

National Socialism: A Left-Wing Movement

Povl H. Riis-Knudsen

Originally printed in Danish (1984). 2024 revision for Frens Chan.

For far too many years, it has been widely accepted that National Socialists are extreme right-wingers, and only rarely have they hesitated to refer to themselves as such. At a certain point, however, it became the official policy of the World Union of National Socialists to avoid the term “right-wing,” claiming that National Socialism does not fit into the pattern of “right” and “left” and instead ought to be considered as standing above this distinction. This most certainly was a step in the right direction, but at this time and within the context of the current struggle, it might, however, be a good idea to reconsider the whole question about political wings and make a few points clear concerning the meaning of the terms “right” and “left” and their application to today’s political scene.

Historically, the words “right” and “left” in reference to political views originated in pre-revolutionary France, where those who wanted to preserve the system of government more or less as it was sat to the right in the National Assembly, whereas those who wanted more radical changes sat to the left. Hence, the term “right” for the reactionaries and “left” for the revolutionaries— terms that have since become universally known and used. Neither the word “reactionary” nor the word “revolutionary,” however, says anything universal about the particular views in question.

They are both relative and receive their specific meaning only within a given historical context. The revolutionaries of former times, as, for instance, the European National Liberals of the 19th century, do not seem very revolutionary today—quite the contrary!— just as today’s reactionaries would have been considered very revolutionary 200 years ago. When the Communists took over in Russia in 1917, they did so as revolutionaries out to overthrow an ineffective and corrupt regime, whereas today they represent the reactionary establishment facing a new revolutionary challenge.

In our time, the traditional left wing is predominantly Marxist—even to such a degree that the very term “left wing” is thought to be synonymous with the word “Marxist.” This, of course, has no basis in reality. Any revolutionary is a left-winger—it is just that the Marxists have had so little competition that they have been able to appropriate the term.

On the other side of the political spectrum, we have the right-wing, consisting of reactionaries who want to preserve the present society and the so-called Christian civilization of the West with its materialism and capitalism. The right-wingers stand up for traditional patriotic values: they are good Christians and good citizens who defend the Constitution and are loyal to their country and their monarch, if they have one. They are willing to go to war against any other nation to assert the greatness of their own—even if it means waging a nuclear war against another White country if they think its system of government threatens their own domestic order, no matter how corrupt and degenerate it may be. They are for an economy based on unrestricted free enterprise, regardless of the consequences, but they resent the Liberal trend in politics as well as immigration and racial integration, because they fear any changes that could upset the order to which they are accustomed.

Where National Socialists are to be found in this spectrum seems quite clear: We are left-wingers—no doubt about it! We do not want to preserve the present system or any part thereof. We do not believe in the foundations of a system that has led our people into the misery of the present time! We do not want to support any institution which is responsible for two world wars between White nations, as well as countless minor wars; nuclear rearmament; the pollution of the environment; unemployment; the total disillusionment of young people, who have lost all faith in the future; drug

abuse; pornography; and all the other forms of complete degeneracy which are displayed today.

We National Socialists want the most radical change of all: we want the complete overthrow of the entire Old Order! Whereas Marxism shares a basic equalitarian philosophy with the Old Order and defines itself as a materialistic movement aiming at the mere redistribution of the material goods.

National Socialism seeks to build an entirely New Order based on idealism and a profound respect for the laws of Nature in all aspects of life. This, definitely, is the most revolutionary idea of this century—and thus very much left-wing!—and it certainly is not Marxist! Compared to National Socialism, Marxism is nothing but a pseudo revolutionary idea, invented by Christianity and upheld by Liberal Democracy: If all people are created equal, why should not all wealth be distributed equally among all people? Seen in this light, Marxism is simply part of the Old Order we want to destroy.

If National Socialism is, in its essence, a left-wing movement, it is, of course, paradoxical that National Socialists should have devoted so much time and energy to catering toward traditional right-wing attitudes, whereas they have shunned all openings to the left. Is it any wonder that all attempts to create a National Socialist movement on this basis have been utterly unsuccessful? The first precondition for creating anything in this world is that one has a clear idea of what one wants to achieve and how one can possibly achieve it. A sculptor who wants to create a work of art starts out with a mental concept, and then sets out to realize it in his chosen material. He does not just dabble around casually with his chisel on a piece of marble, wondering what the final result will be.

Thus, it is crucial to realize that National Socialism is not just a form of extreme rightism.

