

**THE REVOLUTIONARY NATURE
OF NATIONAL SOCIALISM**

by Matt Koehl



The Revolutionary Nature of National Socialism first appeared in issue number one of the NATIONAL SOCIALIST (Summer 1980), the journal of the World Union of National Socialists.

The Revolutionary Nature of National Socialism
Copyright © 1980
by Matt Koehl

First printing in booklet form March 1981
Second printing December 1987

The quotation on the inside back cover is taken from Commander Koehl's address to the final plenary session of the 10th Congress of the National Socialist White People's Party held in Arlington, Virginia, August 31, 1980.

THE REVOLUTIONARY NATURE OF NATIONAL SOCIALISM

BY MATT KOEHL

INTRODUCTION

The true significance of National Socialism as a revolutionary idea as well as a historical phenomenon of fundamental importance has too often been overlooked or forgotten by its adherents. On occasion, its outlook and objectives have been confused with those of a reactionary right, while at other times they have been mistaken for those of the Marxist left.

To dispel such erroneous misconceptions, it is useful not only to re-examine the role of National Socialism against a backdrop of historical conditions, but also to re-evaluate its unique underlying values. Only when the implications of that role and those values are more clearly understood and appreciated can each individual adherent achieve that level of commitment necessary to enable the National Socialist movement to fulfill its historic mission.

THE DECLINE

When Oswald Spengler spoke of the "decline of the West," he was describing an awesome historical process which today has reached its final stages. And even at this late date, there are very few who possess the moral and intellectual fortitude to recognize the full extent of that decline. What we are confronted with is not simply a political structure which has become decadent and corrupt. Every facet of civilization as we know it today—an entire cultural system—has degenerated. Decay has infected *every* institution of society: social, economic, religious and cultural, as well as political.

Not since the declining days of Rome has the earth been witness to a similar phenomenon. Here we find the businessman, whose god is Profit; the politician, who prostitutes himself in parliamentary brothels; the preacher who admonishes one to worship Jews while proclaiming the evils of Race; the teacher, who advocates feminism and homosexuality as an alternate lifestyle; the military officer, who is more concerned about his retirement benefits than his honor as a soldier—as well as the ordinary citizen who, sated with beer and TV, accepts it all with hardly a peep of protest. All of these are symptomatic of a disease, a cancer, a terminal illness which has condemned existing civilization to death.

The condition is *terminal*. According to the great cyclic law governing the progression of cultures, Western civilization, as an organic entity, is finished. No recovery is possible. There is no hope of saving it—nor should one attempt to do so. What has become decadent should not be artificially preserved; it should be eliminated.

Modern Western civilization constitutes a grotesque parody

of true culture. It represents an *Old Order* whose values are false, alien, anti-natural, anti-Life and anti-Race. What we are now witnessing is the final phase of an organic deterioration, which will run its course, culminating in death and *chaos*. Nothing can halt this process.

Confronted with this somber prospect, how does one respond? How *should* one face the impending death of a civilization, of an entire culture of which one has been an integral part? How is one to cope with the trauma of that experience? Does one turn to self-indulgence and hedonistic excess or to self-destructive nihilism? Does one surrender one's rationality and embrace the otherworldly assurances of whatever shaman or religious cult? Or does one simply ignore reality altogether and nostalgically insist upon the restoration of that which is irretrievably lost?

But we must pose an overriding question: Does the death of a culture mean the end of everything? Does it mean that there is no longer a purpose for existence?

For National Socialists, there can be but one course: action based upon a clear-cut perception of reality—bold, resolute action to bring order once more out of chaos.

And here, the first important consideration is that the National Socialist world view has never seen culture as deterministic. Rather, it upholds the primacy of Race, and recognizes in the racial principle the potential for all higher culture. The immediate corollary of this outlook, of course, is that the death of a civilization is not of the same order as the death of a race.

In his book, Adolf Hitler once declared:

Every defeat can become the father of a subsequent victory, every lost war the cause of a later resurgence, every hardship the fertilization of human energy, and from every oppression the forces for a new spiritual rebirth can come—as long as the blood is kept pure.¹

What applies to lesser tragedies is of greatest significance in this instance. Here, the question of the preservation of a racial nucleus assumes paramount importance. *Who* will survive the coming collapse? *What* will emerge in place of Western culture? These are fundamental questions. They are not posed lightly.

A disengagement of our race from the general decadence of Western civilization is fraught with danger. For over a millenium, the destiny of Aryan man has been linked inseparably with the history of the West. Whether he can survive the shock of cultural disengagement is problematical. Yet, the great undertaking must be attempted, for there is no other way.

