

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

copy #
CONFIDENTIAL

Jan. 1952

TABLE OF CONTENTS

*Destinée du Nationalisme
By Horia Sima*

Preface

I. Communism and the Bourgeois and Capitalist Society

The Cause of the actual disorder - The tribunal of humanity -
Bolshevism and the bourgeois and capitalist society - The
value of political freedom - The responsibilities of the
West

II. The Phenomenon of Nationalism

Nationalism and fascism - Nationalism and bourgeois -
The nationalist phenomenon in its pure state - "National"
and "Nationalism" - Nationalism and Christianity

III. The Errors of Nationalism

Ambiguities of the doctrine - Imperialism - Ideological
Imperialism - Totalitarianism - Nationalism and Dictator-
ship - Materialism - Race and people

IV. The constructive Experience of Nationalism

The inherent forces of the nation - Nationalism and
Socialism - Nationalism and economic freedom - Planned
economy - Coordinated economy - The struggle against
Bolshevism - The nationalist victory of Spain - The
Russian Campaign

V. The Tragedies of Nationalism

Nationalist movements that did not reach the stage of
maturity - The causes of their failure - The emity of the
democracies - The trials of the nationalist movements dur-
ing World War II - The attitude of Italy and Germany

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
SOURCES METHODS EXEMPTION 3B2B¹ -
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT
DATE 2002 2008

CONFIDENTIAL

[]

VI. Premises of a Valid History

The future of Nationalism - The nationalist-democratic
Christian synthesis - The spiritual vacuum of the Western
world - The Marshall Plan and the European crisis - The
Nationalist-democratic alliance - The dangers of a fallacious
peace - The revolutionary strength of Christianity

VII. Nations or Social Masses?

The bases of the democratic revolution according to Tocque-
ville - The appearance of the masses in history - Meaning of
the phenomenon people and mass - Historical value of the
nation - Masses and Technology - The Elite and the mass -
Nationalism and the problem of the masses - Nationalism
and federalism

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

THE FATE OF NATIONALISM

This is not a book about abstract doctrine. It deals with political problems such as they appeared to men engaged in action. The author has analyzed the facts, the events which have profoundly shaken the soul of a whole generation of his country. It is the Rumanian Legionary Movement which is here making its deposition. The points of view expressed in this book and the conclusions which it draws are the result of an experience acquired by its leaders during 30 years' struggle. The only relationship that could be established between this work and books of pure speculation is that in both cases the historical detail disappears in favor of its intelligible expression.

But, one may ask, apart from the history of the Rumanian people, why would the political experience of the Legionary Movement be of interest to Europe? As we will try to explain precisely in this book, the nationalist movements of Italy, Spain, Germany, Poland, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, Latvia, Norway, England, France, and Belgium arise from a similar frame of mind, from a social and political phenomenon common to all Europe. None of these movements imitated another -- insofar as this happened, its creative potential was weakened -- but each one answered an appeal which history addresses to all nations. Mussolini was right to affirm that Fascism -- that is to say Italian nationalism -- was no product for exportation. No people can credit itself with having brought nationalism into being and of having spread it throughout the world. Each nation hides within its depths its own nationalism; it is up to each nation to mold it in the die of reality. If

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

nationalism manifested itself with more vigor after World War I by creating a style of life, an era which replaced the Bourgeois period, it is to be explained by the fact that conditions favorable to its full bloom were reunited only at that moment (the awakening of the popular masses). The Legionary Movement did not appear as the continuation of an impulse coming from outside the frontiers, as has so often been affirmed in jest or in bad faith; it is truly an expression of the necessities of life of the Rumanian people. The fact that one may see in it certain relationships with other movements or note certain ideological similarities can be explained by the common ground which exists at the basis of all nationalist groups.

Our expose does not aim at explaining the history of the Rumanian Legionary Movement; it endeavors to include the general panorama of the nationalist phenomenon, and to do this with the aid of facts which our own experience gives us. Since ideas which are characteristic of our century are reflected in the history of the legionary Movement, we have applied ourselves to the job of bringing out the factors common to all nationalist movements, the elements capable of clarifying the phenomenon as a whole.

This does not mean that our sole aim is to explain the bases of nationalism and its historical vicissitudes. It is not our intention in writing this book to study a recent phase of European history. It is rather concern for the future which has compelled us to write it. This book is a book of attitude, of combat. It is committed to supporting the cause of Nationalism and, if possible,

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

to detaching it from the damages of the war. But how can we attain this result without first knowing its true face, without defining what it really is? Both friends and enemies have judged it falsely. The nationalism which the world knows and evaluates does not correspond to its authentic image. The aspirations of the peoples have been adulterated. People talked about nationalism; acts have been committed in its name; but in reality the survival of the bourgeois and capitalist era, the era of imperialism and chauvinism, has been troubling the conscience of the peoples and poisoning the international atmosphere. The defeat which the nationalists have undergone is, in the first place, the result of this false appreciation of the phenomenon.

Nationalism finds itself once more at a crossroad.

Vanquished on the political level by the military victory of the Allies, the nationalist myth has not ceased to move the soul of the peoples. The nationalist states, with their formidable armies, have disappeared from the world scene; but the spiritual energy which gave rise to these forces has not died. Dispersed, decapitated, and haunted from all sides, but nonetheless alive, present and indestructible, nationalism could disappear only if the nations disappeared.

What direction will the survivors of the nationalist catastrophe of 1945 take? Will the tragic experience of the war be of some use? Will it enable us to discern in the political past what was good and what was erroneous? Or will the nostalgia of vanquished ideals be stronger than the lessons which life teaches, even

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

to the point of preventing a new orientation of the peoples, which would be in greater conformity with the profound meaning of nationalism?

The nationalist world with its diverse ethnical baggage, is solicited today by diverging tendencies. Certain people continue to confound nationalism with its historic tragedies, without going back to its principle, without searching for its real meaning. For this category of Nationalists the cause of the defeat, a superficial defeat, goes back to the absurd coalition of Democracy and Bolshevism. They believe in this all the more since the disappearance of the great nationalist powers has opened the door to the bolshevist invasion of Europe, and because no Western state is capable of replacing their political and military potential.

There is also another current, which without sacrificing anything of the spiritual treasury of nationalism tries to detach it from all manifestations which do not belong to its essence and to its aspirations, manifestations which have corrupted its character, and tries to put it back into world circulation in its pure form. Under this aspect, nationalism loses its aggressive characteristics and becomes a factor for creating harmony between peoples.

The first attitude is entirely lacking in foresight. The historical outline or outline of nationalism is lost in a multitude of wanderings, and disordered engagements; to continue the same policy would mean to repeat tomorrow the errors of yesterday. A nationalism focused on the past would never be able to dissipate the suspicions which the public opinion of the democratic states

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

manifest toward it. In order for the nationalist idea to become again an active and constructive political value, it must be separated from the acts and attitudes which do not belong to it by nature.

This reconciliation is even more necessary since the nationalist energies have become indispensable for the creation of a powerful anti-communist front. The democracies are passing through a grave ideological crisis. Liberalism has entered a phase of decline and no longer has any influence with the masses. It is impossible to start the battle against Communism -- all the virtues of which are open to dispute except for élan and militant spirit -- with an ideology which is in the process of decay. In order to compensate for their spiritual vacuum, the Democracies must look to the support of the nationalist movements.

Whether one wishes it or not, from 1945 on, the fate of nationalism has been confounded with the fate of the democracies. If there still exist democrats who, blinded by passion, do not even see in their last hour where death will strike from, the nationalists must not fall in the same error. It is their task to see to it with perseverance that their friendship with the democracies is not compromised by unthoughtful acts or by unreasonable demands. If the nationalists insist upon extremist and rigid attitudes which cannot at least boast the unreserved support of truth, they could impede the process of unification of European forces and indirectly increase the chances for the victory of bolshevism. Let us suppose that the democracies feel strong enough to defeat bolshevism alone. Should we conclude that because of this nationalism would lose

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

its reason for existence, that it will no longer play any role whatsoever in the life of the peoples.

The error would be great. In bolshevism the nations are threatened with an acute and immediate danger, but even without the intervention of the Bolshevik plagues they could lose their vital balance and perish. Man in our era is much too deprived of spiritual life to be able to dispense with the crutch of nationalism. Deprived of this spiritual force, he would be exposed to the most harmful ideas and political conceptions. Without the living presence of nationalism, without the permanent action of this principle in the conscience of the individual, the popular masses would destroy the natural frame of history, formed by ethnical categories, and would disappear in a degrading mixture of races, of peoples, and of cultures. Nationalism is not only a useful ideology for the present moment, it is the creative element in history, an element which will be even more indispensable in the future.

The ideas which we expound here are not the result of meditations suggested by the war. They belong to the "first principles" of the Rumanian Legionary Movement and events have only confirmed them in a way for which we had never hoped. The singular fate of the Rumanian Legionary Movement, the persecutions which it suffered even during the period which was, from the political point of view, most favorable to it can be explained by its constant faithfulness to the fundamental truths of the nationalist doctrine. In the West the legionary Movement has few friends. Apart from the defamations

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

and lies which have been widely bandied by its enemies, practically nothing is known about its past, its sufferings, and its aims. This book has no intention of reestablishing the truth as far as we are concerned. It deals with a question of general interest. It restricts itself to revealing to the readers one single fact which we think is eloquent enough to make it unnecessary to accompany it with commentaries: from 1938 on, the concentration camp regime became a new universe for the Legionaries. They emerged from one concentration camp only to be directed to another camp. Rumanian camps, German camps, allied camps, Soviet camps! And their calvary continues today behind the Iron Curtain.

In these considerations we have been guided by one single thought: the catastrophe which threatens the existence of all peoples. Too much hatred, too much despair have risen in the world for individuals and nations to continue to allow themselves to take truth lightly. We no longer can permit history to develop haphazardly, ruled by chaotic aims. The moment for the Great Reform has arrived. All the ideas, all the systems, and all the conceptions of the past centuries must be revised and adapted to the inner man, to his structure and to his ends. We must cease to separate the spiritual man from the political man. History is an aspect of the great life of the spirit. The unending quarrels which the peoples have among themselves over territory to conquer, or for objectives of glory or interest represent only his lower nature which must be defeated and must be subordinated to peremptory ends.

The aim of history is the liberation of peoples from fear,

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

from oppression, from injustices so that their purest and best energies can be utilized in the realm of cultural creation, the only creation which is gifted with the halo of immortality.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

CHAPTER I

COMMUNISM AND THE BOURGEOIS AND CAPITALIST SOCIETY

The lack of progress which can be found in the moral and political sciences is caused by the inability of man to improve the results obtained by his predecessors in the realm of social organization. A long time ago this "disorder" was already no longer part of the realm of the positive sciences where discoveries and inventions can be transferred from one country to another, where no one dares operate with notions which have been contradicted by experience. The spirit of improvisation which rules over social activities makes the art and science of governing suffer from the gravest contradictions: on one hand the progress achieved in that order by one generation is blurred by following generations; on the other, errors which have been branded by the experiences of peoples reappear after having remained buried for a long while and once more enjoy the confidence of the masses as well as of their rulers. How much suffering and torment could have been spared humanity if its past had been analyzed so as to discover what has proven to be false, unjust, absurd, destructive, and what has proved to be valuable, so that from this selection a criterion, something like a fundamental concept of humanity, a concept which could at the same time serve as a central idea for political coordination and a frame of reference for the sciences, whose aim is related to the destiny of human groups or collectivities, could come into being.

In order to distinguish between truth and error in the frame of history, more is needed than just a rational effort. The human

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

intelligence can easily detach itself from the facts observed by the physical sciences, because in that case it is dealing with a matter which is inert, anonymous and subjugated to our destiny. But it is incapable of retaining the same objectivity when dealing with human events. Judging and at the same time participating in history, man ends by yielding to inclinations which are foreign to his vocation. Egotisms, vanities, unreasonable interests falsify the past of a people, thus preventing the authentic lessons of history from penetrating the soul of future generations.

This does not mean that the art of governing, that is the political sciences, are subject to a perpetual instability; the preceding remark indicates only that the means of investigation with which we want to decipher the mysteries of social institutions are not adapted to the objective of its investigation, and we must come to its aid with a tool of greater subtlety, a tool which would have greater impact. In order to elucidate or solve the problems of history, reason should be supported by a great and disinterested vitality. Man should first purify his thoughts from the complex of egotisms in order to obtain a real knowledge of the complexities of society.

For having delayed the composition of this "Magna Carta" of universal history, preconditioned, it is true, by the development of the spiritual nature of man, humanity wanders today in the labyrinth of its own faults. Peoples and individuals struggle with each other to see to it that theses and ideals whose bases are equally weak may triumph.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

A profound uneasiness, a terrible fear of the future arises from today's torment -- while the extraordinary advances of technology should assure us of the contrary -- because everything that is started is done in a haphazard manner, without probing the unknown, without knowing where we are going to stop in the future. Humanity has only partial visions of life which interfere with each other in limitless confusion. In a period where we constantly speak in terms of the political unification of continents, what man lacks the most is the principle which could animate such an effort and such an accomplishment, that is, enlightened historical insight.

The war over, the victors overran the vanquished. Accusations are made, the search for the responsables is started, they are found, they are punished. The procedure in itself would not have been bad if the tribunal of humanity had tried all the criminals of the war, without taking the question of nationality or political color of the delinquents into account, and, naturally, without sparing the victors. Otherwise this international tribunal is in great danger of appearing to be an instrument of vengeance rather than a means of expiation in the service of the inherent justice of history. There is no doubt that the nationalist movements have made mistakes. But how can we isolate these errors from their historical frame and present them in a separate file? These are the errors of an era, they correspond to a state of mind, they have their antecedents. There are mistakes which preceded the faults of the nationalists, which accompanied them, and which have never ceased to exist, even

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

after the breakdown of the Axis powers. One cannot speak of the errors of nationalism without dealing with those errors which brought up the apparition of this movement. Nationalism is only the reaction of national collectivity against the errors of the bourgeois and capitalist society. Is it possible to consider these errors with indulgence when it is through their accumulation that the pedestal of Bolshevism, that abomination of human history, was created?

It would be entirely incorrect to liken Bolshevism to an error. To do so would even be to pay a compliment. Error exists only in relationship to what is good and true. Error results because there is a lack of assiduity in man to discover and serve higher values. Bolshevism cannot even boast of this privilege. Truth is entirely banished from its sphere, from the vision of the new world which its rulers wish to build. Not only does Bolshevism think that truth has no usefulness for the life of the State; truth is persecuted and condemned, even when it remains in a latent state, without any relationships to action. Whosoever attempts to give to it the most innocent or the most timorous expression, risks being branded an enemy of the people and disappearing into the unending ranks of those who no longer have any name or any family.

Bolshevism is engaged in permanent warfare with truth; its entire system was built in order to persecute and exterminate it. The Bolshevik State is not so much at grips with the political and social entity of man as with the truth which lies in his soul. It is not content with asking from its subjects an impeccable civic

REPRODUCIBLE COPY

conformism, but pursues them and controls them in their inner selves. The model citizens of the soviet state are individuals separated from their internal world, incapable of thinking by themselves or affirming their personal aspirations; they are men whose spiritual functions have been standardized and who can be perfectly controlled from the exterior. After the expropriation of property and the confiscation of work, comes the expropriation of the spirit. The slightest bit of truth left ignored in a corner of the soul constitutes for the bolshevik an explosive substance of unbelievable efficacy, capable of creating the most stubborn resistance and endangering the very continuity of the regime.

Let us not imagine that the triumph of bolshevism will take the form of a political or military victory. This triumph will be celebrated on the day when the Soviet monoculture has succeeded in killing the last spiritual vestiges of humanity. The ideal of Bolshevism is the expropriation of the human person.

How was the creation of this monstrous organization made possible? How can one explain its extreme virulence and its universal apparition? The answer would not be conclusive if we mentioned only the hundred-year struggle of the different communist groups over the whole world. This revolutionary tradition started by the Russian Decembrists explains only one phase of the problem, the least important one: the existence of an organized force, which, profiting of the difficulties of the period, captivates all popular discontents. In order to become a worldwide calamity, communism had to find an environment in which it could develop freely, within the very society which it hated and wished to destroy. A handful

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

of fanatics in the service of a fatal idea would never have been able to constitute a danger to the security of peoples without the complicity of those who precisely today do not know where to hide to escape from it, or how to stop it.

The advanced state of disintegration in which the bourgeois and capitalist society found itself has been communism's best propaganda agent. The forces which today are plotting against the fundamental institutions of humanity were brought into being by the vices, the injustices, the cowardly acts, and the cruelties of the bourgeois and capitalist society. It was this society which fed the fire of world revolution by disinterested itself in the fate of the masses, and by abandoning them to poverty, corruption, and ignorance. The proletariat of today is first of all the result of the egotistical bourgeois morals, the mentality of businessmen. Incapable of sacrificing a bit of their opulence to raise the living standards of the masses, they preferred to see the ranks of their adversaries grow with new categories of malcontents and to the extent of endangering the very existence of the peoples.

One could doubtless reply that this picture is not that of a particular social phenomenon of our era, that at all times the transition from one type of society to another starts when the old type shows signs of weariness and lets itself die. Our remarks would therefore tend to describe a normal historical procedure, a phenomenon which repeated itself often; this time it would be the turn of the bourgeois and capitalist society to disappear and for another social system to replace it.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

This explanation would disturb no one if an unexpected complication had not made its appearance; if between the two forces which today are struggling for mastery of the world -- one conservative, the other revolutionary -- one could distinguish clearly what separates them, what innovation one brings in comparison with the other? Unfortunately, we do not see in the name of what reform program the communists justify their pretensions of overthrowing and replacing the old world. The capitalist society in its time was justified its existence by rejuvenating feudal society, by recreating it in a more spacious way, by making it conform better to the necessities of the era. But what horizons does communism open to humanity?

This question is nevertheless debated in all newspapers, in all marxist-inspired publications and reviews, and it is discussed over and over again in all communist meetings. If one were to believe them, communism brings a superior social structure in which all the old abuses disappear. Nevertheless when one analyzes carefully the achievements of communism in Russia and elsewhere, one realizes with astonishment that it is not reform of the old society or a program which seeks to correct the errors of the capitalist system. On the contrary -- and it is the only innovation that can be attributed to communism -- these same errors reappear with an aggravated intensity and a force of generalization up till now unknown.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

BOURGEOIS AND CAPITALIST SOCIETY

SOVIET WORLD

1. ATHEISM: state of mind of a few restricted circles, without signs of aggressiveness toward those who keep their faith.

ATHEISM: official religion, exclusive and intolerant.

2. MATERIALISM: dominating concept of our period, less of a doctrinary aspect than a rule of conduct for modern man.

MATERIALISM: philosophic system raised to the rank of absolute truth, the only one to be admitted in the schools, universities, and State cultural dispensaries.

3. EXPLOITATION OF MAN BY MAN

EXPLOITATION TILL EXHAUSTION OF MAN BY MAN: creation of modern slavery. The robot man as the unit of labor.