Anybody within our ranks who still has such notions should devote himself to studying the idea of National Socialism to find its true meaning and significance—or, if he doesn't have the energy or ability to do so, he should find another outlet for his activities. This Movement does not have room for frustrated haters or religious dreamers, but only for devoted National Socialist revolutionaries!

* * *

Let us face it realistically: The right-wing is mostly a pitiful conglomerate of people with very unclear ideas. They realize that something is wrong, but they refuse to leave the Old Order. Instead, they cling to it with all their might and wish to revert to the situation as it was 75 or 100 years ago, thinking that this will solve all their problems. They simply fail to see that the mess we are in today is a logical result of the system we had 100 years ago—that the foundations of that system were not good and stable enough to safeguard us from the present development. The father of most of our problems is to be found in that very Christian idea, whose equalitarian philosophy and alien and unnatural teachings have robbed our people of its soul, but which they continue to praise as the very shield against the decline they see all around them. When all their futile attempts to halt the development fail, they become frustrated and turn into mere haters, because they have no real vision and no ideology.

It is a historical fact that nothing good has ever come out of the right-wing. If it had not been for such revolutionaries as Copernicus, Kepler, Giordano Bruno and Galileo, we should still believe that the earth is flat and the center of the universe. When capitalism developed, the establishment made no attempt to solve the social problems resulting from the industrial revolution, but went on to exploit the new working class mercilessly— thus giving rise to revolutionary thoughts as expressed in Marxist ideology. And all the necessary and just social improvements we have seen during the

past 100 years have only been introduced after hard pressure from the left wing, with right-wing conservatives in constant retreat, pitifully trying to preserve as much as possible for themselves.

This does not mean, of course, that any effort to overthrow an established system is, per se, good. If man succeeds in creating a new natural order which does not fossilize but remains a living organism and develops within the boundaries of natural law, adopting new scientific and philosophical insights into the nature of life without clinging to outdated conceptions, it would, indeed, be a most serious offense to try to uproot that order and revert to egoistic materialism, Christianity, or any other unnatural philosophy.

What is good and bad can solely be judged on the basis of natural law—the closer to it, the better.

It is almost universally accepted that there is a gulf between National Socialism and Marxism. By the same token, however, National Socialists are certainly not right-wingers, either. The only common ground National Socialism seems to have with the right-wing is the racial issue. But here, too, there is an extreme difference in the outlook. The right-wingers believe that being White holds an absolute value in itself, which elevates the Aryan race over all other living organisms and gives it a right to do with the world what it wants to. As National Socialists, however, we are not just concerned about the life and immediate wellbeing of our own race. We see the White race as part of the whole natural order of the universe and our wish to preserve it is linked with our wish to preserve the entire natural environment—including other human races—out of a deep respect for the inscrutable wisdom of Nature.

No doubt, our race has great possibilities in its intellectual capacity, but its abilities have absolutely no value as such, however, if they are not put to the right use in accordance with the laws of Nature. For much too long, we have joined in the chorus claiming “White Power,” and ignored the sad fact that our race has had the absolute power for at least 2000 years. And it is exactly this power that has led to the kind of society we have today.

Thus, we do not share the right-wing belief in continuous technological and economical expansion, which has already led to the pollution of air and water and has made huge areas of the world unfit to live in for all species—a development which means that the ozone layer in the atmosphere is systematically destroyed so that coming generations are going to be exposed to life-threatening radiation, that tropical forests, which had supplied us with oxygen, are cut down to make room for industrial growth, and that the deserts are irrigated so that the ground water level sinks in fertile areas, which then become deserts in turn. All this is the result of Aryan genius, without which it would not have existed—genius which has not been put to work to build a better world for our children and grandchildren, but only to satisfy the human greed of the moment, to secure a pleasant life now without regard for the future. This fatal trend, which, by the standards of natural law, has most certainly turned the industrialized White countries of the West into a far more degenerate state than any so-called primitive society of the Third World, is violently supported by the right-wing, which seems to think that everything would be just fine if only the Blacks, the Jews, and the Boat People were expelled. We know that in itself this would not change anything at all.

Our aim is a complete spiritual rebirth, and it is our immediate goal to define and build the foundations for this rebirth—which is the only thing that can give the racial struggle any meaning. And this struggle should not be understood as a struggle against other races, but as a relentless fight against the decadence of our own race. The isolated appeal to Race as the basis of a new society is meaningless, unless we can overcome this decadence and find our way back to natural values. Our race can only survive within the context of the present system; we do not want it to survive, because

then it would represent nothing but the grossest form of anti-natural degeneracy. The claim for “White Power” can only gain any meaning if, by that, we mean the wish to reactivate the power of Nature as it rests latently in the genius of the White man, whose duty it is to put this power to use in order to uphold the very principle of life.