Unless our race—or at least a viable segment—can manage through a conscious effort to separate itself from the disintegrating cultural mass, it will be hopelessly swamped. Because only in the creation of a *New Order*, with its own distinctive values and ideas and arising defiantly out of the ruins of the Old, can there be any future worthy of the name for Aryan man.

What is crucial is not whether a decadent civilization survives, but rather a race capable of culture. *For what is at stake is not the life of a culture or a civilization as such, but the eternal life of a race capable of the highest culture.* That is the real issue of our time.

As long as Aryan man exists, he will bear within him the Promethean spark which cataclysmic tragedy can only serve to fan into a bright new flame of creative expression. And just as Western culture freely adapted elements of the preceding Classical period into its historic fabric, so will it be with the post-Western culture of the New Order as it appropriates as a timeless legacy those features of the West which have remained worthy and undefiled.

TRUE REVOLUTION

A proper appreciation of National Socialism as a revolutionary force presupposes an accurate definition of terms as well as an understanding of its role in a larger historical context. To regard revolution as synonymous with nihilism or bolshevism is puerile. True revolution is hardly the same as nihilism, which involves nothing more than destruction for destruction sake without an accompanying set of values. It is not bolshevism; in an age of degeneracy, upholding decency becomes a revolutionary act. It is more than rhetoric; any confidence man or opportunist can utter words. It is more than violent action, although such a development may attend the revolutionary process. It is more than a mere change of political administration by unconstitutional means. All of this is superficial.

By the term "revolutionary" we understand a commitment to radical change involving the introduction of a fundamentally different set of values.

During the course of Western history, there have been several notable events which have been described as revolutions. England experienced a violent change of regimes in 1649, when Cromwell and his Roundheads succeeded in toppling Charles I and in establishing a Puritan Commonwealth, the primary

legacy of which has been a tradition of moralistic hypocrisy in Anglo-Saxon political affairs.

The next great European upheaval occurred in France in 1789 under the Jacobin banner of *Liberte', Egalite', Fraternite'*—an event which signaled the triumph of the mob and mediocrity.

In many ways similar to the so-called French Revolution was the Bolshevik outbreak in Russia in 1917—the monstrous culmination of a leveling process already manifest in the two earlier upheavals.*

Apart from a common pattern of regicide and general savagery, all of these European "revolutions" were similar to one another in that they sprang from the same spiritual subsoil and partook of the same material values already present to some degree in the ongoing Western devolution: concern for numbers, mass, material wealth, creature comforts, happiness, particular freedom, privileges and rights—all of it a pandering to human selfishness! One might say, in fact, that each succeeding revolution was but a more advanced manifestation of a progressive deterioration.

The American Revolution of 1776, while assuming some of the features of a genuine national rising, was unfortunately infected with the materialistic rationalism of the 18th century. After the Civil War had destroyed whatever possibility there existed for the United States to develop into true nationhood, what remained were nothing but the seeds for the most poisonous egalitarianism and spiritual bolshevism, the full flower of which we are witnessing today. Whatever it may have originally meant, the American Dream of "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" has become a cheap pretext for the most vulgar aggrandizement and selfishness, just as what is known as Americanism has become a universal symbol for the most appalling decadence and lack of culture.

* * *

In contrast to the previous "revolutions," the *German Revolution* of 1933 represented a totally new phenomenon. Not only was it virtually bloodless, but more importantly it involved

*Some may consider Russia outside the pale of Western culture, having its roots in a Byzantine tradition. While this may be technically correct, it is also true that for several hundred years the ruling elements of that country had oriented themselves towards the Germanic West. Because the Russian Revolution involved these elements as one of the antagonistic forces (the other one bearing a doctrine which itself had originated in the West), that upheaval must be considered within the general context of Western history.

a mighty *spiritual transformation*. Growing out of a distinctive Teutonic-Prussian tradition of duty, service and discipline and inspired by the mighty leadership of Adolf Hitler, it reflected the political maturity of the German people as the first Aryan nation to rise consciously against the decadence of the West. It brought into play a *whole new value system* fundamentally opposed to that of the Old Order.