4. TENDENCY TO CONCENTRATE CAPITAL: dispossessing small capitalists in favor of a restricted group of financiers

GENERAL EXPROPRIATION OF CAPITAL: a parasitic bureaucracy disposes of the wealth and the work of a subjugated people.

5. ADVANCED STATE OF DISINTEGRATION OF THE HUMAN PERSON

LIQUIDATION OF PERSONAL CHARACTER of man with the help of collective ^{breaking} [as in "breaking" of a horse].

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Bourgeois and capitalist
society

Soviet World

6. THE INNER LIBERTY OF MAN IS THWARTED BY THE GIGANTIC ACHIEVEMENTS OF TECHNOLOGY. MEN ARE THE SLAVES OF THE MACHINE. TECHNOLOGY IS THE SUPREME ACHIEVEMENT OF THEIR ASPIRATIONS.

7. PERIL OF THE DISINTEGRATION OF THE INDIVIDUAL THROUGH HIS DETACHMENT FROM THE BODY OF TRADITION: NATION, HOMELAND, HISTORY, NATIONAL CULTURE, RELIGION, CUSTOMS. TRANSPLANTATION OF THE INDIVIDUAL TO SURROUNDINGS WHICH ARE FOREIGN TO ALL THE INSTITUTIONS OF HIS NATIONAL PAST.

In these considerations we have omitted everything in the history of Bolshevism which has only maneuver value or is only a modification of a tactical order. Russian imperialism, religious freedom, the orthodox offensive, papalavism, color nationalism, are just means of action for Bolshevism. They do not indicate a conversion of communism toward nationalism, its evolution toward specifically Russian ends; they represent only intermediary ends. All the concessions made in one sense or in another will be destroyed by the fire of purification as soon as their tactical advantages have been spent.

This comparative table shows in quite an explicit manner what relation communism bears to the bourgeois and capitalist world. The great innovation consists in the feverish search for

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

the negative aspects of the bourgeois and capitalist society. Bolshevism does not change anything; it does not improve anything whatsoever, does not bring any generous idea, but seeks to activate in the highest degree the causes of social disintegration. It extracts all the evil which prevails in society and cultivates it in its pure state, just as microbe cultures are cultivated in a surrounding dedicated exclusively to their development. A bizarre phenomenon is occurring, and for the first time in history: continuity of substance between two social structures which fight against each other bitterly. It is not a question here of positive continuity, of the torch of tradition which a period passes on to the one that comes after it, but as we have already remarked, it is a revival of the dead matter produced by the bourgeois world. Communism hates the real values of bourgeois and capitalist society, but it is avid to avail itself of all the cast-offs which are the result of wear, time, and old age.

The revolutionary force arises against the conservative force not with an eye to suppressing the abuses, but only because this conservative force has not pushed far enough the perfecting of the techniques of evil and does not wish to abandon the last vestiges of humanity and the life.

The bolshevist spirit is the bourgeois spirit without the intermediary nuances of evil. Whereas in the bourgeois and capitalist society evil appears through lack of spiritual vigilance, through error, in the Soviet world it is adopted as a general norm of government, as a constitutional principle of State. It is

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

endowed by a hierarchy, by a status, by a code, by a police, by a justice which defend it against all deviations. He who still has a longing for good, who tries to discover in his inner self another meaning to life than that prescribed by the thought of the regime is ousted from the ranks of the collectivity like a sterile plant.

These conclusions have been dictated to us by reality as it appears in Soviet Russia or in the countries invaded by her armies. We arrive at the same result by studying directly the Marxist doctrine, the concept which dominates its political attitudes. Marxist dialectic foresees a general settlement of accounts with the past once the bourgeoisie has been vanquished by the proletariat -- last episode of the class struggle -- a past which will be succeeded by the communist ideal, the classless and stateless society. None of the traditional institutions created by the millenary work of the peoples will be spared by the wave of destruction. Nation, country, religion, family, property, rights, morale, individuality, liberty, will be equally swept by the wave of the proletariat. Nevertheless, for a doctrine which pretends to erect a new world the constructive part shows an astonishing weakness. Whereas the destructive mission of the proletariat is scrupulously described, the texts dedicated to the construction of the future society appear brief and inarticulate. All which is related to conquest of power is presented in a masterly way, whereas all that concerns the use of power after the victory remains wrapped in mystery. The formulas which are dedicated to the future do not seem to rise from the same precise and sagacious analyst; we are suddenly transported into a world of unreal dimensions.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

It is evident that these formulas have not been enounced in order to represent something tangible, to suggest an achievable image of the future, but rather to hide an inner emptiness, a weakness of the thinker, an abdication of his creative energies.

By making a tabula rasa of the past, Marxist thought annihilates implicitly all its creative possibilities. It has reached the point where it no longer can undertake anything. In front of it lies the dark immensity of an abyss. The revolutionary synthesis can no longer take place, because the matter which it was supposed to utilize lies dying under a pile of rubbish. It is then that marxist thought dissimulates its own catastrophe by transforming negation into virtue, by adopting the formula of the concentrated evil -- a formula which distinguishes itself also from the parallelism of the bourgeois-communist manifestations -- as a durable system of government. The critics and adversaries of Marxism have not seen that this doctrine is entirely lacking in the essential thing, an ideal, a creative vision of society. It is a formidable dialectic of destruction, and not a dialectic of creation.

Communist society constitutes an enigma only for the one who wishes it to be that way. It is identical with the Soviet Leviathan. One can accuse the actual leaders of Soviet Russia of all evils, except that of not having remained faithful to the founder of the communist movement. The western socialist parties no longer have anything in common with Marxism, apart from a relationship of prestige. (Many other reasons bind us to the West. What sympathy could Soviet Russia -- that immense slaughterhouse of peoples, where everything which belongs to a nation, to a culture is destined to

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

disappear, buried in a shapeless form -- awake in us?).

Having noted that the ideological differences between the bourgeois and capitalist society and communism are much slighter than would have been thought and that what one starts, the other achieves, for what reasons do we nevertheless not hesitate to declare ourselves the supporters of the western world? Because in the West, evil has not taken the form of an institution; it has not yet become a State ethic.

The peoples of the West live in a climate of freedom. Their technique of government, Democracy, cannot prevent evil from manifesting itself; but if it does not do anything about it, at least it does not offer to it the direct support of the state, a symbiosis which has been achieved in Soviet Russia. Democracy is a neutral political frame, a rule of a game which accepts and can sustain diverse ideological contents. In the XIX century she welcomed economic liberalism and a capitalism of a most advanced type; today the socialists of diverse tendencies do not feel disturbed at all by her company. She is responsible neither for the political content elaborated by the diverse currents which agitate the collectivity, neither for the results homologated under her arbitration. She registers the fluctuations of the public opinion, but it is not her task to evaluate or influence them. Democracy is rather a procedure to be followed in public affairs, than a concept of life. She plays a role in society analogous to the free arbiter in the life of the individual. It follows that materialism, atheism, and the other defects of modern society are not the product of the system of government inaugurated

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

by Democracy, and that their appearance concomitant with the victory of democratic ideas is only fortuitous. We could not therefore ask Democracy, which called upon to respect with impartiality all principles and all parties, to rule out social evils or to undertake crusades in order to fight them. Democracy does not oppose herself to the appearance of some ideas, but she can offer to reformers of society only the guarantee of political liberties.

Democracy distributes equal opportunities to everyone; the result of the struggle between good and evil depends upon the wisdom of the leaders and upon the virtues of the collectivity.

This fortunate separation, which was able to take place in the West, between political opinion and its mode of expression is not respected by communism. Its technique of government is an instrument of expansion for the communist ideal. It does not register the opinions of the citizens to utilize them in the framework of the State, but to discover and to annihilate those which could cause disturbances to its all-powerfulness. The Soviet State admits no exceptions, does not tolerate any heresies, does not recognize anyone's right to nonconformism. The iniquitous treatment which it applies to its subjects, its violent intervention each time they attempt to manifest personal viewpoints is the result of the principle upon which it is based. The communist State is a diabolical breach in the forehead of humanity, a complete projection of evil.

The ^{political} democratic powers told themselves, without doubt, that the spiritual bases of humanity were so damaged, that humanity was so degraded, was so sick that they (the ^{political} democratic powers) would find no obstacles if they manifested one fine day their desires for

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

world domination. When communism succeeds in taking in hand the destinies of a people, it immediately gets rid of all tactical hesitations, rejects little by little all the masks of occasion, and by its acts, by the terror which it exercises, by the horror which it has acquired rivalry with other forces, by all this ferocious cloak, characteristic of the regime installed in Russia, (it) reveals its identity with evil. It finds the view of what is good, what is right, intolerable, for the contradictions which good would raise in the souls of people would be fatal to its existence. Placed in the presence of a means of comparison, the latter would not take long to recognize the true face of the State which rules them. In order to maintain itself, the communist State must transform terror into a permanent principle of government.

Supposing that the development of the actual conflict favors the western democracies, as everything would tend to have us believe; this would not mean that the danger of communism is definitely over, and that a period of prosperity and of peace would establish itself between the peoples. The bourgeois and capitalist society carries in itself the germs of communism. The whole of humanity has suffered from a tendency toward evil and communism represents only the extreme of this tendency. It follows, therefore that its effects will continue to threaten the existence of the peoples. If evil is not confronted with energetic means, it will one day feel strong enough to suppress -- even without exterior aid -- liberty in the world. This new social form would perhaps not be called communism, but that would not prevent its structure

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

from resembling it.

The Western world must not think that it is sheltered from such a change of fortune. Its great advantage is that of having kept intact the opportunities of achieving good -- in the communist world these chances no longer exist -- and its unexploited reserves, its possibilities of improvement suffice to keep alive the flame of our hope.

However, an overestimation of its spiritual forces, an attitude of arrogance and heedlessness, the illusion that things might arrange themselves automatically for the West would be fatal for the future of humanity. Once the Bolshevik peril is out of the way, the peoples of the West will have to become more lucid, more conscious of the role which they are to play in the world. The revision of ideological bases weakened by the time, the rejuvenating of the political frame of Democracy because of the necessity which a new social ideal imposes must be considered, so that the tragic experience which we are witnessing may not repeat itself.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

CHAPTER II

THE NATIONALIST PHENOMENON

The struggle between communism and capitalism becomes complicated after World War I, when a new pretender to the heritage of the old world makes its appearance: Nationalism. Nevertheless, that date only indicates the moment when its efforts were most heroic, when it was able to affirm itself with courage. For, if one wishes to discover its remote origin, one must go back to the second half of the nineteenth century and even further.

We have called that phenomenon "Nationalism" or the "Nationalist Movement" rather than "Fascism" or the "Fascist Movement" because the former seem to agree better with the exact sense of things. The term "Fascism" imposed itself on the general attention in virtue of its priority in the birth of the Italian nationalist movement. In fact, Fascism was the first to conquer power and to found a State. Its emblem served as the insignia of all the political groups who were fighting for the same ideals. Nevertheless, if one compares Fascism to the nationalist movements which appeared later, one realizes that it is too impregnated with particularities, too specifically Italian for all other manifestations of nationalism to be called by that name. The term which we choose does not, on the contrary, evoke memories of any one regime, and all parties which are oriented in the same direction can be included therein without difficulty.

What new factors did the nationalist movements bring? What was their position in relation to the forces which dominated international rivalries? Their opponents classified them among freak occurrences of history: phenomena whose antecedents are not discern-

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ible, without roots in the past, arising from the unknown to destroy all the hypotheses for the future; phenomena permitting of no explanation, unless it be described as having its origin in the depths of primitive man, reappearing on the surface from time to time, in spite of the thousands of years of civilization which separate us from the age of cave dwellers. In reality, the nationalist phenomenon is not at all obscure. It is a normal product of history and its origins can be extricated with precision. It was born of the same social conditions, from the same sort of turmoil which caused the eruption of communism in history. Its doctrine and its policies represent a reaction against the errors of society. The deficiencies of that society determined the appearance of the revolutionary movement parallel to the reforms projected by communism. These two transformers of social life, both desiring to become the unique inheritor of the old society, sprang from the same old root.

The tendencies of communism are known: In its dialectic one encounters no positive ideas, no trace whatsoever of good or of truth. An emanation of evil, its principal aim is to tear man from his national, cultural, and religious surroundings, so as to render him apt to lead the termite's existence which is that of the soviet citizen. The reactions of nationalism are of an entirely different nature. They have nothing in common with that assiduous hatred which communism manifests toward all the institutions of the past. Its inner creative principle is particularly constructive. Whereas the communists work with all their strength to prepare the destruction of the old world, their bitterness going so far as to make them willing to destroy its every vestige in history, the nationalists are only engaged in a family dispute with this world. The nationalists,

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

also remarking the existing disorder under bourgeois leadership, do not have the intention of exploiting it as the communists do, but, rather, intend putting an end to it through a new social synthesis.

Communism represents the negative achievements of the bourgeois and capitalist society. Nationalism inclines toward a positive solution of contemporary difficulties. It detaches itself from the bourgeois and capitalist society in order to find a remedy for its faults, thereby giving it a new creative impulse. To this end it incorporates that part of the national organism which is sound, that part which has not yet been ravaged by the ferment of disintegration. The effort of the nationalist movements is oriented toward the conversion of the bourgeoisie into a new social form which conserves its real social values, meanwhile causing all its abuses to disappear. A society of a capitalist type can no longer go on existing, even should it escape the revolutionary explosion of communism. It is threatened by another death, that caused by the slow accumulation of evil. The mercantile and anarchic individualism which created the glory of that society, which once represented its factor of progress, has now become its principal agent of destruction. One can no longer base his existence on that concept, for life itself surpassed it and eliminated it from the social cycle. The sudden appearance of the "extremism of the right" is not a pure accident. The sane or healthy forces of Europe intervene in the combat only when the bourgeois and capitalist type of democracies prove themselves too weak to confront the attacks of bolshevism with an efficient resistance.

To what extent can nationalism assume the bourgeois heritage?

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

For what reason does the attitude of the nationalist movements toward the institutions of the past differ from that of bolshevism?

This can be explained by the fact that the bourgeoisie and nationalism belong to the same type of civilisation. Nationalism could not wish for the old world to disappear entirely, for it regards itself as the continuator of that world. Nationalism knows how to distinguish the faults of the bourgeois and capitalist society, which it hates and opposes unmercifully, from its permanent content which surpasses in interest and in value its historical formula.

Bourgeois society came into being through a revolution; but it was a revolution which kept the pillars of European civilisation intact. In the same way, if the nationalist revolution had met with a complete victory, it would have developed itself in the midst of a better grouping of the social forces and would not have affected the constitutive elements of that civilisation. The transition from the bourgeoisie to nationalism would not have meant estrangement from the spiritual patrimony of Europe, but only its reconstitution in another form. The transition would have taken place within the same culture and within the same social group. The way in which the innovating action would have occurred, the mechanism involved, quiet changes or revolutionary shocks, all this would have been a question related to the particularities of each people and not essential to the basis of the problem. What is important to know is that the divergencies which exist between liberal democracy and nationalism are of an accidental nature; whereas, what brings them close together is related to their similar substructure. The reaction of nationalism is the reaction of the archetype of European culture against forms which ne

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

longer relate to its development. It is a phenomenon of growth and the realization of the same spiritual efflorescence as took place during the middle ages.

The bourgeoisie, used in its nineteenth century sense, cannot survive. This does not mean that it is in irremediable opposition with the new social order. A multitude of antiquated tendencies merged themselves in the bourgeois and capitalist society. The true history of the bourgeoisie does not start with the nineteenth century, but two thousand years earlier. By passing into the nationalist phase, bourgeoisie only brings on the plunge into the prospects of a millennial organism. It is not vanquished, but a continuer. It would be vanquished for certain if it did not transmit any of its historical substance to the future generations. This disaster would occur only if it permitted itself to be absorbed by the tidal wave of communism. The victory of communism would not only result in the transfer of the political center of gravity to that social class which is actually in distress, as the doctrinaires affirm it, but also the substitution of one type of civilization for another. Communism is alien to Europe, alien also to the succession of events which determined the appearance of the bourgeoisie.

The conflict between the past and the future should have been solved according to the rules which went into effect at the time feudal society disappeared -- a disappearance succeeded by rebirth. Why was this experience not followed up? For what reason did bourgeoisie prefer an alliance with bolshevism, a movement with which she had neither common origin nor creative affinity? All this constitutes one of the strangest events in history.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

- In what follows we are going to try to throw some light upon the errors committed by the nationalist movements in their relations with the democratic powers. We are going to attempt to establish their share of the responsibility for the European disaster.

The errors in the conduct of nationalism cannot be discovered unless one possesses a general view of the nationalist phenomenon. One cannot judge the nationalist movements according to what the democracies or communism think about them, but only by taking their real aims into account. In order to approach the question of responsibilities, one must proceed first toward a "restitutio in integrum" of the nationalist phenomenon, toward a reconstitution of that movement in its initial aspect. This operation of delimitation is necessary because of the differences between the initial impulses to which it owes its birth and its historical achievements are sometimes quite large.

What we have said about the nationalist movement up to now does not affect this question. We have established its historical justifications and the contacts which it has maintained with democracy and with communism, but we have revealed almost nothing about its structure. By taking the word "national" as a starting point, we will find the genesis and meaning of nationalism. "National" and "Nationalism" represent two different stages in the life of a nation -- two different periods in its life -- one directed particularly toward the exterior world, toward the "epos", the other toward the internal world, toward the "ethos". The term "national" contains in

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

itself the movements of political unification of the European peoples, their grouping in independent states. These movements, generalized after the French Revolution, ended, in the majority of cases, at the beginning of the twentieth century. Nationalism presupposes this stage as already achieved. It appears only when the ethnical borders of peoples have already been established. With nationalism there begins the period of organization of the very depths of a nation, the period when its spiritual content is being explored. The nation abandons the era of external conquests and concentrates on itself. The term "national" represents the phase of geographical delimitation of the nations, the period of fixation of sovereignty over a determined territory. It has an extensive sense. "Nationalism" transfigures "national". It expresses its virtualities, its profound creative energies. The term "national" represents the territorial mobilization of a people; the term "nationalism" takes this acquisition as a point of departure and undertakes the spiritual mobilization of the people.

There exists between these two terms a difference of perspective in the hierarchy of values. The nation "nationalises" itself from ~~the~~ ^{which} it leaves its material life; it interests itself in its spiritual destiny. In the "national" phase, history expands beyond the natural necessities of the peoples and creates unnecessary superstructures which impede their destinies and consume the greatest part of their creative energies. In the "nationalist" phase, the principal preoccupation of the peoples becomes culture, the contemplation of the internal world. History then serves mainly as a protective wall. Political activity does not cease. The people continue to

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

interest themselves in the State, in the way public affairs function, but in the discovery of the splendors of life they find a sort of immunity against aggressive attitudes. The zeal manifested in that direction is limited by the necessity of defending the freedom of expression of the national genius. Nationalism has nothing to do with imperialism and chauvinism, specific forms of the manifestations of the "national", which, in the history of the European peoples, accompanied the bourgeois period.

From "national" to "nationalism" there is the same distance as between a shapeless block of marble and the same block after it has been carved by the hand of the sculptor. Centuries are necessary for a people to be able to form its personality.

