

RACIALIST AUTHORS

REFERENCE HANDBOOK



BERSERKER

BOOKS



This is the ruling that earned its author a death sentence and the postponement of his work (including the burning of books), which today is little known outside certain legal circles. J.C.C.

OTHER GERMAN AUTHORS

A large number of writers, poets and novelists, some great and celebrated, others popular and little known or worse, but all of them National Socialists, were the ones who carried out the cultural work of New German Literature. The most important ones have already been mentioned; others, also important, can only be mentioned briefly - due to the thick veil that the "victors" placed over everything that hinted at something beautiful or had any connection with National Socialism - and some works are listed. Despite everything, with limited resources, we have managed to shed new light on the history of the New Europe, which today is fighting hard to survive and which, barely forty years ago, was born as an effective force, but which has existed for many centuries within its people, developing and perfecting itself over time, and which one day will see the light of day in all its splendour.

HANS FALLADA

Born in 1893 and died in 1947. He began his writing career after the First World War, like so many others who felt the need for a rebirth in every sense. He was very well known and came to be known as the "novelist of the people".

Many of his novels were published in France by Albin Michel, most notably his work "Gustave-de-Fer" in 1943, which had already appeared in Germany in 1938. Fallada welcomed the work undertaken by the National Socialists from the outset. Among his works, *Kleiner Mann was nur?* (And now, little man?, 1932) stands out for its popularity.

HANS HEINZ EWERS

He is considered by specialists to be one of the classic writers of fantasy literature. He was the novelist with the highest print run in Germany. He was a National Socialist and a member of the NSDAP.

He is the author of the biography of Horst Wessel, hero of the SA in the early days of the struggle, which made him particularly well known. Other celebrated works include "Reiter in Deutscher Nacht" and "Mandragore", etc.

Ewers often showed himself to be a great admirer of Hitler and his work: "What drew me to Hitler was not the desire to see a remarkable contemporary, but rather the honest intention to place myself at the disposal of a man who was fighting almost alone in the midst of Germany's worst despair, for our freedom" ("Mandragore").

In other sufficiently extensive statements, Ewers shows his total adherence to the New Idea: "... Adolf Hitler promised nothing. He demanded, required, imposed heavy duties on those who followed him: he asked them for their savings down to the last penny, all their labour and even their blood. One thought, like a refrain, recurs in all his speeches: 'Even if you give your life for Germany, you will have given nothing.' He recognises only duties towards the people for himself and his supporters, and a single right: to fulfil their duty."

"In this way, Hitler gathered around him first a dozen men, then a few hundred, then thousands and millions. The strange power that emanated from his personality passed from his lieutenants to the people.

"I don't know if that man always speaks as he spoke to me. I had the impression that he understood me with the certainty of a sleepwalker. His gaze remained somewhat in the air and a dream sang on his lips, a dream called Germany. I understood: that man was my equal, a poet, an artist, a dreamer, a German."

"The heart is nothing without the brain. But the clearer and simpler a great thought is, the more the heart shapes it, and his heart bleeds for Germany. A person who is nothing more than a journalist will never understand this. Hitler has only one love: Germany. The journalist will smile and say, 'So what?' But the people understand him and respond with equal love. Therein lies the secret of his success: he does not address certain sections of the population but the whole people. Hitler declares himself opposed to the isolated and selfish efforts of groups. He wants nothing to do with the particular interests of farmers and workers, craftsmen and industrialists, religions and classes; for him, class struggle is a crime against the homeland. Hitler fights for the very soul of the German people..."

And further on: "... Today he no longer laughs, since twelve million men march behind Hitler. Many political parties know that the storm of National Socialism has swept them away, others tremble for their existence. They are still trying to fight fiercely, by all means, but they must succumb. That man who had faith in his dream accomplished what seemed impossible: he taught Germans to feel German. He did it for the good of Germany and of all European civilisation. If Europe is not prey to Bolshevism, it is mainly thanks to two men: Benito Mussolini and Adolf Hitler."

KURT KLUGE

He is another important National Socialist writer. He was born in Leipzig on 29 April 1886 and died on 26 July 1941. He completed his studies and later attended the School of Art in Leipzig. His prolific work includes *Der Glockengieser* Christoph Mahr (1934), *Der Nonnenstein* (1936), *Die gefälschte Göttin* (1935), *Der Herr Kortüm* (1938), *Die Zaubergeige* (1940), "Die Silberne Windfahne", "Das Flügelhaus", "Grevasalvas", "Der Gobelin", "Gedichte", the novels "Nocturno" and "Die Gefälschte"; the comedies "Die Gold von Orlas", "Die Ausgrabung der Venus" etc. and "Ewiges Volk",

GOTTFRIED BENN

Writer, poet, doctor, soldier and dermatologist born in 1866 and died in 1956. Along with Gerhard Hauptmann, he is the most controversial writer due to his relationship with National Socialism.

While his artistic work was partly removed from the new style, he had no qualms about stating: "We are glad that he has come to Germany at the moment when this new Reich is being established, for which the Führer, whom we all admire without exception, has asked for the collaboration of writers." (Statement by Gottfried Benn on receiving Marinetti in Berlin on 29 March 1933).

Some of Benn's writings, however, were not in line with the new artistic concepts and were therefore classified as "degenerate art". Despite his unconditional support for Hitler, in 1936 he published a collection of poems that were

prohibited. His downfall was swift. In 1938, he was expelled from the National Chamber of Literature. This gives us an idea of the importance given to artistic merit, as political allegiance alone was not enough to rise in the cultural field.

Despite everything, Benn understood the necessity and goodness of National Socialism and spoke in its favour, insisting, for example, on the interest it placed in artistic matters. For him, the regime should correct certain defects. When the intelligence of Europe is in danger, Gottfried Benn notes Hitler's generous concern for art.

From his work "The New State and the Intellectuals" (1933), we extract these paragraphs in which Benn shows us National Socialism as necessary: "We see that the spirit and international propaganda, both socialist and industrial, could not arouse the slightest representation, nor did they awaken the slightest feeling capable of excluding in us, on a broad basis, the notion of the State, and the State is the absolute State, it is the National State ."

In the High Middle Ages, the era of feudalism and tournaments, it began simultaneously in China, Persia, Russia and Languedoc; what we have today is a new case of that historical trend we are dealing with, totally oriented towards the future, towards a positive order, the modern trend of the state, the modern idea of the state that wants to abolish the Marxist opposition - because it became sterile - between the worker and the employer in order to achieve a higher community, let us call it, as Jünger (Ernst) did, 'the worker' or National Socialism."

" 'The International Proletariat to Power' is today for us nothing more than a kind of magic formula, a distant fairy tale, chimerical and, from the point of view of European society, neurotic...".

Gottfried Benn's position on the New Idea is very clear. After the war, due to this curious position and his works being banned by National Socialism, he achieved a certain degree of success. He accepted the democratic premises of those who fully accepted his work, and by feigning repentance, he flattered the conscience of the "intellectuals" of the day, who believed they had foreseen the defeat of National Socialism.

In his works, Benn displays a certain aesthetic refinement and subtle irony combined with excessively gruesome realism. Notable among his works are "Abschied" (Farewell), "Was schlim ist" (What is bad), etc.

ERWIN GUIDO KOLBENHAYER

Son of architect Franz Kolbenhayer, he was born in Budapest on 30 December 1878. He spent his youth in the Sudetenland, Karlsbad and Eger. He studied natural sciences, psychology and philosophy in Vienna, obtaining a doctorate in philosophy. After several years of wandering, he settled in the university town of Tübingen, later moving to Solln in Munich (1932). In 1937, already distinguished with numerous other awards, he was awarded the Goethe Prize by the city of Frankfurt. On his 60th birthday, Hitler himself awarded him the Eagle Badge of the Third Reich.

A great thinker and poet, Kolbenhayer conceived of life as a divine sense of infinity, eternity and indestructibility, which forms the basis of all his art. He wrote articles and gave speeches or expressed himself in major works, always in favour of keeping art pure and clean, and basing it on a biological perspective. His entire philosophy can be found in the compendium of his articles " Stimme" (Voice, 1931), "Neuland" (New Earth, 1934), in his major philosophical work, "Die Bauhütte" (1925), and in a series of separate publications that collect his speeches from 1931 to 1940.

Kolbenhayer's main poetic work is his trilogy "Paracelsus", which consists of the following three parts: "Die Kindheit des Paracelsus" (The Childhood of Paracelsus, 1917), "Das Gestirn des Paracelsus" (The Star of Paracelsus, 1921), and Das dritte Reich des Paracelsus (The Third Reich of Paracelsus, 1925). Kolbenhayer seeks to make his fellow citizens aware of their own values, describing the great German physician Paracelsus as the central character and attempting to demonstrate the invincible youthful strength of the German soul. His novels include Amor Dei (1908), Montsalvasch (1911), Meister Joachim Pasewang (1920), Das Lächeln der Penaten (1927), and Das gottgelobte Herz (1938). Also worthy of special attention are the stories in the style of Kämpfender Quell (1929), as well as four written dramas, which were performed numerous times on stage, two of the most important being Heroische Leidenschaften (1928) and Gregor und Heinrich (1934).

The author masterfully expresses people's ideas and also conveys in his works even the smallest details of his time. The main protagonist is the German man. To reveal his true nature, Kolbenhayer delved deep into the history of the German people and extracted their inherent characteristics.

His works include: "Reps, die Persönlichkeit" (1931), "Die Begegnung auf dem Riesengebirge" (1932), "Ahalibama" (1925), "Weihnachtsgeschichten" (1932), "Klaas Y, der grosse Neutrale" (1936), "Vox Humana" (poetry, 1940), etc. PV.

WILHELM SCHAFFER

Born in Dorfe Ottrau, formerly Kurhessen, on 20 January 1868. He was one of a group of new German writers who, united in a common mission, worked for the rebirth of true literature. He was awarded the Goethe Prize by the State of Frankfurt, one of the most prestigious awards in Germany.

His extensive body of work includes a series of masterfully written anecdotes as well as numerous works of all kinds. Notable examples include: "Anekdoten" (1911), "Die begrabene Hand und andere Anekdoten" (1918), "Neuen Anekdoten" (1926), "Anekdoten" (1928) and "Wendekreis neuer Anekdoten" (1938). Hundert Historchen, Novels (1928), Spätlese alter und neuer Anekdoten (1942), Mein Leben (1934), Ein innernamen Schmitz, Der fabrikant Anton Beilharz und das Theresle (1932). "Der Hauptmann von Köpenick" (1930), "Huldreich Zwingli" (1926), "Karl Stauffers Lebensgang" (1911), "Ankemanns Tristan" (1936), -Die unterbrochene Rheifahrt (1913), Die Missgeschickten, Die dreizehn Bücher der deutschen Seele, Deutsche Reden (1933), etc.

FRANZ TUMLER

Born in Gries (Bozen, Austria) on 16 January 1912. He formed part of the new generation of writers, winning the "Literature Prize" of the Reich capital, Berlin, in 1940. Among his works: "Der erste Tag" (1940), "Der Soldateneid" (1939), "Das Tal von Lausa und Duron" (1935), etc.

WILHELM VON SCHOLZ

Born on 15 July 1874, he was the son of Minister of State Adolf von Scholz. Another of the German National Socialist writers who contributed to New Literature. After World War II, he enjoyed a certain degree of popularity among the nationalist circles that still existed.

His extensive literary works include: "Gedanken zum Drama" (1905-1915), "Berlin und Bodensee" (1934), "Eine Jahrhundertwende" (1936), "An Ilm und Isar" (1939). His works also include various lyrical, epic and dramatic pieces. "Frühlingsfahrt" (1880), "Hohenklingen" (1898), "Der Spiegel" (1902), "Lebendahre" (1939), the great novel "Perpetua" (1926) and another well-known novel "Der Weg nach Ilok" (1930), "Die Unwirklichen" (1916), "Zwischenreih" (1921), "Die Gefährten" (1937), and "Der Zufall und das Schicksal" (1924). His dramatic works include: "Der Jude von Konstanz" (1905), "Meroe" (1906), "Vertauschte Seelen" (1910), "Der Wettlauf mit dem Schatten" (1918), "Die Frankfurter Weihnacht" (1938), etc.

EBERHARD WOLFGANG MOELLER

Very popular and well known for his publications at the time, Moller offered readers a whole new style of storytelling, which can be seen in his exciting drama: "Douaumont". In "The Mask of War," Moeller presents us with a series of literary sketches drawn mainly during the days of the Western campaign. Moeller does not conceal or embellish anything. He paints the destroyed cities, the wrecked machines, the broken bridges, the devastated streets; he tells us about death, grief and pain. However, he does not stop at description and offers us much more than a realistic account of war, for he knows that the struggle has meaning and pursues a higher purpose; the heroic soldier who fights and dies gives meaning to the work.

GERTRUD VON LE FORT

A poet of great inspiration and religious spirit, she was born in Minden (Westphalia) on 11 October 1876. She studied at the Universities of Heidelberg, Hamburg and Bern. A writer of great sensitivity, she was a narrator of realistic vigour. A heartfelt patriot and intensely religious, she converted to Catholicism after a stay in the Eternal City, Rome. On the occasion of this conversion, she wrote her work "Hymnen an die Kirche" (Hymns to the Church, 1924), and as a patriot, "Hymnen an Deutschland" (Hymn to Germany, 1930). After the World War, she wrote "Die Heimatlosen" (The Stateless, 1950). Also due to her religious conversion is the novel "Das Schweisrtuch der Veronika" or "Veronikas Schleier" (Veronica's Veil, 1928), in which she exposes the struggle between the experience of divine calling and the denial of a stubborn soul, and which would be the work that launched her to fame. The second volume of this work did not appear until 1946: *Der Kranz der Engel* (The Crown of Angels). Within the narrative genre, he wrote "Der Paps aus Ghetto" (1930), "Die Magdeburishe Hochzeit" (1938), "Die Letzte auf dem Schaffott" (The Last on the Scaffold), etc. Another of his notable works is "Der Ewige Frau" (The Mystique of Femininity, 1934). Von Le Fort's latest book is *Das Freunde Kind*. His work is being translated into all Western languages.

KARL HEINRICH WAGGERL

Born on 10 September 1897 in Bad Gastein, the son of a humble family of carpenters. Politically aligned with the regime. A great writer of novels, among which "Brot" (1930), "Schweren Blut" (1931), "Mutter" (1935), "Wagrainer Tagebuch" (1936), etc. stand out, concise titles for concrete ideas.

ERWIN WITTSTOCK

Born in Hermannstadt on 25 February 1899. His style is similar to that of fellow National Socialist Herbert von Hoerner. His novels include *Die Freundschaft von Kockelburg* (1935), ... abends Gäste (1938), *Bruder, nimm die Bruder mit* (1933), etc.

HERBERT VON HOERNER

Writer and poet, born in Ihlen (Kurland) on 9 August 1884. Characterised by the inspiration of his works in mythical stories. Notable works include *Der grosse Baum* (1938), *Der graue Reiter* (1940), *Die Kutscherin des Zaren* (1936), etc.

AGNES MIEGEL

Born in Königsberg on 9 March 1879, she was one of the most popular and well-known writers in National Socialist Germany, and her work was widely disseminated.

Her style and skilful pen earned her one of the most important literary awards of the time, the "Goethe" prize from the State of Frankfurt, and she also won the "Herder Prize" from the Goethe-Stiftung.

An extensive body of work showcases her artistry: "Gesammelte Gedichte" (1927), "Herbsgesang" (1932), "Kirchen im Ordensland" (1933), "Geschichten aus Aitpreussen" (1926), "Gang in die Dämmerung" (1934), "Noras Schicksal" (1936), "Kinderland" , "Unter hellem Himmel" (1936), "Frühe Gesichte" (1939), "Ostland" (1940), etc.

LUIS TRENKER

He is another writer who, with a special love for the mountains, beautifully describes the struggle of the men of an untamed land and sings of the beauty of sublime landscapes.

His works include *Hauptmann Ladumer*, *Lauchtendes Land* and *Montafia in Flames*, which is set in the mountains of Central Europe during the First World War.

Although Luis Trenker's stance after the Second World War was not very orthodox in relation to the one he held during the National Socialist era, it should be noted that his works were published by "Franz Eher Verlag", the official publisher of the NSDAP (National Socialist Party).

HEYBERT MENZEL

He was perhaps the youngest of all the new National Socialist writers, who, with youthful ardour and an early pen, contributed a wonderful literary work to European culture. He was born in Obemiz (province of Posen) on 10 August 1906. Totally devoted to the New Idea, his works include: "Im Bann" (1930), which he wrote when he was just 24 years old, "Der Grenzmarkrappe" (1933), "Gedichte der Kameradschaft" (1936), " Umstrittene Erde" (1933), " Siebengestirn" (1942), " Im Marschtritt der SA" (1933), etc. All were written in his youth.

Similarly, writers of great stature, such as Johann von Leers (14 Jahre Judenrepublik, Rassische Beschichtsbetrachtung, Adolf Hitler, Der Junge von der Feldherrnhalle, etc.); Christoph Steding (with his seminal work Das Reich und die Krankheit der europäischen Kultur), Hans Zbberlein (Der Glaube an Deutschland, which was made into a highly successful film, Der Befehl des Gewissens, etc.); Arnold Krieger (Empörung in Thom, Luz Negra, Su vida fue amor, etc.); Fritz Weber ("Die Trommel Gottes"); Manfred von Killinger ("Klabautermann", "Ernstes und Heiteres aus dem Putschieben", etc.); Tódel Weiler ("Peter Monkemann", etc.); Paul Ernst ("Erdachte Gespräche", etc.); Heinrich Anacker (Die Fanfare, Einkerhr, Die Trommel, Erdenweg, etc.); Will Vesper (Sam in Schnabelweide, Kranz des Lebens, etc.); Hans Buchner and many others, whose list would be endless and could only be compiled in an immense encyclopaedia with much more bibliographic material than the "democracies" have allowed to be published on the subject. All of them have contributed to the creation of a New Literature as beautiful and interesting as it is extensive, which, presenting a new idea of the world and of life, was brutally sealed and pigeoholed after the defeat of Europe. PV.

National Socialism is, without a doubt, a Weltanschauung, a World Conception, a closed system based on an indisputable reality: Race. However, the racial question is not based on abstruse philosophical or dialectical systems, but on unanimously recognised scientific facts. Therefore, in order to develop its theoretical framework, National Socialism needed scientists specialising in racial issues (racists, racial scientists), among whom Dr Hans F. K. GÜNTHER occupied a prominent position, above CLAUSS, FISCHER, LENZ, DARRE, SIEMENS, BAUR, HELMUT, GRAZ, GRIMM, KERN, etc.

Some might consider Dr. GUNTHER a fanatic bent on proving the superiority of the Nordic race at all costs, regardless of objectivity. Nothing could be further from the truth. GUNTHER's works are characterised by their measured tone, profound scientific rigour – even when his research yielded conclusions contrary to his general theses – and utter seriousness. Reading his works reveals not a series of unbridled racist passions and delusional Germanism, but a totally cold and impartial study of the racial question, based on irrefutably proven data. That political considerations conducive to a more or less exacerbated Germanism can be drawn from these scientific data and facts is another matter, one in which GUNTHER no longer engages. Above all the events he experienced in his eventful life, he remained what he had always been: an honest scientist.

GUNTHER begins his study of race by dispelling old myths. For him, the concepts of 'Germanic race', 'Romance race', 'Jewish race', etc., have no scientific value, as they are based on considering strictly linguistic groups as races, which can only be understood in their biological conception.

There was debate over the recognition of a Germanic race versus a Romance race or a Slavic race. To say this, one must have forgotten that only those brother groups whose representatives all possess a basic psychological and physical identity can be designated as belonging to the same race. Can we speak of a Jewish race when there are Jews with characteristic noses and without them, with broad and narrow faces, tall and short, dark and light-skinned, and this without even considering psychological differences? What happened was that the concepts of race, people, and ethnic group (Völkergruppe) had not been defined, and racial identity was confused with linguistic, cultural, and other identities (1). As a result, it is no longer the case that all those who simply speak German are considered to be of the "Germanic race", but rather those individuals who have physical and psychological characteristics – biological characteristics, in short – that are consistent with the "Germanic-Nordic" genetic pattern. The first myth, that of the inseparability of the concepts of race, ethnic group, and language, has already been debunked.

GUNTHER then sets about doing a general clean-up of the junk room that was biology in the first two decades of the 20th century. The first target GUNTHER attacks is the theory of the hereditary transmission of acquired characteristics, or Lamarckism. "The physical and psychological differences between men, peoples and races were attributed during the 19th century to factors such as environmental influences: diet, both in terms of quantity and quality, and lifestyle. The achievements of different peoples throughout history were attributed to environmental differences, but today the still young science of heredity has shown that we must be extremely careful in considering

environmental influences and that: differences between peoples and races are mainly due to hereditary factors". This would inevitably have political consequences, and GUNTHER points out that scholars of heredity, such as GROTH and MÜLLER, both social democrats, found it difficult to propagate the ideas of natural hereditary inequality among men in their circles of acquaintances. He also states that "it is well known that research into race and heredity openly clashes with the spirit of the times in the second half of the 19th century". With his characteristic honesty, GUNTHER sets out to unmask every charlatan disguised as a scientist he encounters. Now it was the turn of the American Jew Franz BOAS, who thought (?) that environmental influences would give rise to a unified racial community with identical physical and mental characteristics from the different racial communities existing in North America. BOAS had noticed physical differences between the parents and children of Jewish and Sicilian immigrants in terms of cranial measurements, but GUNTHER explains that this was because both Jews and Sicilians are not pure races, but racial mixtures, and therefore it is easy for qualities to arise in children that do not appear in their parents. GUNTHER adds that "this theory, called the 'melting pot theory', is now a source of laughter for American researchers of heredity". For what it's worth, we would add that among BOAS's disciples are such evocative names as KLEINBERG, HERKOVITS, BENEDICT, MONTAGUE, etc. This is, broadly speaking, the demystifying action of GUNTHER, which is all the more commendable

more merit in that at the time, the pseudoscientific opinions cited were still in vogue and forced true researchers to swim against the tide. It is noteworthy that GUNTHER's thinking is presented in a plain and simple way that anyone can understand, hence the enormous print run of his works in Germany before 1945 (for example, "The Racial Theory of the German People" achieved a print run of more than 250,000 copies). It is on these solid scientific foundations that GUNTHER builds his entire edifice of racial science, which has yet to be surpassed.

The fundamental principle of racial science is to recognise racial differences and the danger of racial mixing. GUNTHER was no exception. "Recent research seems to indicate that the activity of the internal secretion glands differs between races, and that racial mixing would bring about an alteration in the existing balance of these glands... All racial mixing leads to a breakdown in the selection processes that, over a long period of time, gave rise to the appearance and inheritance of distinct physical and mental characteristics."

But where GUNTHER made an invaluable contribution was in the study of the Nordic race, both in its anatomical and physical aspects and in its mental and spiritual aspects. GUNTHER laid the foundations for the "Nordic movement" and "renordification" (Aufnordung). "The Nordic movement aims to reawaken in the German people the creative force that Germanism once possessed, and this will be achieved through a triumph in the birth rate of the Germanic elements, that is, of the Nordic character." And What is this Nordic character? Physically, the typical features are already known to all: dolichocephaly, fine blond hair, blue or grey eyes, slender body, pink skin that is very sensitive to sunlight, narrow face, thin nose and lips, etc. But in terms of the psychological and spiritual aspects—what is truly important—Günther conducts an anthological study of the Nordic soul. Based on countless bibliographical data and meticulous personal observation, he reaches the following conclusions: the racial psychological type is achieved through the isolation of the "Essential Virtues"; thanks to these virtues, we can understand the different behaviour of the various races and the place that

these occupy in the history of culture and nations. Conversely, the psychic virtues of a race can be deduced from the culture it achieved, especially in the case of isolated colonies of that race which, living in foreign countries, demonstrated the same spiritual virtues as in their ethnic origin. The type thus obtained is still incomplete, and we must endeavour to complete it with the direct study of many individuals of the same race, but compiling the data of many researchers to avoid personal bias. " Thus, by two different paths, that is, by direct observation of the behaviour of individuals and by comparative observation of the history and culture of peoples, it is possible to define the racial psychic type, because in individuals as well as in peoples and races, their deeds and achievements are the tangible expression of their psychic nature" (2). Having made this digression, he gets straight to the point. "The main characteristics of the Nordic race are judgement, frankness and energy. From their capacity for judgement or reasoning arises a marked spirit of justice... The capacity for reasoning and the great love of truth, as well as a strong propensity to think about the issues of the world, make the Nordic man more capable of science and philosophy than any other race. The Nordic man pursues the achievement of his thoughts and goals with passionate self-denial. He renounces the pleasures of life in order to follow an idea to the end. In his actions, it is not the judgement of others that is decisive, but his own conscience. In the fulfilment of his duty, he is often hard on others and on himself... His chivalrous behaviour is based on his great spirit of justice... His spiritual isolation determines a lesser sociability than in other races. The Nordic man is more inclined to sports than any other; he is always found where there is something to risk; it is a known fact that he is found in somewhat dangerous professions more often than the average human population. (3). These are the broad outlines of the Nordic racial soul according to Günther, with whom one may or may not agree, but whose absolute coldness and objectivity and exclusively scientific treatment of the question cannot be denied. Günther's contribution to the understanding of the Nordic psyche would not be surpassed by anyone (except perhaps by Clauss on some very specific points) and would serve as the scientific basis for National Socialist ideologues.

At the same time, Günther devoted himself to studying the psychological nature of other European races. He considered liveliness and mental agility to be essential characteristics of the Mediterranean race. He stated that "like the body, the spirit also lacks weight. The Mediterranean man is superficial, light-hearted, cheerful and friendly in his manner, but he lacks the depth of soul and seriousness of the Nordic race." (4). According to Günther, the psychic colours of the Mediterranean race are red and yellow, while those of the Nordic race are blue and light green. He maintains that the Mediterranean spirit is, like the Nordic spirit, imaginative. However, the Nordic spirit is concentrated and the Latin spirit is expansive.

His study on the racial composition of Spain is also very interesting. The population is, for the most part, Mediterranean. According to Ploetz's data, Nordic and Alpine blood account for 15 per cent each. Alpine blood is found only in the northwest. Traces of Nordic blood in Catalonia, on the plateaus of Castile and in the extreme northwest date back to the Visigothic period. Throughout the country, there is a Semitic influence, probably derived from prehistoric immigration and the commercial colonies of the Phoenicians. The Arabs, who ruled for a long time in the southern part of Spain, introduced a large amount of Eastern admixture; small amounts of Black blood are also noticeable. The Basques are a fairly isolated racial unit and

represent, in an ethnic sense, a mixture of Mediterranean population with a strong Nordic and weaker Alpine proportion. ("Racial Information of Europe", p. 117).
 Günther's work on the Jewish people is also classic, in which he demonstrates—contrary to what many believe—that the "chosen people" are not a pure race but a mixture of races. To get a clear idea of the ethnic composition of the Jewish people, we have to go back to the dawn of their history. The countries of the Caucasus, where the Semitic race still lives in its purest form, are considered to be the origin of this race. "Megalithic remains and monuments bear witness to the fact that 3,000 years before the Christian era, Nordic peoples from central and north-western Europe penetrated Asia Minor and Central Asia... When the Semitic tribes later marched to Palestine, the Jewish people were formed from a mixture of Oriental and Semitic, Nordic, Hamitic and Black blood. It is assumed that Hamitic and black blood was added during their stay in Egypt, but most of the black admixture dates from a later period, when freed slaves, who were admitted to the Hebrew religion, gave rise to numerous crossbreeds. (5). From a psychological point of view, Günther characterises the Jews by the conflict between the flesh and the spirit in the man of this race. "The unbridled carnal enjoyment observed in them is nothing more than an intimate union between the sanctuary and the brothel." (6). In the Nordic, there is neither spirit nor flesh, but a combination of both, which in their unity manifest innocence. The victory of the spirit over the flesh, the "redemption of the flesh," says Günther, ennobles the Semitic man. The priest of pure style is the aristocratic form of this type. Such is, in a very brief summary, our author's conception of some key points of raciology. We believe that this outline can serve as a starting point for an in-depth study of Günther's thinking. E.A.

NOTES

- (1) *Kleine Rassenkunde des deutschen Volkes* (A Short Racial Encyclopaedia of the German People). The unnumbered quotations in quotation marks also correspond to this work.
- (2) "Rassenkunde Europas" (Racial Treatise on Europe).
- (3) *Der nordische Gedanke unter den Deutschen* (The Nordic Idea among the Germans).
- (4) "Rassenkunde Europas" (Racial Treatise of Europe).
- (5) "Rassenkunde des jüdischen Volkes" (Racial Treatise of the Jewish People).
- (6) *id.*

In contrast to the narrowly materialistic conception of race, which considers it to be a set of physical and intellectual factors—the latter grouped exclusively around the Intelligence Quotient (IQ)—a new psycho-racist theory arose in Germany after the First World War, based on the harshest and most controversial aspect: the so-called "spirit of race." We say that it is harsh and difficult because the experimental studies that attempted to conceive of the spirit of a race as something purely physiological, that is, as the result of physical-chemical phenomena, had not yet yielded positive results. Within this school of thought, which was non-conformist with the materialism of its time, L.F. Clauss stands out.

Clauss calls his method of ethnic research, based on the study of racial gestures, the "mimic method". He asserts that all the dynamism of the spirit manifests itself externally in some way, and this psychic influence on movements, body gestures and mimicry is determined by the law of "racial style", which can only be explained by the regular repetition of acquired habits. "Through the movement of the body, its expression, its response to external stimuli of all kinds, the mental process that has led to this movement becomes an expression in space, the body becomes a field of expression for the soul" (1). Clauss starts from the material differences that reveal human races to conclude that spirituality is equally diverse. He maintains that the materiality of all racial manifestations is the field of expression of racially different souls. Consequently, he shifts the focus of the racial question, and therefore of heredity, from the material to the spiritual; he seeks to evaluate the soul as a means of judging Race and thus obtain an appreciation of Race based on spiritual research. In short, the racial psychologist Clauss investigates race through the external appearance of individuals, because the body, according to him, is the "mirror of the soul," and every movement, gesture, mimicry, and grimace is closely related to each other and to the spirit of the Race. Our author understands Race in the Platonic sense, as an idea, and therefore does not describe Race in its average form, but rather draws its ideal type—the archetype in its most authoritative representatives. According to the above, Clauss defines Race as "a set of internal properties, typical style and genius, which characterise each individual and which are manifested in each and every member of the ethnic population" (2).

We also note that, philosophically speaking, his point of view does not necessarily contradict that of anthropologists who base their work on the natural sciences, since Spirit and Matter – according to 'psychological parallelism' – are ultimately just two different ways of referring to the same reality.

Unfortunately, however, the works of Clauss and his school (especially Prince Friedrich Wilhelm De Lippe) made an impression on certain readers that neither of them had anticipated or desired. Some of their readers believed that it was possible to dismiss the experimentally established scientific facts of the doctrine of Races and Heredity, as they saw them as a 'materialistic' conception and, by rejecting this, considered themselves 'idealists'. But the material laws of heredity exist: they are facts of experience. The error of these "idealists" lies in their considering as "materialistic" the observation of rules imposed by Matter within the body, considering the latter as a field of expression of the soul. It may be that, in another world, the soul is freed from the laws of Matter, but not in the world in which we live. For example: the style of a building is the expression of tastes and

personal conceptions of its builder. But this does not affect the laws of matter in any way, since the material of which the building is made compels it to observe them. The architect, despite all his spirituality, is obliged to take into account the laws of gravity, the resistance of materials, the influences of the climate, etc. "A master builder is one who manages to master the demands of building materials through the spirit. What matters is not to make the Spirit prevail over Matter, but not to feel obliged, because one possesses the Spirit, to disregard the laws of Matter" (3).

But there is more. Even if we accept the theories of the 'idealists', we cannot disregard the laws of Matter. Let us see: the soul, part of a primitive divine force, pure and perfect in itself, has human bodies as its field of expression here below: during the soul's earthly existence, these bodies follow the material laws of the earth. A perfectly pure soul can only express itself perfectly in a perfect body, for any imperfect body would counteract the manifestation of the soul and the possibilities of this manifestation. It would therefore be our duty to seek the perfection of the human body in order to realise the best possible expression of each individual soul. In some way, a people should be freed from all impurities that could disturb the body of the individual and, therefore, the souls. But this is only possible by observing the laws of heredity and suppressing everything that is undesirable. Therefore, "idealistic" theses taken to their extreme precisely confirm the opinions that they sought to combat.

Furthermore, the close interdependence of physical, spiritual and emotional qualities in humans has been a recognised fact since Kretschmer ("Körperbau und Charakter" - Body Constitution and Character). Even the ancients were aware of this truth; Mathilde, daughter of Widukind, the Saxon chieftain defeated by Charlemagne, stated that "noble family is the only guarantee of noble thinking", meaning that the soul depends directly on the materiality of the family. "It has been proven that the value of blood is the only thing that gives stability and duration to healthy morals" (4).

Clauss calls the Nordic man a "type of performance," as he always tends to achieve something. The terms "type of performance," "style of performance," and "performance man" are very appropriate for this race, whose actions are driven by the desire to achieve something and to make an effort.

"In all manifestations of Nordic man's activity there is a goal; he is directed from the inside out, choosing a motive and undertaking it; he is very active. Life commands him to fight on the front line and at any cost, even that of perishing. Manifestations of this kind are therefore a form of heroism, albeit different from military heroism" (5).

Nordic people are often described as "cold" and lacking in passion. Clauss says that the coldness of the race in question depends on the different type of environment which, when it hurts them, also hurts their style and racial law. (6). Nordic men feel in their element if they can live alone with their families and at a great distance from their neighbours.

Tenement houses in cities break down Nordic men both physically and psychologically.

The Nordic drive, their audacity, leads them to a bohemian lifestyle, to conquests, to inventions, to discoveries. People of Nordic blood have always distinguished themselves from others; they do not know absolute tranquillity; they have, to a certain extent, marked humanity with the style of their race, since most innovations and inventions are due, according to Clauss, to men of Nordic blood. Their individualism is viewed negatively by other races. Clauss devoted one of his most documented works, *Die Nordische Seele* (The Nordic Soul), to the study of this racial type.

On the contrary, this researcher's opinion of the Mediterranean type is quite pejorative. He considers that even "Latin" culture is not the exclusive heritage of Mediterranean men, but rather a collision between their liveliness and mental agility and the creativity of the Germanic type. He calls the Latin type "spectacular".

Clauss sees the Alpine spirit as the opposite extreme of the Nordic spirit, as is the case with their physical forms. They endure injustice, suffering and death without any outward appearance of martyrdom or heroism, with the indifference of the wise. They cannot have an aptitude for great ideas and lofty thoughts because they are not imaginative (7).

Clauss studies the Semitic race with particular care (as he lived among Jewish communities). Like Günther, he confirms a conflict between spirit and flesh in this type. Therefore, the defeat of the flesh, 'redemption', is considered the supreme act of courage for this race. He calls it the 'redemption type'.

The Oriental race (the Arab Bedouin) is also studied with special attention, as the author in question lived for many years disguised among the Bedouins. His analysis is therefore of extraordinary importance. Clauss characterises the Oriental race as the "desert type". Its characteristic feature is opportunistic fatalism, and its idiosyncrasy consists of the "psychic concealment" of the future, which is forged in daily life, for when a creative spark arises in a spirit of this kind, it is considered a divine calling. And then it is accepted that the most perfect life will be that of a "messenger of God". At this moment, he feels inspired by divine vocation. The term "enlightened" characterises this racial type in its most perfect state. Not everyone can enjoy this virtue, which is only present in a select few, but not in the common type (8).

It should be noted that many of Clauss' concepts and definitions are unstable, as he sometimes attempts to generalise behaviours, attitudes and "poses" observed in isolated individuals to an entire people or race. Likewise, it would be very difficult to isolate what actually corresponds to the "racial spirit", that is, the genetic and anthropological basis of the psyche of a race, from the customs, traditions and acquired practices originating from other racial types. For all these reasons, we believe that this researcher's work should be studied with a critical eye. Nor does it help to avoid confusion that, according to completely reliable sources (a former senior member of the NSDAP), Clauss married a woman of Jewish race, for which he was expelled from the Party and the SS. E.A.

(1) "Rasse und Seele" - L. F. Clauss.

(2) Id. previous citation

(3) "La Raza, nueva nobleza de la Sangre y el Suelo" (The Race, New Nobility of Blood and Soil) W. Darre.

(4) Id. previous citation

(5) "Die Nordische Seele"

(6) Id, previous citation

(7) "Rassenseele und Einzelmensch" - L. F. Clauss

(8) Id. previous citation.

WRITINGS OF NATIONAL SOCIALIST LEADERS

National Socialism has been the only political doctrine of the century that has enjoyed a large number of highly educated men, not only politically but also culturally and literarily. For this reason, it is worth dedicating a section of this chapter to the most important political writers.

JOSEPH GOEBBELS

Born in Rheydt (Rhine-land) on 7 October 1897. Descended from an old family of farmers and petty bourgeoisie in the province of Westphalia, he attended public school and then higher education. He studied at the universities of Bonn, Freiburg, Würzburg, Munich, Heidelberg, Cologne and Berlin. From 1917 to 1921, he studied philology and art history, as well as history and literature, among other subjects. In 1920, he received his doctorate in philosophy in Heidelberg with the thesis "Wilhelm von Schütz: A Contribution to the History of Romantic Drama."

In 1922, he joined the NSDAP, where he took charge of the newspaper *Völkische Freiheit* (National Freedom). He would later found another newspaper, *Nationalsozialistische Briefe* (National Socialist Letters), which provided the movement with a platform for its political agenda. He was not yet 30 when Hitler appointed him Gauleiter of Berlin and entrusted him with the difficult mission of conquering the capital of the Reich for National Socialism. With only one National Socialist for every 10,000 inhabitants, Goebbels faced the powerful and growing Marxist and Social Democratic parties and the strong Communist trade unions. Faced with all this, they had only a disorganised handful of men. This mission could be described as little short of impossible. However, some time later, he was able to address Adolf Hitler more proudly than ever: "Mission accomplished." Berlin had been won over to the cause. The memory of that distant epic enabled him to never lose heart, even in the most desperate situations, and to risk everything, trusting in the quality of his ideals and the strength of his men.

During those years of struggle, he himself created and organised the National Socialist newspaper *Der Angriff* (The Attack), initially published as a weekly and, due to its great success, soon after as a daily.

His great intellectual and literary capacity led him to write numerous books, sharing his time, even once in power, with that of a speaker at a large number of rallies, publishing daily articles for various newspapers and editing other newspapers himself, carrying out his activities as a minister and completing up to 10 pages of his diary each day, while also attending to countless occupations in the various cultural chambers.

Among the works of "our doctor," as his comrades affectionately called him, we should mention: *Der unbekannte SA Mann* (The Unknown SA Soldier), *Das Buch Isidor* (The Book of Isidore), *Knorke, "Kampf um Berlin"* (Battle for Berlin), *"Blutssaat"* (The Seed of Blood), *"Der Wanderer"* (The Wanderer), *"Die Zweite Revolution"* (The Second Revolution), *"Die verfluchten Hakenkreutzler"* (The Damned Swastika Wearers), *"Der Nazi-Sozi"*, *"Das kleine ABC"* (The Little ABC), *"Signal zum Aufbruch"* (The Signal to Depart), *"Lenin oder Hitler"* (Lenin or Hitler), *"Wege ins dritte Reich"* (Towards the Third Reich), *"Das erwachende Berlin"* (The Awakening of Berlin), *"Vom Kaiserhof zur Reichskanzlei"* (From the Kaiserhof to the Reich Chancellery), *"Communism in Theory and Practice"*, *"Communism Unmasked"*, the aforementioned newspapers and a large number of articles and works published weekly by *"Das Reich"* and

other newspapers on a weekly basis. He is the author of several books that collected his writings and speeches, such as "Angriff" (Attack), "Das Eherne Herz" (The Iron Heart), "Die Zeit ohne Beispiel" (The Unprecedented Time), "Revolution der Deutschen" (Revolution of the Germans) and "Signale der neuen Zeit" (Signals of the New Age). And his famous political novel "Michael".

He was also head of the Reich Chamber of Culture, which he created himself and which made such great progress in such a short time.

In 1945, he was appointed "Defence Commissioner of Berlin". As Hitler's successor, he was Reich Chancellor for one day, sharing ultimate responsibility with Grand Admiral Dönitz as Head of State.

For the first time, he disobeyed an order from Hitler, who had instructed him to form a government in the mountains and continue the fight to the end. In his Testament, he states: "The Führer has ordered me to leave Berlin in the event of the collapse of the Reich capital's defences and to take part as Chief in the government he has appointed. If I did not refuse to obey the order, apart from the feelings of affection and personal loyalty that would never allow us to abandon the Führer in his hour of greatest distress, I would appear for the rest of my life as a traitor without honour and a vulgar scoundrel and would lose my own esteem as well as the respect of my compatriots, respect that would be necessary for me to fulfil any future task of rebuilding the German nation and the German state.

In the nightmare of betrayal that surrounds the Führer in these critical days of the war, some unconditional supporters must stand by him until death, even if this contradicts the strict order – perfectly justifiable from a material point of view – given in his will.

I believe that in this way I can best serve the future of the German people. In the hard times ahead, examples will be more important than men. There will always be someone to show the nation the way out of its troubles, but the reconstruction of national life would be impossible without clear examples that are clearly understandable to all. For this reason, together with my wife and on behalf of my children, who are too young to speak for themselves but who, if they were old enough, would agree without reservation, I express my unshakeable decision not to leave the capital of the Reich, even if it falls, and to end my life at the Führer's side, a life which, for me personally, will have no value if it cannot be spent in his service and at his side.

Joseph Goebbels fell on 1 May 1945, in a sublime manner, amid the thunderous final collapse, going down in history as one of those examples "clear and understandable to all" that he sought.

ALFRED ROSENBERG

Born in Reval on 12 January 1893. He studied architecture at the Riga Technical College. He travelled to Munich in 1918. He was co-founder of the National Socialist Party (NSDAP). In 1921, he was editor-in-chief of the "Völkischer Beobachter" and that same year he met Dietrich Eckart. From 1931 onwards, he edited the science and culture publication "Nationalsozialistische Monatshefte".

A writer, philosopher and NSDAP activist, he was one of the party's most important theorists. He was a member of the Reichstag from 1930. He wrote a large number of articles and gave numerous lectures and speeches. In 1933, now in power, he took over the leadership of the newly created Foreign Policy Office of the NSDAP. He was the founder and promoter of the Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur (League for the Defence of German Culture).

His work is contained in a seminal book that will have a place among the works of political thought of recent times: "Der Mythos des 20. Jahrhunderts" (The Myth of the 20th Century), published in 1930 and already in its fourth edition by 1932. Sales are estimated at 800,000 copies, not counting post-war editions.