Of course, this does not mean that we are in favor of any kind of multiracialism. Race is one of the cornerstones of the natural order, and thus must be defended like all other natural principles. It certainly does not mean that the white color of one’s skin is necessarily a hallmark of human quality. The White race has allowed the world to slide to the brink of disaster, and unless it can be brought to realize that the quality of life can be improved by replacing the materialistic consumer’s society—which is the supreme goal of both Marxism and Liberalism—by natural and spiritual values, it is doomed and will only be destroy the whole planet in the process of its absolute decline.

Naturally, National Socialists do not think that we should go back to the Stone Age caves, but we do think that we should never take more out of Nature than we put back into her. The quality of life should mean more to us than the quality of material goods.

In today’s disillusioned society, growing numbers of people realize this and, what is more, they protest against the ruling order. They do not become National Socialists, however, for one simple reason: They are not aware that National Socialism—and only National Socialism!—can solve today’s crucial problems. Instead they allow their protest movements to be taken over by the Marxists, who are better at selling their product than we are, despite the fact that no Marxist government has ever made the slightest attempt to tackle these issues—simply because the very concept of Marxism is materialistic, and at no point concerned with natural values. The Marxists merely use popular dissatisfaction with the establishment to promote Marxism. The dissatisfied individuals themselves are not at all Marxists to begin with.

While National Socialists run around trying to win over small fringe groups of traditional right-wingers, with all their political and religious hang-ups, their notorious megalomania, and their lack of commitment to a cause—resulted from their being constantly on the defensive trying to save what has to go—the Marxists get a foothold among concerned citizens who renounce unlimited materialism out of an idealistic concern for the future of our planet. For the most part, these people do not realize that preservation of the natural order calls for more far-reaching measures than the control of pollution and the abolition of nuclear energy and the atomic bomb. They do not see that it also demands racial separation and a general spiritual revival that can lead Man back to the sources of life.

They can also learn this, however—or rather, they cannot help but see it—if they are provided with the necessary information and insight and not left exposed to the exclusive influence of asinine Marxist teachings. These people are idealistic and for Nature, and thus they really belong to us—and they are generally far more valuable as fighters than a good many disillusioned youngsters who call themselves National Socialists in an attempt to boost their egos and hide their personal problems and insecurity behind a self-styled uniform and ludicrous ranks and titles. But the environmentalists are not attracted by storm troopers or by hate propaganda, all of which just confirms their negative impression of National Socialism. Nor does it help to talk to them about the significance of Race, because they have not yet come so far in their development that they can see the relevance of the racial issue. They must be approached where they are and on issues that concern them here and now. To do this, it is necessary to produce good material on the environmental problems as seen from the National Socialist point of view, and to go into the groups where these people gather in protest against nukes, pollution and nuclear warfare. We cannot expect

the environmentalists to come to us, because they have no way of knowing what National Socialism is all about; and, if we fail to get in contact with them, they will be lost to the Marxists, in whose hands they are never going to realize the full consequence of their own attitude.

These new protesters are hostile to us—simply because of decades of enemy propaganda, which has not only alienated sound and intelligent people from any kind of movement which overtly expresses National Socialist ideas, but which has also succeeded in attracting a large number of individuals to our movement who suit this propaganda image of National Socialism only too well, and who come to us simply because they want to live up to this image. They want to be such murderous, bloodthirsty beasts as they have come to know from countless Hollywood productions and yellow-press accounts of the terrible “Nazis.” For far too long, we have welcomed such psychopaths into our ranks and, for far too long, we have failed to dissociate ourselves from other organizations which do the same.

Because people call themselves National Socialists and wave the Swastika does not make them our comrades! Many organizations still do not realize this, and, as long as they do not do so, they are doomed—and, unfortunately, so are we, if we do not take every opportunity which offers itself to denounce them in public. It has often been said that we should not “wash our dirty linen” in front of our enemies and that all “internal strife” should be kept within our own walls. However, this is not our linen and it most certainly is not “internal strife”—it is a necessary cleaning operation, and it must be carried out in public.