A people which has attained the height of the "national" phase, which is at the saturation point of all its territorial pretensions, is threatened by the most violent crisis of its history -- by the crisis inhering in a lack of ideal. The aspirations which till then had stimulated it are suddenly antiquated and no new vision enlarges its horizon. At that point of spiritual weakness, when peoples are stifled under the weight of the past, the creative power of nationalism intervenes. It directs the energies of the peoples toward superior aims and gives a new impulse to history.

On the level of international relations nationalism favors understanding between peoples and of "national" history is dominated by mutual suspicions, perpetual conflicts provoked by the thirst for territorial conquests. In the nationalist period the peoples interest themselves more and more in their inward life, feel

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

themselves more attracted by the fearlessness of the spirit. Then the old hostilities weaken. Their reconciliation is no longer the result of efforts which were often unfruitful, but the natural achievement of their way of life. A people which has discovered its soul can only be filled with respect toward the other peoples, who, like them, are a unique appearance in history, an entirely different universe, representing an intransmissible creative genius, the destruction of which would be equivalent to an outrage against humanity. It is only by elevation to this conception that a group can become a messenger of peace and fraternity among other peoples.

A nation cannot refine its customs with its resources alone. Whatever the desire of the peoples to direct their destiny in an honest way, if they do not invoke the aid of the religious sentiment, they will never be able to master their baser instincts. Nationalism tends to discipline nations with the aid of transcendental realities. The nationalist spirituality is inseparable from the ultimate mysteries of our existence as they were revealed to man in the Gospel. There is no nationalist movement which is not a tributary of religious truths.

One must not forget that the Lateran Agreement, which put an end to the conflict between the Italian State and the Vatican was a result of a nationalist movement, that the Spanish phalangism had its basis in Catholicism, that the legionary Rumanian Government sent its best representative to Spain for the defense of the Cross. Even National Socialism, the evolution of which tends toward a nebulous pantheism, does not hesitate in its beginnings to speak of Christianity. In general, all the nationalist movements, more or less conscious of this fact, have borrowed something from the mystic and from the revolutionary flavor of Christianity.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

CHAPTER III

THE ERRORS OF NATIONALISM

Now that we have examined the content and the characteristic traits of the Nationalist concept, let us return to the study of Nationalism as a historical event.

The greatest error of the nationalist movements was to act before having fully elaborated their ideological basis. What does the new phenomenon represent and what is its historical mission? Its deepest meaning was never revealed to the public, whereas this was done in the case of the French Revolution, which had precursors of such genius as Locke, Montesquieu and Rousseau. The nationalist movements have had to struggle not only against their enemies, but also against their own insufficiencies. And if their leaders have had to suffer so many resounding defeats, it is because they failed to seek the ultimate goals of Nationalism. They wanted to contain in too narrow and too rigid a frame realities which were much too vast and too complex. Their political programs were subject to troublesome influences because they became an undigested mixture of original ideas and imitations, instead of being a unique expression of independent thought. Carried away by diverse tendencies (at times even contradictory), misunderstanding the new European spirit, they ended by definitely losing the initiative to their adversaries.

The defeat suffered by the nationalists was caused, to a certain extent, by a lack of clearness in their ideology. The absurd coalition between democracy and bolshevism was its gravest consequence. Naturally, all the nationalist movements are not equally responsible.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

It was chiefly the great nationalist movements which, through their political and military strength, could have been answerable for Europe. We mean fascism and national socialism. Even within this restricted circle, a further line of demarcation is necessary. From 1936 on, national socialism surpasses fascism in combative force, as in political ascent. It is equally just, therefore, that the center of responsibility transfer itself from South to North of the Rome-Berlin Axis.

As soon as these two movements appeared, they declared themselves the irreducible adversaries of bolshevism, and the leitmotif of their propaganda was to denounce the peril coming from the East. Conscious of belonging to the Western world, they addressed themselves to all of its combative forces in order to create a single front against the common danger. This attitude could not do otherwise than to attract the sympathy of the democratic ruling circles. In any case, even if certain tensions between them were inevitable, it would never have led to World War II if other factors had not intervened. The real difficulties began only when Italy and Germany abandoned the antibolshevik struggle and manifested ideas of revenge and territorial conquest. Let us remember the indulgence which the Western allies manifested toward these nationalist movements during the years necessary for the consolidation of their power.

One who closely examines the foreign policy of Great Britain will not fail to recognize the considerable concessions which were made to Germany for the purpose of conserving her as an essential

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

part of the famous European balance. Unfortunately, after having benefited from this conciliatory attitude, the national socialists forgot that England had contributed to their success. Hitler, instead of understanding the price of the concessions which were made to him as head of an anticommunist power in Europe, lost all sense of limits and gravitated toward a policy of force. Through his rash actions he then furnished decisive arguments to those who were preaching for a war against Germany, and all the efforts of those who still believed that a reconciliation between the nationalist states could be obtained remained in vain.

The long period of fascist government profited in the same way from a climate proper for its development. Without the consent of England it is not very probable that Mussolini could have remained in power for long, alone in the midst of an unfriendly world. The bolshevik threat imposed on the democratic powers the obligation of handling these new political forces with tact as long as principal aims of those forces did not exceed the limit of their European interests.

The increasing suspicion with which these same powers eyed the nationalist states later, was caused by the changes which occurred in the external policy of the latter. Tempted by the artificial advantages of an imperialistic nationalism the nationalist states threatened the Peace of Europe by time-worn claims. The heads of the nationalist states did not understand the difference between "national" and "nationalism", and adopted an obsolete ideological stand in foreign policy. "Nationalist" as they were, they called for the "national", a political conception which was particularly bourgeois and capitalist.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

From the strategic point of view, this divergent policy of the axis powers created an untenable situation, caused an unnecessary and dangerous disunity among the forces at their disposal. A crusade against bolshevism (under pretense of which Hitler wished to present his Russian campaign to the world) presupposed the removal of all European difficulties and then the enthusiastic participation of the majority of the peoples of our continent. But where could this giant enterprise have obtained the necessary stimulus, what internal springs could have motivated this formidable coalition which was to destroy Moscow, when the supreme head of this coalition himself trampled the liberty and life of other peoples under his feet? With the exception of Russia's neighbor states, the European peoples abandoned the idea of putting up a common front against bolshevism because Hitler himself was the first to give the signal of defection.

The result of this absurd association of aims was that the war ended as a disaster for both theaters of operation. Germany -- an empire covering all of Europe -- and Italy -- a great maritime power, master of the key positions of the Mediterranean -- were annihilated. On the other hand, bolshevism became more powerful and more dangerous than it had been on the eve of the war.

We must, out of respect to truth, make a distinction between the attitude of Italy and that of Germany. Mussolini, it is true, nursed dreams of imperial grandeur; but he was too much of a realist not to realize that one lifetime would not be enough. His Caesar-like attitude was caused particularly by his desire to secure a place in history for the Italian people, and this renewal of national energy did not seem possible to him without reviving the glorious past of

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

of the Roman Legions. Mussolini only elaborated an imperialist vision, the achievement of which required centuries and generations. For the other part of his reign, he had no other aim than that of assuring his country a position of first rank in the concert of European peoples, and to give her possibilities for colonization. One can consider fascist expansion as ended with the Ethiopian campaign. The pretensions which Italy raised in 1938 were not born from the same inspiration. They were caused by the fascination which the German victories had for the Duce. A powerful jealousy urged Mussolini to claim his share of the national socialist booty.

Hitler had an entirely different political vision. He thought himself predestined to solve once and for all the problem of vital space for Germany. In his view, Germany should expand to the extreme limits of our continent, and from the heart of Europe should rule over the whole world. If the imperialistic formula of Mussolini was destined to serve as an element of stimulation for Italian history, the German empire imagined by Hitler was to attain a definitive form during the very life of the dictator. In the mind of Hitler, the vital necessities of other peoples were of interest so long as they could serve his plans of world domination. He did not content himself with a preponderant influence on the part of the Germany within the frame of the European community, with a "Führung" [leadership] which, to a certain extent, would not have been abnormal; but he aspired also to the "Herrschaft" [domination], to the total submission of other peoples to Germany.

When, after having signed the treaty of Munich, Hitler occupied Czechoslovakia, he at the same time took away from national socialism

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

the prestige of being a great historical revelation. Till that time the political acts of Germany had not caused any suspicion in the nationalist world, being justified by the need of the German people for unity. Upon the occasion of the Anschluss, Corneliu Codreanu, head of the Rumanian Legionary Movement, sent a telegram in which he paid his respects to Hitler, celebrating the triumph of truth in Austria. Codreanu was no longer living in 1939, and therefore could not be witness to the pact of nonaggression between Hitler and the Soviets, nor could he see "the Armies of the Cross and of Christianity" (it was in these terms that he spoke of the Rome-Berlin Axis) extend their hands to the armies of evil intentions, so as to join forces in crushing the small peoples of the East. When Corneliu Codreanu declared himself a supporter of the Axis (which he believed was at the service of the European and Christian cause) he placed in that adherence all the ardor of his idealism and all the purity of his sentiments. He judged the nationalist manifestations in relation to their intrinsic truth and could never have conceived the fact that the protagonists of the new Europe might one day separate themselves from the fundamental truths of their doctrine.

In the realm of ideas Hitler gave proof of the same uncompromising spirit. The difference between Hitler and Mussolini in this respect is even more striking. The "Duce" of Fascism pursued only the spiritual preeminence of his doctrine, a recognition from the other movements of the path which he had chosen in history. It is his merit to have perceived early the political and spiritual unrest of the European peoples, and of having been able to give it a form of expression.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

He thought also of the necessity for a systematic contact among the nationalist movements. To further this aim, he patronised the establishment of "Committees of Action for the Universality of Rome", which began their activities under the most favorable auspices. The principal purpose of these committees, in spite of the fact that their somewhat theatrical names seemed to suggest other interpretations, was to establish intimate bonds of friendship with the other nationalist movements, to distinguish the general constituents of the phenomenon from the particularities of its many manifestations. Fascism did not come to impose its principles on docile delegates; the discussion took place among equal partners and in an atmosphere of freedom. The final protocol of the works achieved represented the opinions of the majority. This enabled the delegates to know each other, to exchange experiences, and to coordinate their doctrine and their means of action. It was Ion Motza who, in December 1934, represented the Legionary Movement at the annual meeting of the Committees of Action. The meeting took place in Montreux and obtained appreciable results. Ion Motza was deeply impressed by the fact that the German National Socialists had not appeared at the congress, and insisted that efforts should be made to assure their participation at the next meeting of the Committees.

Unfortunately, the Committees were not to meet again. One of the most fruitful activities initiated by Mussolini, which, if it had been allowed to develop, might have exercised good influence on all the nationalist movement, was then sacrificed to the interests of the external policy. These direct contacts annoyed the heads of the nationalist socialist movements, and Mussolini, in order not to displease his new allies, abandoned the committees -- to the great

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

stupefaction of those who had contributed and appreciated the activity. The abandonment of this idea was not only a grave political error, but also an essential moment in the destiny of these movements, a fateful error. The suppression of the Committees interrupted the ascending evolution of these nationalist movements by arresting the spiritual effervescence which had accompanied their meetings and which is essential to the life of a new idea.

National Socialism assumed an attitude of indifference toward the Roman initiative because its doctrine lacked too much of universality to harmonize with other movements. The National Socialist doctrine lacked that generosity which opens the hearts of peoples toward a political idea. The Hitlerian ideology means the complete triumph of the "national" to the detriment of "nationalism"; the interest in Germany alone absorbs all the doctrine and takes the form of a myth. Even the racial idea was not cultivated for its intrinsic value, but to contribute to the domination of the world by the Reich. Hitler hated William II and presented him in the eyes of the German people as a poor example of a leader. But in reality he only reproduced him in greater proportions.

Making his appearance in a nationalist period, Hitler stood aloof from its atmosphere. He used the frame of nationalism, but he distorted its origin and meaning. Rather inclined toward the past, Hitler, without discerning what was false and what was true in the history of Germany, what out of the bulk of events was in accordance with the new European spirit, made German nationalism out of all this heritage. This would have been of no importance if the Fuhrer had been the head of a small country with limited possibilities of action.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

In that case, he would have become noted for his chauvinism. Unfortunately, the one who disposed of the greatest military and political force among the heads of nationalist states, was also the one who understood the least the basis of Nationalism. His errors did not affect only a single country; they caused the ruin of our whole continent. Even more considerable than the political defeat of Europe -- for, apart from Soviet Russia, no State came out of World War II as a victorious power -- was the failure of the new historical synthesis toward which it was inclined.

National Socialism was, of all nationalist ideologies, the least accessible to other peoples. And, although it willingly abandoned the idea of a European collaboration, it nevertheless attempted to model all other movements in its own image. How was this possible?

The egocentric position of National Socialism deprived it of the hope of ever being welcomed in Europe. A conception which remained so exclusive could not in fact be accepted as the spiritual image of the new Europe. At that point there remained only the messianic idea of a people elected by Providence to achieve the highest ideals of humanity. Rendered powerful by their military success, the Germans declare themselves the sole leaders of the destiny of Europe and regard the other movements with an attitude of indifference. To the National Socialists, the new European conscience is no longer forged by the common assets of all the Nationalist movements of Europe, but is delegated to them alone as representatives of the most valiant of peoples.

The leaders of the Third Reich only saw in the Nationalist movements bothersome companions of whom they would readily have freed

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

themselves if necessities of a tactical nature had not restrained them from doing so. This conviction was so clear that they did not even try to hide it until the day of final victory. Even when the risk of war had become apparent, they devoted themselves to making plans to bring the nationalist movements under their subjection. We do not know the details of this plan. It was never revealed. But a multitude of actions started by those who are accountable for the Third Reich confirm it:

1. The fate of the nationalist movements never interested the external policy of the Third Reich. The national socialists pursued their aims without ever concerning themselves with knowing if, under their blows, a nationalist movement would not be entirely destroyed, and if these would not affect the very idea of European solidarity. How could the nationalist movements of Yugoslavia, Poland and Czechoslovakia maintain their popularity when the force which polarized the rebirth of hope in Europe was preoccupied exclusively with territorial conquests, and had no respect for the rights of other nations? When the national socialist diplomacy was asked to explain the curious friendship of which it gave proof toward the nationalist movements, it would present the excuse of tactical necessity. Finally, the lack of good will on the part of the German government no longer deceived anyone. The fear of contracting commitments which would prove too inconvenient to fulfill on the day of victory induced the Germans to employ trickery in dealing with the nationalist movements. It was only at the moment when their whole political system collapsed that the Germans called upon the nationalists to save a hopeless situation. The example of Hungary, of Rumania, of the Vlassov army and of the

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Ukrainian units, which were permitted to appear only on the eve of defeat, is evident proof of this fact.

2. National socialism did not favor the creation of a spirit of cooperation among the nationalist movements. Not only did it not favor in any way the interrelation of nationalist groups, but it was also suspicious of rising friendships. The nationalist movements were waiting for a watchword, for a signal from somewhere. But Mussolini, who was the only chief of state capable of answering their appeal and of imposing on the national socialist leaders a more reasonable policy, did not move.

3. After her territorial conquests, Germany demonstrated her aim of absorbing on the ideological level the countries which she had occupied or which had become subject to her influence. The remote aim of German policy was to substitute autonomous ~~the~~/nationalist movements with that of the national socialist.

4. The nationalist movements which were too independent, which rebelled against being reduced to bondage, were prevented from developing too rapidly. As soon as a nationalist movement found itself in difficulty, the leaders of the Third Reich profited by the occasion to take away its liberty. Jean Tuka, former President of the Council of the Slovak Republic and successor of Bishop Hlinka as head of the Slovak National Guards, bitterly admitted to us the lack of consideration which the national socialist diplomacy manifested toward the new Slovak State, created in 1939, after the dissolution of Czecho-slovakia. The Slovak nationalist movements, which for years had been struggling for the liberation of the Slovak people, were

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

forced to abandon their initial positions and to participate in a hybrid government. The man who received the order from the Reich to crush the movement of the Slovak Nationalists was the Baron Manfred von Killinger, a person who was later entrusted by Ribbentrop with a similar task in Bucharest. The coup d'etat of Antonescu, who, in January 1941, overthrew the national legionary cabinet, was carried out with the aid of German troops stationed at the time on Rumanian soil, and coincided with the arrival of a new German plenipotentiary in Rumania.

By permitting national socialism to be usurped by the false images of the past, Hitler deprived the German people of a great historical moment. National socialism in itself is not the creation of Hitler, but corresponds to the state of mind of all the German people, who, like other peoples of Europe, were attracted by nationalism. Through national socialism, the German people participated in a movement of universal character. Its glory would have been to assist in this great revolutionary movement by contributing its immense potential. Hitler preferred to avenge the injustices of the treaty of Versailles, and through this Wilhelmian imperialist conception made German history move back a hundred years into the past. This does not mean that the territorial problems should have been eliminated from his policy, but only that they should have been solved without endangering the whole concept of nationalism.

During Hitler's last year one could observe among the important personalities of the party a tendency toward making national socialism milder. In January 1945, the promoter of this new conception, Professor Doctor Six, head of the cultural section of the Ministry of

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Foreign Affairs, organized in Weimar a congress of all the nationalists who sought refuge in Germany, with the aim of creating among them a common basis of understanding. After ten years of oblivion, Mussolini's idea was again being considered in Germany, at a time when it could no longer have any influence on the destiny of Europe. Following the example of Professor Six, official delegate of Germany, all the speakers rejected imperialism and chauvinism as incompatible with nationalism. In the twilight of the Third Reich one could find again, after a long period of having been led astray, the true laws of nationalism. Opened under the auspices of the universalist thought of Goethe, the Congress of Weimar represented, in spite of the defeat which occurred, a crucial moment in the existence of the nationalist movements and a new point of departure for their future.

Another error which was committed by European nationalism was to allow itself to be seduced by the formula of a single party. In spite of appearances and in spite of the theories to which nationalism is devoted, the single party does not constitute its essence. It was the general spread of this error from the great movements to the small which created the impression that the techniques of government and of nationalism were identical.

Totalitarianism was introduced in history for the first time by the bolsheviks. They are the creators of the single party. Their doctrine is so destitute of humanism that it can affirm its position in the state only by the confiscation of power for the benefit of a single party and through the exercise of terror. A minority without scruples seizes power, and once it is in possession of it, suppresses the sovereignty of the people, has everyone who attempts to resist its abuses assassinated or imprisoned.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Does nationalism need to have recourse to such procedures? Is it so contrary to the souls of people that it would find itself obliged to set up a police state? Nationalism is not in conflict with the popular conscience. The ideas which it professes are not contrary to the supreme interests of the nation. Why then should it attempt to evade the trial by election which is the expression of national will? Nationalism cannot avoid this dilemma: either it is the quintessence of a nation and so does not have to fear the popular verdict, or it chooses force and recognises implicitly that it is far from the aspirations of the people.

