

**CONTRIBUTION TO A  
RACIST ETHIC**



**RENE BINET**

**BERSERKER**

**BOOKS**



CONTRIBUTION  
TO A  
RACIST ETHICS

**By the same author**

THEORY OF RACISM

ed. des Vikings, Paris 1950 (*out of print*)

SOCIALISM VERSUS MARXISM Comptoir

national du livre, Paris (*out of print*)

**Our institute intends to republish these works.**

In the same collection:

Précis DE biopolitiqUe by

Jacques de Mahieu

We Other Racists by G.-

A. Amaudfuz

NATURAL MEDICINE

by Jacques Baugé-Pfévost

CELTICISM, THE BIOLOGICAL ETHICS

OF THE blue MAN

PaJ Jacques Baugé-Pfévost

CONTRIBUTION  
TO A  
RACIST  
ETHICS

RENÉ BINET

## FOREWORD

*In Barcelona in 1969, the 10th Assembly of the New European Order, at the suggestion of the Celtic Movement, decided to establish the Higher Institute of Psychosomatic, Biological and Racial Sciences. This institute, which has already published several works in defence of the race, was obliged to publish a posthumous work by René Binet, who in 1951 was one of the five founding members of the New European Order.*

*Before reading Contribution to a Fascist Ethics, I must admit that I felt some apprehension. Would this text, which dates back nearly thirty years, not be outdated by scientific research, political events, other doctrinal works, or at least "aged" by the irrelevance of its references?*

*Well, apart from two or three entirely secondary points and a few slips of the pen that the author would undoubtedly have eliminated, everything is still written in letters of fire. The first chapter, for example, is not only absolutely avant-garde in racist thought, but it opens up, precisely today, new and immense horizons for anyone who wishes to rescue our peoples from decadence and bring them back onto the path of biological ascension.*

*By extraordinary coincidence, the main idea of the book has never been more relevant. René Binet shows that non-Marxist socialism, if it does not serve the race, can only stumble along, going from split to split. Only racism will bring unity, because true socialism is merely the logical consequence of defending a race... At a time when, under the threat of economic crisis, national socialist groups are multiplying in search of an unattainable unity, this book provides the solution, the only solution to the problem.*

*But Binet could only be so relevant because he is irrelevant. He speaks to us as if he were alive today, because in reality he is not yet dead, because he is, in any case, a man of the 21st century.*

*This book is not to be read like a novel. But it will be reread tirelessly, because the vigour and boldness of its ideas compel reflection.*

*And to action.*

*While Binet addresses all healthy forces capable of action, he addresses young people more than anyone else. Young people who can devote their entire lives to the cause, while we, the older generation, can only offer what remains. Young people who, having the most future, also have the most tasks.*

*And Binet speaks to them. He tells them how to build the Party, the weapon of the race. He tells them of the greatness and beauty of fulfilling one's duty.*

*But the reader will judge for themselves. And they will pass this book on.*

*Our institute hopes to be able to republish René Binet's other works soon.*

G.-A. Amaudfuz



## BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

Because the masses are accustomed to placing a specific label on everyone that classifies them into a distinct political category, it seems difficult for them to admit that a man, a group of men or a party refuses to fit into this overly simplistic classification and claims to be the representative of an entire people or a faction. Immediately, the crowd feels uncomfortable around such a man or movement. They still try to label him as right-wing or left-wing, condemning him as one or the other, without realising that he is not, that he is no longer one or the other, but that he is both at the same time! He has become both, not because he is afraid to conclude or hesitates before making a choice, but simply because, transcending the right and the left to unite them into one people and one face, he has overcome and synthesised both.

For a man or a group of men or a movement to reach this political position, they often need to come from the right or the left, to have lived long enough on the right or the left to know and overcome them. This experience has allowed them to develop in new ways and reach a new stage. From the outset, those who have taken this step, in the desire to categorise them under a specific and familiar label, have been imagined to be unstable, to be wavering, when in fact there is only natural development, a broadening of perspectives and a raising of the goal itself!

Sometimes the unexpected and sudden development of a political situation or major social upheavals are at the origin of this broadening of views and action, but more often than not, persistent and methodical study forces us to adopt a new position which, from conclusion to conclusion, inevitably recognised as more accurate and better verified.

Must I point out that, having been condemned as a "fascist" by the communists and socialists, in short by the Marxists, as early as 1936, was I not nonetheless condemned as a "communist" by the justice system of the 1939 government, and persecuted as a "communist" by the leaders of the SS Brigade in 1944-45? and I was no less persecuted as a "Nazi" by the justice system of the government of 1946-47. This is, however, one and the same fact, the result of a certain continuity of political position which, refusing to be confined within the limits of either of the camps present, sees them constantly fighting against it, their very existence threatened by a unity that no longer accepts them!

I do not intend to explain my position to those who have never understood political struggle. Nor do I intend to justify myself to those whom even the desperate situation of the entire civilised West has not shaken from their complacency. I only want to show those of my friends who did not fully understand it in its progressive development that my political position has remained consistently faithful to a constant unity, gradually expanding and becoming more precise.

I joined the Communist Youth because I vaguely believed in the can-

political idealism of my sixteen years, that only the Communist Party and the Young Communists had sufficient discipline, a sufficiently rigid hierarchy, and a sufficiently precise programme to achieve the unity of the country on the basis of a profoundly socialist programme.

That I then fell into the trap of many who confuse Marxism with socialism is of little importance, and others more intelligent than I have also followed this path. Nevertheless, one fundamental fact remains: I wanted to see the realisation of a centralised and planned socialism that would be capable of unifying the country and the most important sections of the French people. Admittedly, this position was poorly formulated and more sentimental than justified by any specific theoretical study, but it was no less profound or sincere for that.

Let no one object that the influence of the Komintefn on its French section was at that time such that it was subsequently impossible to fight for a "French flag"! The struggle waged at that time by the Dofiot, the Babé, and the Celof sufficiently countered this argument and demonstrated that since 1928, or even earlier, a serious opposition had emerged between the "strictly sectarian" pfogfamme and the tendency towards the unification of the working classes.

This struggle, unknown to the public, which had been simmering for years, was to erupt for the first time in 1933-34 when an important faction of the Communist Party called for the unification of the socialist working classes, as a prelude to a subsequent unification with the "middle classes". Once again, in 1939, the outbreak of war led twenty-seven communist parliamentarians to declare themselves "French" and to reject the policy of the "party of the foreigner".

I only remember the first half of these battles: As early as 1933, a group within the Communist Party had called for "unity" — the events of February 1934, which followed immediately after this declaration of war, brought to the public's attention what had until then been nothing more than an internal struggle between factions. The immediate and almost spontaneous formation of hundreds of socialist-communist "agreement committees" was proof of a deep desire for unity among the working class of both parties. But more importantly, in two or three localities in France, "unity" immediately spread to all groups that claimed to be socialists, and particularly to organisations that the Communist Party at the time called "petites bourgeoisies".

Le Havre was one of those places; Le Havre, where I spent my youth, where comrades defended a political position similar to mine within the Communist Party! This movement, led by a few comrades and myself, was so strong and powerful that, on 3 February 1934, for the first time since 1928, the people took to the streets and demonstrated "against the thieves" — against the political and financial scandals of the moment — with the support of the entire population. A few days later, groups of right-wingers trying to demonstrate *freely* in the streets were dispersed by five hundred people who, after a half-hearted march of five hundred metres, dispersed and disappeared into general indifference! Naturally, the Communist Party condemned our attitude: the entire political leadership of the French Communist Party fought against it, and the result was Thofez's famous article: "Fire! Down with opportunism".

In Le Havre, the battle ended, after a fierce factional struggle, with the exclusion

and the resignation of a large number of staff and my expulsion on 20 June 1934. The battle was so fierce that several times physical fighting broke out within the party itself!

At the time when, in Le Havre, I was expelled along with my comrades for having attempted to establish a massive unity on a socialist and national basis, Bafbé-Dofiot, who held a similar but more moderate position, was also expelled. They did not push their demands for unity as far, since for them unification meant only socialists and communists and was intended only to "polarise" the middle classes, not to encompass them. Moreover, their tendency to gradually abandon many of their socialist principles and to make room for elements of international big capital, such as Pucheu, further alienated us from them, and even Bafbé abandoned them at that point.

The unity of the people on a French and socialist basis proved impossible to achieve under the leadership of the Communist Party following this experience. The SFIO was nothing more than an "electoral machine". The problem was therefore to find elements whose basic formation was socialist and who did not depend on an established International. Moreover, they had to be fully in agreement with the idea of unity that inspired us. This grouping could serve as the basis for a broader and more viable unity!

I then encountered activists described as "Trotskyists" but who were detached from any international organisation and from Trotsky himself. In addition to their newspaper *La Commune*, they had formed unification groups which they called "Revolutionary Action Groups". These groups included activists from all the socialist groups of the time and even "Fonists" from Befgefy. It was a "possible" start. I began collaborating with them, but this proved increasingly difficult as time went on. The G.A.R. was nothing more than an attempt to win over a few men to a group as sectarian as the P.C., without having the political influence, personal conduct, organisational discipline or practical capacity for sustained work. I quickly formed a factional group that decided to establish at least a more rigid political and personal code of conduct so that, after some time, we could take up the fight for unity.

The newspaper *Le Prolétaire* was launched, and a few months later, abandoning their tactic of infiltrating the party, the people of "La Commune" joined Masceau Pivest's PSOP. we began, on a regional level, to make honest attempts at unification on a political basis with this same organisation. The preparations for the struggle, and the struggle itself, interrupted this work, but at least we had been able to demonstrate our desire for unity and our political commitment throughout this period. We had been populists, socialists and unionists since 1933. Our position on international politics at that time was also characterised by the same firmness and clarity. The two poles of this attitude were defined by a position on the USSR and a position on the European states, including Germany.

As early as 1936, while the Trotskyists, even the dissidents, were absolutely allied with the Stalinists on the principle of "defending the USSR", and "the Commune" accepted Trotsky's proposal that Stalin enlist as a "simple soldier" in the army to defend the USSR, I wrote clearly:

"The revolutionary and socialist peoples and workers no longer defend the USSR! They see a certain form of savagery developing there that is the opposite of socialism. The USSR has the right to develop an industrial revolution that we have been pursuing for a hundred years, defending methods that our capitalists abandoned long ago, but socialists and trade unionists have a duty to reject them as reactionary."

This attitude was clear! Our opponents do not agree with it and accuse us of "fascism" because anything that is anti-Stalinist is "fascist"! Let us look at the other side of the argument.

As early as 1934, we wrote that regardless of the regimes in Western European countries, unification had to take place, culminating in a Federation of Socialist States of Europe. This platform was undoubtedly less precise, but since we were no longer part of any established international organisation, these socialist states of Europe were necessarily national. This attitude led us in 1939 to explain in a manifesto, which led to our condemnation, that the war that was coming — this manifesto was published before the declaration of war — was purely reactionary and in no way represented the interests of the European peoples! and that the peoples of Europe, and particularly those of France and Germany, should oppose it.

It is noteworthy that, although our position on Jews and Arabs in general has not yet been clarified, it turned out that both in domestic and foreign policy, our position was always at odds with that of the Jewish members of the organisations in which I found myself. This spontaneous opposition began in 1933 and has continued unabated ever since! We have never been able to collaborate for long or in any meaningful way. In our view, this fact is not the result of mere coincidence. Jews and we cannot agree on the conception of the future world because of our professional temperaments, which are specific to our respective fields and which were bound to set us apart.

Then came the "gueffe-éclair" of 1940, followed by captivity. Completely cut off from our comrades in France, who were scattered by the war, I found myself surrounded by ordinary people from all political backgrounds and social classes. Political discussions began, heatedly, among us! No longer having to take into account existing parties or organisations, in the camps and labour Kommandos, I was able to freely express my views on a large number of issues. I was also led to clarify these views in many of their forms and often in their substance. Finally, I was able to reaffirm and then redefine everything I believed was useful for the future development of our country — I was no longer bound by the formal discipline of a group or an officially recognised doctrine; it was becoming easy!

And so, confined to a disciplinary Kommando, between Peine and Hanover, on the banks of the Mittelland Canal, after months of captivity, after several escape attempts, in the few moments of leisure that my hard labour allowed me, I forged a "pfofamme". From the outset, I wanted it to be socialist, united, French. Since then, some have wanted to see in it the influence of a "milieu" — Let me suffice to say: Those who have experienced the cruelty of the disciplinary Kommando, the isolation of captivity compounded by the isolation of additional guard duty, will agree with me! At that time, in my two years in Germany, I had not read a single French newspaper, nor had I had two hours of conversation

contributed to racist politics

with a German — my contact with Germany had been more with the muzzles of its soldiers' rifles than with its activists! No! If any environment had impressed a few new ideas on my mind, it was only that of the French workers and peasants who had been surrounding me for months.

Mostly fugitives, united by common aspirations, we did not raise the issue of "resistance" or "collaboration" because for none of us could it arise! We only had to defend ourselves against the guards, who had long since lost any sense of nationality in our eyes and were nothing more than guards! The trust of my comrades nine times saved me from the difficult task of separating them from the German authorities. Nine times, in fourteen Kommandos, the Frenchmen who surrounded me and often followed me from Kommando to Kommando, knowing my personal and political attitude, named me their "man of trust".

— Often, it was the guards themselves who recognised me as such, the only tribute paid to my attitude, which was purely French. — This is the only proof I want that this man, surrounded by my comrades, undoubtedly best represents their deepest aspirations, their popular common sense, and their real needs. Written in the light of my previous political experience, it naturally also reflects everything I had previously been able to find in terms of working methods essential to any real political development.

There was no demagogue or political agitator to disturb us — and I insist on this point. Our defence and our unity were self-evident, without discussion or hesitation. That is why, in this atmosphere of camaraderie and French unity, this programme was adopted with a clarity and decisiveness that I had never seen before. Without fear of being misunderstood, I affirm: this is what the workers, the peasants, all the people of France, are asking for deep down. The demagogues may confuse the issue for a moment, but they will quickly return to what is socially and morally their will and their certainty.

From that moment on, what had until then been merely the theoretical position of a militant who believed that socialism should be for everyone and not just for one class, that it could bring about unity among all people, but that otherwise it should and could only bring about unity nation by nation and face to face, what had been only a theoretical position, I say, became the concrete manifestation of a deep-seated reality and necessity in the hearts of the masses. There could be no more hesitation! The path was there and only there! Socialism would either be realised in this way or not at all; and if it were realised, all those who wanted to oppose it would be swept away by the force and will of the people themselves.

René Binet



CREATION OF  
THE NEW MAN



Fascism, as a particular conception of the world and insofar as it gives rise to a new political and social doctrine, undoubtedly sends an important message to European man. Although Europeans do not always perceive it clearly, the foundation for a new world has been laid. It may encounter fierce opposition and momentary incomprehension, but it will nevertheless soon be understood.

Undoubtedly, Europeans seem almost more attached to their degenerative profession than to their profession itself; they seem resigned to their apparent decline and decadence. And in the same way that fascism seeks to select a new breed of white man; in the same way that this selective process may exclude him from a world he suspects without wishing it; in the same way, finally, that he finds himself wounded in his self-sufficiency, he tries to defend himself against his recovery and his salvation.

We have said that it is a matter of galvanising the forces that remain, of reviving the vestiges of an ancient nobility that characterises European civilisation, culture and humanity. In doing so, we must hasten the birth and advent of a stronger, more complete — healthier — individual who will break through the limits of today's stagnant society and world without prospects. Faced with the decline of the old man, the new man of the new world is born, worthy of a philosophy and ethics corresponding to the level of knowledge of our time. Such is the message and purpose of our fascism.

Fascism is both the most complete negation and the most futile affirmation. Beyond the disgust and despair of a man who has been emasculated by the mixing of bloods and the influence of Asian or African philosophies, he wants to awaken confidence and faith in the man who is coming. He is the embodiment of this certainty. He must oppose from the outset all those who cling to the past, its methods and its outdated values, who see the age of decline and not the future before them. He must oppose all the disorder, all the chaos, all the inadequacies of today's societies, which are overwhelmed by knowledge and technology that they are in no way worthy of and cannot make use of.

Our message still uses certain words from the man of yesterday and the world of yesterday, in the sense that the new values still in gestation have not yet found their own language. Yet the old words are already filling us with new substance. Thus, the voice of the face that is beginning to stammer its first words must awaken and be awakened in the great multitude.

We can hope that the immense pride of birth and the voice of birth will suffocate, in many people, the petty selfishness, the intense thirst for immediate pleasures, the voice of the declining face that lies and suffocates in each of us.

The first selection, which constitutes the evolutionary path, the expression of its goal, the form of its struggle, already prefigure the new face. Its message is received only by those who are ready to hear it in their hearts and minds. Its message is born of their own movement, their own will, their own vision of the new world.

We would add, however, that it is not an immutable dogma, but a moving figure; it is a message that is always incomplete, always in the making, living and breathing like and with the fighting and creative man who conceives it. This is why the past, as the most complete expression, as a synthesis of the man of yesterday and the man of today, must become increasingly effective and judge of the past, creator and legislator of the future.

In every era, the masses seek a new perfection to replace what was once considered perfection in the past, but in every era, the evolving past and the small elite who express its message give rise to a series of struggles within individuals and society. We want our past to remain alive and young enough to constantly trigger this struggle of self against self, and of self against all, not as the moralists and negative religions wanted, to suppress the instinctive and profound aspirations of man, but on the contrary, to exalt and sublimate them.

The law of the complete man is effort and struggle. Only the man who is physically and intellectually fit can fully experience this struggle within himself. If man is indeed perpetually divided between his desire to surpass himself, to transcend himself, in favour of an imperious collective necessity, and his animalistic inertia, only those who have long been accustomed to this struggle can triumph in it. It is only a small number who are fully aware of the general interests of the species and who can lead the masses in this direction. As leader and ascendant, as creator and mediator, as judge and legislator, the past is alone capable of overcoming and making others overcome this hesitation and leading the people to the same goal.

This creates an obligation for the man of the party to take a constant interest in the traditions and habits, aspirations and needs of his people, not in the sense that they express themselves spontaneously, but in the sense that the party expresses, thinks and represents them.

He must constantly maintain contact with what is dynamic and positive in his people, but he must also anticipate and guide them. He must detect in the people he guides and is responsible for anything that causes weakness and decline.

It is therefore not a matter of mechanical contact, of simple adaptation, in the family examination, but of constant and acute criticism, of active and creative exchange, laying the foundations for facial profession, selection, and constant criticism in the fabric of the entire population. The man of the past, in perpetual anxiety, is preoccupied with the permanent becoming of the people and the face. His life is a constant struggle to satisfy himself and his people with the way of life that is theirs at every moment. The man of the past must constantly look beyond the current state of affairs to the new goal, the new conquest, the new ideal to be achieved. Receiving within himself the expression of his people and his face, he must immediately transpose it, give it new impetus and lead his people in an uninterrupted movement of selection, in a permanent process of facial birth, in a permanent evolution. Every day, he rejects the type of the day as a type that has already evolved.

because the facial model is more deeply selected than his will projects and designs.

For the man of the past, there is no longer any question of a fixed objective, an end in itself, a final and permanent ideal. He no longer has, as in the religions of the past, an eternal type to imitate and perpetuate. He ceases to conceive that one can model one's life and future on this or that type of human being from the past.