Our worst enemies are not the Jews or the Communists, but the very people who, while calling themselves National Socialists, debase the fundamental concepts of the National Socialist philosophy through their behavior, thus confirming the distorted impression of our Idea conveyed to the public by our enemy. Indeed, we can feel no loyalty towards such people and no friendship. On the contrary, we have to rid ourselves of any connection with them whatsoever, and go out of our way to show people that they do not belong to us. Above all, we should take great pains to do exactly those things that are not expected of us. We are expected to embrace just about any right-winger who waves a Swastika—and we are most certainly not expected to be found anywhere near the left-wing, simply because people have been told over and over again that we are right-wingers. Consequently, we should deliberately show them that they have been misinformed. The surprise effect will be likely to make at least some people listen to what we have to say. Furthermore, it is going to make people think twice about what they are told concerning National Socialism when they realize that they have been lied to once on this subject.

* * *

In this connection, it should be noted that we are not a historical association. Many National Socialists seem to think that we are going to revive National Socialist Germany and transplant it to other parts of the world. This is the way our enemy would like to make us look, but this is not the case! National Socialist Germany represents an attempt—and a not altogether successful attempt!—to organize a National Socialist community at a given time and in a given historical context. It can inspire us and we can learn from it—but we cannot revive it—nor should we ever try to. It was an experiment designed to deal with a set of problems that were of major concern to the German people at the time, but which are not necessarily felt as equally important by people today.

When Hitler set out on his historical mission to reorganize Germany about 60 years ago, the entire German nation was at its knees economically, militarily, and politically. After the defeat in World War I, Germany not only lost all its colonies, but an enormous part of its European territory settled

by several million Germans who found themselves cut off from their mother country, living a miserable life as minorities in foreign countries that only wished to wipe them out. What was left of Germany was totally demilitarized, and the weight of outrageous claims for reparations put forward by the conquerors caused the most hideous inflation in world history and crushed any possibility of economic recovery.

In this situation, a small minority of Jewish immigrants from the East slowly gained control of the shattered economy, as well as the entire cultural and political life of the country. Compared to this situation, all talk about a present economic crisis is ludicrous.

Materially, any country of the West and most Communist countries are far better off than Germany was in the '20s. Today, it is a matter of selling the family car and perhaps moving to a cheaper apartment. In Germany, it was simply a question of surviving.

* * *

Morally, however, we are faced with a much graver threat than Hitler was. His Germany was still a fairly homogeneous country, where most people shared a set of common values and norms and a common belief in the cultural tradition of the nation. They wanted to regain their former power—they wanted to be strong and respected by other nations. Hitler did not have to tell them to love their people and their race. He could take it for granted that they did. Their values and norms were not necessarily all in accordance with National Socialist philosophy, but they were a sound basis on which a National Socialist state could be built without too many difficulties, and thus Hitler could concentrate his political propaganda on more mundane things.

He was living in thoroughly revolutionary times, in which the need for work and food was of paramount importance, and he knew that a program which could secure these things would give him the support of the voters and thus enable him to gain power so that he could try to realize his political vision, which, of course, went much further than the immediate need for material things.

However, as we all know, National Socialism was not the only revolutionary force in Germany at that time. The Communists had exactly the same advantages as Hitler: a starving population willing to try almost anything to survive. They also had the advantage over Hitler that they could point to the successful revolution in Russia. Hitler had nothing of the kind to which he could relate his struggle. And it is noteworthy that he did not link his movement to any of the powerful right-wing ideologies of the past, such as the monarchy or the churches. His approach was thoroughly left-wing and equally opposed to the Establishment and the Communist Party. When, at last, he won over the Communists, it was not by beating them into silence, but by draining away their support by taking up the same issues as the Communists and pointing out a better solution—all of which convinced the German worker that he could be a better and more competent leader than Thaelmann, who was head of the German Communist Party, would be. He talked to people about what concerned them in the language of his time and adopted a military style, which was popular in a country full of ex-servicemen who had any reason to feel betrayed by the government and which was also useful in a situation where you had to fight the numerous Communist murder gangs, who used very much the same style and language as Hitler.

To try to imitate Hitler's style today would be political suicide. As a matter of fact, it has been the end of every group which has tried it so far. Nor can you take over Hitler's propaganda material. To translate it, reprint it, or imitate it in a different context as anything but historical study material is ridiculous. Hitler was catering to the German masses of the 1930s. Apart from everything else, we

must realize and accept that there is no way to win the masses in the present situation. Today, we are looking for a small number of idealists. To find them, we have to turn our attention to problems that concern exactly the type of people we are looking for: pollution, the nuclear threat, the curse of multinational Capitalism, etc. Most of these problems were unknown to Hitler's contemporaries—but that is no reason not to tackle them! Our world has become much more complicated than it was 50 years ago, and any political movement that fails to take this into account reduces itself to an anachronistic fossil.