The nationalists must admit that they permitted themselves to become fascinated by the vision of eternal power, and that they succumbed to a temptation a propos of a world of hatred and negation. It is true that through the voice of democratic liberties the progress of truth is slower. But are not truths which are acquired in the midst of difficulties more lasting? The principal preoccupation of nationalism must be the education of the masses and not the conquest of power. If ever the responsibility of government must devolve on its representatives, it must be only through the means of universal suffrage. And if other political groups which are more active and even more conscious of public welfare should manage to assert themselves and to obtain the votes of the nation, the nationalist parties would then have to yield them the place in government with loyalty. (The position of the legionary movement toward democracy will be explained in another work.)

The obligation of having to consult the people does not exclude the fact that a nationalist movement comes to power through direct action. While the political activity of a nationalist party

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

must generally bear the stamp of legality and avoid the use of violence, there are exceptional circumstances which absolve it from such commitments and justify the conquest of the state through abnormal means. The march on Rome in 1922 was brought about by the apathy of the Italian State, by its total lack of strength to answer the attacks of the social-communist left. If Mussolini had hesitated for a moment, a dictatorship similar to the Soviet dictatorship would have been installed in Italy. Democracy could no longer have existed even if Mussolini had not taken its place. It was, therefore, in a moment of widespread unrest that he attempted his coup d'etat. The machinery of state for the transmission of public powers had been clogged by turmoil and the nation, being delivered to the forces of anarchy, appealed to his decisive spirit. No one could have offered him a better, more valid, more legitimate command than the nation itself. Mussolini abused the call to power which he had received from the nation only when he prolonged further than was necessary an emergency by becoming the tyrant of the order which he had restored.

The situation in Spain was entirely different. In that country, the monarchy broke down under the blows of the republicans. The regime which succeeded it transformed itself into an anarcho-communist government and, at the worst hour of this national catastrophe, a group of patriots, recruited from among the officers and members of the Phalangist Movement, reestablished order after a grueling civil war. The fact that Generalissimo Franco became the leader of the Spanish State is a natural consequence of the risks and responsibilities which he assumed when all the other national forces, monarchy, nobility, bourgeoisie, moderate socialists, had capitulated. Could

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

the Franco regime retire and leave the power in the hands of a monarchical-democratic faction by openly consulting the popular will? The internal situation of Spain, which is closely related to what is actually happening on the world-wide level could not permit such a solution, at least not immediately. To revert suddenly to the past would be to return to chaos. Fed as they are by the agents of international communism, the old hatreds await only one moment of weakness in the actual authority. There is no reason why the old political groups, which made such a pitiful surrender in 1936, should declare themselves more worthy of leadership tomorrow. Apart from the communists, there is no one who could replace Franco, no political group capable of assuring a democratic succession which would survive under the existing conditions.

Due to the fact that certain theories have made violence the prime characteristic of nationalism, a series of political experiences which have nothing to do with it have been attributed to the latter. Thus, all the regimes which, after 1922, used force to come to power were qualified as "fascist". "Fascism" had become a sort of political vogue in Europe. Marshall Pilsudski in Poland, Primo de Rivera in Spain, Oliveira Salazar in Portugal, the Chancellor Dolfuss and Schuschnigg in Austria, and several crowned heads, King Alexander of Yugoslavia, King Boris in Bulgaria and King Carol in Rumania, interpreted and adapted to their situation the tactics and the methods of government of Mussolini. World public opinion, no longer interested in the substance of the phenomenon, remembered only its appearances and classified all these regimes under the label of fascism, even when they had been created for the very purpose of crushing the true nationalist movements.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

After having analyzed the successes and failures of these regimes, which are also based on different factors, what are the reasons which prevent us from considering them as nationalist movements?

Let us try to outline their fundamental characteristics. These regimes all imposed themselves through an act of force planned from top to bottom by a coup d'etat of the state, if one can say, without the participation of the nation and often in opposition to it. No popular trends, no mass movements prepared the way for their rise to power. Only certain reactions, certain dissatisfactions among the ruling classes were the decisive factors of their victory. A nationalist revolution, on the contrary, is never a plot formed by official circles. It is the expression of profound transformations undergone by the whole of the national organism. It is always manifested from top to the bottom, from the nation to the state. The conquest of power is made on a large front with the participation of the popular masses.

The above-mentioned regimes were authoritarian regimes. They emphasized the authority, ^{the} coercive power of the state. They are not based on the popular will but on the state, on its capacity to throttle the free will of its citizens. Their political support is varied: the army, a group of politicians, a group of bankers, the monarchy, the nobility of the country, the prestige of a great military leader, or a combination of all these. But, whatever their composition, whatever their internal political aspect, the results are the same. The state finds itself in conflict with the nation, and the duration of the regime depends on the amount of pressure

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

exerted on the citizens.

These regimes are not the unique appearances of our period. They are to be found in antiquity, in the period of the Renaissance. The "Prince" by Machiavelli reflects these movements. They always take the distinctive quality of a personal adventure: a man makes his bid for fortune while the state is passing through a moment of crisis. That is why we can also call these regimes "dictatorships", and they are the only ones who really deserve to be called by that name.

The authoritarian regimes have no ideology. That is what constitutes their weakness. However, this does not mean that they have no major goals or that they are not supported by any faith, for they are at times backed by a powerful fanaticism. The heads of these regimes believe that a powerful impulse originating in the center and moving outward is sufficient to cure the nation of all its evils. They think that a strong man, the man who knows how to command, can accomplish miracles. Whether the country as a whole responds or does not respond to their impulsion, whether or not its creative powers join in the effort, is not a consideration to deter them from continuing the experiment.

After having taken power in the name of freedom, the nationalist revolutions fell into the error of authoritarianism and denied free play to the two constitutive elements of the state. Nevertheless these authoritarian nationalist regimes were superior to just plain authoritarian regimes, for the authority that had been delegated to them came from an important fraction of the nation. A nationalist

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

regime is, in effect, always supported by a party which is animated by an ideal, whereas the dictatorships disguise themselves in the abstractions of the state.

In order to remedy their weakness, the authoritarian regimes create organisms which keep them in artificial contact with the masses: parties, youth organizations, social services, corporations, sometimes even parliaments. It is through the external similarity of their systems that the modern dictatorships have been confused with fascism. The differences are nevertheless very clear. On the one side, the state creates the party, on the other, the party creates the state. A dictatorial party, if one can call it that, does not come into being at the moment the dictator appears, but is established later, as an ulterior and secondary product of the regime. The power of an authoritarian regime, therefore, does not come from the party, but from the repressive measures of the state. Moreover, when the regime breaks down, the political organization which was established under its protection, disappears with it.

Once admitted as a constitutive principle of the state, the single party imposes an identical pattern of life upon all of its citizens. The human person becomes a proving-ground for party experiments. A gigantic struggle takes place between the group in power and the free will of the individual.

The opposition of individuals is liquidated by two courses of action: on one hand, the active elements of the opposition and all those who give evidence of dissension in the population are annihilated or cut off from the mass of the people; on the other hand, the

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

new generations are subjected to a rigid and uniform education. The education no longer attempts to realize the personality, but attempts to readjust it to the intellectual standard of the party. It is no longer a question of favoring the creative potentialities of the individual, but of inculcating him with the principles which constitute the basis of the regime.

Fascism and national socialism were not able to escape the consequences of totalitarianism. The concentration camps and coercive education were the inseparable attributes of these regimes. Mussolini, it is true, did not behave like a tyrant toward his adversaries. Although he was obliged to repress opposition, he managed to do it with a certain amount of humanity. Hitler, on the other hand, applied the concentration camp system with characteristic brutality. The indignation which he aroused in the world is justified. But could the indignation which he caused be greater than that deserved by those who preceded him on this road? And who furnished the example? The judgment of Nuremberg appears to be without meaning in history, because among the members of that international tribunal could be found the representatives of a power which would have been more at home sitting on the bench of the accused. Hitler committed the most reprehensible acts; but why were those who started this series of monstrosities, those who numbered at least five times more victims than he did, not equally punished?

If it is once admitted that the nationalist world does not approve of the existence of concentration camps, one can ask himself what was the position of the nationalist movements on the question

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

of the education of the masses. Is the latter not necessary to the constitution of a powerful state? Nothing is more false, more contrary to the truths of the nationalist doctrine. Nationalism is a spiritual revolution. As we have already explained, nationalism marks the moment when the nation becomes conscious of itself, of its creative potentialities. In other words, nationalism appears at the moment when the people transfer all their energy from the historical level to the cultural level. The pioneers of this bright vision of nationalism could not be the product of a uniform education. It is to the spirit of refinement, to the variety of means and inexhaustible wealth of the human being that one must appeal in order to achieve these ends. Nationalism wishes to form a nation of personalities, it seeks to organize the masses individually. It is not the unified combatant who can assure the future of a people, but the spiritually emancipated individual who, while taking the experience of others into consideration, follows his own inner path.

Up to now we have talked about the two great errors of nationalism — imperialism, with its origins in the bourgeois and capitalist society, and the totalitarian state, borrowed from the bolsheviks. The third error of nationalism was to allow itself to become contaminated by materialism, and praised by the communist and capitalist societies alike.

It would be an exaggeration to attribute to fascism a pronounced materialistic tendency. The Italian soul is too deeply rooted in its Catholic traditions to succumb completely to materialist temptation. It was with the national socialists that materialism could take

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

a lasting shape. What one can reproach in both these movements is the excessive grandeur, the epic majesty they lavished upon the material constructions achieved under the auspices of the state. A building, a bridge, a railroad, an exhibition became occasions for collective vanity, as well as pretexts for the proud affirmation of the nation. One could observe therein a kind of obsession with the desire to immortalize the people in stone, such as the conviction that the value of the latter could be expressed in tons of steel, in the number of houses that were built, in the quantity of ships produced in the workshops, or in the number of inventions patented. We do not want to be misunderstood; happy are the people who are gifted with technical ability. Their achievements deserve to be praised. Absurdity starts only when one considers what is technical as an end in itself. This transfer of interest from the inner self to externals, from the spiritual image of a people to the frenzied creation of material things, deprives man of all the original elements of his culture. All the wonders which he might then accomplish in the technical realm could not compensate for the vacuum which that policy creates in the spiritual realm.

The economic factor ended by occupying a preponderant place in the thoughts of the fascist and national socialist leaders. These preoccupations were justified by a real situation. Italy and Germany lacked raw materials, and were threatened by an endemic unemployment problem. It was perfectly natural to see the statesmen of those countries searching for a remedy for the material sufferings of their nations. The economic factor cannot be eliminated from the life of a people, nor can it be treated lightly. It is nevertheless inadmissible that in order to fill the gaps of its own national economy, a

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

country should deprive other countries of their means of existence. By proceeding in such fashion one only meets with conflict and war. When figures are the only factor which determines the external policy of a country, it is but one step from the legitimate acquisition of the goods necessary to the life of a people to economic imperialism.

National socialism did not restrict itself to the abuse of technical and economic formulas, it also sought to elaborate a materialistic vision of the world. It came to power in opposing the materialistic vision of history, but in another respect only repeated the same errors. Marxism attempts to explain all social transformations by the changes which occur in the economic structure of society. Hitler emancipated man from the tyranny of the economic factor, but enslaved him to the highest degree to the biological element by subjecting him to the racial theory. The theory held that it is not man with his internal resources who creates history, but man as a racial element, differentiated by a certain number of physical particularities. It suffices for an individual to be a member of this sacred heredity for him to be superior to his less fortunate fellow-creatures. History found itself once more under the influence of a material factor: blood, the biological entity, the physical constitution of the individual. Materialism did not disappear, it only changed its form. In the place of economic materialism, which concentrates itself on work, on production, on the relationships between man and nature, there appears biological materialism. Social relations are determined by the physical characteristics of the individuals.

Did Hitler remain faithful to his racial ideology? The existence of races cannot be denied. The error of national socialism was

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

to consider them as distinct creative forces in history. By directing his appeal to the Nordic race, Hitler addressed himself to a group which did not exist. The races supply only the raw materials of the peoples. The same race can enter into the composition of several peoples, in much the same way that a nation can be constituted by several races. The spiritual unity of a people does not depend on its racial purity, as Hitler believed, but on preserving its creativity. This is the reason for which the other Nordic peoples did not consent to sacrifice their national identity for the benefit of a greater racial community. The Dutch, the Norwegians, the Danes defended themselves against the German invaders with the same stubbornness as other peoples less qualified than themselves to understand the myth of the Nordic race.

Anyhow, Hitler never based his acts on a biological principle. He made use of the notion of the race so as to give his doctrine coherence, but he never took into account its practical consequences. All his decisions are contradictory to the historical existence of races and confirm his belief in the reality of the peoples. His fanaticism was not fed by racial notions, but by the specific energies of the German soul. His plans for the future course of the great German Reich called for depriving the Nordic nations of their historical individuality. Only the German people was to maintain its ethnical integrity, so that in the mold of its culture the ancient unity of the Anglo-Saxon world might be recreated.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

5-1129

CHAPTER IV

THE CONSTRUCTIVE EXPERIENCE OF NATIONALISM

Having examined the deviations of nationalism, we are going to attempt to explain that part of its heritage which proved to be of value. If nationalism has had its faults, one cannot disregard or wilfully ignore the values which it created and which henceforth belong to humanity.

Against all the tendencies of modern society toward disintegration, nationalism opposes the immanent force of the nation. As soon as the national phase of a people tends to become "nationalist", the process of social disintegration is arrested, and the history of a people takes on a constructive rhythm. As long as the nationalist movements remained faithful to their distinct organization, they succeeded in solving with elegance and efficiency the problems which confronted them. As soon as they appealed to foreign sources for encouragement, they were led astray and came to ruin.

Who, for example, would not be able to recognize the decisive contribution of nationalism to the solution of the social problem? In this area filled with contradictions, wherein the bourgeoisie definitely had made a mess of things, nationalism stepped forward and found a formula for reconciling the classes of society, at the same time barring the way to communist agitations. The solution advocated by Marxism is the product of a distorted mind. Why should the achievement of social justice require the destruction of the institutions of the past, and even the disappearance of peoples as historical individuals? One might as well put fire to a house in order to repair a door or a window. It is sufficient to reestablish the normal

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

functioning of the national organism which presupposes calling back to order the anarchical and irresponsible individuals, so that by itself and through its own means, the nation may repair its affected tissues.

The great merit of nationalism is to have discovered the means for the coexistence of two notions which, according to dialectical Marxism, would be irreconcilable -- the nation and socialism. The workers do not need to violate the integrity of nations to improve their living conditions. The road to the realization of the workers' claims does not necessarily require the ruin of the nation. The boldest social reforms correspond to phases of progress through which the nation as a whole must pass. The more the individuals enjoy a prosperous situation, the greater their attachment to their country. They no longer feel like outcasts in the midst of society, but they enter with full rights in the ranks of decent and dignified citizens. Liberty and equality then become in their eyes consistent notions and formulas which correspond to tangible realities. To lead the workers from the periphery toward the center of society, to interest them in the great aims of the nation, to associate them with the responsibilities of the state -- such is the formula of government under nationalism.

Socialism is a problem which must be solved by the nation. It does not require a solution on the international level or the establishment of a world state of proletariat. Class hatreds disappear when the national conscience is stringently revealed to a people. From that moment on, what reasons for revolution could the communists

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

present to the working classes? The very aim of their agitation disappears if all the social classes declare themselves jointly and severally responsible for the destiny of the nation, provided that the bourgeoisie reaches the point where it understands that the exploitation of man by man is a sacrilege and a dishonor.

The Germans were the ones who best understood and applied nationalism. The socialist state created by Hitler had had no counterpart in this world. In no other country did the working classes live in more perfect harmony with the rest of the nation. They really felt that they constituted a major part of the national community.

Real socialism does not mean whiter bread and a regime of greater comfort and social security. These are the derived aspects of the problem, the results which occur once the nation has achieved a certain degree of spiritual cohesion. The just division of goods and duties within the society remains without doubt a question of vital importance, the solution of which is very urgent; but the problems of socialism are not exhausted by improvements on a strictly material basis. Real socialism begins only with the free circulation of human values from one social class to another, which is inconceivable without the total disappearance of prejudices of wealth, birth, etc, which constitute so many obstacles to the development of the individual. It is essential that the worker lose his inferiority complexes, that he be helped in acquiring the conviction that his qualities and his efforts suffice to make him the equal of those who through birth and through social standing are his superiors. When

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

this atmosphere of good will, of just appreciation of the efforts of others dominates the mentality of a people, it is a sign of the existence of authentic socialism. The eternal agitation on the question of salaries will not be able to appease this class hatred, for, in spite of all these material claims, even should they be satisfied this hatred would remain alive. The real problem consists in the spiritual emancipation of the worker, in the restriction of the psychological distances which separate one class from the other. In order to accomplish this revolution, one must consider each citizen as a creative force of the nation.

Hitler was able to remove the artificial obstacles imposed on the relations between individuals by birth, by social circles and by fortune; he was able to insulate the national substance against the inhibiting influences of historical vicissitudes and to assure its continuity. Mussolini, who sought to achieve the same aims, did not succeed as well as Hitler in transforming the class mentality.

Another great victory of nationalism was to have accomplished the boldest social reforms without thereby denying the advantages of private initiative. Socialism of Marxist origin adopts in this realm a solution injurious to the interests of the people: the collectivization of the means of production. If one studies the effects of collectivization where it was applied in a sincere and generous way (in contrast to the USSR, where the aim of collectivization is to rob the peasant, the worker, and the intellectual of the fruit of his work and of his talents, to destroy in him the feeling of human dignity and to reduce him to an endless slavery), one cannot deny real improvement in the standard of living of the popular masses. But, it

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

is nonetheless true that collectivization can have disturbing consequences. Where collectivization is in effect the national economy as a whole suffers from the gravest insufficiencies and enters into a period of decline, for what is won extensively for the well-being of the popular masses detracts from the intensity of the economic effort of the whole nation. Collectivism is a class solution. Desirous of improving the situation of a part of the population, collectivism ruins other important values of the nation, other factors which might guarantee its prosperity.

Private initiative is inseparable from the human being. To deprive the individual of his economic freedom signifies taking away from him one of his essential attributes. As soon as this natural type of activity is denied him, his interest in the economic life weakens. He loses his creative dynamism and acquires a bureaucratic mentality. Who could awake the taste for great enterprises in a being who is constrained to remain all his life in the condition of a wage-earner? Who could stimulate his taste for invention, who could make him bold, assiduous, clear-sighted? The economy of a people withers away without the incentive of private initiative.

Through controlled economy, nationalism attempted to find a remedy for all the faults of economic liberalism. This system does not suppress private initiative; it merely gives it another perspective by binding it more closely to the whole of the nation. An economy devoted exclusively to the making of profits -- the classic type of capitalist exploitation -- would degenerate into an anarchical exhibition incapable of representing even the real interests of capital. In the final analysis, the social dissatisfactions and

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

disorders arising from investment are detrimental to its own activity. It may further be said that capital interests must willingly submit to that government control which really helps them function.