For the new European man, creator of his own face, the goal is a goal that matches, the model is in front of him and not behind him. His facial ideal, achieved each day, is not abstract and external, but in the sense of the elevation of the face, the deification of his face. For him, the ideal and changing type of face is, in a way, deified. This changing and living model, perpetually unattainable and constantly sought after, is the projection of his will into the world. But the past and the man of the past cannot achieve this goal and this moving type every day except through the total submission of their lives and their souls to the imperative of the development and elevation of their faces: the creators and creators of their faces, the creators of their model.

We are undoubtedly living in a time when the guardians of facial ideals, the guardians of the face, have grown weary for a moment of being the guardians of a culture and a superior type of human being. They have been weakened and diminished for a time by the mixing of blood, by social chaos, by continuous contact with a scale of values created by elements from Asia or Africa. Their spiritual contact with negative values sometimes led them to believe that other races were equal to European man. These values, undoubtedly adapted to the level and abilities, and indeed the needs, of the races that gave birth to them, are certainly not bad in themselves. However, although they are alive and valid for others, they are potentially hypnotic and destructive for the faces of Europe.

The tragedy of our time is that European men, through weariness and weakness, have abandoned the obvious sense of superiority of their race, their blood and their culture.

Creators of all cultures, builders of all civilisations, they have accepted as their equals those who, far from creating, have traditionally destroyed the cultures and civilisations they have encountered in the course of their expansion.

European men themselves condemned their gods and their morals in order to accept those of the peoples of the desert, without even realising that in doing so they were bringing about the destruction of what made them superior, the level of their ideals and the validity of their goals.

They went so far as to wonder whether peoples who for millennia had been mired in physical apathy and intellectual nothingness, in moral stagnation and social decay, had not discovered in their "contemplations" values equal to or superior to their own. They assumed that this idea could be expressed as follows: individuals who mimicked the gestures of their culture and civilisation were of equal importance and standing to the face that created that culture and civilisation. They "discovered" what others call "cultural humility" in the face of other continents and placed themselves in the position of the professor who wanted to instil the knowledge of his students. The authority of the teacher over his students seems an excessive privilege. Moreover, if this authority must become permanent because the student is incapable of ever rising to the level of the teacher, then, disillusioned, they prefer to remain silent and believe that they must awaken from their slumber.

The interest they post and which they are tasked with posting to the values of which they are custodians and accountants must push them to reject the very assumption that the traditional culture of white people can be replaced by that of faces which, over the centuries, have been infested as long as the purity of their blood is a guarantee of the permanence and development of this culture.

That is why, even now, and as a counterbalance, they must jealously guard the purity of their blood, rejecting any mixture and any way of life that might diminish it, any scale of values and any teaching that might lead to its weakening.

By agreeing to discuss the historical evidence of the superiority of their race, they open the door to the disintegration of their personality and their race. Is the opening of the debate anything other than the preliminary manifestation of doubt about the value and historical strength of their race and its future?

The power of the face does not come solely from cultural observations, but arises from an obvious and sufficient, congenital certainty. It is an intense feeling of superiority, a belief in the power of blood.

The total awareness of facial fidelity leads and must lead to the feeling of consciously participating in the most perfect form of human development and the development of the world itself. The greatest insult that can be inflicted on the entire face and, without exception, on its personal personality by an individual belonging to the superior face is undoubtedly doubt or the end of non-belief opposed to facial fidelity or the idea of the superiority of European man, as creator and legislator, as participant in a unique, mythical, divine type.

It is only in this way that the sense of the absolute superiority of the face, whose facial capital we hesitate to reveal, develops, along with the sense of responsibility towards this appoit, which must be transmitted to the new face permanently created in and through each man of the face.

We can therefore summarise our conception in a single formula: the face determines being, but being consciously creates the face. Action is consubstantial with being; obedience to the facial imperative is identified with knowledge.

Thus, the face does not act in any way on behalf of man, but man can act beyond the face in its current form. It is there, and there alone, that man's greatest freedom is expressed: in the conscious and permanent creation of the face. It is this certainty, this upward freedom, that determines the solution he seeks and must seek to the problem of the relationship between the face and the world; between the face and the individual; of society and the individual; which subsequently determines, more specifically, the attitude of European man towards other faces and other societies. The fact that different faces are currently face to face and often coexist makes it impossible to escape this question. At the heart of and beyond all faces, the white face must maintain the flame of a culture and a scale of values that belong to it in principle and which, although not valid for all faces, are nonetheless the only ones that can raise them a little above their eternal vegetative state.

It is also important not to give a distorted interpretation of this definition, which contributes to racist ethics.

. Undoubtedly, European culture is the only one that can contribute in any way to raising the standard of living of other races. In any case, we do not in any way claim that our conception of the world and of man's place in it, or our scale of values, is applicable, assimilable or accessible to these races. We know and acknowledge the opposite. However, we believe that in certain areas, these elements are capable of being reproduced and copied in a very consistent — and, for them, useful — manner.

—the manifestations of our culture. It is not impossible that, in order to adapt them to their needs, they transform them by improving them. In this case, as in others, however, they have only copied and thus demonstrated their inability to reach our level and to influence our development in a useful way.

The true meaning of our face, which is initiative and creation, is opposed to the abilities of all other faces, not because of hatred or misunderstanding of our part, but because they hinder the harmonious development of our face in the same areas. It is therefore pointless at this stage to dwell on what differentiates our face from the others and what makes it a unique product that no external or sentimental analogy can ever replace.

It has been objected that there is no such face in the world today. We would like to point out that it does in fact exist in the historical manifestations of a completely unique culture and is therefore biologically virtual in most European countries. But even on this biological basis, when we were asked to make it a purely subjective notion and we recognised that it exists above all in our desire for freedom, we would add that it is also the manifestation of the creative will that defines and creates the conditions for the existence of the face. The identity of our representation of the world and the expression of our will in action constitutes the only valid basis for individual and collective development among European peoples.

The projection of this will and this thinking into the vibrant life of our era must necessarily create the biological conditions for the social and political unity of these peoples, beyond the freely associated nationalities of the continent.

Those who speak of a European federation or union, of Europe or of the continent without conceiving or expressing that this union can only arise from the deepest aspirations of the peoples of the continent and through the progressive emergence of a European identity, and not through the creation of a formless mass of peoples and identities without character, Those who do so despise human culture in general and deny it any value whatsoever.

Even those who dare to accept the idea of creating a European identity without clearly stating that, in order to achieve this, all causes of degeneration within each national community must first be eliminated, are still preventing the true liberation of the continent. Any confused or indecisive attitude in this area, any solution that does not give absolute predominance to the best elements, produced by a selection process across Europe, can only water down and weaken any social and political construction and contribute to the more rapid decline of our civilisation of origin.

That is why we cannot emphasise enough the fundamental and total abyss that

must oppose the future "European face" to other faces, regardless of their current level of development. However, we do not oppose them in a wholly negative way: We belong to one face and from it we create a better face. In doing so, we oppose other faces that stand in the way of our future and our destiny. Our fascism, a manifestation of faith, strength and fulfilment, is not, and cannot be, negative. It is in the very name of its becoming that it eliminates what opposes its becoming.

We have accepted and implied the unity of essence between the face and the individual in the face, following the tendency towards unity between the world and man in the measure in which the world expresses itself to him through a concept of his will. The supreme goal of the consistent fascist is to realise entirely in a voluntary unity his conception of the face, man and the world. The immutable centre of our entire conception of the world is the will, the imperative of the face as it manifests itself fragmentarily in every healthy individual.

There is, however, a certain contradiction in wanting to impose on our conception of the face, the world and man a speculative and abstract theory, when only the living face, the living man, in constant becoming, are the only valid premises of our conception.

The will of the face manifests itself in healthy and conscious human beings as a concrete act and not as metaphysical speculation. If an individual is healthy and 'well-adjusted', they cannot be anything other than this will made flesh and projected into the world and the constant struggle of life.

Any liberal weakening of this concept could only undermine and destroy the social basis of the facial future. The face cannot survive, first of all, and then persist, except through constant creation in life, through systematic selection, and not through the elaboration of more or less intellectual theories cut off from reality. Such sterilising theories are mere negations without any constructive political or social prospects. We do not deny that it is tempting to simply accept certain political tendencies and certain social and political manifestations arising from these tendencies, especially as this requires less effort. Such easy solutions cannot satisfy us. It is not flight that protects the face and the people, but combat. It is not a sterile defensive stance that leads to victory, but only, in combat, a permanent attack.

When one of us observes the history of migrations, for example, and the transformations of social, cultural and political structures, we must not only grasp its organic particularities and analyse the capacity for combat and violence of the forces that constitute it, but also express to what extent and in what way the destiny of our society transcends and surpasses them. On the other hand, it cannot be a matter of choosing from among the values accepted by the adversary those that seem acceptable to us as well, i.e. it cannot be a choice determined by the adversary. Even a value that seems acceptable in this case cannot be considered as such as a result of a momentary assessment. It is not the expression of a truth. No value can be the common heritage of two sides or two species. In the event that their form is similar, their essence, by definition, can only be contradictory and therefore harmful to the original development of our own side.

Under no circumstances can we be selective about the values we hold dear. These values, in order to

The values held by others are false in our own values. Any adoption or acceptance of a non-original value is an act contrary to nature. Even the most precious value we hold is fundamentally tainted by the stain of origin that masks it. The essential difference between our scale of values, our conception of the world and that of other faces, lies in the fact that each scale of values is influenced by a very specific, defined and highly characteristic facial will. The will of the face as a representation of the world is at once the law, the faith and the judgement of every human act, every history, every philosophy, and is itself inconceivable as accessible to any other face whatsoever that does not wish to fulfil its mission or its vocation.

All intellectual, moral, social, or political attitudes arise from clear positions on the nature and will of society, on the nature and will of the individual, and as long as he has chosen to be a legislator and creator of society in his field.

It is certainly not possible to admit that any social community, whatever it may be, can ever be free from weaknesses and compromises, from tendencies towards abandonment and decadence. That is why the most rigorous formulation and the greatest vigilance are required of everyone, and all the more so as their role becomes more important.

Only one form of society can guarantee automatic compliance with the law, obedience to the imperative of the law. It is the one in which the law corresponds as closely as possible to the requirements of the law. It is not a question of man accepting or rejecting this law, nor of merely obeying it passively, but on the contrary, insofar as it corresponds to his own necessity, of defining himself as the champion of this law, of identifying with it. His attitude then becomes one of constant opposition to any value foreign to the face, of constant tension and militancy, so to speak, insofar as he too is a creator of this face and a defender of its imperative.

Of, the European man does not live in a society or world where he is master of a domain that is solely his own, where opposition comes only from outside, from people living in other parts of the world. He does not find himself in a living space that he can immediately populate with his social, political and cultural conception. On the contrary, his own space is cluttered with considerable parasitic vegetation from all sides. Moreover, within his own bosom, through the mixing of bloods foreign to him, aspirations that are alien and debilitating to him have been introduced.

If we are talking about the creation of a new face in the process of becoming permanent, we cannot imagine the slightest spontaneity of creation. Such spontaneity renders organisation and planning useless. This is a case of individual and collective perfection for which there is no precedent in human history. In any case, it is inconceivable in the current state of human development. We cannot neglect either the systematic study of the history of the superior faces of the egg or the methodical individual preparation for collective elaboration within the party and the people, with the party acting as the subjective factor of the people and the face.

Facial teaching is therefore composed of familiar and well-known concepts, but it must also include the deepening of entirely new and evolutionary values; values of shock and crisis.

Facial religion is neither submission nor obedience, but permanent challenge and creation.

It is not the response to a word of command or to external discipline, to a mysteriously justified, established or "revealed" dogma, but the deep-seated awareness of a forgotten loyalty, of a duty that had already been imperative at a time when, in nascent societies, hierarchy was spontaneously established from the conquered to the conqueror. It is the conscience of a feeling that centuries of submission to the dogma of negative religions, of falsely egalitarian corruption, of empty humanism had stifled and almost destroyed.

The first task is therefore to denounce the fragility of this veil, to unmask the vile parody which, under the pretext of "love of humanity", annihilates the best and purest of everything that constitutes its essence and value. We must constantly denounce the threat to a life that must be made complete and free from all false hypocrisy. We must denounce everything that could destroy the victorious pride that must inhabit everyone who feels truly effective and continuous in the face of conquerors, legislators and creators. Finally, it is necessary to abandon the wasted energies, the scattered members of a great political body that is exhausted and collapsing.

Participation in the voluntary creation of the new man within the new face, spontaneous adherence to the popular and facial body, constant participation in the party's development in its will, such are the duties of those who in our time dare to rise up against the general degeneration, against the progressive degradation of their people and their party. The awareness of this necessity is the first step on the path of struggle for the European man who raises the banner of his dignity and civilisation.

## SOCIALISM AND RACISM



The civilisation we have agreed to call Western did not come into being with the emergence of a religion or the founding of a city, but rather with the emergence of a superior race which, since then, has been called the white race solely because of its external appearance.

At the prehistoric moment when the primitive yellow or Negroid races that had until then occupied our continent were disappearing, the white man was already asserting his indisputable intellectual and technical superiority over the more developed forms of his art. The combined expression of his technical superiority, his intelligence and his sense of beautiful forms are such that, from that moment on, we can almost speak of a white intellectuality relative to his contemporaries.

Undoubtedly, in the following centuries, certain parts of this magnificent race underwent interbreeding, degenerated and disappeared. Other groups of the same origin, which had remained preserved, still fill the void. From struggle to struggle and migration to migration throughout the centuries, we still find the active presence of a superior race that represents a well-defined physical and moral type. Thanks to this race, the torch of white civilisation was passed down to the historical world and to us, the heirs responsible for this legacy.

There were times when the purity of this type, more widely spread throughout the continent, without any immediate proximity to less developed and less elevated races, posed no problem of defence and unity for it. There were other times, however, when it no longer found itself alone on the vast expanses of the continent, but when invasions, bringing with them a more or less extensive mixing of blood, also brought division and physical fragmentation. Nevertheless, through all the ebbs and flows, the genius of the white race maintained its superiority over all others.

They try to oppose us by arguing the ancient existence of a yellow "civilisation" in China, for example, and to prove it, we are told that the Chinese had "solved" certain social problems through nationalisation and the collective cultivation of land, combining 800 years before Christ the cultivation of a personal plot with the cultivation of the "Kolkhoz". This naturally leads us to certain comparisons. However, a state of constant civil unrest makes their history a series of long convulsions, each movement of which is manifested by a few hundred thousand severed heads. We can reasonably conclude that their inability to establish stable government and organisation is proof, alongside certain technical capabilities, of their impotence in the field of social organisation.

The similarity of their reactions to problems such as that of the Agfaife organisation also allows us to draw conclusions about the facial expressions associated with certain manifestations.

"political and social" manifestations of our time. However, at a time when Chinese heads were falling by the thousands on the borders of China in endless civil wars, Western civilisation, Hellenic civilisation, to name but the most familiar to us, was shining with a particular brilliance. Even those whom the Greeks and Romans called barbarians had reached a much higher level of civilisation. This is so true that their political and social organisation is still capable of inspiring our modern politicians.

How can we compare Chinese philosophies to ours, when they are nothing more than the theology of physical gymnastics tending towards a state of ecstasy, or a poorly assimilated copy of the philosophies of ancient India?

At the same time, the most powerful philosophies of Greece had already seen the light of day. Plato and Aristotle, Heraclitus and Pythagoras had already given the white world the principles of their current systems.

Since ancient times, every phase of Western civilisation has coincided with an advance of the Eastern or African world, with a penetration of foreign cultures, with a mixing of blood. The mixing of blood itself immediately translates into an important social phase in all areas.

At the height of Greek culture, the genius of the white race inspired Plato with the essence of socialist doctrines, the conception of a united and socialist state, a critique of the principles of property, not all of which are yet perfected.

At a time when the culture, having reached its peak, was about to embark on the path of decline as a result of Asian influences, Julius Caesar, a friend and supporter of Catiline's conspiracy, rejected the main laws and social demands of his time and, imposing them on the empire, laid the foundations for the first dictatorial welfare state in the West.

Subsequently, periodically, Western thought, faced with the anarchy of the East, faced with a community of misery brought about by both the yellow and the Semites — in forms slightly different from each other — promoted the idea of a powerfully unified and responsible state, granting all its members rights to a comfortable and materially and intellectually unique standard of living for each era.

This is the whole story of the development of socialist thought as a manifestation of the genius of the white race, which needed to be written. The white race's ability to unify the most powerful and the most popular socialism in the government of the state is obvious.

Until now, every time the fundamental unity of the West was achieved through a social ideology born of its genius, a new wave of invasions came from Africa or the East, which destroyed it twice over, through force and through the mixing of blood. It is also true that the mixing of blood through "peaceful" means often prevailed, as was the case in Greece and Rome, and this happened without even the intervention of force.

Every time these means were exhausted, a new era of political instability began. The material and spiritual standard of living of the people declined accordingly. This

was not only the anarchy itself that lowered this standard, nor the consequences of civil or external war, but the emergence of social theories that were foreign to European concepts and denied the importance of social achievements. These were conceptions that preached abandonment and contempt for material goods, or that replaced systematic social organisation with an abstract and impotent spirituality.

Thus, Greece collapsed less under the blows of the Medes or Alexander than under the arrival of thousands of Easterners who slipped into the Macedonian phalanx, destroying its military and popular unity and bringing with them their own negative philosophies and religions.

It was Rome again that collapsed less under the blows of the Germans than under the blows of Spartacus and his ilk, Jews and slaves preaching the equality of faces and men, the contempt of worldly goods, of the social world in a word.

However, when the Church took control of certain social institutions, it was because its invasion of European peoples detached it from the essence of its Semitic origins. The "Latin genius" described by Mauffas would have been lost, as it is in certain parts of the West today, if the new blood of the "bafafes" had not invigorated, animated and purified it. It would have remained dormant if the peoples, still healthy in spirit, had not introduced one of the forms of their spirit of enterprise, conquest and combat.

Is it not characteristic that the "great" popes who tended towards the unification of the West by splitting its desire for conquest and combat and at the same time encouraging the communes to demand their franchises, were often French or Norman popes, and that one of the greatest was named Hildebrand and was abbot of Cluny?

But is it still the case that the emperors of the West saw their empires collapse more under the blows of Eastern invasions and Semitic ideology than under the weight of their own mistakes or internal revolutions? The spirit of European faces, a spirit of freedom, hierarchy and unity, as well as a profoundly social spirit, was opposed at all times in the development of the West to the spirit of communising anarchy of the Semites.

Now that it is finally possible to know the true causes of the decline and divisions of peoples, we have the right to discover all that the genius of our white faces can and must still contribute to the civilisation of peace, progress and harmonious development, through finally conscious social realisations.

It is necessary to emphasise that all socialist thought originated in the West, whereas the spirit of Semitism has been nothing but a factor of false egalitarianism, disunity, division, and social and human degradation.

We must resolve at the same time the problems of social, facial and popular unity, continental unity, as well as the political and social problem of socialist unity, whenever we discuss the face or politics, one being resolved only by the other.