The content of his main work has been widely debated, and the content of "The Myth" and Rosenberg's theories in general can be summarised as follows: throughout history, people have revolved around a myth, around a unifying idea: religion (which motivated life in the Middle Ages and the religious struggles of the time), the crown (which gave rise to dynastic nationalism, shaped by absolutism and which displaced the religious idea), the nation (a myth that arose from the monarchy, with the French Revolution and the liberalism and democracy that would follow), the class (which would be the myth created by the Marxist International, led by Jewish elements)... Some myths have replaced others in a continuous historical process. (See A. Medrano, "Hitler and his Philosophers", Ed, Bausp).

In the face of all these myths, a new and definitive one emerges that will bring men together: the myth of race. This will be the myth of National Socialism, its inspiration, its real myth that will in turn inspire the creation of true socialism. In 1933, Rosenberg wrote: "An era has just died", referring to liberal democracy and nineteenth-century Marxists.

Among his most notable works are: *Die Spur des Juden im Wandel der Zeiten* (1920); *Wesen, Grundsätze im Ziele der NSDAP* (1922, which had already reached 160,000 copies by 1932); *Der Zukunftsweg einer deutschen Aussenpolitik* (1927); *H.St. Chamberlain als Verkunder und Begrunder einer zukunst* (1927); *Freimaurerische Weltpolitik* (1930); "Das Wesensgefüge des Nationalsozialismus" (1932, reprinted twice), "Tradition und Gegenwart", "Gestaltung der Idee": "Kampf um die Macht": "Dietrich Eckart, ein Vermächtnis"; "Blut und Ehre". As a refutation of the book "Studien zum Mythos 20. Jahrhundert" (Studies on the Myth of the 20th Century), Rosenberg wrote in 1935: "An die Dunkelmänner unserer Zeit" (To the Dark Men of Our Time). He is also the author of "Der Staatsfeindliche Zionismus" (Zionism, the Enemy of the State).

He directed other publications such as "Der Weit Kampf" (The Great Struggle), of which he was editor in 1929 and in which he uncovered the hidden struggles for world power. Already in the midst of the World War, he took on the responsibility of Reich Minister for Eastern Territories and Affairs.

Alfred Rosenberg was executed on 16 October 1946 by those who had to crush by force an incipient revolution that carried the New Idea, that Myth of the 20th Century that Rosenberg had announced.

"This is the duty of our century: starting from a new myth of life, to create a new type of human being."

Alfred Rosenberg

GOTTFRIED FEDER

Born in Würzburg on 27 January 1883. He completed his secondary education in Aushach and Munich and studied at the Universities of Munich, Charlottenburg and Zurich. In 1905, he obtained his engineering degree. He carried out various important projects in Germany and other countries, but especially in Bulgaria.

From 1917 onwards, he devoted himself entirely to the study of economic and financial policy. He founded the "Deutsche Kampfbund" and carried out a very active campaign against usury, which culminated in a manifesto published in 1918. In it, Feder proclaimed that the social problem was insoluble unless the servitude of interest accruing on capital was abolished; in Feder's view, interest was unnecessary to provide employment, whereas work, conversely, produced capital.

A writer, engineer and one of the most revolutionary economic specialists of his time, he dealt with the problems of banking, speculation and money in his works.

A member of the NSDAP, he drafted the party's famous 25-point programme, in which he set out his economic vision. In 1922, Feder's programme was approved by the NSDAP Assembly, of which he was one of the first seven members.

Feder later became Chairman of the Technical Economic Commission of the Political Department of the NSDAP. From 1924 onwards, he was a member of the German Parliament. When Hitler came to power, he served as State Secretary of the Ministry of Economics until early December 1935, when he withdrew from political life.

He was a member of the German Academy of Law (1933), Honorary Professor at the Berlin Technical School (1934), editor of the weekly magazines *Die Flamme*, *Hassenhammer* and *Deutsche Wochenschau*, and founder of the National Socialist Library. The full title of his main work is *Das Programm der NSDAP und seine weltanschaulichen Grundgedanken* (The Programme of the NSDAP and its World-Historical Basic Ideas). During the election campaign for the Reich Presidency (1933), 350,000 copies had already been published. A year after the first edition of the Programme appeared in 1927, a fourth edition was already necessary. Just five years after National Socialism came to power in 1938, the 985,000th copy was published. This figure speaks for itself. Feder's *Das Programm* is volume 1 in the collection of texts published by the Official Library of the National Socialist Party. New party members were trained using this collection of essential texts.

Among the works he wrote and published are: "Der Manifest zur Brechnung der Zinsknechtschaft" (1919), "Die Kommende Stenerstreik" (1921), "Der deutsche Staat aus nationaler und sozialistischer Grundlage" (1923), "Der Dawes Pakt" (1924), "Der Soziale Bau und Wirtschaftsbank", "Kampf gegen der Hochfinanz" (1932), "Die Juden" (1934), "Das Manifest zur Brechnung der Zinsknechts des Geldes" (1932) and countless articles on economic issues. These articles deal with the basic aspects of the problem of servitude to money, which is ultimately the key, the solution to the problem and the social question, which requires each individual to make a decisive choice: service to the community and the people or lawful and limited private enrichment. He exposes high finance as the leaders of world economic policy, studies the scientific probability of a tax-free state (which he demonstrates), etc.

Gottfried Feder died on 24 September 1941 in Mumau (Upper Bavaria), when the implementation of his theories was cut short by the war.

DIETRICH ECKART

An early member of the NSDAP, writer, poet and playwright, Dietrich Eckart, born in 1863, wrote a large number of works that were hardly successful with the public, in the midst of the hostile world that surrounded him. He translated Ibsen's "Peer

Gynt" into German in a particularly successful version that would be performed on numerous occasions.

With his extensive knowledge, he had a significant influence on Hitler. He was editor of the printed sheet "Auf Gut Deutsch" (In Good German), which was dedicated to literature. A specialist in Wagnerian themes, he described Parsifal as "a song of lofty love; a lofty song of love." On the occasion of the Bayreuth Festivals, his collaboration was requested and he wrote several articles on Wagner and the Master's work. He even collaborated on the programme for the 1912 Festivals.

"He who does not rise above time with violent impulse does not understand what he sees, does not live existence," Eckart wrote in the edition of the drama Lorenzaccio, which he gave to Hess in October 1922. In a few words, he summed up what the struggle of National Socialism should be: to rise above contemporary minds, to anticipate an era in order to create a superior one.

Among other works, he wrote the tragicomedy "Father of the Family" and the aforementioned tragedy "Lorenzaccio". His early struggle poem "Sturmlied der Deutschen", better known as "Deutschland Erwache" (Germany, Awake), also became popular.

Dietrich Eckart died in 1923 as a result of his participation in the failed coup d'état in Bavaria. He died without seeing his dream of a true Artistic State come true, but he helped his comrades to create it ten years later. A year after his death, the work "Der Bolshevismus von Moses bis Lenin; Zwiegespräch zwischen Hitler und mir" (Bolshevism from Moses to Lenin. My conversation with Hitler), a fundamental work for understanding the political thinking of Eckart and Hitler. The future Führer of Germany, who deeply appreciated the ignored poet, ended his work Mein Kampf with a tribute to Dietrich Eckart.

RICHARD WALTER DARRE

A German with a French surname, originally from Argentina, he was born in Buenos Aires in 1895. He began his studies at the Goethe Institute in Buenos Aires. Later, his parents sent him to England to study agriculture in Wimbledon. The First World War caught him in Europe, where he held the position of assistant agronomist at the Ministry of Agriculture.

In 1930, already a member of the NSDAP, he was appointed Agricultural Policy Officer of the Party, by express order of Hitler. Darré replaced Hugenberg in his Cabinet position. Once in power, Darré was appointed Reich Minister for Food and Agriculture. He was responsible for the famous National Socialist theory of "Blut-Bo", as it was popularly known, an abbreviation of Blut und Boden (Blood and Soil). In this regard, we can consider Walter Darré to be one of the leading specialists in matters relating to the peasantry and of such revolutionary ideas in this regard as in all those that touched on the subject of man and his environment. Darré always fought to restore man's sense of ownership of the land, to find the maximum number of men to work it. His main concern was to re-root man and his family in the soil that nourishes them and to combat the cosmopolitan theories of high financial capitalism that guide the world today and praise the mass of concrete and steel as the highest social order.

Contrary to what many people think, our century has not been the century of technology; it is the century of social racism and its struggle to establish itself, which has been, will be and is

the central axis of events, despite attempts today to conceal this assertion.

Darré's concept of beauty is also completely new and revolutionary. For Darré, beauty, understood in a healthy way, ceases to be a personal taste and becomes a duty to one's own people. Female beauty, for example, implies for Darré an aesthetic and educational revolution of the first order. Natural, popular beauty, exalted at all levels and freed from all false Christian taboos or from all 'gogo girls' without modesty or appreciation for women of any kind. The general harmony of the New Order was a point of great importance.

From 1933, when Hitler took power by popular acclaim, Darré held the post of Minister of Food and Agriculture until 23 May 1942, already at war, when he was replaced by Bache. He retired for health reasons, although without expressly resigning from his post.

Darré, as one of the specialists in racial issues, is notable for his works "Das Bauerntum als Lebensquelle der Nordischen Rasse" (Peasantry as the Source of Life for the Nordic Race), "Netiadel des Blut und Boden" (The Netiadel of Blood and Soil), "Das Schwein als Kriterium für nordische Völker und Seniten" (The Pig as a Criterion for Nordic Peoples and Races), etc.

In 1949, Walter Darré was tried in the famous Wilhelmstrasse trial for minor National Socialist leaders. He was sentenced to seven years in prison and released sixteen months later. In poor health since 1942, Walter Darré died in Germany in 1953, having enjoyed almost three years of freedom. PV.

MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Born in Messkirch on 26 September 1889, the son of a modest sacristan and cooper, his father's home provided him with the spiritual environment that would permeate his work. The Black Forest, his native land, would shape his character; "Sein und Zeit" would be written largely in his small cabin in Todtnauberg. Heidegger himself would much later affirm his belonging to the country and the people of the Black Forest, in a rootedness to the land, to the soil and even to the blood, which united him with Darré.

Heidegger completed his normal studies, after which he continued his education at the Faculty of Arts in Freiburg, where he obtained his doctorate in 1914. Since 1923, he has been working as a professor in Marburg.

A neo-scholastic, Heidegger is considered the last great romantic philosopher and the last of the classical metaphysicians. He confessed to being a disciple of Nietzsche and studied the poet Hölderlin in depth, as well as Mörike, Hebbel, Rilke, etc. "Philosophy and poetry stand on opposite sides, but they say the same thing," Heidegger would say. From Hölderlin, he recalls the verse: "Where there is the greatest risk, there is also the greatest hope."

A controversial and evocative figure, his many enemies have not been able, despite the silence imposed on him, to consign his work to oblivion, a work that has experienced a new rebirth since his death. Sartre, in his usual cowardice, unable to silence Heidegger's valuable philosophical contributions, excused himself by saying: "The Heidegger case is too complex for me to discuss here."

Die Lehre vom Urtefl im Psychologismus (1915), Zur Zeitbegriff in der Geschichtswissenschaft (1916), and Die Kategorien und Bedeutungslehre des Duns Scotus (1916) are among his early works. His most notable work is Sein und Zeit (Being and Time), published in 1927, considered his magnum opus and now standard reading in philosophical and theological centres, etc. The second part of this work, Zeit und

Sein" has yet to appear. In 1928, he published "Vorbemerkungen der Herausgebers" and, a year later, "Kant und das Problem der Metaphysik". In 1936, "Hölderlin und das Wesen der Dichtung"; in 1942, "Platons Lehre von der Wahrheit"; in 1943, "Vom Wesen der Wahrheit"; and in 1944, "Erläuterungen zu Hölderlins Dichtung". In the post-war years, he published his famous "Letter on Humanism" and, between 1953 and 1957, a series of very important short works. In 1961, his two voluminous tomes on Nietzsche appeared, bringing together the work he had disseminated through seminars, papers and lectures between 1936 and 1956.

As he himself stated, "in the long run, philosophy cannot do without its own perspective, Metaphysics". His concern for Metaphysics would be a constant theme in his work. Nietzsche's superman would be influenced by Ernst Jünger (and his work "Der Arbeiter"), identifying him in large part with the worker of the new Germany, a practical link to the concepts of National Socialism. "This Europe, which, in its incurable blindness, is always on the verge of stabbing itself, is today caught between Russia on one side and America on the other. Russia and America are, from a metaphysical point of view, the same: the same sinister frenzy of unleashed technology and the rootless organisation of the normalised man."

When Hitler won the elections that brought him to power on 30 January 1933, he spoke of work, ethics, art and the future, in language that closely matches Heidegger's ideas. In 1950, Cassirer recalled Heidegger's well-known inclination towards anti-Semitism.

Mölldorf, a member of the Social Democratic Party and until then rector of the University of Freiburg, was dismissed, and Heidegger was proposed as his replacement. His anti-liberal and anti-bourgeois ideas were in line with the purest anti-democratic current in German universities, in the words of J.P. Cotten in 1974. The new rector was unanimously elected to the post on 21 April 1933, after publicly declaring his support for National Socialism. Ten days later, he joined the NSDAP. The press reported the news, commenting: "We know that he is wholeheartedly behind our movement". Heidegger himself, on the anniversary of a fallen student, gave a speech that ended with the words: "Let us honour the hero and raise our arms in silence as a tribute." Although he held the position of rector for only a few months, retiring from public life afterwards, Heidegger, considered "the most important thinker of our time," remained devoted to Hitler at all times. Three times, on 3, 10 and 11 November 1933, he publicly declared his support for Germany's withdrawal from the League of Nations on the occasion of the referendum, stating on that occasion: "The National Socialist Revolution is not simply the seizure of power by another party that has grown for that purpose. On the contrary, this Revolution brings about a total change in our German existence." And also: "Do not seek the rules of your being in dogmas and ideas; the Führer himself, and he alone, constitutes the German reality of today and tomorrow; he is your law."

Without changing his way of thinking in the slightest, he made a similar statement ten years later, in the midst of the war, in 1943: "Neither dogmas nor rational truths should be erected as norms for our conduct. Today and always, the Führer is the only one capable of deciding what is good and what is bad. The Führer is our only law." For him, the National Socialist revolution would be the path to an authentic "Dasein", through the transition from "Dasein" to "Volk" (people) and to the Führer as the unifier of the "Volk".

Between 1933 and 1945, he gave numerous lectures, among which those collected in the volume "Lost Paths" stand out. All this would bring him no benefit in the eyes of the victors of 1945. Suspended from his duties as a professor, he was banned from teaching at the University of Freiburg, an order that lasted until 1951.

In 1952, he retired to live in his native village, blaming his collaboration with National Socialism in all his interviews. It was not until 1969 that an interview with him was broadcast on West German television. Regarding some of his statements, published by *Der Spiegel* in 1966, we quote:

"As far as I know, according to our human and historical experience, everything essential and great has arisen when man had a home and was rooted in tradition. Contemporary literature, for example, is mostly destructive.

Sp- If art does not know its place, is it therefore destructive?

Heid- Well, let's leave that. I just want to clarify that I don't see the direction of modern art and that it remains unclear to me where art is looking and what it is seeking.

At the end of 1974, preparations began in Germany for the publication of his complete works, which were to consist of 70 volumes, undoubtedly the most comprehensive and profound philosophical work of the 20th century, far surpassing the self-proclaimed great philosophers of our era. Heidegger died, far from public life, in the silence that only democracies know how to subtly impose, in May 1976, at the age of 86, in his native village in the Black Forest, without ever agreeing to definitively renounce a past that was already part of his very life. J.T.

"There is only one German 'way of life' (Lebensstand). It is the way of labour (Arbeiterstand) rooted in the foundations of our people, freely submitted to the will of the State. Its character is portrayed in the movement of the German National Socialist Workers' Party."

Heidegger

"Knowledge and the possession of that knowledge, in the sense in which National Socialism understands this word, does not divide people into classes, but rather unites and binds the members of the homeland and the states (corporations) in the single, great will of the State."

"Thus, the words 'knowledge' and 'science', 'worker' and 'work' have taken on a new meaning and a new sound. The 'worker' is not, as Marxism would have it, the mere object of exploitation. The working class (Arbeiterstand) is not the class of the dispossessed that must bear the burden of the general class struggle."

Heidegger

Otto Rahn was born on 18 February 1904 in Michelstadt in the Odenwald, a town located in an area of Hesse closely linked to the Grail tradition. Passionate about history and philology, Rahn focused his university studies on Romanistik, the study of the culture, history and language of Romance countries and, in particular, the country of the "langue d'oc", Provençal Occitania. Introduced by Richard Wagner to the world of Grail legends, Rahn decided to write his doctoral thesis on the poem that inspired the brilliant playwright and composer, Wolfram von Eschenbach's "Parzival", and on that strange character, Kyot (Guyot de Provins?), who, according to Wolfram, told him the legend of the Grail. The search for traces of this legend in Occitania, with its Cathar genealogy, would determine the meaning of his first work, "Crusade Against the Grail," and his subsequent output.

Rahn sensed a close relationship between medieval Occitania and the myth of the Grail which, without knowing it at the time, would lead him to the most unexpected conclusions. He therefore left for Occitania, the ancient Cathar Romania, staying there for a long time and establishing close relationships with the best-known experts on Catharism of the time, such as Déodat Roché, Maurice Magre, and, above all, Antonin Gadal, with whom he would form an intense and long-lasting friendship. He carried out extensive research in the field and conducted exhaustive speleological explorations in all the caves of the Ariège region—of which there are many—that are closely related to the history of Catharism.

Upon his return to Germany, he soon published a book in which he compiled the fruits of his studies and presented his theories on the Grail and the Cathar question: *Kreuzzug gegen den Gral* (Crusade Against the Grail). A year later, in 1934, thanks to Robert Pitrou, a professor at the University of Bordeaux, the French translation appeared under the title *Croisade contre le Graal* (Grandeur et chute des Albigeois). Both were immediately successful, due to the revolutionary nature of their revelations and the depth of their conception.

Until then, the myth of the Grail, conveniently manipulated, had been presented in a light devoid of its original legendary content; it had been given a "history" and a meaning close to an external ideology. This was Rahn's work, as it would later be, in a similar way, Evola's: to restore the Grail to its true essence as legend, myth and symbol, and to determine who its bearers had been throughout history. Saint-Loup puts the following words into the mouth of an imaginary Otto Rahn, but one very close to the reality of his thinking:

"The Grail has become a myth, starting from a living reality, according to a classic process of evolution. Christians have stolen this myth from the pagans, just as they stole all their sacred places by building churches on the ruins of their temples" (1).

In reality, the Grail had simply followed the path of so many myths from the Aryan tradition that were assimilated by Christianity. Rosenberg himself tells us of pagan deities and symbols that, due to their popular roots, were "converted" to the new religion. (2). The remote origin of the Grail is confirmed by Wolfram, whose version of the legend is unanimously recognised as the most authoritative:

"... Kyot is a Provençal,
he found the legend of Parzival
narrated in a pagan book..."

and also:

"Guyot, the highly renowned master, found,
in convoluted pagan writing,
the legend that reaches the primary source of legends."

The first traces of this story, which dates back to the Hyperborean origins of the Aryan race, can already be found in Zoroastrian culture. Otto Rahn offers us a beautiful version of it in his work *"Luzifers Hofgesind"* (1937), chapter II. In it, he offers a synthesis of the origin of the Aryan race. He recounts how, for the Iranians and Aryans of India, tradition remembers the Great North as their origin. A country that, having frozen over in the past, forced their ancestors to migrate south. From there, a whole tradition was born which, for historical and linguistic reasons, is closely related to the tradition of the Grail. Words such as *"Parsiwal"*, *Gamuret*, *"Lohenrangrin"*, *Mujavat...* of Iranian origin, come to life in Wolfram von Eschenbach's poem with some modifications, revealing an incredible parallelism that links it to the entire Cathar tradition.

Rahn also believed that, at a certain point in time, the Grail legacy fell into the hands of the Albigensian Cathars of Occitania, in the same way that they took on as their own the legacy of the Mazdeist doctrine, which he also expounded with notable ideological authority.

Was Otto Rahn a National Socialist? According to Paul Ladame, prologue writer of the French edition of *Luzifers Hofgesind*, who was apparently closely related to Rahn at that time, and a virulent anti-Nazi, the publication of *Kreuzzug gegen den Gral* greatly interested Himmler, who summoned Rahn, whose financial situation was not very comfortable, and offered him a very substantial contract to continue writing works along the same lines. Ladame, whose anti-Nazism leads him to rail mercilessly against Angebert without naming him, claims that Rahn was not a National Socialist; However, he himself recounts how he encountered him on several occasions wearing the uniform of the Leibstandarte SS Adolf Hitler and that in an interview, Rahn, informed by Heydrich himself, mentioned Ladame's contacts with the Soviet embassy, indicating that he did not wish to see him again. Ladame ultimately acknowledges that Rahn's second work "contains many racist passages".

Saint-Loup also maintains that Himmler discovered Otto Rahn, who became enthusiastic about *"The Court of Lucifer"* and sent it "to the party's top leaders, thus giving it gospel value," and that he delegated him to Rosenberg, "organiser of the Grail quests." According to Saint-Loup himself, Rosenberg organised expeditions to Montségur in this regard years later, and on 16 March 1944, the 700th anniversary of the fall of Montségur, Rosenberg was to be on board a German reconnaissance plane that flew over the former Cathar fortress, drawing a giant Celtic cross with its smoke tubes. Saint-Loup claims that this fact is confirmed by the testimony of several local residents. All of this was to be the confirmation of a Cathar poet who claimed: "After seven hundred years, the laurel will flourish again" (3). Saint-Loup also puts the following words in the mouth of his Otto Rahn: "If Germany were fortunate enough to possess a Montségur, all Hitler Youth would ascend it on their knees" (4).

The theory of Nazi excavations at Montségur was picked up by French television itself, which devoted a low-quality series to the subject (5).

Apart from these facts, which are difficult to confirm, we would like to highlight the similarity between Otto Rahn's works and those of Alfred Rosenberg, who in his *"Myth of the Twentieth Century"* acknowledges the Cathar contribution to the struggle for racial-religious consciousness and, in other sections, supports the same ideas as Rahn, referring, for

the Nordic origin of the Aryans, and even more secondary issues, such as the anti-Jesuitism common to both.

The chapter of Otto Rahn's life on which forgers and mystifiers have most exercised their imagination is that concerning his death. Ladame claims to have received a death notice with the text:

1 SS Otto Rahn fatally
injured during an
exercise. His
comrades."

(SS Otto Rahn, accidentally killed during an exercise. His comrades). Ladame claims that this was between March and April 1937, but this seems impossible. He also claims that Rahn fell from grace in 1936, yet Luzifers Hofgesind appeared in 1937... (6).

Karl Rittersbacher, editor of "Kreuzzug gegen den Gral" in 1964, believes that Otto Rahn died, probably from cold, practising Cathar "Endura" on the peaks of the "Wildes Kaiser", near Kufstein, on 13 March 1939, a theory that seems the most plausible and is supported by people as diverse as René Nelli and Saint-Loup.

It is not our mission to engage in speculation. We will conclude these lines on Otto Rahn with a few lines by Otto Rahn himself, which speak for themselves. Rahn has a Cathar speak thus, whom he has imaginatively encountered on his Grail quest:

"My homeland no longer exists. It has been transformed into a field of ruins, and under the Pope's orders, everything has been done to 'regenerate' it. We have been annihilated because we have rejected Jehovah, the god of the Jews, and Moses, and the prophets. We do not pray to the god of the Jews because, precisely, the divinity has no more connection with the Jewish people than with any other people. The Jews are the only ones who have dared to claim to be God's chosen people. What is Yahweh if not the very soul of the Jewish people, proud, intolerant, vengeful, power-hungry and devoid of any chivalrous generosity? The soul of my people was very different. Our god was clear, luminous, full of nobility. He represented in his perfection that which we, men, embody in a very imperfect way" (7). J.M.

Notes

- (1) Saint-Loup: "Nouveaux cathares pour Montségur", Paris 1969, p. 29.
- (2) Alfred Rosenberg: "El mito del siglo XX" (The Myth of the Twentieth Century), Buenos Aires 1976, pp. 101-102.
- (3) Saint-Loup. Op. cit., pp. 183-184 and 376-377.
- (4) Ibid. p. 24.
- (5) From 29 August to 6 September 1975, TF 1 broadcast a series entitled "Le Passe-montagne", written by a notorious anti-Nazi libeller. See "Histoire pour tous", Boulogne, September 1975.
- (6) Paul Ladame: Preface to "La Cour de Lucifer", Paris 1974, pp. 24-25.
- (7) Otto Rahn: Luzifers Hofgesind, II, chapter "Along a road in southern Germany".

MIGUEL DE UNAMUNO

In 1864, the man who would become the greatest, and we could almost say the only, Spanish philosopher of the 20th century, Don Miguel de Unamuno, was born in Bilbao. Spain would produce many thinkers, writers, sociologists and moralists, but as a philosopher, a researcher of the beyond, of the original problem of man, of the essence of being, only Unamuno would achieve universal renown.

There are two stages in Unamuno's life: the first, which lasts until 1900, in which Unamuno is not yet a philosopher and is not yet troubled by the vital problem: Unamuno is a rebellious young man who abhors the monarchical reaction of Alfonso XIII and flirts with Marxist parties. He is completely unknown, has not yet written anything of importance, nor has he contributed any original ideas to Spanish literature. These are his years as a student in Madrid and as a teacher in Bilbao. Marxism has not yet enslaved Russia nor shown its face to the world, and even less so in Spain. On the other hand, Spain is governed

by the most enervating reaction, liberal capitalism, under the most appalling misery for the people. Unamuno, like Mussolini in Italy, will militate in Marxist socialist circles. From 1894 to 1897, he contributed to the Bilbao magazine *La Lucha de Clases* (Class Struggle) with articles attacking clerical abuse, Gil Robles' bourgeois right wing, etc., within a Marxist framework.

From 1897 onwards, he gradually abandoned this line of thinking. In 1901, he became rector of the University of Salamanca and began to undergo a major change in his thinking. He moved from the contingent to the essential, from demagogic politics to philosophy, from being just another person to being Unamuno. He began to suffer from the vitalist problem, his martyrdom of the hereafter, his vision of life as tragedy. This is the Unamuno that the world would come to know and admire. It was then that he wrote all his works. Unamuno was now a "fascist", an ardent nationalist, a conflicted Christian (anticlerical), a staunch anti-democrat, a spiritualist fatalist, an anti-materialist and, therefore, an anti-Marxist. He will hardly collaborate in party politics (which he finds repugnant), but will defend his ideas through his work, fascist not from a "political activist" point of view but mainly fascist because of his doctrines.

Unamuno was exiled to Fuerteventura in 1924 because of his courageous stance against the bourgeois and decadent monarchy. The court was the main instigator of his exile: the reason was "insults to the king". Fortunately, he managed to escape from Fuerteventura to France. By this time, he had completely abandoned Marxist materialism. In his article published in *La Nación* in Buenos Aires, he wrote: "Gambling in all its forms, profiteering, the stock market, the murkiest financial schemes, invade everything. Historical materialism is the general doctrine, the concern, from the deputy to the farmer, to the king himself, is nothing more than to enrich oneself at the expense of the common good."

The advent of the Republic and the fall of the Bourbons was greeted with great enthusiasm by Unamuno, as it was by almost all Spanish fascists. The republic will appoint Unamuno rector of Salamanca again. But Unamuno will quickly become disillusioned with this republic, which is turning into a bourgeois and Marxist partyocracy. He then writes his famous plea "Spain's soul is in pain", in which he expresses his disgust for the Republic.

Unamuno quickly and passionately joined Franco's National Uprising, and the Marxist republic issued a special decree condemning him.

On 26 September 1936, Unamuno, as rector of Salamanca, signed an official manifesto condemning the Republic and supporting the Movement of 18 July: "Faced with the terrible struggle to defend our Western Christian civilisation, the civilisation that has shaped Europe, against a destructive Eastern ideology, the University of Salamanca notes with immense sorrow that certain acts have been perpetrated that force it to proclaim its protest to the civilised world. Unnecessary acts of cruelty, the murder of priests and lay people, etc..." Salamanca. 26-9-36. The Rector, Miguel de Unamuno".

His support for the uprising was passionate and unwavering. From his balcony, he harangued Franco's troops: "Overthrow the Republic of the 'tiorras'!" (referring to the female militiamen, mostly prostitutes, who accompanied the red troops). "Long live Spain! Lads, now let's go and get the 'pharaoh' of El Pardo," was Unamuno's farewell to the Falangists marching on Madrid from Salamanca. The "pharaoh" was the Mason and degenerate Azaña, whom Unamuno detested. Of the civil war, Unamuno had written: "The Madrid government, and everything it represents, has gone mad, literally mad and lunatic. This struggle is not a struggle against the liberal republic, it is a struggle for civilisation. What Madrid represents is not socialism, it is not

democracy, not even communism. It is anarchy with all the terrible attributes that the word implies. Joyful anarchism filled with skulls, tibia bones and destruction...

Unamuno nevertheless clashed with some of the leaders of the Movement, although he never abandoned his support for 18 July. The clash occurred on Columbus Day in 1936 at the University of Salamanca. The reason was the centralist, anti-racist, reactionary position of Maldonado and Millan Astray against the Basques and Catalans.

While German fascism was fundamentally regionalist, in Spain Basque and Catalan nationalists had to unite with their worst enemy, Marxist internationalism, to escape the Falangists' recalcitrant centralism.

Unamuno, a passionate Basque, was outraged by these attacks on Basques and Catalans: "You will win, but you will not convince." It was true. The incident cost him his position as rector, but above all, it was a lost opportunity for the national leadership to reconsider and be convinced that fascism requires support for the races and cultures of all peoples in the face of the centralism that prevailed at the time.

Despite this incident, Unamuno continued to support the uprising tirelessly. He once said: "At this critical moment of pain for Spain, I know I must follow the soldiers. They are the only ones who will restore order." Unamuno died on 31 December 1936. With him died the last great Spanish philosopher.

If, as a historical figure, we can consider Unamuno to have been linked to the fascist movement only in his later years, his philosophy and his works always defended fascist ideas (after his early Marxist period, during which he wrote very little). A staunch anti-democrat, in his article "On Bolshevik Democracy," he says: "And so democracy means the same thing as majority rule and seems to be the same thing as Bolshevism. If Bolshevism is majority rule and not maximalism... And there is nothing more imperialist than democracy."

"Doing Politics," he says, speaking of Parliament: "... Once that pneumatic bell (Parliament) rings, it has to sound very bad, very bad. Everything there becomes dull. And it becomes dull because it does not represent Spanish public opinion."

"But aren't elections part of politics?"

Yes, but not where they are held by governments in collusion with the parties. That is, where citizens do not run for public office but are nominated by their fellow citizens."

In his essay "My Religion", he says: "There are a certain number of individuals whose prestige and fame are due to the universal suffrage of vulgar and uncomprehending minds. They are the representative celebrities. Not those who imposed themselves on the masses by taming them, fighting with them, but those whom the masses made in their own image and likeness."

Unamuno abhorred the masses, aligning himself with the hierarchical doctrines of fascism: "A crowd never expresses anything but shouts."

In his work "Contra esto y aquello" (Against This and That), he says: "Rojas is quite right when he says that one of the democratic aberrations of our time is that works of high philosophy circulate in cheap volumes, more affordable than school textbooks."

Unamuno always fought against liberal, bourgeois pacifism, cultivating a sacred cult of war: In his masterpiece "The Tragic Sense of Life", he says: "And it so happens that, as people believe less and less in the soul, in its immortality, the value of poor, fleeting life is exaggerated more and more. That is where all the effeminate sentimentality against war comes from." In "From the Correspondence of a Fighter," he insists: "Do not preach peace to me, for I fear it. Peace is submission and lies. You know my motto: truth before peace. I would rather have truth in war than lies in peace." "I seek the religion of war, faith in war."

In his work "De esto y de aquello" (On This and That), he writes: "Because what is terrible is the peace of the optimists, the peace of the peaceful. The peace of warriors is something else entirely."

Finally, he concludes in his Soliloquies and Conversations: "Live in peace with everyone? Horror, horror, horror. No, no, no. No living in peace... I don't want to live in peace with others or with myself. I need war, war inside me, we need war."

He was an ardent nationalist, as he stated on numerous occasions: "And should I not applaud his nationalism, I who, like him, have pointed out a hundred times how selfish humanitarianism is...?" "We also suffer from the evils that Rojas points out here, where a nationalist restoration is no less necessary than there." (Against this and that)

Having completely abandoned his Marxist beginnings, he always showed himself to be deeply anti-Marxist: "And materialism is purulentism. And the materialist view of history is a purulent view. Marx himself had it, who did not go hungry but did have the other thing. And the other thing is pus." (Visions and comments).

There was one aspect, however, that made him an enemy of Nationalism: the concept of race. Unamuno wrote two articles combating the National Socialist concept of race. He considered race to be the offspring of language; in other words, he was a culturalist, etymological racist. For him, a race was determined by its culture, language and religion, regardless of its physical race. He was mistaken in not understanding the interrelationship between physical appearance and culture.

He attacked Judaism on several occasions: "And many believe that a new religion is being born, a religion of Jewish and, at the same time, Tartar origin: Bolshevism." "And hence a Jew, Karl Marx, has sought to create a philosophy of the proletariat. The materialistic Sadducee Jews seek the resurrection of the flesh in their children. And in money, of course." (Agony of Christianity) R.B.

PIO BAROJA

Pío Baroja, a writer born in San Sebastián in 1872, is undoubtedly the best Spanish novelist. After his experiences as a doctor and baker, he wrote his first work, "Vidas Sombrías" (Gloomy Lives), a series of short stories, in 1900.

His vast literary oeuvre (more than 100 volumes) is divided into different categories: first, there are the novels, most of which form trilogies, the best known being "La lucha por la vida" (The Struggle for Life), "El mar" (The Sea), "La raza" (The Race), etc., totalling 10 or 11 out of a total of more than 60 novels. Then there are the standalone novels, including "The Legend of Juan de Alzate," "Susana," "Laura," etc. The important section of short stories occupies several volumes, as do plays and essays. articles a n d a book of poetry called 'Canciones de Suburbio' (Songs of the Suburbs); the long series of 22 novels about the character Aviraneta, a series called "Memorias de un hombre de acción" (Memoirs of a Man of Action), which was written between 1913 and 1935; and finally, his memoirs, written in the last years of his life, which fill seven volumes. Baroja died in Madrid in 1956.

Much has been written about Baroja's style; some have said that his technique is very simple and that he only seeks to capture the reality of what he sees; others say that beneath this simple style there is actually a well-composed structure. They say that he is a writer who does not write well because his writing is somewhat disordered, and this is only partly true;

but what is truly surprising about Pío Baroja is his direct and personal style, which attracts the reader. That is why it cannot be said outright that he does not write well, as he has managed to develop a style that gives his work its distinctive character. The carelessness attributed to his style is nothing more than a way of expressing his fierce sincerity and radical scepticism towards all forms of society. His novelistic style could be defined as tending towards fast-paced and free narration, a consequence of his great vitality and, at the same time, his entertaining subject matter and his use of prose inspired more by conversational language than literary language.

Pío Baroja has been framed within the so-called "Generation of '98", but he always rejected this framing while he was alive, as he could not be associated with other writers who differed so much in terms of style, genre, subject matter, etc.

With regard to Pío Baroja's anti-Semitism, it must be said that it is very pronounced throughout his literary output. It is rare to find a work that does not contain some paragraph or phrase dedicated to the Jews. This hatred of Judaism stems from the clash between Baroja's strong sincerity and the climate of lies, deceit and usury that surrounds everything related to Judaism, the clash between the writer's humility and the stupid and impertinent arrogance of the Jew. Baroja blames the badness in the Spanish character on that mixture of Semitic blood. In one of his works, Baroja says of the dominant character of the Jewish race: "There must be something characteristic and special about this Jewish race, because all the great holy men in history have been Jews or, at least, Semites. Their confidence, their pedantry, their categorical statements have made them dominate the world." In 1938, the book "Comunistas judíos y demás ralea" (Jewish Communists and Other Riff-Raff) was published, which is a compilation of anti-Jewish and anti-Communist texts from all his works up to that year, with a foreword by E. Giménez Caballero. There has been much debate about who compiled the collection, Baroja himself or Giménez Caballero. Personally, I believe it was the latter, as it is the only work by Baroja that has this structure.

His anti-communism is also evident throughout his work. He attacks communism at its core, criticising its principles and the bloody leaders of the 1917 revolution. He also attacks its Jewish roots, which are closely linked to everything communist, especially its theorists and leaders. Pío Baroja dissects communist ideas and sees that they cannot exist. Pío Baroja confronts all forms of collectivism and communist communities with his individualism. Given Spain's eternal problem, which is agriculture, the writer says that communism can never be implemented, as it has no practical and concrete solutions to the major problems that agriculture represents in Spain.

Along with anti-communism, his anti-democratic spirit, which leads him to hate the aforementioned system, is also evident throughout the work.

For Baroja, democracy can only lead to one place: histrionics. Pío Baroja wrote several articles against democracy, but in particular, in his book "Rapsodias", he wrote a short article entitled "Against democracy" from which I have extracted a few paragraphs:.. "Democracy, which is an etymological joke in that it is government by the people, does not strike me as an idea or an ideal; it is, at least in practice, a political procedure that I do not think has much value. That fantastic channelling of parliamentarianism, whereby 50 or 60 thousand men are represented by a single individual, seems to me more like a religious myth of the Aruntas or the Botocudos than a rationalist idea of Europeans. Democracy, if it is not a mystification of orators, seems to be. There is another democracy, which is popular or populist: the fleeting reign of mass violence. This good lady is so obscure in her desires that she never gets what she wants, and often, at the same

, the authority that strikes and the rebel who is struck consider themselves its most legitimate representatives.

I think this is an important text for seeing how Baroja thinks about that political system. On one occasion, Baroja also said that when people talked to him about democracy, he laughed so hard that he feared he would end up like that Greek philosopher who died laughing when he saw a donkey eating figs.

Throughout his life, Baroja had a great love for his Basque homeland, for Spain and also for Europe. Baroja thought a lot about Europe and was always concerned about what would become of it. In 1954, two years before his death, he once said: "What interests me these days, what concerns me, is whether Europe will get out of its quagmire and whether it will be possible to come and go as before and speak and think without obstacles." In Europe, Baroja always had a predilection for Germany in all its aspects. Baroja also says that one of the evils of Europe has been, on the one hand, the influence of the Jews, with their consequent infiltration everywhere to the point of corroding everything. Art, music and society, with the deception and rottenness of prostitution, drugs, gambling, drinking, pornography, etc. And on the other hand, the American influence that has managed to automate everything and make us forget the old European ideals: chivalry, heroism, courage in war, race. In short, for the writer, this is a danger to Europe and must therefore be eliminated before it is too late.

In the field of art, it should be noted that Baroja likes above all art that reflects Nature, or rather, reality as it is, and as such he hates all kinds of abstract art and feels a special repugnance towards Cubism because "Picasso's art is like a lure for songwriters", says Baroja. For him, all new art is verbiage and he calls it the dehumanisation of art; only art that is human is art. There is no longer any new art, there is no such thing as the new art that they say they have invented, he points out. "The Cubists produce in me an incomprehensible repugnance because of their exaggeration," writes Baroja in his novel *El Hotel del Cisne*.

Commenting on Freud's work, Baroja compared it to Cubism, writing that Freud's sexology is something like Cubism, although not as petulant, foolish or absurd as that pictorial system.

As for music, Baroja liked Italian opera above all else, Verdi, Rossini, Monteverdi... He also liked Franz Lehar's waltzes and the music of Weber, Mozart and Beethoven, which were his favourites.

Another important facet of Baroja is his love for animals; he has always had cats or other animals in his home. It was precisely his affection for a dog he had that cost him his friendship with Valle Inclán. He has written several stories in which he talks about animals. Obviously, this love for animals made him hate the "National Festival" with a passion, which he branded as cruel and bloody, in which people applauded and rejoiced at the death of an animal. J.N.

SPAIN:

A GENERATION CONDEMNED TO OBLIVION

There is a whole generation of intellectuals and thinkers who have been relegated to the past, collected in books under a layer of ice and oblivion, like someone who keeps a bad memory.

Ernesto Giménez Caballero defines it very concisely: "Where are our Dannunzio, Croce, Raina, Gentile, Pirandello, Evola...?. Well, they have simply been... apart."

Yes, apart, we could say segregated by their own and condemned to silence by the System. Because in Spain there is a whole rich series of thinkers against the System, against that kind of "globalist consciousness" that dominates the current intellect, famous during the 1920s and 1930s, only to be confined to forced oblivion after the European defeat of 1945.

Spanish intellectuals were overwhelmingly opposed to the Bourbon monarchy of the last king, Alfonso XIII. The baseness, injustices and simplistic policies he pursued led the entire intellectual community to confront the monarchical system and believe that the Republic was the solution. Rebellious, anarchic and critical, most intellectuals opposed Primo de Rivera's military (and anti-intellectual) dictatorship, which only knew how to repress without building. But they also ended up opposing a Republic that was merely an extension of the system towards massification, which was demagogic and democratic. And so they found themselves turned into "fascists", since fascism is ultimately nothing more than a confrontation with the System, a struggle to build something different from Marxism and democracy.

Like Valle Inclán, "an eminent writer and eccentric citizen", as Primo de Rivera would say, who was appointed by the Republic as National Director of National Heritage and resigned because the socialist deputies were going to hunt pheasants in the gardens of La Granja Real and the minister refused to punish them. The Falange leaders enjoyed widespread sympathy among intellectuals, almost all of whom engaged in dialogue with José Antonio, but the Falange failed to reach out to them and understand their anti-party stance, with the magazine *Haz* (published by the SEU) going so far as to insult the Generation of '98 as "free thinkers, Freemasons, atheists... fools" (26-3-1935).

This is the tragedy of Spain: misunderstood intelligence and wasted nascent fascism. Figures such as Pío Baroja, Unamuno, Ortega, Maeztu, Pemán, Manuel Machado, Ors, etc., were not incorporated into the active struggle for political restoration.

Any bearded man of our day cannot help but include the works of these geniuses among the "fanatical Hitlerites". "The Rebellion of the Masses" is undoubtedly characteristic of the SS in its anti-democratic zeal. And yet, this was the line of thought of the intelligentsia of the 1920s. It was impossible to prevent them from falling into disgrace, forgotten, frozen by the current 'intellectual' consciousness.

Throughout my student life, I have witnessed tributes to Antonio Machado, García Lorca and Miguel Hernández (the only one of the three who was actually a communist), but I have never heard a word about Benavente, Muñoz Seca, Unamuno, Ortega, Maeztu and so many others. Some of the most significant figures of the Generation of '98 are already studied independently in this issue, such as Unamuno, Pío Baroja, and Pemán, but they are not isolated cases; there is a whole line of them.

THREE AGAINST THE MONARCHY ORTEGA Y GASSET

On 10 February 1931, the newspaper *El Sol* published an article signed by Ortega y Gasset, Dr Marañón and Pérez de Ayala, entitled 'Delenda est Monarchia', which intellectually buried the decadent monarchical society.