Controlled economy harmonizes the fluctuations of liberal economy with the productive cycle of the whole nation. It does not reject private initiative, but it cannot ignore other economic realities which have an equal right to exist: the claims of the workers and the redistribution of the material resources of the nation. These do not belong to a generation, but to a long line of generations. A sound economic system can develop only with the permanent cooperation of these three factors. The difficulties which arise in the economy of a country are caused by the preponderant role which is granted to one of these factors to the detriment of the others. These form an inseparable trinity, and it is only when they operate in perfect harmony that they can assure the material prosperity of a nation.

This triple conditioning of national economy demands from each country an appropriate economic plan. Economic factors do not by any means act as independent functions of a biological organism; they require the continual intervention of the human intelligence so as to maintain their unity of action. But the establishment or the existence of a plan does not always signify planned economy or economic controlism. What we wish to say is that this establishment is embodied in the idea of the organization of these factors, in their supervision. Except for a few areas of vital importance to the existence of the state, planned economy does not intend to take production out of private hands in order to turn it over to the state, but only to integrate it with the whole of national life.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

The concept of planned economy always gives rise to certain memories of the war period when Germany and Italy were forced to impose severe restrictions on private enterprises due to the lack of raw materials. Because of the ambiguity of the term "planned economy" we prefer to call this new type of economy by the name of "coordinated economy". (Liberal economy in its classical sense, as it was known in the nineteenth century, no longer exists in the world. More or less clearly, the economy of all countries has been transformed into a planned economy. A significant fact is that even the United States, a country of unlimited possibilities and champion of the doctrine of "free enterprise", could not avoid the intervention of the state in the economy.)

The social and economic conceptions of which the nationalist movements were deservedly proud are today appreciated by all the free peoples of the world. Nevertheless, the struggle these movements waged against communist infiltrations in Europe surpasses in importance what they have achieved on the economic and social level. The sacrifices made by all the nationalist movements in the battle against bolshevism will survive all the campaigns of defamation to which they were subjected. The day will come when posterity will revise the judgment which was passed by our contemporaries. The evidence that will count at that time will be the blood which was lost for the defense of European civilization.

The struggle of the nationalists against bolshevism has no parallel in any known rivalry of history. For now it is no longer

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

a question of two peoples, two trends, or two conceptions of life struggling against each other for supremacy; it is a spiritual vacuum trying to triumph over the creative forces of humanity. This is why the champion of anticommunism who is ready to sacrifice his very life, the hero of the whole of humanity as long as he serves that cause, enjoys the support and protection of God.

The nationalist movements checked bolshevik penetration into Europe for over a quarter of a century. Let us try to remember the chaotic condition of our continent after World War I: all nations and established principles in a state of confusion. A world devastated by misery was feverishly trying to find a vent for the suffocating atmosphere emanating from the ruins of war.

In this general confusion, when the dikes which had held order seemed to break, when the trumpets of world revolution already announced the end of the old world, faithful messengers of peace arrived and calmed the souls of peoples by finding an equitable solution to the social problems. It is certain that without Mussolini, without Hitler, and the host of European nationalists the bolsheviks would have installed themselves on our continent in 1930. One after the other, the nations of Europe would have been conquered by the gradual penetration of communists into the country.

The intervention of the nationalist powers in the Spanish Civil War is another important fact which can be added to their activities. The secret propaganda of the bolsheviks had met with difficulties in operating from Russia. Russia needed a western or occidental satellite, a country which would contain within itself all

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

the revolutionary tendencies of the West and through which Europe, in a time of world conflict, would be caught between two fires. Spain seemed the country best suited to meet those requirements. The revolutionary tradition of the Spanish anarchist movement and the poor economic conditions of the Iberian Peninsula had favored the development of a powerful Communist Party. Spain had the added advantage that it was close to Africa, and could thus become a center from which to carry on agitation on the Dark Continent, to say nothing of the countries of Latin America.

Let us try to imagine for one moment what a victory for these plans of Moscow would have signified. Imagine Soviet Russia installed in Gibraltar and occupying the area of present-day Spain. What a change of situation, what immeasurable consequences for the destiny of the three continents! Spain would have become the western arsenal of the Bolshevik Revolution. In a few years the flames would have spread from this nucleus over the Mediterranean Basin, over the whole of Africa, and would have given a decisive impulse to all the communist movements of Latin America, agitation in those countries being favored by the community of origin and of language. Great Britain, France with her vast overseas territories, the United States, whose interests extend over the whole surface of the globe, all profited from the Spanish debacle and from the sacrifices of the nationalist volunteers.

Nationalist Spain has the honor of having saved Europe when the latter was passing through a crucial period in its existence. The democratic world can continue to brush France aside, to curse the nationalist leaders who sent reinforcements to the other side of

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

the Pyrenees. The fact of that conflict, the victorious result of the nationalist forces in Spain, must nevertheless be considered in an objective manner. By refusing to take action against Soviet interference in the Spanish Civil war, the western democracies adopted an anti-European attitude. Were it not for the vigilance of the nationalist powers Spain would definitely have fallen within the political orbit of Moscow.

Only once did the nationalist movements suspend their unfriendly attitude toward the enemy in the East, and that was when Germany concluded its pact of nonaggression with the Soviets. This act, which German propaganda liked to compare with the ingenious diplomatic contrivances of Bismarck, spread doubt and suspicion among all the peoples of Europe. The material profits which Germany was able to acquire by this step were insignificant when compared to the losses which she suffered in the realm of imponderables. Actually, the conclusion of the pact revealed a crisis in the structure of the nationalist world, for only a home front undermined by uncertainties could tolerate such an alliance.

The importance of the pact of nonaggression did not reside in the declaration of a good-neighbor policy which it contained, but in the fact that it was really intended as a pact of aggression, an aggression aimed against Europe, against that very spirit which the new Germany pretended to represent. As soon as this pact was signed the armies of the Reich invaded Poland. A year later, all the barrier states which protected Europe in the East and which had been established after World War I had been destroyed. Instead of favoring the establishment of a European coalition against Soviet Russia

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

and taking its supreme command, Germany associated herself with the evil plans of the Kremlin and prepared the ruin of the peoples who should have been protected by the nationalist powers and who should have participated in the common struggle.

It is totally incomprehensible that Hitler could have conceived the plan of wiping out the small states of Europe, his secondary rivals, so to speak, by appealing to his principal enemy for help. Normally, the exact opposite should have been done. In facing the greater of her dangers, Germany should have organized her own system of defense. This policy would have precluded the possibility of an armed conflict in the center of Europe, in Czechoslovakia, in Poland and with the states belonging to the defensive system of Europe. The results thus obtained might not have been very brilliant, but, even if they had been mediocre, this was nevertheless the only card which the external policy of the Third Reich could play with a maximum of success.

From the German point of view, the nonaggression pact was more than an error in political and military strategy. Germany was failing in its historical mission. Even in the event that she had chosen a heroic course which ended in a catastrophe similar to that of 1945, this defeat would have been blessed by all humanity. If the 22 June 1941 had later contributed to rehabilitate Germany, the credit for this would not have fallen upon the national socialist leaders (who were somewhat late in realizing that the pact redounded solely to the advantage of Russia), but to the formidable spirit of the German soldiers who were able to attack the endless steppes of Russia and endure the rigors of its climate in order to bring that nation, which

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ever since 1917 had become the implacable enemy of Europe, back into the European community of nations. However, in 1941, Germany no longer enjoyed such conditions as would favor launching an offensive. Since 1938 she had made all sorts of enemies; she could no longer count on the help of the European nations in her struggle against Russia but instead, she was forced to wage battle on two fronts, against Russia and against Europe.

When he attacked the Kremlin, Hitler seemed to have lost some of that unhealthy passion which he had for his people. In attacking Soviet Russia he had the feeling that he was donning armor of a Siegfried of humanity. He probably thought that this gesture was eloquent enough to appease the enmity of the Anglo-Saxons and to alter the international climate in his favor. He hoped that by taking this new stand he might ease the tension on the Western Front, thereby giving the German armies the respite necessary for success in the great struggle which was about to begin in the East. The cause, on the whole, was lost. Nevertheless, Hitler hoped for a sudden change in the European conscience; for a revision of the initial positions of the war, in virtue of those changes which had occurred in the theatre of operations. (Unfortunately, this exceptional psychological moment was not put to use by Hitler, who lacked a sense of reality. Following the declaration of war against Russia, a charter of European liberties should have been issued. Europe, which was destroyed politically, was to be reformed so that Germany might obtain the maximum reinforcement in the gigantic struggle which was undertaken against the East. The Allies then answered by declaring their desire to liberate the European peoples according

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

to the Atlantic Charter, and the only thing which Hitler could oppose to this propaganda was the sorry sight of the countries occupied by his armies.) The inexplicable attitude of Germany toward the British in Dunkirk is an anticipation of that idea. Hitler began to feel uneasy with his own successes and he wanted to compensate for the excessive favors which fate had bestowed upon him, which, due to their dazzling abundance, exposed him to the greatest perils.

But when Hitler realized that the struggle which he had undertaken against Russia had only awakened joy in the souls of his enemies at the prospect of his defeat, that a price had been set on his head, he began to defend himself with the stubbornness of a man who can be saved only by an act of desperation. From that moment on the crematories were in constant use and towns were burned. Each side outdid the other in the perpetrating of horrors. This fact excuses neither Hitler nor his imitators, but it explains the phase of "total means" in which the war had entered. The certainty that she could have no other issue than that of total victory or of total defeat only increased and generalised her cruelties. Those who refused to give Germany an honorable way out of the impasse in which she had entangled herself contributed equally to the preparation of the tragic hour which Europe experienced. From this point of view, the demand for unconditional surrender made by the Allies at Casablanca in January 1943 had the same evil consequences for the future of Europe as the misdeeds of Hitler. This declaration cost millions of human lives; it unnecessarily prolonged the war and prepared the way for the Soviet invasion of Europe. It was an act which was motivated by vengeance and not by political reasons.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

The downfall of the civilized world is the result of a conflict of ideas between two groups of prominent peoples. The catastrophe of World War II was neither inevitable nor provoked by a contrary fate. If it took place, it was because both sides were lacking in clear-sighted and courageous statesmen who would have directed European energies toward a collaboration beneficial for all peoples.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

CHAPTER V

THE TRAGEDIES OF NATIONALISM

Of all the nationalist movements, fascism and National Socialism are the only ones which were able to impose their power completely. They are also the only ones with whose intimate preoccupations, with whose reasons for entering into the war, and with whose past conditions and aims we are familiar. The other movements did not reach the stage of complete crystallization. Their physiognomy manifested itself because of an external complex which is difficult to understand and to grasp. At the very moment when, upon making contact with realities, their content was to become clear, a wave of emities stopped their development and forced them to retire from the scene of history. That part of their activity which reached us revealed only the pale reflection of an inner life much richer in possibilities than they were vouchsafed to know.

With the exception of fascism and National Socialism, the other nationalist movements are characterized by a fragmentary and uncertain existence, leaving behind the impression of something insufficiently developed, of a prematurely closed case. But this ill luck which fills their past is compensated by the advantage of the free values which they still have at their disposal. An unachieved social phenomenon cannot be excluded from history by force. It works within the consciousness of peoples till they are able to find new possibilities of expressing it. This does not mean that fascism and National Socialism have been exhausted of their means of rejuvenation, but merely that the other movements, less committed by their past, are more accessible to reorientation.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

The obstacles and enmities which have not ceased to bar the route of the nationalist movements grew into a hallucinating crescendo, as if mysterious forces had coalesced throughout the world to smother their vitality. The communists, the principal nationalist forces, as well as the democracies (in short, all the powers), showed the same hostility toward the efforts for rebirth of the European peoples.

As could be easily foreseen, it was from the communists that the nationalists met with the greatest enmity. The antagonism between these two forces was irreducible. Nevertheless, the communist groups in various countries constituted a restricted minority, so that the struggle was waged under equal conditions and without either side having any more support than that which could be obtained from its own ranks and from their fighting spirit. The result of the battle depended solely on the strength manifested by each camp, for neither the one nor the other had at its command the apparatus of state, the fiery power of which could have been used against the adversary. In those countries which were the theatre of nationalist tragedies: -- France, England, Holland, Belgium, the Nordic countries, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Bulgaria and Greece (Spain does not enter in this category) -- the political power was in the hands of the democratic parties of the center or was held by similarly inclined dictatorial powers, so that the "extremes" could confront each other only within the limits permitted by the situation.

The relation between the nationalist movements and the governmental parties of these countries was not so clear. Whereas the

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

hostility between the communists and the nationalists was apparent in one place or another, it would be an exaggeration to speak of a declaration of war on the part of the nationalists against the old parties. Their principal aim was that they themselves should substitute for the ineptness of the democratic forces in the struggle against bolshevism, to interfere in a conflict which the old parties could not face with any real chance of winning. The nationalists did not count on effective support on the part of the bourgeoisie, but they hoped at least that it would remain a friendly neutral, supposing, as it was natural to suppose, that it was not indifferent to the issue of the struggle against the communists.

The bourgeois-democratic parties gave no evidence of the same foresight, nor of the same subtle judgment. In their eyes, this policy was a much too dangerous game. Long accustomed to succeeding each other in power, and exchanging services in a closed circle, these parties had acquired the mentality of privileged classes. They had, so to speak, almost bestowed the realm of public affairs on themselves and refused even to consider that anyone could accede to power without asking their consent. When the nationalist movements first made their appearance, the bourgeois parties only saw in these new political formations unyielding enemies. They did not see the objective elements which had given rise to them. According to the democrats, the danger lay on the right as well as on the left, and according to them, the fight against both sides should be waged with the same stubbornness. The difference between the principles which animated the two forces, the fact that for the right the nation was an act of faith, whereas for the left it was only a class presumption which was destined to disappear from the popular conscience, hardly

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

moved the leaders of the bourgeois parties. These parties did not attempt to understand which of these two rivals was the one which really threatened the foundations of society, and which one responded to the new social necessities. They outlawed all political groups, for, as they had won the confidence of the people, they had become dangerous. For the bourgeois parties to include both nationalists and communists in the same hated group and to consider them as equally undesirable, it was sufficient for them to note that their influence on the voting masses had diminished. The satisfaction of the bourgeois parties was at its height whenever the "similarity" of the two extremist parties would be proved. In order to plant this evidence in the minds of the people, these parties wilfully stressed the less significant factors, as, for example, a certain similarity of political technique, purposely avoiding to mention the profound differences which separated the nationalists from the communists.

This notion, of which the ulterior motive is too transparent for one not to be able to recognize its origin and intentions, urged the leaders of the bourgeois parties to play an even more dangerous game. Since the bourgeois parties made no distinction between their adversaries, and any political movement which did not accept their leadership must be annihilated -- the nationalists being the ones who progressed the most rapidly -- it was the nationalists and not the communists who constituted the principal danger for Europe. The communists undoubtedly remained a disquieting element, but their activity was not such a threat to the bourgeois parties, held as they were at the periphery of society, incapable -- because of their hybrid doctrine -- of assembling the votes of the majority. It is the belief

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

of the governmental parties that the people react in an altogether different manner toward nationalists. They appear to be vested with the prestige of the nation, and they appeal to that layer of primary energy belonging to the group which, once in action, threatens to win over the whole national organism. It is true that the nationalist forces also counteract the violence of the communist agitations, but, owing to their very existence, they also take away some of the votes which otherwise would go to the other parties or groups. The nationalist forces refresh the political atmosphere and contribute to the redress of the public opinion; the means of propaganda of the other parties proves ineffective against their action.

Before the decade which preceded World War II, and particularly after Hitler came to power in Germany, the attention of the democracies was directed to the right. They feverishly searched for a means of arresting the growth of the nationalist movements. Although sanctions were still taken against the communists during that period, they were in general more moderate; they were inflicted without conviction, and often served to hide blows which were dealt to the nationalist movements.

In order to push back the assault of the nationalist parties the liberal democrats were forced to abandon their usual system of combat. It is evident that had they not changed their system, they would surely have been defeated by the nationalists. The bourgeois parties praised democracy as long as the popular masses tended to favor them and maintain them in power. As long as they did not have any serious competitors and they were sure of parliamentary support, the voice of the people and the voice of God were one. As soon as

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

They realized that the people were progressing -- since other formulas and other men could better serve their aspirations -- the enthusiasm of the democratic leaders for election arithmetic suddenly disappeared. So long as this arithmetic had confirmed their wishes it was considered faultless. But, as soon as they felt that their own political existence was threatened, they did not hesitate to engage in open battle with what they called demagogic agitation.

The bourgeois and democratic parties declared "we are democracy", and thanks to that inadmissible substitution of terms (the permanent principle of democracy and the ephemeral existence of the parties) considered themselves as absolved from all ideological scruples. It was thus that the occasional pleadings of a few parties who were in full retreat on the electoral front became, with time, the handbook of internal policy of most European states. "The new spirit" of the democracies led to the conclusion that in defending themselves the democracies could have recourse to all sorts of means, even if these means were contrary to their intimate structure and disqualified them. The democracies did not have to rack their brains to come by those arms, since they could easily be obtained from the arsenal of the modern dictatorships and from the totalitarian regimes. The democratic leaders tried the lot of them, at first with timidity, later with boldness. They then discovered, and not without interest, that dictatorship was not so hateful when practiced to their advantage. The same parties which had always raised their voices when they believed that the state was attacking the rights of the individual now spoke forth in authoritarian language, advising the governments to suppress with energy the "subversive" and "anarchical"

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

currents. As the constitutional guarantees did not seem to be sufficient for the protection of the democratic regime, the leaders of the parties amplified them with a new system of special laws, and when they realized that the wave of nationalism could circumvent these laws they went even further. They suppressed the opposition, saw to it that all the political groups which annoyed or hindered them would be dissolved and terrorized the population which refused to submit itself to their leadership. Events occurred in much the same way as if, in the course of a duel with sword, one of the adversaries, realizing that his opponent was more skilful than he was, threw his sword away to take up a pistol.

It is necessary to add that these observations particularly concern the democracies of Eastern Europe. In the western countries, the nationalist movements have certainly met with many obstacles, but the persecutions directed against them never reached the point where they could be called atrocities. In those countries the democratic regimes had been installed only after lengthy social debates, after an intense process of clarifying the consciousness. The respect for civil liberties was not a vain formula but an assimilated concept. The political frame of these states, in spite of all their aversion for the nationalist movements, could not completely ignore the spirit of legality of public life. That is why their measures of repression had to respect legal order, at least on the surface, and avoid entering into open conflict with the law.

The situation was entirely different in the countries of Eastern Europe. Democracy in those countries did not develop organically; it did not arise from profound and lasting causes. It was

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

superimposed on social states and on mores which were entirely different from those which had given birth to democracy in the West. Democracy presented itself as a new fashion to those peoples who found themselves forced to take a leap from the structure of the past to an unknown rhythm of life. From this difference in form and background there arose a disfigured democracy which had nothing but the name in common with western democracy. To outward appearances nothing distinguished them: the same constitution and the same separation of powers; but all contacts with real political life rapidly proved that the latter conducted its activity with a disregard for the arrangements provided for in the constitution.