It is perhaps not entirely without significance that it was precisely those other nations, whose historical experience involved a commitment to human decadence, which found themselves in mortal opposition to National Socialist Germany during the Second World War. And although this unique creation was tragically shortlived in a narrower sense, in a wider sense it must be seen not only as the *first* real rising of Aryan man as a conscious racial entity, but also as the first true revolution in two thousand years. Whereas all previous upheavals were to a greater or lesser extent part of a process of dissolution under an existing system, the National Socialist revolution in Germany represented a radical revolt against that system itself, resulting in the introduction of an entire new set of values.

What is remarkable about the National Socialist value system is that in contrast to the anti-naturalism of the Old Order, it consciously sought to apply the immutable laws of Nature to human affairs. Proceeding from an open recognition of the principle of universal inequality, it posited the values of Blood and Race as the cornerstone of all its policies. For it, the concept of equality could never be an end in itself, but always simply a means to permit the enhancement of human genius. Against the malignant sickness of our time, it stood for health. Against decadence, it proposed regeneration. Against weakness, strength. Against falsehood, truth. Against death, life.

It is in this sense that the German Revolution must be understood as *the one true revolution* of the past two millenia, a singular event of transcendent importance for Aryan man. And so it is to this mighty source of inspiration that we National Socialists now turn, and it is by its values that we proceed to stake our claim as true revolutionaries of this age.

DICHOTOMY OF VALUES

Ever since Marxist propaganda invented the notion that National Socialism (as some ill-defined form of "fascism") represents nothing but the "last, dying gasp of the capitalist system," there has existed a certain amount of confusion concerning our creed and its proper position among world

ideologies. Not only has this patent absurdity been generally accepted by the political left, but it has also been believed by some marginal elements on the right.

The truth is that National Socialism is neither capitalist nor communist. It is neither of the right nor of the left. It is not a part of the interplay of forces under the existing order. The National Socialist perception of political and social reality rejects as meaningless any such dichotomy, which it sees as merely an artificial outgrowth of those class contradictions which have arisen out of the Industrial Revolution during the past two centuries. It is of no relevance to modern racial requirements.

Despite superficial differences, capitalism and communism—right and left—represent nothing more than the two aspects of the Old Order. They are generically similar, with a common world view based on *economic materialism*, according to which they both view the world in terms of money and mass. Like rival gangs, their quarrel is not over basic values, but over the application of those values, viz., the distribution of wealth and attendant political considerations. That life on this earth might involve a higher purpose is a concept alien to both.

In contrast to the materialistic ideologies of the Old Order, National Socialism postulates a philosophy of *racial idealism* involving individual sacrifice and service on behalf of the organic whole, which it sees as not only the premise for all true culture, but also the basis for a meaningful existence for the individual himself.

Adolf Hitler described the idealistic attitude in this manner:

But, since true idealism is nothing but the subordination of the interests and life of the individual to the community, and this in turn is the precondition for the creation of organizational forms of all kinds, it corresponds in its innermost depths to the ultimate will of Nature. It alone leads men to a voluntary recognition of the privilege of force and strength, and thus makes them particles of that order which shapes and forms the whole universe.²

Explaining the significance of such idealism, he continued:

How necessary it is to keep realizing that idealism does not represent a superfluous expression of emotion, but that in truth it has been, is, and will be, the premise for what we designate as human culture, yes, that it alone created the concept of 'man'! It is to this inner attitude that the Aryan owes his position in this world, and to it the world owes man; for it alone formed from pure spirit the creative force which, by a unique pairing of the brutal fist and intellectual genius created the monuments of human culture.³

In light of this materialistic/idealistic contrast, it becomes ap-

parent that the real alignment of systems is not between National Socialism and a reactionary right on the one hand and a so-called revolutionary left on the other, but rather between both the right and left wings of the Old Order against a nascent New Order politically represented by National Socialism.

This basic dichotomy of value systems was dramatically demonstrated during the Second World War, when the supposedly contradictory forces of international finance capitalism and international communism joined together in an *unconditional* struggle against the one force which was perceived as a mortal threat by both. As National Socialist legions were besieging the citadel of Marxism, the world was witness for all time to the spectacle of communists eagerly embracing their capitalist counterparts in a desperate crusade to defeat a common enemy and to preserve the Old Order.

ALLEGIANCES

Having examined the historical condition of the West and considered a resolution of the crisis posed by decline through a revolution based upon the radical values of National Socialism, we turn now to the relationship of the individual National Socialist to this historical process—to those moral responsibilities concomitant with his practical participation, as well as to certain objective realities whose implications must govern his inner attitude and personal allegiances.