Ortega y Gasset was born in 1883 and would become perhaps the most important Spanish thinker of the century, along with Unamuno. A promoter of the Republic as an alternative to the monarchy, the inspiration behind the "Association in the Service of the Republic" (to which the founders of the Falange, such as García Valdecasas, would belong and for which they would become members of parliament), he was a member of parliament during the early days of the Republic, only to withdraw from it completely disillusioned. On 8 November 1931, just seven months after his call for the Republic, he also wrote his famous "No es eso, no es eso" ("That's not it, that's not it") in *El Sol* against the democratic and demagogic Republic and against partisanship.

The National Movement catches up with him in Madrid, and he signs a declaration in favour of the Republic along with other intellectuals, a declaration that they will later denounce as having been obtained by force. Those who do not sign it are shot, such as Muñoz Seca and Maeztu. Despite signing the declaration, Ortega has to ask for protection so as not to be shot by Republican militiamen. Ortega manages to go to Paris, citing health reasons. As soon as he arrives in the city, he makes a huge statement against the Republic and declares his unwavering support for the National Movement. In 1937 (when all predictions were still favourable to the Republic), he wrote his "En cuanto al pacifismo" (On Pacifism), in which he denounced communism as the culprit: "While in Madrid the communists and their sympathisers forced writers and professors to sign manifestos, speak on the radio, etc., under the most serious threats, some of the leading English writers, sitting comfortably in their offices and clubs, free from any pressure, signed another manifesto guaranteeing that these communists and their sympathisers were the defenders of freedom." This book and others earned him total ostracism from the "world's intellectuals" from then on. Curiously, he lashed out at Einstein, who had taken sides with the Republic, calling him "ignorant of everything that is happening here or malicious".

Ortega goes through several intellectual stages. First, in his "Meditations on Quixote," he is a classical rationalist, a thinker of principles. With "The Spectator" and "Topics of Our Time," he begins his permanent stage of what we might call "rational-vitalist biologism," a Nietzschean, vital, anti-democratic, and elitist period. The influence of the great thinker Heidegger leads him to sublimate this vitalist tendency in "The Rebellion of the Masses", a manual for anti-democrats. The book "Invertebrate Spain" was taken up by the Falange, dedicated to Maeztu, "with a fraternal embrace".

Just a few sentences will show us the horror that democracy and proletarian Marxism caused Ortega:

"... Democracy in religion, or in art, democracy in thought and taste, democracy in the heart and in customs, is the most dangerous disease that a society can suffer" (*El Espectador*). "Journalists, teachers and untalented politicians make up the general staff of envy. What we today call 'public opinion' is in part nothing more than the purulent secretion of those resentful souls" (*El Espectador*). "Today we are witnessing the triumph of a hyper-democracy in which the masses act directly without law, through pressure, imposing their aspirations and tastes" (*The Rebellion of the Masses*).

Ortega defines himself by a government of the best (a typically fascist idea): "The mission of the masses is none other than to follow the best" (*España Invertebrada*).

"The select man is not the petulant one who believes himself superior to others, but the one who demands more of himself than others." (*The Rebellion of the Masses*).

He was totally opposed to internationalism, to the universal, opposing the idea of nation and identity: "The mass man is the man previously emptied of his own

history, without the entrails of the past, and therefore docile to the disciplines called international. More than a man, he is a shell of a man." (The Rebellion of the Masses).

"This habit of talking about humanity is the most sublime, and therefore the most despicable, form of democracy." (The Rebellion of the Masses).

He accuses communism of being the most perfected form of democracy, of the masses, of anti-personality: "The characteristic of the moment is that the vulgar soul, knowing itself to be vulgar, has the audacity to assert the right to vulgarity and imposes it"; the communist state is, for Ortega, the means of imposing this vulgarisation.

Ortega also committed the "sin" of being racist: "There is no other means of ethnic purification and improvement than the eternal instrument of a will operating selectively" (Invertebrate Spain), which is a blatant call for eugenics. "Political improvements are not enough; more profound work is essential to refine the race."

Like Unamuno, Ortega opposed pacifism as an idea, although he was an enemy of all gratuitous violence. "I am sorry to disagree with contemporary pacifism in its antipathy towards force; without it, there would have been nothing of what matters most to us in the past, and if we exclude it from the future, we can only imagine a chaotic humanity" ("España invertebrada" [Invertebrate Spain]). "For a century, Europe has suffered from pernicious propaganda discrediting force."

On the social problem, Ortega opposes class division: "There is no division into social classes, but into classes of men", mass men and individuals.

With fascism, he indicates that the problem is not economics but ethics. "Faced with industrial ethics, for the ethics of the warrior" ("España invertebrada"), it is in reality a denunciation of materialism in today's world.

"We cannot separate the labour issue from the national issue" is a phrase that would lead to National Socialism, and one that Ortega uttered in "España invertebrada" (Invertebrate Spain). Ortega was enamoured with the nation, and his concept of the Nation as a "project suggesting life in common" was fully adopted by the Falange. As Mainer says in his book *Falange y Literatura* (Falange and Literature), the Falange's greatest ideological debts are to Ortega. We could say that the Falange took Ortega's assertions to their ultimate political consequences. Because Ortega's great sin is, in the words of Giménez Caballero, the following: "Ortega is terrified of the consequences of his denunciations."

José Antonio initially had personal problems with Ortega due to Ortega's criticism of his father, General Primo de Rivera. Much later, in Haz, he wrote the famous "Homage and Reproach to Ortega", in which he praises his ideas and reproaches him precisely for not continuing the struggle, for not being consistent, for not confronting the system definitively.

In "The Dynamics of Time," Ortega points out the financial nature of the Jew. "Today, the Jews possess money and are the masters of the world, just as they possessed it in the Middle Ages and were the scum of the earth."

GREGORIO MARAÑÓN

Another of the three signatories of the declaration against the monarchy was Dr Gregorio Marañón, a writer famous for his psychological studies of historical figures who was persecuted by Primo de Rivera. The war caught him in Madrid and, like Ortega, he had to sign a declaration in favour of the Republic. Like Ortega (the similarity is striking), he managed to get to Paris and as soon as he arrived he denounced his declaration. In 1937, he wrote in the *Revue de Paris*: "Even if there were not a single soldier or Soviet rifle on the red side

, it would be the same. Red Spain is spiritually communist. On the Nationalist side, even if there were millions of Italians or Germans, the spirit would be infinitely Spanish, more Spanish than ever." And in 1938, he wrote "Liberalism and Communism," in which he denounced Marxist and capitalist materialism and officially declared his support for Franco. This earned him eternal silence, as it did Ortega.

Marañón, with his historical studies, came to promote (like Menéndez Pelayo and Menéndez Pidal) the identification of the spirit with the Race itself, truth in permanence. In his book "Los españoles fuera de España" (Spaniards outside Spain), Marañón strongly denounces the role of Jews as enemies of our people. We can imagine what public opinion today would say in response to his denunciations, when he claims that the expulsion of the Jews in 1492 was justified, that the Jews have been permanent enemies of Spain, that Mendizábal and his famous confiscation of church property was directed by Israeli bankers in France, etc. Marañón returned to Spain after the war and died in 1960.

PEREZ DE AYALA

The third signatory of the "Delenda est Monarchia" declaration was Pérez de Ayala. From London, he always supported the National Movement and the Falange. In The Times, he wrote: "From the beginning of the National Movement, I have explicitly approved it and sent my support, as unwavering as it is unfailing, to General Franco. I am proud to have my two sons at the front as simple soldiers." All this also earned him silence.

The three men of the republic, the three intellectuals who encouraged it, who gave it confidence, all three went over lock, stock and barrel to the absolute disillusionment of democracy, and found their roots in their own feelings, in the vitality of Spanishness.

THREE MARTYRS

The unfortunate case of García Lorca is well known. After being sheltered in the home of Falangist Rosales, he was murdered by civil guards. But perhaps it should be noted that for Ramiro de Maeztu, Muñoz Seca, and Víctor Pradera, there were no communists to protect them in their homes from the murderers, from the courts of the government itself.

RAMIRO DE MAEZTU

Ramiro de Maeztu was born in Vitoria in 1875 and began his career as a passionate and anti-clerical Nietzschean anarchist.

In 1911, he followed Croce and his thinking, like Sorel. In 1919, after writing Crisis of Humanism, a series of articles with a common theme, he decided on his permanent line within a combative traditionalism.

He repudiated his previous books, particularly "Towards Another Spain", and became a lifelong Catholic Hispanist. A man of '98, he was a friend of Ortega, Unamuno, Baroja, etc. In 1931, he formed Acción Española, based on unitarian and Catholic traditionalism. We could now call him an integrist, but one of a cultural, intellectual, combative, anti-reactionary kind.

He totally criticised democracy and the subversion of Marxist values. In 1934, he wrote the seminal book that would lead to his assassination, Defensa de la Hispanidad (Defence of Hispanicity), a controversial and

famous, which led him to be considered a "pariah" by the press of the time. Eugenio Montes, who praised "Defence of Humanity", received this letter from Maeztu: "Do not do it again, do not quote me, do not mention me. You are very young and you do not have the right to be silenced as I am. I am a leper."

Maeztu's thinking establishes the primacy of "values" over the contingent. Primacy lies in values and principles, as opposed to liberal and democratic relativism.

He began writing "Defensa del Espíritu" (Defence of the Spirit), of which he only managed to finish the first draft in prison before his assassination. "In the face of liberalism, which atomises man, and Marxism, which robs him of his soul, rediscover the dignity of man, the family and the nation, endowed with all the rights that their duties demand and with no other right than to fulfil their duty."

A Thomist renovator and follower of Kantian logic, he was in Madrid when the civil war began. Arrested solely for his ideas, he was murdered along with so many others in Aravaca (Madrid), uttering those famous words: "You do not know why you are killing me, but I know why I am dying."

Maeztu denounced the machinations of Judaism and Freemasonry, as in the article "Are Jews Jews?", in which he denounces the Jewish tactic of infiltration: "For Jews to prosper further, people must be persuaded that they are not Jews and that calling them Jews is an abominable crime."

VÍCTOR PRADERA

Víctor Pradera Larrumbe was born in 1872 in Pamplona to a Carlist family. He studied engineering and law, but soon turned to philosophy and principles. A staunch traditionalist, he confronted the corrupt monarchical society: "Revolution is absolutely essential," he wrote. He was a member of parliament in 1889, 1901 and 1918, but, completely disillusioned with the democratic system, which he always criticised, he withdrew from parliamentary life, not returning until 1933, in view of the chaotic state of affairs and the danger to the nation. He rejected several ministerial portfolios offered by Maura. He supported José Antonio in founding the Falange and wrote "Falange y carlismo" (Falange and Carlism), in which he expounds on the similarity of their foundations. This work would later become the core of Franco's unitarian policy and doctrine between the two doctrines.

His best-known book is *El Estado Nuevo* (The New State), a work of utopian idealism based on a return to the idea of UNITY (a fundamental idea in Pradera's philosophy), unity of country, God and politics, a unity on which the policy of the Catholic Monarchs was based and which was Víctor Pradera's ideal in his attempt to achieve total unity, not only of territories but also of ideas. Captured in San Sebastián at the start of the war, he was murdered for no reason other than his ideas.

MUÑOZ SECA

One of the most brilliant Spanish humorists at the start of the Civil War was Muñoz Seca, born in Puerto Santa María in 1831. With his crazy, critical, ironic humour, he was an affable and sweet person.

His work "La venganza de don Mendo" (The Revenge of Don Mendo) is world-famous and contains a profound moral lesson within its humour. A humorist in his works and in his life, he pretended to be illiterate in the military just for fun. He wrote a brutal work against the rabble, against the low, against the demagoguery of the class unions, against (above all) the barbarism of

illiterate anarchism; his famous "LAOCA" (Anarchist League of Tired and Bored Workers) earned him the hatred of the gunmen and drunks who ran the Marxist and anarchist unions. Arrested for writing this work, he was murdered without trial or consideration. Before he died, he uttered those famous words, a testament to his sensitivity: "You can take my life, but not my fear."

Humour on the national front was mainly represented by the magazine "La Ametralladora" (Machine Gun, a name taken from another similar magazine in fascist Italy), edited by Miguel Mihura, Edgar Neville and Alvaro de la Iglesia (who later joined the Blue Division and went on to found "La Codorniz"). Based on the humour of Ramón Giménez de la Serna, an Ortega supporter and also a nationalist who lived in Buenos Aires, it fought both Marxism and the bourgeois system. Neville said of it: "It was about crushing a bourgeois and false civilisation that had been limping along for a century of kitsch." "La Ametralladora" was read by all the nationalist and Falangist forces.

FOUR GENIUSES WITH THE NACIONALES

JACINTO BENAVENTE

The most prestigious men of Spanish intellectualism of their time supported the national ideology, with the exception of the three great poets: García Lorca, Juan Ramón Jiménez, and Antonio Machado.

Perhaps the most famous Spanish writer of the time was Jacinto Benavente, winner of the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1922, an unrivalled playwright who, like the others, has been forgotten by our youth because of his nationalist affiliation.

The war caught him in Madrid, where he reluctantly pretended to be a Republican, although he did not collaborate in any way. He was imprisoned in Valencia after passing through various police stations where his life was in danger. He was detained with Muñoz Seca, whom Benavente admired, and whose murder enraged him greatly against Marxism: "They did not forgive Seca for his mockery, like all his other mockery, which was without malice or hatred, but rather a healthy warning. Seca was murdered by barbarism in collusion with envy. Pedro Muñoz Seca:

Present!" wrote Benavente in his prologue to the edition of "La Venganza de don Mendo" (The Revenge of Don Mendo).

Remaining completely silent during the war, when the Nationalists entered Valencia he launched harsh attacks against democracy and Marxism. He presided over the Victory parade of Franco's troops in Valencia.

He was always a defender of the spirit of 18 July and denounced Marxist tactics of "rapprochement": "Nothing is more generous than forgiving, but never forgetting!".

In 1950, he wrote a strongly worded article in *La Vanguardia* against Freemasonry and the boycott that was already beginning against non-Marxist writers. Anti-democratic and anti-Marxist, he wrote in his Memoirs:

"The love of the Jews for their people only translates into hatred for other peoples of the earth; hatred disguised as love for an idea, which is the most abstract thing that can be loved and in the name of which the destruction of everything that exists is preached. Humanity included. Wherever you see ruins and devastation, you can be sure that the Jew has been there."

In his work "The Joyful and Confident City", he denounces bourgeois pacifism. "Public tranquillity is the best narcotic for disposing of the city's treasure without anyone feeling any pain": he attacks subversion, disarmament in the face of the enemy, pacifism.

He denied that wars were caused solely by economic rivalries and affirmed the role of race: "The true causes of all war, which only over time

They perceive it as if from far away, as if from high above: the providential design, the dominance of one people over another, of one race over the others. For all his writings, he was condemned to oblivion.

AZORÍN

José Martínez Ruiz, "Azorín", was, like Maeztu, anarchic in his youth, only to quickly end up embracing a vitalist traditionalism. A great lover of Castile and its traditional spirit, he spent the war in Paris, later returning to Madrid with Franco, whom he supported unreservedly. He collaborated with the most radical Falangist currents, such as in the magazine "Legiones y Falanges", published by the Falange in Mussolini's Rome. "The State is a totalitarian instrument at the service of the integrity of the Fatherland," he wrote.

MANUEL MACHADO

Manuel Machado, a Sevillian and sublime poet, is one of the clearest cases of premeditated oblivion. His brother Antonio, a staunch Republican, is the subject of tributes and remembrances, while nothing is said about Manuel Machado, whose poetry Unamuno said was a must-read. He was a Falangist at heart from the beginning, collaborated in all the cultural activities of the new regime, dedicated a wonderful poem to José Antonio... and paid for it all with oblivion.

D'ORS and JOSEP PLA

Eugenio D'Ors, "Xenius". Although the *Reneixença* had already ended in Catalonia by the 1930s, and all its great men had already died, there were still two great figures of Catalan literature: Josep Pla and Eugenio D'Ors. Although they were completely opposite in character, both were opposed to Marxism and capitalist materialism. Pla, a reserved and sensitive man, a prolific and descriptive writer, was never a lover of politics, which is why he never actively participated in public life. However, he did actively contribute to the magazine that Ignacio Agustí (another Catalan Falangist, who dedicated several poems and works to José Antonio and wrote various historical novels about the Crusade) founded in 1937 in Burgos to bring together all Catalans who opposed the Republic.

Eugenio D'Ors was a fanatical Franco supporter who fought alongside the traditionalists and Falangists from the outset. His youth (a constant feature of his entire generation) was spent in open conflict with the right-wing bourgeoisie, which he fought against in the magazine *El poble catalá*. Quickly disillusioned with Marxism, he, like others, took a traditionalist path in the sense of militancy against the transmutation of values towards materialism implied by capitalism and Marxism.

A Catholic in his "Glossary", he became an Academician in 1927. He soon became involved with the newly created Falange. The war caught him outside Spain, but he immediately returned to the Nationalist Zone in 1937 and, in the Church of San Andrés, "kept vigil over the weapons of the Falangist cavalry".

The "New Glossary" appeared in the Pamplona newspaper "Arriba España", and he was appointed National Head of Fine Arts, inspirer of the "Instituto de España" in the midst of the civil war and, with Pemán, one of the leaders of intellectual life in Nationalist Spain.

MENENDEZ PIDAL

The historian Ramón Menéndez Pidal, successor to the unforgettable Hispanist Menéndez Pelayo, did not express his political views, although his traditionalist thinking was well known. A philosopher and traveller, as well as a historian, he was liberal in his early days, before turning decisively towards traditionalism and the Catholic and imperial conception of Spain. Caught in Madrid, he signed (like Ortega y Marañón) the declaration in favour of the Republic. He managed to leave for Argentina and once there, like the others, he recanted and denounced this signature as having been obtained under threat of being shot. He returned to Franco's Spain and became Director of the Royal Spanish Academy.

In "La España del Cid" (The Spain of El Cid), he expresses himself as follows: "The life of El Cid has, as could not be otherwise, a special Spanish opportunity now... Against this current weakness of the collective spirit, all the historical memories that brought us closer to the essence of the people to whom we belong could serve as a reaction."

COMMITTED INTELLECTUALS

Several of the best thinkers and artists not only declared themselves supporters of the National Movement, but also formed part of its Falangist policy.

Ernesto Giménez Caballero is undoubtedly the most famous of the Falangist intellectuals. Born in 1899, he began by fighting the bourgeoisie and the dictatorship of Primo de Rivera, who persecuted him for his "Moroccan Notes of a Soldier".

He founded *Estafeta Literaria*, a formidable magazine that rebelled against the system and was anti-conformist, as Giménez Caballero always was. He joined Ramiro de Ledesma's JONS and in 1932 wrote his main work:

"Genio de España" (Genius of Spain), a mystical work of love for his country and the empire. "Be Catholic and imperial!" Spain is an empire, not only of lands, but also of ideas, ideals and spirit.

The war caught him in Madrid, and he had to flee to the Nationalist zone, where he became a provisional second lieutenant.

He is one of the very few intellectuals who still stands firm, fighting and defending the same principles that have always been part of his thinking. He has suffered betrayal from everyone and abandonment and mockery from those who changed sides. But he continues to stand up against "the genius of GOLD, the god of money, of capitalism, of banking, that God who allied himself with the God of Israel for his financial policy in the world".

Agustín de Foxa, Catalan diplomat, fine poet and playwright. A regular at the "La Ballena Alegre" literary salon, attended by Ridruejo, José Antonio and Quadra Salcedo, he was a Falangist from day one.

He edited Madrid de corte a Checa against Marxism and contributed to all the national magazines, such as *Vértice*. He founded *Legiones y Falanges* in Roda, where writers such as Azorín, Cela, Eugenio Montes, A. Marquerie, etc. contributed.

Victor de la Serna, son of the writer Concha Espina and a writer like her, joined the Falange from its foundation.

He was a National Socialist and a great admirer of Adolf Hitler, to whom, upon his death on 2 May 1945, he dedicated his farewell in *Informaciones*: "A huge 'Present!' spreads across Europe for Adolf Hitler, son of the Catholic Church, who died in defence of Christianity."

Eugenio Montes, poet, sensitive and exquisite man, a perfect speaker and scholar of language. In love with our language and literature, he lived for many years as a champion of

our eloquent speech from his residence in Italy. As a young man, he was active in Catholic Action, a friend of Maeztu, and joined the Falange. A friend of José Antonio, he dedicated a fine poem to him upon his death. "The collapse of democracy, which is no longer popular, the collapse of liberalism in the face of the clamorous demand for commandments and dogmas."

García Valdecasas: Member of Parliament for Ortega's "Association in the Service of the Republic", he joined the Falange when it was founded. Director of the FET's "Institute of Political Studies", he supported the totalitarian and racist tendencies of Pareto, Sombart and Carl Schmitt in his magazine.

An exceptional writer: Wenceslao Fernández Flores. As a prominent figure among the writers of this cursed generation, we cannot overlook the humorist and novelist Fernández Flores, a Galician, a tender and sentimental man despite being a humorist. His humour was sarcastic and ironic, sad at heart, as in his "Tragedies of Ordinary Life".

Politically, he became famous for his columns in ABC, under the title "Impresiones de un hombre de buena fe" (Impressions of a man of good faith), in which he offered fierce and incisive criticism of democracy and parliamentarianism, both on the right and on the left. He earned the hatred of the entire professional political class and the appreciation of the man in the street, becoming tremendously popular.

In 1936, the war caught him in Madrid, and certain that he would be killed if he fell into the hands of the Republic, he took refuge in an embassy. From this odyssey, from the first days in hiding, from the "walks" and the Checas, from the Marxist rabble and bourgeois cowardice, he wrote a great work, unknown like the others, "An Island in the Red Sea".

He was later exchanged and thus passed to the Nationalist zone, where he fought against Marxism and capitalism until his death in 1964.

Some of his quotes give us an idea of the sarcastic humour that characterised him:

Contrary to what its name suggests, Parliament was not created for the purpose of speaking. In Parliament, only a select few gentlemen—the group leaders—speak, and even they never settle disputes in the chamber, but rather in private meetings at their homes or in the offices of the president or ministers.

In public, they are only allowed to utter vague phrases such as: 'We serve the interests of the country'. 'We must maintain a patriotic silence'. 'Ah, gentlemen!' 'Our proven love for democratic principles', etc. Then there is a crowd of MPs and senators who cannot even say that.

They are only allowed to spread rumours. When a group leader utters any of the phrases we have mentioned, they go: "Oooh! Uuuh!" ("Impressions of a man of good faith").

"For some years now, our leaders, both on the right and on the left (because it is well known that only their names differ), when they need money for any national need, decide: - We'll get it from the theatres.

With very few exceptions, our politicians are people of inferior intelligence and zero artistic sensibility" ("Impressions of a Man of Good Faith").

MANY OTHER NAMES

Not only the geniuses we have mentioned form a generation of intellectuals; there are many more, both minor and major, who make up an entire "intelligentsia". We could mention Julio Camba and his work "Madridgrado"; the prose writer Ricardo León, with "Cristo

en los infiernos"; Cossio, participant in the Falangist literary circle "Musa Musae", together with all the intellectuals of the Falange;

Alvaro Cunqueiro, who dedicated a delicate poem to José Antonio, a contributor to the Falange magazine "Vértice" in 1937 and who, in his book "Relatos de guerra" (War Stories), writes: "In times to come, this war in Spain will be spoken of as a cavalcade of fever and fire, the immortal victory of a spirit against all the capitulations, horrors and death of our century."

Poets for José Antonio, such as Gerardo Diego and Lain Entralgo, the traditionalist Luca de Tena, a unique novelist, or Pombo Angulo who, during his stay in National Socialist Germany, wrote in "Germany and I": "Germany fights. With courage, with fortitude. Only those who live there can know what conditions are like. Rationing is harsh, clothing is scarce, blood is plentiful. Germany is honourable in its sacrifice, giving more than anyone else and fighting completely, totally, against its enemies and against its scarcity."

Men such as Eduardo Marquina, an illustrious Catalan playwright who deserves to be considered one of the best and comparable to our great classics, as in "En Flandes ya se ha puesto el Sol" (The Sun Has Set in Flanders) or "La hijas del Cid" (The Daughters of El Cid); works in which he highlights Spanish and Castilian honour and spiritual virtues in the face of materialism.

0 Jardiel Poncela, in his extraordinary book "La Tournée de Dios" (God's Tour), offers an excellent critique of the modern world: "If there is a people on earth today who are tyrants over others, that people is you. You have all the money and influence possible. As owners of large companies, you wield the sceptre of finance and rule the world. You are the driving force behind power, the barometer of wealth and the balance of activity. You have all that; you are all that... and yet it seems little to you. Humans give you their pockets and you still want them to give you their hearts... Arbiters of capital and power, you still covet the arbitration of sentiment..."

Almost all of them have been forgotten, or rather buried in a paid silence, a conspiracy of those who direct modern intelligence, who do not like the classics and those who speak without a gag.

Only a few, those who sold themselves in their old age for money and fame, were able to enjoy some popularity. Ridruejo, for example, who after being a divisional commander and Falangist, switched to a social democracy more in keeping with the times. Or Camilo José Cela, who forgot his early Falangist contacts to switch to obscene pornographic literature or the absurdity of his "Oficio de Tinieblas" (Office of Darkness), and who is perhaps one of the examples of how, by changing with the wind, one can achieve fame and "honour".

A forgotten generation, stuck in textbooks because today's "modern" society cannot bear their nobility. Their light hurts those who live in the darkness of the brothel. R.B.

RAMIRO DE LEDESMA
Y GIMENEZ CABALLERO

It seems paradoxical that Spanish authors who can be classified within what we have come to call "another Europe" are hardly known by the militants who also claim to belong to this trend. Even more paradoxical is that some are even better known outside our borders than within them. And it is even more so when we consider that the last forty years have seen the rule of a

regime that claimed to be nationalist and anti-communist and in whose early years there were even revolutionary "whims".

Can we really talk about nationalist and revolutionary authors in Spain in the 1930s and post-war period? Undoubtedly yes. But it takes painstaking research, sometimes arduous, to discover them. Little or practically nothing has been published about them today, and very few texts devote a few pages to analysing the content of their works; however, these hasty and obviously incomplete notes are the best proof that, behind this wave of oblivion and generalised ignorance, the vanguard of nationalist and revolutionary Europe also saw the light of day in Spain.

In the 1930s and the post-war period, to speak of revolutionary nationalism in Spain was to speak of the Spanish Falange. Clearly, the two phenomena were inextricably linked, as demonstrated by the march of the volunteers of the Blue Division to fight "side by side against the common enemy". On an ideological level, National Syndicalism, the ideology of the Falangist movement, had the same components as other European fascist movements: neo-Maurrassian nationalism, Sorelian-inspired syndicalism (socialism in other latitudes), a philosophy of history inspired by Spengler, a Nietzschean philosophy of life (albeit watered down by the traditional Spanish Catholicism of the time), and a vitalist and revolutionary view of life inspired by Ortega y Gasset and the events of 1898. This is, initially, very dense to assimilate; let us therefore dilute it.

RAMIRO DE LEDESMA RAMOS

Among the founders of National-Syndicalism as an ideological movement, Ramiro Ledesma Ramos stands out above all others. Although his figure was overshadowed by the appeal and mythification of José Antonio, in terms of ideology and even political analysis, he was far superior to the "founder." Ramiro Ledesma had an exceptionally solid intellectual background; he did not limit himself to completing and pursuing a career, but devoted much of his life to study and research. Well versed in traditional and modern European philosophy, he had published countless essays on philosophers as diverse as Bertrand Russell, G.V. Vico, Hegel, Ortega, Keiselring, Dütthey and many others. Ramiro's novel *El sello de la muerte* (The Seal of Death), published in 1924, is comparable to *Fuego Fatuo* (Will-o'-the-Wisp), and we can find in it features very similar to *Drieu la Rochelle*. In this novel, Ledesma defines himself in the following way in the words of the protagonist: "Mine was a fiery temperament, not given to mystical vulgarity and very fond of the virile intellectuality of man, a mind open to all forms of stoicism and averse to sensitive moods, a free spirit, irreligious and a lover of noble impulses; fond of the clarity of all Darwinian and Nietzschean ideology." Around the same time, he devoted a study to Nietzsche (later included in the collection "Escritos Filosóficos de Ramiro Ledesma" [Philosophical Writings of Ramiro Ledesma]), in which he defines him as a philosopher who "by his very nature as an arbitrary and brilliant thinker, was condemned to live in semi-darkness" and even compares him to Unamuno in their common devastating aspect. José Antonio, however, had no direct knowledge of Nietzsche other than through Ortega.

Spengler had found an echo in Spain, not only among the National-Syndicalists, but also earlier among the group surrounding Ramiro de Maeztu, who had adopted positions very similar to those of the German historian. One need only replace the term

"Prussianism", so common in Spengler's work, with Maetzku's "aristocratic sense", and we find ourselves in the same place. As in the previous case, Spengler penetrated Spain through Ortega, some of whose theses he took up in *The Rebellion of the Masses*, translating them into Spanish coordinates. Even the definition of Nation ("an entity of destiny in the universal") is nothing more than a transposition of Spengler's concept, filtered by Ortega y Gasset in one of his political lectures. The same can be said of José Antonio's concept of "person": "One is not a person unless one is ANOTHER; that is, one in relation to others, a possible creditor or debtor with respect to others, the holder of positions that are not those of others". The ascetic and mystical definition of the National-Syndicalist prototype as "half monk, half soldier" can be considered to be taken from "Prussianism and Socialism". And finally, as a curious piece of information demonstrating the founder of the Spanish Falange's knowledge of Spengler's work, we should mention the letter sent generically "to the military of Spain" a few days before the uprising: "And it has always been so, the last resort is the resort to arms. At the last minute," said Spengler, "it has always been a platoon of soldiers that has saved civilisation."

The third philosopher who had a decisive influence on the National-Syndicalist movement was

Ortega y Gasset, and we must specifically limit ourselves to two titles in particular: "*La España invertebrada*" (The Spine-less Spain) and "*La Rebelión de las masas*" (The Rebellion of the Masses). Some of Ortega's choices are, in our view, more than debatable. "Liberalism and nationalisation" is Ortega's motto. "By liberalism we can understand nothing other than that radical emotion, always alive in history, which tends to exclude from the state any influence that is not purely human and always expects, in every order, new social forms, greater good than the legacies of the past" ("Old and New Politics"), or see this other excerpt: "Every European today knows, with a certainty much more rigorous than that of all his expressed 'ideas' and 'opinions', that the European man of today must be liberal"... Opinions that to a certain extent can be described as "subversive", the first sentence could suggest a certain Ortega-style "progressivism" (in the historical sense, of course), while the second suggests the recognition of a fact – debatable, moreover – and a rather un-European resignation. In our view, it is precisely in the ambivalence of Ortega's thinking that we must seek part of the excesses of the Falangist movement in the post-war period, which have continued to the present day, in some cases to the point of absurdity. Ortega has two sides: one liberal and the other nationalist, aristocratic and liberating (not liberal).

The second word in Ortega's paradigm, "nationalism", is much more appealing to us. It refers to a project of freedom for Spain: "Nationalism implies the desire for one nation to rule over others, which presupposes, at the very least, that that nation is alive. But we are not alive! Our aim is very different: we, as stated in our society's prospectus, would be as ashamed of wanting a dominant Spain as we would be of not wanting a healthy Spain, nothing more than a Spain that is structured and standing tall." In his "Epilogue for Englishmen" in "*The Rebellion*", Ortega takes a qualitative leap in his "nationalism": for him, Europe is the new national dimension. He says: "Instead of thinking of the European nations as a series of separate societies, let us imagine a single society – Europe – within which groups or nuclei of more intense condensation have been produced".

National-syndicalism inherited from Ortega and the Generation of '98 their concern for Spain, the critical patriotism spoken of by José Antonio and, before him, Ganivet, their "pain for Spain", their "social desire" (the transformation of the masses into a people), and their interpretation of Spain's "lack of backbone". Apart from Ortega, Spengler and

Nietzsche, few other philosophers influenced National-Syndicalism. Some have mentioned Carlyle, Kant, or Fichte, but we can only say that these are coincidences that could very well have been "accidental." The influence of Hegel, on the other hand, is evident in the early manifestos of the *Conquista del Estado* and the *JONS*, which insist, even obsessively, on what we have no hesitation in describing as "statolatry", much more radical than that of Italian fascism.

But how did this influence translate into the national-syndicalist intelligentsia? The cultural reality of national-syndicalism was, in truth, very poor.

It did not generate a mass political-cultural movement; it was always exclusive to exceptionally diverse elites with no clear common ground between them. The lack of this "intellectual class" was perhaps one of the factors that made it incredibly easy for the Falangists to be ousted from power by men without nerve, temperament or ideology, by the technocrats. Under Franco, the Falangist movement was thus confined to youth circles that were systematically undermined by those in power; first the SEU fell, and the Falange Youth did not resist for long. But it would be a historical injustice not to recognise that the ranks of the Falange Youth forged an ardent and combative spirit, militant and selfless, a desire for service and sacrifice, a style and camaraderie far removed from any purely scouting movement... If, over the years, many of these young people were demobilised, distanced themselves from National-Syndicalism and even took sides with the Marxist revolution, this was undoubtedly because they were confronted with the immense disappointment of a 'National-Syndicalist' regime, a breeding ground for American imperialism, the most dehumanised technocracy and the most irresponsible obscurantism.

Returning to the subject, we cannot help but wonder why the cultural movement

National-syndicalism failed to break out of the ghetto and became an extremely elitist movement, detached from the experiences of the common people in some cases, or, in others, focused on the people but unable to interpret their desires (see, for example, the "imperial literature" or "cardboard celluloid" of the post-war period...). From the beginning, and until its final exhaustion, the National-Syndicalist cultural movement was the exclusive heritage of the narrow circle of readers of a myriad of magazines with small print runs and limited distribution, which were always in deficit and very rarely found approval in official circles (this after 1 April 1939).

GIMENEZ CABALLERO

We must seek the origins of the national-syndicalist cultural movement in a man who was closely linked to the name of a magazine of which he was the soul: Giménez Caballero and "*La Gaceta Literaria*". Giménez Caballero is one of the most curious, fascinating and colourful Spanish intellectuals. He could be compared to Marinetti, and his degree of exaltation is certainly similar to that of the Futurist author. So too is his excessive eagerness to be at the forefront of the most avant-garde literary experiences of the moment. His name began to be heard in parallel with the emergence of Surrealism in Spain. He was the first in many things: the first surrealist with his novel *Yo, inspector de alcantarillas* (I, Inspector of Sewers), the first national-imperialist with *Círculo Imperial* (Imperial Circuit) and, of course, it could not be otherwise, also the first Spanish fascist, as he continues to be labelled today in any manual of Spanish literature of the present century. Like many revolutionary fascists, Giménez Caballero did not feel a visceral hatred for communism; in fact, he collaborated with it on several occasions, and it was only during the war that he showed signs of primary anti-communist tendencies, the result of

surely dramatic circumstances (such as that famous speech after the liberation of Madrid). It was precisely several communists (very *sui generis*, it is true) who would collaborate in "La Gaceta Literaria". In "Genius of Spain," Giménez Caballero recalled that "La Gaceta" "had given birth to the two spiritual youths that would shape the future of Spain: the communists and the fascists." Among the contributors to the magazine were such disparate names as Buñuel (already a communist at the time) and Ramiro Ledesma (also a convicted and confessed fascist at the time), along with Sebastian Gasch, Antonio Espina, Guillermo de la Torre and many others from diverse backgrounds who were physically and morally distanced by the post-war diaspora. We can compare La Gaceta to the French *Je suis partout*, to any of the many magazines of the German "conservative-revolutionaries" or to the many literary magazines that flourished during the "ventennio". Their characteristics were always the same: praise of youth, vitalist and aggressive nationalism (Spanish nationalism), intellectual terrorism and dialectical violence, corrosive criticism.

La Gaceta Literaria took its first steps in 1927 and would die around 1932, when the political leanings of the editors made "peaceful coexistence" impossible, especially as the political climate was rapidly becoming more radicalised, leading to civil war. Meanwhile, Giménez Caballero, with his paradoxical and sometimes incongruous reasoning, continued to ponder the causes that led him to fascism, and could hardly avoid a certain frivolity when he wrote in 1929: "When the fascist phenomenon arose in my consciousness, after my deep appreciation of Rome, I found myself lost. I had to admit it UNCRITICALLY (irrationalism, n.d.a.) as a family mandate, as an imperious call to obedience. His black shirt, the black of the imperial eagle, the black of the medieval clergyman and the black of the Renaissance doublet. It was ecumenical black, Catholic black, expansive black, intervening in incipient cultures, poor but original. Opposite the Nordic blond. Opposite the Asian red.

Like Italian fascism, the nascent Spanish fascism sought inspiration in the African wars to find sources of excitement and exaltation. Of course, Spain had little to be proud of in the disastrous war in Morocco (Anual and Abdelkrim were tragic names for Spaniards, which marked the entire first quarter of the century; only later would La Legión, Alhucemas, etc. contribute to creating a more favourable climate of patriotic exaltation). Giménez Caballero, naturally, could not remain indifferent to this issue. Another Catalan writer, later an early Falangist who still maintains an unwavering loyalty to his Falangist principles, Luis Santamarina, followed the same path. Thus, while Caballero wrote his "Notas marruecas de un soldado" (Moroccan Notes of a Soldier) (he had served as a regular soldier in the Rif), which was philosophical, exalted and critical in nature, the latter published "Tras el águila de César" (Behind Caesar's Eagle), a title that was already grandiose in itself, inspired by his experiences as a volunteer soldier in the Legion. The latter deserves special mention, as it contains all the features of Spanish and European fascist literature, with its aggressive and avant-garde expressiveness without limits. See this excerpt by way of illustration "How beautiful you are, dove! On the day that reason governs the actions of men, the Tercio will carry naked women instead of silk flags, their hair floating in the wind, and then everyone, unanimously, will follow their banner, that of the favourites of victory... Besides, you are as light as a rose; I could carry you for days and days without tiring... What is your name? Dolores? What a sad name! I am going to change it... From today you will be called Leda, for you will be loved by an eagle rather than a swan... I baptise you in My name, Amen."

These early dalliances ended in 1931, when the African wars were already a distant memory and when Ramiro Ledesma and a group of activists decided to launch the first

a truly fascist political organisation in Spain, "La conquista del Estado" (The Conquest of the State). Its first issue appeared on 14 March 1931. Eight months later, around the core group of editors, the J.O.N.S. was formed. In its pages, *La conquista del Estado* published articles by Malaparte and texts by Hitler, reviews of the first doctrinal books on fascism and National Socialism and, above all, as the issues progressed, we can see how an ideology—National Syndicalism—slowly took shape. The experience of *La Conquista*, *Falange Española* (which for a time included the J.O.N.S.) was followed by the magazine *JONS* and the weekly *FE*, in which—especially in the former—the process of ideological consolidation that the war and the persecution by the Popular Front had nipped in the bud continued. Among the contributors to *FE*, we find Victor d'Ors, son of Eugenio d'Ors, Samuel Ros, author of humorous novels, and the ineffable Giménez Caballero, publishing articles on classical Rome, which drew a response from some students who claimed that the tone of "FE" was not combative enough and that it was not worth risking one's life to sell a magazine that talked about Plato and the ruins of Rome. José Antonio responded to this letter with his famous note addressed "To a student who complains that FE is not tough enough", in which he laid the foundations for the Falangist style. *FE* was followed by *Arriba*, which took the same tone from 21 March 1935 onwards. Rafael Sánchez Mazas was in charge of the "Consignas y normas de estilo" (Slogans and style guidelines) section, José Antonio was personally responsible for the "Crónica Política Nacional" (National Political Chronicle), while Giménez de Sandoval (José Antonio's passionate biographer) was in charge of international politics.

However, apart from the magazines, the intellectual groups that surrounded Giménez Caballero, José Antonio's friends tempted by literary intervention and young university students who were followers of the Ninety-Eight thesis. Among the various typical gatherings that reflected this current of sympathy, one that stood out was the one that took place at the "La Ballena Alegre" venue, which was usually attended by Mourlane Michelarena, Ridruejo, Agustín de Foxá, Quadra Salcedo, the painters Cabanas and Ponce de León, the essayists Eugenio Montes and Sánchez Mazas, the novelists Samuel Ros and the prolific Zunzunegui, journalists such as Víctor de la Serna, and the composer of "Cara al Sol", maestro Tellería. These very frequent gatherings were followed by the so-called "Cenas de Carlomagno" (Charlemagne Dinners), held at the Hotel París in Madrid. The diners, dressed in formal attire, did not hesitate to consume medieval delicacies by the light of three candelabra and a fire in the fireplace, impassive in the face of the chaos that Spain was experiencing at the time. It was a form of protest against the revolts that were ravaging Spain, and particularly Madrid at that time, a way of reviving a mythical and legendary past to replace a present that was becoming increasingly hateful and that would precipitate many of the diners at the "Charlemagne Dinners", who were none other than most of the members of the Ballena Alegre literary circle, to a tragic end.

In the militant structures of *FE*, there was a time for literature and intellectualism: the SEU barely managed to get a minute's respite between pitched battles. The magazine *Haz*, the mouthpiece of the SEU students, could barely devote a few lines to cultural criticism of the moment: there was no mention of the centenary of Lope or the university theatre of La Barraca, Casona and the literary avant-garde of the time, but such analyses could hardly find the slightest echo amid the sound of gunfire ravaging the university cloisters. On 18 July 1936, the civil war broke out. The conservative wings of the National Movement took care to promote a certain nationalist literature of a patriotic and conservative nature: José Antonio Pérez de Cuéllar's *Defensa de la Hispanidad* (Defence of Hispanic Culture) was read ad nauseam.

Maeztu and Vázquez de Mella's "New State". Giménez Caballero's "Genius of Spain", despite the conservative and national-Catholic character that the new regime had always predicted, was enthusiastically read by the Falangist youth of the time. *Acción Española*, a magazine of neo-Maurrassian Spanish nationalist thought, was transformed into *Cultura Española*, and in its columns Juan José López Ibor wrote his "Discurso a los universitarios Españoles" (Address to Spanish University Students). The magazine *Jerarquía* deserves special mention, despite the fact that only four issues were published. It featured contributions from intellectuals of the stature of García Valdecasas, Laín Entralgo, Angel María Pascual y Torrente Ballester, Dionisio Ridruejo, Agustín de Foxá and Eugenio d'Ors. *Jerarquía* was followed by *Vértice*, with the painter Sainz de Tejada and Giménez Caballero, José María Pemán, in full Falangist-patriotic fervour, writing his "Odes to the Provisional Ensign" and the "Poem of the Beast and the Angel". Edgar NeviHe, José María Castroviejo and Alvaro Cunqueiro also wrote in "Vértice". Simultaneously with "Vértice", "Legiones y Falanges", published from Rome, sought to symbolise the unity of Mediterranean fascism. The latter featured contributions from prominent writers: the critic and playwright Alfredo Marquerie, Rafael García Serrano, Azorín and the then young student Camilo José Cela, who was foul-mouthed but knew how to disguise his profanity with a subtle and careful vocabulary.