The eastern democracies were characterized by a disproportionate influence of the executive factor in the organization of the state. The governments were not formed according to the directions of the electoral body, nor according to the number of votes won by each political party, but with no regard for the results of the elections. The principal beneficiary of the succession was determined behind the presidential scenes or in the palaces. The party which had thus been authorized to serve as the instrument of government then mobilized all the means of pressure and of state persuasion, police, guards and secret funds, to obtain the consent of the people by force. The rights of the people had not received any apparent injury, but the judicial and administrative organs took it upon themselves to interpret the expression of its will according to the electoral needs of the government. Thus can be explained these sudden and abnormal changes of opinion, this inconsistency of the electorate in the eastern democracies. A party which, while it was still opposed

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

and had only a small number of votes in its support, multiplied those votes in an unexplainable way once in power.

In Eastern Europe, the principles of democracy, universal suffrage, freedom of election, and the parliamentary aspect of government merely served as camouflage for oligarchic dictatorships. These principles were never any more than mere formal concessions which the ruling classes granted to the victorious spirit of the time. Let us not, therefore, be surprised if in Eastern Europe the persecutions of the nationalists reached the last degree of violence and savagery. What scruples could have checked the rulers of those countries, since on occasions of less importance they had shown none?

Seeing that the means of legal oppression were inefficient, the pseudodemocracies did not hesitate to reject the last vestige of legality and to adopt the dress and insignia of a dictatorship. When the oligarchic class in the East proceeds to install an authoritarian regime, it does not for that reason experience an inner conflict with its own convictions; it finds itself in its natural element, and concludes by calling by its true name of dictatorship that which it had exercised under the name of democracy.

The war placed the nationalist movements in an even more unpleasant situation. On one side, these movements were not integrated with governmental affairs and were not the decisive factors in the destiny of their country; on the other hand, international events forced them to declare themselves in favor of one or the other of the combatants. The nationalist movements have had to suffer the consequences of war without having been parties to its declaration, and

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

without having in any way determined its character.

After the war, the allied governments, motivated by a spirit of vengeance rather than by the desire to obtain a clear view of what had really happened in Europe, found it quite natural to classify as "collaborationalists" all the nationalist movements which had attached themselves to the Axis powers. According to them, this formula should have acquired the stature of an undeniable sentence of history and was to become a sort of stigma which would have disqualified the nationalist movements forever. Whoever had taken sides with Germany automatically became collaborationists in the eyes of the allies.

Even had certain partisans dishonored nationalism by their stand during the war, all nationalist movements should not therefore be considered as extensions of German imperialism. Each nationalist movement has had its internal drama, and those who collaborated with the Axis powers had to face tremendous difficulties. The very fact that these movements remained on the side of Germany till the end is a decisive indication -- a real paradox, it seems -- of the nobility of the ideals which animated them; it constitutes the best answer to the grave insults which were heaped upon them.

The scope of this analysis does not allow for a detailed examination of the particular reactions of each nationalist movement during the war; nevertheless, we will try to group them according to a few typical manifestations. The nationalist movements truly found themselves faced with special problems and their attitude varied,

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

depending on whether they belonged to states who were in conflict with the Axis or states which were friends and allies with the Axis.

which
The movements formed part of the Axis theatre of operations were confronted with the greatest difficulties and passed through the most crucial moments. Let us try to imagine the state of mind of the nationalist fighters of Czechoslovakia, Poland, Yugoslavia, Greece, France, Holland, Belgium, Denmark at the time of the German invasion; the army which was called upon to direct the military efforts of Europe and concentrate them against Soviet Russia, humiliated their nations and shed the blood of their compatriots. A heart-rending conflict was taking place between the reality of the war and the lofty aspirations which had given birth to those movements. The nationalists, enveloped in the hatred and contempt of their compatriots, had even more difficulty in enduring the moral torture. Because, for the man in the street, the nationalists were merely traitors and the miserable instruments of the enemy.

If the nationalist movements of the countries occupied by Italy and Germany had had to choose between the Axis powers and western democracies, we do not for a moment doubt that they would have followed the decisions made by their respective governments. But World War II represented something altogether different from the 1914-18 war, an entirely different group of forces. In reality, three opponents were facing each other, two of which had allied themselves together temporarily to eliminate from the theatre of operations the one who, in their opinions, was the most dangerous. The nationalists were not in revolt against their country. They had not been fascinated by the colossal force of Germany, but they had drawn back in

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

horror at the bolshevik-democratic coalition. To them, this fact seemed so absurd, so lacking in any kind of perspective, that by having nothing to do with the Axis powers, they had the impression that they would be untrue to their conscience.

The nationalist movements had suffered a cruel disillusionment at the time when the Soviet-German non-aggression pact was in effect and they were very much relieved when that sad interlude ended. How then could they have accepted an alliance with the bolsheviks and helped them to invade the continent? What would have become of Europe if, at the dawn of her history, the irresistible advance of the Huns had not been stopped on the Catalan front by the coalition of the West. If the Germanic and Roman peoples had not, at that decisive moment, forgotten their family quarrels so as to defend their ethnic substance and their spirituality in one common agreement?

These are questions, whose troublesome analogy with present-day events clearly shows us the answer. The nationalist fighters did not see any honorable issue in the predicament into which the war had thrown them unless they firmly continued the struggle against the Communists. They preferred the thankless collaboration with Germany to the sad privilege of victory on the side of Soviet Russia. The survivors of these sacrificed units cannot restrain their joy when they see that today the whole of humanity adopts the attitude which they held in the past.

Let us pay a token of respect to the nationalist movements of the West, who, although they did not belong to those countries which were directly threatened by bolshevism, who, although they had not

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

seen the deathdealing effect of that sickness of the human spirit at close range, remained faithful to their ideal. The fact that they were situated quite far from the danger might have made them more or less conscious of the danger, more inclined toward making compromises. The fact that they did not abandon their early convictions is better proof than any other argument that they were neither the product of sterile imitation, nor the work of a few impostors. Only movements which arose from a powerful source of truth could resist the unfavorable concurrence of the war without renouncing the principles upon which their existence was based.

The combatants sent by the nationalist movements of France, Belgium, Holland, and Denmark deserve to be hailed with enthusiasm. In the bravery and enthusiasm of which they gave proof, we recognize the incarnation of the spirit which once asserted itself on the Catalan fronts, which emerged victorious at Tours and Poitiers, which gave birth to the great movement of the Crusades and removed the blockade from the walls of Vienna, when that city was besieged by the infidels. It is this same spirit of sacrifice and devotion toward the eternal truths which humanity must find again in order to defeat and push back the nameless hordes of the Orient.

In the countries which were allied with the Axis: Bulgaria, Rumania, and Hungary, the nationalists at least did not have to suffer from being in conflict with the people. But as regards their possibilities of action within the framework of the state, their situation was more precarious and more unfortunate than that of the Western movements. The governments which had concluded agreements

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

with the Axis powers were composed of the very same politicians who had suppressed legal existence of the nationalists, who had thrown them into prison or interned them in camps. These persecutions did not stop when these countries affiliated themselves with the Axis powers. Not only were the nationalist movements not invited to share in the responsibilities of the state -- after all, their views were triumphing in the foreign policy of their countries -- but the government circles displayed so much injustice and hatred toward them, that they even got Germany itself to sacrifice the nationalist movements. The anxiety of the governments was not caused by the risks which would be involved in the new foreign alignments, but stemmed from fear that the nationalist groups might come to power by profiting from the new relations of force between the great powers. The new Europe, for whose sake the nationalists had made immense sacrifices, brought neither joy nor comfort to those movements. The same tyrants continued to oppress them, the same sinister parody of legality was pursued, the same prison walls crushed the hopes of an entire generation.

There are certain nationalist movements which cannot be classified in any of the above mentioned groups. Such are the groups which consist of the Ustachi of Croatia, and the Hlinka Guards of Slovakia. These movements belong to a backward phase of the "national". The Croatians and the Slovaks believe that they represent distinct ethnic and historical groups. They were not satisfied with the decisions taken on their problem at the peace conference which followed World War I. The Ustachi and the Hlinka Guards represent that effervescence of national energy, that agitation which comes from the depths of a people and is not appeased till it has achieved its

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

goal of an independent state. These groups mark one of the most conscious and most stable phase in the struggle for the political emancipation of the Croats and Slovaks. The aims of these countries did not differ from those of so many other peoples which for centuries or for dozens of years had gained their national unity.

Why should this natural aspiration be considered a war-crime by the victorious Powers? Is the fact that the Germans and Italians helped these peoples achieve their national ideal sufficient reason to decide on their crime? In their thirst for independence, peoples do not ask where their aid is coming from. And besides, they have no choice. It may be that history will offer them only one opportunity, and they have no right to refuse it. We do not want to say that we have less sympathy for the Czechs or for the Serbs. We are not pleading the cause of either one, and we are inspired by the sincere desire to see all these peoples find a way to lasting friendship or good relations. But we reject the concept of international law which was inaugurated by the Allies, according to which a national struggle is condemned because it is led on the side of a group of peoples whom the Allies happened to be at war with. If the Croats and the Slovaks allied themselves with the Axis powers, it was because those states were the only ones who facilitated those Slavic peoples' political birth. The nationalist doctrine, strictly speaking, was not lacking in the ideology of the Ustachi and Hlinka Guards, but the necessities of consolidating the two states surpassed it in importance.

The Spanish Falange occupies a position different from those exposed above. Because it was situated outside of the war area, it

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

was influenced only superficially by the Axis powers. Its collaboration with Germany and Italy can be reduced to an anticommunist stand of unofficial character in the war. The Falange could not neglect a duty which did not go beyond political frontiers, or fall a matter of honor which involved an understanding of the future. It sent its volunteers to the Russian front, but at the same time, fulfilled the requirements of a neutral policy. After the enormous losses in men and materials which occurred during the three years of civil war, the country needed a rest. This was a new internal shock. The virtues required by the circumstances -- prudence, wisdom, discipline, unity with the supreme head of the state -- were the only guarantee of inner reconstruction. The Falange understood this and gave up its role with profound self-sacrifice. The maintenance of the state, of its independence, of distinctive Spanish pride was the decisive factor in all of its actions.

The considerate attitude displayed by the Falange toward the political exigencies was not without consequences as regards its creative potential. All prolonged political concession, even if made with the best of intentions, entails a loss of one's own substance. The present-day circumstances, the abyss which separates the East from the West, the gigantic concentrated forces on both sides of the Iron Curtain came to the support of the restoration of the Falange. These particular circumstances might someday again be of help when the Spanish State, liberated from its external problems, will probably take the road leading to reforms in its organization. The Falangist movement is indispensable to the rebirth and to consolidation of Spain. If pressure from the outside should succeed in

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

removing it, all the work of internal appeasement would be threatened, and Spanish history would once more taken on the aspect of permanent civil war, as was the case during the last century.

After so much suffering, the Calvary of the nationalist movements is not over. After having suffered from the continuous attacks of the bourgeois-democratic parties, and after having floundered "on the borders of despair" at the beginning of the war, they were not even spared by their own companions. When they presented themselves before the principal nationalist powers, with their past, their struggles, their injuries, and the responsibilities which they had committed themselves to take for the future, they were treated like poor relatives at the door of a sumptuous palace. The nationalist movements had detached themselves from a world well-known for its sterile customs, and they waited, their hearts filled with hope, for the world which would enter history proudly, imagining it more just and more aware of the beauties of the spirit. But, instead of a serene and affable humanity, the nationalist movements met only with a darkened sky, with the same old atmosphere which had been vitiated by national egotisms.

During the last decade of its existence, fascist Italy escaped from its obligations to the nationalist world; Germany, on the contrary, asserted its presence in every place that the nationalists took action. But, its ulterior ^{motives} ever being that of securing something for itself at the expense of others, it falsified the concept of the New Europe, wishing it to be particularly pangermanic, trying to

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

exploit the spirit of sacrifice of the nationalist movements in order to fulfill its imperialistic aims. Norms, servitude, paths which did not agree with their internal harmony and in no way served the common cause were imposed on the nationalist movements. All this "SSization" of the nationalist groups in France, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, and the Ukraine was a most poorly inspired move, a reversal of the natural vital force, and it diminished the fighting spirit of these groups and separated them from the people. The beauty and vigor of the nationalist movements consists, strictly speaking, in their distinctive tendencies, their particular type of manifestations, those through which the talents and virtues of each nation assert themselves. A universe composed of a homogeneous mass of individuals would lose all its creative possibilities, even if the qualities of the individuals comprising these masses would, when taken separately, surpass human capabilities. For, it is through a variety of feelings of motivation and through personal concepts that people influence one another. Such a universe would be consumed by its own monotony, by the exhaustion of the urge which drives people to seek to understand the unknown, by the extreme stereotyping of its resources.

In our eyes, this triptych of the nationalist sufferings constitutes three ordeals, three acts of purification. If these movements had had an easy time of it, most assuredly the dizziness caused by success would quickly have dulled their internal creativity. But having thus been attacked from all sides innumerable times, they were forced to make occasional revisions, to face certain problems, to examine doubtful questions, and make many experiments. The energy which they were unable to direct toward external problems they

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

directed at internal problems, thus enriching their concept of life.

We believe that the nationalist movements have not yet had their

last say in history. A day will come when the whole of humanity will

remember their tragic experience.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

CHAPTER VI

THE PREMISES OF A VALID HISTORY

What possibilities actually lie open to the nationalist movements?

The readers, and especially the "friends", will hasten to say: the return to the past, to the ingenious form of the nationalist phenomenon, so as to go back to the very source of a process which was ill developed. It is natural to think of this solution immediately for it is a logical continuation of what we have shown. Still, it would not be entirely correct to adopt it without reserves. The course of history cannot be turned back. A film which has failed while being shown on the screen has failed forever, and cannot be repeated as a laboratory experiment can. It is to be hoped that in the midst of the present upheaval we can go back to the very sources of Nationalism, but solely for the purpose of ascertaining where it erred.

Once the true path has been chosen, it would be irritating and useless to persist in considering the past, and to attempt to revive Nationalism, as if nothing had occurred since that time. Nationalism gave birth to a certain type of mentality. It molded the thoughts of a few generations. Therefore, the hopes of those who would like to see it sink into oblivion are vain. But equally vain are the desires of those who refuse to consider that its experiment failed, and would like to see Nationalism achieve a new world by itself. Twenty years of disappointments, of false historical orientation seriously crippled the confidence one could have in Nationalism. This confidence can be restored only if

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Nationalism collaborates with other political forces and with other currents of ideas.

It may be that the nationalists will not welcome this view with favor. One may ask how a compromise can help? The most it can do is alter the nature of the phenomenon. We must admit that these apprehensions are legitimate, but we believe that we can remove them by outlining the conditions of the association that we are planning. Let us hasten to say that we do not mean to "save" Nationalism by associating it with "unreal" circumstances which might be a handicap to its fundamental structure. The formula which we are thinking about would be a synthesis of the European spirit, a selection of the experiences obtained by all the peoples of our continent. Two thousand years of European history allow us to have a certain perspective of the past and to understand its strong points, its bases, and its valid premises. By proceeding to this great analysis of the European spirit of the past we see that there are three factors of vital importance to the destiny of our civilization: Christianity, Democracy, and Nationalism.

From whatever aspect we attempt to examine the problem we always find the same elements. If we refer to historical events, we note with what extraordinary force these three factors imposed themselves upon the life of the European peoples, one or another of the three dominating their entire development at some time. There was a period in which Christianity was the determining factor, another, when the problems of individual liberties won first place over all other incentives for social organization. Finally, in our period, we see that Nationalism surpasses the two other factors in interest. Each one of these European archtypes, acting alone,

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

asserted itself too vigorously as if only it encompassed every aspect of life. But it is just these excesses which show how profound was the source from which they stemmed, and what true needs they fulfilled.

If we consider man with his need for a spiritual life the results are no different. Christianity, Nationalism, and Democracy exhaust the whole scale of human liberties and deliver the individual from every possible and conceivable type of slavery. Only their fusion, their simultaneous action can raise man to the level of human being. Each one of these concepts launched a spiritual revolution, liberated the individual from a series of temporary situations which prevented the free development of his creative faculties. Christianity freed man inwardly from the yoke of sin. Democracy emancipated him outwardly from the leadership of certain social classes. The mission of Nationalism was to save him from the tyranny of national pride.

If we now consider the logical relationship of these three concepts, we see how completely in accord they are. It is not foolish to attempt to consider these three concepts together; it is the only way of understanding them clearly. Considered in their purest forms, Christianity, Nationalism, and Democracy have the effects of magnets on one another. They presuppose and support each other mutually. What is essential in this comparison is not to draw conclusions from what has been only superficially determined, from a subject which was not studied sufficiently.

Let us first examine the relationship between Democracy

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

and Nationalism, which for many years were presented as excluding each other. A Rumanian nationalist writer, Aurel C. Popovici, even wrote a book to prove it. The book appeared at the beginning of the century and was entitled Democratie on Nationalisme (Democracy Or Nationalism). The system of democratic government is a social invention, a product of the human genius, a set of rules for group organization. Nationalism, on the other hand, is not a technique nor a creation of the intellect. It is a reality. The people's spiritual state gradually penetrates their consciousness. Democracy is a means of expressing this invisible reality. Democracy registers and brings forth what is taking place in the depths of a people's soul, the variations of its consciousness, its magnitude and its diverse aspect. Universal suffrage, parliament, and the law are means of expressing national consciousness, that is, if nothing happens to oppose their normal functioning. When the attitudes of a people change and when their new aims no longer agree with the present institutions, Democracy allows them to express themselves. Dissatisfaction is not brooded over in secret but is expressed freely. If nationalism did not support Democracy, what would be the sense of having election ballots? What would be the use of having elections? Would it be to express the vague and abstract will of the people? This will becomes intelligible only when it has bearing on a certain country and a certain people. There is French public opinion, British public opinion, Italian public opinion; each one corresponds to so many particular attitudes. There are as many ways of solving the political problem as there are peoples. Public opinion means that Nationalism is related to something real, to an immediate interest of the national group. It is in perpetual upheaval, in

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

continuous transformation, because the questions which it challenges change constantly. However, the attentive observer will not fail to realize that the reactions of public opinion are not the results of chance, but follow a line of their own, and this line expresses the things which are permanent in a nation.

Political parties often forget that their relationships to the nation is one of dependence. Instead, they interpose themselves like a wall between the nation's creative forces and their own manner of expression. Instead of lending an attentive ear to the inner voice of the nation, the parties tend to set themselves apart, to substitute themselves for the nation as independent realities. They tend to ~~take over~~ ^{throw over} the role of intermediary organisms, whose purpose is to gather the many individual opinions and reduce them to their several fundamental types. Instead, they tend to take on a life of their own, by weakening the reflexes of the national consciousness and falsifying the historical meaning of these manifestations.