Going back to the roots of our civilisation and our culture, we can express what we believe to be the most consistent conception of its traditions and needs, and we say how the past must be the foundation of these traditions and conceptions by

adapting them only to the necessities of our time.

Representing a positive, unified and socialist ideal, linked to a specific history and development, can it free itself from the burden that centuries of neglect and decline have placed on our people and on itself, which is its expression? Can it impose itself on a nation that has long since lost sight of its true purpose and dignity? Yes, if we are prepared to gradually reveal its specific characteristics by improving them.

Are we moving towards the haughty isolation of a racial minority that has kept the torch alight for decades, holding it high above evil hands? Are we, on the contrary, moving towards a rebirth of the peoples of the West in the harmonious understanding of each other's faith in a hard-won unity? Only our relentless action will enable us to answer these questions.

The solution to these problems is linked to our ability to organise new forces and to our aptitude for creating a new elite capable of transposing our principles into the city and the state.

We are now faced with the problems of organising public life and educating young people. Beyond these immediate problems, there are others that are hardly less pressing, namely those of civilisation and the place we occupy in it and the place we give to the ethnic community we represent. We know that our peoples can play an important role and be decisive factors in the history of the white race and, subsequently, in that of humanity as a whole.

Because we are and want to be of our time, we must try to see what problems are also posed by the "distortion" of socialist movements by Jews who have instilled foreign theologies in them, and by the division of Europe in the current circumstances. Finally, we see what tasks our belonging to a superior race imposes on us today. That is why we are aware that we are the result of a long racial evolution that has given us a well-defined heritage. Nor do we forget that, as socialists, we cannot be detached from the great figures of socialist thought, whether they be called Plato, Thomas More, Proudhon, Blanqui or Socrates. Finally, we are living in an era of scientific development where it is possible to reconcile what seemed irreconcilable: the aristocratic theologies of Gobineau, Chamberlain, Vachef de Lapouge, Nietzsche, and those of the masters of socialism, thanks to the most recent studies of biological laws.

It became possible to reconcile the people and their elite and to tell the people "you must" at the same time as the men of the past had the right and the duty to say "I want". It gradually became possible for the people, who were gradually merging and blending with the past, to say "I want" without harming the racial imperative that defined them, because they were aware of this imperative.

By reconciling the people with themselves, uniting the workers of the head and the hands, entrusting each person with the role that befits their value, we have the opportunity to see a new consciousness with a new unity emerge in the West. We have the opportunity, each of us, to say: "It is time to rediscover your original pride, your strength and your health. You must overcome the tired humanity of our time to become a new man,

contributing to a racist ethic

beyond and above it. Have no fear, no pity, no compassion; the old gods are dead." With a new man come new measures and the possibility for each person to fulfil their destiny and their work.

It was the origins of the socialist movements that presented us with the problems of unity in an imperious manner: the unity of the world and its unity in order to create this unified world.

Its emergence was not linked to the same causes and did not involve similar means or methods in every country, so its unity was threatened from the outset.

The various socialist groups arose under the pressure of immediate, non-ideological necessities. These necessities varied according to the technical and social development of each region and the level of the ethnic groups that constituted them, and they imposed different methods. The justification for these methods was based on varying theories.

Thus, on the ideological level, even when absolutely identical problems arose, each local "task" expressed its needs and organised its socialism differently. More common in Nordic countries and England; more clearly influenced by Semitic culture in Germany; entirely Semiticised in Russia, the instability of the French or Italian racial mix imposed multiple forms on France and Italy.

Thus, from the birth of the First International, the deep division broke out, and in the Second, it manifested itself with even greater acuity as each group was called upon to exercise power in different countries.

However, it is a mistake, unfortunately often made, to see socialism only through the lens of international organisations, which are in fact only fragments of socialism. These are enterprises designed to channel and defuse the profound socialist tendencies of the European peoples. The desire for unity and discipline among the peoples should have led them to welcome such organisations, but not to entrust their leadership to men who are strangers to our continent.

Alongside the need for a nascent and overexploited proletariat to create organisations for combat and defence, the analysis of historical development by white-faced theologians led these definitions to lay the foundations for a worldview more in line with human equilibrium, nature and the genius of European races. This defining influence, which shaped every conceptual development and every task at hand, was at the origin of the diverse theologies at the beginning, as much as, and perhaps more than, the different economic conditions.

Thus, as well as being a fighting organisation, the socialist organisation was, from its inception, an organisation of thought and education. Alongside the purely materialist socialist movements, essentially idealist socialist movements arose, of which the anarchists are undoubtedly the authentic representatives in our time. The fact that they have detached themselves from their original goal and their true origins cannot in any way alter our view on this subject.

The fact that the international Jewish banking community, followed by the Soviet state, provided substantial funding to Jewish international organisations did not contribute to their development.

rapidly and considerably, providing them with resources that socialist groups, with only their own supporters, could obviously not finance with the fruits of their labour. Finally, wealthy non-Jews also followed the Jewish bank rather than their socialist compatriots, and this was no small factor in the stagnation of isolated movements, which were both national and socialist.

The development of scientific knowledge, particularly in anthropology and biology, could and should have led to a reduction in the differences between the various national socialisms by allowing for the unification of their doctrinal foundations. This was not the case for a long time, and it was only the war of 1939-40 that made many socialists aware of national and racial reality. At the same time, it made many nationalists aware of social solidarity, which led to an enormous shift in European political movements and even in social classes themselves. Thus, new relationships were established between governments and between groups. However, awareness of a certain unity across the West became apparent at the same time as the idea of a new unity of Western socialism based on common values emerged as the most capable of bringing about a new grouping of the peoples of the West.

The continuous fragmentation of socialist movements in their modern form seemed an insurmountable evil, fuelled as it was by the "theorists", often Jewish, and by activists of all stripes. This stemmed, as we can now see, not from the ferment of ideas within Western socialism, but rather from its ideological weakness and its inability to overcome its lack of overall coherence. This problem stemmed, fundamentally, from the fact that neither side had succeeded in isolating the deep and real causes of their continual divisions, nor the motives and justifications for a unity of view on the essential elements of the programme.

Periodically, major movements arose within Western socialism, some with a purely trade unionist tendency, others with a purely political tendency, which claimed to revive or renew European socialism. Each of these movements achieved nothing more than further dividing socialism, failing to find a soul and a way of being. The desire expressed by the "innovators" to "renew" themselves in Marx, the others to Pouzdhon or Jausès, was merely a manifestation of their inability to create for themselves the great socialist model which, while attached to the most powerful traditions of Western socialism, was nevertheless adapted to our level of technical development and the dominant needs of Western societies.

Only the emotion caused throughout the world by the advent of German socialism in its fascist form in 1933 led a certain number of theorists to revise several of the basic words of their programmes and doctrines. Even then, they did not have enough originality to "digest" the lesson and the thought.

In the same way that they had recently followed Marx, or the USSR, or Jaufès, they clung to the fantasy of German National Socialism without understanding that it only corresponded to the needs of a certain facial cadence and could not, as such, be applied to the entire West. The vague feeling of this inadequacy and impotence, now commonplace, could only lead to the proliferation of programmes

and organisations. Several parallel movements and currents, often hostile to one another, once again divided the French people. The "fact" of the occupation, which encouraged the occupier to divide or exacerbate divisions that could be useful to him, obviously did not facilitate the necessary task of ideological clarification. The clearest result of this situation was simply that the Semitic socialism of the "two" and "three" internationals prevailed in all areas of Western politics, despite the completely opposite spontaneous tendencies of the broad popular strata of the West. That is why these defences are still waiting for the orientation and doctrine they lack.

One might wonder why the French, whose tendencies towards unity have always been so profound that they were the first people to find the path to national unity, accepted divisions within the socialist movement so easily. It is undoubtedly because, for them, neither the principle of unity nor the principle of autonomy satisfy the organisational need, and it seems possible to them, according to a famous saying, to "live separately but work together", which is naturally inconceivable neither a German nor an Englishman.

It therefore seems perfectly logical to him to follow what he believes to be the "truth" without disciplinedly following an organisation whose words he does not entirely agree with, but which he can nevertheless influence more effectively from within. His concern for the absolute and the clear led him to demand clear-cut positions rather than the tentative half-measures that would have allowed him to achieve tangible results much more quickly.

The essential task of consistent socialists is therefore to respond immediately and clearly to respond fully to all the problems raised and, above all, to identify the key permanent issues which, by resolving outstanding questions for the long term, will enable the massive failure of different strands of French national socialism, conscious of its European role and linked to similar movements across Europe.

It is inaccurate and unfair to say that division is the result of excessive individualism on the part of the French or the result of critical principles recklessly introduced into socialist doctrine. In fact, socialist theorists in Western countries have never claimed that it is better to be alone than to accept a divergence of opinion within the organisation. Only Semites have been able to organise and embody this formula, which nourished them, by relying on the Westerners' desire for the absolute, thus literally escaping one of their most powerful tendencies.

In fact, when we observe the history of the multiple splits in the socialist movement in its non-Semitic form, one is led to conclude that their frequency is due above all to the coexistence within the movement of principles that belong to it in principle and other principles that it has received from Marxism and its various Semitic dissidents.

National socialism, whether trade unionist or political, fascist or not, immediately applied this essential principle that the substantial loyalty of socialism is not organisational in nature but doctrinal, and that it is achieved not, for example, by increasing wage levels or the number of trade union representatives, but by a new conception of the role of man in the world and in society. This new role, through the creation of a healthier, more complete and more responsible human being, must, according to his very conception, lead to social renewal. But it took him a long time to understand this.

if, however, he has understood it correctly, that this doctrinal conception could tolerate certain interpretations of detail or form, provided that the fundamental line and the main principles are maintained and respected. Finally, he has not yet realised that the quality of adherence cannot be attached solely to the simple performance of external acts of political propaganda, but to a profound personal commitment, to an individual form of faith that defines each of them as a model and an example.

Many divisions have been caused by doctrinal autofitism, not on essential issues but on questions of detailed application, without realising that the only thing that counts is the unity of struggle of activists who have the same orientation on the major issues and who accept the consequences of this general orientation in their personal lives.

It is therefore not a question for us of achieving formal unity based on a slogan that is easy to apply, but rather profound unity based on the fundamental forms of doctrinal and personal orientation: Different methods of application can contribute to the same goal, if a sufficiently flexible organisational discipline allows for immediate practical implementation.

It should be noted that since 1945, a clear tendency towards fragmentation has been evident in the movements that the government and its followers have sought to eliminate. Thus, the best and most disillusioned men of the nationalist and socialist movements have sought, in obvious good faith, to unite and collaborate. We are now witnessing a movement that is exactly the opposite of the one that scattered the socialists at the end of the last century and the beginning of this one. There is no doubt that it still lacks the definitive doctrine that would give it the necessary cohesion, at least in France, but the fact that the different tendencies have come together should allow for a more active development of doctrine. This will accomplish the task that scattered organisations have been unable to carry out, since the essential elements of the doctrine are apparently already in place.

One reason for this trend towards unification can be found in the fact that the classes are seeing the antagonisms that the movements of Semitic socialism had systematically fostered fade away. In many areas, national "capitalists" seem to be a little more aware of their social duties, and socialist activists have a more accurate appreciation of the organisational and defensive role of the "capitalist" when he is genuinely committed to his enterprise and works faithfully for it.

This leads to a more harmonious conception of each person's role, and in the overall doctrine, the idea of national unity and the importance of class considerations and antagonisms are clearly evident. At the same time, this idea creates a clearer sense of solidarity among members of the same popular community and develops the desire for social achievements and mutual understanding. This explains the attenuation of class differences and the immediate possibility of a socialism that is both itself and national at the same time.

If this highly favourable situation is not seized upon, it is clear that antagonisms will tend to fester. If the socialist party of national and racial unity cannot be enabled to implement a programme of socialist and fascist education and construction, the class struggle, despite its tendency to disappear due to the technical programme, will be prolonged and difficult for a period of time that cannot be estimated.

But the essential task is the immediate establishment of a body of doctrine sufficient to

sufficiently precise and complete so that the individual education of all adherents prevents new divisions or renders them powerless. In general, it is simply a matter of unifying the basic elements and realising their synthesis.

By studying the entire history of socialism, we realise that it was only during moments of individual intellectual crisis, when personal study and commitment gave way to blind obedience to an organisation or individual, that splits became most likely. Indeed, the leader's influence became such that he demanded passive obedience, so that the slightest personal effort on the part of his followers seemed illusory or problematic, lacking a deeper commitment based on study and political education leading to sincere engagement.

It is therefore not true that the principle of division is inherent to the French people or to socialist doctrine, but rather to the fact that each theorist has limited himself to a fragmented view of socialism instead of embracing the overall doctrine, which alone could have allowed for a fundamental unity expressed in different ways.

It is not the doctrine but the insufficiency of doctrine, it is not even the discussion but the superficial discussion, that has led to the divisions. Let us therefore get to the heart of the problem and extract the few fundamental truths of the doctrine and its permanent necessities, and then any serious split will be avoided. The adherent himself is better able to judge the sincerity of the leader who offers him a new "tendency" through the split. He is better able to refuse such a division and prefer to remain with the leader in question than with the indispensable unity of the movement and the people.

It is therefore by responding to all questions, solving all problems and being truly united that socialism creates the conditions for individual loyalty, the only condition for unity. It is by affirming its specific principles and methods that national and united socialism can truly be national and united.

He must be able to place every new adherent before his personal responsibility and his professional duty, faced with the necessity of giving himself entirely to the cause of his nation and his people. It is this attitude alone that will make each person look within themselves and lead them to become aware of the ties that bind them to their nation and their people, and consequently to the social concept that is dear to their nation and their people. This attitude allows us to combine the absolute freedom of each individual with profound personal commitment. Insofar as a spiritual community is established between the adherent and his community, and therefore between the adherent and his party, the expression of the community and the people, unity is safeguarded and assured.

Unity must therefore not be sought in the attenuation of this or that position in order to accommodate this or that sensitivity, but in a thorough and in-depth examination of all the issues; in an intensification and deepening of the study, in its fair and systematic implementation.

In light of the events of 1939-40, socialism seems to have understood that the question of unity within the movement in France is closely linked to unity within the movements of Europe. To the extent that French national socialism resolves its own problems, it will contribute to clarifying the problems of unity in Europe and throughout the world.

Colonial peoples are indeed bearing with increasing impatience the burden of a domination whose meaning escapes them, since white peoples do not seem capable of organising either peace or even war at home, nor of achieving an understanding between cultures that seem to them to be identical in essence.

They rightly feel that white peoples do not know how to defend themselves and get along with each other, and are therefore not fit to be their role models and act as their masters. **T h e y** are encouraged even more when these peoples grant them excessive rights and call on them to become the true guardians of their internal and external interests.

It is time to reclaim socialism and, in the awareness of our immediate and national needs, to achieve the unity and authority that are the conditions for our survival and the preservation of our material and moral integrity.

It is clear that in our efforts to unify socialist and national forces, we are coming up against existing Semitic internationals that are not easily persuaded to abandon their notion of internationalism (declared in the third, virtual in the second, but no less faithful in both), the notion of strictly national parties uniting through mutual representation and negotiations based on common affinities into a true federation of socialist and national parties and states. It is also difficult to make organisations that are only organisations with Semitic divisions accept the principle of nation and face, the principle of selection and hierarchy.

We therefore have to fight simultaneously for unity among organisations that already accept the broad outlines of our conception; and for unity with individuals from large international organisations who accept these same principles.

It is possible that, in this way, deep divisions will come to us from the internationals, but we cannot naturally expect that sections of the international will be able to pass, without force, a decision on the theoretical level where we stand. They could not accept an organic unity that would be an admission of the political defeat that is already theirs. Membership is therefore, in most cases, only individual.

The fact that we ask everyone to study and provide them with the means to do so gives us the confidence that the old theologies will, sooner or later, collapse and disappear. To the imperative of the "general line" imposed by the seven members of the political bureau, we oppose the profound adherence of each individual, not even to a party, but to a conception of life and the world.

The organisation must be a party based entirely on personal contact with the soul of the face.

To each person we say, following a famous saying: "Become what you are," and we ask them to feel that if their clothing and their choices bear the same name and have the same profound meaning as the clothing and choices of their neighbour and their people, nevertheless, they are not the same choice or the same clothing, but something different that belongs to them in essence and is not equal to others. To each member of the party, we must teach the words that democracy has banned from its vocabulary: "I am" and "I want".

To each one, when he has conquered this new moral position for himself of "I

"I am," this awareness of one's value as a member of society, we still say that this value is not sufficient because it is only the external manifestation of the inheritance received. Beyond oneself, beyond the "I am", each person must conquer a new value for humanity and, surpassing oneself, must create for one's descendants and challenge them to a new value, a new emotion.

What is the value of someone who makes themselves the centre of attention within a diminished, degenerate humanity? They are nothing more than the greatest of the degenerate and the dwarfs.

The man we want to shape must not be one who follows humanity as it is at this moment, but one who, beyond that, is the pioneer of a new man and a new society.

Let those who are short of breath and weak in muscle, let those who fear danger and effort, let those above all who fear being often alone amid the jeers of the multitude, let them flee from our cause and leave the way open for the free development of our cause.

Let those who believe themselves to be destined for rights and privileges depart from our ranks. We offer only effort and hardship, the certainty of blows and faith in ultimate victory to those who join us. Let those who find this new life too harsh turn away: they are not one of us. With us, there are only duties, no secrets, no material rewards. These duties are freely chosen by each individual as the simple task of each day.

Let those who, on the other hand, are ready for anything and everything, let those who want to serve and continue to serve and surpass themselves, let them come into our ranks if they are destined to live in our atmosphere and find any other suffocating.



THE THOUGHT OF  
THE NEW MAN



We can only sketch the problems of individual thought as they arise for the members of the new movement by virtue of their very membership. But we believe it is essential to say a word about this before going any further in our study.

There are problems that arise for a movement such as the one we want to see born, not for other reasons, but because we want it to be not only a political and social movement, but also a movement that can give each member a philosophy, a theory of knowledge, a world view. We therefore want it to be a movement that breaks free from the narrow political confines of current organisations and delves deeply into the personal lives of each member and their families.

Politics is not, as some believe or claim, solely a public matter, but must also become a private, moral and spiritual matter.

This philosophical and moral stance that we ask everyone to adopt should not lead to a systematic set of conclusions, but rather to a general intellectual attitude, a particular way of viewing and analysing life's problems. The originality of our thinking and our conception is therefore manifested not only in the angle from which it raises the problems of all acts of life, but also in the solutions it proposes.

Fascist socialism is the affirmation of the preponderant role of the state in determining all problems relating to the life of each member of the people and in finding solutions to them. It is therefore the assertion of the absolute predominance of the state in all manifestations of the life of individuals and peoples. This in itself defines our position vis-à-vis the members of the political organisation and the people.

By prioritising the autonomy of the facial feature and denying the right to interfere in the lives of our people to any individual, group or doctrine that denies its authenticity, we are radically separating ourselves from all existing groups, but we must also find on our path all the healthy groups within our people.

Therefore, while we sever all ties with the doctrines and negative groups of this kind, we establish all ties with the men of our faith and our people who, enlightened, still follow them. Our attitude towards them is consistent, understanding, friendly, welcoming and non-hostile.