We must admit that, generally, we have tended to speak and write too much about National Socialist Germany. In spite of all the good we may be able to show that Hitler did for Germany, the people we are looking for today are not really very interested in what happened 50 years ago. They are concerned about their own time—and the future.

When we cling so desperately to the past, one of the reasons is, of course, that National Socialist Germany is the only example of applied National Socialism the world has ever seen and that those 12 short years represent the only glory and success our Movement has ever had. This is understandable. We need it in these difficult times of humiliation and persecution. We need it to show to ourselves that National Socialism once was victorious—in spite of all adversity.

However, it is extremely dangerous when this respect and admiration for the past, instead of being a productive inspiration, becomes a nostalgic fixation on a bygone era, a blind love for the paraphernalia of the NSDAP, the uniforms, the symbols, the ranks, the haircuts, and even for the linguistic style of the '30s. Not the outward appearance but the inherent idea is important, and we have to get on from there. Like Hitler, we must avoid being trapped by history. In other words, we must show how National Socialism can solve the unemployment problem today—not merely how Hitler solved it in 1933.

The idea behind National Socialism transcends Hitler and National Socialism itself.

Hitler applied it to an earlier time and place; we have to apply it to our own. It is timeless, because it represents the very principle according to which Nature lives and creates. It has existed since the beginning of time and is going to exist forever, as long as the universe exists, no matter whether the Aryan race—or mankind as such, for that matter, exists or not. Man has abandoned this principle, and it is our task to show him that he cannot do so unpunished, and that all his present problems are caused by the insane belief that man is elevated above Nature. In doing so, we should be as little tied with National Socialist Germany as the other leftists are tied up with the Soviet Union.

* * *

We should also learn a great deal from the way the other leftist groups are organized. It is commonplace to claim that Marxist organizations consist of human waste. This may, of course, be true of the followership of some groups, but the hard core of the serious Marxist organizations is organized along lines that are certain [to] secure quality and devotion. Members are very often tithed and they are required to spend a certain number of nights every week with ideological training and practical activities.

Altogether, the demands put on a Marxist far exceed anything we have ever dared to expect of our members. This says something about quality, and it also explains why the Marxists are doing so much better than we are— despite the fact that what they preach is utter nonsense.

Among National Socialists, however, taking stands or adopting methods which are normally considered to be Marxist seems to be met with a good deal of fear of somehow being “contaminated” by Marxism. It would give us a bad name among both friends and enemies, they claim. Now, we certainly have a bad name already—to be quite honest, it could hardly get any worse. But as we are not too concerned about winning over traditional conservatives, what does it matter? If they cannot tell the difference between Communism and National Socialism, it is their problem, not ours! In that case, they show a lack of intelligence that makes them useless for us in any event. We cannot allow our enemies to determine what is a National Socialist viewpoint and what is not, and we sure cannot leave all the good causes to the Marxists just to please people who have proven to be totally useless to us anyway. We have already done that for far too long—and that is another reason why Marxists have been so successful and have been able to take over vast segments of our culture and intellectual life, while National Socialists have allowed themselves to feel obligated to say “yes” to NATO, the European Common Market, the bomb, Capitalism, unlimited “free enterprise,” etc. It is time that this be changed! Let us not continue to do what people have been led to expect of us. Let us do what National Socialism teaches us to do—not what people think it ought to teach us.

In this connection, the sad truth is that many National Socialists, in their traditional thinking, have fallen victims of the worst kind of right-wing anti-Communist propaganda.

The main threat against Man most certainly does not emanate from Moscow, Peking or Havana. There is absolutely no way you can blame the Communists for the sorry state of the world today – for drug abuse, crime, pornography, nuclear rearmament, racial integration, pollution and so on. It is our own present system of government that is to blame—neither the Communists, nor the Jews! We have to realize that these evils have been created by our own corrupt and morally depraved politicians and stockbrokers and that we, the Aryan peoples of the world, have ourselves allowed it to get this bad. It is not a foreign government but this present system which is a threat to the existence of the planet, and without this system there would not be any Soviet Union or any other Communist state today. Communism would have been wiped out during World War II if the West had not given the Soviet Union the necessary arms and technology. Even today, all Communist states would immediately disintegrate if they were not constantly supported by Western governments and bankers, who earn fortunes on trade with these countries—and on lending them money. The Communists certainly know this, and they have more than enough to do keeping Eastern Europe in line and securing the Communist regime in Afghanistan to constitute a serious danger to the West.