The third factor in this political-historical synthesis of tomorrow -- Christianity -- transforms these values and projects them into the world of eternal truths. As we have already indicated in the chapter devoted to the nationalist phenomenon, in order to go beyond the "National" phase, the period of external upheavals, and enter into the phase of "Nationalism", knowledge of one's self, the peoples must lose all their pride and accept the Christian truths. Without Christianity there can be no Nationalism. And, according to the writings of Montesquieu, there can be no effective Democracy without Nationalism.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

In stating these theses, we do not affirm that they can come into being alone. We are only saying that the true needs of the people direct the course of history in that direction. Not as an inevitable movement, or a course of events which cannot be resisted and in which we do not believe, but as a creative system of European civilization which arose from the historical unrest of two millennia. Under the protection of these three factors, one can face the future with confidence. All the strategic elements are united together so that the results may not be deceptive. Nationalism, Democracy and Christianity represent the premises of a valid history. But the forces which shape them into actualities, which bring them into the world arise from the inner life of man from the energies of his soul. The collective system is the result of millions of individual activities. The histories of peoples can be marked at certain times by certain trends. These trends will not be able to cause defeat by themselves, but will only be promoted by the energy of the individuals. It is not enough to note that a phenomenon has come into being, or that it is evolving, in order to assure its success. It must be observed constantly and followed every moment. The trends of a period represent something formless, which can either take on an adequate historical form, or be diverted and employed for other less legitimate purposes. The aspiration to emancipate the popular masses, for example, is a characteristic trend of our century. But from the same type of social matter one can build Socialism, Syndicalism, Communism, Christian Democracy. This means that the result varies according to the amount of energy expended for each political ideal.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

The time has come when history must be freed from uncertainties and incoherences and directed toward prospective ends. History consists not only of what was, but of what will be. She registers the deeds of the peoples, but she anticipates them also, in the sense of a continued creation, a daily struggle, so as to impress valid directives upon them.

The minds which have been educated to see things in a practical way will not allow themselves to be easily convinced by our analysis. Considerations of a historical, psychological, logical or metaphysical nature can very well allow us to admit the value of the Nationalism-Democracy-Christianity group of factors, but, they will say, we are living in a certain period which has its needs and its concrete preoccupations. Of what use would this group of factors be in the actual crisis?

In what follows, we shall attempt to demonstrate that the three elements which constitute European civilization are able to unite with one another when events demand an immediate solution.

Today humanity is divided into two camps: East and West, Communism and Democracy. Actually, there is no longer any possible intermediary solution for the two hostile blocs.

Something disquieting is happening to democratic principles. They no longer have the same success in the world conflict, they no longer move the consciousness so as to incite it to make great decisions. The democratic formula has become so inoffensive that the bolsheviks themselves have adopted it for tactical reasons,

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

calling or naming the States which they dominate "popular democracies", or "progressists". Such a clever way of juggling concepts to make them appear to be what they are not presupposes that the procedure was facilitated in the mentality of the western world through a change in political values. For no one would take the risk of borrowing his adversary's terms of propaganda if that propaganda still had a definite power. The confusion becomes advantageous only when the spiritual debauchment in the enemy camp reaches such a low point that the fundamental political concepts are confused and the masses disoriented. The bolsheviks never dared to call themselves fascists, but they deign to call themselves democrats, even though they hate Democracy and wish to destroy it. This signifies that the democratic vocabulary no longer has sufficient influence on man, that it has lost some of its effectiveness and some of its probatory force. For the same reason, the Western Democracies more voluntarily use expressions such as "anticommunism" and "antibolshevism" rather than their own name to stress their attitude toward the international red.

In reality, a great injustice is being committed against Democracy. For it is only a technique, a means for registering the opinion of the citizens, and on that score, nothing could replace it. The warning of spiritual corruption is therefore not aimed at Democracy. For democracy, in itself, is intangible, precisely because it is not bound to any ideological content. The warning concerns the bourgeois and capitalist society, which is associated with those principles of government. To fight for Democracy does not signify fighting for the bourgeois ideal in which the rights of the individual are not identical with the abuses of capitalism. This preference for a negative term on the

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

part of the West indicates the ideological crises through which the European peoples are passing. The bourgeois-capitalists sense only too well the emptiness in their souls. They know that they have nothing to oppose communism with, that the idea of unlimited economic prosperity is over. Therefore lacking anything better, they define their attitude by a negation, by calling themselves "anticommunists". Democracy is not the opposite of communism, for a technique cannot oppose an ideal.

Confronted by this inner void in the bourgeoisie, it is normal for us to ask ourselves whether the fight which has been taken up can be waged in the name of a negation, if by desperately persisting to keep a defensive position, the West is capable of facing the present difficulties. In order to answer this question, let us turn our eyes toward the enemy camp, observe his preparations, study the forces which support the morale of the bolshevik soldier.

The abnegation and the revolutionary energy of the communist fighter are known. After having made an analysis of the evil intentions of that movement, we can state that the partisans of communism possess the fervor of disciples. The Soviet Army went through its trial at Stalingrad. Composed mostly of young men, who, since their earliest years, have been brought up in the cult of the proletarian country, its fighting spirit must be feared. The intensity of Russia and of Siberia contains terrible secrets which the allied staffs cannot even imagine, but the souls of the men who are attempting to invade Europe contain even greater surprises for them.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

What spiritual bounter-balance, what mobilization of energy will the European peoples use to oppose these formidable reserves of hatred, accumulated for dozens of years in the souls of several generations? The bourgeois ideal, as it became at the end of the nineteenth century, is static and anti-heroic. It cultivates minor virtues, and, if it takes interest in the fate of the State, it is for the purpose of safe-guarding individual interests. Will this world whose sole interest is the acquisition of material wealth be able to renounce the satisfactions of an easy existence, in order to throw itself in a war of apocalyptic proportions, a war which addresses man as a sacred entity of history, which will require the total sacrifice of the individual, the renouncement of all joys, which will require all the bravery of the citizen, all his energy and all his disinterestedness?

Those of our contemporaries who exhaust their energies in daily agitations can hardly perceive these warnings of destiny. And even when they allow themselves to be moved, they pacify their anxieties by clinging to the idea of the technical superiority of the West. Not only are these speculations without basis, they also contain a certain naïveté when one thinks of the human masses on the other side of the Iron Curtain who work day and night to produce the arms of destruction.

The Marshall Plan itself can be considered only as an expedient. The aid of the United States can delay the penetration of communism into Western Europe, but it will not weaken it to the point of making it completely inoffensive. No one denies that communism develops by predilection in a social circle which finds itself in misery. It would be absurd, however, to count on a

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

solution of the problem through alleviation of this misery. After dozens of years of political education, the mentality of the proletarian class has reached a point of stabilization, a crystallization independent of the material conditions of life. The material conditions can improve to the point of becoming excellent, but they will no longer modify the way of the workers' thinking. A powerful communist trend can be noted among the workers who have a standard of living which is equal or even superior to that of the petit bourgeois. For man does not live by bread alone. He also needs spiritual food. The present-day worker aspires to more than just having a better salary. He aspires to enjoy greater consideration, equality on the moral level, and he believes that this fulfillment of an intimate order can be found in communism. Communism speculates on social misery, but it has surpassed the phase where we could fight it exclusively on that ground. The material prosperity which America flashes before the eyes of Europe may for a moment delay the plans of the communists, but they will immediately resume the offensive at the first sign of economic depression or hesitation. Do the Western powers confuse the excellent effects of a blood transfusion administered to a very sick patient with the definite recovery?

Without questioning the immense value of American aid, it is still necessary to view it more cautiously in order not to fail. If the Marshall Plan grants a moment of respite to Europe, it cannot restore its soul. If the efforts of the Marshall Plan are not to be in vain, we must begin by clarifying and fortifying the European soul.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Although the ideological nature of the actual tension between the East and the West is recognized, we still persist in carrying on the actual struggle on the basis of a defensive attitude. Communism is an active ideology, a revolutionary doctrine, and it is impossible to fight against it, unless one fights with a force at least as powerful as theirs and as determined as theirs. If we were to have a European plebiscite, it is certain that the majority of the inhabitants of our continent would declare themselves against communism, but, we mean by that a passive anticommunism, without internal adherences, without the possibility of making great decisions. When considering the European youth of today and its evident lack of spiritual preoccupations, one cannot help but think of its obvious inferiority in relation to the fanatic and hardened communist youth.

This is why the western Democracies, devoid of their old bourgeois and capitalist content must appeal to a compensating element, to the experience and combat power of the nationalist movements. Communism, a revolution without a constructive ideal, must be attacked in the very absurdity of its doctrine.

The alliance of Nationalism and Democracy, as we have already shown it, is indicated by their similarity of principles. This cooperation actually has become a necessity at present. What should really create surprise is the delay to which this alliance was subjected, and not the alliance itself. Only minds which are obsessed by vengeance oppose that act of European reconciliation.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

After the communist aggression in Korea, the western world was suddenly obsessed with a fever for rearmament. After many futile discussions and delays, the communist peril was finally recognized. Old alliances have been renewed and new ones are being concluded. Only one thing is not examined with sufficient attention: the state of mind of the peoples who are called upon to face bolshevism. The European nations are contaminated with defeatism. One has the impression that even the instinct of self-preservation does not function in a normal way. Each European nation rejects the responsibility of an eventual war, trying as much as possible to pass the responsibility on to others. A victory without sacrifices, obtained miraculously by a last-minute intervention, this is what Europe really hopes for. This state of mind is widespread. One might even say that communism, in itself, is not so powerful, except for the enormous contingent which it causes those who refuse to face it with a tenacious and conscious resistance to prepare. The principal problem of western strategy does not consist of rearming Germany, of including or not including Spain in western defense, establishing France as the principal pivot of this defense, of increasing or not increasing the number of Italian divisions. All these projects are necessary. But if parallel to the efforts of rearmament, the spiritual energies of the European nations are not seized with vigorous action, the value of their military commitments runs the risk of becoming meaningless. Only solid citizens can form a solid army. When the minds of a people are filled with doubt, it is logical that its armies reflect the same state of mind. It would be of greater importance for the defense

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

of Europe to know if in Germany, in France, in Italy, in Denmark, in Belgium, etc., the public spirit is coherent. A war of the dimensions which should be anticipated cannot be conducted by parties; only the bloc of the nation can face the enemy. And it is an absurdity to eliminate the most vigorous part of the nation from the fight, that part of the nation which because of its ideal, finds itself the most committed in the struggle, that is to say, the nationalists. The war against Russia -- if it breaks out -- will not be a war of the capitalist type, but a "nationalist" war.

We know very well those to whose interest it is to maintain an atmosphere of enmity between Nationalism and Democracy. The bolsheviks put the dark war memories to a good use. Every individual or political group which, guided by an enlightened patriotism, fights for the creation of a single front of the national forces, becomes automatically in their eyes, a "fascist", or a "nazi". Each time that the peoples of the West attempt to recreate their national unity, which was gravely weakened by the war, the offices of the Cominform agitate the specter of aggressive Nationalism. And it should be said that they regularly or usually succeed in troubling the international atmosphere and preventing a return to a normal political life. The truth is that during the last ten years of the war conditions changed so much that the greatest industrial power of the world can easily prevent the rearmament of countries who would cherish dreams of revenge, or of world hegemony. In case there are still some nationalists in Germany -- for it is that country which we are discussing primarily -- preoccupied with resurrecting the Hitler regime, this regime would not be able to obtain any results.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

If their intentions were ever achieved in the realm of active politics, they would lead them nowhere; they would give the communists a pretext for agitation, and make the unification of European forces even more difficult. On the level of objective truths this tendency will always be defeated.

Even more detrimental than the direct propaganda of international communism, which, since it is known can be answered, is the infiltration of bolshevism into the very ranks of the democrats. A tremendous bolshevik fifth-column undermines the position of the West. It constitutes a kind of underground extension of the Kremlin, and, acting in secret its plots are even more dangerous than the action of the politbureau. The best proof of this is the strange attitude which the western Democracies adopted during and after the World War II, the excessive prudence which they manifested in all their contacts with the Soviets; the great concessions granted at Teheran, at Yalta, and at Potsdam; the treason inflicted on the former allies: Eastern Europe abandoned, China given up without any fighting, a lack of systematic reaction against the synchronized pressure of the communist parties of the whole world.

The favorite theme of these invisible forces, which, so long as the war was launched against the Axis powers, were of an extreme intransigence, is that a third World War would be equally annoying to the victors, for there would remain only a heap of ruins of all the things which human civilization built in the course of millions of years. But this concept is far from serving humanitarian aims. Its primary aim is to prevent the

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

crystallization of a categorical anti Soviet Russian attitude in the western world. Every one agrees that a third World War would be the worst of catastrophes. But who is responsible for this situation? In 1945, the Allies still had the opportunity, with the aid of the leading national-socialist circles -- and this would have been the least of evils -- to chase the Russians out of Europe by ordering the German army to take the offensive. Germany, weakened as she was, could no longer exist as a totalitarian power; Soviet Russia would have ceased to exist. In 1946-47, an energetic attitude on the part of the United States would have sufficed to make Russia see the light and retire its armies behind its old frontiers. At that moment the atomic bomb inspired a sacred terror. Why was the warning given by Churchill at Fulton? Why was Russia granted all the facilities of time and means for creating an atomic industry? And now, after all measures of foresight have been systematically neglected, it is proposed to the peoples who still enjoy a certain environment of liberty that they abandon their future to men without scruples whose only aim is to see their depots filled with arms for launching the final assault.

Does anyone believe that by adjourning "sine die" the uncertainties of the moment, the chances for a lasting peace are increased?

There are only two ways of avoiding the war: either by admitting the weakness of the West by making one concession after the other to the Soviet Moloch, or by waiting for Stalin's return to Christian sentiments. But in the case of this last alternative, we are confronting the realm of miracles, where God alone can give us an answer.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

When we affirmed that the actual conflict was primarily an ideological conflict, we neglected to state the matter in its entirety. A social controversy, a philosophical or literary dispute can also become ideological conflicts. The conflict which today includes all the peoples of the globe has a more profound meaning. It goes beyond the concrete history of man and enters the realm of the religious. Apart from the interests of the peoples, from the impending threat to their national liberties, this conflict takes place on the level of metaphysical realities. The actual nature of the struggle is rather that of settling general controversies of all known values, from the most modest, from those which are included in the daily life of the individual, to sublime and divine revelations.

Communism is not a phenomenon which can be explained by the method of historical analogies. To compare it to the apparition of Genghis Khan or to other devastating imperialisms sheds no light on the subject. These comparisons are rather false signs which are shown for the specific purpose of confusing the spirit of the peoples. Bolshevism is the imperialism of negation, the imperialism of devilish forces which assail the earth. Its triumph would signify the end of all the hopes for redemption which are known to history. The offensive of the East has as a goal the uprooting of the human being from the protection of divine grace.

Since the communists attack the bases of society, and since their war is aimed against God, the West should oppose them with an equal force. Political men should have ^a complete picture of this universal conflict. It is important not to

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

forget that this time the battle will be waged for the last truths of the world, and that the strategic magnitude of the struggle requires the participation of Christianity. Democracy allied with Nationalism represents an impressive force, but one insufficient to cover the entire length of the front, which exceeds the dimensions of the earth and encompasses the realms of the absolute.

Christianity is a converging point for all human ideals. If, up to now, men were allowed to deny its blessings, and to consider it as a private affair, today, only the revolutionary forces which it contains can still save us. Evil is establishing itself with such vehemence over the world, that only the sight of the flag of Christ can prevent the forces of darkness from conquering the whole world. The victory of the West is uncertain, unless we do put into the fight all the reserves of energy which our inner spirit possesses.

History is beginning to take on eschatological appearances. Not only the earth but the heavens too are preparing themselves for the battle.

From the Spanish battle front, where Ion Motza went to defend Christ, he addressed this prayer to his compatriots: "This hour is a difficult one. It is our duty to determine, by the way in which we accomplish our tasks, whether the future generations -- our children, our grand-children, and our great grandchildren -- will rejoice or weep on the day of the Birth of our Lord.

"Let us not allow them to lose the blessings which

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

the Birth of the Savior has given. Let us not leave them a country without churches, without religious pictures, without the protection of the hand of God. Let us not give our children a life without Christ (Ion Motse, founder of the Legionary Movement, killed during the Spanish civil war while fighting against the communists. (His testament).)

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

CHAPTER VII

NATIONS OR SOCIAL MASSES?

In his book Democracy in America, the French writer Alexis de Tocqueville, deciding to study the causes of the democratic revolution, reached the conclusion that Democracy ~~was~~^{did} not start with the French Revolution but that the origins of the phenomenon go back much farther, that they go back even to the Middle Ages. The French Revolution, he says, is an important episode, but neither the first nor the last. According to Tocqueville, democracy is characterised by a movement for equalization of the individuals within the frame of the State, by a levelling of the social causes, and this advance on the part of history toward the non-privileged classes, started during the crusades. After the French Revolution, this process of political and social levelling was pursued with even greater intensity. It extends in depth within the framework of the nations where it came into being, but, at the same time, it spreads by slowly but surely attracting into its sphere of influence all the peoples of the world. It seems that the movement for equalization is endowed with an irresistible force of propagation, for nothing can stop its course.

Due to his profoundly religious spirit, he saw in this act of historical levelling more than just an event of human dimensions, he considered it a divine commandment, an inspiration from heaven showing the peoples the path which they should take.

The historical synthesis of Tocqueville has retained all of its importance right up to our time. It is so exact, that it is no longer considered as mere speculation. Not only did this

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

movement toward equalization pursue its irresistible march since the time when Tocqueville formulated his theory, but it is approaching its saturation point.

Ever since Tocqueville, this problem has not ceased to preoccupy a great number of writers and thinkers. Auguste Comte, Hegel and Nietzsche formed the earlier group (to be interested in the problem. Ortega y Gasset, Huxley, and Jaspers, among the moderns, analysed the transformations which society underwent under the influence of the plebian spirit, and have attracted the attention of the people as to the lack of equilibrium which a too sudden rise in the historical level of the people might cause. With this difference, that now we do not speak so much of the vast historical panorama of the phenomenon which was so brilliantly presented by Tocqueville, but we study specifically its immediate product, the social groups which benefited from its development. It was then that the notion of the "masses" was first used, in order to stress the character of invasion of the phenomenon, the appearance of the masses on the historical scene. When Tocqueville was writing the popular contingent was not so large. But with the advent of the second half of the nineteenth century, the progress in technology and industrialization increased the migration of masses from the country to the cities. Men deserted the villages by the hundreds in order to find work in the new enterprises. Technology and capital accelerated even more than the French Revolution the process of the equalization of the social classes. The word "mass" has still another meaning. The term is borrowed from the sciences of physics, where it refers to uniform behavior of matter, to the quantitative reaction of the

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

phenomena of nature. The fact that this term is used in the social realm indicates that there is an analogy of situation. The popular masses present an ambiguous physiognomy in much the same way as the physical masses do. The individuals which compose these masses resemble each other so much in thoughts, in attitudes, in tastes, and in pleasures, that they seem to be a repetition of the same psychological cliché. Each one presents an anonymous style of life, a mentality which does not belong to him, but to the social group of which he is part.