When the Axis lost the war, all this disappeared as if by magic. Many

Fervent "national-syndicalist intellectuals" went to bed thinking about the empire and unity of destiny and woke up as social democrats, liberals or Alfonsine monarchists; those who had so strongly encouraged Falangist rhetoric immediately stigmatised it. Not only the children of the regime, but also the men who until recently had been the regime itself, turned against it. When the first incidents occurred at the University of Madrid in the 1950s, with the closure of educational centres and the forced resignation of Ruiz Giménez and Fernández Cuesta, the protagonists were not exactly the *Escuálidos* or groups of communist students, but rather the "monarchist intellectuals", the "Juanists" or liberal monarchists who engaged in shootouts with members of the SEU... the beginning of the end had begun.

The magazines that attempted to uphold Falangist orthodoxy and purism and continue to bring together the core group of loyal intellectuals (mainly *El Español*) were nothing more than mere information outlets dependent on *Información y Turismo* (which continued to be published even in the early 1970s). although they enjoyed a certain degree of autonomy and allowed themselves to take a few jabs at liberals or Anglophiles (both terms were synonymous for a time); the reality was that they were nothing more than the tamed rebellious children of a regime that had long since abandoned the ideology for which José Antonio, Ramiro and Onésimo Redondo had died. E.M.

JOSE MARIA PEMAN

If we were to ask in 1936 which intellectual most faithfully represented the fascist spirit of the Movement that had just been born on 18 July in Spain, we would probably be told that it was José María Pemán.

José María Pemán was already 38 years old and a popular writer who had already produced some of his immortal works. A native of Cádiz in blood and spirit, he was born in 1897. His "Divino Impaciente" (Divine Impatient), written in 1930, was not only an exceptional dramatic work, but also became a banner against the Republic. In addition, Pemán wrote for various newspapers, especially ABC, which at the time represented the

far right against the Republic, often close to the moderate line of pre-war fascism.

His opposition to the democratic and Marxist Republic soon went from dialectics to conspiracy, with the death of Calvo Sotelo, a great friend of his. He dedicated some heartfelt verses to him upon his death: '

'There is nothing to say! There is much to do! And by God and Santiago, it will be done!'

Pemán enlisted among the leading figures of the Movement, becoming a member of the Technical Board of Burgos in 1936, responsible for Culture and Education, and a close collaborator of Franco as the highest representative of Spanish fascist intellectualism. He was a staunch supporter of the unification of the Falange and the Requeté into a single party, often wearing the red beret and blue uniform himself. His first propaganda contribution to the Uprising was his poem "Poema de la Bestia y el Angel" (Poem of the Beast and the Angel), a lyrical ode to holy war, to the national crusade against democracy and Marxism, a hymn to armed rebellion. In his prologue, he defines this war not as a civil war, but as the eternal struggle between good and evil, between the Beast and the Angel:

"The hand of war is
like five ploughs
searching the earth
of our being, the others buried.

My mind has become precise, defined, certain, far
from any fog of vague reality.
War is chaste and harsh, as
harsh and chaste as truth.

I am not troubled by fate or luck...
How much peace there is at the heart of war."

He immediately launched an ideological campaign through radio broadcasts and pamphlets. His speech on Radio Nacional de Salamanca on 18 May 1937, entitled "Intellectuals and the New State", is famous for clearly defining the enemy of the Uprising and fascism: "For the crime of high treason against the nation represented by the Masonic, Jewish, internationalist pact, committed with the aggravating circumstance of intelligence, the new State reserves all its purifying severity."

Indeed, Pemán sees Judaism and Freemasonry as the central axis of democratic and Marxist chaos. In his pamphlets of harangues in Cádiz (1937), he denounces them once again: "There is a whole Judaic, unctuous and Masonic Europe which, knowing that it cannot defeat the people on the front, would like to defeat them by the twisted path already tried of fading the intransigence of our victorious position."

Pemán fully defends the fascist concept of the "intellectual," so far removed from the "scholar." A combative intellectual, a fighter of the book and the trench: "These are bad days for frivolous and subtle intellectual pedantry."

"The intellectual, that is, as the name itself indicates, that mutilated or incomplete type of human being characterised by the excessive growth and swelling of a faculty His position within the Uprising was immediately highlighted when he was appointed a member of the Academy of Language in 1936 and its director in 1939. In 1936, Pemán represented the hard line of Spanish intellectual fascism, the hierarchically disciplined line, as opposed to the liberal, independent wing, although he thought of it as fascist, which

could be personified by Unamuno, Ortega or Baroja. The two conceptions would soon clash.

On Columbus Day in 1936, in Salamanca, the clash occurs. In the University Auditorium are Pemán, Unamuno, Astray, Maldonado, Franco's wife, etc. Maldonado and Astray speak first, both expressing themselves unfortunately regarding the Catalan and Basque people, without understanding the racial, cultural, and nationalist problems of both. Unamuno, a fervent Basque and passionate nationalist (although a staunch anti-separatist), replied furiously, exchanging words with Astray. Astray shouted "Long live death!", Unamuno replied, and Pemán finally defended the orthodoxy of the movement by supporting Astray with his "Long live intelligence, but death to bad intellectuals!". The incident was of no further importance, but it marked the total triumph of the orthodox, Falangist, military line of the Movement's intellectuals over the independents, and with it a serious defeat for an authentic culture within the Movement, which needed both lines.

Pemán defends Astray's "Long live death" because he sees in it the racial cry, energetic, brutal but mystical, that Spain needs in those circumstances. He will say the same thing in his article "Mobilisation of Hearts": "Life born of death: the paradox of redemption. The same paradox as that 'Long live death!' with which the legionnaires fill the air with hallelujahs and funeral dirges... And so, once again, Spengler's phrase that ultimately it will always be a platoon of soldiers that saves civilisation".

After the war, Pemán actively defended Italian and German fascism. He was particularly attracted to Mussolini because of his Mediterranean fascism, which was closer in temperament to Pemán's Andalusian character. He dedicated a heartfelt poem to Mussolini, in which he declared himself to be his follower:

Since then, my young course has been marked by the gaze of a Caesar, clear and semi-divine, with a round skull, a steel helmet and a prominent lip that attacks Destiny, and behind which, Rome, which seemed dead, crowned with flowers and starlight, in the manner of an Empire, has its hand open to catch the wind, the earth, the sun and the sea.

Pemán contributed to various National Socialist magazines, such as *Joven Europa*, a publication for European combatants, in whose January 1942 issue we find Pemán, Marquerie and W. Fernandez Florez as representatives of the Spanish fascist intelligentsia, alongside other articles by Hitler, Mussolini, Antonescu, Bruno Brehm, Pavelik, etc. There he will say: "What happened in Russia? The population was organised in the form that exists today, by some 2 million privileged people who, constituting the Soviets and the People's Commissariats, eat and live well, and under whom there are 180 million slaves Democracy, with its agitations, its

its newspapers, electoral collapses, paralysing all disinterested activity, with its temptations of public employment, turns the professor into an orator, the philosopher into a journalist, the poet into a deputy, and thus squanders all the spiritual energies of the country. Democracy is noise, and intelligence does not need noise."

Pemán would become a prolific writer, both on political topics and in his charming costumbrista theatre. His works would consistently defend the West, morality and honour (see his "Cisneros"). He would attack democracy and capitalism as a compendium of his fascist doctrine. See, for example, his article "Representatividad" (Representativeness): "If you hear that a king or leader perfectly represented the soul of his people, he is usually an autocrat. On the other hand, if you hear that a people is Catholic, devout, family-oriented...

but that its government has been thinking or doing the opposite, there is no doubt that it is a democracy. I don't know how the world manages, but the intervention of democracy has been necessary to create governments that have nothing to do with what the people think." In another of his articles, "Towards a consumer art", he says: "In general, the preponderance of the bourgeoisie and its economic and democratic formulas for life are characterised by a predominance of consumption". Pemán believes he sees in the current world situation "a period of mental collapse and anti-classical barbarism".

It is certainly not his political style that brings Pemán fame and honour. He is a brilliant writer, with a subtle Cadiz irony in his traditional theatre that will undoubtedly make him famous, with his character "El Séneca" thanks to its broadcast on national television. Perhaps what attracts us most, however, is his dramatic theatre, classical and versified, where we see that style of nobility and honour that sublimates all his work. Pemán was the head of the intellectual movement until, lately, in his decrepitude, he changed his blue shirt, like so many others, decisively influenced by the environment. R.B.

BERNARD SHAW

The 1925 Nobel Prize winner was not only one of the most brilliant playwrights in modern history, but also one of the most exceptional and interesting geniuses known to Faustian culture. Irish by birth, but English in his writing and heart; a naive protector and friend of all kinds of animals - perhaps this inscription should be placed on his tomb, like the similar one commemorating Axel Munthe in the village of San Michele on Capri - but a relentless enemy of the philistines of the time; a die-hard Ibsenian, but a Wagnerian at heart; already in his sixties when, in his masterpiece, he extols eternal and ideal youth embodied in an alouette from Domrémy whose spirit he identified with in the most prodigious way; this is the man who did not mind becoming Wagner's disciple and his British John the Baptist: Bernard Shaw.

Shaw was born in Dublin in 1856; at the age of fifteen, he was no longer a schoolboy. to become an office worker; this is where his socialist vocation was born, which would later take shape in various essays. At the age of twenty, he abandoned his clerical job to devote himself to literature. He first wrote five novels, none of which were ever published; he then became a literary and music critic for several newspapers in London, the city to which he had moved and which would become his fiefdom, his ridiculed and despised fiefdom. Despite his prolific career as an art critic, he abandoned it when, after attending a performance of A Doll's House, he decided, deeply impressed by Ibsen's theatre, to become a playwright.

His career as such would be prolific in works and of high quality, and his birth was attended by two geniuses who were his literary parents and the presidents of his ideological life: Henrik Ibsen and Richard Wagner.

Shaw not only adopted their Weltanschauungen, translating their situations and dramatic aims into his own works, but also commented on their productions, of which he was an expert connoisseur. This gave rise to his essays "The

Quintessence of Ibsenism" and "The Perfect Wagnerian" . While the former marked the beginning of his defence of Ibsen in particular and of new Nordic literature in general, which would lead him to accept the Nobel Prize on condition that the monetary prize be used to create a cultural society to promote it (the Anglo-Swedish Literary Foundation), in the latter, in addition to defending and commenting on Wagner, he aligned himself with the great Wagnerian writers —Nietzsche, Baudelaire, Liszt, Chamberlain... whose writings will one day make it worthwhile to see this work, written in 1898, compiled, and which unfortunately has not yet been translated into Spanish.

His staunch Wagnerism led Shaw not only to this, but also to reflect the spirit of Wagnerian dramas in his own. Thus, we find him quoting the titan of Bayreuth on countless occasions. In the preface to *The Philanderer*, he writes: '...the Bayreuth Festival Theatre would not have come into existence had it not been for Wagner's Ring Cycle', and later expresses this distinctly Wagnerian thought, one of the foundations of musical drama: "And readers of Ibsen and Maeterlinck, those who study Wagner on the piano, must know that they can fully appreciate the power of a dramatic masterpiece without the aid of the theatre." In the preface to *The Devil's Disciple*, he says, referring to his Wagnerian habit of self-analysing his work: "I write prefaces as Dryden did, and dissertations as Wagner did, because I can," and four pages later he states categorically: "No one will ever write a better tragedy than *King Lear*, a better comedy than *Le Festin de Pierre* or *Peer Gynt*, a better opera than *Don Giovanni*, or a better musical drama than *The Ring of the Nibelung*." There are also allusions to Wagner's dramas themselves, and thus he says in the preface to *"The House of Sorrow"*: "... intrepid Amazons who fell asleep to the first chords of Schuman were born, horribly displaced, in Klingsor's garden", and in the same work, when one of the characters, *Mistress Hushabye*, wants to describe a wonderful night to her companion, she expresses herself in this way: "Come, Alfredo, you will see what a beautiful moon. It's a night like in *Tristan and Isolde*."

These and other quotes border not on anecdote, but on the ideology of their Wagnerian connection; let us see how Shaw speaks out against materialism when he says: "... having Butler, Bergson and Scott Haldane on his shelves alongside Blake and other major poets (not to mention Wagner and the minor poets). *The House of Sorrows* was not as ravaged by the dull materialism of the laboratories as the uncultured world outside."

Shaw, like Wagner, was a vegetarian because of his love for animals, which forced him to endure countless jokes and taunts, although this did not prevent him from reaching the respectable age of 94. This sensitivity towards animals should not be judged as sentimentality, from which he always distanced himself, since he advocated, like Nietzsche, the triumph of the strong over the weak and the feeble-minded, and he was a supporter of 'Vital Force' and 'Creative Evolution', concepts which he opposed to Darwinian materialism and which integrated well with his ideas on the 'Evolution of Man'. the strong over the weak and the morons, and was a supporter of "Vital Force" and "Creative Evolution", concepts that he opposed to Darwinian materialism and which are integrated into many of his works, such as *"Man and Superhorrible"* and, above all, as Spengler has pointed out, *"The Barbarian Commander"*.

Shaw believed that capitalism, which based its existence on immorality and exploitative theft, should die to make way for an ethical socialism, national in nature and unrelated to Marxist state capitalism. Like Wagner, he defended this regenerative idea in his writings and in practice, for just as the poet-musician lent his arm to the revolution of 1848, he subscribed to Fabian ideology.

Shaw, like Wagner, believed that women should be emancipated and elevated to the status of protagonists in the drama of life, and like Wagner and Ibsen, he defended this idea and transferred it to the realm of theatre. If Wagner had opened a revolutionary path by pointing out that the path to man's redemption lies through the love of women and gave women the ability to open up infinite space to men in the roles of Senta (*The Flying Dutchman*), Elisabeth (*Tannhäuser*), Brünnhilde (*"The Ring of the Nibelung"*), and Isolde (*"Tristan"*), Shaw combined this redemptive vocation with the strong personality of Ibsen's Nora (*"A Doll's House"*) in Saint Joan, a female character who is at once Nietzschean, Wagnerian, Schopenhauerian, and Ibsenian. Because she is the prototype of the "superman", that is, the hero, because she is spiritual like Elisabeth, because her will to live has died, as in Brünnhilde and Isolde, because she has the iron will and dominance of Ibsen's women. This is paradoxically a graceful nineteen-year-old woman who is the lever for a pathetic exaltation of idealism and individual struggle, set against the backdrop of the Middle Ages, which he romantically presents as rising above the abominable scourges of the Inquisition and feudalism that he himself denounces, without altering a breath of that "medieval atmosphere" that he saw in Shakespeare's works, because he knows that today they have their socio-political counterparts. R.B.

OTHER ENGLISH

Among the Anglo-Saxon writers of this tendency, we can mention HARRY ELMER BARNES, a revisionist historian whose book *Blasting the Historical Blackout* contributed greatly to dispelling the myth of German atrocities during the First World War. CARLTON PUTNAM, who specialises in the subject of race, whose two major works, *Race and Reality* and *Race and Reason*, are essential additions to any library of any importance. LOTHROP STODDARD, a sociologist and writer of great stature who, in certain respects, can be compared to Le Bon, author of several prophetic books, such as *"The Revolt Against Civilisation"* – the best of them all – *"The High Tide of Colour"* and *"The New World of Islam"*. ERNEST SEVIER COX, chronicler of the American colonisation and author of the demystifying *"Lincoln's Black Policy"*. His work *"White America"* marks a milestone in historical narrative. GEOFFREY BIBBY, author of a delightful *"Testimony of the Sword,"* in which, without pretensions of erudition, he follows the movements and flourishing of the culture of our primitive ancestors, whom we follow in their work as bearers of civilisation and culture. He also wrote *"Four Thousand Years Ago,"* which analyses the latest archaeological discoveries of his time (it was written in 1958), proving the white origin of pre-Columbian South American cultures.

GORDON CHILDE

In England, there are two important figures: the well-known historian and archaeologist V. GORDON CHILDE, whose *"The Decline of European Civilisation"* has often been misinterpreted as Spengler's *"Decline of the West"*. Another of his major works is *"The Movement of History"*, which certain sectors known as "progressives" branded as racist.

A.K. CHESTERTON

Arthur Kenneth Chesterton, first cousin of the celebrated author of *The Paradoxes of Father Brown*, Gübert Keith Chesterton, has for many years been a writer opposed to capitalism and communism, first through his well-documented monthly magazine *Candour*, and later through his well-researched books, the most notable of which is undoubtedly *The New Unhappy Lords* (*The New Unhappy Lords*), one of the most important works in the field of national revolution ever written anywhere in the world.

Chesterton was a member of Mosley's British Union of Fascists. He believed in a fairer distribution of wealth, which Jewish capital worldwide opposes, hence his admiration for Mussolini, the only one who could achieve this. Chesterton visited Italy in 1929, stating, with regard to press control and freedom, that "Mussolini acts within the principles of fascism, while the others act according to their own principles of freedom," because "British newspapers, in reality, belong to two or three men, and it is enough for them to agree to suppress something for it to be suppressed" (*The Resurrection of Rome*, 1930). J.B.

H. WILLIAMSON

Henri WILLIAMSON was an English author who had a close relationship with Mosley, even joining his British Union of Fascists. One of the characters in his novels proclaims that money should be controlled by the state so that it does not serve the big trusts.

Eager to see things for himself, Williamson travelled to Germany in 1935. His reaction was highly positive: there were no beggars, no unemployment, everyone was working, and their faces radiated happiness. In *A Solitary War* (1936), he states that Hitler had freed the peasants from mortgages, ended unemployment, and replaced the barracks with cheerful neighbourhoods. He considered Hitler to be "the only pacifist in Europe" and could not understand why he would want war, even planning a flight to Berlin in 1939, which he did not take because Mosley himself advised him against it. J.T.

WODEHOUSE

Pelham Grenville Wodehouse was born in Guildford, Surrey, England, on 15 October 1881, and died in London in 1976. He is undoubtedly the foremost English humorist of his era.

In his works, which are always entertaining and—despite some snobbish critics—always full of quality and insightful reflections, he offers light-hearted but not malicious satire on certain aspects of English society. He first gained notoriety with his series of novels "Psmith in the City", "Psmith, Journalist" and "Leave it to Psmith!", and his works were later translated into numerous languages, especially when he tackled the series about the hugely popular Jeeves, the obsequious and competent butler who solves the intricate problems of the scatterbrained gentleman he serves. In *Poor, Lazy and Optimistic*, he criticises certain attitudes typical of British Labour, but in *Handsome, Rich and Distinguished*, the same criticism is levelled at certain aspects of British Conservatism. Wodehouse's list of works runs to a hundred, including film scripts and musical revues.

Wodehouse lived in France and the United States for many years. In 1940, after the fall of France, he was interned by the Germans, although he was soon released, and he frequently gave radio talks on stations in Hamburg and Berlin; these were purely literary talks, with the occasional anti-communist intervention. He had difficulties with the authorities in his country at the end of the hostilities, but his literary colleagues supported him and he was able to avoid prison. J.B.

D.H. LAWRENCE

He was born on 11 September 1885 in Eatswood, Nottinghamshire, and died in 1930. His muse and lover, whom he never married, was Frieda von Richthofen, a German aristocrat who followed him around the world. An adventurous individual, he was the first English writer to use taboo words and sexual symbolism. He was a close friend of Aldous Huxley. His main works were: *Ottoline*, *The Rainbow*, *The Plumed Serpent*, *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, *Women in Love*, *Kangaroo*, *Lorenzo in Taos* and his posthumous work *Etruscan Places*. His friend Huxley said of him that he was a mixture of naturalist, realist and mystic writer. One of the best Anglo-Saxon writers of his time, with clearly anti-Jewish texts. J.B.

MULLINS

Eustace Clarence Mullins was born in 1923 in the state of Virginia, USA. He was a leading landscape painter, although his paintings were not very well received at exhibitions in his country, which was dominated by Cubist and Surrealist dealers. However, he was most notable for his study of taboo subjects, such as Judaism and high finance. His main works are: "The Federal Reserve", "The Federal Reserve Conspiracy", "Ezra Pound, a Difficult Individual", "History of the Jews", "My Life in Christ", "The Biological Jew". An objective and well-versed writer, albeit passionate, with incisive prose.

He was a member of the famous "McCarthy Commission" and a senior employee of the United States Library of Congress. He fought actively for the release of Ezra Pound. He was the first American writer whose books were burned in Germany after World War II. In fact, Otto John, director of counter-espionage for the Federal Republic of Germany and a paedophile, as well as a spy in the service of the USSR, had his anti-capitalist book "The Federal Reserve" burned fifteen days before fleeing to East Germany. J.B.

MADISON GRANT

American writer and ethnologist. His major work is *The Passage of the Great Race*, which is a racial interpretation of the history of Europe and its peoples. This work achieved great resonance, but then suffered the classic "blackout" of the mainstream "news" media. J.B.

SAVITRI DEVI

An original writer, little known due to the almost exclusive subject of her works: German National Socialism. Born in France to an English mother, raised in Greece, she lived for a long time in India, where she married an Aryan Indian, Mukhedee,

who would later edit her works. This author, whose books are highly sought after, was systematically sanctioned, and her works were seized by the censorship of democratic countries.

He has a vigorous and passionate style, displaying extensive historical and political knowledge. His main works are Pilgrimage and The Lightning and the Sun, written in English. Also noteworthy is his study, published in French, Paul de Tarse, ou Christianisme et Juiverie. J.B.

CHARLES COUGHLIN

He was born on 25 October 1891 in Hamilton, Ontario, Canada, to American parents. He always held American nationality. In 1911, he graduated in Law, and in 1916 in Philosophy. In 1923, he was ordained a priest. In 1923, he founded the magazine "Social Justice".

Throughout his life, he wrote about economic and financial issues, becoming an authority on the subject. Naturally, orthodox writers soon put him on their list of censured authors because of his very accurate criticisms of capitalism and Marxism. His book Money: Questions and Answers is a classic on the subject. His name would appear in all encyclopaedias if today's society valued quality and merit. J.B.

STUART CLOETE

Undoubtedly the best South African writer in the English language, even though he was of Afrikaner (or Boer) origin. His main work, "Wild Land", is an ode to the Great Trek, or march of the Afrikaners, persecuted by the British and facing the nature of the Transvaal and the Bantu and Zulu peoples. His other notable works include Turning Wheels, Waiting for Dawn and The Hill of the Doves. His ideology, described as "ultra-right-wing" by literary critics, is clearly evident in all his works. J.B.

FRANCIS PARKER YOCKEY

Francis Parker Yockey, by his real name or perhaps by his pseudonym Ulick Varange, will go down in history as one of the best political essayists of his time, as Spengler's successor in his monumental "Decline of the West".

Yockey was born in Chicago in 1917. He graduated with degrees in Fine Arts and Law. He was an economist, a concert-level pianist, and knew several languages. In 1946, he was offered a job at the "war crimes" tribunal in Wiesbaden, which was trying second-tier Nazi leaders (the top-ranking ones had been tried in Nuremberg). Yockey tried to carry out his task objectively, for which he was severely reprimanded by his superiors. As a result, he resigned from his position, advising the "judges" to produce their own propaganda, as he was a lawyer, not a journalist.

On his return to America, he found it difficult to reintegrate into civilian life, so he returned to Europe. He settled in an inn in Brittas Bay (Ireland), and there, in isolation, without notes, he wrote his monumental work "IMPERIUM" in six months. The next step was to publish the work, both due to the endemic scarcity of financial resources and the lack of collaboration from publishers, who were always fearful of democratic censorship, which was invisible but no less effective. Finally, in 1948, under the name Westropa Press, it was published by Brooks and Jones & Dale of London in two volumes,

with a thousand copies of the first and two hundred of the second. This discrepancy in quantity and the change of printers from the first to the second volume is proof of the difficulty of financing the work. Subsequently, more editions would be published by Noontide Press, Sausalito, California. The first translation of the work into Spanish was in 1977. It was later translated into German.

In 1949, Yockey organised the "European Liberation Front" and in 1951 published a manifesto entitled "The London Proclamation". His efforts were not continued, due to a lack of faith or preparation on the part of his immediate collaborators. In 1952, the State Department refused to renew his passport. The FBI subjected him to severe surveillance, as if he were a dangerous criminal. What was the reason for this surveillance? Perhaps the answer was given by Yockey himself, when he stated that his enemies had assessed him better than his friends. For William Carto, his friend, collaborator, editor and prologue writer, the reason why Yockey had to be watched, harassed and bothered, why he had to be imprisoned, the reason, in short, why he had to die, was none other than for having written *Imperium*.

On 17 June 1960, the radio announced that the strange writer Yockey had committed suicide with potassium cyanide. No one knew where he had obtained it. There was no autopsy, despite the law requiring one. The case was closed.

"*IMPERIUM*" is, as Yockey himself says, more than a book. It is a work that accurately interprets the past of the cultural organism called Western Civilisation, Europe, the White World, whatever we want to call it, and from there, it provides us with an optional vision of the Future. The choice is twofold: either the West, victim of cultural parasitism repeated several times in the course of history, although unparalleled in its virulence, rebuilds itself and, remaining true to itself and its high mission, returns to the path marked out by its destiny, or it continues on its current path: Democracy - Socialism - Marxism - Globalism, which will lead to certain and inevitable destruction in the short term.

Throughout the pages of "*IMPERIUM*", following some very insightful studies on the historical and political perspectives of the 20th century, the concept of Cultural Vitalism is used to analyse the Health and Cultural Pathology – that is, the Total Pathology – of the Historical Organism. The work ends with a raw, dispassionate and objective exposition of the geopolitical phenomenon called "America", considered by Yockey to be a Cultural Colony of Europe. In the form of an appendix, the world situation is studied, with a series of observations that were prophecies in 1948, when the book was published, and are now realities.

It is important to note the significance of the pseudonym Yockey chose as the author of "*IMPERIUM*": Ulick Varange. Ulick is an Irish name—remember that the book was written in Ireland—derived from Danish, meaning "gift of the mind." As for Varange, it refers to the Varangians, the branch of the Vikings led by Rurik and called by the Slavs, who civilised Russia in the 9th century, built the Russian Imperial State and founded the basis of the Russian aristocracy that was murdered by the Bolsheviks in 1917. Ulick Varange, then, a name drawn from two concepts anchored at both ends of Europe, signifies a Europe united "from the rocky promontories of Galway to the Urals," as he himself anxiously calls for in his book. Varange also signifies a reminder of the Western origins of historical Russia. J. B.

EDGARD A. POE AND H. P. LOVECRAFT

Certainly, for Europeans; Americans (especially those from the North) are a young people, whom they label as inexperienced and naive. However, the first Western nation where modern society took shape and form had the courage to almost immediately engender reaction, protest, denunciation, self-marginalisation, and artistic struggle against the media-driven world that was already taking shape at the turn of the 19th century. Of course, it counted on the Europeans of the time who, with their own way of understanding the phenomenon of life, could bring them closer to their traditional ancestors. There was a need in that movement for American journalists and writers who are so well known today, and unfortunately offered as just another consumer product, such as Poe, Howard and Lovecraft, were not specifically insignificant beings in a society that suicidally and voluntarily renounced everything that was necessary to be what it was.

It is doubly logical that this avant-garde reaction occurred in literary circles in the United States, since it was the first Western nation in which democracy took root and, consequently, the first nation in which "modern society" became an oppressive nightmare, where quantity prevails over quality. On the other hand, the modernity of its people engendered a "void of the past" in people who needed or desired to have a connection with it. This historical anguish, or void of the past, compels them to immerse themselves in the most ancestral of traditions, in the darkest recesses of the human soul, and this envelops their writings and reflections in the most fantastic and anti-systematic search for the traditional, as shown in the phrase that precedes Howard's beautiful story, "The Black Stone".

"They say that the foul beings of the Old Days lurk in the dark, forgotten corners of the Earth, and that even now the Gates open, on certain nights, to release forms imprisoned in Hell."

Reflection, testimony of marginalisation, and attack on the world around them are curious constants in this school of American writers that began with E. A. Poe and reached the circle of H. P. Lovecraft. These writers led extravagant and sometimes unpopular lives, and often maintained contacts and initiatory interests in the most hermetic of traditions... The aesthetic and almost ornate cult of terror, evil intentions, the supernatural, the immortal, the immovable, the perpetual, the strong, the immaterial, dreams, the night, the esoteric and mythical, made it impossible for the patients of a rationalist, quantified and technified society to pay attention to the first spark of opposition to a path that, day by day, proves to be increasingly inadequate for human self-realisation.

In a society that has made gold prospectors, or rather seekers of riches, famous, here we have a group of writers who decide to become "Seekers of Tradition" and truly succeed in doing so. It was undoubtedly "historical anguish" and its institutionalisation in their social environment that led men with a special sensitivity to seek a connection with the distant past.

Poe immersed himself in the search for the remote, the immaterial in the deepest fibres of the human being; Poe's stories could cause dread, terror, attraction and anguish at the same time as a transcendental fear, because in his narratives, from "The Cask of Amontillado" to "The Last Watch", he captures the most unspeakable horrors that the man of his time was capable of engendering, and for this reason Poe was read, admired and abhorred at the same time.

His stories hint at a journey into the most unspeakable desires, the most intimate tendencies and fears. E.A. Poe was undoubtedly a great connoisseur of the early incapacities of what we might call the 'modern little man', with his burden of

fears and their unwillingness to overcome them on the grounds that anything that cannot be rationalised cannot be a living reality, and if it manifests itself as such, it is something terrible and must be rejected. Edgar Allan Poe devoted himself to showing his contemporaries and successors their spiritual miseries and their lack of strength to live; his desire to always reach the deepest fibres of the world around him led him to undertake the project that he later defined as his magnum opus, his controversial essay "Eureka". In this essay, Poe attempts to make a live dissection of the nature of the Universe. It is a dense essay that may even seem naive to today's reader, but Poe's effort to unravel the origins, essence and final destiny of the Cosmos is worthy of the deepest respect, especially since he gives his analysis a unified interpretation, not dividing Cosmic Destiny and Essence, but assimilating them all into a Totality that encompasses the parts, taking a stand for the Unity of Destiny of Creation against the rationalist current, whether inductivist or deductivist, that dominated the interpretation of the Cosmos at that time. At the end of his essay, Poe integrates all parts of the Cosmos and all its moments into an integrative synthesis of a pantheistic nature, the conclusion of the most fanatical worshipper of the Great God Pan, whose apologies were written by the little-known A. Machen, who was closely associated with the literary circle of H.P. Lovecraft, a man of strange habits and even stranger stories, with esoteric interests and a member of the well-known "Golden Dawn".

Unlike Poe, Lovecraft does not delve into the essence of Man, but only in his dreams and desires, especially those that seek integration with the past. To prove this, let us cite two works, "The Strange Case of Charles Dexter Ward" and "The Dream-Quest of Unknown Kadar"; throughout his literary career, mythical, abnormal, timeless elements are mixed with references to ancestors, elements that, although with a different slant, are also fully embraced by the American Howard. They constantly establish a bridge between a mediocre, almost hateful reality and a project of the past or future, always fantastic or terrifying, but never mediocre and grey. Both Lovecraft and Howard maintained contact with A. Machen and the "Golden Dawn," and this is evident not only in the references in literary criticism, but also in the structure of their inner world, which is manifested in the pages of their works. The mythologies that nourish the basic outline of both authors' works are as suggestive as they are traditional: the names Arkharn, Miskatonic and its University, the files of the old library, the Necronomicon and the old mad Arab who wrote it, whose name is little less than a ritual blasphemy of those contained in the Cthulhu Mythos; They are as evocative as they are traditional: Leng, Lemuria, R'Ilhe, Kaddath the Golden City, Asgard, Vanheirn, Hyperborea, Atlantis, Turan and the Pictish heroes, as well as cataclysms, debacles, total wars, catastrophic cycles and the almost ritualistic clashes between two opposing ways of understanding existence.

They use a strange language, misunderstood in all its depth by their dull-witted contemporaries, with the methodical appearance of esoteric and traditional symbols. The Silver Key, which R. Carter pursues on his adventurous journey to the afterlife, facing the most terrible horrors in a prolonged dream at the end of which, upon awakening, he discovers in the golden reflections of the rooftops of his secluded, quiet and traditional city of New England, the nature of the dreamt-of Kaddath, the golden city... Gold, the Golden Age, a new traditional element that connects Carter to the oldest of the great metahistorical cycles

, linked to a fantastic and timeless past, a great testimony to the rejection of a society that stubbornly and stupidly refuses to identify with its past.

Another example of the same spiritual dynamic can be found in "The Strange Case of Charles Dexter Ward"; the absorption of young Charles' personality by Grandfather Ward, after prolonged and esoteric studies by the young man, is nothing more than the embodiment of Lovecraft's fascination with the total surrender of youth to the timeless past, often replete with sinful qualities from a modern perspective, as in the case of Grandfather Ward. Despite this, Lovecraft makes clear his admiration for everything that the society around him condemns in a superstitious and prudish manner.

The Ward case is actually the Lovecraft case: his misanthropy, his misogyny, his contempt for his neighbours, the wall of antipathy surrounding Lovecraft is the iconoclastic movement of the insignificant against the eternal. But Ward, unlike Lovecraft, achieved what he longed for, for he found his ancestor, even though it led to his death. Friends and doctors declared young Ward dead, but Lovecraft will never give up, for Ward and Lovecraft are the same person, immersed in the search for tradition without fear of moral judgements from a social environment they reject. For this reason, Lovecraft, together with his closest collaborators, appears deeply linked to initiatory circles, committed to the search for and transmission of traditions that his time did not want to embrace, even symbolically. And with this, he bore witness to a deliberate struggle to overthrow the society that gripped him and plunged him into the most deadly of nightmares. Democratic mediocrity, not as a political framework but as a way of life!

Another faithful exponent of the circle of early American authors is Howard, a true prodigy of work capacity, who in a short time was able to create heroes, heroic ages and entire worlds, all far removed from the self-conscious modern world that surrounded him... Howard's characters, despite seeming insignificant at first glance, display a code of behaviour and even a constitution that is completely opposed to the world around them. Conan, Kane, Turlogh and others are men of honour, seemingly primitive but complete beings, physically and morally strong characters who take their convictions or tendencies to the extreme with the most pronounced maximalism. Howard, the pioneer of the "sword and sorcery" genre, maintains in his protagonists an attitude of reluctance towards rational knowledge, or rather towards modern science, because in Howard's cycles, and especially in Conan's Hyborian Age, science is presented as magic, white or black, always despicable except when it provides the second necessary for the edge of steel, wielded by a healthy and strong body and a brave and willing spirit, to undo the spell of the evil incantation of systematised, used and manipulated knowledge; In Howard's wonderful world, true science is the will to fight and the determination to be who you are, with pride and gloriously incorporating that past that your fellow citizens wanted to erase for the sake of a mediocre and grey world... a terribly grey world. And always, among his celebrated fantasies, there are references to ancient myths and divinities.

In the muscular strength of his heroes lies praise for physical strength, something our world rejects, and in their skillful use of steel, a repulsive reaction to pacifist society. In the code of honour of primitives like Conan, in his law of blood, Howard speaks of a NATURAL LAW opposed to the modern one, of a morality that knows neither frustration nor inhibition.

blood, Howard speaks to us of a NATURAL LAW opposed to the modern one, of a morality that knows neither frustration nor inhibitions.

It is clear that from Poe to Howard, through Lovecraft and the Europeans Machen and Sprage, all of them conceived their world in opposition to the present one, a world brimming with struggle, sometimes anguished, sometimes heroic, with always sincere loves, always sinful curiosities, and also with deep respect for the laws of Nature, whose investigation was vetoed and cursed at every turn.

From Lovecraft's ideas to Howard's, four elements appear constantly: the elite, race, contempt for the numerical, rational and quantifiable, and the exaltation of the will to persevere through struggle, tenacity and strength, naturally everything they miss around them and an obsessive allusion to "that paid" that their environment systematically denies them.

Critics today, of course, enjoy warning the astute reader against these characteristics, arguing that they convey a racist, elitist and anti-democratic spirit. Well, like the young Ward, the authors cited are not afraid to confront the moral prejudices of the society of numerical dwarfs that surrounds them, and their works are an apology for racism, elitism, tradition and, in short, the most refined anti-democratic spirit.

If we analyse the above and place it in the context of the time in which the authors in question lived, we can see a certain parallel between their artistic and philosophical struggle and the great political and social movements that took place in the first third of the twentieth century. Based on the cultural foundation provided by the literary movement studied here, both in Europe and America, and the heyday of the philosophers of the Traditional Revolution, the relationship between Lovecraft, Howard, Sprage, Machen, the Golden Dawn society and the hermetic Thule group is undeniable. This makes it clear that these authors had connections, even if only at the level of tendency, with European fascism.

They also say that Howard, being tall and strong, was self-conscious, and that is why his heroes were larger than life; however, his heroes are hateful to mediocrity, their strength unattainable and their fighting ability incomprehensible to the little man of today, while his message of tradition remains defiant, and his model of manhood will live on, despite the law of numbers. For every failure of the modern world, there is a Conan, a Ward or a Carter, restless fighters, dreamers who will make all this fade away as quickly as a match burns, even if it is as serious as the sinking of the Atlantis mythology or as heroic as the defence of Thermopylae.

Truly marginalised authors, not seen in their true light but consumed, dreamers of an era that was or will be, that is what matters least. Authors who may be fascists, but no one can deny that they anticipated their world and that their time will come. The time that future generations await. R.B.

ALEXIS CARREL

"Everything extraordinary that has been achieved since the world began is due to individual actions."

"Force achieves lasting results only when it is at the service of an idea."

Alexis Carrel

Carrel's attitude towards being erased from medical dictionaries that should have included his name was one of absolute honesty throughout his life. His is a rare case of a man of science who, at a given moment, was able to consider the importance and role of scientific achievements in the general context of humanity, who sought new values for a society of automatons, and who was not afraid to write or say what his common sense dictated.

Alexis Carrel was born on 28 June 1873 in a village near Lyon. After completing his secondary education, he studied medicine and began working in hospitals in Lyon. The then burning issue of vascular sutures occupied part of those years, and the new doctor was concerned with finding a way to sew severed vessels.

In 1902, he travelled to Lourdes for the first time. In "Le voyage á Lourdes" he describes his experiences there. Nothing could be further from the image of a convert to Catholicism that people have wanted to see in his interest in the reality of miracles. Carrel maintains a strict scientific approach here, although he is driven by an undeniable curiosity. On his return to Lyon, he found the atmosphere sterile, and his statements about what he had seen in Lourdes sparked controversy and earned him enemies. Lyon became too small for him, and it was at this moment of hesitation that Carrel decided to take the big leap that would change his life: after a brief stay in Paris, in May 1904 Carrel boarded the ship that would take him to America.

He first travelled around Canada. He contacted men of science, as he was not interested in practising medicine. He knew that his mission was to devote himself to research. He continued working on experiments with sutures, but his name was still little known. His pilgrimage was long: Montreal, California, Chicago, New York... his personal notes reveal discouragement and pessimism at not finding the right place. It is not until the end of 1905 that he comes into contact with Simon Flexner, and in October 1906 he is able to officially start working in the new laboratory at the Rockefeller Institute, which provides him with all the necessary resources to carry out his work. Dressed in his usual black coat, he devotes every hour of the day to his work, and the publications and results of his medical knowledge follow one after another without pause.

In 1912, as a clear sign of his renown and the fruits of his research, he was awarded the Nobel Prize in Medicine, which he collected at the same time as Hauptmann received the Nobel Prize in Literature.

During the Great War, he travelled to France, where he saw the need to treat the wounded before, six hours after the injury, microbial infection had wreaked havoc. He therefore insisted on the need to set up hospitals close to the front. Carrel, supported by money from the Rockefeller Foundation, was able to set up his hospital and devote himself to the study and practice of antiseptic methods. A laboratory (funded by the American Foundation) and a hospital (under the Military Health Service) thus coexisted under his command. Without his solid international prestige, such a solution, in a country at war,

would have been impossible. The result of his research was the Dakin-Carrel treatment, a method of disinfection that remained the standard until Fleming discovered antibiotics in 1944.

Even in France, Carrel understood that the disaster caused by the war was due to more than just military defeat; he himself wrote: "Our democracy has not been able to form the aristocracy necessary for its own leadership".

Back in America, his disillusionment grew, but this did not mean he gave up his scientific work: "Americans have chosen the opposite path. Life in a herd, the complete elimination of meditation, the dispersion of the spirit, the suppression of all inner life and discipline."

In his work "Jour après jour", dated 1935, he writes: "Democracy, socialism, communism date from a time when science was in its infancy. These doctrines are remnants of ideologies dating back to the 18th and 19th centuries... Science today gives us a different and broader view of civilisation, of what it will become in the near future if, instead of clinging to outdated forms of human society, we have the courage to destroy them. The 18th century, which saw the birth of democracies, and the 19th century of Karl Marx, were times of ignorance compared to ours. None of the doctrines born in that era of obscurantism can suit us today. We have created a new material world: we must also create a new society.

Slowly, the scientist gives way to social and political reflection. "Science will be useless if society and the race degenerate," he tells himself: Carrel thus rebels against progressive massification ("I don't believe that more than 4 per cent of people in the world are intelligent. The rest are either imbeciles or both imbeciles and cretins"), against parliamentary systems ("There is no doubt that democracy in its current form is a disaster"), and he fixates on and sympathises with the figure of Mussolini as a guarantor of discipline and order.

His future thinking is already foreshadowed in his considerations on the value of science. Our civilisation is collapsing, and science must adapt to the human mindset so that, with its enormous power, it can rebuild a new society according to the laws of nature. Thus emerged the idea that he would express in his best-known work: *Man, the Unknown* (1935), which was a tremendous and unexpected bestseller:

400,000 copies sold in France and translated into 18 languages. In his book, using scientific language, Carrel maintains the thesis that social classes are equivalent to biological classes: it is a question of forming racially pure peoples and achieving an aristocracy of the most responsible.

The postulates of this work can be summarised as a defence of health, a true understanding of human nature and the human body, and a defence of race as the principle behind the formation of peoples. "Modern civilisation, with the help of hygiene, comfort, good food, an easy life, hospitals, doctors and nurses, has enabled many individuals of mediocre quality to live. These weak beings and their descendants contribute greatly to the weakening of the white races. Perhaps we should renounce this artificial form of health and pursue exclusively natural health, which comes from the excellence of adaptive functions and innate resistance to disease."

Carrel goes so far as to defend the means of preserving the race in its creative state, without fear of uttering words that are forbidden in democracies: "Eugenics is indispensable for the perpetuation of the strong. A great race must propagate its best elements. However, in the most civilised nations

, reproduction is declining and producing inferior beings. Women voluntarily ruin themselves through alcohol and tobacco. They subject themselves to dangerous diets in order to achieve the conventional thinness of their type. They also refuse to have children. Eugenics can exert a great influence on the destinies of civilised races. A medical examination could be imposed on people who are going to marry..."