The affirmation of this unitary value of the face separates us as much from traditional religious thought as it does from traditional materialist thought as developed by Semitic socialism. We introduce into everyone's life the definitive and absolute criterion that gives them the moral orientation for all their activities, whether family,

personal or more broadly political.

Of, because this fact, however definitive it may be in essence, is evolutionary and scientific in terms of its destiny, it opposes its becoming and the flexibility of its dialectic to a dogmatic figure incompatible with science and scientific thinking. It opposes the dogmatism of official religions as much as the equally dogmatic attitude of infallibility of Marxist dialectics.

These, in fact, each claiming to be the only valid source of knowledge, deny any possibility of intellectual development beyond themselves, whereas our facial affirmation only sets a point of reference beyond which lies facial degeneration and intellectual decadence, leaving the face entirely free to go elsewhere. It then leaves thought free in all areas except those where it inevitably and simply commits suicide. Our thought cannot be "free thought" since it is limited by the point where its decline and the decline of the face begin, nor can it be a doctrine of absolute autonomy limiting the action of thought since the latter can rise as far and as high as it wishes in all positive domains. It is therefore in no way a concept of the "happy medium" but rather the concept of men who always want to rise and expand their domain. To this end, they carefully guard against the only factor that is decisively capable of leading to total degeneration: facial degeneration.

This tendency to conquer ever new but ever higher and healthier positions is still the only concept that can bring about greater unity and harmony through the harmonious integration of individual and collective values. It is therefore in accordance with these principles that each person should study history and philosophy, science and politics, that they should appreciate literature and art, and that they should use them in the most productive way for themselves and their people.

Intellectual activity therefore functions not as a party or the doctrine specific to that party, but as a political party, concerned solely with the needs of the development of the nation and the people, and free from any allegiance to political authorities as such, as long as they cannot be seen as a factor in the disintegration of the nation.

We cannot accept that in any branch of science, the result should be predetermined and imposed by an authority on the pretext of its particular political conception. It is nonsense to impose on any science limits other than those set by its own methods. The decision of the Stalinist party to ban certain scientific research on the pretext that it is contrary to the "general line", or to oppose literary or philosophical investigation for the same reasons, seems to us both ridiculous and anti-scientific.

Finally, even in the philosophical realm, fascist socialism is confident enough in its methods not to fear developments that do not conform to its conclusions, knowing that doctrinal refutation in the eyes of a people who have become aware of their fascist destiny is more likely to find an echo and achieve a result than outright condemnation and prohibition. However, as he is in no way a supporter of a formal democracy that is nothing more than demagoguery, while accepting the expression of all sound thinking, he reserves the manifestation of this expression to those who are capable of

and possibly refute them. "You don't throw pearls before swine."

However, we object that this entirely liberal manner of allowing the expression of opposing views in an environment capable of understanding them is a flatly democratic formula. But on the contrary, we find in the facts a different truth; We know that, in the face of a tendency towards decadence, it has always had a fixed theme. Without bowing its decisions to conclusions that are not scientifically established, it has always been able to find the limit beyond which freedom no longer has the right to go, without harming the common good. The fact that the face is for us the starting point of all forms of thought and life and that it opposes all forms of life and thought that harm the development of the face, since this attitude provides the fundamental data for a conception of the world, this definition fully answers the questions of origin and end. Thus, the limit is established, not by a decision of political organisation or by the data of a text, but by the feeling that the face has made us what we are, that we are, therefore, the custodians of a sacred good whose presence we feel so strongly that its weight becomes irresistible to anyone who accepts this determining factor and that, ultimately, any deviation from it is forbidden.

Beyond deliberation and discussion, beyond the conviction that arises from thought, a kind of instinct born of acquired or innate facial wisdom must make each person feel that such a gesture, such an act, such a word is contrary to the destiny and permanence of the face. Thus, for the fascist socialist, this fact is not provided by the precise affirmation of a law or even a moral rule, or by a dogma, but by the deep-seated feeling of belonging to a lineage that cannot degenerate, of being responsible for one's heritage and, finally, of being in constant spiritual contact with the genius, traditions, aspirations and needs of the people and the nation. This feeling is simply a matter of education. Thus, permanent contact with the living reality of the nation must ensure that no one can escape its imperative without condemning themselves, without condemning themselves to degeneration and decline in themselves and in their nation.

For him, however, it is a matter of adopting a scale of values that inspires and constrains at the same time, and to which voluntary obedience is the only means of fulfilling his destined purpose.

Thus, while the desire for investigation is free from any constraint for those who are healthy and maintain healthy thinking within themselves and in their actions, it imposes an absolute rule that cannot be questioned or transgressed.

This conception of absolute value attributed to facial fidelity leads to a dual attitude in political practice. Considering that each individual must strive, in a state of physical and intellectual health, to conceive of this loyalty, to be aware of it and to orient their life accordingly, they refuse to "impose" this manner of voice.

There is no longer any deep commitment. Formalism, which may be acceptable from a political point of view but is intolerable for the conduct of life and the development of a personal moral code, quickly degenerates the organisation, its members and, through them, the people themselves.

Determined to safeguard the unity and health of the community in all areas, he is prepared to oppose by all means the forces of corruption and physical and moral degeneration. Similarly, he opposes by all means attempts at corruption or

attempts at weakening, whether by elements foreign to the nation and the people, or by elements within the nation and the people themselves that have degenerated. He sums up this point of view in a concise formula: It is permissible for anyone not to be a fascist, but it is not permissible for anyone to be an enemy of their own nation. Neutrality, indifference and ignorance are normal attitudes, but negation is not.

Indeed, anyone who opposes a moral and theological position must be familiar with that position, and anyone who has studied the issue and still chooses to fight it appears to be deliberately seeking disintegration, as if their own degeneracy and decline were evident to all.

There is therefore no contradiction in this dual attitude, and this reconciliation is only possible because of the certainty with which the socialist fascist holds to his own conception.

We now come to the phatic domain of organisation itself and the *cfîtêfe*, which allows us to recognise a certain form of organisation as the only valid one.

If the conviction of the fascist socialist is closely linked to the facial conception, it is clear that here too, the face represents the integrity of the face and its unity. This is his only means of control and certainty. It is possible that for a certain period of time, the party may not correspond exactly to what he expected or hoped for. Nevertheless, he will be concerned with maintaining the integrity of the face and preserving its unique soul: *the pastiche*. He will oppose any attempt to weaken this integrity and diminish this soul, whatever the argument may be in favour of dispersing efforts.

How could he conceive that the face would be divided again, when his sole desire was to unify it? How could he accept that a powerful force was protecting the face and that this force would be taken from him?

The supreme interest of the face takes precedence over all other considerations and continues to guide his actions and maintain his attitude.

There is, however, a valid objection that our opponents seem to raise: since you have accepted this study of history on a fascist basis, are you not afraid that new scientific discoveries will undermine your system and destroy your theology? In that case, obedience is automatically enforced?

We can safely assume that the facial type we wish to see is before us and not behind us, and that our conception of man is more valid for the future than for the past. We could say that our conception of the face is such that we do not believe that, scientifically speaking, any other attitude could ever be adopted. We recognise that there are currently no perfect faces, but that certain products of current mixtures, as they stabilise, may create types of humans that are particularly suited to helping humanity achieve harmony. This still seems particularly sound from a purely scientific point of view. It is simply a matter of choosing human types who, even though they are not perfect, have historically been endowed with a certain number of qualities that are specific to them.

Finally, based on this, we can say that if history were to be rewritten in its entirety

its past development through the sensational discovery of documents confirming all the facts, the ideal type of man towards which we are striving and which we intend to maintain or select, nevertheless remains as a goal to be achieved.

This position, which is also unfortunately ours, is that of idealists who tend to remake the world for themselves and intend to detach themselves from all tradition.

Our attitude is therefore quite different. The fact that we encourage and accept all positive scientific research does not, in our view, pose the slightest threat to the validity of our theory of origins.

The development of current knowledge has made it possible, over a century of analysis, to establish the essential data of human evolution and the role played in it by the peoples who, from the beginning, occupied Western Europe.

We are therefore perfectly confident and calm about the discoveries that may be made in this regard. None of the fundamental bases of our conceptions can be threatened in this respect. That is why we do not oppose the tradition of our faces and the obligation they impose on us to maintain and perpetuate them, an abstract and ideal construction of a human type unrelated to the origins of our faces and our civilisations. We affirm without fear of being contradicted by any historical criticism that from our mythology, throughout the ages, there emerges a type of man who, far from being the guardian of the nomadic tribes of the Semites, far from being anxious for human sacrifices in the manner of Abraham, far from being possessed by an abstract desire for domination over foreign peoples to be kept "under a yoke of iron", was the embodiment of the lofty and calm thinking that makes civilised conquerors and temple builders.

This type, which goes from Rama to ORPHEUS, from Orpheus to Plato, from Plato to our modern civilisations, unites the spirit of the warrior with that of the sage, and it is this spirit that gave the Western world Alexander, Caesar, Charlemagne, to name but the greatest or the best known.

The permanence of this type is a sure guarantee that no modification of the study of history will ever be profound enough to affect or diminish it.

Finally, it is in contemplating this type that we draw the moral certainty of our truth and the destiny of our face.

Our desire is not to celebrate the apotheosis of a particular man, even if he is a hero, by attributing absolute personal value to him and deifying him, which is as simplistic from a scientific point of view as it is false from a philosophical point of view, but to extract from the model provided by each of the greatest men of our civilisation that which was precisely the essential reason for his greatness and which belongs to the common type of humanity.

We thus arrive at a permanent type, not only of the "great man" of our time, but of the Western man in a state of physical and moral health, the man with a healthy face. Finally, we strive to see what particular qualities this type possesses in its various personal manifestations in order to discover in each of the men of our time, of Western faces and of our people, which individuals, faces and peoples are closest to this type, so that we may select and encourage their descendants.

By examining and analysing this type, we thus gain an insight into the world at the beginning and end of which we find ourselves, along with a permanent facial feature, an equally permanent system of intellectual creation. In our view, this is the best way to build a life that acquires its full value by being closely linked to the great figures of the past and striving to transmit traditional heritage by enriching it.

The new way of life is not the result of an abstract construct but the current manifestation of a millennial destiny that no one can escape without denying their origins and their very existence. This is why the fascist socialist, who tends to rise ever higher, has no intention of promoting a political ideal of levelling, but rather an ideal of hierarchisation of values through rigorous selection.

He opposes the current despair and impotence of thought, due to a lack of long-term perspectives and traditions, with a clear vision that is conscious of its immemorial destiny and immediate purpose. He paints a picture of a world where greatness and value are neither excluded, discredited nor diminished, but rather elevated and glorified so that they may serve as a model and guide.

That is why this idea is quite open to admitting all possible developments of human knowledge, provided that they are affirmative and not negative. He considers that Western civilisation cannot survive or subsist if, thanks to its past and its people, it does not also preserve the meaning of its destiny; if it does not take into account these vital necessities, the most important and lofty questions that dominate its existence.

Finally, he considered that any neglect of study and research could only hinder the selection of the great guiding personalities that are so sorely lacking in our artificially levelled society. Through the liberation of a historically extinct but, in our society, new type of person, he provides our world with the basis for a renewed scale of values, which alone will enable the West to restore its balance and harmony by establishing the most natural and most fitting hierarchy.

It is only a particular conception of man that leads us to take a political position, whereas the activists of most organisations, when they do arrive at a world view, are led to it solely by politics.

This definitive fact was caused mainly because social and scientific development in the 19th century was a thousand times faster than human development and adaptation to their professional environment. Modern man has unwittingly retained ways of thinking from the 18th century, even though he is surrounded by all the technical developments of our time. Modern man has been precipitated into the 20th century, breaking radically with a whole past of traditions that he cannot yet replace. Furthermore, a terrible facial disfigurement has taken place in our Europe without the moral values of defence having been established. This imbalance and destabilisation can only be accentuated. We are therefore left, with a Western humanity diminished by intermingling, to govern without general principles and to act only on a day-to-day basis.

No doubt the socialists are the first, and, it is said, the only ones, to attempt to develop

contribution to a racist ethic.

a theory capable of resolving the material difficulties of their era by effectively shaping the future. But the lack of a comprehensive vision, due in large part to insufficient study of human development, prevented them from doing anything other than economism. Another factor, and, as we have seen, the most serious one, intervened: the birth of a Semitic theophany of socialism that may have been valid for Semites but not for our group of faces.

Thus, governments without principles, tossed between the flawed theories of social conservatism, the necessarily incomplete theories of economic socialism, and Semitic theories, held all the levers of power in their hands without knowing how to use them. Sometimes the triumph of a single trend made it possible to avoid disaster for a time, but since the applied theory did not correspond to historical development or reality, the system was bound to collapse fairly quickly. Liberalism, far from being a formula for freedom, was in fact the tangible manifestation of an inability to foresee, organise and govern, an admission of uncertainty in its methods of exercising power.

If the regime does not meet the moral, intellectual and material needs of the people and the state, it can only vegetate and live by expedients. It was necessary for them, in the absence of profound support from the people, to allow a multitude of parties to exist, whose periodic succession could, in the best of cases, pass successively to the most dangerous extremes of each.

On the contrary, when the regime, thanks to its vision and overall plan, can solve the problems of today and propose solutions to the problems of tomorrow, the people's support quickly becomes total and profound. The parties disappear of their own accord, having no reason to exist.

There is a natural order based on personal merit and value. When everyone's abilities are allowed to flourish and everyone's resources are freely manifested through the methodical organisation of all latent possibilities, then balance is established in a fair hierarchy of values. The role of the state is now only to maintain and regulate the various social functions, without even exercising its traditional task.

In a politically and socially healthy state, it is simply a matter of establishing a kind of "internal settlement" setting out the duties and obligations of each individual towards the community, so that the rights of each individual are clearly defined. There are therefore only reciprocal duties, the fulfilment of which creates the rights of each individual.

It goes without saying that these duties are primarily towards others and that all other obligations, whether material or moral, derive from this single obligation.

It matters little, therefore, whether the form of government is a republic or a monarchy; what matters is that all the conditions necessary to guarantee the land and its people, as well as the harmonious development of all, are enshrined in the fundamental law of the state.

By subjecting the individual to the permanent obligation to serve his country, he is entrusted with the permanent right to judge whether the state is good or bad, in accordance with natural law or not. Thus, each individual will naturally deduce the rule of the bonds that unite the individual, the party and the state.

If the state is anti-facial or neutral, the party must oppose it, conquer it in order to modify or destroy it, but cannot accept to compromise with it since it does not guarantee the values that are imperative in our eyes. On the contrary, if the state is facial, the party finds itself merged into the state, the people into the party, and a decisive harmony is established through the automatic hierarchisation of values. Thus, there can be immediate identity between the individual conception and that of the party; between the conception of the party and that of the state, between the party and the state, between the people and the state, from the moment when the general conception of man and the world that is his own is applied. Then the state becomes truly unified in its form and in its manifestations.

It is at this moment that individual freedom is realised in its highest form. It is the individual freedom of each member of the people, through the collective realisation of what is the destiny of each person in the people and the face. The question of obedience to the state, so serious elsewhere, does not need to be resolved in this case, since obedience to the state is one and the same as obedience to one's own moral law, obedience to one's own destiny. Only from this can the most perfect discipline arise, because it is freely consented to and voluntary.

The unified attitude of the state therefore constitutes a clear attitude towards education. If the destiny of each individual is intertwined with the destiny of the community, the people, the party and the state, which establish the principles and possibilities for its realisation, the problem of schooling is that of educating citizens who are aware, from an early age, of their destiny and the social and civic responsibilities that come with it. Also, with the sole aim of promoting the power of the people and the nation to the highest degree, and to allow for the most rigorous selection possible, access to culture must be so widely open that everyone can fully realise all their potential: a superior nation needs scholars more than it needs soldiers. Scientists are always able to find the best solutions when the need arises. Thus, many of the credits usually allocated to the arts are more usefully employed in the general development of culture, if they serve to raise the general level and harmonise all the values of the people and the nation. As for the moral content of this education, the fact that it is a moral as well as a political or economic concern that animates the fascist socialist, together with the desire to realise his conception of the world in the organisation of the state, makes it his duty to provide the child of his nation with all the means to adopt his conception of the world.

Thus, in a world where everything is a struggle, everyone fights for their very existence. They know that the place they occupy will only be obtained through hard struggle: all the men of their people and their community started out at the same time as them and with the same chances as them. This may be a brutal image of a humanity where everyone must be a fighter, but it is not in effeminate societies or in those who give up that humanity has ever found its leaders and inspirers. We are too socialist to defend here the ruthless motto of Rome: "Woe to the vanquished." We shape society in such a way that the vanquished still has his place in the sun, but he also knows that it is a privilege and not a right, and that only then will the victor grant it to him.

In this way, all resources are used to the maximum and as harmoniously as possible, safeguarding the rights and opportunities of each individual under the best possible conditions.

## THE RACIST AND HIS PEOPLE



When Paul Valéry declares that modern Europeans are the product of a Greek, Roman and Christian heritage, he seems to be exaggerating the truth. From the point of view of the formation of Western man in the so-called Christian West, Christianity is in fact only a superficial and secondary factor. Christianity has come down to us only in the form completely transformed by St Paul according to the Greek philosophy composed by a Jew and Semitised, and seen by Catholicism which, having largely Latinised and Germanised it, has made it, for the West, an acceptable whole, more perfectly reflecting Greece and Rome. In order to erase certain conformist ideas, we say that the whole of the West, in its political, philosophical and moral manifestations, is derived from Greece and Rome, and that even its Christianity has been sufficiently Westernised to be no longer Semitic but mainly Greco-Latin and Germanic.

Only a thin Semitic and Negroid layer still attempts to infuse the West with its values of anarchy, disaffection and nomadism, but the essence of Western thought and life is therefore exclusively Greco-Latin.

The fascist must therefore, in today's Western civilisation, carefully discard the harmful aspects of the infidel faces and discover the pure metal of the Greco-Latin and Germanic tradition that is ours. Only the gathering of individuals capable of identifying these elements will enable us to build the strong foundations that our peoples lack in order to follow the path of their true destiny. In this work of stripping away the old, it was necessary above all to free socialist thought from its Semitic, Mongoloid or Negroid matrix, and to point the way to traditional social conceptions of our faces, based on the most characteristic teachings of the great socialist theosophists of the West, from Plato to Sofel, via Blanqui.

But at the same time, he had to constantly remind himself that theocracy is meaningless in itself if facial corruption prevents the people from embracing and utilising it. The fascist's task was therefore to emphasise the need for socialist reforms and to demonstrate that these were only possible in a racially homogeneous people; a racially selected people. It was not enough to hold political power and resolutely apply great social reforms if the people, caught up in the path of facial degeneration, could neither understand nor safeguard them. It is therefore not only through external factors that Western society became socialist, but also through its ability to establish its own socialism in moral and racial intellectual unity. Moreover, if the idea of profound solidarity, which from the outset unites all men of the same face, were not present in the minds of everyone, any social realisation would become impossible.

As long as his party is not in power, the fascist activist must work with all his might to transform his environment morally and to prepare for the revolution.