The "multitudes" which are dispersed in the villages and in the hamlets cannot be called masses. A peasant belongs to a well established social hierarchy. The world in which he lives is a small universe, with its customs, its traditions and its specific structure, and, in this reduced social cosmos, he represents something: a name, a destiny, a place. The society in which he lives is interested in him, and he, in his turn, influences the existence of all. Transplanted to the city, this same peasant loses his social personality and becomes an amorphous being. It is therefore necessary to differentiate between the population of a country, with traditions which have lasted for millennia, and the masses of a people, which came into being through the dismembering and levelling of the former. From the soul of the individual who was uprooted from his ancestral home flows, little by little, that substance which differentiates him from others. In turn, new influences, coming from a uniform society, also transform into uniform beings the persons upon which they exert their influence.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Tocqueville and the above-mentioned thinkers do not waste too much time in the realm of pure speculation. They also study the same problem from the ethical and political point of view. According to them it is possible to interfere efficiently in the evolution of the masses to correct their disorderly manifestations. They all agree that the masses have become an important factor in history, and that they can no longer be isolated or kept at the margin of society. But these thinkers anxiously ask themselves for what purpose the surplus of vitality of those people who have been uprooted by the appearance of modern technology will be harnessed. For, the energy expended by the peoples can help to forge a historical period whose fruitfulness would be without equal; and, to the contrary, if this energy is left to develop haphazardly, it may decide the victory of mediocrity and the annihilation of European culture.

A great number of solutions for the actual crisis of society come to our minds. Only one is valid; that which is based on realities. The misunderstanding of these realities, their partial consideration, would lead to incomplete or totally inefficient solutions. In our case, because the question is one of a historical fact, we must direct ourselves according to the creative entity of history, according to the factor which serves as permanent support to its manifestations. What does history do? What force, what organism activates its springs? We are thinking about concrete history, the history which can be studied by our intellects, leaving aside the question of supernatural intervention. The problem consists therefore, in determining the creative factor of history. And, in order not to diverge from our point of departure,

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

we must ask ourselves if it is not the masses who hold the key-position in history, if they are not the ones, who, in the final analysis, decide the course of history? Or, if this mission is prohibited them, toward what superior realities are we advancing?

Great speculations were made about the masses. People brought out very well as if it were an imperfection what was amorphous, anonymous, and indicative of a lack of responsibility in their character, without granting enough importance to what distinguishes them, to the interruptions which occur in their uniform extension at certain points. There is no homogeneous human mass on the earth. There is no mass that could present the same characteristics whether Chinese, American, African, or European. The human product of the mass is subject at certain points to profound modifications which coincide with the geographical distribution of peoples. The concept of the masses must therefore be reconsidered, by saying more specifically that we are dealing with "national" masses, with the masses of a certain people. This does not prevent us from thinking of "the mass", with its general characteristics, as something apart from the national particularities, without pushing the abstraction to the point it would not coincide with realities.

The national diversity of the masses can be explained by their origin. Before becoming masses they resided in the biological and historical sphere of a nation. They detached themselves from the inner sphere of a people, and came into being marked with an ethnic stamp. The masses are not autonomous entities, they represent a phase in the development of a people, a modification of the national substance. One cannot separate the

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

"mass" from the "nation", for the mass is nothing else than the nation with a greater display of forces. The masses are continuing to play their role in history as the "national" masses.

The masses lead us toward the nations. Masses hem of the same stuff with no national meaning, do not exist anywhere in the world. The "national" type of human species has not yet appeared. We do not know of any individuals who are neither Rumanians, nor Greeks, nor French, nor English. The type of man described by the sociologist as belonging to the mass yields everywhere to the type of man who belongs to the nation. It may be that the Germanic mass is in many ways very similar to the Gaellic mass, but, by their way of thinking and their concept of life, the elements which are derived from the nation always have the last word. At decisive moments, the voice which arises from the depths of a people will be stronger than the apparent nihilism of the masses.

The appearance of the masses merely signifies that the peoples have entered another phase of achievement, that considerable contingents of individuals, favored by technological and industrial potential, are awaking from their millennial inertia. But it is always a question of a revolution which takes place within a nation. The nations, and not the masses who do not control their future, are the ones who either win or lose. In order for the masses to exist, the nations must pre-exist. In other periods too, social changes occurred which affected the fate of numerous peoples as well as vast regions of the earth; but these changes in turn "changed", whereas the nations which underwent these transformations still exist today. Once feudalism embraced the whole of Europe. The democratic revolution had the same general re-

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

percussions, but neither one nor the other of these social structures represent the end of history. "The mass" is an equally general social phenomena. But if the period of the masses is beginning, this does not mean that the period of the nations is over, for a substitute, a second-rate phenomenon cannot replace the principal phenomenon from which it draws its life.

History is the theatre of struggles, of passions and unrests, which set one nation against another. It is true, nevertheless, that the environment in which the nations flourish changes constantly under the influence of supranational values: the great religions, the great philosophies, the great scientific discoveries, the great historical shocks, and the great cataclysms of nature. But these factors of a spiritual or material nature constitute only a group of circumstances which are outside the nation; they change the atmosphere, they create new problems, they demand a new attitude on their part, without ever being able to take their place. These forces act from without, whereas the people work from within. In fact, the great currents of ideas never addressed themselves to isolated individuals, but to the nations. It is only after the nations have appropriated them that the ideas are able to spread. What are the triumphal dates in the history of the Christian church, if not the dates of the Christianization of the European peoples.

The same remark can also apply to the great figures in history: Alexander the Great, Caesar, Napoleon, Pitt, Bismarck. They were not great because they had more than the average human qualities, but because they placed their eminent qualities at the service of their peoples. If they had pursued goals alien to those

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

of their peoples, it is certain that their compatriots would not have helped them in achieving their exceptional personalities.

Have things really changed today, as it is supposed they have? Are the nations doomed to disappear, and are the centuries to come ever to get to know these social entities? Will the joint forces of the mass and of technology destroy the national groups and produce a uniform type of humanity?

These dark omens are completely without basis. Let us review a few events. Is it not true that the nineteenth century, which has been called the century of technology and the appearance of the masses, also acquired the name of the "century of nationalities"? The unification of Germany, of Italy, of Rumania, of Bulgaria, of Servia, and of Greece took place during that period. Other peoples obtained their independence after World War I: the Poles, the Czechs, the Estonians, the Letts, and the Lithuanians. The National Asiatic States formed under our very eyes: the Philippines, Burma, Hindustan, Pakistan, Indonesia, Lebanon, Syria and all the Arab States. The Israelites, too, who for twenty centuries have tried to return to their original homes, created a state. Do these extraordinary events not contradict all the pessimist prophecies which were made on the subject of the nations? Can we find here any signs of decadence?

By paraphrasing Tocqueville, who believed in the universal propagation of the phenomenon of equalization, could we not also say that the movement for the national resurrection of the peoples also has a universal character, and seems to be guided by the hand of Providence?

Technology also contributed to this extraordinary flourishing

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

of the national spirit. Technology, which is a factor in class equalization, may also be a contributing factor in differentiation. Without the modern possibilities of production and circulation, it would be hard to imagine the Asiatic peoples' reaching a stage of self-consciousness so rapidly. The Europeans were the ones who offered the spiritual and material arms capable of helping them to acquire their independence. But in spite of the important role of technology in the life of modern man, it would be absurd to rank that factor, which appeared in the last century, of equal importance with the nation, which has always existed.

Since nations create history, it follows that all the modern problems concerning the State, culture, technology, continental unification, and economic plans must be grouped within the framework of the nation, and their solution considered as an extension of the national perspective. The problem concerning the masses is of the same character; it cannot be solved to the exclusion of the existence and necessities of the nation.

It is necessary first of all to stop considering the masses as a calamity of our period. The appearance of the masses is a normal phenomenon of history. Technology only accelerated the rhythm of the process, by giving it a turbulent character, a character of unrest, but it is not the basis of its origin, and does not regulate it. It is only an accident in the inevitable movement toward the equalization of society. Even without the brutal intervention of modern technology, the mass movement would have occurred, since this was proscribed in the inherent order of

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

the nation. The trend toward equalization rests upon the creative urge of the nations. It is a sign of their vitality, and a phenomenon which manifests itself firmly only in Europe. It is the Christian religion with its universal vision which enabled the European nations to achieve the greatest display of forces. Analogous movements in Asia and in Africa only reflect the events taking place in Europe.

By playing a part in the nation, the masses are only taking the place which was reserved for them since the dawn of history. In fact, it is not normal for a small part of the people to decide the future of the whole while millions of men have no word in the affairs of the state. The nations which are limited to that feeble historical participation are in an incomplete phase of their development. For the results are not the same if millions of men work with all their strength for the happiness of their nation, or if only a few citizens are conscious of their national duty. Nothing is more desirable than to see the whole nation preoccupied with vital problems. A nation is even more powerful when its creative basis is larger, when a greater number of citizens take an interest in its ideals and sacrifice themselves for those ideals.

Is not Tocqueville's movement for equalization the repeated effort of the people to achieve self-knowledge, to understand and have control of themselves? The various incidents which occurred in that movement indicate the phases of development in the active consciousness of a people. The advance of equalization marks a progress in the creative forces of a people. Groups of individuals who demand the right to shape the national

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

destiny break away successively from the masses of men without history. The French Revolution created a great breach in the state by allowing all of the middle classes to participate in its life. Technology and capitalism removed the last of the old social barriers and transformed the trend toward equalization into a veritable deluge. Nevertheless, the process is not over yet. It is going to penetrate even more deeply, until the artificial differentiation between people and nation disappears completely.

If there is something over which to be alarmed, it is not over the appearance of the masses in history, but over the inability of the old ruling classes to understand the significance of this phenomenon. In the final analysis, it was the bourgeois and capitalist class, which, through its democratic principles and its technological achievements forced men to leave their homes. This class is responsible for the depopulation of the villages. It also should have foreseen the changes in attitude which were bound to occur among an uprooted population. The crisis of contemporary society is not provoked so much by the appearance of the masses as, in the first place, by the backward spirit of the ruling classes, which did not adapt the State to the new situations. To throw the responsibilities on the masses is to transfer the guilt to the wrong quarter. The masses constitute a threat only in proportion to the failure on the part of the elite. The individuals who comprise these masses have been uprooted by industrialization. They are passing through a critical moment in their existence, through

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

a period of transition, and they need a friendly hand to help them resist this trial. The mission of the elite is to take up the cause of the masses, through wisdom and patience to make them once more of use to the nations. The masses broke away from the old regime which had reigned over society till then. But they did not break away from the spirit of the nations and continue to serve it under their new conditions of life. Their natural impulse urges them to reestablish themselves within the framework of the nation. The elite who would adopt this program would not be acting contrary to reality, nor would they be pretending to establish things which are opposed to the general tendencies of the masses.

Since the old elite no longer respond to these needs, the only solution to the actual crisis lies in the appearance of a new elite. This elite will be favored from the point of view of selection, for the basis of recruitment will now encompass the entire population of a country. But an elite established itself around an ideal. It has a doctrine for its core. There are no elite serving events. The elite has nothing to do with groups of opportunists in political life. The question consists, therefore, in knowing on what concept of life, on what doctrine the present-day elite will take its stand. It seems that only a spiritual guidance capable of unifying the contradictions of our time would be able to attain this goal. The role of the contemporary elite is to mold the diffuse energies of the masses in proportion to the national substance which these energies contain. An elite which would not respond to this appeal would itself become an expression

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

of the masses, and its intervention would have no other effect than to aggravate the present chaos of society.

Only one doctrine can solve the problem of the masses in a manner that would last and would profit all the world: the nationalist doctrine. Nationalism represents the inherent force of a nation and that force moves all the individuals. Each individual, no matter how obscure his existence, carries in him the seed of the nation's destiny. Therefore, in order to obtain nationalism, it is necessary to start by awakening these latent energies. A dull people cannot be a nationalistic people. The movement toward equalization promotes Nationalism, for, through its appearance the masses, which until then have led a static life, liberate themselves from their social inferiority complex and direct their energies toward the higher realms of the nation. The masses are the natural allies of Nationalism.

Nationalism is as old as humanity. If, however, it appeared only in our period as a determining factor in history, it is because the sources of ethnical vitality acquired importance only in our time. Not only were the old class privileges an instrument for oppressing the masses, they were also a force hostile to the nation's development. The true history of a people can start only with the realization of their creative potentialities.

Nationalism recognizes in the stream of the masses the creative energies of the nations. But it does not stay in that primary phase. It does not allow itself to be carried away by the stream of the masses. It imposes a certain spiritual discipline

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

upon them. Nationalism circumvents the dangers of total equality by provoking in the very center of the masses a counter movement of an anti-equalization nature. It breaks the amorphous bloc of the mass down into individuals gifted with a personal concept of life, and these individuals, through their constant growth, change those pitiful characters. Nationalism dissolves the mass into individuals and personalities. The amorphous men who compose the masses can become nationalist only at the price of a great inner effort. In order for him to discover within himself and within the circle which surrounds the nation's existence, he must appeal to the forces of intuition and contemplation. This spiritual concentration wins over equalization. The individual who is intensely concerned over the fate of the nation frees himself of stereotyped patterns of thought, and his judgment acquires a personal accent. A new aristocracy will come into being based exclusively on the forces of the soul. Naturally, these changes encompass only the spiritual level, for on the political level the democratic principles will continue to decide the relationships between individuals.

The solutions most frequently posed and most welcome today are those which propose to solve the problem of the masses without the nation's participation. After World War II, Nationalism was not only vanquished on the political level, but banished from the level of speculative thought. A kind of prejudice which eliminates this concept from intellectual circulation imposed itself. Yet, to avoid Nationalism is to avoid the nation, the primary reality of history, the seat of the creative energies of humanity. That

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

is why, all the solutions which apply directly to the masses while ignoring the existence of the national reality are based on false premises. They could hardly make the masses more noble, or differentiate them. They would only aggravate the situation by amalgamating them even more.

Socialism and the non-Nationalistic European States are two concepts which are fighting to obtain public favor. They also tend to erase the ethnic diversity of the masses, a diversity which is the very source of their opportunity to renew themselves. We do not see what spiritual progress can be made if the nationalist masses of Europe should become an amorphous bloc of 400 to 500 million souls. Will the average man, of whom the masses are composed, be able to improve his spiritual self if he is uprooted from the framework of the nation and absorbed into a nameless multitude? On the contrary, this manner of hurling him into boundless social space is the same thing as depriving him of all the moral support of his conscience. Socialism and the non-nationalistic state are attacking the last barriers which hold back the pressure of the masses.

Individual liberty itself, considered by Tocqueville as the only factor which can keep the total levelling of society from coming about, cannot very well change the crude appearance of the masses if it does not ally itself with Nationalism. External political and social liberty is not an independent value but the epiphenomenon of a fundamental condition of the soul. The need for external liberty is felt when the creative forces of the individual are in effervescence. Then, anything coming from without which impedes the creative energy of the individual is blamed

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

upon lack of freedom. Creation is the support of freedom. If man lacked creative impulse, or if that impulse in him were killed through fear, he would not fight for external freedom. This means that it is not enough to create and maintain an environment of political liberty in a country, if, at the same time, that country lacks the proper environment for creative instincts. External freedom in itself remains a big question mark, for the most part a favorable supposition if not accompanied by inner liberty, if the individual is not encouraged to fulfill the social framework of freedom.

There is technological creation and cultural creation. Technological production offers products in series which can be sold and transmitted to other countries. Culture is the opposite of this imitation, of this transplantation of the values of one country to another. It always bears a nationalist character, and its dissemination among other peoples does not play a stimulating role. The individual who wishes to shine in the cultural realm must follow the same road; always use the specific energy of the culture, which emanates from within the nation. To be a cultured man means first of all to master the spiritual coordinates of the nation. Individual liberty is inseparably bound to creativeness, and creativeness of a superior order, i.e., culture is inseparably bound to Nationalism.

The opinions that we have just expressed may give rise to the idea or opinion that we see danger in the movements for the federalization of Europe. We are not fighting against the principle of such a union. Humanity will have taken a decisive step on

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

the day the nations cease to tear each other apart and instead spend all their energies for constructive purposes. But the hopes which people place on the achievement of such a European Union depend, in the first place, on the moderation which is practiced in applying this principle. A united Europe is not a revolutionary end, if, by revolution, we mean a certain spiritual transformation of man. The fact that the masses will be able to circulate freely from one end of the Continent to the other will in no way improve their way of thinking. Why attribute to this Union virtues which it does not possess? In what way would the actual crisis be alleviated? A united Europe would merely represent a framework, a larger political sphere, which, in order to become productive, would have to be inspired with an ideological content.

There is a positive limit to the concept of unification, and when it surpasses this limit it becomes a handicap. The present-day federalist movements desire an organic reconstruction of Europe, that is to say, they wish to build a new building with the consent of the peoples and not by an act of force, as was the case with Napoleon, Hitler, and, in our time, Stalin. This fact shows that they recognize implicitly the existence and individuality of the nations; and, as a result, all the programs which they elaborate must be inspired by this basic truth. The fundamental criterion which must guide the federalist movements -- as they themselves admit -- is respect for the integrity and specific needs of each nation. A federation of the European States cannot have as its aim the destruction of the nations' bases, but their preservation from the mortal danger which threatens them because of modern means of destruction.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

If the federalist movement agrees on building Europe on the basis of the free union of peoples, it is inadmissible that tendencies contrary to that principle will appear at the core of that movement, tendencies which would tend to sacrifice the nationalist existence for abstract formulas. One of those ideas which lacks all sense of reality is that which proposes that the Europe of tomorrow might be built by taking the United States as a model. It would be built in the same way as the new continent, where the small States grouped themselves under a central administration. Our federalists forget one basic fact; the United States represents one single nation, and the federal State which was proclaimed at Washington is the expression of the ethnic unity which was based on ancient Anglo-Saxon traditions. The small States which agreed to become members of a greater state, represented the local particularities of the same nation. Let us take another example; the German States which existed before Bismarck were political systems which appeared within the same nation and they gravitated within the orbit of a greater state, capable of encompassing the whole of the Germanic nation. In Europe, things are otherwise. Within its confines are a multitude of nations. Each State covers the sphere of existence of one single people. European unification cannot be accomplished the way it was in America. In Europe we must, rather, proceed empirically from the particular case to the particular case, by starting with unities and regional interests, and by avoiding formulas too general which are borrowed.

A Europe which would unify itself hastily because of over-enthusiasm, without taking into account the perpetual unrest of the

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Nationalist spirit, would easily cut its own throat. And if an outside nation took upon itself the task of establishing order on the European continent, this would be a repetition of the same stereotyped political situation inherited from Napoleon and Hitler, and the same results would be obtained. That power would have to make itself the guardian of order without the consent of the peoples, and its accomplishments would last as long as it was capable of maintaining that order by force.

In the realm of unification also, Nationalism reestablishes a clear comprehension of things. It disposes of two great possibilities of action: on one hand, it conserves and fortifies the soul of the nations; on the other, it creates an atmosphere of reciprocal understanding and good relations between peoples. This spirit of fraternization is what makes it possible to have a union of National States, and what guarantees the feasibility of this new political formation. Nationalism prepares the minds of the peoples for what Federalism wishes to accomplish. From the national level to the international level, the transition takes place without difficulty because the nation's spiritual contemplation also purifies their reciprocal relationships. Every nation which has reached an enlightened phase in its history sees in the existence of other peoples a miracle, and considers the creations of these peoples a divine gift in which the whole of humanity should rejoice.

E N D