Ultimately, Carrel is right when he sums up: "True civilisation will consist, above all, in overturning current values, in ordering the world in relation to man, so that the personality can develop its full potential, instead of forcing man to bow to the material world."

Attracted by the phenomenon of dictatorships, his anti-democratic stance is evident in all his writings. He sympathises with the French "Flames of Fire" movement and is later attracted to Doriot's PPF; Carrel attempts to intervene in French politics himself, but after brief skirmishes he returns to his work in America. Upon leaving, he made a brief statement on the situation at the time: "...They suffer the ravages of socialism, the idiocy of capitalist conservatives... The situation is extremely serious... People's ignorance is growing. They are treated like beasts and idlers. The progress made by Germany and Italy is not sufficiently appreciated. Democracy is slowly but surely killing the great races. An ideal, a faith, a heroic attitude towards life are indispensable."

In 1939, for reasons he did not understand, he was dismissed from the Rockefeller Foundation, despite his 33 years of service. "Ah, the Rockefellers! They have done me a lot of good, but also a lot of harm. All the propaganda surrounding my name was for them." With the outbreak of World War II, Carrel once again placed himself at the disposal of France. After a brief 25-day stay in Spain, he arrived in Vichy, where Laval offered him the position of Minister of Health for two consecutive years, which he declined. Carrel explained to Pétain his ideas on the health status of French children and their most urgent needs, obtaining the green light from the head of state. He worked in Paris on the formation of a new society that would fight for a new humanity.

Strongly opposed to the Resistance and De Gaulle's proclamations, with the arrival of the Allies he immediately received an urgent communiqué suspending him from all his duties; his case was to be referred to a Purge Committee, as Carrel had not been bothered by the National Socialist troops during the German occupation. It is 21 August 1944, and the press, newly engaged in its persecution of former collaborators, describes him as a "racist, apologist for Nazi theories, and Nazi eugenicist". The police go to his home to prevent him from escaping. In reality, Carrel cannot and does not want to escape; his health is precarious. On 5 November 1944, he finally dies, while outside there is still talk of his trial.

After his death, his words still ring true: "...The past will not begin again. The days that enchanted our youth are gone. We must look to the Iron Age that is coming, in which new and great things will be accomplished." J.T.

"Another mistake is that of democratic equality... The democratic creed does not take into account the constitution of our body and our conscience. It does not suit the concrete fact that is the individual. It is true that human beings are equal, but individuals are not. The equality of their rights is an illusion. The mentally weak and the man of genius should not be equal before the law. The stupid, the intelligent,

those who are scattered, incapable of attention or effort, do not have the right to higher education. It is absurd to give them the same electoral power as fully developed individuals. The sexes are not equal. It is very dangerous to ignore these inequalities. The democratic principle has contributed to the failure of civilisation by opposing the development of an elite. It is clear, on the contrary, that individual inequalities must be respected.

Alexis Carrel

"Liberalism has led democracies to bankruptcy. Marxism has collapsed into the most abject barbarism.

Men today need a new doctrine in order to rebuild civilisation."

Alexis Carrel

"Eugenics is indispensable for the perpetuation of the strong. A great race must propagate its best elements."

Alexis Carrel

"I simply want a new civilisation." Ezra Pound

One of the most dramatic cases of the repression of democracy against culture, Ezra Pound was born in Hailey, Idaho, in the heart of the "Wild West," on 30 October 1885. At the age of four, he was taken to Philadelphia; his father worked at the US Mint, and from childhood he became accustomed to seeing gold and silver melted down and turned into coins, which was probably the origin of his constant concern with monetary policy, leading him to write several works on the subject.

Having completed his studies at the University of Pennsylvania in 1906, he crossed the Atlantic to search for documentation for a thesis on Lope de Vega. He travelled again in 1907, settling permanently in Europe. In 1912, from London, he began his collaboration with the Chicago magazine Poetry. As a correspondent for the magazine, he published his own work and promoted other writers; thanks to him, Tagore and Eliot (1) began to make a name for themselves. Pound was traditionally generous, even despite his precarious situation, in promoting young authors whom he considered to be particularly gifted. In this way, he was able to influence an entire generation of poets, establishing himself as the undisputed leading poet of the century in the English language. Joyce would not enjoy the renown he has today if it had not been for Pound's selfless and unconditional help, and even his *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake* might never have been written.

Yeats also maintained a friendship with Pound that was reflected in an influence mutual. Pound worked with W. Lewis, founding Vorticism. In 1918, he devoted an entire issue to Henry James, who had died two years earlier in obscurity, initiating his revival. Pound managed to publish Hemingway's first novel, helping the author considerably, and, just as he had sent money to Joyce, he helped Eliot leave his office job to devote himself to writing. That is why Pound wrote to H. Monroe: "My problem is to keep alive a certain number of avant-garde poets, to place the arts in their rightful place as a recognised guide and beacon of civilisation. His main work, the "Cantos", would occupy 50 years of his life. In 1921, he moved to Paris, and four years later, tired of artistic intrigues, he retired to Rapallo, Italy. There, Pound planned to carry out his work, and indeed, Rapallo would be his home for 20 years, where he would work until the end of the war.

In his retreat in Rapallo, Pound organises concerts, composes music and even operas, does some sculpture, and above all writes. Pound analyses the modern world and becomes increasingly aware of his outright opposition to it. Considering his struggles to get new authors such as those mentioned above published, he writes: "In thirty years' time, the utter stupidity of two decades of publishers will perhaps be more apparent. I refer to their short-sightedness; and particularly, their policy of counterfeiting literary currency to the point that it no longer deceives even fools" (Time would undoubtedly prove him right, but history is repeating itself now as well).

In Rapallo, Pound developed his theories on Social Credit and his studies on money, highlighting the profound culpability of international finance. He translated Confucius and became interested in Eastern culture.

In "Jefferson and/or Mussolini", he praises Mussolini and takes his side, considering that fascism is the only way to defeat international banking

and Jewish bankers. 'Usury is the cancer of the world, only the scalpel of Fascism can remove it from the life of nations,' he wrote in 1929. Harshly attacking what he called 'demo-liberal usurocracy', he stated: 'It is the task of this generation to do what the first democrats did not do. The corporate system, which grants the people powers in relation to their work and vocation, provides them with the means to protect themselves eternally against the powers of money.'

When World War II broke out, Pound did not hesitate to blame international finance for causing the disaster. He stated, "This war was not born of a whim of Hitler or Mussolini. This war is part of the millennial war between usurers and workers, between usurocracy and all those who do an honest day's work with their arms or their intellect."

Pound's goal has always been a state that worships personality and art. That is why he has no sympathy for democratic systems, and in "The Renaissance" he states: "Democracies have always been overthrown because humanity vehemently desires the outstanding individual. And to date, no democracy has provided sufficient space for the expansion of such a personality." He thus advocates a massive return of societies to art and culture, concluding: "When a civilisation vibrates with life, it supports and encourages all the arts: pictorial, poetic, sculptural, musical and architectural. When it is dull and anaemic, it shelters a rabble of priests, inept instructors and parrots who do nothing but repeat everything second-hand. If literature is to resurface in North America, it would have to reappear through, despite, the current commercial publishing system."

Wishing to avoid war, he moved to the United States, and when that proved impossible, he obtained authorisation from Radio Rome to speak regularly on the condition that he would never be asked to say anything that his conscience would not allow or that was contrary to his duties as a citizen of the United States, a condition that had to be specifically stated in each programme. The Italian government kept its promise, and from January 1941 to July 1943, Pound spoke on the radio twice a week. In his talks, he railed against the war, against the main culprit, President Roosevelt, against the 'system of usury' and against the Jews. He attacked the Talmud and repeatedly recommended the Protocols of the Elders of Zion. He claimed that the war was organised by a few financiers against the American people themselves. He c u r s e d Churchill, Baruch, Morgenthau, and even accused American Judaism of having created Bolshevism. But he also discussed Confucius, literature, and the best authors of our century.

When he was later condemned for these broadcasts by the Allies, Ezra Pound declared: "Freedom of the press has become a farce, for everyone knows that the press is controlled, if not by its owners, then at least by its advertisers. Free speech under modern conditions becomes a mockery if it does not include the right to free speech on the radio."

As if to prove these statements right, on 5 May 1945, Pound was arrested by American soldiers and taken to a Disciplinary Training Centre in Pisa. He did not know that he would have to prove his own words over and over again with facts: "If a man is not prepared to take risks for his opinions, it is because either his opinions are worthless or he is worthless." He was put in an iron cage (in *The Canticles* he calls it "the gorilla cage"), in a row of cages where those condemned to death were kept. The sun and rain beat down on him, and at night powerful floodlights prevented him from sleeping. After three weeks of such treatment, Ezra Pound had to be transferred to the medical area. The treatment he received in Pisa

violated, as Professor Giovannini later pointed out, several clauses of the US Constitution and, of course, the human rights for which the Allies believed they had to fight Fascism.

After six months (without trial, without a solicitor, without the right to bail), he was flown to Washington and charged there with being an enemy of the United States. Without trial or verdict of any kind, it was said that Pound was "not in possession of his faculties and unfit to stand trial," and so it was decreed that he had gone mad ("... and now they call me mad, because I cast all madness from me..." as some verses from "Personae" would say). Dr Marion King, of the US Public Health Service, considered Pound to be "a sensitive, eccentric and cynical person, who was in "a paranoid state of psychotic proportions that prevents him from facing trial", and the jury declared the writer mentally ill, admitting him to St Elizabeth's Hospital. The reality is that this allowed Pound to be imprisoned for 13 years without being convicted of any crime. In the hospital, his "illness" received no medical treatment whatsoever, clear evidence of the intentionality of the act, and for the first year and a half he did not see the light of day, remaining in the same room with other patients, all of whom were wearing straitjackets.

Ezra Pound was opposed to all forms of psychiatry; when asked whether he preferred Freud or Jung, he replied that he could not tell the difference between the contents of a sewer. Despite his confinement, the American doctors were unable to get the "patient" to undergo psychoanalysis. On several occasions, Pound explained that he was, in fact, locked up in one asylum within another, considering American society to be a huge madhouse.

When he was awarded the Bollingen Prize for Poetry in 1948 for his *Cantos* Pisanos, a prize worth \$1,000 from the Library of Congress, the outcry against the members of the jury was fierce; the press brutally attacked Pound, members of the US Congress tore their clothes, and since then the Bollingen Prize has never again been awarded by the Library of Congress, its jurisdiction having been transferred to Yale University. A shining example of the objectivity of Allied democracy... Even Radio Moscow attacked Western societies that lack poets to the extent that they have to award prizes to madmen...

Ezra Pound maintained his political, economic and artistic convictions until the end of his days. He showed visitors to Santa Isabel photos of Mussolini hanging, and in the "*Pisan Cantos*" he calls the Italian leader "the twice crucified". He maintained his attacks on the Jews and their responsibility for the war throughout his imprisonment, finally stating: "The only chance of emerging victorious from brainwashing is the right that every man has to have his ideas judged one by one." The most prestigious names in literature from around the world came to visit him at St. Elizabeth's; evidently, for a madman, his last years in the asylum were highly prolific.

When Hemingway received the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1954, he said he would have preferred it to have been given to Pound instead of him. Numerous writers and intellectuals wrote letters calling for his release, and even all the residents of Rapallo sent a petition for clemency to the US Congress.

But it would not be until 1958 that Pound would be able to leave his confinement, completely free. He never had a trial or an apology. The silent repression would continue throughout his life: the American Academy of Arts and Sciences did not accept his name for the

Emerson Medal, refusing—in an unprecedented move—to accept the report of its own committee. Year after year, he was denied the Nobel Prize, even after it had been awarded to writers (such as Yeats, Elliot, Hemingway, etc.) who were influenced by him and certainly inferior. Elliot wrote, among many testimonies of his enormous literary value: "No man alive can write like him, and I wonder how many writers have half his talent."

Ezra Pound died in 1972. His name remained that of the thinker, the artist, who had managed to endorse a tremendously personal ideology with his tormented life. And Pound's story is the same story of the discrediting of his enemies: by humiliating him, they proved their mistake.

From his Canto LXXVI, these verses still resonate, ending as follows: "Woe to those who conquer with armies and whose only right is their strength!"

KNUT HAMSUM

He was born in Lom, Norway, on 4 August 1859. He began writing at the age of 19, when he was an apprentice shoemaker. Paying for his studies with his work, first as a shoemaker and then as a miner, he became a schoolteacher. He then left for the United States, where he lived for 10 years, working as a tram driver and farmer in the state of Illinois. In 1890, he returned to Norway, where he published his first novel, *Hunger*, one of his best known but perhaps not his best.

His literary output is extensive: "Bread", "Editor Lynge", "New Land", "Mysteries", "The Game of Life", "In the Land of the Custos", "A Life of Adventure", "Along the Old Roads", "Rosa," and the so-called "Trilogy of the Vagabond," composed of the works "Under the Autumn Stars," "A Vagabond Plays Softly," and "The Last Joy," but perhaps the best works, from a strictly literary point of view, are "Children of the Age" and "Vagabonds."

The influence of Nietzsche and Strindberg is evident in Hamsun's work, emphasising the social problems of man and carrying out fine psychological analyses of the individual when faced with simple realities such as hunger, physical labour, injustice, fear... He was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1920.

After the Second World War, Hamsun was accused of treasonous behaviour towards his homeland and of collaborating with the Germans. His statements upon hearing of Hitler's death were decisive in his conviction. "I am not worthy to speak of Adolf Hitler aloud," he said in 1945. "His life and work do not give rise to sentimental gossip. He was a fighter, a combatant for humanity and a preacher of the message of justice for all nations. We, his followers, bow down before his death." At the age of 87, he was sentenced to 30 days in prison on the specific charge of shaking hands with the German Foreign Minister, Von Ribbentrop, at an official reception. In addition, a declaration of national unworthiness was issued against him. Upon his release from prison, he was interned for some time in an asylum for lunatics, his old-age pensions were withdrawn, and his works were completely blacked out in Norway.

Despite this, his works have been republished abroad, and the cursed writer can now even be republished in his own country. Hamsun died on 19 February 1952. J.B.

SVEN HEDIN

Sven Anders Hedin was born in Stockholm in 1865. He was the son of Ludwig Hedin, municipal architect of Stockholm, and studied successively at the Universities of Uppsala, Berlin and Halle. At the age of twenty, he travelled to the Caucasus, Persia and Mesopotamia, and five years later he was appointed official interpreter for the Swedish-Norwegian mission to visit the Shah of Persia.

Hedin is perhaps the greatest explorer of our time. His travels to Central Asia, China, the Gobi Desert and the Trans-Himalayan mountain ranges are famous. He received the highest decorations and honours from the leading geographical societies of Europe and America, the Swedish Government created a special title of nobility for him, and in 1909 the Indian Government appointed him Honorary High Commissioner of the Indian Empire.

His main works are travelogues, which are extremely interesting and controversial, as he always draws conclusions from his observations and discoveries that have not always been officially endorsed by the "right-thinking" people. His political activities during the First World War already created problems for him with the Indian, Russian and Chinese governments, as well as the British, as he was suspected of being pro-German. His book "A People at War" had a great impact in Europe, and one of its paragraphs is worth mentioning: "In the early stages of the war, the British press had accused the Germans of being cruel to prisoners and the wounded. I never believed these claims for a moment, but in defence of the Germanic race, I set out to destroy these slanders and spread the truth everywhere. A people that claims to have achieved a high degree of culture can at least be expected not to accuse its adversary of crimes it has not committed." This defence of defeated Germany earned him the friendship of the National Socialist government, and Hedin never hid his feelings in favour of the New European Order established by Germany during the Second World War. Upon learning of Hitler's death, he did not hesitate to declare to the Dagen Nyheder his sympathies for the recently deceased man, saying: "Not a word of hatred or unkindness ever passed his lips. The Führer's great hope was always to establish a true friendship with England and France. I have for Adolf

Hitler a profound and invaluable memory, seeing him as one of the greatest men in history. Hitler is dead, but his work will live on. The memory of the great Führer will live on in the German people for a thousand years." These words, spoken at the age of 80, led to his ostracism by the official awarding bodies. He died in Stockholm in November 1952. J.B.

GUSTAV FRODING

Swedish writer, directly influenced by Nietzsche. Central to his way of thinking is an appreciation for all that exists, both in nature and in society. De Boor has said that "nothing could be further from the truth than to interpret Froding as a poet who feels compassion for social injustice in the sense of biased democratic poetry." He imagines the Hero, the Super-Man of the future, as standing beyond Good and Evil. His most notable works are "The Legend of the Grail," "Splashes of the Grail," "Guitar and Accordion," "Old and New," and an extensive body of poetry. J.B.

THOSE WHO WROTE BY EXAMPLE

There are two general approaches to developing political theory: the author who, without actively fighting, writes dull volumes on economics and concocts obtuse theories that few will understand (such as Marx), or the fighter who becomes aware of the need for a new conception of the world by suffering deprivation and struggle in his own flesh (such as the leaders of the European revolutionary movements). The work of the former is a sterile laboratory product, conceived as a chemical formula and applicable indiscriminately without taking into account the idiosyncrasies of each people. The work of the latter is born of a knowledge of the reality of the moment; it does not invent utopian paradises and is developed and shaped, until it reaches full consciousness, through the struggle itself.

All the founders and leaders of revolutionary nationalism were like this: men of austere lives, tireless fighters, who wrote little but did much and preached by the example of their own lives. The shining example is Adolf Hitler, whose only book, "Mein Kampf," bears the title of his work; in it, he recounts his personal evolution and that of the movement until they became aware, through struggle, of their own ideology, in a dynamic lexicon accessible to the general public, at the opposite extreme from the cumbersome tome "Das Kapital" by a good bourgeois named Karl Marx. But Hitler's great artistic work would be neither his book nor his speeches, but the practical creation of a new conception of the world, the formation of an optimistic and flourishing people, and the creation of a strong state.

Perhaps the clearest example of exemplary literature was that of Corneliu Codreanu. Initially more of a moralist than a politician, he saw revolution as based solely on the renewal of man himself, rather than on economic infrastructure: "The country is dying for lack of men, not for lack of political programmes... We must not create new programmes, but new men." A tireless worker, he suffered all kinds of persecution, together with his comrades in the Iron Guard. He wrote a passionate autobiography of his struggle, which is well worth reading, as well as some notes and messages from Jilava prison, before being assassinated on the orders of King Carol II. Codreanu was tortured,

beaten and had to endure, and even witness, the suffering of his own family, whom he adored. His greatest work was undoubtedly his own life.

In Belgium, Léon Degrelle provides another example of a man of action who writes with deeds. Author of numerous articles (especially for *L'Europe Réelle*), volunteer on the Eastern Front, and leader of a broad mass movement, the Rex, he is the author of works such as *The Russian Campaign*, *Memoirs of a Fascist*, *Burning Souls*, etc.

Martyrs included the Flemish Staf de Clerq and Joris van Severen. Ante Pavelic, a Croatian and tireless fighter, offers an impeccable example. His life was a true novel of combat for his ideology, and he was assassinated by communist agents after a life of exemplary dedication. Another martyr was the Slovak Monsignor Tiso, of the Slovak People's Movement. A clear fighter was the Frenchman Doriot, of the French People's Party, who evolved from the ranks of militant communism to a determined national-revolutionary stance. And Mosley, who in England organised a movement similar to those in other European countries. And José Antonio, who gave his life in prison in Alicante for remaining faithful to the principles that inspired his struggle. And Ferenc Szalasi, leader of the Hungarian Movement, who rebelled when he saw how they were trying to make a pact with the USSR in the name of his country. He kept his word of honour and fought to the end for Hungary and Europe until he was assassinated after the German defeat.

Mussolini was perhaps the fascist leader who wrote most extensively, perhaps partly because, being a progressive, he was the first to propose solutions to the serious global crisis from a national-revolutionary point of view, and was therefore compelled to seek theoretical solutions as well. His complete works comprise ten volumes, starting with his early writings from the socialist party, of which he was a member before becoming aware of the new revolution. Despite his hesitations and flaws, Mussolini knew how to fight to the end, and his body, dragged through the dust and then hung in the public square, is a clear symbol of the savage and animalistic reaction of the democratic masses against the innovator.

All the works of these leaders are works of action, writings of combat, memoirs of struggle, proposals for the future. Even Quisling, the cultured and austere Norwegian diplomat, author above all of memoirs such as *"Politics of East and West"*.

Perhaps Oliveira Salazar was one of the most theoretical authors. From a very humble family, he became a member of parliament through his own efforts, but he could only endure one parliamentary session, retiring because of the disgust it caused him. A professor at the University of Coimbra, he was the author of numerous essays on state theory and economics.

In this volume, devoted entirely to intellectuals and thinkers who understood and understand the true meaning of a European revolution, far from the patterns set by the two "greats" of world politics, we must not forget those who, with their lives, wrote the most authentic and useful work. Our conception of the world is based more on the blood and example of those who lived and died for an idea than on complicated laboratory speculations. RB-JT.

THE SOCIOLOGICAL TREND:
GAETANO MOSCA, WIFREDO PARETO,
THOMAS MOLNAR AND JULES
MONNEROT

Traditionally, Marxism has viewed sociology with certain reservations. Luckacs, for example, writes: "The birth of sociology as an independent discipline means that the treatment of the problem of society disregards its economic basis

... the scientific function, in harmony with general economic and political evolution, becomes a methodology and an ideology hostile to progress and, in many respects, reactionary." Indeed, it was not in vain that Luckacs, a notorious Marxist and heterodox at times, warned that a science such as sociology (the science of human behaviour in its entirety) had a global character, encompassing elements of other sciences such as economics, biology, other natural sciences and even philosophy itself. Therefore, sociology, by definition, shuns the dogmatic and sectarian practices of Marxist economism and has reality as its only reference point. As a science, sociology cannot accept unprovable clichés and, for its analysis, discards all demoliberal mythology about "human goodness" and egalitarianism, just as it discards Marxist determinism as a sclerotic ideology.

Given these premises, it is not surprising that, in one way or another, sociology was coincided with the fascist phenomenon. At least part of this science served as its ideological basis, while another part coincided with it entirely. Nor is it surprising that some of the sociologists who most directly coincided with the phenomenon of revolutionary nationalism were declared "banned" after 1945. Julien Freund, in his work on Vilfredo Pareto, is surprised by the incomprehensible wall of silence that official science erected around Pareto. But he forgets that if history has not paid tribute to Pareto, it is not because of the principles he established about the elite, but because, consistent with his scientific theories, he accepted the position of representative of the fascist government in the League of Nations. The examples could be multiplied... Werner Sombart, forgotten after analysing the "soul" of the Jewish people and explaining the birth of capitalism in its light; Gaetano Mosca, confronted with egalitarian theses, Pareto's teacher and surpasser of the functions of political parties with his notion of the "ruling political class". And a long etcetera...

Gaetano Mosca... an illustrious stranger even to many nationalist and revolutionary militants, yet without Mosca, he laid the sociological foundations, without intending to, for what would later become fascist governments. Mosca died in 1941, only a few years after Pareto and his systems could easily be identified. In his book "Elements of Political Science", Mosca starts from the premise that communities cannot be governed, nor have they ever been historically, by isolated individuals or by abstract and inorganic collectives. In the first case (see the example provided by Francoism), if the political system depends on a single individual, it does not normally survive him: its duration does not extend beyond the natural life of its founder and leader. In the second case, power lacks stability, rigour and identity, and the power vacuum can lead to a multiplicity of centres of power, in the same way that anarchy can lead to circumstantial compromise.

Power and its administration must be managed by a specialised and qualified minority: a ruling political class. In all periods of historical splendour, although there has been a leading figure – Caesar, Napoleon, Hitler – this figure has been just one member of a small, active minority, the true leaven of the masses and the authentic polariser, channeller and guide of national energies.

Mosca distinguishes between two types of political class: what he calls the "open" class, which he identifies practically with democratic regimes (later, Burnham would assimilate it, as we shall see, to the general staff of political parties), and the "closed" or aristocratic class, examples of which would be precisely the fascist or National Socialist states. Given that all aristocracies can degenerate into oligarchies, the

"regulator" for Mosca is a state in which "the governed are better protected against the arbitrariness, caprice and tyranny of their leaders". Mosca appears here to be infected with some liberal tics: in effect, he finds in the liberal doctrine of the unity of power and the division of functions the counterbalances that ensure the equanimity and rectitude of leaders. Machiavelli's political theory actually followed the same path, as a predecessor of liberalism, of a princely and authoritarian liberalism, that is.

Mosca's notion of the political class is important insofar as, perfected, it acquires greater coherence and doctrinal rigour with Vilfredo Pareto.

Pareto, whose mother was French, was born in Italy, although he lived most of his life in Switzerland. Until the middle of his life, he had extremely liberal views on economics, to the point of criticising any kind of state interference in economic life. In reality, Pareto's political views were always vague and, in any case, right-wing and even reactionary. He adhered to fascism not out of revolutionary faith but, as he wrote to his friend Carlo Placci, because fascism "is the only movement that can save Italy from infinite evils". And in many other articles he always affirmed that the most important values that should take precedence over all others were freedom, order, respect for the law and private property.

Like Mosca, his work is not so important because it is defined by this or that political label, but because his historical analysis of the state and power leads him to an objectively pragmatic and fascist conception. He made two contributions: "The theory of the elite" and "The theory of the circulation of elites".

Pareto contrasts the notion of "elite" with that of social class: societies are not ruled by the latter, but by the former. Elites (synonymous with small minorities) shape societies and characterise them according to their will: a society is, therefore, what its elites are. The problem of decline, then, is closely linked to the problem of the decline and degeneration of the ruling elites. All these conclusions and those that will follow are based on an easily verifiable fact, almost a truism, we might say: "Every society is divided into two strata: an upper stratum, of which the rulers are usually a part, and a lower stratum, of which the ruled are a part." In his "Course in Sociology," he links this conception with the notion of hierarchy: "Society appears to us as a heterogeneous mass organised hierarchically. This hierarchy always exists, except in savage populations that live in a state of dispersion like animals." And in his book "Socialist Systems," he is equally categorical: "Human societies cannot live without a hierarchy."

However, the notion of elite does not always have a positive connotation, as one might think: just as there are elites among criminals, there are also elites among the military. The notion of elite is therefore not absolute and is present in any field of human activity, which leads to the rejection of liberal egalitarianism and the overcoming of Mosca's narrow concept of the legitimacy of government: a government is just when its elite is at the service of the population, and unjust when it puts its own rights before those of the general public.

If we were to ask Pareto what he sees in history and its eternal evolution, he would answer that the history of humanity is the history of its elites, fighting each other in a perpetual struggle for supremacy. This is what he calls the circulation of elites.

"One could conceive of a society in which the hierarchy was stable, but such a society would have absolutely nothing real about it. In all human societies, even those organised into castes, the hierarchy ended up being mortified: the difference

between societies consists of this: that this change may be more or less slow or more or less rapid. The often forgotten fact is that aristocracies disappear and that this is the history of our societies. The history of human societies is, to a large extent, the history of the succession of "aristocracies". (Manual of Sociology).

In a way, the theory of "elite circulation" could be likened to the "doctrine of caste regression," as expounded by Evola in *Revolt Against the Modern World*. They differ only in their terminology and in the general context of the work: what Evola refers to as the bourgeois and proletarian castes, Pareto considers to be degenerate elites. Interestingly, Pareto uses a certain 'traditional' symbolism when he distinguishes between 'lions' and 'foxes'. When "lions" are at the forefront of society, they put their own privileges before the collective good, while "foxes", on the contrary, seek to protect themselves in any situation: today, Western society is ruled by "foxes", that is, by bourgeois elites in decline. What is the unmistakable sign that an elite is in decline? 'A sign that almost always heralds the decline of an aristocracy is the invasion of humanitarian sentiments and a weak sentimentality that render it incapable of defending its positions'.

Thomas Molnar assimilates several concepts put forward by Pareto in "Socialist Systems". Molnar cannot really be described as a sociologist, although his most important text, "The Counter-Revolution", analyses, using sociological methods, the characteristics of the counter-revolutionary phenomenon from 1789 to the present day and lumps Taine and Mussolini, Hitler and the German-Jewish philosopher Krause together. Nor is he a historian, since he does not tend to expose all the vicissitudes of the counter-revolution, but rather its philosophical and sociological interconnections. Much less is he a politician, since, although he makes common cause with all the conservatives of the world (he participated in the International Congress for the Defence of Culture, organised by Professor Armando Plebe), he has not sought office or carried out propaganda work in the service of any particular party. We will call him, for the sake of understanding, the 'philosopher of the counter-revolution'.

Molnar analyses all the revolutionary processes that have taken place since 1789.

to the present day and draws a single conclusion: the revolutionary upheaval occurred not when the previous regime maintained odious and frankly dictatorial positions, but when it showed signs of greater liberalism and condescension towards the revolutionaries. Louis XVI, for example, like Nicholas II, granted great benefits to the revolutionary forces and even refused to use all his power to crush the subversion. It is said that when the rebels approached Versailles, some armed advisers asked Louis XVI if they should fire to disperse the crowd; the benevolent king refused, arguing that it would cause carnage (the young Lieutenant Bonaparte, who was nearby, did not hesitate to mutter, "What an imbecile"). Nicholas II granted the Duma broad representative powers. The regimes of Franco and Salazar succumbed the moment they began to make concessions: concessions that were presented as a sign of strength when in reality the revolutionaries knew that they were signs of weakness and that, once a position had been conquered, nothing should stop them from marching on to the next one. Thus, the regimes in power also demonstrated a lack of faith in their mission: neither Tsar Nicholas II, nor Salazar, nor Franco believed, towards the end of their days, in the divine origin of the monarchy, nor in the organic or corporate state in the case of the latter; nor did the ruling elites around them have excessive faith in the future and came to wonder whether the

"Revolutionaries": the moment when the "republique des lettres" infiltrated the Palace of Versailles can be compared to the statements made by Arias Navarro and his cronies when they attempted to bring about an "evolution towards more democratic and decentralised forms". The subsidies granted by Franco's last governments to theatre companies run by markedly subversive elements can be compared to the applause given by Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette to the works of frankly anti-monarchical authors. What was happening? The ruling elites were degenerating.

Molnar expressed Pareto's criterion: "Any elite that is not prepared to fight to defend its positions is in full decline and has no choice but to give way to a new elite whose virile qualities are more pronounced. It is dreaming if it imagines that the humanitarian principles it has proclaimed will be applied to it: the victors will make the relentless *vae victis* resound in its ears. The blade of the guillotine was prepared in the shadows when, at the end of the last century, the French ruling classes began to develop their 'sensitivity'.

Molnar and Pareto agree that the beginning of the end of a government starts when all spirit of resistance is castrated. "Aristocracies do not last forever. Whatever the cause, it is clear that after a certain time they disappear. History is a graveyard of aristocracies." Mussolini was very familiar with Pareto's writings and was aware of the truth of his statements. When Mussolini stated in 1936 that "the duty of every regime is to last," he was also aware that his personal power could not last forever: the Fascist Party was, therefore, the replacement political class, or, if you will, the new elite. And it is curious that, referring to Mussolini's speech to parliament in 1933 creating the "corporations", a commentator in the first weekly magazine of the Spanish Falange, "FE", noted: "Who will succeed Mussolini? The party will succeed Mussolini, the party will take care of the renewal of the ruling elites". That is how it should be. The National Socialist party was conceived in identical terms, so that the renewal of the elites would not mean the liquidation of the system. On the other hand, the renewal of elites brought with it perpetual tension within the movement: not a moment's respite, not a moment's relaxation, hierarchies are not static, but dynamic in every fascist movement, it is the daily, constant struggle that promotes hierarchies.

Jules Monnerot is best known for his book *Sociology of Communism*, which Simone de Beauvoir has described as the "bible of contemporary anti-communism", and not without reason. The book, which is somewhat outdated, especially considering that it was written in 1949 and that since then there have been sensational changes within the international communist movement, both politically and ideologically (the Maoist split, the emergence of Eurocommunism and the New Left, etc.), attempts to demonstrate that communism is the "Islam of the 20th century", which appears at a time of collapse of the bourgeois oligarchies (in the same way that Islam swept away weak and internally divided states such as the Visigoths) to establish prophetism, not of Islam, but of a new religion of technology and dialectics. Perhaps Monnerot's most important assertion is that "the communist enterprise is above all a religious enterprise"... "Communism presents itself both as a secular religion and as a universal state. As a secular religion, it drains feelings, organises and makes effective the impulses that rebel against the societies into which men are born, accelerates that

state of separation from themselves and of division from part of their living forces, which accelerates the pace of dissolution and destruction." Leaving aside the fact that Monnerot's book is a product of the Cold War, there is an underlying truth to it that makes it still worth reading today: not only because it demonstrates the extent to which man's natural religious instinct has been exploited (just as an aikido fighter uses his opponent's strength to defeat him) for the benefit of Marxism, but also to verify and observe the mechanisms used by subversion to achieve its ends.

Monnerot agrees with Pareto in his analysis of the material driving force behind subversion: the Marxist ruling elite, the 'apparatchik' (equivalent to a man of the apparatus in the communist organisational hierarchy), the Communist Party and the International. He also agrees with Thomas Molnar on the impotence of the "counter-revolutionaries" (i.e., all those who, without being Marxists, offer fierce resistance) as long as they do not assimilate modern tactics of propaganda and mass manipulation, just as Molnar considers that Marxism can only be defeated through coherent counter-revolutionary approaches. Finally, he agrees with Max Weber and all those mentioned above on the importance of "charismatic leaders".

Max Weber was called by some "the German Machiavelli"; his extensive ideological, political and philosophical work far exceeds the scope of this limited work. A few years before Hitler came to power, Weber put forward the theory that in a bureaucratised society that would progressively reach higher technical stages, which would imply a constant increase in bureaucracy, power must be in capable hands (a managerial elite) and contact with the masses, contact necessary to prevent the individual from being lost in anonymity and impersonality, must be ensured by "charismatic leaders" who know not only how to win the support and sympathy of the people, but also how to interpret their desires and issue new directives: bureaucracy is not enough to achieve these tasks, which are not only generational, but also ethical and moral.

Two other sociologists, Robert Michels and James Burnham, complete the picture of sociological observations on elites, the ruling political class, and current social reality. For Michels, for example, the key phenomenon of our century is the tendency of societies towards Bonapartism. The term "Bonapartist" evokes the figure of Napoleon I, in whom it is necessary to distinguish between his political and military aspects. The latter is unquestionable: he was a genius at manoeuvring armies. The former has another meaning: the bourgeoisie born of the French Revolution, in order to escape the bloody stagnation into which it had been plunged by disputes between parties and sects, all resolved by the guillotine, handed over power to a dictator to whom it entrusted its destiny. The same image has been repeated throughout the centuries on different occasions. The tendency towards Bonapartism is linked to Max Weber's charismatic leader and Pareto's ruling political class, all of which complement each other perfectly.

Michels, however, goes further. In his book "Essay on the Oligarchic Tendencies of Democracies," he sets out to destroy democratic myths: power does not reside in the people because "when a conflict arises between leaders and the led (the masses), the former always emerge victorious if they know how to remain united" (that is, if they do not show any cracks). The "iron law of oligarchy" takes into account the tendency of people (remember Gustav Le Bon's theme in this regard) to allow themselves to be dominated by a minority of specialists in times of crisis. In

Another later work, *Sociology of the Political Party in Modern Democracy*, Micheis is even harsher in his judgement of the democratic regime: even assuming that all men were equal in ability to their peers, even assuming the same level of knowledge, the mass media and the manipulation of information channels by political parties would condition any democratic election to such an extent that it would be "worthless".

James Burnham, also one of the "Machiavellians", considers the march towards Bonapartism to be a natural tendency of modern times. What is more, he considers certain forms of Bonapartism to be the extreme consequence of the liberal regime, coinciding surprisingly with Evola. Indeed, Bonapartism always acts "in the name of the people," by "the will of the people," formulas similar to democratic oaths and the spirit of the United States Declaration of Independence, the first political text of a modern democratic nature. We must regard this tendency as normal, which does not mean, we note, that it is positive or negative; it is positive insofar as it is consciously directed towards the service of ethics and morality and assumes a Western tradition; it is negative, on the contrary, when it becomes a mere formality or excuse with which an economic oligarchy tends to preserve and retain power. Burnham was certainly not the first to warn that capitalism is destined to disappear and that socialism is not capable of replacing it, as they have objectively identical aims and evolve in the same way. However, he was the first to warn that power in any modern state increasingly belongs to a new political ruling class: the technocrats ("In a managerial society, sovereignty is located in administrative offices"). He also warns of the synarchic tendencies of some technocrats ("the problems of technicians and managers are the same everywhere, they are made to understand each other, while politicians are made to fight each other") and the general tendency to make politics increasingly dependent on the economy. The latest international trends seem to confirm this hypothesis, especially the activities and aims of the Trilateral Commission and the Bilderberg Club.

Finally, technocracy currently represents a political ruling class devoid of any ideological norms other than effectiveness and production at all costs. A class that dominates the globe, beyond the spheres of political influence, a caste that can be considered a caricature of the priestly caste, the new priests of technology and economics who rule the world.

With Burnham and the entire sociological trend, we have covered the central theme of fascism. With Burnham, we have once again arrived at the identity between socialism and capitalism and their logical correlation of ultimate ends. E.M.

APPROACHES TO FASCISM:

Neo-socialism and neo-traditionalism

HENRY DE MAN

The communist revolution in Russia produced a mutation within the international communist movement, within which two strategic paths emerged: Leninist Bolshevism, which triumphed in Russia, and the social democracy of the Jews Adler, Bauer, Bernstein, etc. Both tendencies hold power in some European nations and ultimately show all they are capable of: either a reign of terror or permanent instability. Within the global Marxist movement,

there was a situation similar to the current one, which, like the current one, gave rise to a new theoretical current that, in the long run, would be unable to transform itself into a mass movement within the Marxist field, having to move on to militant anti-communism and the theoretical and practical rejection of the principles of dialectical materialism. This current is to the Marxism of its time what today may be the embryo of the "Nouvelle Philosophie".

The questioning of Marxism finds its greatest ideologue in the Belgian socialist Henry de Man. Born in 1885, de Man was a professor of economics and politics at the University of Brussels. Among his first notable works, it is worth mentioning his attempt

-and in this he was a precursor to Marcuse- of adapting Marxism to Freud's modern psychoanalytic thinking, attempting to use it to cast doubt on the inevitability of Marx's economic analysis of the crises of capitalism. An orthodox Marxist until 1914, he was deeply surprised to see the mobilisation of national and patriotic sentiments at the outbreak of the world war: how could this emotional explosion be reconciled with the rigorous deterministic schemes of Marxism? The question, from a theoretical point of view, was even more difficult since the proletariat had also been swept up in the patriotic fervour. After the war, de Man watched with surprise the rise of fascism in Italy, and more particularly in Germany, where its proletarian component was undeniable and deeply rooted. Gradually, these reflections led him to distance himself from orthodox Belgian socialism, which found its inspirational model in German social democracy.

The first point of disagreement between de Man's socialism (better called "neo-socialism") and social democracy is the voluntaristic character he gives it: "Socialism is a tendency of the human will towards a just social order. It considers its demands to be just because it judges social institutions and relations according to a universally valid moral criterion. The socialist conviction therefore presupposes a decision of conscience, a personal decision directed towards a goal" ("Heppenheim Theses"). This voluntarism is combined with a moralism that is also absent from official socialist realism: "The greatest possible development of the faculty of conceiving and realising truth, beauty and goodness" (is the goal of every social movement). Thirdly, it is the non-classist nature of his movement that appears to be a disengaging element: since it is "emotional factors" that come into play at certain decisive moments in history, such factors cannot be the product of an economic situation, as they are completely subjective and therefore not the exclusive heritage of one class (the working class), but are common to all those who have the "will to realise socialism". Finally, materialism is also questioned. Unlike Marcuse, de Man uses psychoanalysis with a deliberate interest in penetrating the subjective factors that overlap with the objectives (economic conditions according to Marxism) and giving importance to what he called the 'religious fervour of primitive socialism' (the utopian socialists) as an essentially voluntaristic driving force.

In the social sphere, de Man is considered the originator of the "planist" trend in today's economy.

For him, planning (and a certain degree of state interventionism) is an essential condition in a modern anti-capitalist economic system. The state should not be the property of a party or an oligarchy, but rather the "work of a popular community". All this sounds familiar... Little by little, Henry de Man's ideological evolution had led him to adopt, albeit with a different vocabulary and somewhat opposing formulations,

opposite, some views very close to fascism. His reservations about the fascist phenomenon lasted until 1933. His book "Constructive Socialism" is particularly aggressive against National Socialism. But little by little he became disillusioned with democracy's ability to "plan" and achieve, through its own means, an order of justice and the realisation of "constructive socialism". In 1940, when Belgium was invaded by the armies of the Third Reich, de Man recommended that his fellow citizens should not oppose the occupying armies, as "the way is now clear for the two aspirations of the people: European peace and social justice". Judged after the war as a "collaborator", he died in exile in Switzerland.

MARCEL DEAT

The banner of "constructive socialism" was revived in 1930 by a young French socialist MP, Marcel Deat. Reading De Man's seminal work had transformed him. In *Beyond Socialism and The Pleasure of Working*, Deat found new approaches to socialism: socialism being a struggle of the exploited, the latter are not only workers but also peasants, intellectuals, tenants, small traders, etc.; the struggle against capitalism, or rather the need to fight against capitalism, is the common denominator of all these sections of society.

However, the struggle against capitalism requires a strategy that Deat believes must consist of the struggle for a communal and cooperative economy (socialisation of property), the struggle against the tyranny of capital interest (socialisation of profits), and the struggle against the power vacuum and the weak state (socialisation of power).

And the tactics? The various partial struggles against capitalism, participation in democratic elections that will advance the exploited and recover parcels of power. The goal? A planned state that coordinates the various branches of human activity. Such was the complete scheme that inspired Marcel Deat shortly before his decisive conversion to fascism. The year was 1940, and the evolution up to that point had been a long one...

Marcel Deat is undoubtedly the most appealing figure, alongside Jacques Doriot, of French fascism. François Duprat defined him as "the ideologue of collaboration" with the Germans during the occupation. He was born in 1894 in Nièvre and studied at the famous École Normale on Rue Ulm. The year 1914 was a turning point in his life, with two events that would have a profound impact on him: he joined the

S.F.I.O. (French Socialist Party, then called the French Section of the Workers' International) and marched to the front as an infantry soldier. His courage was recognised in both fields: as a socialist, he became a member of parliament, and as a soldier, he was awarded the Legion of Honour and the rank of captain. In 1928, he wrote his first book, *Socialist Perspectives*, which was edited by Georges Valois (1). His theses echoed and translated into French those put forward by de Man in Belgium. Perhaps the thesis that caused the most controversy during the war was the one that denied the revolutionary character of the SFIO. At the 1930 Socialist Congress, he rallied behind him a tendency called the "Neo-Socialist Right", which represented practically half of the party. But little by little, the officialist tendency regained ground until, in 1933, they were expelled after an Extraordinary Congress of the party in which Deat and his supporters (especially Marquet) defended a motion entitled "Neo-Socialism? Order, Authority, Nation". Léon Blum, the future president under the ill-fated Popular Front, will brand this motion as "pure and simple fascism".