Without which social evolution cannot be conceived. When his party came to power, his task was not diminished but rather expanded by the new means at his disposal. So, while he laid the legal and then moral and political foundations for his actions, he had to strictly apply his principles in his personal life so that he could be a model and example for his community.

The man of our country, even when he approaches our conceptions, has a tendency to be influenced by his environment and to divide his life into two parts: one devoted to politics and the other to his private interests, without realising that without total unity in his life or in his principles, there can be neither profound political action nor a consistent private life. Finally, condemning certain methods currently practised and favoured by Jews, he combats these methods in words and ultimately accommodates them when he finds himself in the midst of his business or personal life. It is essential that the fascist resolutely unify his life, unify that of his family and that of his community, if he then wants to unify that of the people and the world. With a clearer awareness of his permanent duties towards all men of his race, he will be better able to create the "revolutionary" atmosphere necessary for any revolution by setting an example himself through the social achievements that are immediately possible. Finally, being already personally 'committed' in this way, he fought with greater vigour against the current form of government and social organisation, in the name of which millions of our people are deprived of the most basic freedoms under the pretext of wanting to free them from a few minor duties. He could no longer tolerate the servitude and degeneration that a society dominated by the insatiable systematically maintains and develops. He was outraged, not in the name of some vague idealism, nor even in the name of a false sentimental social solidarity, but because he saw millions of lives of our fellow human beings wasted, debased and despised, without any benefit to society or the people. That is why he was not satisfied with fragmentary social reforms. He wanted to attack the root of the problem: to change the structure of the state and society, based on an awareness of the collective interest of the whole community and the strong solidarity that unites its members, creating an obligation for some to help others achieve their full development and liberation.

It is not possible, of course, not to mention the colonial problem in passing, given that it raises social and political questions for fascists. Objections may be raised on this subject. We maintain that only Europeans are capable of conceiving of a certain form of socialism and certain norms of civilisation. Is it because other races cannot attain a level of civilisation such that they can create a form of socialism adapted to their own circumstances? For us, socialism means that it is only achieved when each individual, thanks to society, has been able to reach their full physical, moral, intellectual and material development and occupies the place that their value deserves. It is therefore obvious that if each nation or people in its own part of the world establishes a regime where these conditions are fulfilled, it will have achieved "its" socialism, just as we ourselves have achieved ours. When we proclaim for our own community the right to realise 'its' socialism itself, while safeguarding its physical health and traditions, we are in no way denying each other the same possibilities, knowing full well that in a consistent global order, a hierarchy of faces will inevitably be established, just as a social hierarchy is established within each face. This is the only valid organisation of the world that can ensure lasting peace.

We know that the Semitic nomads are gradually abandoning their nomadic lifestyle and that the Mongols are abandoning their yuffte. We have no reason to fear this clear demarcation of each side's domains. On the contrary, it is a means of demonstrating more clearly than ever the superiority of the West. This is why the Semites, the Negroes and the Mongols oppose it so fiercely, with the help of the International Jewish Bank and the Stalinist Mongolian state. This is also why we are fighting so energetically against the levelling and corruption brought about by this enemy. Any concession made to the idea of racial equality, any concession made to the cause of mixing blood, is just another step towards an inexpiable disaster. If degeneration is great enough, if decadence and resignation are far enough advanced, and the entire West will be submerged by barbarism and anarchy, as China was a thousand years before Christ for the same reasons, as Greece was, as Rome was in its decadence, and as any civilisation that renounces its proper destiny. But if the right to fulfil its destiny is won for us, an era of peace will open up before us and the descendants of our people.

Western socialism's primary concern was not so much to establish socialism in each country, but to establish it everywhere at the same time — or almost everywhere. The world revolution was the myth that moved the masses, making them forget their own problems, their own countries, their own faces. It was normal for a socialist to have a vision of the global organisation to be given to the world, but it was wise, before seeking to liberate the universe and organise it, to think first about organising one's own country and one's own face. Before even advising others to implement socialism, it was right to experiment with it at home in order to set an example. Finally, it would have been wise to recognise that socialist thought had originated among only a few peoples and that these peoples had a particular facial composition. It would also have been wise to note that while there were different tendencies within socialism, each tendency corresponded to the conception that a particular facial group had of socialism. Thus, before setting himself up as the champion of the Universe and the International, modestly and humbly, leaning over his people and his face, the socialist militant would have realised that the hastily and sentimentally constructed Internationals were driven by Jews and only promoted the social theories of the Jews and not of Westerners, and that the current definition, neither Jewish nor Mongolian, imposed on the West all the characteristics of social organisation specific to these groups.

In conclusion, European socialism asked itself what form of socialism was best suited to its countries and their circumstances, and it realised that a certain form of socialism was capable of uniting all the peoples of Europe and even of uniting most European countries around a single set of basic principles. Thus, he would have preserved socialism from above, his people from destructive and debilitating Semitic infiltrations, and socialism would undoubtedly already be an old reality in a pacified Europe.



## THE RACIST AND HIS PARTY



Belonging to a certain race gives each individual a certain number of aptitudes. These aptitudes are more or less developed depending on the individual, but it is possible to identify constants for each race. Thus, the conception of life and the world tends to be spontaneously the same among individuals of the same racial origin before education intervenes. The fact that similar or closely related constants can be observed among the different faces that populate Western Europe leads us to believe that Western European peoples can develop a social system that is not common or exactly similar from one to another, but strongly similar.

This allows us to assert that the origin of social, political or moral movements has a deeper cause than education or religious or governmental influence.

The concern of a consistent scientific socialism is therefore to identify these deep causes, which are undoubtedly of a social nature, to isolate them and to unify them by safeguarding or establishing them in their original state.

It has thus been observed that the conditions for the creation of a socialist theofia in Europe lie in the preservation of the constants and traditions of the European peoples. Efforts were made to develop among the peoples on the one hand, and among governments on the other, the desire to maintain a social stability that would become its best guarantee.

This attitude is not unrelated to each person's personal conduct; it is necessary to pursue the task of defending the face in the spirit of each individual, making everyone aware of the importance of the facial feature as something that irrevocably determines the destiny of the individual and the people.

Thus, the political and moral attitude of any consistent scientific socialist who seeks to realise the unity of the people and the face, regardless of the doctrines that emanate from the genius of this people and this face, is determined in advance.

To understand the attitude of fascist socialism, it is not enough to say that it had to analyse this or that fact, or take this or that position; it must be said that in our era it is the promoter of a veritable dogma: Having grown up in a world that denied the reality of facial features, after having acted in a political environment which, by legally denying it, was unable to conceive of or truly realise socialism, it must simultaneously be both one and the other and lead the people to follow the same path.

Discovering the importance of the face in the development of human societies, and then in the evolution of human knowledge and thought, he must defend socialist theories and weigh them against this new standard.

Thus, since he is attached to the traditional socialist movement, precisely because of his discovery of this fundamental factor, he must re-evaluate everything, and we can say that he represents a new moment in socialist thought and gives it a wholly modern definition.

The basis on which the socialist fascist establishes his doctrine is the conception that all individual existence is determined by his loyalty not only to his family but also to his race and that, as a result, for better or for worse, man belongs entirely, through his heritage, to the race that gave him birth.

If he himself wants to obey the law of his destiny, he has only one path: to conform to the necessities and imperatives of his race. From this it naturally follows that a people can only fully realise its destiny if it bends to the laws of its racial destiny and the constant sense of its racial health.

It is therefore not an external obligation, a political or social constraint that leads the individual to choose one way of life over another, but, if he is aware of it, the awareness of his own destiny. It is a genuine voluntary choice, one path leading to degeneration and decay, the other to the full realisation of one's potential. Of course, in the development of today's society, very few are in a position to make such a choice, since the very world in which each person grows up opposes *this choice* or, at best, ignores its necessity.

The whole problem of human destiny hinges on this precise question: is man determined or not, is his individual freedom total or does he depend on a superior power? This is a quasi-religious problem in some cases, but also a biological, physical and political problem in the present case. Put this way, it becomes infinitely more serious than a simple political issue. If the individual is the owner of a given amount of capital, if he is determined by it, does he have the right to waste or destroy it, and if he is legally entitled to do so, can he morally do so? In the absence of a law in the political sense of the word, does not a moral law oppose the disposal of his nominal inheritance? The socialist fascist answers resolutely: Yes! If a chain of men preceding him in existence acted and developed in such a way that he was able to acquire a set of particular qualities, these qualities do not belong to him in fact, but he is only their temporary custodian. He is morally obliged not only to preserve this deposit intact, but also to increase it before passing it on to his descendants. He also has an obligation not to break this chain. He must ensure its preservation, its growth and its continuation. This is a collective, and therefore social, problem, but at the same time an individual imperative, opening up to each person the path to their personal and political future.

Undoubtedly, this immense leap towards individual responsibility is in stark contrast to much of what some people are accustomed to accepting, but was this not the attitude of the gods, who in their heyday wished above all to be "beautiful and good", while knowing that the gods punished both the crime of "demesufe" and the attack on the face — a notion entirely contained in the myth of Oedipus and his descendants. Thus, while everyone can accept degeneration and the decline of their face, a new notion intervenes that prevents them from doing so through facial awareness of their face.

Through this awareness, they discover that they do not belong to themselves but to the chain of men who preceded them and which they must continue, as one of its links.

It is in the name of the rights of the face that the fascist socialist defends himself; he calls for a form of government that guarantees these rights and for a life for the people that ensures the harmonious development of all facial qualities to the maximum extent possible. Finally, it is the desire to safeguard the defining role of the concept of the individual that leads him to advocate a role within society and the state that will enable him to establish harmony among all members of the "popular family" to which he belongs, in order to become its leader.

In France, perhaps more than elsewhere, one must bow to the individual's desire to preserve his "free will", to consider that "his life is his own", 'that his body is his own', to quote the famous words of a well-known philosopher. We are told that everyone has the right to make a masterpiece of corruption out of their life and that the flood can come afterwards. This attitude is the result of decades of systematic intellectual degradation carried out throughout the West by ethnic elements foreign to Europe. It is precisely against this that the fascist socialist fights most vigorously. How can it be permissible for anyone to voluntarily mutilate themselves and, above all, to mutilate their offspring? Is it not extraordinary that the law has the right to prosecute those who mutilate their fellow citizens, yet cannot appeal to the sense of dignity and responsibility of those who, through their inconsistency, mutilate their descendants and their own faces?

How can we not condemn or exclude those who lack the sense or dignity to prefer illness to health? Those who are unaware of the necessities of their position in all areas and act as if they have deliberately chosen illness and decadence. That is why the fascist socialist tries to force them to adopt a healthy outlook or demands their exclusion from the community.

In the eyes of the socialist fascist, fascism is therefore the means of saving a society and a people who are turning their backs on their true destiny and their ultimate goal. The party is nothing more than this: a select group that attempts to establish in its entirety the type of man who, traditionally, best represents the whole. This is why, once again, he acts as a propagandist not for the party itself, but for the new society that the party envisions. It does not act as an agent for a clique that seeks to vulgarly attain power, but as the champion of a new world established on its true foundations. The society it envisions is not only a vision of the future, but for every fascist socialist, a personal daily reality. The party itself is the blueprint for this. The new society and the new man are not for tomorrow or the distant future, but already exist today through the personal experience and the activity and organisation of the party.

The fascist socialist finds himself, not as the leader, the vulgar agitator who thrashes about on a stage, but above all as the one who defends the men of his race and his people one by one, for their honour and their sense of destiny. He is the one who, after this conquest and after having won their allegiance, leads them into the struggle for liberation and purification that is necessary for them.

The most important thing in our view on the path to this popular rebirth is not the method each person uses to lead others to a healthy conception of life and the world, but the way in which each person sets themselves as a model and example.

It is by demonstrating in practice what the man of our time can be, what he can become when he is healthy, that we can make everyone feel the difference between the opposing conceptions that exist today. In this case, words alone cannot transform or convince.

It is therefore by touching upon what the human type is that the socialist fascist will obtain the best practical results. We do not mean, of course, that he should be content to strive alone towards this type. In the complex society in which we live, amid widespread degeneration, he cannot come close enough to it himself. He must therefore, in addition, for the people of our nations, EMBODY and PERPETUATE the image, in a kind of GOLDEN LEGEND of the West. This "Dofée legend" is still to be written, but it is to BE HOPED that our work will inspire someone to undertake the TASK, GIVEN the wealth of documents that make it possible.

From the moment the faces of Rama, Ofphée, Plato, St Louis, Chafle-magne, appeared in the memory of the peoples, their characteristic features were forgotten, an important step was taken TOWARDS THEIR liberation. The DAY when everyone among our peoples realised that the struggle we are asking them to CONTINUE began at the dawn of time, they understood its true meaning. They felt THE WEIGHT of so many crusades waged FOR the protection of the white face.

Thus, the pafti of the face intends TO PRESENT to the people, not the most obscure theosophy of a dusty philosophy, but rather a gallery of faces whose gestures and deeds ultimately constitute, throughout the ages, the unique but moving and living image of the white man: the white man fighting FOR the survival of his face.

This fealty, becoming myth, gives rise to the law and doctrine to which each person's life can be vividly ATTACHED. Once again, it is not formal membership of a cultural, social or political organisation that is important, but each individual'S acceptance of the living model, THROUGH orientation TOWARDS the multiple ideal types of the face.

It is therefore certain that a particular form of organisation, a party, and a certain form of state are necessary for the formation of this new man in society, but it is good to KNOW that the achievement of the goal is always secondary.

Nietzsche wrote that everyone must construct their life as they wish it to be, according to him, lived for millennia. This image of THE great THINKER must BECOME a reality FOR the fascist socialist.

Because before him, hundreds of men built THEIR lives SO that THE VOICE COULD RISE as high as the millennia, each establishing his own life plan SO that, throughout the millennia, a new thought, a new sensation, a new emotion would be added to the facial capital and be eternally experienced BY all the descendants and heirs of his lineage. It is not THROUGH the persistence of a fixed organisational, social or political form; IT IS NOT THROUGH the "taboo" of a "theophany of knowledge" that he intends TO DEVELOP this ideal, but only THROUGH fidelity to a type whose DUTY it is to DEVELOP and PRESERVE wisdom and beauty. This is why the living formula proposed BY the fascist socialist is the antithesis of the coldly economic mathematical formula of the Marxist Semite. Far FROM IMPOSING a rigid and definitive framework on human development, he strives to DEVELOP its

scope of action and to THE BREEDER, assuming that the progressive evolution of millennials could ever LEAD to definitive perfection or a dead end. Marxism clings to a certain stage of development, UNABLE TO CONCEIVE of anything greater beyond the "communist" society that it sees AS the final point of all evolution. As if for twenty thousand years man had evolved solely with this communist end in mind! **T**he fascist socialist accepts that human progress passes THROUGH political upheavals and convulsions WITHOUT DETRACTING from his permanent loyalty to the model he has recognised AS his own. The certainty of the solidity and persistence of this type through the ages gives him the corresponding certainty that all social evolution is possible and desirable, that all progress and development are possible, in every sense, provided only that the existence of this type is guaranteed.

That the survival of the state then implies social obligations, and in particular a standard of living conducive to the full development of its members, is only the inevitable consequence of its position. That is why, being fascist, it was socialist. There was another reason for this. **H**is loyalty to the spiritual heritage of the great philosophers who punctuate the life of the state reinforced this, reminding him that they were all social reformers and that they always sought to improve the material and moral life of their peoples as much as possible.

Thus, fidelity to tradition is precisely what compels the naive socialist to be a revolutionary, to be a SCEPTIC, a socialist instead of a staunch CONSERVATIVE. It is this fidelity to tradition that compels him to WIELD the axe against what some falsely call tradition, but which is nothing more than a manifestation of senility and decadence.

What is killing and destroying our society today is not the lack of "traditions" or what we commonly refer to as such, but rather the excess of false traditions that are the empty forms of an anti-facelift and anti-social organisation. These are not social forms that have long since been perfected, nor is it the preservation of unjust privileges that weaken and diminish the state and the people that can ESTABLISH them in THEIR entirety. **T**he radical transformation of the current state of affairs plunges everyone into the very depths of true traditions.

The fascist socialist therefore defends the right to COFFEE, and that is what makes him a fascist. Firmly attached to the oldest foundation of our civilisation, he intends to build ON this foundation a society worthy of its inspirers, and this stems from his loyalty to the "inspirers" he claims to follow. Were they not, too, builders of empires, founders of doctrines, legislators? By defending this tradition, he obliges himself to CONTINUE and RENEW it; it too must be a FOUNDER of empires, a conqueror, a LEGISLATOR FOR its people, and this is the supreme form of loyalty to its cause.

We have seen above that, LIKE the fascist socialist, the pafti represents a pfemièfe selection that tends to ESTABLISH a SPECIFIC type of man in his entirety. It is therefore the party which, in its members, embodies the exemplary MODEL of this type FOR the present era and which is capable of RENEWING this type through the future evolution of society and white humanity.

It is therefore not only a group of men united AROUND a common cause, but also a group of men who are capable of renewing this type through the future evolution of society and white humanity.

A diatribe of social or political realisations, it is also the vehicle for a conception of life and humanity. An idea which, attached to the deepest traditions of European faces, is nevertheless entirely adapted to the current level of Western humanity.

Insofar as the party takes on the character of a group of men, it can only be that of men who realise within themselves and AMONG themselves a conception of the world, as well as a flexible political doctrine. In THEIR case, political doctrine derives solely from THEIR conception of the world. Once this conception has been specified, a fairly great flexibility in the means of realisation is always possible, since the ground ON which the party and its doctrine stand is firmly established. It is therefore this fact that specifies the broadest limits of individual freedom and the organisational discipline indispensable to any social, political or other struggle.

It goes without saying that this flexibility makes it a moral obligation FOR anyone who recognises the validity of the theological principles we defend TO ADOPT this way of THINKING and living. This flexibility obliges anyone who wants TO SERVE their country and their people to join the party, and it is impossible TO IMAGINE any action in line with our principles without establishing a link between it and the party. The idea of unity in the nation and in socialism naturally leads to the idea of union in the organisation that sets out its principles and is its active body.

The affirmation and determination of the fascist socialist is primarily ideological and principled; it is therefore individual. His activity, even when conceived as tending towards unity, must BE DIRECTED towards the unified whole of the struggle. The fascist socialist idea can appear, and normally does appear, outside the party in the mind of the individual. It can only MANIFEST ITSELF in the unity of the party, which alone is capable of GIVING life to this idea. Outside the party, there can be no militants!

The party is not, as it tends to be among Marxists, an "international party". Rather, it develops within the framework of a given cultural unity. It is not the current geographical boundaries of a state that can DETERMINE its boundaries, but the facial and cultural characteristics of each European group. The unity of language, immediate traditions and education, even in the absence of any current governmental unity, must alone ESTABLISH the characteristics of the development of the pafiti. Thus, as far as France is concerned, all those who think like socialist fascists, speak French, belong to the constituent social strata of the French people and preserve its essential traditions are CONSIDERED French.

The pafiti, a national manifestation of the face, cannot ACCEPT the historical constraints imposed on it by outdated treaties or governments that are alien to the people and the face.

It is not an artificial creation driven by speculative interests, but rather responds to the need of a people to REAFFIRM their unity and PARTICIPATE in the struggle for their future in general, by providing them with the most conscious support possible.