Interestingly, the same multinational corporations which generate huge profits on trade with the Communist bloc make another fortune on the production of arms our politicians try to persuade us are necessary to defend ourselves against the Communists—as if you can defend anything by destroying all life in a nuclear war. This is, of course utterly ridiculous—but it is nonetheless the political and financial system so vigorously supported by the right-wing.

No doubt about it: Communism would most certainly be a very unpleasant thing, but it would not be the end of the world. Christian liberal democracy most likely would! There is far more racial purity in Eastern Europe than anywhere in the West—simply because their inefficient economic system does not attract large-scale Third World immigration; and the racial consciousness of the Russians, who are the dominant nation in the Soviet Union, definitely promises a better prospect for the survival of the Aryan race than the visions of liberal and conservative American politicians. It is true, of course, that Communism does not support racial principles in theory—but, with Communism, theory and practice are two very different things. No doubt, the materialism offered

by the West is more attractive here and now, but this pleasant life is more likely to be followed by a deluge that might well wipe out all life on earth. However, with a sound political system in the West, Communist states could not exist. They simply would not be able to survive on their own, and their hungry populations would rebel. Very much the same thing would happen if the Communists were to take over the West—their regime would not last very long.

* * *

At this point, someone might venture to ask whether we should not then abolish all talk about National Socialism and the Swastika and disguise ourselves as “real” left-wingers with a new idea that could easily be sold to people under a different name. This, of course, is not possible. To try such an approach is to underestimate our enemies. They really do not mind the name or the symbol. What they mind is the idea, and you could not disguise that beyond recognition. Our enemy will always oppose anything that is good for our people, and they would—rightfully!—claim that we are just “Nazis.” Then we would have to devote a lot of effort to “proving” that we are not. This would be ridiculous.

Many organizations have tried it; none has ever succeeded.

There is only the difficult way: to prove that National Socialism is not what people think is and that it is the only way to secure the survival of life on this planet. We know that we are in a weak position, but, quite frankly, we should rather be glad that we do not have to worry about taking over power right here and now. We simply would not be able to handle it. This is one of the unpleasant facts that many National Socialists—and people who call themselves National Socialists—seem to overlook completely. It would be of little use to us to win over the masses tomorrow, when we do not have the necessary number of National Socialist experts to make a National Socialist state work. We need economists, jurists, administrators, biologists, etc., who are also National Socialists.

Power must never be an aim in itself. We want to create a New Order because we want a better world, but a better world cannot be created just out of the blue sky. It takes a lot of dedicated people with thoroughgoing education to carry out such a task: and right now it is more important to win over a number of these people, than to fight a losing battle in the streets to impress a number of bigots and losers.

Again, National Socialist Germany furnishes us with a very instructive example. One of the reasons why the experiment to create a National Socialist order right from the beginning could not be completed and a new state could not survive the pressure from the outside world was that Adolf Hitler had to rely on a large number of experts who had nothing but disdain for National Socialism. He simply did not have the time to train and educate enough National Socialists, because he had to concentrate on winning the people before the Communists could take over. We should be grateful that we have no such worry. We could never win a revolutionary victory under the present circumstances anyway, so let us concentrate on establishing a sound foundation for a future mass movement.

However, let us be realists. This, too, could be a losing battle. We have no guarantee that we are ever going to win. To be quite honest, we have nothing but a very vague hope to support the belief that we can win. However, Nature herself may wipe mankind from the surface of the earth because it has neglected the laws of the universe. This may be what is in store for us. We National Socialists, however, have decided not to accept such a development without a fight—even against all odds! But we have no desire to be martyrs for a lost cause—and that is exactly what we are

going to be if we stick to the old ways.

As a Movement, we have been notably unsuccessful, so far. It is time to wake up and recognize the true significance of our ideas. A first step is to become revolutionary professionals. We must leave all half-cocked right-wing attitudes behind us and realize that we are left wingers. Furthermore, we should stop blaming others for our misery. We have been our own worst enemies in all respects, and we need no scapegoats! Any change we desire has to start as a change in the basic attitude of our own people. This is a heavy task—but the thought of what is going to happen if we do not win makes it worthwhile to give it a try!