Those expelled – approximately 20 per cent of the SFIO – formed the "Socialist Party of France-Union Jean Jaurès", a short-lived and turbulent organisation.

and which would eventually merge with other splinter groups from the Radical Party to form the Socialist Republican Union, which would have a no less turbulent existence. Deat professed anti-fascist views at the time and did not hesitate to join the "Committee for the Surveillance of Anti-Fascist Intellectuals," but his collaborations with intellectuals reputed to be "right-wing" and even "fascist," such as Jules Romains, became increasingly frequent. Together with Romain and Lacoste, he drafted the "Plan of 9 July", intended to provide a way out – at least on paper – of the social and economic crisis in France in the early 1930s. Minister of Air in Sarraut's centre-left government (January 1936), he lost his seat in May. Secretary-General of the USR, he distanced himself from the "Popular Front", although he was in favour of "critical support", which translated means "limited confrontation". But little by little, the opposition between Deat and Blum grew. He applauded the Munich agreements as a step forward for European pacification. He returned to parliament in April 1939 with an anti-communist programme, and a few months later, when war in Europe was already looming, he wrote a famous article that would go down in the history of journalism and politics: "Die for Danzig?", a decisive pacifist plea. He would later edit the newspaper L'Oeuvre, maintaining his anti-capitalist and anti-communist theories under German occupation and frequently attacking the "reactionaries of Vichy". His campaigns against the reactionaries would initially result in a clash between factions within the Vichy government and the fall of Laval on 13 December 1940.

On 9 July 1940, Deat wrote a historic editorial in his newspaper, the most important paragraph of which read: "The parties are dead... France will not be rebuilt on the misconception of 'national unity'... like all peoples who have made their revolution... we need a party, a single party that highlights and guides our common aspirations. A party that, alongside the state and the government, will frame, encourage, and sustain the nation. Parliament has disappeared; the party will assume the role of liaison between the government and public opinion." The Rassemblement National Populaire was born a few days later as the ripe fruit of these lines.

Deat and his RNP achieved a certain degree of notoriety, although it is true that they remained light years away from being the "single party" they aspired to be. The turbulent period of the German occupation of France, the division that lasted until 1943 between the "Occupied Zone" and the territory of the Vichy government, and the convergence of other parties (mainly the PPF) and small groups (especially the Francists) deprived it of the audience it would logically have deserved. Furthermore, some of its militants were killed by the communist resistance. However, despite their differences, it was precisely Jacques Doriot, a former communist and leader of the PPF, together with Deat, a former socialist and leader of the RNP, who placed the most emphasis on the creation of a Legion of French Volunteers who fought on the Eastern Front, participating in Europe's common struggle against communism. The Germans did not grant the French leaders' request that their volunteers go into battle wearing French uniforms; the LVF, like the Blue Division and the rest of the volunteers from across the West, thus wore the German "feldgrau" uniform in virile and combative brotherhood.

After the war, Marcel Deat was tried for collaboration and, naturally, sentenced to death... in absentia.

It would take too long to explain the various vicissitudes of the RNP until the end of the war. Suffice it to say that with it, Henri de Man's neo-socialist formulations, combined with Marcel Deat's political personality, found their own 'mass line' that coincided exactly - the proof being precisely his 'collaborationism', although

we prefer to call it 'patriotism' during the world war – with the national revolutionary youth movement that was developing throughout Europe.

But if Deat and de Man had gone "beyond socialism," the *Ordre Nouveau* collective, around the same time, sought to go "beyond nationalism." The collective's intentions were clearly set out in the final paragraph of the work that made the group's most representative figure, Thierry Maulnier, famous: "National consciousness and revolutionary consciousness, separated and set against each other, do not constitute, one with a better title than the other, the dialectical forces of the creation of the future; they are merely the sterile products of a dying society. National consciousness becomes conservative, that is, it stupidly associates the effort to perpetuate the national reality with the effort to preserve within it the power of the forces that destroy it; revolutionary consciousness becomes anti-historical and anti-national, that is, it works to annihilate what it wants to liberate. The very words 'national' and 'revolutionary' have been so discredited by demagoguery, mediocrity and verbalism that they are now received in France with an indifference verging on disgust. The problem today is to overcome these political myths based on the economic antagonisms of a divided society; to free nationalism from its bourgeois character and revolution from its proletarian character; to interest the nation in the revolution in an organic and total way, since only the nation is capable of carrying it out; and to engage the revolution in the nation, since only the revolution can save it" (*Beyond Nationalism*).

Just as the phenomenon of Marcel Deat and Henry de Man was called "neo-socialism", these circles were dubbed "neo-traditionalism" and also "new right", names that do not really tell us much.

Disillusionment with socialism and rejection of the right wing and liberal capitalism led some intellectuals who did not initially harbour excessive sympathy for fascist regimes to gather around magazines and cultural societies that defended the same fascist principles in practice, but only on an intellectual level: Jean Pierre Maxence founded "Les Cahiers" in 1928, two years later Jean de Fabregues published the first issue of "Reaction" and, finally, in May 1933, Armand Dandieu and Robert Aron began publishing "L'Ordre Nouveau". Later, in the same vein, "La lutte des jeunes" appeared, with Bertrands de Jouvenel as its driving force, followed by "L'Homme reel" and "Combat", by Roditi and Maulnier respectively, and several others. This wide range of publications shows us that the group was not unified in character; it is our synthesis that unifies it, highlighting the common aspects, apart from the dilettantism that was not uncommon. Their revolutionary interest, their rejection of both the right and the left, their rejection of parliamentarianism, the definition they give of themselves in "Manifeste pour l'Ordre Nouveau" ("traditionalists but not conservatives, realists but not opportunists, revolutionaries but not rebels, builders but not destroyers, neither warmongers nor pacifists, patriots but not nationalists, socialists but not materialists, personalists but not anarchists, human but not humanitarian") and a planned and corporate vision of the economy, give an idea of what united and separated this group from the national and revolutionary phenomenon, which in theory was not much. One can also see what united them with the personalist school of Emmanuel Maunier (who rejected Stalinism and capitalism in the name of rediscovering the human person, all within the framework of a Christian view of life, and whose thinking has been used by renovators of Catholicism on both the right and the left) and with Nietzschean thought.

During the war, the whirlwind of events consigned all these theories to oblivion. However, some figures continued to work along similar lines. Thierry Maulnier, for example, wrote *Violence and Conscience* in 1942 under the occupation and *The Medusa Face of Communism* in 1951, which, together with Jules Monnerot's *Sociology of Marxism*, can be considered the 'bibles' of contemporary anti-communism. Jouvenel and Aron also continued to write, but, as in the case of Junger in another field, their works are now devoid of the youthful and rebellious character of their early writings and have become staunchly conservative. The very title of Maulnier's work, "*The Face of Medusa...*", is significant: like that mythological creature, communism is the new Medusa that freezes the blood of civilised people and rectifies, apologising, his youthful outbursts of yesteryear: "The right to be wrong is the fundamental right of human beings. The same can be said of Aron, who considers that only the affirmation of "Christian and human" values can save humanity from the "monstrous" communist system. said of Aron, who considers that only the affirmation of "Christian and Westerners" can stop Marxism (curiously, he barely explains what those values are). But this matters little. What is written is written, and it matters little that those who wrote it later rectified their thinking if they did not criticise what they thought before. From the pre-war "revolution of order" to "order for order's sake", that is, to subsequent reactionary conservatism, there was no logical evolutionary sequence, only a sudden leap. We are left with his revolutionary thinking, which attempts to synthesise socialism stripped of its materialist component and nationalism stripped of petty bourgeois chauvinism. And this did not remain mere theory: the PPF and the RNP took it up and paid for it with their noble blood. E.M. paid for it with their noble blood. E.M.

(1) George Valois was a pre-war trade unionist who founded "Le Faisceau" in 1923, the first fascist movement modelled on the Italian example. Later, after various vicissitudes, Valois dissolved "Le Faisceau" and joined the SFIO. A member of the Resistance during the war, he founded a publishing house.

EUROPEAN NATIONALISM AND ITS LIMITS

In the early 1960s, a movement attracted public attention in several European countries: "Young Europe". Under the emblem of the Celtic cross, in just a few months, a movement that originated in Belgium, particularly among groups of repatriates from the Congo, spread throughout Europe and created some fifteen national sections. Jean Thiriart was at the head of the organisation.

The ideology of "Young Europe" quickly took shape in the editorials of "Nation Belge" first, then "Nation Belge Europe" and finally "Young Europe". In our view, Jean Thiriart, together with Julius Evola, was the main "revisionist" of fascism and the person who contributed most to an ideological and strategic "aggiornamento". Thiriart was the first to warn of the need to break out of the "ghetto" that democracies and Zionism had placed around revolutionary nationalism. Above all, he sought political effectiveness, marginalising the dilettantism that has always characterised a certain extreme right and the passivity that is congenital to another. His work was not understood by everyone, not even by some of his closest associates.

Jean Thiriart's ideas and the strategy that inspired "Young Europe" are extensively set out in two books of transcendental importance: "Arriba Europa!" and "La Grande Nation - 65 theses on Europe". In both, Thiriart not only updates some interpretations of revolutionary nationalism and gives them new approaches, but also defines what the political and tactical instruments of the "community path to Europe" should be.

The need to overcome petty nationalism, especially Jacobin and chauvinistic nationalism, is the starting point for Thiriart's analysis. But why overcome them?

Why? Precisely because the existence of nations is threatened by the reality of Russian-American imperialism: it is necessary to find "a new dimension of nationalism", that is, a human, cultural, territorial and historical entity capable of building a "third way" between the imperialist monsters. Europe is the new national dimension. And European nationalism is the flame that must ignite the struggle for liberation.

For Thiriart, Europe is the "new unity of destiny in the universal". There is no other destiny for the different European homelands than to be refined into a new and great nation: "An empire of four hundred million men".

Europe's first mission is to fight to expel the Soviets and Americans from the continent. This struggle involves the destruction of the Yalta Treaty, which confirmed the division of the continent. Only then will Europe cease to be the battleground on which the two superpowers fight. The Berlin Wall is the most painful image of the situation on the continent, so European unity must involve

German reunification and the destruction of the wall. Once established, the future European State must remain neutral, maintaining a policy of non-alignment and alliance with the Third World, especially with the Arab world and Latin America.

Thiriart expresses in all his writings a particular reasoned hatred of micro-nationalisms. His thesis is that only strong and large nations are free nations and that micro-nationalisms, i.e. those who claim to act out of "love for the nation", are, paradoxically, their greatest and most dangerous enemies: isolated nations are easy prey for internal enemies (mainly parties considered to be imperialist pawns of Russia or the US) and the interests they represent.

However, Thiriart continues in his analysis, the construction of Europe must be based on a double rejection of communism and plutocracy: in the face of collectivist society and capitalist selfishness, for a society based on solidarity (from "to each according to his needs" to "to each according to his ability and according to his effort"). Thiriart is also in favour of free enterprise, but not within a monopolistic financial framework, rather within a community-based and organised economy. Not directed by the state, but guided by it. The large profits of trusts must be limited or abolished. The social programme designed by Thiriart is very similar in its original conception to that established by the Italian Social Republic.

In practical terms, Thiriart puts forward a series of ideas that are worth considering: Europe will be born when a minority of Europeans embrace the idea of Europe; a nation comes after the idea that a determined minority has of it. This minority must be framed and organised within a structure that is not simply a party in a universe of parties, but a political movement capable of becoming political-military when circumstances require it. Within this movement, the hierarchy – the hierarchy of law – will be created through constant, daily struggle. Heavily influenced by Pareto and Mosca, he considers that both the 'circulation of elites' and the existence of a ruling political class are indispensable for the European revolution. The form of struggle that the European movement must carry out resembles the 'revolutionary war' as expounded by Lenin in 'What Is To Be Done?'. In fact, Thiriart's movement initially studied the classic texts of Marxism carefully and noted that the European liberation struggle was, at least in essence, similar to that which the Vietnamese and Algerians were waging at that very moment against the French metropolis. Thiriart was clearly hostile towards the Viet Minh, and especially towards the FLN, but this did not prevent them from offering him invaluable suggestions on how to conduct a liberation struggle. Thiriart's practice can ultimately be defined as "voluntarist and personalist Leninism".

So much for the fundamental tenets of the Young Europe movement. Politically, it was significant in Belgium, and there were national sections in Spain, Germany, France, England, Ireland, Switzerland, etc. From 1965 onwards, the movement lost momentum and some of its national sections disintegrated. In reality, in many of them Thiriart had not found the right people to lead them; in others, in Belgium in particular, he found that part of his base had their "own ideas" about the tactics to be employed. "Young Europe" and its weekly newspaper were replaced by "La Nation Européenne", a monthly magazine that appeared in two editions (Franco-Belgian and Italian) and continued to develop the movement's doctrine.

It was precisely in this magazine that we can glimpse what we can now rightly call "left-wing fascism", represented by the "Organization of the People's Struggle". Indeed, the revolutionary radicalism of "La Nation Européenne" was a magnet for

attraction for many young nationalists and revolutionaries between 1967 and 1970, especially in Italy. The Italian edition of the magazine was edited by Claudio Mutti, a fervent supporter of the Palestinian cause against international Zionism. In 1969, a few months after the Six-Day War, the fedayeen came to the conclusion that their cause, like that of Vietnam, would only prevail if they managed to create a favourable international response. To this end, they decided to organise solidarity and propaganda campaigns throughout Europe. In March 1969, the first major pro-Palestinian meeting took place in Italy, specifically in Padua. The rally was organised by a young lawyer who, in the early 1960s, had given a course on "State Doctrine" at the Paduan federation of the MSI and was a local leader of the UFAN; militants from the Maoist group "Potere Operario" and fedayeen from "Al Fatah" also collaborated. At the end of the meeting, a supposed Palestinian, Selim Hamid, introduced himself to Fredda as an agent of the Algerian secret services and, after several meetings, asked him to buy several "timers" (electrical timers used in terrorism for the construction of time bombs) for the fedayeen. Selim Hamid turned out to be a member of the Mossad (Jewish secret service). The timers were apparently used months later to carry out the massacre at the Banca Agricola di Milano...

On 6 December 1971, two years after the Milan massacre, Fredda was arrested and accused of having participated in its organisation. This marked the beginning of the "black trail" that for months provided juicy fodder for journalists and a public hungry for sensationalist news. A few days after Fredda's release from prison (which would last until 26 August 1976), his unexpected popularity led to his doctrinal pamphlet "The Disintegration of the System" selling out completely. Fredda is of particular interest to us: he represents an ideological renewal within revolutionary nationalism and, in the same way that Thiriart revised fascism, Fredda revises and surpasses Thiriart himself. We will focus solely on this aspect. We are not interested at this point in Fredda's political derivations, nor in his behaviour before and after the attacks, to which he was completely unrelated.

Fredda can be considered "Evolian", or rather "traditionalist", and he warns that Thiriart's work has its limitations: "Thiriart at least has the merit of considerably broadening horizons by helping to eliminate the provincialism (Italian, French, German, etc.) of many militants who come from the extreme right. But the European dimension alone is not enough to constitute a powerful idea. Thiriart's limitation consists simply in believing this. To speak simply of the Great Europe from Brest to Bucharest, or even from Dublin to Vladivostok, means only to situate oneself in terms of a geopolitics that serves as a support for a policy of power. In short, Thiriart lacked a worldview ordered according to 'traditional' orientations." Indeed, as Thiriart conceived his movement, it merely aspired to replace Russian-American imperialism with another imperialism, which, while liberating and positive, still carried within it the seeds of dissolution by conceiving the nation in the bourgeois and Jacobin form, albeit giving it a continental dimension.

The ideas contained in "The Disintegration of the System" served, as we have said, to fuel the new nationalist and revolutionary generations. "The Disintegration" is a pamphlet heavily influenced by the proximity of the revolutionary events of May 1968 and the Italian "autunno caldo" (hot autumn). The vision was simple: the leftists want revolution, we want

revolution: let's destroy the System with them. The statement made sense at the time: the Student Movement, the driving force behind the revolutionary "new left", had been born on the fringes of the orthodox communist parties and its Marxism was very "sui generis". It was an austere, idealistic, voluntarist, militant and creative Marxism, that is to say, a very un-Marxist Marxism. Its model was China: a regime in which the rulers were austere and measured in everything except their revolutionary demands. Its idol was Commander Che Guevara, a revolutionary who abandoned his comfortable position as Minister in Havana to carry the flame of the liberating revolution until his death in the Andean highlands. But if this vision was fair in 1967-70, the charm of the new left would dissolve in the following years to become what it is today (except for the phenomenon of "autonomy"): a myriad of small groups and subgroups that follow the policies of the Eurocommunist parties (such as Potere Operaio, Lotta Continua in Italy and the ORT/MC/PTE in Spain).

The importance of Fredda's work also lies in his ability to analyse the instruments used by the System to achieve its domination: myths (progressivism, egalitarianism, pacifism), the "mass media" (major press, radio and TV networks, etc.), educational channels, political and social organisations (parties and trade unions), and legal structures (magistrates, etc.). In conclusion, the System must be dismantled: there is no solution within the system; it must be sought in its destruction, and this struggle against the system must be waged in the world of culture, science and morality, against everything that is "official" (bourgeois and conformist). The aim of the struggle is to achieve a new type of society in which contradictions do not stem from the productive mechanisms of the system, but from within man, from his passions and his struggle for life.

Ideologically, someone has aptly defined Giorgio Fredda and his publishing house in Padua (Edizioni di Ar) as a "left-wing Evolian" movement. Its only concrete political manifestation was the People's Struggle Organisation, which disbanded in 1973 in order to escape the harsh repression that was being unleashed against it. Today it survives as a current within the MSI and more as an ideological tendency in extra-parliamentary revolutionary movements.

Fredda ultimately provides what Thiriart lacks: values that go beyond strictly geopolitical and anti-imperialist ones, a conception of the world and history, and an analysis of the Student Movement and the revolutionary phenomenon that emerged in (and after) May 1968. E.M.

"Materialistic American society shows us the quagmire into which a community falls when it neglects the moral preparation of its leaders and masses. Material satiety is achieved, but at the price of general psychological imbalance. A country of wealth, a country of neurosis. A country of pleasures, a country of psychiatry. Communism is heading for the same lamentable end. Only its poverty has, until now, sheltered it from a similar fate."

Jean Thiriart

THE ETHOLOGICAL REVOLUTION

Readers may wonder why we use the term Revolution to refer to the progress made in recent years in the field of this biological science called ethology, which studies the behaviour of living beings. If we stop to consider the significance of the work of Lorenz, Ardrey, Irenaus and other ethologists, we will realise that they have gone far beyond the purely scientific and academic, and have burst violently and untimely into the world of philosophical anthropology, ethics, pedagogy, psychology, and the conception of Man in general, revealing how many errors, falsehoods, and prejudices exist in the image of man that we currently hold, inherited directly from the French Revolution and a few romantic thinkers, dreamers, full of illusions and utopias, but totally detached from the biological reality of man. The reaction against ethology was not long in coming. From very diverse fields, from apparently divergent but related ideologies, inquisitorial voices of 18th-century, Rousseauian or Marxist-style "orthodoxy" have launched furious attacks against these "heretics" who maintain and have demonstrated, that men are not born equal, that education is not everything but that there are innate characters and instincts, that the instinct for territory and property has biological roots, etc.

However, none of these advocates of "modern" thinking, none of these pseudo-humanists, has been able to support any of their arguments with scientific experiments or concrete facts. Dilettantism, vague and nebulous theories, even personal attacks against ethologists—everything except experimental facts, which are the only thing that counts in natural science.

But why are ethological doctrines so dangerous? Let us try to explain. The modern world, which curiously calls itself the "free world", lives under a monstrous form of domination, technocracy, in its "democratic" form in the West and "socialist" form in the East. This dominant system, in order to be effective at the individual level, is based on an ideology, on myths, on a conception of man and society.

There are a series of basic dogmas, powerful ideas that the System must maintain at all costs, ideas that are repeated ad nauseam not only by the media and politicians, but also by many intellectuals and scientists who claim to be independent. These ideas are easy to summarise: men are equal, behaviour and character are the result of education, aggression is the product of 'repression', cultural factors are everything and biological factors count for nothing, differences between peoples or races are cultural, not biological, economics is the only factor in history, historical progress tends towards progress, etc.

But suddenly, thanks to a series of experiments, works and studies, a number of scientists are demonstrating that all these ideological pillars are nothing more than nonsense, utopias, the musings of narcissistic and dreamy minds, and are constructing a new image of Man, his historical dimension and his future. The reaction is not long in coming.

A "classic" of anti-ethology is the book by John Lewis and Bernard Towers: "Naked Ape or Homo Sapiens?". Given our space limitations, we cannot stop to break it down, but we recommend it to the reader so that they can see for themselves. Its authors, disciples of the pseudo-mystic Teilhard de Chardin, put together a curious mixture of pseudo-scientific arguments, inquisitorial ranting and personal attacks on ethological scientists. We challenge the reader to find

a single objective scientific fact in the entire book to support the theoretical musings of its authors. That says it all.

THE WORK OF KONRAD LORENZ AND HIS SCHOOL

There is no doubt that we owe the existence of ethology to Konrad Lorenz. The science of ethology existed before him, but it was his studies, awarded the Nobel Prize in Medicine, that launched ethology into controversy, that made it relevant, and it was undoubtedly his scientific genius that shaped ethology as a doctrine. His work has had followers and disciples, such as Carthy Leyhausen and others.

Lorenzian thinking is based on two basic pillars: the concept of the innate and the idea that the aggressive impulse is the elemental impulse from which all other impulses or patterns of behaviour arise, through ritualisation, redirection or transformation. The first, the idea of the innate, is common throughout ethological thinking, as we shall see later in Irenaus, Eibl-Eibesfeldt and Robert Ardrey. The idea is that biological species are the result of a complicated series of processes of transformation and progressive adaptation to the environment in which they live. A biological species, at a given moment in its history, carries a genetic message that conditions its behavioural patterns and forces it to react to certain stimuli in a specific way. Humans are no exception to this law, contrary to what behaviourists claim, psychologists who for the most part do not know biology; the human mind is not a blank slate on which experience and education write things, but rather humans carry in their genetic makeup a complex series of instincts and patterns that compel them at certain moments to react in a specific way, and many aspects of human behaviour, which we believe to be purely cultural, HAVE A BIOLOGICAL BASIS. We will expand on this topic in more detail later on.

The Concept of Aggression. Lorenz distinguishes between two distinct types of aggressive behaviour: interspecific aggression and intraspecific aggression. The former occurs only in predator-prey interactions, as it is very rare to observe conflicts between animals of different species over territory or prey. A fundamental difference between the two types of aggression could be said to be psychophysiological: if we observe two individuals of any species engaged in a dispute, whether over territory, prey or females, we will see that each of them undergoes a complex series of psychophysiological reactions and acts according to a complicated set of patterns. Before fighting, each tries to scare the other, and in many species, direct confrontation between two individuals of the same species is rare, unless they are very similar in social status, strength or size. Each individual is subjected to tension caused by what is called the fight-or-flight stress of adrenaline, produced by this hormone, through which two opposing forces act on them: on the one hand, the aggressive impulse, which leads them to fight, and on the other, their instinct for self-preservation, which leads them to flee. The purpose or consequence of all this is that in intraspecific conflicts, it is rare for two individuals to harm each other, leaving one of them dead or seriously injured, as hierarchical relationships are always established. Social species have also developed what are called pacification rituals, which consist of a series of patterns developed by the weaker individual that inhibit the aggressiveness of the stronger one, and which usually consist of submissive attitudes and exposing the weakest parts of the body without any defence.

On the contrary, in interspecific aggression in general, although there are also different cases, the individual's psychophysiological processes are different. When a predator attacks its prey, even if it is large and has to fight it, it does not respond to the same impulses as in a fight with a fellow species. It never attempts intimidating manoeuvres, but rather moves as quickly as possible to kill its prey and is not subject to the physiological stress or tension it experiences in intraspecific combat.

We are going to focus on the study of interspecific aggression, which is of most interest to us. As we have said before, for Lorenz and his school, aggression constitutes the elementary drive, from which all others are developed. This "transformation" of drives is carried out through a series of processes, one of which, perhaps the most important, is called ritualisation.

Ritualised fighting. We have already mentioned this phenomenon, but now we are going to analyse it in depth. Ritualised fighting is a series of patterns of behaviour, threats and demonstrations of strength which, in intraspecific confrontation, completely or almost completely replace combat. At the individual level, it serves as an outlet for the individual's aggressive passions, and at the species level, it prevents one of the contenders from being killed or seriously injured in each confrontation.

Ritualised fighting is the result of a selective process. In general, aggression fulfils a series of very important functions in each biological species: it separates individuals of a species in the habitat of a species; it selects the best through rivalry in terms of the defence of the family or society by the male; it establishes a social order of hierarchies, which is particularly important in social animals, and others of lesser importance. Many of these functions could not be performed without ritualised fighting.

For example, in animals that live in communities, as we have said, a hierarchy is established that is the result of aggression. The observation made in a chicken coop of what is called the "pecking order" is now classic: the higher-ranking hens peck at all the others; others are pecked at by their superiors, but in turn peck at those below them, and finally those of lower status are pecked at by everyone without being able to peck at anyone themselves. If the animals were to engage in open combat that could only end with one of the contenders being knocked out, this hierarchy would be impossible. On the contrary, there is a whole genetic programming of behaviour, which varies from social animals to those that live in isolation: confrontation generally only occurs between animals of similar status. In animals that live in isolation, it usually occurs over a dispute over territory: as a general rule, the owner of the territory always has the upper hand, initiates a mock attack, and the invader flees. The flight of the opponent immediately inhibits aggression. Experiments carried out with animals of this type, specifically with several species of fish in captivity, have shown that if the contenders are enclosed in a small space (a fish tank) and the defeated cannot flee, the victor continues his attacks, which usually end in the death of the defeated. But the curious thing about this case is that the death of the defeated animal is not caused by the injuries inflicted by the other, but rather by the psychological stress to which it is subjected by not being able to flee.

In animals that live in society, the mechanism is different. The defeated animal does not flee, but performs a series of acts intended to inhibit the aggressiveness of its opponent. These are known as "pacification rituals" and are of two main types: some consist of exposing vulnerable parts of the body to the opponent. These are common in fights between male iguanas. The defeated animal exposes its belly to the attacker's blows, and the aggressor's aggression is immediately appeased.

Others imitate sexual behaviour. These are classic in primates: the defeated individual behaves like a female and presents its rear to the victor, who mounts it and even performs copulatory movements. This behaviour even occurs between females: the higher-status female behaves like a male and mounts the lower-status female.

Redirected aggression. A pattern of aggressive behaviour can become ritualised and completely lose its original meaning. Lorenz uses this phenomenon to explain very complex patterns, whose simple components are ritualised aggressive impulses. Lorenz studied the courtship and mating behaviour of wild geese and saw that the complicated courtship rituals were made up of ritualised aggressive patterns. For example, a male who wants to court a female begins a kind of dance around her that is nothing more than attacks on imaginary rivals. The female responds with another ritual that consists of running away from the male and then turning around and standing next to him but on the opposite side. Lorenz observed that in confrontations between two pairs of geese, it was common for a female to charge at the rival pair, but when she moved away from the male and lost his protection, she would become frightened, turn around and run to stand behind him, seeking his protection. The female's behaviour in forming the pair would be nothing more than a ritualisation of this form of attack-flight.

These phenomena of redirected aggression can become increasingly complex, and become intertwined with complicated patterns. Lorenz explains that, for example, the gregarious instinct of many species to form groups is nothing more than aggression redirected outward and inhibited inward. Groups, when faced with external pressure, increase their internal cohesion proportionally.

The concept of the innate. With the vast empirical basis provided by his extensive research on wild geese, corvids and other species, Lorenz entered the theoretical realm of the concepts of innate and learned, laying the foundations of ethological thinking.

The concept of the innate. With the vast empirical basis provided by his extensive research on wild geese, corvids and other species, Lorenz entered the theoretical realm of the concepts of innate and learned, laying the foundations of ethological thinking.

Contrary to the behaviourist view, which holds that the innate-acquired distinction lacks analytical validity, and to the attitude of English ethologists (Timbergen) who argue that the innate and the acquired are extreme cases of a continuous series, Lorenz clearly defines both concepts, arguing that individuals come into the world with a series of innate patterns and passions, the result of the evolutionary history of the species, and that these patterns are triggered by stimulus-signs from the external environment.

Countless experiences support his claims. Young geese, which have never seen a sparrowhawk, show signs of terror at any flying object that resembles this bird. Only later, through experience, do they learn to distinguish between them. Many species of birds recognise the first living being they see when they hatch as their mother. Artificially incubated chicks may take a human being as their mother, or even the incubator itself. When raising their young, turkeys kill any other animal they find in their nest that is not their offspring, but deaf turkeys, which cannot hear their offspring chirping, may also kill them. They recognise their offspring by their voice, and this inhibits their aggression. Unable to hear them chirp, they mistake them for enemies and kill them. We could fill hundreds of pages with the experiences of Lorenz, Leyhausen and their school.

The concept of the innate applied to man gives rise to an anthropological biologism with important consequences, and in sharp contradiction with the doctrines in vogue (Marxism, psychoanalysis, behaviourism, the anthropological doctrines of Levi-Strauss and others). Humans, therefore, carry in their genetic material a huge series of behavioural patterns that are triggered by specific stimuli. Many aspects of human behaviour that we are led to believe are the result of education are in fact biological in origin. A typical example is the behaviourist psychological interpretation of aggressive behaviour in humans, which is seen as the result of repressive education, when in fact it is the result of a genetic memory of tribal or territorial hunters. In the same vein, we can place the supposed "taboo" that exists in all human societies regarding incest, which is explained by the "Oedipus complex", when it is nothing more than the biological defence mechanism of the species against inbreeding, in which the frequency of lethal recessive traits is much higher than in normal crossbreeding.

The concept of the innate is ethology's great contribution to the world of anthropology and thought in general, as it revolutionises a whole series of beliefs elevated to dogma by the modern world. It turns out that the validity of tradition as a legacy of ancient knowledge, of "natural law," in many cases regains its meaning, not as a religious or mystical speculation, but with scientific backing.

Robert Ardrey: the Territorial Imperative. As we have indicated above, ethology does not constitute a monolithic body of doctrine, but rather an acceptance of basic facts and doctrines, with different nuances among different authors and schools. Konrad Lorenz, creator and leading proponent of ethology with his Nobel Prize, bases all his thinking, as we have seen above, on the function of aggression. Robert Ardrey offers interesting variations on Lorenz's theme, basing his work on the study of the territorial instinct as a basic element of behavioural motivations. Ardrey began his intellectual career as a writer and playwright, later devoting himself to anthropology and ethology; this has made him the target of attacks by many anti-ethological intellectual dwarfs who, unable to refute his doctrines, have called him an "upstart," an "amateur biologist," and other niceties. However, his main work, "The Territorial Imperative", is a classic in ethological thought and a work produced with the utmost scientific rigour.

Concept of Territorial Imperative. The deep connection between living beings and a particular space was discovered by Elliot Howard in 1920 in his studies of birds. Ardrey defines the territorial imperative as the impulse that drives all living beings to conquer and defend their property against violations by members of their own species.

The motivations behind territorial behaviour are more biopsychological than physiological. Territory mainly satisfies the need for identification that all animals feel. They tend to identify with a plot of land that is larger than themselves and more enduring. Demarcation and Conflict. Just as humans define borders and property boundaries, animals have a variety of methods for demarcating their territories. This prevents unnecessary conflicts arising from the inadvertent intrusion of one individual into another's space.

Forms of demarcation include the vocal warnings of birds, which always take care to sing in clearly visible places (as well as the roar of the lion, which makes its presence known several kilometres away). Others use the olfactory method, through glands with special secretions, or with urine or excrement. Among the

animals that demarcate in this way are the Thomson's gazelle, the red deer of Scotland, the hyena, various types of antelope, the lion, etc.

Visual signals are emitted by territory owners who position themselves prominently and clearly visible to their neighbours.

In general, each species uses the type of signalling most appropriate to its environment through a combination of processes, but with one ultimate goal: to eliminate ambiguities at the boundary for a clear affirmation of ownership.

The demarcation of territory is neither fixed nor static, but rather depends at any given moment on the relationships of the individual, or of the community in the case of a social-tribal species, with its neighbours. Demarcation is achieved through conflict, and the border is a reality of tension, a balance of forces that evolves over time. Thus, territories tend to increase or decrease in line with the energy of the owners, the violence of their aggressiveness. A balancing factor lies in the fact that the smaller the space occupied, the greater the effort put into its defence and the higher the chances of success.

An animal outside its territory loses courage and shows a clear tendency to flee; on the contrary, the closer it is to the geometric centre of its territory, the more its efforts to win the fight multiply: from the balance of these two tendencies, which are controlled by the attack-flight effect of adrenaline, come the laws of territorial conquest and attack.

Another curious aspect of this system is the formation of groups among tribal animals through the submission-flight pattern. In animals that live in isolation, when a conflict arises, the loser flees, but in those that need to form groups, individual conflict has resulted in the formation of a pacifying ritual: the loser does not flee but performs a series of acts aimed at pacifying the winner and remains living alongside them as a subordinate. These pacification rituals are very complex, but in general they have two simple components: exposing vulnerable parts of the body without defence, and then sexual components: the defeated, even if male, behaves like a female. This case is common in primates, where dominant males mount inferior males, as if copulating, to demonstrate their dominant status.

It is also common, as in many deer species, for species that normally live in large groups to form their own harems during the mating season and expel weaker males from their territory.

In many animals, territorial possession is closely linked to reproductive function, as is the case with the "Lek territory", whose role is predominantly sexual. Buechner's description of the Cobe in Uganda is exemplary in this regard: males possess a plot whose value is inversely proportional to the distance from the centre of the area where the herd lives. The strongest male occupies the central territory and the others are distributed around it through fierce combat. Females in oestrus only respond to males within the area and more intensely to the central animals, i.e. those whose physical strength allows them to permanently defend a central territory.

This phenomenon, together with the increase or decrease in an individual's aggressiveness as it approaches or moves away from the centre of its territory, clearly shows us how physiological functions of a hormonal nature (aggression, sexual drive) can be determined by the animal's spatial position within its territory, proving its biopsychic nature.

We can see, then, that the influence of the territorial imperative on behaviour may vary from one species to another, but it always exists. We will now look at the territorial behaviour of the human species and its influence on anthropology.

Man, a territorial animal. The ethological conception of man, based on the territorial imperative developed by Ardrey, starting from Darwinism, completely dismantles the naive "progressive" conception of man as a primate with a superior brain, and seriously questions the theory of a linear and progressive evolution towards a "paradise on Earth".

Ardrey's thinking on man is developed mainly in his book "The Evolution of Man: The Hunter Hypothesis".

Ardrey places the appearance of the first hominids in Africa. We will not dwell on this point, as the origin of Man is not the subject of this work. However, what is really important is to highlight the enormous change, the break in continuity that exists between our closest relatives, the tree-dwelling, fruit-eating monkeys, and man (or the first hominids), inhabitants of the savannah, hunters, carnivores and territorial creatures.

Researchers in immunology and molecular genetics have demonstrated our close relationship with chimpanzees. During an extensive study of wild chimpanzees conducted near Lake Tanganyika, a polio epidemic broke out, which quickly spread to the animals under study, killing them in the same way as humans. However, this is proof of kinship, but not, as some biologists obsessed with the idea of linear evolution would have it, that pongids are our ancestors. On the other hand, embryological studies carried out on chimpanzees have shown that, in the course of their ontogenetic development, the animal undergoes an involution, from skull shapes closer to those of humans to shapes more characteristic of other mammals. The study of the infant orangutan skull also reveals more anthropomorphic features than the corresponding adult skull. The snout region is already advanced (it is shorter in newborns), but the neurocranium clearly dominates the esplanocranium, which appears to be only a relatively insignificant appendage of the strongly domed neurocranium. The forehead is vertical, the eye sockets are directed forward and slightly inclined, the foramen magnum opens downward, and the articular protuberances are located at the base of the skull in a fairly anterior position. The temporal line is lower, and the jaws are short and almost horseshoe-shaped.

The problem of the relationships and kinship between Pongidae (great apes) and hominids is complex, and much remains to be resolved, but that is not our concern here. The only thing that is clear is that pongids are descended from beings more hominid than themselves, who are the product of involution.

After this digression, let us move on to what really interests us. We see that early humans invaded a new, completely different living space: they went from living in trees to living on the savannah, and from a fruit-based omnivorous diet to a carnivorous one. There is a hypothesis that early humans were vegetarians, an argument used to attack the "hunter hypothesis"; however, Ardrey masterfully demonstrates the childishness of this hypothesis: it is clear that cooking and the control of fire are relatively recent developments in human history, at least as far as we know. None of our plant foods can be eaten raw without causing significant digestive problems. For example, beans and the entire legume family, when ripe, incorporate a substance called protease into their proteins and starches, which is an enzyme that helps the

seed to digest its reserve substances. Protease must be destroyed by the oxidation that occurs during cooking, otherwise it causes acidity. Other seeds, such as yams and cassava, contain enzymes so strong that they disrupt our entire metabolism. Cassava includes a significant dose of cyanide among its starches. It is clear, then, that cooking, and cooking alone, has made available to us the world of high-calorie plant foods that we have today.

To all this we must add Crawford's research, which showed that only the fatty acids present in meat enabled the nine billion neurons in our brain to evolve. If our knowledge of the Ice Age is correct, it is clear that we were long pre-adapted, through our equatorial experience, to survive the unimaginably long, freezing winters in which we fed only on meat.

Another common objection to the hunting hypothesis is that an exclusively carnivorous diet during this ice age would have led to vitamin deficiencies. Stefanson counters this by demonstrating the existence of ascorbic acid (vitamin C) and other vitamins in raw meat, which were destroyed by cooking.

Man thus began to become man and to differentiate himself from apes, or from his mysterious animal ancestor, in the transition from arboreal to terrestrial life. He adapted to bipedal walking, which freed his hands, which soon learned to wield a weapon, which later became a tool, BUT IT WAS A WEAPON FIRST AND FOREMOST. Man became a carnivore and hunter, and defended his territory against other hostile groups, as any hunter does. This warrior-hunter way of life allowed him to survive the long winter period and shaped man as he would become today, with a powerful genetic legacy of being tribal, aggressive and, above all, tied to a territory. The territorial instinct is common to all animals, but in hunters it is vital, as competition for prey is a condition for their survival. Human aggression is not only the result of socio-political circumstances, but also has biological roots. It has often been said that national sentiment and the wars it can lead to are merely the result of demagogues responding to economic interests. However, if the territorial instinct did not exist, the 'territorial i m p e r a t i v e' would not exist, n o r would this sensitive fibre that can move entire peoples towards gigantic and sometimes terrible undertakings. It is there, and there is no point in ignoring it.

Irenáus Eibl-Eibesfeldt: Aggression and Cooperation. The work of this author, a disciple of Lorenz and his successor at the Max Planck Institute, definitively completes the great work of Ethologism as a conception of man, destroying the last arguments of its adversaries. Lorenz carried out all his experimental work on the animal kingdom, specifically birds, and by induction extended the results to Man. In contrast, Eibl-Eibesfeldt's extensive research was carried out on human material, he created Anthropological Ethology and has demonstrated, with slight conceptual variations, that Lorenz's major conclusions about man were true.

Unlike Lorenz, Eibl-Eibesfeldt does not believe that aggression is the only primary impulse, but asserts that there are two primary drives that interact with equal force: aggression and sociability.

Innate faculties of man. When we looked at Lorenz's work, we already discussed the concept of the innate. Eibl-Eibesfeldt's experiments dispel any doubts that may have existed in this regard: his observations of newborns, blind

and deaf-mute children show how the expression of basic emotions responds to innate mechanisms. These children cry, laugh, or show calmness on their faces, depending on their mood. On the other hand, the author shows expressions, rituals, and patterns common to very diverse cultures, which can only be explained by the concept of the innate. For example, to greet someone from a distance, people from many different cultures quickly raise and lower their eyebrows while smiling. Other forms of friendly contact, such as hugging and kissing, are also common to many cultures. These behaviours can also be observed in chimpanzees, which proves that they are phylogenetically very ancient and come from our distant ancestors.

Based on all this, he develops what he calls a "pre-programmed model of human behaviour" and shows us interesting examples of how behavioural patterns are formed through ritualisation processes. For example, Eibl-Eibesfeldt tells us that the behavioural patterns that appear in the phenomenon of flirting in females are ritualisations of much more complex patterns: it is common in many species of mammals for the female to flee when courted by the male. When human females flirt, looking at the male who is courting them and then quickly looking away, they are unconsciously imitating their distant animal ancestors, and in the act of "looking away" they are ritualising the pattern of fleeing.

It has been claimed that the pre-programmed model of human behaviour is a restriction on freedom, and attempts have also been made to equate the concept of instinct with man's baser tendencies. Nothing could be further from the truth: the greatest aberrations of which human beings are capable are rarely observed in animals when they live freely, and it is the tendency in human beings to reject their natural patterns of behaviour and act according to their "own rules", developed by their "reason", that has produced the greatest deviations. On the other hand, altruistic behaviour, sacrifice for the family or the community, may have, as we shall see, a biological basis. Our instincts are both a restriction and a foundation of our freedom. Aggressiveness and sociability. We have already seen, when discussing Lorenz's work, the nature and function of aggression. But Eibl-Eibesfeldt adds a new element by defending the thesis that there is also an innate tendency towards sociability. The same phylogenetic mechanisms that have fixed aggressive tendencies in the hereditary material have done the same with the rites and impulses that bind us together, whose purpose is to inhibit aggression. A typical example is the inhibition of aggression produced by infantile characteristics, which can be perfectly explained by a phylogenetic process of early fixation with great selective value, since a species that did not possess it would run the risk of losing many of its young to adults. Among his many studies of anthropological ethology, Eibl-Eibesfeldt has produced a classic work on the subject, which deals with the Pijigao festival among the Waikas, a tribe of Indians who live in the upper Orinoco region. This festival takes place between two tribes who wish to seal ties of friendship for the purpose of hunting together or trading. During the festival, a series of dances are performed that are nothing more than peace rituals, showing that there is no break in continuity between cultural and biological rituals. The festival begins with a dance in which warriors dance with their weapons and war paint in front of their hosts, in an attitude that may seem aggressive, but behind each warrior dances a child, whose appearance emphasises the warrior's peaceful intentions. Intimidation and conciliation, two basic functions of human behaviour, are intertwined here.

Conciliatory and friendly behaviour matures in humans from childhood. In the mother-child relationship, the individual learns friendly interaction and cooperation with members of their species. Recall the importance of imprinting, which we studied earlier, how a newborn bird can recognise any living or non-living being nearby as its mother.