Historically, we are faced with the PECULIAR fact that the white races, spreading throughout Western Europe, HAVE been led by climatic, military, social, political and other necessities to DEVELOP different national cultures within their own forms, although they obey common general constants. Each party must therefore ACCEPT this state of affairs. But where, despite the artificially created differences, it sees

a single people, it declares itself to be its sole representative.

The pafiti is not only a means FOR a people to MAINTAIN their unity, it is also a means FOR them to DEMONSTRATE their unity. Since it is faced with a de facto division that it cannot OVERCOME, it at least tends to MITIGATE its effects THROUGH permanent contact between pafiti and pafiti within the framework of the face. It strives to HELP bring about a federation of peoples of the same race who have discovered the meaning of their destiny and the political organisation that corresponds to their national character.

The party is an outpouring of the people, but it is also an outpouring of the face, and it is not possible for the fascist socialist to KEEP his party separate from neighbouring parties that are facially similar. If he does not accept any subjugation of his people to a FOREIGN people, even if that people is of the same face, he is always ready to STUDY the best means of PROTECTING the fundamental interests of the entire face THROUGH consistent struggle. If we were to imagine a picture of this development, we would say that the white faces are found in Europe, like the apple tree that has grown its branches in different directions. The branches can no longer be confused, but they are all attached to the common trunk, so the different peoples and socialist fascist parties that represent them must FEEL the need to DRAW THEIR nourishment from the common trunk, without necessarily becoming confused.

It will no doubt be objected that there is no or little (in some countries there is no longer any) socialist fascist party and that it is difficult to SUPPORT this position of unity beyond the people themselves. We respond that the history of socialism is full of similar examples, where many national groups were banned or dissolved, without this diminishing the desire of the groups that remained free TO establish contacts. The fact that these contacts most often tended to form an "International", i.e. an international party devoid of any living traditional content, does not alter the reality of the situation. Contacts were always established at some point, and the coherent development of these "socialist organisations" was once again possible.

Why is this happening to our movement, when means of COMMUNICATION are improving from country to country, especially since the war has shown how easy and desirable it is to have contact between individuals and between organisations throughout the West?

It is futile to THINK that we cannot strive for this organisation ON a facial basis when we see that in our own country, groups have formed that are mutually ignorant of each other, yet with a similar basis and goals, before UNITING. What was possible within our national borders is equally possible within our regional borders. All we need to do is ESTABLISH 'diplomatic' relations between different parties and SET UP permanent representations between them.

We have defined what the pafiti is as a whole, but it is worth CONSIDERING what the pafiti should be FOR the committed fascist socialist. Since the goal of the party is to CREATE the personal, political and social conditions necessary to safeguard the people and the nation, it must USE all means necessary to achieve this goal. It must PROVIDE its adherents with everything that is desirable in social and political life. The pafiti must BRING together all the social, welfare, trade union and youth organisations that are essential to its

development and the development of its members. At the same time, it must PROVIDE the necessary resources to these different organisations and ensure that training courses and seminars give not only future leaders, but all members, the means to GUIDE themselves in THEIR struggle and then to GUIDE the people of THEIR nation.

But he must also CREATE an "atmosphere" AROUND the activist so that he never feels isolated and, in moments of fatigue, can always FIND relaxation and advice from his leaders.

It must ORGANISE premises where the aspirations of all members can flourish freely and where an atmosphere of struggle and solidarity can be created. The permanence of the party must be a true CENTRE of political and social culture, as well as the necessary basis for any real action. We say that it must be a welcoming place FOR all members, and this is obviously the case, SINCE the members of the party are the lifeblood of the party, but it must also, as far as possible and increasingly, be a welcoming place FOR the members of our people. It must be a place where everyone can increasingly FIND the advice, support and protection they need in all circumstances. A parish group that does not strive to be present wherever the people may need its presence and its help undermines the very foundation of its mission to be at the service of the people and the Church and to be its soul and its means.

In this sense, every socialist fascist must FEEL and understand that everything he does is still insignificant as long as he has not achieved the unity of his people and conquered their hearts. Even then, his task remains limitless IN ORDER to deepen the conquest of the people and their hearts.

Finally, beyond unity and permanence, in the field of propaganda in his own environment, there is a place where the fascist socialist must DEMONSTRATE his adherence to a particular conception of life and the world: it is his own HOME. Perhaps this requirement seems excessive to some, and yet is it not there that the fascist socialist, despite everything, most often finds himself and where he is called upon to truly defend and CONTINUE the people and the cause? Is it not his duty, then, to give his people FOYEF a sense of the destiny that is his, that of his party and his people? — He could easily, WITH a simple gesture, WITH a little effort, give all the members of his FOYEF the elements of reflection necessary for a healthy position. Could he not, FOR example, at the beginning of the evening when everyone is gathered together, quote a passage from a theologian of our beliefs, COMMENTING ON it simply if necessary? Even without commentary, such a repetition of ideas that are ours should make those around him REFLECT and MEDITATE, LEADING them to a positive attitude.

What the people ask of the popular activist, IN order to become aware of the necessities of their struggle, is not so much to be a "leader" as to be an ADVISOR and guide who enables them to understand the major political and social issues for themselves. They do not ask them to be the chosen one, but rather THE EDUCATOR who will help them to LIBERATE themselves. In the history of the great figures of our time, activists must therefore FOCUS much more ON the principles and inspirations that have moved them than on the actions that have defined THEIR existence. In this way, at every moment, beyond the gesture and beyond the act, he can FEEL the profound motive that came from within. Consequently, it is less history that needs TO BE TAUGHT than the explanation of history, so that by becoming accustomed to it,

BY ANALYSING past events in terms of certain principles, he can also ANALYSE present events in terms of the same principles. What the socialist fascist seeks in the history of the great figures of the West is the history of the development of a principle or set of principles, not just that of individuals. There is no doubt that it is useful to keep this tradition alive by highlighting its successive achievements, but this must be a means and not an end: beyond man and above him, the Race and its ideal type! Any other method would lead to a form of action that is completely meaningless and too superficial for an active militant. Our concern in this regard is to strive for quality before quantity, both in the party and among the people. We would be inconsistent if, in wanting a hierarchy, we did not demand a methodical selection of our OWN.



## THE RACIST AND FREEDOM



Socialists have long been criticised FOR THEIR anarchism, THEIR disorganisation, THEIR impotence, and it seems that in this regard, only the large organisations of Semitic Marxist socialism have been taken into account. In its inability to ATTACH itself to a popular and visible tradition, it sought to destroy everything and rejected as pessimistic any notion that did not come from its own method. Moreover, having no past to CONTINUE, it found itself unable to GIVE THE FUTURE any content other than economic. From the day when the conservative socialist retains all his social demands but knows how TO ATTACH himself to the living tradition of his people, it is no longer possible to OPPOSE him with this objection. Ceasing to REBEL, he submits entirely to the notion of organisation that a consistent analysis of the traditional forms of his culture indicates to him as the most appropriate. He discovers that the concepts he considered original ON the social level are in fact simply customary in his community and that they were applied whenever a defensive action by the community led it to become more clearly aware of its destiny.

By socially accepting this facial discipline, he also accepts it morally and modifies his way of being accordingly. Accepting historical materialism as a method of analysis and investigation, this very method, which STANDS ON its own two feet, provides him with the opportunity to morally CREATE an extremely feminine absolute ideal. This synthesis resolves FOR him what until NOW had been difficult to reconcile: a feeling that ideally drew him towards his people and a theosophy that opposed all ideals.

Finally, those who BELIEVED IN the myth of the division of a single people into antagonistic and irreconcilable classes realise that, although this division does exist AT times, it is not permanent or inevitable. The establishment of a collective consciousness in a united people must, thanks to the existence of a soft party and a soft government, resolve as best it can what is, at most, a conflict of interests within the same family.

Finally, and this is the real problem, it seemed to him that by abandoning his "maxist" attitude, he was renouncing a certain "freedom". He notes that, in fact, freedom is the right OF everyone to fully REALISE their natural abilities and gifts. The only freedom possible is one in which everyone, by fulfilling all their duties towards others, thereby gains a range of possibilities that no other system can GUARANTEE. Ultimately, it suffices to NOTE that freedom is only a sum of duties and not the assertion of a series of rights. The fulfilment of duties creates rights, while the assertion of rights creates only irresponsibility and anarchy.

Naturally, the conditions in which modern socialism was born INFLUENCED the individual attitude of socialists and often made them both rebellious and revolutionary; sometimes rebellious and timid at the same time. This is because the Revolution inspired by

Jewish faction of 1789, at the same time as it allowed Semites to take control of the country's political levers, the bourgeois revolution inspired by Freemasonry took place in other European countries at other times but under similar conditions, prohibiting them from UNITING and ASSOCIATING with all working classes of the people. AS a result, socialist and trade union organisations were immediately declared illegal and persecuted. This accumulation of countless sufferings and difficulties could only GIVE the revolutionary socialist an anarchic attitude. At the same time, his organisation often took forms appropriate to this state of affairs and not to socialism and the union of all strata of the people around a common social programme. The result was that, from the outset, socialists were more "contrary" to the existing order than constructive in their mentality. It was only gradually that they adopted a constructive attitude. In countries where socialism has not been persecuted, it has taken on a different face (England, the United States, Germany), which amply demonstrates this assertion. However, what we noted above about his ignorance of the facts made him incapable of ACHIEVING unity among the people or even of ESTABLISHING a feasible social and political programme. This ignorance is due to the fact that the Jews very quickly took over socialism and claimed a monopoly and defection over it. This masked the reality that the people were divided and oppressed BY the Jewish-controlled Bank and the State, in which the Jews held sway. The notion was propagated that "capital" as a whole was solely responsible for this state of affairs, whereas in reality it was Jewish methods, or methods imposed BY Jews, that were at the root of this "class division". The fact that the inevitable selfishness of some non-Jews allowed this EFFECT to develop more rapidly and perpetuate itself does not ALTER the fact that non-Jewish capitalists often strive to ALLEVIATE flagrant inequalities. In the confusion and with a confidence that can only be explained by THEIR social position, they attempted TO ARTICULATE social theories (paternalism or otherwise). Thus, whatever THEIR position—capitalists or proletarians—non-Jews raised and attempted to solve the social problem, while Jewish internationalists tried to oppose any viable solution that did not put them in POWER and guarantee THEIR exploitation OF the people. It is therefore perfectly understandable that the socialist caught between these different tendencies had a disorganised position.

It was only the fascist socialists who were able to resolve these contradictions and oppositions by indicating the principle of unity and development of a socialist theory, emphasising the fundamental importance of faith in the destiny of peoples and in the birth of their social, political and governmental theories.

Ignorance of this fundamental law had led to rebellion, denial, and anarchy in theologies and socialist movements. The discovery and acceptance of this law must ESTABLISH unity. True socialists have always sought unity, without DISCOVERING the means to achieve it. Their conscience was always torn between the thirst for unity they desired FOR their organisation and their people, and the anti-unifying obligations of a theory that was foreign TO THEM. Fascist socialism resolved the question of unity in a completely responsible and coherent manner, along with that of the acceptance of socialist norms, not BY a "class" but BY all classes of the people: workers, peasants, intellectuals. It placed all its VALUE on the notion of autonomy and hierarchy, which had become alien to socialism, despite its counterfeit protests. If the living forces of a people are united ON the principle of a unified social organisation, it goes without saying that the hierarchy of values follows from this. THE contradiction lies in Semitic socialism, which had to, IN ORDER TO

MAINTAINING the "dictatorship of the proletariat" and appealing to "enemies of the ruling class" is futile. Socialism belongs to everyone, everyone has a place in it, and everyone is in their rightful place. If family quarrels still broke out from time to time, the party and the state, as representatives of the people and the face of the people, saved the peace and APPEASED the quarrellers.

The law is therefore, FOR the socialist fascist, neither the result of a political upheaval provoked by a clique in POWER, nor the manifestation of the interests of a class, but the legitimate and permanent rule, inspired BY the supreme interests of the people and the nation, FOR the defence, protection and development of the people and the nation. The authority THAT he accepts as a moral law, which he obeys spontaneously in the conduct of his personal life, he finds in the spirit of the laws of the State. Far from being a law that is respected only BY the "FEAR of the police", it is a rule willingly accepted "because there can be no better" FOR himself and his people in their particular state of development. Thus are created the conditions for the most complete freedom possible in social life, as well as the most freely accepted discipline FOR the common good.

The fascist socialist rejoices at SEEING this unity of discipline and freedom so easily achieved and fully EMBRACES his individual responsibility in choosing and adhering to it. In contrast, Semitic socialism increasingly tends to IMPOSE a stifling orthodoxy, the definitive manifestation of which can be seen in the USSR. Thus, at the same time as a GUIDING principle, a point of reference is permanently given to him: the face. He sees ENOUGH for his personal development and the activity of his spirit, an independence he had ceased TO HOPE FOR. Finally, he rediscovers his professional spontaneity by diving into the lively sources of the genius of his face, from which he had been cut off for so long. There is no longer any opposition FOR him between the activity of the community as a whole and his own, since they now draw from the same source.

In any case, the application of the law, whether personal or collective, ceases to be the observance imposed BY the police authority of lifeless rules. It becomes a permanent contact between the citizen and his people and his faith, just as in another era when law and faith could be confused, the man of the Middle Ages saw no essential difference between the rule of the state and that of the Church, between the rule of the Church and his own conception of life. Christianity was at that time entirely adapted to the face. FOR a time, it had been able to UNITE all strata of the people around a common ideal and goal and ACHIEVE a form of popular unity for which many still feel nostalgia today.

HAVING failed to clearly see the importance of the face and its unity, which it has often professed, the Church has allowed this organisation, this conception and this attitude TO BE FORGOTTEN. The time for a revival in the temporal sphere therefore seems to have come. The mission it was unable to FULFIL, fascist socialism will lead it to its end.



## RACISM AND MORALITY



We have said elsewhere that it is not IN moments, but constantly, that the socialist fascist remains faithful to his ideal and his conception of the world. His entire life is conditioned BY an attitude of contempt for the people and for the state, as a result of his belonging to a particular class.

This attitude cannot be sufficiently emphasised in participation in a meeting, but insofar as his awareness of the reality of the situation awakens in him a sense of pride and deep faith, it becomes a constant attitude. It shapes his life at all times.

When, as a member of a party, he finds himself in everyday life, when he COMES into contact with a mass of people who are not yet aware of the truth that inspires and uplifts him, he does not think, as a member of another party might, that his work is done. He does not assume that he can live "like everyone else" and GO unnoticed. On the contrary, his work begins at that moment. He has grasped new arguments, and his contact with his party and his comrades has infused him with new COURAGE. He will DEVOTE HIMSELF more wholeheartedly to serving his people.

The fascist takes pride in his personal life in MAINTAINING and always ELEVating this dignity, this nobility that is his own. In collective life, at the same time, he RESPECTS this dignity, this nobility, this 'honour' in himself first, and then in his people. He urges his compatriots to be keenly aware of this. **The** dignity of the face is a permanent reality, not an assertion of unity, and there can BE no eclipse in its manifestations.

He who belongs to a civilisation of civilised people, conquerors and legislators can only ever ACT as a CIVILISED PERSON and a conqueror, and not as a servile subject!

**The** fascist completely excludes from his thinking and his conception the notion of a party made up of "honourable members", content with HAVING a card in their pocket and PAYING a membership fee, without membership committing them to anything other than this symbolic or purely material effort.

Pouf, the labourer who gave his total support and profoundly changed his way of life, becoming aware of his dignity, is more noble and closer to the healthy loyalty of the people than the son of a wealthy family who is content with mere formal support. There is only one criterion: one is either worthy of one's face and one's people, or one is not, and social origin has nothing to do with it!

There is only one field of action open to all, allowing each person to MANIFEST their true "nobility": **the** people, with all their demands, their needs, and their liberation.

that he is waiting for. Thus, wherever he may be, at school, in the factory, in the fields, at the buffalo, whether he is A DEFECTOR or a simple labourer, he must HAVE only one goal, must know only one ideal: TO SERVE his country and his people, TO WORK for their advancement, their liberation, and the realisation of their dignity and destiny. We do not deny that certain social positions prevent some people, FOR a time, from GIVING their all, but what we want TO EMPHASISE above all is that no position can EXCUSE indifference or LUKEWARMNESS. There is always a way to CONTRIBUTE "to the maximum" to the emancipation of the people and the nation, to the development of the party.

There is no area that can escape determination BY appearances, and anyone who does not act in accordance with the law of appearances has betrayed the interests of their own people and their own destiny.

Let no one think that a task is beneath his destiny if that task is in the service of the people and of the face. The most humble activity today is perhaps the one that has the greatest consequences, bringing one more man to the path. Who knows if this man will not be the one who liberates the people and the face?

Thus, this position is totalitarian, unifying, and defines all acts of the fascist's life, and particularly his obligations towards the party, which he voluntarily declares to be unlimited.

But since this adherence permeates all areas, is there therefore a socialist-fascist movement? Yes, and that is what we keep REPEATING. The family is not an artificial creation of maniacal minds, but has its roots in the observations of all men who live in society. First the primitive family, then the tribe and the clan, and finally the city, EACH had ITS own morality, which was always grouped AROUND the same set of principles that remained constant throughout the history of that society. Just as cannibalism and human sacrifice belong to Asian and African cultures, so too do the fear of human sacrifice and respect for the body belong to white cultures: was not Rama himself murdered BY the black priests because of his fear of human sacrifice? The concern to obey the imperative of the race leads the fascist socialist to REJECT on every occasion certain attitudes, certain ways of life, as contrary to tradition and even more so to the health of the race. Alongside the depravity and debauchery so eagerly propagated by foreign faces in Europe and those who have been corrupted BY contact WITH THEM, the fascist adopts all the imperatives of the traditional morality of our face. It is characteristic, moreover, that notions of dress were essentially the same among the Greeks and Romans in their heyday, among the Germans and in all Western societies. AS a result, the essential moral concepts are easy to understand and REMEMBER, and the concept of "sin" is not unknown to him! "Sin" includes everything that intellectually, morally, or physically can harm the development, health, or dignity of the face.

He therefore obeyed this traditional moral law, not because it was imposed on him BY some metaphysical system, but because in his mind he knew at every moment that behaving differently would CAUSE harm to others and to himself. This was not a discipline imposed from OUTSIDE, but rather the constant awareness of a necessity that could not be ignored without TARNISHING his reputation AND undermining his dignity. He also rejected all formal hypocrisy, AS judgement did not come from OUTSIDE but from his own assessment. No one could

He does not demand accountability or need to DEMAND it, for he knows THAT ACTING in accordance with the principles of the facial tradition is contrary to his own dignity. His own judgement should BE sufficient for him to refrain from MISTREATING himself as a result of an action that is unworthy of the face or harmful to its development. The judgement of the past or the people will only intervene afterwards.

Only constant intellectual contact with the spirit of one's people and one's face allows everyone to adopt this attitude without effort. It is clear that Semitic Marxist socialism, by making man a single economic unit, could not respond to these questions as we do. A class deprived of its popular and facial support, denying all previous tradition, rejecting all historical heritage except economic, could not HAVE at its disposal any moral rules or even any moral concepts.

