he writes, "no less have those for the war between classes". Has this already been forgotten?

No one has questioned the necessity for the working classes to gain the control of government. The point at issue is between the theory of a social cataclysm and the question whether with the given social development in Germany and the present advanced state of its working classes in the towns and the country, a sudden catastrophe would be desirable in the interest of the social democracy. I have denied it and deny it again, because in my judgement a greater security for lasting success lies in a steady advance than in the possibilities offered by a catastrophic crash.

And as I am firmly convinced that important periods in the development of nations cannot be leapt over I lay the greatest value on the next tasks of social democracy, on the struggle for the political rights of the working man, on the political activity of working men in town and country for the interests of their class, as well as on the work of the industrial organisation of the workers.

In this sense I wrote the sentence that the movement means everything for me and that what is usually called "the final aim of socialism" is nothing; and in this sense I write it down again to-day. Even if the word "usually" had not shown that the proposition was only to be understood conditionally, it was obvious that it could not express indifference concerning the final carrying out of socialist principles, but only indifference—or, as it would be better expressed, carelessness—as to the form of the final arrangement of things. I have at no time had an excessive interest in the future, beyond general principles; I have not been able to read to the end any picture of the future. My thoughts and efforts are concerned with the duties of the present and the nearest future, and I only busy myself with the perspectives beyond so far as they give me a line of conduct for suitable action now.

The conquest of political power by the working classes, the expropriation of capitalists, are no ends in themselves but only means for the accomplishment of certain aims and endeavours. As such they are demands in the programme of social democracy and are not attacked by me. Nothing can be said beforehand as to the circumstances of their accomplishment; we can only fight for their realisation. But the conquest of political power necessitates the possession of political rights; and the most important problem of tactics which German social democracy has at the present time to solve, appears to me to be to devise the best ways for the extension of the political and economic rights of the German working classes.

The following work has been composed in the sense of these conclusions.

I am fully conscious that it differs in several important points from the ideas to be found in the theory of Karl Marx and Engels—men whose writings have exercised the greatest influence on my socialist line of thought, and one of whom—Engels—honoured me with his personal friendship not only till his death but who showed beyond the grave, in his testamentary arrangements, a proof of his confidence in me.

This deviation in the manner of looking at things certainly is not of recent date; it is the product of an inner struggle of years and I hold in my hand a proof that this was no secret to Friedrich Engels, and moreover I must guard Engels from the suspicion that he was so narrow-minded as to exact from his friends an unconditional adherence to his views.
Nevertheless, it will be understood from the foregoing why I have till now avoided as much as possible giving to my deviating points of view the form of a systematic and detailed criticism of the Marx-Engels doctrine. This could the more easily be avoided up till now because as regards the practical questions with which we were concerned Marx and Engels in the course of time considerably modified their views.

All that is now altered. I have now a controversy with socialists who, like me, have sprung from the Marx-Engels school; and I am obliged, if I am to maintain my opinions, to show them the points where the Marx-Engels theory appears to me especially mistaken or to be self-contradictory.

I have not shirked this task, but, owing to the personal grounds already mentioned, it has not been easy to me. I acknowledge this openly so that the reader may not deduce uncertainty in the subject matter from the hesitating, clumsy form of the first chapters. I stand by what I have written with firm conviction; but I have not always succeeded in choosing the form and the arguments by means of which my thoughts would have gained the clearest expression. In this respect my work is far behind many a work published by others on the same subject. I have rectified in the last chapter some omissions in the first chapters. Further, as the publication of the work was somewhat delayed, the chapter on "Co-operation" has undergone some additions in which repetitions could not wholly be avoided.

For the rest, the work may speak for itself. I am not so ingenuous as to expect that it will forthwith convert those who have disagreed with my previous essays, nor am I foolish enough to wish that those who agree with me in principle should subscribe to everything I have said in it. In fact, the most doubtful side of the work is that it embraces too much. When I came to speak of the tasks of the present time I was obliged, unless I wished to flounder into generalities, to enter on all kinds of isolated questions over which differences of opinion are unavoidable even among those who otherwise think alike. And yet the want of space compelled me to lay stress on some principal points by implication rather than by establishing them. But I repeat I am not concerned that others should agree with me in every single question. That which concerns me, that which forms the chief aim of this work, is, by opposing what is left of the utopian mode of thought in the socialist theory, to strengthen equally the realistic and the idealistic element in the socialist movement.

ED. BERNSTEIN.
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20. MT W 10 Th, 01. 12 J.B., Text: Walter Benjamin: The work of art in the age of mechanical reproduction

21. MT W 11 Mo 05.12.: J.B., The role of the intellectuals in the Weimar Republic  
Text: Thomas Mann: Culture and Politics

22 MT W 11 Th 08. 12 J.B., Exile as a European Phenomenon

23 MT W 12 Mo 12.12 J.B., The idea of Europe after the War

24 MT W 12 Th 15.12. J.B., The birth of the European Union from the ruins of war

READING PROGRAMME FOR THE TUTORIALS

The tutorials are held
Group 1: Thursdays at 09h00 in A/B5085
Group 2: Thursdays at 14h00 in A/B4101
Group 3: Tuesdays at 13h00 in A/B5085
Group 4: Tuesdays at 11h00 in A/B5040

The tutorials will start in Week 1 of the teaching week of MT and will run until Week 12. You have already been allocated to a group. See the European Studies noticeboards for further details.

1. MT W 1: Introduction
2. MT W 2: Karl Pearson, National life from the Standpoint of Science
3. MT W 3: Edouard Drumont: La France Juive,  
Maurice Barrès: Manifesto of Nancy
4. MT W 4: Benito Mussolini: The doctrine of fascism  
Adolf Hitler: Mein Kampf
5. MT W 5: Marx/Engels: The communist manifesto
6. MT W 6: Eduard Bernstein: Evolutionary socialism
7. MT W 8: Friedrich Nietzsche: On Truth and Falsity in their Ultramoral sense
8. TT W 9: Sigmund Freud: Civilisation and its Discontents
9. TT W 10: August Bebel: Women in the past, Present and Future
10. TT W 11: Walter Benjamin: The work of art in the age of mechanical reproduction
11. TT W 12: Thomas Mann: Culture and Politics