According to Eibl-Eibesfeldt, the first modelling of conciliatory patterns occurs through the exchange of food. It is common to see primates, and in many primitive cultures, mothers feeding their children half-chewed food from their own mouths. According to Eibl-Eibesfeldt, this behaviour shapes future patterns of sexual behaviour, such as kissing. Other patterns are shaped in a similar way.

Epilogue: We have thus seen, albeit very briefly, the general lines of ethological thought, and perhaps now we understand why we call it the "Ethological Revolution," because of the radical change in concepts it brings to the conception of Man.

Human behaviour is not the result of the environment in which we live, the education we receive, or the culture in which we develop, but rather the opposite: all or almost all of our actions have deep biological motivations, conditioned by the genetic memory of the species since the dawn of time.

There is, therefore, what was once called Natural Law, and not "everything is normal", as many modern pseudo-intellectuals claim: there are biological criteria for defining the normality of behaviour.

However, because Man has freedom of choice, he can choose between living in accordance with Nature or devising his own rules for living, relying on his supposed omnipotent Reason.

Many religions and legends, and even, in their own way, modern doctrines such as Marxism and psychoanalysis, tell us about the primal trauma of the human species, when it lost contact with a higher reality, with a primordial innocence in which it was happy. There may be some truth in this, and this initial trauma may have occurred when man wanted to abandon his biological instinct as a rule of life and develop his behaviour in a rational manner. Perhaps the future will clarify these doubts. J.A.

It is often said that Mishima was the greatest Japanese writer of his generation. He did not receive the Nobel Prize, but he undoubtedly enjoyed greater fame than Kawabata, who did receive it and who discovered him. Publishers knew that every Mishima novel would be a bestseller, and theatre and even cabaret owners would have given several years of their lives for Mishima to work for them, whether acting, writing the script or simply being present at the venue. Such was Mishima's fame in Japan...

His fame reached Europe shortly after his death. Until then, he had been an illustrious unknown, even in the most knowledgeable literary circles. On 26 November 1970, the major national newspapers published a photo of Mishima perched on the balcony of a Japanese army barracks. Minutes after that photo was taken, he committed hara-kiri. It was not the Japanese writer's first attempt at suicide; when he was unknown, in the final years of World War II, he volunteered for the kamikaze squadrons and would have crashed into an American ship had it not been for a last-minute bout of flu that prevented him from dying for the emperor.

Mishima was an extremely extravagant character in his public image; famous writer, candidate for the Nobel Prize for Literature, exhibitionist, athlete, theatre director, film, theatre, television and cabaret actor, writer of exuberant prodigality, researcher of immemorial Japanese imperial traditions, collector of samurai swords and a long etc., such are the attributes that must necessarily be associated with the name Mishima. His 244 volumes of great literary quality bear witness to his personality. In Spain, Barral and Caralt have published some of his texts, of which, without a doubt, the most brilliant of all is "Runaway Horses".

Mishima's scandals caused a furore in Japan in the 1950s and 1960s. He had no qualms about kissing a transvestite in a cabaret scene and then going about his duties as a family man; he considered one of his happiest moments to be when an encyclopaedia requested a photo of him to accompany the entry for 'bodybuilding', and he was just as quick to sue another magazine that published without permission 'a photo in which he looked less Herculean'. An extremely controversial and contradictory man, the least that can be said about him is that he followed the Far Eastern formula of "riding the tiger", participating in everyday life not as just another person, but as a figure who attracted attention, yet who, amid his eccentricities, maintained a solid and traditional worldview. Something more than impossible. It can be said that his works, and especially "Runaway Horses", represented Mishima's escape valve from Westernised Japan. But this contradiction between a "traditional man" on the inside and an exhibitionist and brilliant writer on the outside could not last long.

Just as he was writing the pages of "Runaway Horses", he conceived the idea to form the "Tateno kai", the "Society of the Shield". This association was much more than just another far-right group, of which there are no fewer than 500 in Japan. Conceived as "the shield that would protect Japan, and especially the Emperor, from the Western onslaught" (of what is bourgeois, consumerist and anti-traditional about "the West"), it could be likened to a mystical and combative order. Its members, trained in martial arts, came from all social classes. Those who joined it ceased to belong to the

world of the contingent, devoted their time to practising martial arts and conversing with Mishima. The "Tate no kai" was conceived as a shock structure: its first performance would also be its last: its debut, a farewell. Mishima initially planned to burn his fifty men fighting with their bare hands against the students of the Zenkaguren (Japanese ultra-leftist student movement). Such a confrontation would mean the death of all of them, crushed by the leftist horde, and would force the military to act, restoring the Japanese code of honour and abolishing Western customs. But when one of the largest and most violent leftist demonstrations took place in 1969 and was dispersed by riot police without a single casualty, they realised that such a project was no longer of interest: the emperor was not defenceless, he had the local 'greys'. The decisive action had to be something else. Until llegar el 26 de noviembre de 1970, su tarea literaria había sido

extraordinarily prolific, as we have said. He touched on every subject an author could touch on. His genius seemed to know no bounds, and he would write and perform a libretto for café theatre, not exactly very moralistic, just as he would conceive, write and direct a nô or kabuki play (typically Japanese genres). He would act in the theatre performing plays by Molière and then play the leading role in his film "The Rite of Love and Death", a film that ended with Mishima's own hara-kiri in a perfect staging of what would later be his ritual suicide in General Morita's office. Japanese poetry held no secrets for him, the novel was his speciality and, within this genre, the novel as a synthesis of Japanese traditions was his constant. The trilogy "Thirst for Love", "Spring Snow" and "Runaway Horses" are good examples of how an aesthetically perfect novel, whatever its setting, is accessible to audiences anywhere, regardless of the geographical location of the plot. If this is the case with Don Quixote or Shakespeare's plays, the same can be said of Mishima's work.

But Mishima's life was rapidly sliding downhill. The tribute exhibition, which curiously enough was self-organised in a department store in Tokyo, was a great success. On display were all the editions of his works, his most cherished photographs (Mishima believed that through the camera, the body could push its possibilities to the limit), and, in a privileged position, the very samurai sword that two weeks later would accompany him to General Morita's office. That exhibition took on the characteristics of a farewell, but only Mishima and the three comrades from the "Shield Society" who had been selected to carry out the "incident" knew this.

On that day in December 1970, when the turmoil unleashed by the Burgos trial in Spain left little room for news other than that related to public order, Yukio Mishima "had the pleasure of dying" and proved himself to be the last samurai. Japan was surprised that Mishima's gesture was understood and welcomed by the younger generation. His example must have served some purpose. E.M.

MAURICE BARDÈCHE

He was born in Dun-Le-Roi in central France on 1 October 1909. In 1932, he graduated with a degree in literature, becoming a specialist in Balzac, to whom he dedicated his thesis in 1940. That same year, he was appointed Professor of 19th-Century Literature at the Sorbonne. In 1942, he became Professor of French Literature at the University of Lille.

He did not engage in political activities during the German occupation of France, but in 1944, Robert Brasillach, the famous Franco-Catalan poet and brother of Bardèche's wife, was sentenced to death for "crimes of opinion" and executed despite a petition for clemency signed by almost all French writers. This tragedy determined Bardèche's political vocation.

In 1947, he published his first book, *Lettre à François Mauriac* (Letter to François Mauriac), in which, for the first time in France and Europe, he denounced, with extreme violence, but not without gallantry and style, the hypocrisy and illegality of the Resistance legislation and the "situation" created in France under its protection. More than 80,000 copies were sold in less than a month, but more importantly, it became the starting point for a wealth of revisionist literature.

A year later, he published "Nuremberg or the Promised Land", in which he denounced, with admirable logical rigour, the illegitimacy, illegality and inappropriateness of the legislation imposed by the victors at Nuremberg, legislation which, in Bardèche's opinion, undermines the authority of the State and is contrary to the traditions of military honour and the higher interests of the peoples of Europe, including the victors on the battlefield. The French government of the time, which had been caught off guard by the "Lettre à François Mauriac", reacted strongly to the attack by the "jurists" of Nuremberg, and ordered the arrest of Maurice Bardèche. The Attorney General, relying on existing legislation, accused Bardèche of... anarchist propaganda! Bardèche was acquitted by the court, but the Attorney General appealed the sentence and, on appeal, Bardèche was convicted. Bardèche then appealed and, finally, after a legal battle that lasted six years, he was definitively sentenced to one year in prison and the destruction of the incriminating edition. President Coty generously pardoned him, a generosity that earned him harsh criticism from the resistance parties.

In the following years, Bardèche continued to expound his ideas in an admirable series of essays, such as 'Nuremberg II or the Forgers', in which he expands on many points from his previous work; "The Egg of Christopher Columbus," in which he laid the foundations (1951) for a Europe independent of Washington and Moscow; "Les Temps Modernes," perhaps his best work; "What is Fascism?", etc. In support of his political action, he created a publishing house, "Les Sept Couleus", and the "European Social Movement", which brought together various sectors of the opposition in various European countries, but which soon had to cease all activity when he realised that political circumstances made "in-depth" action by the Movement impossible.

Also in 1951, he created a monthly magazine, *Défense de l'Occident*, to which prestigious figures such as Pierre Hoffstetter, D'Orcyval, Setze, General Navarre, Ollivier, Ploncard d'Assac and others contributed.

Apart from his political activity, Bardèche published *Pour une lecture de Balzac*, *Stendhal romancier*, *Histoire des Femmes* and, in collaboration with his brother-in-law Brasillach, *Histoire du Cinéma*. J.B.

"I believe that the modern world is an enterprise of denaturalising Man and Creation. I believe in inequality among men, in the evil of certain

forms of freedom. I believe in the hypocrisy of fraternity. I believe in strength and generosity. I believe in hierarchies other than money. I believe that the world is corrupted by ideologies. I believe that to govern is to foresee, to preserve our independence and to let us live as we please."
M. Bardèche. ("Sparta and the Southerners").

"Who controls the past controls the future; who controls the present controls the past."

George Orwell.

There is a lack of essays in Spain that document the contradictory personality of George Orwell (1). This brief reference will attempt to present his most salient aspects. Those familiar with literature on the 1936 war in Spain will be familiar with his work "Homage to Catalonia", in which he accurately describes the situation in Barcelona in the early days of the war. Orwell had arrived with the International Brigades and showed some sympathy towards the POUM. His work contains some errors highlighted in the prologue to the Spanish edition. It was not well received in left-wing circles and was banned for a time under the previous political system.

Another work that is well known in Spain (and other countries) is *Animal Farm*. Critics are divided on this novel, falling into two camps: those who believe the work is an anti-Stalinist allegory and those who claim it is an anti-communist satire. Anyone wishing to delve deeper and learn more about his views on this subject should read his essay *The Road to Wigan Pier*, which did not go down well in socialist and communist circles. And yet he belonged to the Fabian Society, a more or less esoteric circle linked to other lesser-known groups that seek to establish a world government and propose socialism through reform.

He could be described as an enigmatic person, because although in *"The Road to Wigan Pier"* he tackles fascism with some confusing attacks: "To combat fascism, it is necessary to understand it, which implies recognising that it contains some good things, as well as many bad ones." However, he does not specify what these good things are, and in any case, he summarises the "many bad things" as "a shameful tyranny". Nevertheless, I insist on describing him as an enigmatic person, because there is a constant theme in all his works: his characters' references to Jews, which are always contemptuous and derogatory. Read this as an example: "The British Empire is simply a device that serves to give commercial monopolies to the English, or rather, to the gangs of Jews and bourgeoisie" (*The Mark*).

"The owner was a red-haired Jew, an extraordinarily unpleasant man. It would have been a pleasure to smash that Jew's nose" (*Down and Out in Paris and London*). "There was also a deaf-mute, stiff as a board, and a small, middle-aged Jew in a sheepskin coat, who had been the buyer for a well-established KOSHER slaughterhouse. That character had embezzled twenty-six pounds in Aberdeen and other places, spending the money on prostitutes. The man felt wronged because he argued that he should have been sent to the rabbi's court and not to the police" (*You Won, Rosemary!*). " ... brutal atrocities... hateful displays of sadism... rubber truncheons... concentration camps... shameful persecution of the Jews... obscurantism... European civilisation... act before it's too late... indignation of all civilised peoples... alliance of all democratic nations... firm stance... defence of democracy... democracy... fascism... democracy... fascism... democracy... You know the record by now. These guys can go on for hours and hours. It's like a gramophone. You turn the handle, press the button, and off it goes: democracy, fascism, democracy..."

But in a way, I was interested in watching him. A small, insignificant-looking man with a pale face and a bald head, sitting on a platform shouting slogans.

What is he doing? In a totally open and deliberate way, he is stirring up hatred. He is doing everything he can to make us hate some foreigners called fascists. How strange, I thought, to be known as 'Mr So-and-so, the well-known anti-fascist'. Anti-fascism is a strange profession. I imagine this man makes a living writing books against Hitler. But what did he do before Hitler came to power?

What will he do if Hitler disappears one day? He was trying to stir up hatred in the audience, but that was nothing compared to the hatred he felt himself... It must be interesting to meet such an individual in private life. But does he have a private life?

Or does he just go from platform to platform stirring up hatred?

"The three communists and the young Jew walked up the street and continued talking about proletarian solidarity, dialectics and what Trotsky said in 1917. In reality, the four were all the same" (Subir por el aire).

"The worst of them all was the Jew on the corner, the owner of Knockout Trousers Ltd. He had realised that she was not a prostitute, but he thought that living where Mary did, it wouldn't be long before she became one, and his mouth watered. When he saw her coming down the alley, he would stand on the corner, his bulging chest thrust out and his lecherous, sullen gaze fixed inquisitively on her" (The Reverend's Daughter).

However, Orwell's pen reaches its peak in "1984". It is a dense, pessimistic novel. Written after the Second World War, in 1949, was he warning us of the danger that was looming, the Jewish World Government? Did he glimpse the "hidden forces" that unleashed it? Is it possible that he read some books that demystified Allied propaganda, such as "Vindicated Bombing" by J.M. Spaigh, Undersecretary of the Air Force, published in 1944, which acknowledges that the bombing of civilian populations was carried out primarily by the British? There is no doubt that he was interested in the subject, as in his collection of essays, published under the title "Hunting an Elephant", he devotes a chapter entitled "Considerations on James Bumhan" to discussing the future of a centralised, planned and depersonalised society. He states in a footnote that a survey conducted among American troops stationed in Germany showed that 51 per cent "thought Hitler did a lot of good before 1939". This survey was conducted after three years of anti-Nazi propaganda. The date of the essay is not recorded, but it must have been written before "1984", as it does not show much support for Bumhan's thesis, although in "1984" he would adopt it.

This is a key novel. *La Revista de Occidente* (2) devoted a few lines in an article by Luis A. Diez to commenting on his works, in a very superficial manner for a magazine of such standing with such a controversial author. When referring to "1984", the manipulation is obvious and evident. According to the writer, the theme of the novel points to what would have happened in England if it had been conquered by the German Army. It seems more certain and true that Luis A. Diez works for the Ministry of Truth, "control of reality" in Newspeak, "doublethink". He takes a futuristic novel and traces its effects back to a hypothetical previous situation. An exemplary official of the Ministry of Truth.

I do not know what reasons prompted Orwell to set the date as "1984". But it has become a point of reference for writers, essayists and even politicians. Was he an initiate? The sum of the numbers is 22, an esoteric number for René Guénon. The novel is a denunciation of a future that is reality. Does the BROTHERHOOD exist? Of course, behind the scenes of politics, we can glimpse secret societies and underground leagues, as a PSOE politician (3) describes them, among the blocs of the great powers.

And BIG BROTHER? Does it materialise? "In any case, these things are also driven by other factors, and in the end they usually depend on what is known here as 'THE BIG BROTHER', an eloquent expression of that SUPERPOWER which, in reality, pulls the strings of politics, above the White House and the Capitol itself" (4). M. B.

NOTES.-

- (1) George Orwell, whose real name was Eric Blair, was born in Motihari, Bengal, to English parents in 1903 and died of tuberculosis in London in 1950.
- (2) Revista de Occidente, February 1976.
- (3) Alfonso Guerra, in Interviu, 15 March 1978, no. 95.
- (4) Julio Camarero, in the newspaper Pueblo, 9 December 1978. From New York.

Saint-Loup is the literary alias of Marc Augier, the writer most representative of what we might call national-revolutionary Europeanism. Although he has written some twenty books, each one more interesting than the last, perhaps the most exciting novel would be the story of his own life. Born in 1908, in 1935 he founded the so-called "Secular Youth Hostels", of which he was the main driving force for many years, until their politicisation by the socialists. A year later, he became Under-Secretary of State for Youth and Sports, becoming the youngest ministerial undersecretary in the history of France, which he officially represented at the World Youth Congress in 1937. At that Congress, Mrs. Roosevelt, wife of the then President of the United States, took the liberty of personally declaring war on Germany, Italy and Japan, which provoked an angry protest from Marc Augier and his departure from the Congress, slamming the door behind him.

It was during this period that Marc Augier became a national socialist. In 1941, he joined the "Collaboration Group", within which he founded the "Jeunes de l'Europe Nouvelle" group. In 1942, he enlisted in the L.V.F. (Legion of French Volunteers against Bolshevism), rising to the rank of sergeant and always fighting on the front line. Wounded in Russia, he returned to Paris, where he founded the newspaper "Le Combattant Européen" and contributed to Alphonse de Chateaubriand's "La Gerbe" and "Devenir", subtitled "Combat Newspaper of the European Community". In 1944, as an officer in the SS "Charlemagne" division, he played an important role in the "Europeanist" opposition movement within that organisation, in contrast to the excessive "Germanism" of some of the "old guard". Himmler personally supported Augier against some German "nationalists" within the SS. He fought until April 1945, when he returned clandestinely to France via the high mountains. It should be noted that Marc Augier had been a first-rate mountaineer and had travelled across half of Europe with a rucksack on his back; he had also been a competitive motorcyclist.

Augier lived in hiding in France until 1947, when he took advantage of the new political circumstances created by the Cold War between Russia and the West and sought refuge under the Ramadier amnesty. He then published *Face Nord* (North Face), a book about mountaineering. As he still faced difficulties in France despite the amnesty, he left for South America, where he became Technical Advisor to General Perón and, with the rank of Argentine Lieutenant Colonel, organised the Andean forces of that army. He travelled through the Andes and Tierra del Fuego and returned to France in 1953. He then abandoned active politics and devoted himself to "engagée" literature.

In the literary work of this extraordinary man and highly entertaining writer, we must highlight the series of books dedicated to the mountains, which include, apart from the aforementioned *Face Nord*, *La Montaña sin Dios* (The Mountain without God), *La Montaña no quiso* (The Mountain did not want to), *La Piel del Aurochs* (The Skin of the Aurochs) and *Mont Pacifique*, as well as the travelogue *El país de Aosta* (The Country of Aosta). He has three books dedicated to the glorification of the European industrial epic: *Renault de Billancourt*, *Marius Berliet, el Inflexible* (Marius Berliet, the Unyielding) and *Diez Millones de orugas* (Ten Million Caterpillars). His adventure novels "*La Nuit Commence au Cap Horn*" (Night Begins at Cape Horn) and "*Le Roi Blanc des Patagones*" (The White King of the Patagones) are relatively politicised, but the latter, "*Une Moto pour Barbara*" (A Motorcycle for Barbara), is totally politicised, in which Saint-Loup expounds his national-revolutionary Europeanist ideas, expressing a non-aggressive but total racism.

His books on what he calls "the carnal homelands" - Saint-Loup is a staunch regionalist - are noteworthy: "*Nouveaux Cathares pour Montségur*" (New Cathars for Montségur), on the Provençal problem; "*Plus de Pardons pour les Bretons*" (No More Pardons for the Bretons), naturally on the Breton problem, and

"Le Sang d'Israel", in which he manages to address this extremely sensitive issue without violating the provisions of the Marchandeu Law and the very recent Pléven Law on racism and anti-Semitism. In "Les SS de la Toison D'or" he discusses the Belgian problem, specifically old Burgundy and the current Walloon country, while narrating the epic story of the SS from that country who fought against Bolshevism in Russia.

On the Second World War, he has written a series dedicated to the French volunteers who fought in Russia in German uniform: 'Les Volontaires' (The Volunteers), or the history of the L.V.F., 'Les Hérétiques' (The Heretics), or the history of the SS Division 'Charlemagne', and 'Les Nostalgiques' (The Nostalgics), or the history of the survivors, as well as 'Les Voiliers Fantômes de Hitler' (Hitler's Ghost Ships).

Saint-Loup's books are a page-turner, as he manages to combine depth with entertainment, all tinged with a very French self-assurance and verve. Saint-Loup is a committed writer who nevertheless achieves the difficult: he excludes no one a priori, he is of total doctrinal integrity, his theses are always fresh, and he commands the respect of his adversaries.

He was president of the "France-Rhodesia Committee". J.B.

Saint-Paulien is the literary alias of Yvan Sicard, born in 1910 into a family of farmers and soldiers. From a very young age, he devoted himself to journalism with success, contributing regularly to *Le Petit Journal*. He even founded a magazine called *T.e Huron* and was editor-in-chief of the weekly magazines *Germinal* and *Le Spectateur*.

In 1936, he joined Jacques Doriot's *Parti Populaire Français*, and two years later became a member of the movement's Political Bureau.

Despite having staunchly opposed the war, when he was mobilised he distinguished himself for his military merits in his regiment. After the armistice of 1940, he was Secretary of Press and Propaganda for the P.P.F. and Deputy President to Doriot in the "Anti-Bolshevik Liberation Committee," an entity created by Doriot himself in Germany in 1945, three months before the end of the war. Sicard had also been personally called upon by Marshal Pétain to join the so-called "Union of the National Revolution".

After Germany's defeat, Sicard managed to reach Spain where, despite having regularly contributed to Spanish newspapers (*Arriba*, *Semana*, *Madrid*, *Mundo*) and six other different countries, he began to develop an intense activity in the French language. His books were regularly sold in his homeland despite his having been sentenced to death in absentia, a sentence that would later be commuted to ten years in prison, which he obviously did not serve.

The following works date from this period of exile in Spain: *El Sol de los Muertos* (The Sun of the Dead), *Doble Corazón* (Double Heart), a very interesting book about sport; *Los Malditos* (The Damned), in which he recounts episodes from the struggle of the French volunteers who fought against the Soviets from Smolensk to Berlin; *San Francisco de Boda* (Saint Francis of Boda); "Velázquez y su tiempo" (Velázquez and his time); a monumental and objective "Historia de la Colaboración" (History of Collaboration) and "Goya, su tiempo y sus personajes" (Goya, his time and his characters) and the very curious "Porqué perdí la Guerra, por Adolf Hitler" (Why I lost the War, by Adolf Hitler). The style is very direct, although not without a certain lyricism. Despite the fact that current literary criticism in France is quite left-leaning, Saint-Paulien has undoubted prestige.

Before and during the last war, he wrote, under his own name, Sicard, "Study on Germany" (1938), "History of France for Those Who Have Forgotten It", "Doriot Against Moscow", "Long Live France" and "The Paris Commune Against Communism" (1943).

Although Sicard has not been affiliated with any political party since 1945, he has remained faithful to his ideas and to the memory of his comrades. On one occasion, he told *Juvenal* magazine: "Quite sincerely, I believe I have been a revolutionary all my life. I continue and will continue to consider that the socialist, national, unitary revolution is an urgent necessity, not only for France, but for the whole of the West. I would be happy if my books could serve to unite former adversaries in good faith in our common enterprise." J.B.

If the European peoples manage to survive their current decline, René Binet's thinking will have contributed to this, and this comrade, who passed away too soon, will be counted among the benevolent geniuses of our race.

1948. A Europe occupied by plutocratic-communist armies. The revenge of Nuremberg, the bloody "purgings" in Italy and France, and the hunger in Germany have unmasked the enemies of Europe.

One day in December, I receive the first five issues of "Unidad", the organ of the "French Socialist Unity Movement". The editorial in issue 1, entitled "Julio Moch, is he French?", rebels against the fact that a Zionist wants to remain a French minister. This courageous newspaper calls for Franco-German reconciliation, the defence of the race and the political unity of Europe.

I write to congratulate the courageous team. René Binet replies, and we get in touch. I discover a lucid intelligence at the service of an indomitable will: to defend the race, to ensure first its survival and then its biological ascension. Surrounded by a few comrades, he dares to confront the coalition of destructive forces that dominate France in the name of "democracy". He will go to prison, go on hunger strike, and keep the flag of Europe flying high.

So who was René Binet? Born in 1913, he studied theology. When he lost his faith, he joined the Communist Party, from which he was expelled at the same time as Doriot for his "nationalist" deviation. A prisoner of war in Germany, he discovered that Hitler was synthesising socialism and nationalism. He understood that this synthesis depended on a higher ideal, that of defending the race. And he enlisted in the SS to fight on the Eastern Front.

Repatriated as a prisoner of war, he escaped repression, which would have immediately cost him his life. But instead of keeping a prudent silence, he published "Combattant Européen" in 1946. The editorial in issue 4 proclaimed: "Let us build the Party of the National Socialist Revolution! We oppose the unity of France against Stalinism, against Jews, blacks and reaction." He then published *Bandera Negra* (Black Flag) with the SS runes, for which he was sent to prison.

As soon as he regains his freedom, he continues the struggle. After "Unidad", there will be "Centinela", "Nuevo Prometeo", "Fuerza Joven" and "Joven Revolución".

In June 1950, his "Theory of Racism" appeared. Returning to the arguments of the Communist Manifesto, René Binet demonstrates that a sincere and lucid socialist must arrive, not at Marxism, but at racism. This work, extremely concise and ahead of its time – and ours too! – contains the central idea of every European revolution: the indissoluble unity of socialism and racism. The only possibility of salvation for Europe, for the white race, for life itself on earth.

He will develop this idea in "National Socialism versus Marxism", where he will regroup various articles on this subject. Although time prevented him from giving this book the systematic form he desired, despite the inevitable disorder of a compilation, its pages contain a synthesis that is absolutely avant-garde for social racism.

In September 1951, he participated as a founding member in the first assembly of the New European Order.

The aim was to create a place where the militants responsible for European social racism could meet; a means of agreeing on new problems and, from there, increasing the impact of their respective propaganda. Recognising the need for collective discipline in the dissemination of ideas, René Binet tended to overcome individualistic, i.e. divisive, attitudes.

In the sphere of national-European opposition movements, he supported, with the 'French National Committee', the activities that arose from the Rome Congress (1950) organised by the FUAN, the student section of the Italian Social Movement. At the Malmo Congress (1951), he successfully defended the line of European independence. He convened the 1953 Paris Congress on behalf of the C.N.F. and participated in the 1954 Brussels Congress.

On 16 October 1957, Rend Binet died in a car accident.

Under the title "Contribution to a Racist Ethics," his widow and friends published an important manuscript that represents the essence of his spiritual testament. Developing the idea of his life, René Binet showed us that if socialism is not placed at the service of the race, we are merely groping in the dark and going from division to division. This book teaches duty, mission and sacrifice. It shows how to build the Party, the weapon of the race. Next, in the same vein, "National Socialism versus Marxism" is republished.

Following the death of Marie Binet, I examined the papers that remained. There are still unpublished writings which, together with Theory of Racism – now out of print – will be the subject of a third volume if we can find the necessary funds.

Today, the peoples of Western Europe are drowning in plutocratic-democratic rot. Millions of Afro-Asians are invading France and England and, from there, spreading throughout the rest of the continent. Everywhere, the cult of material well-being prevails; duty and honour are ignored. But if Washington is rotting the white peoples, it is doing so with Moscow's complicity. Capitalism and communism, the two criminals of Yalta, intend to divide up the planet.

One day, perhaps very soon, when catastrophe knocks at the door, the peoples will wake up. It is up to us to ensure that, at that moment, the spirit of Rend Binet can guide them. G.A.A.

THE N.O.E.

Maurice Bardèche declares in the "Credo of the White Man": "The defeat of Germany in 1945 is the greatest catastrophe of modern times".

Indeed, 1945 witnessed not only the victory of the enemies of political Europe, but also of the enemies of the Aryan world. Democracy and decadence imposed in all domains this cult of material goods and their enjoyment, which has always led to the collapse of civilisations.

However, the positive Aryan and overseas forces were re-establishing contact, organising themselves and continuing the struggle. In 1946, in Portugal, the magazine *A Nação*, with Alfredo Pimenta, declared itself against the Nuremberg Trials. In 1947, the monthly magazine *Der Weg* in Buenos Aires began the monumental ideological work that continued until 1957. The Italian Social Movement entered the scene.

In 1950, the FUAN, the MSI's student organisation, convened the First Congress of European National Forces.

At that time, the ideological inadequacy of the European national opposition became apparent: one entire wing believed that it was necessary to silence the racial question and play the American card by supporting the Atlantic Pact.

During the Second Congress in Malmö, however, the social-racist forces succeeded in imposing the principle of European independence. "This independence implies that Europe belongs neither to the democratic bloc nor to the Soviet bloc, and that it will determine its own political regime."

But this needed to be clarified. Faced with the need for supporters of social racism to organise themselves in order to improve their audience, five European comrades met in Zurich in September 1951 and founded the New European Order.

As the Zurich Declaration states, it is not a question of "creating a new body to which existing organisations would belong, but rather of bringing together a tendency at the national and European levels".

The members of the New European Order deliberate in their personal capacity and without involving the organisations to which they belong. They simply undertake to disseminate as widely as possible the ideas they share and which are set out in the "Declarations".

At a time when Afro-Asian immigration to France and England had only just begun, the Zurich Declaration demanded "the return of foreign groups to their traditional areas". Since then, the tide of colour in these two countries, from which it has spread throughout Europe, underlines the validity of this postulate. The comrades of Zurich knew full well that this immigration marked the beginning of a global anti-Aryan conspiracy that would continue to unfold.

The weapon of the Aryan racial community will be Europe. A European confederation, Western in principle but destined to quickly encompass all the Aryan peoples of the world, including those of America, Australia and the current Soviet Union.

But this Europe will only become strong through social justice, which is also a postulate within biological policy. And this is where true socialism comes in as a means of saving the race.

In the course of subsequent "declarations", the New European Order addressed new problems in the light of the defence of the Aryan community.

Then the need arose to present the ideas of the New European Order in a more systematic way, since the biennial "declarations" followed current events. In 1965, the Ideological Commission of the New European Order adopted the "Social Racist Manifesto". This text first emphasises the primacy of the biological factor: "In a world where everything is a struggle, no one can escape this choice: to support or betray the race to which they belong". It then defines the basic notions of "race" and "ethnicity" and explains the *raison d'être* of racism. "Why does the community of blood stand out above all else? Because it is based on the eternal laws of life." The "Manifesto" defends a racist conception of socialism: "Social justice is the order that allows everyone to place their abilities fully at the service of the

racial community. It implies a renewal of the elites according to their abilities and not according to acquired situations." He then outlines the principles of our European revolution and specifies what European unity and biological policy will be.

In 1969, in Barcelona, the New European Order created the "Higher Institute of Psychosomatic, Biological and Racial Sciences," whose direction was entrusted to Dr. Jacques Baugé-Prevost of Montreal. This institute has published several social-racist works, including those of René Binet, a founding member of the New European Order who died in 1958.

Today, the New European Order continues to be the focal point of Aryan social racism. Its influence will depend on the influence that each of its members is able to acquire. We can say, very objectively, that it corresponds to a need. The galloping aggravation of decadence: miscegenation, criminality, the cult of selfishness, makes it increasingly indispensable to coordinate responsible militants who want to teach duty in the service of the race. G.A.A.

One of the paradoxes of the modern world is undoubtedly that the mentality of the "democratic" or "Western" world is Marxist, while that of the "Marxist-Leninist" world is anti-Marxist. This is a logical consequence of the fact that neither world provides solutions to the spiritual yearnings of white people, as both are materialistic, with each world seeking solutions in the other.

The communist takeover suddenly stifled a whole glorious body of Russian literature, forged by men who had written against the tsarist regime and who are the cream of world fiction. Its most "political" expression is Tolstoy. Persecuted by the Tsarist police, he was never silenced, nor were all his works banned. But Lenin and Stalin were the ones who categorically banned Tolstoy's work, creating a new sin: being a "Tolstoyan", an accusation that led many writers to Siberia (Tolstoyanism as a symbol of the Christian religion), to the point that one of the reasons given for banning Solzhenitsyn's works was that "there is no difference between Solzhenitsyn and Tolstoyism".

Contemporary Russian literature of quality is anti-Soviet (let us forget, of course, the economic pamphlets and stories of class struggle); authentic literature is always found among exiles or dissidents. Its great geniuses have undoubtedly been Pasternak and Solzhenitsyn, both Nobel Prize winners (and, unusually for Nobel Prize winners, both "anti-Soviet" and persecuted, although their behaviour differed).

Pasternak could not endure the prisons, torture and persecution of Stalinism; he had to surrender by performing a humiliating "self-criticism" and dying quickly. But Solzhenitsyn took on the role of indomitable standard-bearer despite the enormous repression that came down on him. He has been the tip of the iceberg of Russian culture drowned in the sea of Soviet censorship and persecution.

Solzhenitsyn was born in December 1918, and his dramatic adventure began in 1945 when he was arrested for writing a sentence against Stalin in a letter to a friend (which was intercepted). As he himself would say, without this arrest, without this seemingly insignificant event, he would not have been able to discover a world of which he had only had premonitions, the world of Siberia. For this letter, he was sentenced to 11 years of hard labour in Siberia, where he would write and "live" all his works.

After all kinds of suffering and a serious cancerous illness in 1953 (the basis for his future "Cancer Ward"), he was not released in 1956, when his sentence expired. He remained in the Siberian camp until 1962, after Stalin's death and the beginning of a brief period of de-Stalinisation. As he himself would say, it was only because his "crime" was against Stalin and not against "Marxism" that he was released.

Then began a tremendously dangerous period for Solzhenitsyn. He was still unknown to anyone, and if his originals were discovered, he would be completely eliminated. He wrote tirelessly while working as a mathematics teacher in a tiny Russian village, hiding his papers in various places thanks to his contacts with the "Samisdat".

Samisdat is an illegal organisation dedicated to disseminating all censored and prohibited material, in which millions of Russians participate. They are not printing presses or a formidable secret organisation, but simply a union of ordinary people who, at night, in their homes, type, write by hand, copy and recopy all "prohibited" literature. They form a huge library of manuscripts that spread like wildfire, reaching everywhere. These are not "political" works, but literature in general:

novels, poetry, short stories... all banned because, as Trotsky and Bukharin defined it, literature does not exist for Marxism; it is just another weapon in the service of class struggle, of political struggle.

Then came Solzhenitsyn's big chance. After the 22nd Party Congress, Khrushchev decided to attack Stalin's memory and "rehabilitate" the communists who had died in Siberia (the Congress only talked about the "dead communists," never mentioning the non-communists, and even a planned monument to the communists who died in Siberia was rejected as excessive). Thanks to the secretary (a friend of Samizdat) of the editor of the magazine *Noviy Mir*, Tvardovsky, he sent him a copy of the novel *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich*. Tvardovsky (who would later die as an "anti-Soviet") gave the novel directly to Khrushchev and, incredibly, Khrushchev approved its publication, believing that it would attack Stalin.

This is Solzhenitsyn's leap to fame, and he will enjoy relative personal immunity while Khrushchev is alive. His work is a huge success, read by millions of Russians who write to him. But Khrushchev quickly realised that this had been a mistake, as it attacked not only Stalin, but the entire camp system. And Khrushchev had not closed the camps, far from it! Not a single word by Solzhenitsyn would be accepted by the censors; all would be banned. But Samizdat would publish them, they would be sent abroad and published by Grani, the Russian publishing house in exile.

"The First Circle", "Cancer Ward" and "August 1918" are the pillars of his gigantic novelistic oeuvre. A work that brings him fame in the West, and that will save his life. The police kept him under surveillance, his originals were stolen (although he had other copies hidden away), he was accused, expelled from the Writers' Union, and isolated; nothing he wrote was published while his works were sold abroad.

There is also his "The Banquet of the Victors", a totally anti-Marxist work, which is the target of all criticism (although it has not yet been published, as the authorities only have the stolen original). He is accused of defending Vlasov (a Russian general in the Waffen SS), and the entire system will attack him. Meanwhile, Solzhenitsyn is quietly preparing what he considers his own suicide: "The Gulag Archipelago". He accumulates thousands and thousands of notes, knowing that if they are discovered, it will be the end of him. The measures he takes are incredible, worthy of a fictional film: only his preparation in Siberia allows him to take sufficient measures to prevent the originals from being found.

Then, when he does not know how to get the "Gulag" out, he is awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1970. He can no longer be eliminated so easily; he is well known and under the relative protection of popularity. He does not go to collect the prize because he knows they will not let him back in. He is not allowed to give a speech when he collects it. He continues to work, but his fate is already sealed; he will be expelled from the USSR. He publishes *The Gulag Archipelago* abroad.

Solzhenitsyn is an exceptional novelist, writing in a style that only Russians have managed to achieve; a tireless fighter, he has suffered what is difficult to imagine (one need only read his "Kicks to the Sting" to get a glimpse of this). He is not a politician, he does not want to be a politician, he has been forced to be a politician by those who believe that everything should be politics. His philosophy is that of all Russian dissidents: Christian, spiritualist, a resounding denunciation of all Marxism, materialism and hedonism, both in the USSR and in the West.

In exile, he will initially receive all kinds of attention. The Zionist press has always been instructed to present dissidents as "human socialists" and "democratic Marxists." Both he and Sakharov and Jaures Medvedev (locked up in a psychiatric hospital) are presented in this way, but Solzhenitsyn will not play along.

He will quickly speak out against democratic duplicity, accuse financial policy of favouring communism, Willy Brandt with his Ostpolitik (whom he will accuse of

being at the service of communism: "he would have had relations with the USSR even with Stalin"), the Vatican for its unilateral silence on communist issues, and democracy in general (suffice it to recall the talk on TVE during the Franco regime).

His initial stance in support of Jews seeking to emigrate from the USSR soon turned into condemnation of their selfishness and lack of solidarity with the Russian people, who did not wish to emigrate but to live in Russia, free from Marxism. The Jews supported the Jackson amendment, which only asked the USSR to respect the Jews' right to emigrate, as opposed to the Mills amendment, which called for respect for the rights of the Russian people. This stance led to total silence from the Western press, forcing him into ostracism. He is attacked with hatred and viciousness, it will be said that he went into exile only for money and luxury, and all kinds of barbarities, among which this phrase by the very democratic Juan Benet in "Cuadernos para el Diálogo" (¿?) on 27-8-1976 stands out (Benet is now a prominent democratic and liberal figure): "As long as there are people like Solzhenitsyn, concentration camps will endure and must endure, and such concentration camps must be better guarded so that people like Alexander Solzhenitsyn, until they acquire a little education, cannot go out on the street..."

Solzhenitsyn, a great novelist, a Russian artist and a man who swims against the tide. Swimming against the tide in the USSR and even more so here in the West! R.B.

VINTILA HORIA

Very briefly, Vintila Horia's biography until he settled permanently in Spain is as follows: he was born in Romania, the son of an agricultural engineer; he was press attaché in Rome in 1940 (when Marshal Antonescu was head of government in Romania). Dismissed shortly afterwards by his government – surely due to his disagreements with the Iron Guard – he was sent to Vienna in 1942, but – and this is a confusing story, similar to what happened to Horia Sima, his compatriot – he was interned by the Germans. We know nothing about the reasons why he was interned or about his life during this period of confinement. What is certain is that at the end of the Second World War he did not want to return to his homeland, which was dominated by the Red Army, even though he claimed to have been a prisoner of war and declared himself to be a "lifelong" anti-fascist, a valid passport for all kinds of rogues and opportunists.

We know that he first went into exile in Italy, where he befriended Papini; then in Argentina, where he worked as a simple bank clerk, while his wife helped him by working hard, according to Mr Daniel-Rops of the French Academy in the prologue to his book 'God was born in exile'; and finally in Spain, where, in that order, he was a hotel employee, reporter, literary agent, and writer.

His sufferings as an exile proved Nietzsche's maxim true: "What does not destroy me makes me stronger." The definitive recognition of his talent as a great writer, which he already possessed, came with the book mentioned above, *God Is Born in Exile*, for which he was awarded the Prix Goncourt for Fiction in 1960. This book is about the supposed diary of the Latin poet Ovid during his exile in Tomis and his inner evolution. In this novel, the great poet of the first century and the great writer of the twentieth century, Vintila Horia, are magically united. And above them both is the presence of God, who was also born in exile, in Bethlehem.

Due to V. Horia's literary and philosophical work, which we will briefly look at below, it is difficult to pigeonhole him into a specific ideology or political movement. Obviously

intelligent and not at all utopian, which of course "disqualifies" him from the practice of profitable and respected intellectual leftism. If the word "right-wing" were not so ambiguous and so associated with bourgeois populism, he could be classified in this way. The label of "civilised right-wing" thinker would suit him even better, but as the gentlemen who today bear that name do nothing but use it to camouflage their lack of vision for the future and their constant and "civilised" servility, so contrary to Vintila Horia's firmness, we cannot call him that either. So, a fascist? A national revolutionary, perhaps? Well, here's the funny thing: as the introducer—or would-be introducer—of his work and thought into circles that call themselves National Revolutionaries, his greatest mentors have told me about him with emphatic sobriety: "Well, he has some 'interesting' ideas, but he's obviously not one of us."

But for those of us who are convinced that our struggle requires, more than street riots, more than uniforms – which are totally counterproductive in this materialistic age with all the means of disinformation against us – more than "reincarnations", I say, it requires knowing how to fight and be alone, knowing how to or trying to convince the uninformed, knowing how to read between the lines, remaining firm to the limit on transcendental issues; to possess and cultivate a critical spirit; for those of us who believe this, Vintila Horia is ours and, moreover, currently in Spain, the intellectual master.

Without a doubt, the greatest and best cultural endeavour ever undertaken in Spain – and I am aware of the boldness of such a statement – for the comprehensive training of elites was the creation by Vintila Horia in 1971 of the magazine FUTURO-PRESENTE, which sadly disappeared after seven years and 41 issues. In it, Vintila Horia, together with a small but talented team of Spanish and foreign contributors, and also with translations of articles from the best European magazines, offered us masterful lessons on all branches of culture: philosophy, science, tradition, futurism, etc. From highly erudite and specialised articles written by the best thinkers and scientists in physics, Heisenberg; in ethology, Konrad Lorenz; in futurism, García Durango; in politics and sociology, Alain de Benoist; excerpts from the writings of Nietzsche, Evola, Pareto, Marinetti, etc.; Vintila Horia's pen always synthesised all of this, intertwining the different disciplines to point out and anticipate what will be – and nothing and no one can prevent it because it is the "fate" of history – the thinking of the coming centuries: the sudden or gradual collapse of the sphinx of materialism and Marxism – both already corpses as systems of thought and only artificially sustained for the "philosophical" justification of bureaucratic regimes – and the resurgence of a higher ethic and spirituality, in which science will no longer be contrary to religion or vice versa, and in which the latter will return to its genuine sources in the High Western Tradition.