Only the fascist, seeing in the current "class divisions" a temporary accident that cannot PREVENT him, while at the same time REMAINING linked to THE DESTINY of his face and his people, has also overcome this contradiction and weakness; He has done so by attaching himself beyond the centuries and through them to all the spiritual and philosophical sources of the nation. This is what makes the fascist's moral conception popular and accessible to all, its unifying character, since anyone can identify with it, regardless of their degree of religiosity. This is also what allows fascism to accept all religious practices as long as they do not deviate from THEIR spiritual and moral framework, that is, as long as they do not harm the harmonious development of the people and the world.

Thus, unlike other political parties, the Pafiti rejects both moral neutrality and religious affiliation. While some proclaim THEIR absolute atheism or materialism, others declare themselves attached to Catholicism or simply "indifferent," considering morality to be a private matter, the fascist socialist party, on THE CONTRARY, WITH its unified conception of the world, does not remain neutral on this issue and resolves it, but cannot ALIGN itself with any of the European confessions since its only claim is "contact" with the spirit of the face.

It is highly probable, however, that its moral conception is at odds with all Asian and Semitic religions based on resignation, fatalism and passivity. Our morality is one of struggle, our morality is one of conquest, our morality is one of defending our honour. We do not say, parodying Lenin's phrase, "everything that is the face is moral," even though this conception may be close to ours, but we say: "everything that affirms man and helps him to REALISE himself completely is moral; that helps him to SURPASS himself SO that he can CREATE new values and concepts." Thus, by surpassing himself, by creating new values and concepts FOR himself, man also creates them FOR his party, FOR his people and FOR his face. Only those who have not created anything hide their WORK, but those who create throw what they have created INTO the public arena. Those who create detach themselves from their creation IN ORDER TO SURPASS it, TO GO BEYOND it and TO CREATE something else beyond their creation. As soon AS it can be IN the public eye, he goes to his new work and to a new achievement. This is the man that the pafiti demands, and this is the man he intends to HELP CREATE. Let the weak and the pafitans of the pale-faced detach themselves from us, FOR our mofale is not THEIRS! Let the supporters of levelling also turn away FROM US, for our pride is not THEIRS! Let the modest flee, for our pride makes them PERFECT!



A PARTY AND  
ITS PROGRAMME



Only those who have decided to put all their strength at the service of THEIR people will be victorious and reap the rewards of victory!

However, there are many ways to CONSIDER a fogamme, and each party, in presenting its own, has demonstrated that its conception differs in terms of its purpose and even its origin! However, all the major parties have this in common: THEIR programme is motivated BY immediate desires that they set themselves the task of satisfying as quickly as possible, regardless of the final outcome of its implementation. They do not have in mind the profound and long-term interests of the people and the common man in a given development; even less do they have in mind the realisation of a conception of the world that successively creates a SPECIFIC type of man and a society adapted to the life and development of this SPECIFIC type of man. So while we can say that there was a Greek type of man, and further still an Athenian type and a Spartan type; a Roman type of man; even a type of man from the Middle Ages; if we were now TO TRY TO IMAGINE the type of man of today, hybrid and unfinished, we would immediately fail.

Our philosophy differs in this respect; we want to express, through our philosophy and above all through it, a philosophical theology, a scientifically based conception of the world that is capable of "raising" a PARTICULAR type of man. We then, based ON the need we find ourselves in to 'elevate' this type of man, MUST CREATE a programme that responds to this need and satisfies it. A political programme, no doubt, but one that does not only decide on immediate implementation. It must be a government programme with a long-term and specific vision, taking into account the constants of truly healthy human development; one that comprehends from the outset the historical causes of the decline or GREATNESS of empires and peoples.

From there, it is only a short step to ANALYSING the current situation in a new way. We can deduce a certain number of necessities that we recognise as vital FOR the development and very survival of our own people, our community, and the group of communities to which we belong.

This alone has caused the "distant" or permanent decline of our family's fortunes. That is why he asserts that without a long-term policy SPANNING several generations, the decline in which we find ourselves will only worsen. That is why he asserts that if we fail TO APPLY the measures we recommend, our people and the group to which he belongs are doomed to more or less rapid extinction under an invasion of men of COLOUR.

This is what the PFOGFAMME must now STRIVE for. This is why it demands total dedication from each of its members. FOR those who join, it is no longer A QUESTION of petty political agitation or personal interest, but rather

The usual pfogfammes! It is UP to each person TO TAKE RESPONSIBILITY for the future of their face and their people. AS a result, and from the outset, each person must FEEL how much they carry within them the heritage of an entire line of men of their blood; Each must FEEL the weight of this heritage and UNDERSTAND the permanent importance of his role. By committing himself with all the faith he can MUSTER in his face and in himself, he must UNDERSTAND and WEIGH the distant resonance of his gesture.

Let us not be mistaken! While the ideological basis of our programme is permanent, we never deny that the political programme that derives from it, however distant its views may be, is, like any political programme, merely the expression of the necessities and duties of a given historical moment. While it represents the current imperatives of a struggle FOR Soil and Blood, FOR Race and the harmonious development of each of its members, it is still only a transition in the context of complete human development.

It is therefore possible that events, by changing the historical situation, may lead to the readjustment of some of its points. This should not CHANGE the fundamental conception of the world, which is the ideological premise of the programme. We know that the world is always "in the process of becoming," that IN ORDER to remain accurate, every philosophy and every human group must also constantly CHANGE, but we know that this is not feasible without the momentary establishment of a law accepted as valid FOR a given historical period. THE EFFECT is achieved in a pfogfamme, either by GIVING it a definitive VALUE or, on the contrary, by DENYING IT in the name of some unknown historical "dialectic" the necessity of its provisional establishment. BY definition, a programme must REPRESENT both the struggle of one or more generations FOR THEIR development and a permanent commitment TO the continuation of that struggle.

That is why, as it stands, this pfogfamme, which we believe still exists among us, is the only one that takes the biological data of human DEVELOPMENT and applies it to our people. It is the key TO its survival in the decades to COME.

Let everyone feel and know this! Let everyone strive to convince the people of their nation of the necessity of its practical realisation. This work WILL BE OBSCURE and patient before it is brilliant and crowned with success, but the feeling of fighting FOR the destiny of one's race will sustain everyone in their work of renovation. We see a new Man in a new country and a new world!

A new type of person calls for a new type of party and therefore, within the party itself, a different kind of person, a different kind of activist from what political parties usually require.

Maxism asserts that the political party, whatever it may be, is the EXTERNAL means of action of a specific social class, its HEADQUARTERS. In the Marxist definition of the party, there is an a priori existence of the social class, which gives rise, out of necessity, to a particular organisation that defines and directs the struggle and expresses its means. Consequently, neither Man, who creates the Idea, nor the Idea that comes from Man, are, in the eyes of Marxism, at the origin of the party and its programme, but rather the material interests of a class, giving rise to the need for a theory, which appears as a natural secretion of that class and creates the party.

However, Mafxism, ACCORDING to Mafx's own definition, contradicts his own definition: In order TO GIVE rise to a

"pfolétafian" theofie, the class would have had to exist as such, and then, through trial and error, it would have created, THROUGH its "pfolétafian" theoficians, i.e. men from the class concerned, a particular theofie that would have conditioned its struggle.

OF Mafx himself declares that Mafxism is a "bourgeois theofy" at the service of the proletariat. So here we have a class that has no theofy to promote its "emancipation" and, moreover, a class that itself creates the theofy destined to destroy it. I see some of you nodding! Did not Marx and the Marxists explain that each class, through its internal contradictions, creates the very conditions for its own downfall? — Hold on! Let's not play WITH words! The Marxists were simply POINTING out that by creating, FOR example, an ever-growing "proletariat" and increasingly centralising capital, bourgeois society was *unwittingly* organising the class struggle and the material conditions for its own downfall THROUGH an ever-deepening economic and social imbalance. This in no way implies that it must at the same time PROVIDE theorists for its opponents!

— I would add that, moreover, Marxist theology seemed, until then, to be able to PROVE the accuracy of its demonstration: it indicated, in particular, that the nascent bourgeoisie had created its own theologians (the encyclopaedists) TO DEFEND feudalism, and so on. Why does this "truth" not APPLY TO the proletariat? Quite simply because it was only an apparent truth: in all cases, it was "intellectuals" who created political theologies, not members of a particular class. At most, once expressed, the theory became a weapon in the hands of the leaders (still intellectuals) of a particular social class! Marxism, there as elsewhere, crushed or crushed the people who wanted to be crushed by it. In reality, the Idea always precedes the group, and Marx, trapped in his own contradiction, had to STUDY IT. We therefore affirm that there is, in Marxism as elsewhere, a particular theofy that existed and was at the origin of a group of men. It turns out that this group was probably formed in a certain social milieu, but this milieu was not always the same throughout the ages, and this further proves the validity of our point of view, which is not new either on this subject.

We therefore rely ON the most COMMON form of intellectual and ideological creation. We feel more comfortable with it! Marxism is a "bourgeois theofy", yes, like all theofies, BECAUSE they come only from those who have the material means TO STUDY and therefore are the only ones who have the freedom to develop a theofy. But bourgeois theology, we say, is the theology of the Jewish bourgeoisie, which is different. If all theofies emanate FROM the essence of a particular social class, always the same in all societies, the wealthy class, at least, theofies reflect the spirit and needs of a large minority in terms of norms and following the facial features of a particular civilisation. Jewish theologians can only CONCEIVE OF a Jewish theology, whatever form it may take. Non-Jewish theologians always conceive of a different one, that of some always being unassimilable and unacceptable TO others. It is therefore not surprising that only those who were least able TO defend themselves against the sophisms of a Jewish theology, the open-minded, allowed themselves to be taken in by it!

In any case, and this is what we wanted to emphasise: although the pub sometimes becomes a meeting place for people from a certain social class, this was not its original purpose! It is a meeting place for people who share a common or similar understanding of the world.

a common doctrine and philosophy. TO implement this Idea, TO realise this theory, they created an organisation and a form, the party. There is never a particular social category to BE CALLED a party. Only ideological and social content subsequently determines which particular social class will FORM the party. That is the truth FOR us!

Expression of different conceptions of a face, political theories are more or less adapted to the development of this face, and some are even harmful to it by weakening it. THE factor that is, FOR us, A subjective FACTOR in the struggle between aspects is the "means" of an ideology and a theory that are more or less favourable to this aspect, and certain factors that are harmful to the harmonious development of the aspect must be REMOVED or erased from its life!

This is what we believe, and we also believe that only the party that is SKILLED in all aspects of politics should DEVELOP: that only that party should ultimately TRIUMPH, LEST the people and the party itself FALL into decline and disappear.

That is why, as far as possible, the path we define must be the expression and EMBODIMENT of a worldview and philosophy that are eminently suited to the development and fulfilment of the qualities inherent in our people and the group of faces that constitute it! Just as Marxist parties are the expression of a Jewish worldview suited to the development and domination of Jews OVER the world, so too is our party the representative of the forces of our face and of the particular conceptions of the peoples who have occupied the West since its inception and have gradually given the WHOLE world notions of high culture and civilisation.

THE path, being the means of realising a living theory of the world and of Man, is no longer the satisfaction of appetites that associate as long as hunger lasts, but the union of human beings who have created within themselves and FOR themselves an image of society and the world according to which they want to "raise" and bring to life a human being of a particular kind, whose type they define, whom they create and whom they represent.

Theocentric design, difont ceftains. Undoubtedly, but we are only defending and developing our position in response to the method adopted by Marx and his followers TO defend and develop THEIRS and to undermine ours.

However, there is a fundamental difference between THEIR approach and ours. They claim, but without this being anything more than propaganda, that THEIR modification of the world's economic structure will give rise to a "new man". This was, in fact, one of the slogans of Soviet agitation. The fact that Man is, in their eyes, nothing more than an economic abstraction prevents them from TREATING him as such and DENYING him the possibilities of his full development. On the contrary, in our view, AS a result of the awareness of his origins, his face, his traditions, and the constants of his development, THROUGH the adoption of a new faith in some form, man changes his own life, his own behaviour, and thereby must CHANGE the society around him and TRANSFORM the world. The promises range from collective economic manipulation to the promise of an evolution in human nature; we are moving from individual physical and moral freedom to collective social change.

We have spoken of new faith! Indeed, we are also absolutely opposed to the notion that the existence of a "leader" is a prerequisite for the existence of any movement and for any political, moral, and social development. It is possible, probable and desirable that one or more leaders should become the champions and representatives of the Idea, of the new faith, but we do not consider THEIR existence to be a prerequisite for the birth of the movement. Each person must, within themselves, FEEL and FIND the essence of the Idea that we defend, the instinct of their Race. **The** fatal FLAW of movements similar to ours in the past has been to WANT TO DESIGNATE or follow a leader from the outset and then to STOP SEEING where he was going, to STOP THINKING for themselves!

**The** condition for participating in the movement is to understand and accept its purpose and form and TO BECOME, individually, its apostle and missionary.

We have chosen to adopt the organisational form, with a few modifications, of the communist parties. We did not want TO formally OPPOSE cell to cell, but we wanted to encourage everyone to STUDY individually and DEVELOP their personal initiative.

What the communists obscurely desired: "activists" individually capable of ENGAGING in political and social struggle, we strongly affirm the necessity of. Thus, each person becomes, separately, a man who lives according to a particular faith and subordinates everything to that faith. From THE DAY when only five men are united in a cell, there is no longer blind adherence to the collective enthusiasm of a crowd, but rather discussion and profound adherence THROUGH study.

Thus, little by little, each person became more AWARE of what they wanted and how they wanted it. They felt that the Idea also rested ON them, and feeling more deeply responsible for the past, they consciously became its representatives and apostles.

The pafiti, like an "ofdf", has its "initiation", which is the conscious adherence to its way of SEEING THINGS. After this "initiation", this adherence, there is no longer any possible separation or abandonment: the Idea adheres to Man as much as Man adheres to the Idea! That a leader then represents the defection and personification of the idea is of almost secondary IMPORTANCE. Each individual, in isolation, must "be the Pafiti" just as each believer alone must be "the Church".

It is certain that entering into such a "bond" is neither easy nor absolutely free. It is certain that only those who are physically and personally capable of doing so can ENTER INTO it. How could someone FOREIGN to the Race ADOPT such a conception of life and community? How could they even IMAGINE IT? It is simply foreign to them. How could the sceptical, the indifferent, the PLEASURE-SEEKERS FIND THEIR place there and satisfy their needs?

**The** definition is therefore as follows: **the** party is an organisation serving an idea, its members are the servants of this organisation and this idea. Each of its members, even alone, must BE ABLE to WORK to SPREAD this faith, everywhere and at all times. They are therefore men who do not have to follow blindly, but on the contrary, who have to "serve" willingly.

They no longer have to REAP the fruits of the political efforts of a few leaders or

Some activists have to fight and CONQUER themselves. They no longer know the sweet PLEASURE of "harvesting"; they know the profound joy and pain of those who labour and sow. It is no longer enough FOR THEM to WEIGH WITH satisfaction the swollen ear and the grain it yields; THEY must BREAK UP the soil and SOW seeds that they may not harvest. THEY must PERFORM this act of faith, which consists of SOWING seeds whose value they know, without KNOWING whether they will sprout, but with the gratuitous and blind certainty in THEIR HEARTS that they will produce a harvest. This is the kind of person we want TO FIND in this new parish!

A PERSONAL RENAISSANCE  
AND THE PARTY



Even though we may say that we need TO TAKE from our people the leaven of a new man, THE AFFIRMATION and OUTLINE of a new man is not enough for any purpose. FOR a new man, and FOR a new party, we also need words that carry weight and have never been associated with the idea of a party and the image we commonly have of it. — A new man. New actions! Each of you, comrades, known and unknown, members of our people and of our party, must HOLD in YOUR HEARTS THE profound LOVE of your party, not FOR what it is, perhaps not even FOR what it will be, but FOR what it must be and for what it holds within it, sap and blood, promise and certainty. LOVE for the Party must be like an act of faith in the idea that the Party REPRESENTS, and not a superficial attachment to its external form or its leaders! The idea that the Party embodies must be to each of its members like the blind and even gratuitous trust that a fiancé has in his fiancée. Deep in the HEART and in each of its gestures. If these words seem new to our minds as they apply to a political party, it is because that party must POSSESS within itself, not the electoral promise of a hunger that is being whetted, but the life and blood, the force and THE FUTURE of a race and a world!

When each of you gets up in the morning, ask yourselves: "What am I going to do today FOR the Idea and FOR the Past?" With each action you take during THE DAY, you must tell yourselves that this action also imposes itself on the Past and will SERVE or HARM the Idea. Let each action be weighed throughout the DAY and let it be mature. Let it be nothing less than a new act of faith in the Race and the Blood, in the Soil and in the Past. We are members of our Past twenty-four hours A DAY, and even as we drift off to sleep, we must still THINK of SERVING the Past!

Some say that politics is only dealt with during election campaigns, during free time, during LEISURE TIME. On the contrary, it is during other times that we deal with Ideas, and during LEISURE time, we think about them and reflect on them! We always act as men of action, as BEARERS of the Idea! And in "hot" moments, we think about what the Man of Action does during his working hours.

What does that matter to you? Say certain things. — So be it! Do you think that BELONGING to a certain group, HAVING certain affinities, living amid the obvious signs of a particular culture and worldview are not things that you have, that you receive? They are not there BY chance. You have received them on deposit, you have a debt! THE fact of FIGHTING in the Party and FOR the Idea "obliges" you to keep them and to cherish them. No one can say "after me, the deluge", BECAUSE the deluge is there before it goes away, if it has been ALLOWED TO COME!

Know also that you cannot be fooled by anyone if you are not a man but an Idea. By serving only a doctrine, it is the one who wants TO DECEIVE you who deceives himself, NOT your faith alone. Indeed, without Faith, he would not dare what you dare, he would not accomplish what you accomplish. Movement and life, thanks to your faith, sweep him away. He throws himself into such an atmosphere that shame overtakes him, and he flees or allows himself TO BE OVERCOME by faith itself.

Others have told you: "I am political and the Pafiti, from time to time, but on Sundays, when I am with my friends, with my wife, my fiancée, then, no! — Very well! Can you THINK like a Catholic for ten hours of THE DAY and then ACT and BEHAVE like a Protestant or a Muslim or a Buddhist for the eleventh? Then you cannot, for a few hours, PROCLAIM a certain way of life, and then, in the other hours, DENY and FORGET your conception of life and the idea that defines it. Can you DEMONSTRATE the evils of miscegenation for four hours, then immediately, in the fifth hour, BRING a new mixed-race child into the world? That is impossible or despicable. In your family, where you live, at all times, your life must REMAIN elevated, your spirit must BE sustained BY the Idea and the Past.

It is possible that sometimes, due to circumstances, you may find yourself in an environment where your ideas cannot be expressed. It is better to remain silent than to betray your way of life. Better to be rude than to capitulate, and better to be silent than to be deceitful!

However, if you dare to defend your ideas with firmness, dignity and calm, there is no environment that can BE completely hostile and closed to them. It is only a question of courage and faith!

Because the church reflects your ideas and your faith, because your commitment to it is thoughtful and profound, you don't just drop in on the church, like you go to the union when you need it. You always need your Church, you live in it and it lives in you, just as the faithful live in their Church and the Church LIVES THROUGH its faithful.

From the day you came to Pafiti, you committed yourself to living a new life BECAUSE you accepted Pafiti's new way of understanding the world. You adopted a new standard FOR EVALUATING things and beings. From that DAY on, your private life ceased TO EXIST in the same way it had before. Because you have 'committed' yourself, you have committed not only your body TO PERFORM a few automatic actions such as PUTTING UP a poster or DISTRIBUTING a newspaper, but also your mind and your HEART. Your whole life and all your relationships with your usual environment must be changed, and I was going to write 'upended'. Until now, you saw the world as everyone else sees it, but suddenly the scales fall from your eyes and you discover it anew. That is what the Party demands of you! That is what it offers you!

From the moment you join Pafiti, your actions have greater resonance and unexpected consequences. Your actions no longer belong to you, but to Pafiti and the Idea it personifies. If you accept that your convictions and the opinions of the Pafiti must SHAPE society not only superficially but must TRANSFORM it in its very substance by imposing new values upon it; If you believe that the new values, the new scale of values that you uphold THROUGH the Party must TRANSFORM not only the world, but also Man himself in the world, then you will weigh every gesture and feel the full weight of your responsibility.

From the day you join the party, you stop saying "I" and start saying "we". "We" the past, "we", this elite group of men who strive not only to conquer POWER, not only to engage in political struggle, which is simple and minimal, but to conquer man and his very purpose. "We", that handful of fighters and "masters" (masters in the sense OF EDUCATORS) who bring truth TO the life of the millennium.

You obviously cease to be free in the individual sense given to it by bourgeois democrats, but you become free from all these associations and affiliations, and it is this very freedom that gives you a wonderful freedom that comes from deep within yourself. You know that you were free to COME or not to COME, to CHOOSE or not to choose this new life, and when you chose it, you felt within yourself the certainty of finally being ON the path you were seeking. You felt that all the forces you had within you added to your strength TO FREE you a little more. To be free IS TO HAVE the possibility of REALISING in life and in the world the conception one has of life and the world, is it not? When you came to the Party, your conception and that of the Party merged, and THROUGH it you acquired the possibility, the freedom to REALISE your conception. It added to it the force of REALISATION that you alone did not have! It thus granted you freedom with all the breadth of its Force, with all the will of its number. It is power alone, the power of profound adherence and profound participation in the life of the Party, that makes your freedom and your power. This is what the Party gives you! This is what makes your DUTY unlimited, as unlimited as your effort, and as unlimited as your POWER WITHIN the Party, and this is what commits you, and thereby commits the Party to you! You give it everything, but IN RETURN it gives you everything. This does not mean that the Party will make you live materially, but that the Party will respond intellectually and morally to all your needs, all your questions, all your concerns.

We know that the petty bourgeois, THE SHOPKEEPER, and everyone who thinks and weighs the matter in shopkeeper terms cannot SUPPORT such a concept, such adherence, such a gift. But fascism does not make a Party or a World where the petty bourgeois reign and where the petty bourgeois becomes the law. May all the weak, the indecisive, all those who want an easy life and immediate COMFORT FOR themselves alone, stay away from the Party. They would not feel at ease there, they would not be able to live there, and, no doubt, they would also prevent us FROM STAYING there.

That is why we, who have accepted these obligations and duties in advance, who have wanted to live dangerously, who have wanted this fashion and this concept to become ours, say to all those who weigh fashion ON a set of scales: "Leave us alone, your way is not ours!"

But to all those who are capable of GIVING themselves and more than themselves to a cause, to all those who are capable of CONCEIVING this cause and COMMITTING THEMSELVES TO it, to all those whose life is a struggle, a battle, a conquest, to all of them, we say: come to us, and together, let us march! We do not want to create a sect, nor even a new church. Our Party is not a shop competing with other electoral shops. We are promoting an Idea, in the service of a People and a Race; we are working to UNIFY this people and to SAVE, from this fate, what can still be saved. We do not have to CONCERN ourselves with existing groups or parties. Perhaps they WANT TO CONCERN themselves with us and oppose this work? Too bad FOR them, FOR they will be swept away and crushed BY the momentum of a people liberating themselves, of a race defending its consciousness. They are rushing towards the oblivion from whence they came, towards the nothingness from which they barely emerged!

But to you who have come and made our vision your own, we say: May the joy of the struggle be with you!

But every morning, your awakening must be like a cry of battle and a cry of victory, like a hymn of life FOR the day ahead. You learn every DAY to

SING at dawn so that the strength and joy of your song may also awaken the joy and strength of your HEART! You DID not sing those mawkish songs that the accordion plays on street corners, but our songs of the people, and our songs of struggle: Songs that have travelled to the ends of the earth to the rhythm of our footsteps; not those songs that are mere animalistic OUTBURSTS, but those that UNITE the socialist struggle with the will to fight. When you began the DAY in this way, you set off with a spring IN your step FOR work and propaganda!

But you want TO GIVE more to God! Not only do you want TO STIR UP within yourself each morning the enthusiasm that makes you TRIUMPH in the battles of THE DAY, but you also give Him a few moments of silence and reflection that you cannot GIVE Him throughout the DAY. We said that you were becoming a new man. Those five minutes help you to BECOME one. The men of our people have forgotten how TO MEDITATE in silence and solitude! You, a new man, are learning IT again FOR yourself and your people. Five minutes during which you measure your face and your purpose. Perhaps at first you do not think of anything or your thoughts wander, but soon these five minutes become THEIR own discipline, full of substance and life.

At that moment, you called upon all the forces within you and around you FOR this immense battle that you had begun, and TO GUIDE your meditation, you called upon the spirit of your race and your blood to come to your aid:

Spirit of our Race! Spirit of our Blood! Be within us and within our People! Penetrate our spirits and our hearts! Inspire our thoughts and our actions TODAY and in the days to COME! FOR it is you, spirit of our Race and spirit of our Blood, who has made our People GREAT and powerful — it is you who has given birth to the Fighters and Conquerors within them!

“Make us too, spirit of our Race and our Blood! Faithful fighters and conquerors of the New World — You who created the Culture and Influence of the West, give us the strength to FIGHT and win! Make us champions of Soil and Blood, of Faith and Freedom!”

## A FINAL WORD



The European socialist witnessed the succession of countless splits that took place within the socialist movement. Although he was one of the grassroots activists, i.e. he was in close contact with his people, he nevertheless retained a nostalgia for a unified organisation. He nevertheless retained his conviction that socialism is one in spirit. He constantly sought 'unity', the unity that so many leaders had destroyed and so many theorists had declared impossible, the unity to which they had imposed so many preconditions that they had effectively made it impossible.

THUS, HAVING claimed that the people were and should be divided into opposing classes, they acted in such a way that socialism itself, although (according to them) emanating from a single class, was doomed to fragmentation and opposition. Thus, even this "class" of which they were the champions and of which they claimed to be representatives was divided into rival and hostile factions, whose members often ended UP FIGHTING EACH OTHER, as in Austria, Germany, Poland and so many other places, with weapons in their hands.

Never did a man of the people subscribe to this division, and while he did not always understand its causes, he found it difficult to bear its consequences.

We have explained the reasons for the division and specified what makes unity possible. We have identified the common principle of socialism that still allows for the unity of a socialist movement within the same PARTY.

As soon as a principle can BE consciously and clearly ESTABLISHED, which is accepted BY all and dominates all other motions, conditioning them, the question of unity is quickly resolved. Different "tendencies" of application may come INTO PLAY, but they all contribute to the same goal. The leader's role is to COORDINATE and MANAGE them, using each force where it is most useful. It is CLEAR TO everyone that different temperaments make some people "pacifists" and others "violent", but just as there are cabinet ministers and military men among the people, it is possible, within the same party, TO USE particular tendencies in the interests of the party. This was impossible as long as violence or non-violence were the subject of doctrinal debate, but it becomes easy when the subject becomes obedience to the laws of the state or ITS institutions.

Until now, because the problem was posed in reverse, the pursuit of unity was a chimera that inevitably led to Byzantine discussions: violence or non-violence as a doctrinal basis. Since the struggle FOR power and for socialism requires the simultaneous or successive use, but in any case the coexistence, of both means, unity is inevitable; division itself is no longer conceivable. None of the parties present agreed to make concessions? So be it! But no one now

LEUF en demande: They are both equally necessary. There can be no satisfactory education without propaganda, in a word without "justices", but on the other hand, if propaganda is not protected, if education is not carried out effectively, if the law, in a word, does not have its support and its "secular basis", then no profession is possible either. If we politicise our expressions a little more, we say that without theorists, without parliamentarians, without delegates, social change is impossible. But without demonstrations and without a fighting organisation, the actions of theorists and parliamentarians are doomed to failure. Who does not know that the sound of boots has sometimes HASTENED and FACILITATED negotiations in the lives of peoples? Who in the socialist movement would agree to renounce this means? But who also ignores that this means alone leads only to fading away and failure?

It is because the fascist socialist knows that history is made THROUGH the combined use of both means in different proportions that he readily accepts the whole range of these extreme tendencies and their intermediates. He asks only, which is easy, that general discipline be respected; that leaders, both political and military, each using and measuring the effects, have every opportunity to manoeuvre. In short, the fascist demands unity of command in social struggle as the only means of victory, the sole criterion always being the SUPREME interest of the people and the nation.

The leaders, or rather the leader of the party, must therefore BE sufficiently aware of their responsibilities and duties SO AS not TO ALLOW THEMSELVES TO BE SWAYED by any sentimental preference FOR one tendency or another, but TO SEE at all times only the interests of the party, the people and the nation.

Naturally, this leader is human and can never be completely impartial, but if he SURROUNDS HIMSELF with sound advice, he will make few mistakes. Moreover, any mistakes made are always insignificant if the organisation's rigid unity allows them to BE OVERLOOKED. Unity and discipline are the two living poles of the organisation, which always allow all efforts to be MADE and, more often than not, even USE those efforts in the best interests of the party and the people.

What ensures the unity and permanence of the movement, that is to say, of socialism unified ON its popular and grassroots basis, is its ability to SELECT leaders who are capable of SEEING far and deeply into the interests of the people and the nation; whose lives serve as a model FOR every fascist of what a militant can and should be. What ensures the permanence of action is the ability, at any given historical moment, to solve every problem and PROVIDE a response that is consistent with the national destiny of the people.

It is not "trends" as such that have been influential thus far; their particular doctrines had too little connection with the real life of the people for their influence not to be illusory and essentially provisional. It is not trends as such that will DETERMINE the best course of ACTION in THE FUTURE, but only leaders from whatever trend who are able to set aside their differences enough to see the profound resonance of possible action.

Thus, the entire life of the socialist movement, ITS entire FUTURE and the permanence of its unity, are linked to this sole capacity for constant and rigorous selection of its cadres, and above all its senior cadres.

No sacrifice should be too great TO ENSURE this selection, the future

and the training of these leaders.

It is argued that entrusting a few individuals or a single person with the responsibility of DECIDING what is in the best interests of the entire population, and even of the entire world, is dangerous, in the sense that the authority conferred upon them could have serious consequences in the event OF AN ERROR. Once again, we believe that this unity of command is the only condition for the survival of unity, and if we want historical examples of organisations that have successfully used the same method of division, we have no trouble FINDING them: absolute unity of command and strict discipline ensure, in all cases, a certain permanence and unfailing vitality for any organisation. **The** only condition for accepting this discipline and unity is individual submission to the goal to be achieved. Ours is important, broad and lofty enough for every fascist to submit his life to this imperative.

Once again, we reiterate what we have said: THROUGH the party, the adherent is guided into the great faith of the socialist struggle after the awakening of his consciousness of the permanence of the party. This awareness is not imposed on him BY the party, but BY his personal study of the history of his race and the social theories that have emerged from the genius of his race. **The** type of human being he has discovered and agreed to become, he can only become completely within the party and THROUGH the party, the only means and force of the people and the nation TO REALISE their destinies. He could only ENTRUST himself to the party precisely because only the party could carry out the rigorous selection that would enable the people TO BE GUIDED according to their profound and distant needs. This is the position of the fascist socialist.

We conclude, finally, that he did not consider the decisions of the Party TO BE fair and acceptable at the time he agreed to become a member, because he realised, after studying it, that the Party is indeed THE HEIR to the millennia of white civilisation that preceded us.

Our stated requirement for individual awareness prior to membership means that we cannot lightly ACCEPT the membership of anyone who applies. This is why a probationary period must be imposed on everyone, during which they study the party and its ideas; during which they also demonstrate their determination TO ACCEPT the new way of life that membership entails.

Most of the men of our people, until that DAY, when they went to a political party, were welcomed with open arms and without explanations, without any prior obligation. This was because it was simply a matter of ACCEPTING the few demagogic and insubstantial demands of this party, without of course any obligation on their PART. **The** parties did not feel obliged to FULFIL THEIR meagre promises, so how could they ASK their supporters for more dedication and honesty?

**The** fascists want TO completely overhaul the concepts of government, doctrine and allegiance. They have set as their goal not to vulgarly seize POWER, but to CREATE a united people and a strong nation. **The** essential goal is not to REPLACE one constitution WITH another, but to give everyone a purpose in life, knowing full well that if people and circumstances change, the constitution and the law will change of their own accord.

It is therefore a matter of IMPOSING on everyone a moral obligation to choose between health and decadence, and every man of the people must make this choice at some point.

However, FOR each of us, a series of questions arises in our daily lives: Have I lived and built my personal life in accordance with the traditions of the community to which I have THE HONOUR OF BELONGING? Then — by adopting this fundamental meaning, have I fulfilled my task and truly realised in myself the maximum POTENTIAL of the type of person to which I belong? — Finally, having adopted this direction and having done everything in my power on a personal level TO DEVELOP within myself the qualities of the face that were latent within me, have I participated in the collective struggle of the face FOR its defence and its progress? Three stages, then: personal awareness, personal effort, collective effort. Only those who have completed these three stages, who have satisfied these three requirements, have the right to say that they are worthy of their people and that they participate in the destiny of their race. Only such a person will also have a place in the party: it is ON the affirmative response to these three imperatives that the new member will be judged. His personal VALUE, that is, the way in which he personally can satisfy the personal and collective effort, gives him the opportunity to RISE in the party, but he must FIRST PASS this initial selection.

It is here that we get to the heart of the matter. FOR an individual to be truly useful to their people and their country, they must do more than SIMPLY not hinder its development by fulfilling their daily social DUTIES.

Those who perform their normal duties every DAY and remain politically "neutral" may THINK that by simply doing their job, they are helping their people. From a Marxist point of view, from the strict point of view of a mathematical economy, this is quite correct, but FOR us, someone who does only that has in no way fulfilled their DUTY. They have contributed in no way to the permanence and elevation of their people, and this is what we expect of them: Neither at work, nor in his family, nor in society, has he been an example, a conqueror, a LEGISLATOR, and AS a result, he has in no way attained the ideal type that is ours.

The legal, judicial notion that "I have done nothing for my country and my people" is not enough for the fascist. THE very notion that "I have done *something* FOR my country and my people" is also foreign to him. THE only concept that is his own is this: "I have done everything humanly possible in all areas FOR my face and my people." Moreover, he adds that in doing so, he has done nothing more than what he owed in return for the immense heritage he has received. Any other attitude is, in his eyes, almost negative. Those who do not act in this way do not represent the type of person who strives, fights, conquers and strives for perfection. Those who are not this type have not done enough FOR their country, since they represent and perpetuate it in an incomplete form. WHETHER THEY KNOW IT or NOT, they are causing its degeneration. According to fascism, even those who are content to "do a lot" without doing "everything" FOR the nation and the people are still RESPONSIBLE for its decline.

To be worthy of the face, to blend in with the unbroken lineage that comes from the depths of time, adding to its heritage, that is the only goal. We may then ASK ourselves what each of us must do to FULFIL our facial destiny. We simply respond that his DUTY is to INTEGRATE HIMSELF into the party, the only organisation capable of SHOWING him the BEST way TO DIRECT his efforts. We can also ASSUME that it is possible for the people and the party to merge on the DAY when every man of the people becomes aware of this goal. This is also why we insist that there should be no formal membership.

it is WORTHLESS and prevents the party FROM FULFILLING its true purpose. The highest VALUE to which a man can aspire, if the party is worthy of the mission it HAS accepted, is membership of the party, FOR it is the party that enables him to fully REALISE his ideal.

Isn't the self-righteousness that so many French people despise evident in this party, which seeks TO REGULATE all the activities of its members and even claims to PENETRATE their private lives? It is up to each individual to DETERMINE the weight that discipline has ON them, and we are convinced that it is very light for anyone who has joined the party deliberately and honestly. It is undoubtedly simplistic to TALK of politics without discipline, of political struggle without political defection, and of the party's moral authority without CONSIDERING that the party must be powerfully centralised.

Provided that everyone's commitment is well established, and that their obedience to the imperatives of facial tradition is absolute, the discipline of the past not only becomes easy for them, but also provides them with support and strength.

If he submits to discipline, it is more to that imposed on him by his conscience than to that imposed on him by the party. FOR him, the party's discipline is merely the normal obligation of an association designed to APPLY the maxim of his own free will. Once his personal position is established, he will admit that it can and must SERVE as the basis for the law. In this case, he does not think of submitting to this law. The autonomy of the party thus becomes that of his own free will. It is at this moment that he has realised his freedom to the fullest, along with the total unity of his own destiny. The rigidity of the party's autonomy is therefore all the more rigid and justified as it draws its *raison d'être* from the conviction and profound conscience of each of its members. Thus, the freedom of the individual in his determination and the discipline of the party FOR its realisation constantly support each other.

This freedom, like this discipline, is naturally linked to the quality of the individuals who accept it, and it is not the individual who has been debased by twenty crossbreeds who can RISE to such a choice and submit to such self-discipline. He cannot conceive of either one or the other.

This determination, BOTH individual and collective, can only be understood in terms of the theology that is its source. It is difficult to imagine any "bourgeois" or Marxist political party ATTEMPTING to solve a personal problem, then a social problem, then a political problem, and finally a moral problem. ultimately PLACING their total trust and all their resources in a cause and the party that represents it. This implies a certain level of moral, moral and political commitment that is not common to everyone in our time.

Because our principles paint a uniquely powerful and appealing picture of humanity, because the evocative power of the face is limitless, conviction and action, discipline and freedom, personal determination and collective life can FIND their way into the hearts and minds of our people.

That is why we are convinced of the ultimate success of our demands and the triumph of our conception of life and the world.

DECEMBER 1946



## TABLE OF CONTENTS



Chapter	Page
Preface .....	xml-ph-0000@
Biographical notes .....	9
I CREATION OF THE NEW MAN.....	15
II SOCIALISM and RACISM.....	25
III The WEIGHT OF THE NEW MAN.....	39
IV THE RACIST and HIS PEOPLE.....	49
v THE RACIST and HIS PARTY.....	55
vi THE RACIST and FREEDOM.....	67
VII , THE RACIST and MORALITY.....	73
VIII 'S PARTY and ITS PROGRAMME.....	79
IX A PERSONAL REUAISSAUCE and THE PARTY.....	87
X A FINAL word.....	93

**BERSERKER**

---

**BOOKS**

---