However, his articles in FUTURO-PRESENTE, such as those he wrote in the newspaper "El Alcazar", did not merely link disciplines, but offered precise insights into everyday issues such as subversion, terrorism (both physical and intellectual), eroticism (its positive and negative sides), current religiosity, etc., never resorting to sensationalism but rather to the essence of these phenomena, the only effective way to classify and combat them.

As I write these lines, on 25 May 1979, I am reading another of his formidable articles in the cultural pages of El Alcazar, entitled 'Futurism, revolution and reaction'. In it, he clearly shows how Mussolini's fascist regime had the foresight to draw on the new intellectual currents that reached it through multiple, and even divergent, cultural spaces: this is the case of Marinetti and most of the futurists. Everything that tended to affirm character and personality was

accepted by fascism – or rather by Mussolini – even if it led to a dangerous ideological heterodoxy.

Due to the limited space available, we will mention only a few of his many literary works, those written on topics of current interest: *Viaje a los centros de la tierra* (Journey to the Centres of the Earth) consists of interviews with the most influential thinkers and scientists of the present century, either directly or, in the case of those who have already passed away, with their close collaborators. It describes the new thinking, still largely ignored, that is taking shape in Europe and its interrelation with the sciences. *Encuesta detrás de lo visible* (Survey Behind the Visible) is also a book on parapsychology, with interviews with people who have been directly involved in paranormal phenomena, requiring the point of view of the most qualified analysts in the field. "Introduction to 20th Century Literature" is an essential book for understanding all the currents of ethical-political thought that have been expressed through literature in this century, bringing back to the public writers who, because of their undemocratic ideas, are practically ignored today. J.L.T.

JORGE LUIS BORGES

With Borges, as with Mishima, it is fair to say that it is not necessary for the Swedish "brains" who award the Nobel Prizes to have honoured them for their works to have achieved the fame they rightly deserve. And if Borges has not yet been awarded the Nobel Prize, it is precisely because of his political ideas. We would be lying if we said that Jorge Luis Borges is a 'national revolutionary'. Nothing could be further from his political definition than adopting such a radical attitude as this adjective implies. Borges is, rather, a conservative. What's more, Borges is a man of Order, with a capital O, representing something more than the absence of terrorism and street disorder, an Order that is cosmic and universal, which translates into the macrocosm of the person and the entire universe.

Born in the last year of the previous century, Jorge Luis Borges soon moved to Europe and ended up settling in Madrid, after a hurried stay in various European countries. Fluent in German, he began his literary work by translating modern German poets. A tireless reader, from a very young age his brain's archive collected thousands of strange, curious and sometimes grotesque facts, which would form the soul of some of his novels and compilations. In "The Book of Heaven and Hell", Borges, together with his friend and colleague Adolfo Bioy Casares, compiled a prodigious collection of quotations relating to the different conceptions that have defined, in one way or another, the two polarities, divine and infernal. It should be added that these are not commonplace quotations, but rather most of them are taken from extremely rare texts, from little-known books that contain disturbing ideas about hell. This tendency to collect "oddities" and to illustrate his stories with them would be one of the main characteristics of his literature and perhaps the one that gives his short stories their distinctive colour.

Around 1921, he returned to Argentina and settled permanently in Buenos Aires, beginning a prolific period of writing that continues to this day.

More than fifty years of writing is a long time to devote to a single genre, and it can be said that Borges has cultivated almost all of them. As a poet, he was one of the best of his generation, even if this is not precisely the field in which he stands out the most. His most significant poems are included in the volume entitled "El otro, el mismo" (The Other, the Same), which collects his work from 1930 to 1967. Borges has been considered

A poet before a novelist, he has even defined poetry as a "mysterious chess game whose board and pieces change as if in a dream, and to which I will devote myself after I die." We, however, will allow ourselves to doubt his assertion and place him first as a novelist (or rather, a short story writer) rather than a poet. Proof of his importance in this field is that the generation of South American writers who emerged in the late 1960s were directly inspired by the Borgian tradition of storytelling. Just ask Cortazar, some of whose stories are directly inspired by the Borgian system and conception of literature (see "Historias de Cronopios y de Famas" and "Rayuela" and compare them with "La Historia universal de la infamia" and "Historias de la Eternidad" by Borges ...).

As we said at the beginning, Borges cannot be immediately classified among the most representative writers of 'our world', but we must recognise that he has drawn from the same sources as us. He knew Drieu la Rochelle and had read the *Nouvelle Revue Française*, which he cited in several of his works (in *Ficciones*, for example, in the story entitled "The Garden of Forking Paths"). He was an avid reader of Nietzsche and the Greek and Roman classics, and had taken pains to seek out rare editions of their works. Thus, for example, in *The Immortal*, he quotes several strange and ancient editions of the *Iliad*, and in *Stories of Eternity*, he often quotes Nietzsche, apart from the fact that the whole book is more or less directly inspired by the myth of eternal return. Because Borges, in short, totally shares our view of the world.

CONTEMPORARY SPANISH AUTHORS

Alongside Vintila Horia, several authors stand out in the current Spanish scene, among whom we can mention the recently deceased (1973) JUAN EDUARDO CIRLOT. Born in Barcelona in 1916, his work is vast, with highlights including his "Introduction to Surrealism", "Dictionary of Symbols", and an exhaustive "Essay on the Swastika". In the field of art, he wrote a large number of books, but normally defending abstraction in contemporary art, which would place him in a privileged position in fashionable art criticism. Among his poetic works, it is worth highlighting "Cantos a la vida muerta" (Songs to Dead Life), "Lilith" and "Palacio de Plata" (Silver Palace), publishing several unpublished poems in the *CEDADE Bulletin*. As a musician, he composed "Preludio para cinco instrumentos" (Prelude for Five Instruments), "Suite atonal" (Atonal Suite), "Himno" (Hymn) and "Concertino" for string quartet, writing numerous articles on music and a book on Stravinsky.

In addition to essayists such as FRANCISCO ELIAS DE TEJADA, who specialises in the study of Evola's work, and novelists such as ANGEL PALOMINO, we could mention the works of JULIO GARCIA DE DURANGO and the work of two young authors: ANTONIO MEDRANO, from Madrid, author of various works, such as "Islam and Europe", "Essay on Personality," "The Redskins," "Zen," and profound works on the theory of racism. JOAQUIN BOCHACA, from Catalonia, author of works such as his well-known and voluminous "The History of the Vanquished" (a summary of the history of our century, in two volumes), "Finance and Power," "The Capitalist Enigma," "The Myth of the Six Million," and "The Crimes of the Good," in addition to his prolific work as a columnist and translator of the works of Evola, Brassillach, and Yockey. J.T.

UGO SPIRITO

"The crisis of our time is characterised by the death of faith in traditional values," wrote this author, noted for his criticism of values considered most progressive. A widely read author in Italy, his extensive output includes: *Critica della democrazia*, *La vita come ricerca*, *La vita come arte*, *La vita come amore*, *Il problematicismo*, *La filosofia del comunismo*, *Scienza e filosofia*, "Note sul pensiero di Gentile" (Notes on Gentile's Thought), "Significato del nostro tempo" (The Meaning of Our Time), "La riforma della scuola" (School Reform), "Inizio di una nuova epoca" (The Beginning of a New Era), "Comunismo russo e comunismo cinese" (Russian Communism and Chinese Communism), "Machiavelli e Guicciardini" (Machiavelli and Guicciardini), etc.

LEON DE PONCINS

Leon de Montaigne, Count of Poncins, was born in Civens (Loire) on 3 November 1897 and died in 1977. Specialising in the subject of major contemporary revolutionary movements, and convinced that major political and social changes, and what is generically known as 'the Revolution', are caused by secret movements and societies, Poncins devoted himself to proving this in numerous books, which were highly successful and were translated into the most widely spoken languages. His most notable works include: "The Secret Forces of the Revolution", "Storm over the World", "Freemasonry According to its Secret Documents", "The Mysterious Jewish International", "Secret History of the Spanish Revolution", "The Communist Enigma," "The Hidden Forces in the Modern World," "Soviet Espionage in the World," and "Top Secret." His "History of Communism" is impressive for the thoroughness of its documentation. In October 1965, he personally intervened in the Second Vatican Council on the occasion of the vote on the Jewish question. He published a pamphlet under his own name, written in French and Italian, which was distributed in the Vatican itself to the Council Fathers. In this pamphlet, he opposed the pro-Jewish stance that part of the High Church wanted to adopt. J.B.

PINO RAUTI

Leader of the Ordine Nuovo group until it joined the MSI, he is a born essayist, notable for his recent monumental "History of Fascism" in six volumes, a definitive contribution against the lack of rigour of historians themselves, as well as his "Le Idee che mossero il mondo" (The Ideas that Moved the World). Rauti runs the Centro Librario Edizioni Europa, the main publishing house for the works of the most prominent Italian and European thinkers of the national-revolutionary tendency. He also runs several magazines and news agencies and is a member of parliament for the MSI. J.T.

JEAN HAUPT

Born in Oran, France, he worked for many years as editor of the prestigious magazine "Decouvertes", published in Portugal. He is the author of, among other works, the book "Proceso a la Democracia" (The Trial of Democracy), now a classic among anti-democrats. His numerous travels throughout his life and his profession as a translator lend his writings considerable authority. J.T.

JACQUES DE MAHIEU

He is a prestigious French professor and writer based in Argentina. An active collaborator of Perón, his work is divided into two areas: his political works and his historical research. Among the former, his insightful "Fundamentos de Biopolítica" (Fundamentals of Biopolitics), an anti-egalitarian view of the world, stands out, and we can also mention "Evolución y porvenir del sindicalismo" (Evolution and Future of Trade Unionism) (1954), "La naturaleza del hombre" (The Nature of Man) (1955), "Community Economy" (1964), "Dictionary of Political Science" (1966), "Proletariat and Culture" (1967), "Maurras and Sorel" (1969), "Treatise on General Sociology" (1969), etc.

In other fields, after his initial works "Philosophy of Aesthetics" and "Organising Intelligence", both published in 1950, Mahieu is mainly known for his research into the history of the Vikings in South America. Thanks to his investigations and his journeys in search of archaeological remains, Mahieu has been able to prove that it was not Columbus, but the Vikings, who were the first Europeans to reach America. All his work has been summarised in a multitude of books, including "The Great Journey of the Sun God", "The Agony of the Sun God", "Drakkars in the Amazon", "Secret Geography of America before Columbus", etc. J.T.

JEAN RASPAIL

He is a French novelist whose work is now widely read. His best-known novel, "The Camp of the Saints," is a warning about the danger that the invasion of people of colour could pose to Europe.

HENRY COSTON

He is possibly the author who has most decisively and clearly dedicated himself in France to unmasking Zionist power throughout the world. Through his magazine, Lectures Françaises, and the publishing house of the same name, he has disseminated his theories and the countless data collected in his research, compiling them in his books, some of which have highly significant titles.

"The Financiers Who Rule the World" was published in 1955 and has had at least 15 successive editions. His other works include: "High Banking and Trusts," an indictment of the power of finance; "The Return of the 200 Families," "Journalism," "The Europe of Bankers," "The Republic of the Rothschilds," etc. J.T.

JEAN CAU

Winner of the 1961 Goncourt Prize, starting from opposing postulates, he ended up classifying himself as a nationalist.

A former favourite disciple of Sartre, he broke away from his master's doctrines to develop a vast body of work, published by the best French publishing houses, which he continues to this day. Notable among his books are:

"Le Tour d'un monde", "Les parachutistes", "Les creilles et la queue", "Un testament de Staline", "Le pape est mort", "L'agonie de la vieille", "Les escuries de l'Occident" (critique of the age of objects: "When there are no longer any true masters, the whole

society is made up of slaves. But sad and empty slaves"), "Pourquoi la France", "La grande prostituée", "Lettre ouverte à tout le monde", "Le chevalier, la mort et le diable", etc.

For Jean Cau, the evolution of our civilisation has slipped smoothly from Christianity to egalitarianism, from egalitarianism to democracy, and from democracy to decadence. His criticism of egalitarianism is absolute. In "Discours de la Décadence", he states, "An apple tree bears apples, and democracy bears mediocrities." He concludes: "Democracy is the worst moment of our decadence." But he senses a lifeline: "A people must have its history and memory amputated to open the way to egalitarianism, but there is a difficult obstacle: there are works of art, which impose their greatness and speak to Demos of another world."

Jean Cau takes a diametrically opposite view to American globalism, asserting that its triumph would spell the definitive decline of Europe. Perhaps in parallel, he states: "Let us remember: Nazism was not defeated by slogans, but by armies, and as long as democracies (including the USSR) have opposed it with nothing more than loudspeakers and sermons, they have already been defeated."

Jean Cau, a contributor to numerous French nationalist magazines, is today one of the promising young figures in French national-revolutionary literature. J.T.

ALAIN DE BENOIST

In post-war Paris, various anti-communist groups emerged, but it was not until 1968 that GRECE (Groupement de Recherches et d'Etudes pour la Civilisation Européenne) was founded, with an extremely high cultural and intellectual level. GRECE has spread throughout the provinces and has organised numerous conferences, meetings, seminars, etc. Among its publications, the prestigious magazine *Nouvelle Ecole* stands out, perhaps the most carefully crafted in terms of its presentation of Europe. GRECE also publishes the internal magazine *Elements, Etudes et Recherches*, and has a rapidly growing book publishing company (Copemic). Alain de Benoist is the editor of "*Nouvelle Ecole*" and the main driving force behind the group. He is the author of a voluminous book entitled "*Vue de droite*", a summary of the entire ideology of the right, which was awarded a prize last year by the French Academy.

Jean Claude Valla and Michel Marmin complete the core group of GRECE. Among the personalities who have collaborated with them and who help the organisation, Jean Anouilh, Robert Ardrey, Jacques Benoist-Mechin, Jean Cau, Juhen Freund, Pierre Gripazi, Jean Mabire, Thierry Mauinier, Thomas Moinar, Louls Pauweis, Jean RaW4, Lucien Rebatet, Louis Rougier, Paul Serant, Robert Soupault, Jean Varenne and many others. For a time, the core group of GRECE contributed to the Sunday cultural supplement of the newspaper *Le Figaro*. J.T.

THE TRADITIONALIST CURRENT

Within the national-revolutionary political current, there is no doubt that the theme of "recovering tradition" has gained importance in some tendencies. Indeed, although this traditionalist current does not have - and does not want to have - a political character, it has influenced certain political groups. Moreover, it has helped them to carry out an exhaustive analysis of the reality of the modern world and to lay the foundations for a possible response. The importance of the traditionalist movement is, therefore, as follows: a return to the origins of our race, a return to the study of ancient traditions, pruning them of the accidental to glimpse what is common to all of them, thus achieving the redefinition of a tradition common to the whole of the West that can serve as the basis for a radical response to the modern world, as a conception of the world that includes the militant trajectory of the national-revolutionary man within a specific historical moment, justifying his presence and the activism he has developed. And when speaking of traditional thought, we must necessarily refer to Julius Evola and René Guénon.

RENE GUENON: THE ORIENTAL TRADITION FOR WESTERNERS

On 7 January 1951, a Muslim named Abdel Wahed-Yahia died uttering the name of Allah. That man had been born on 15 November 1886 in France, receiving Catholic baptism and the name René, René Guénon. Between the newborn baptised in the Catholic rite and the lifeless body in Cairo, which was to be buried according to the Koranic rite, lay an entire suggestive, strange and extraordinary life.

For some authors, notably fundamentalist Christians, to speak of Guénon is to touch on a taboo subject: "Guénon? He's a Freemason," even though he had written articles in *La France anti-maçonique*. Other national-revolutionary militants despise Guénon's work insofar as he does not take political positions. However, it is clear that Guénon's work, considered objectively, has a political importance in our world similar to that of "Das Kapital" among communists. Some prestigious encyclopaedias have defined Guénon as an "Orientalist," but Guénon was aware that he was born in the West and that it was in this part of the globe that he had to fight his battles. He was not a Christian because he wanted to go beyond the facile and superficial interpretations of Christianity; he was, instead, a Muslim because he saw there a living and working tradition. All these traits give us an idea of how contradictory and intriguing René Guénon's personality could be. Some imbecile has

said that "Hitlerism is Guenonism plus panzer divisions", which is nothing more than a meaningless publicity slogan, but which indicates the extent to which some anti-fascist authors consider Guenon dangerous.

Guenon's family background did not suggest anything special. Just as Gautama Shidarta Buddha, the twenty-sixth Buddha, was born into a noble family, Guenon was born into the upper middle class of provincial France. If Buddha had been predestined to rule a kingdom, Guenon could very well have devoted himself to managing the family estate. This was not the case. The recognition of a spiritual life beyond the material world, the awareness that such a life could be lived and intuited even while remaining in the world of the contingent, and a certain disenchantment with Christian moralising led him to seek new paths to spirituality from the early years of the century. He sought this path in Hermeticism. He was initiated into the esoteric school of "Papus," which he soon abandoned, disenchanted by its theorising. From Hermeticism, he moved on to the Gnostic Church, under the name "Palingenius" (the one who is reborn, René, his French name). He collaborated with the "patriarch" Synesius, leader of that church, especially in the founding of the magazine "La Gnosis". The year was 1909. The Gnostic adventure lasted until 1912, during which time Guenon-Palingenius began to write articles on traditional philosophy and metaphysics.

In 1912, he began his adventures in Freemasonry, specifically in the Grand Lodge of France, Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite. What led him to join Freemasonry? First of all, disappointment with his previous experiences. In fact, neither Papus nor the Gnostics were anything more than pockets of impressionable individuals of poor human quality. On the contrary, Guénon found in Freemasonry a different kind of people, a more serious esotericism, a more authentic tradition. For years, Guénon, obsessed with the idea of restoring tradition in the West, believed that the vehicles for such a restoration could only be the Catholic Church and Freemasonry. Only later did he realise that the Catholic Church had ended up transforming its rites into customs, into a kind of repetition devoid of any meaning. It was not for nothing that the Hindu Vedic texts announced that one of the symptoms of the "Dark Age" would be that men would perform ablutions without any beneficial content (devoid of meaning). As for Freemasonry, Guenon, after studying it from within, concluded that everything esoteric and traditional in this organisation was due to mere reminiscences of the "operative" period and that "speculative" Freemasonry, simply by being so, could not be anything more than mere bourgeois dilettantism. But before reaching these conclusions, he had to go through a long journey in different Masonic lodges, which has led some authors (notably Pierre Virion, see "The Church and Freemasonry") to include him among Masonic authors.

He belonged to the Martinist Order (another Masonic sect) which, according to Guenon's revelation, was supposed to serve as an antechamber to a higher and more elitist organisation, the Hermetic Brotherhood of Luxor. From Martinism, and introduced by him, he went on to contact two Masonic lodges, the Symbolic Humanity Lodge No. 240 of the Spanish National Rite, and the Chapter of the Temple INRI of the Primitive and Original Rite, of which he became Grand Master of the Grand Orient, receiving the black cordon of Knight Kadosh. At the Masonic Congress of 1908, he was secretary of the presidential table. But all this began to disenchant Guénon, who found it... frivolous. With the most valid elements of these organisations, he went on to form a certain "Order of the Temple", which, after various vicissitudes, was dissolved, and he later joined the Thebes Lodge. All this lasted until 1914. At that time, Guénon wrote: "Freemasonry has undergone a degeneration: the beginning of this degeneration lies in the transformation of operative Freemasonry into speculative Freemasonry, although one cannot speak of discontinuity; even if there was

"schism", the filiation was not interrupted by this and despite everything; the incomprehension of its adherents and even its leaders does not alter in any way the intrinsic value of the rites and symbols of which it remains the repository".

In 1909, Guénon began publishing articles and contributing to two anti-Masonic magazines edited by the Catholic publicist Clarin de la Rive: *La France antimasonique* and *La France chrétienne*. Both publications followed the guidelines of Leo Taxil, champion of anti-Masonry in those years. Rive started from the premise of the existence of Luciferian and Satanic groups, that is, groups that consciously strove to discredit traditional organisations and symbols and constituted a "High Luciferian Masonry", situated above and beyond normal Masonry. Like most anti-Masonic writers, Leo Taxil had fallen into countless exaggerations and caused absolute confusion on the subject. Guénon understood that if he had to collaborate with *France Anti-maçonique*, it was not out of solidarity with this fight but to set the record straight, denouncing the excesses of Taxilian anti-Masonry. In the "International Review of Secret Societies", i.e. located at the antipodes of anti-Masonry, Guénon later took it upon himself to denounce the excesses and confusion of anti-Masonry and its practitioners.

In 1914, he was declared unfit for military service, thus sparing him from being an actor and witness to the drama of the European war. In 1917, he had his first contacts with Islam while teaching in Algeria. He returned to France and continued to teach philosophy until he returned to Paris in 1921. He was 35 years old: from then on, he would write his most compelling pages.

Islam. Why did he become "The servant of the one"? In our view, there were two reasons that led him to take such a step: the first was the reality of Islam itself, understood as one of the three living traditions of the 20th century (the other two being Buddhism and Hinduism in particular); and the second was the fact that he could not access Hinduism because of its closed caste system. Islam presented itself and still presents itself today as a popular faith capable of arousing enthusiasm (see the case of the Shiites in Iran), with a living and active esotericism that shaped a traditional society. To these reasons were undoubtedly added others of a practical nature that are not relevant here.

Guenon believed that "if religion is necessarily one, like Truth, religions can only be deviations from the primordial doctrine," and we can see this in his sincere collaboration with *La France Antimassique* and his no less sincere adherence to Islam: the moral element always prevailed in Guénon over the ritual element, but since a religious ritual must be alive and meaningful in order to be effective, Guénon valued Islam more positively than Christianity.

In 1912, after publishing a series of articles and works in various esoteric, Masonic, anti-Masonic and Gnostic publications, he published his first major book: "A General Introduction to the Study of Hindu Doctrines". In it, he touches on a theme that will be constant throughout his work. It would be repeated in "East and West," and he would even feel compelled to devote a chapter to it in "The Crisis of the Modern World." Indeed, much of Guénon's efforts throughout his life were devoted to overcoming the apparent contradiction between East and West. For him, this opposition has not been a constant throughout history, and although it is a reality today—even as the East is abandoning its traditional way of life to imitate the Western way of life—in the past, when the West was not hyper-materialised, it shared with the East the same reality: the reality of the universal and unique Tradition, just as universal and unique is

Truth. If one wishes to recognise a difference between East and West, in their pure and traditional form, one must admit that the West has always given greater importance to action over contemplation, while in the East the opposite has been true. But it is also necessary to admit that the two paths of traditional asceticism are precisely these: action and contemplation (Evola agrees with Guénon on this point, emphasising the Ghibelline Middle Ages and its social organisation).

The "General Introduction..." is followed by "Theosophism," a documentary work dedicated to exposing the absurd lies of a Russian adventuress, Mme. Blavatsky, and her eccentric pseudo-initiatory organisation, "The Theosophical Society." An overwhelming book in terms of its documentation, some of which was confidential until the book's publication, "Theosophism" was not a work exclusively attributable to Guénon; several Hindu "informants" willing to denounce Blavatsky's pseudo-religion and her methods as a professional swindler participated in its writing and, especially, in the collection of documentation. Theosophy was followed by another exposé, *The Spiritist Error*. A medium well known to Guénon, spiritist circles brought together impressionable people, vulgar rogues, authentic mediums and a high percentage of middle-class bourgeois eager for strong emotions. The various spiritualist centres that flourished at the beginning of the century, the satanic sects, etc., represented a murky underworld that needed to be combated both then and now, when they are experiencing a new revival. It is precisely in this book that some of Guénon's most famous pages are found, especially those devoted to the phenomena of immortality and survival, communication with the dead, reincarnation, etc. Some of these themes are later expanded upon by Evola in "Face and Mask of Contemporary Spiritualism," a book that follows the same path as Guenon's and represents an update and revision of some of Guenon's criteria.

Chronologically speaking, "East and West" appears later, around 1924.

Although we have already briefly reviewed the book's subject matter, it should be noted that it was particularly well received in Catholic circles, especially in *Action Française*. Léon Daudet wrote glowing reviews of it, stating that it coincided with Maurrasian ideology. And so it was indeed: Guénon, like Maurras, believed that the greatest disaster in Western history was the French Revolution, and although from this point on each went his own way (one towards integral tradition and the other towards integral nationalism), both agreed on identifying the evils of Western civilisation: materialism and alienation and divorce from the traditional way of life.

In 1925, he published his magnum opus from a doctrinal point of view. While "The Crisis of the Modern World" is his best-known and most important critical work, "Man and His Future According to the Vedanta" is his most accomplished work from the point of view of doctrinal rigour. Vedanta is the most purely metaphysical school of Hindu doctrine, whose core is the doctrine of Supreme Identity, that is, the possibility for human beings subject to contingent life to integrate and become one with the divine. For the first time in the West, a work appeared that was sufficiently comprehensible to the average reader and sufficiently scholarly not to be a mere popularisation exposing the secrets and most sublime realities of Hinduism. This book was followed by another of a historicist nature, "The Esotericism of Dante". For Guenon, Dante's "Divine Comedy" is not mere entertainment or social criticism, but represents the key to its author's ideological origins: Ghibellinism and its groups of initiates. In

the Divine Comedy touches on all the traditional sciences, from alchemy to the science of numbers, from the theory of cosmic cycles to astrology.

And in 1927, "The Crisis of the Modern World", which would be followed after the world war and as a complement by "The Reign of Quantity and the Signs of the Times". What do both works represent in the context of traditional thought and the intellectuality of the "other Europe"? First and foremost, they represent a successful attempt to place the modern world in its rightful place: namely, as the latest degenerate by-product of human history, a world that lives off what all other civilisations have discarded or abandoned. But it is not just a critical exposition; it also aims to be "operational" as far as possible. And it is on this point that Guenon has aroused the most heated controversy in national-revolutionary circles. Guenon believed that a possible restoration of tradition in the West could not be achieved as some claimed – and as some French and Canadian national-revolutionary circles still claim today – by reviving "Celticism", considered by these same elements to be the quintessence of Western tradition; and this for one simple reason: because Celticism is today, as it was fifty years ago, dead and buried, with not even the slightest trace of survival. Such a traditional restoration needed a "vehicle," and in which institutions did traditional remnants still exist? Guenon identified them in two organisations as opposed as Freemasonry and the Catholic Church. We must turn to Evola to clarify this point further. In "The Myth of the Grail and the Ghibelline Tradition of the Empire", Evola, in his last chapter - "A Reversal of Ghibellinism" - speaks of Freemasonry in these terms: "It is surprising to find in an author such as Guénon the assertion that, alongside "companionship", Freemasonry is almost the only organisation existing today in the West which, despite its degeneration, "can claim an authentic traditional origin and a regular initiatory transmission". He more or less explicitly doubts the fair diagnosis of Freemasonry as pseudo-initiatory syncretism driven by underground forces of contraindication, which can be formulated precisely on the basis of Guénon's views. "Indeed, Freemasonry not only preserves a few traditional elements - and these are basically symbolic and ornamental in nature - but is fundamentally completely anti-traditional. Let us look at some examples: in the formula of the 30th degree of the Scottish Rite, entitled 'The Revenge of the Templars', it is said: "Revenge fell upon Philip the Fair, not on the day his remains were thrown among the rubbish of Saint Denis by a delirious mob (...), but on the day the French Constituent Assembly proclaimed, before all thrones, the rights of man and of the citizen" that is to say, the sources of bourgeois constitutions. And even more: for modern Freemasonry, the "Age of Light" (the opposite of kali-yuga, the age of darkness) appeared in 1945 with the "Universal Declaration of Human Rights" issued by the United Nations... And Christianity? Or rather, the Catholic Church? Well, it was evident in 1927 that the Catholic Church retained a certain traditional ritual and even its very structure presented – like that of Freemasonry – a hierarchical organisation and certain features of initiation (tonsure, for example). But this should not distract us from its essence, and its essence was that imprinted by Paul in his preaching in the suburbs of Rome among slaves, Jews who had broken away from the synagogues, and patricians who had betrayed their caste. It was essentially subversive preaching, advising desertion from the Roman legions ("thou shalt not kill thy brother"). It is true that, once in power, after Constantine's edict, all this changed, and Christianity became the religion of power in such a way that at the first Council, excommunication was announced for those who

deserters from the legions... And as in the case of Freemasonry, Evola has once again dotted the i's and crossed the t's: anyone who is a traditionalist Catholic is only half a traditionalist. Catholicism is excessively sectarian, does not recognise the common origin of traditions, and considers any other tradition to be a naturalistic and pagan cult. Today, when progressive "aggiornamento" seems to be certainly receding, when the onslaught of traditional Catholicism - especially in Latin America - has the characteristics of a truly triumphant offensive, it is clear that we are facing a new stage in the Church in which, although it may recover a positive and traditional rhythm, it seems very difficult that it will be able to serve as a vehicle for an eventual restoration of the Primordial Tradition in the West.

The success of "The Crisis..." did not halt Guenon's prodigious ability to study and synthesise the different traditional forms, adapting them to Western vocabulary. In 1931, he published "The Symbolism of the Cross" and "The Multiple States of Being," continuing to contribute to several traditional studies journals. His two articles published in the Arabic journal "El Marifah" ("Knowledge") deserve special mention.

In May 1929, he decided to move permanently to Cairo. He had previously been there in search of Sufi texts that were difficult to find in the West. Once settled in "Villa Fatma", the name of his house in Egypt, he remarried in 1934 to the daughter of a sheikh, with whom he had three children. The European war blocked the publication of new books for almost ten years, and he took advantage of this period to meditate and study Islamic doctrines. He adopted the Islamic religion and was baptised Abdel Wahed-Yahia (The Servant of the One). He still had time to publish two important books along with dozens of articles: "The Great Triad" and "Glimpses of Initiation," both essentially metaphysical in nature. His collaboration with the magazine he founded, "Etudes Traditionales," whose headquarters are still located today across from the Seine, fifty metres from Notre-Dame, continued uninterrupted until his death.

On 7 January 1951, at around 11 p.m., he passed away. He died pronouncing the name of Allah. An hour earlier, he had said, "The soul is leaving." His body was buried in his father-in-law's tomb with his face turned towards Mecca. Today, his work lives on. There are reissues of his works, the magazine "Etudes Traditionales," the large number of later authors he has inspired, and the many readers who have found in his pages and in the example of his life the true meaning of their own lives.

JULIUS EVOLA: THE LAST GIBELLINE

In national-revolutionary circles, traditional thinking is immediately associated with Baron Julius Evola. And this is not surprising: Evola was precisely the only one who attempted to give traditional thinking a political formulation. Concerned with finding an operational character for it, not so much so that power would be imbued with it, but so that the struggle to defend and maintain traditional principles could create a new elite, Evola found a massive audience beginning in 1968-69. It is clear that not everyone has understood Evola, and it is clear that in recent years a strange and extravagant phenomenon has developed that we could call "Evolomania", that is, "the priests of Evola" for whom everything begins and ends with the master, who forget any other reality because for them the only reality is Evola. An exaggeration, of course. Traditional thought is essentially impersonal; nothing is created because everything has already been created, nothing is invented because everything has already been invented, and nothing new is said because

What needed to be said has already been said, and at most it is compiled, disseminated and preached. There can be no cult of "Evolianism", nor is it appropriate to use Evola's quotes as "definitive arguments". Evola never intended this, and those who do so have not understood the message he wanted to convey.

Born in Rome on 15 May 1898, his early intellectual pursuits were oriented towards the avant-garde movements. For a time, he adhered to Dadaism and Futurism, writing a series of Dadaist poems and an essay on abstract painting. The European war temporarily paralysed his production. His early influences came from Papini, through the magazine "Leopardo", and later, after participating in the European conflict as an artillery lieutenant, he became acquainted with the work of Guenon, read Nietzsche and Otto Weininger, and in his first important book, "The Theory of the Absolute Individual" (1925), he combated idealistic positions in favour of "traditional realism".

With little interest in politics, he saw the advent of fascism as the vehicle Guenon spoke of to restore tradition in the West. At that time, the National Fascist Party was a motley crew of neo-Hegelian intellectuals, squadrists with little interest in political reflection, ex-anarchists, former socialists and communists, people from the most reactionary right wing and, naturally, social climbers. The group could hardly be homogeneous—as in fact it was not until the Italian Social Republic, twenty years later—and Evola preferred to remain on the sidelines, dedicating some minor works to it, such as *Imperialismo Pagano* (Pagan Imperialism), which served to recover and give coherent form to all of Mussolini's rhetoric on Imperial and classical Rome. If Mussolini and fascism made explicit reference to Rome and the human and imperial ideal embodied in it, it was possible (such was Evola's reasoning) to move from mere rhetoric to concrete reality and clothe fascism in Roman ideals, thereby advancing the process of traditional restoration one step further. This idea, expressed in the aforementioned book and later in the magazine *La Torre*, had only modest success. Mussolini knew Evola's work and appreciated it. On the other hand, Evola wrote several essays in the magazine *Critica Fascista*, the regime's unofficial organ. Perhaps Evola's most celebrated essay at this time was entitled "Fascism as the Will to Empire and Christianity", in which he denounced Pauline Christianity as a precursor and substitute for Bolshevism, as their humanitarian, pacifist and egalitarian roots are identical. This essay, which appeared in "Critica Fascista", sparked a lively controversy, as it came out at a time when Mussolini was signing the Lateran Accords and was obviously not very interested in fuelling a politically damaging controversy. *La Torre* ceased publication after its tenth issue due to all kinds of legal problems. Evola began to look at the new currents that were emerging in Germany with unusual force from 1927-29 onwards.

His first contacts in Germany were with members of the *Herren-Klub* and the 'young revolutionary conservatives'. In *Diorama Filosófico*, he would expound and disseminate the principles and theses of this German movement, which we have already discussed elsewhere. Germany had an advantage over Italy in that it had a warrior and activist tradition that had survived almost in its purest form: Prussianism. By that time, Evola was already convinced that war was inevitable and that Europe's destiny was either unification or death.

Evola's contributions to fascist magazines or those more or less linked to the regime did not mean that he was absorbed by the fascist apparatus. He always distinguished between the Organic State and the totalitarian State. Fascism was totalitarian, putting the power and reason of the State before the people, and at the origin of all Evola's thinking we find

Finding the person as opposed to the individual, that is, the differentiated human being with their own characteristics that make them fundamentally unequal. The individual (and consequently individualism) is the reduction of the human being to the dimension of a mere atomic entity and, as such, exactly the same as other atoms with which they collide, confront and are forced to coexist. Totalitarianism, in Evola's view, is fundamentally centralising, while organicism is its antithesis: centralised in its principle and in its traditional higher reference, its organs and parts are autonomous; what in fascism is the figure of the Duce and in National Socialism the Führer is replaced in organicism by the Paretian notion of the influence of the "ruling political class" and, on occasions, of the "elite". Evola always considered fascism to be "too plebeian" and demagogic, massifying in some of its manifestations, and spoke of it as the "ultimate consequence of liberalism". He thought, and not without reason, that Italian fascism, as it was conceived, would necessarily end in total and absolute bureaucratisation, parallel to a substitute for scouting. All these theses and some others were expounded at length after the war in "Fascism Seen from the Right", followed by the appendix "Considerations on the Third Reich". In fact, Evola's judgements on fascism also extended to part of the N.S.D.A.P., but not to its entirety. Close to some circles of the SS, he worked with the "Black Order" on the revision of the Masonic archives requisitioned in Europe and deposited in Vienna, until an American bomb irreparably injured his spine. Closer to German National Socialism, especially because of his references to the "doctrine of race", Evola gave several lectures in National Socialist Germany and his most important books published up to that point were translated and published there.

But it was Codreanu and his Iron Guard that most vividly impressed Evola.

In Codreanu, he found the mystical leader who established a supernatural communication between himself and the grassroots; the reorganisation of the party was more like that of a warrior order than a political movement; Codreanu's fidelity to ancient Romanian traditions and his racist-spiritual conception made him the ideal image of the 'leader' of an 'elite' through the ruins of the modern world. He met Codreanu personally and interviewed him, publishing his conclusions in a short essay on the Iron Guard.

After the war, he collaborated with the "F.A.R." (Fascios of Revolutionary Action), for which he was imprisoned and prosecuted. He observed a feeling of rejection among Italian youth towards the democracy brought by the Anglo-Americans and decided to "guide" that youth with a series of advice and considerations published in a national-revolutionary magazine of the time. "Orientaciones" was the seed of what would later become his major work in the political-critical field, "Los hombres y las ruinas" (Men and Ruins), in the same way that "Revuelta contra el mundo moderno" (Revolt Against the Modern World) was his major work in the existential and philosophical field.

Towards the end of the 1960s, Evola's work underwent a re-evaluation. Firstly, because many of his theses – especially those referring to consumerism, massification, the identity between the Soviet world and the American world, etc. – had come true, and because others, although expressed differently by the "new left" and Marcuseanism, ultimately represented leftist adaptations and recoveries of Evola's criteria. In Italy, Evola's name became a battle standard for the "new protest" and the "fight against the system." Adriano Romualdi—who died prematurely in a car accident—and Claudio Mutti, among others, were able to complete and expand some of Evola's works. Romualdi, in particular, published a synthesis essay of Evola's work entitled "Man and Work" and continued to provide political formulations of traditional thought as expounded and summarised by Evola.

Evola entitled "The Man and the Work" and continued to give political formulations to traditional thought as expounded and summarised by Evola. Thus, for example, it is worth mentioning the essay entitled "On the Problem of a European Tradition," a brief philosophical history of Europe, as well as two small pamphlets, "Ideas for a Right-Wing Culture" and "The Right and the Crisis of Nationalism."

Right? The right? What does all this mean? Doesn't the right represent a vector of the system, isn't it the political equivalent of the left? We believe it is necessary to clarify this point. Evola, Romualdi and so many other traditionalists speak of the right, but on what level? Not precisely on the political level, where the right today represents mere demoliberal conservatism devoid of meaning in a world where very little deserves to be preserved. In traditional language, some symbols are represented by words and some words by symbols. We are now on the ideological and metaphysical level, and it is on this level that Evola describes himself as a man of the 'right', as opposed to the left (not surprisingly, in Italian 'sinistra' alludes to 'the sinister', while 'destra' is equivalent to 'the straight'). And on the ideological plane, traditional thinking is the antithesis of leftist and Marxist thinking. Precisely when Evola speaks of "fascism seen from the right", he does so not from the perspective of a bourgeois and reactionary observer, but from the point of view of a traditional revolutionary, ideologically situated on the right and politically beyond the interplay of vectors that are part of the system and counteract each other.

"Men and Ruins" represents the definition of a political line and course of action for those who 'place themselves politically outside and against the system. Starting from a precise and broad definition: "revolutionary" insofar as it is a matter of "restoring" and "conservative" insofar as it is a matter of "restoring" a tradition that deserves to be preserved. Evola goes on to criticise the liberal principle (equality and freedom) and points out the origin of the liberal error (the confusion between the individual and the person). Returning to the line of "Orientations", he develops the idea that Marxism is nothing more than the consequence of liberalism, that the former would not have existed without the latter, just as the latter would not have existed without the Enlightenment and the latter in turn without humanism. These are cause-and-effect relationships and, in this way, we go back, already in "Revolt..... through the theory of cosmic cycles, in which he shows us that the current disorder, examined from a broader perspective, is nothing more than tangible proof of the traditional higher order, since "it was written" that there would be a period of light and another of darkness and that a new period of light could only be reached when the cycle had closed. "For something new to be born, the old must die." And this is the fate of our civilisation: death. A sad fate. What should a man attached to traditional principles do at a time when nothing can be done, since this civilisation is inevitably falling downhill at an unstoppable speed? Resist. Here, Evola's famous advice regains all its greatness: to remain standing in a world in ruins. Today, the restoration of a traditional way of life is practically impossible in the short term, but man, the individual, the one who has understood the message of tradition, is obliged to "ride the tiger", that is, not to be carried away by adversity, not to capitulate in the face of it, but to use it. Use it? For what? Have you ever wondered why the image of the "knight of the Grail" is so widespread in national-revolutionary media? All this is connected and has an explanation that is as coherent as it is ethical. Today, it is not so much a question of fighting for political victory as it is of fighting for the full realisation of the person, to bring about within the militant the transformation that will take him from the state of a participant in the current reality to a being who, through action, will surpass the

transcendent world and will be placed on the plane of a higher reality. Thus, just as the Knights of the Grail devoted their lives not so much to the search for the Holy Grail as an end in itself, but as a means to an end, their inner transformation, so today the national-revolutionary militant must be a new Knight of the Grail: fighting because the struggle must continue, because only in this way can a new race of free men be forged to prepare for the advent of the new dawn.

This idea of "riding the tiger" was captured in a book of the same title which, like "The Bow and the Club", brings together a series of existential guidelines that are essential in modern society, since the militant, however attached he may be to traditional principles, is obliged to live and share in a daily unreality, that of the modern world, from which it is very difficult to escape and which he must judge and evaluate in its various manifestations.

In "Revolt" Evola sets out to lay bare the different Western traditions.

of what they have in common and to recreate and discover the tradition shared by all European peoples. Divided into two parts, the book devotes the first to setting out traditional principles and the second to a brief and hasty critical historiography of Western history, starting with the mythical cycles and ending with the considerations we already know about Russian-American capitalism and imperialism. The ideal model of society that Evola proposes is identified in three historical moments: the ancient empires, the medieval orders, and the Ghibelline conception of the empire. In all these cases, there are some points of coincidence: authority is justified by its transcendence, there is a point of union between spiritual authority and temporal power, the former justifying the latter. The point of union is broken when Jesus of Nazareth speaks of "render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's". The priest-rulers give way to the warriors - we are in the Middle Ages - and military orders based on immemorial traditional principles rebuild the West on the basis of a new type of human being (the warrior monk). When they are dissolved, Ghibellinism, that is, the doctrine that harmonises the empire (temporal power) with spiritual power and unites them in open harmony, regains its flame. Dante will be one of those who most splendidly, in the Divine Comedy, captured the Ghibelline ideal. With the arrival of the Renaissance, everything was reduced to the measure of man: humanism paved the way for rationalism, which in turn led to the encyclopaedia and the Enlightenment society. The final disaster came in 1789 with the advent of the bourgeoisie over the degenerate warrior castes. The break with tradition had been made, and all that remained was for the god Cronos to make the bourgeoisie, with its senseless desire for profit and usury, engender the phenomenon of the proletariat, whose advent as the fourth dominant caste came about after the European war in Russia. The theory of caste regression in the Dark Ages, and in which we currently find ourselves, tends to reach its ultimate consequences.

In 1974, Evola passed away. His ashes, placed in an urn, were buried on the summit of Monte Rosa by two climbers, both members of the Centro di Studi Evoliani (Centre for Evolian Studies). Today, his works continue to attract increasing interest and depth among national-revolutionary youth, who realise that the only alternative to the modern world is to fight against the system and build a new one through combat. E.M.

BERSERKER

BOOKS