The first obligation of a revolutionary is to establish his position upon a solid basis of philosophical and moral integrity. This means, above all, that he must be ready to accept and uphold the truth—*radical* truth, unpopular truth, difficult truth—according to the timeless adage of Adolf Hitler “*The prerequisite for action is the will and the courage to be truthful.*”

For the political activist, it is always easier to conform to current public preferences and prejudices than to take an unpopular stand. The Leader recognized this tendency when he cautioned the National Socialist movement as follows:

We National Socialists know that with this conception we stand as revolutionaries in the world today and are also branded as such. But our thoughts and actions must in no way be determined by the approval or disapproval of our time, but by the binding obligation to a truth which we have recognized.⁴

A true revolutionary can never compromise his ultimate goals. Otherwise he ceases to be a revolutionary, and becomes

instead just another political opportunist. In these words, the uncompromising attitude of Adolf Hitler towards such opportunism is clearly expressed, as it is in the following passage from his work:

. . . A movement that wants to renew the world must serve not the moment, but the future.⁵

Once his moral premise is firmly established, the next obligation of a revolutionary is to achieve *inner segregation* from the decadence of the present order, and to re-examine his basic loyalties with respect to the various institutions of society as well as to the state structure as such. For there can be no such thing as National Socialist allegiance to any state formation which seeks to undermine or destroy the racial integrity of a people. Such monstrosities exist only to be overthrown.

If, by the instrument of governmental power, a people is led toward its destruction, then rebellion is not only the right of every member of such a people—it is his duty.⁶

So spoke Adolf Hitler concerning the legitimacy of state authority, noting that:

The state is a means to an end. Its end lies in the preservation and advancement of a community of physically and psychically homogeneous creatures.⁷

Perhaps nowhere is the general disintegration of Western civilization more apparent than in North America, where the special problem of unformed nationhood presents itself. Whereas in Europe the respective state configurations have for the most part tended—at least until quite recently—to conform to distinct ethnic types, in America there exists no true *Volk*. Here, so-called nationality represents nothing more than a convenient label for all those who happen to share the common fate of living on the same piece of Equal Opportunity real estate—hardly a proper basis for genuine nationhood. Perhaps as a result, one encounters the peculiar American penchant for equating country with government in a pathetic parody of real patriotism.

Whatever the United States may have been at one time, today it represents nothing but a rootless, multiracial hodgepodge without any real character or common purpose. As such, it can only be held together in the long run by the prevalence of universal prosperity and/or by force. In the absence of these two factors, the entire structure can only become very tenuous

as the various centrifugal forces—social, regional, ethnic but especially *racial*—are set in motion, something which must inevitably occur under the stress of modern conditions.

Under such circumstances, not only is it absurd but it becomes downright disastrous for National Socialists to identify themselves with traditional appeals to patriotism. “My country, right or wrong.” But what if one no longer has a country? Can it honestly be said that the Aryan of North America possesses a land over which he exercises sovereign control and jurisdiction? Or might it not be more accurate to say that the American White man lives in a colony whose administrative center lies in Washington, but whose real capital is Jerusalem?

And when millions of non-Whites are permitted to pour—legally or illegally—into the United States, where they can become instant and equal members of a big *Konsumgesellschaft*, then it is no longer possible to regard its borders as something sacred or the status of being an American as possessing any special quality worth mentioning. Then all talk about having a constitution, a government or a free society becomes positively ludicrous and obscene, because these are then nothing more than mere catchwords for enslavement and extinction. Then the existing regime must be viewed not as something to which one owes loyalty and allegiance, but as an instrument of tyranny and oppression—an *enemy*—to be completely and totally destroyed. Then “law and order” must be seen as the worst possible catastrophe for our race, and the centrifugal action of internal contradictions as the greatest blessing in dissolving the bonds of an unnatural and unholy union. For National Socialists to attempt a necessary liberation struggle with any other attitude would be tantamount to forfeiting in advance all chance of success.

* * *

It was precisely this hard-line, revolutionary attitude which Adolf Hitler took when he refused to pledge his allegiance to the old Habsburg state, whose demise he clearly foresaw, due to a lack of ethnic cohesion. The remarkable parallel between that obsolescent structure before its collapse and the condition of the present multiracial state in North America is something for every National Socialist to ponder. Above all, one would do well to remember the admonition from *Mein Kampf*: “We National Socialists must never under any circumstances join in the usual hurrah patriotism of our present bourgeois world.”⁸

It is typical of bourgeois reactionaries to prefer tilting at targets a safe distance from their borders, rather than embark-

ing on the more difficult and hazardous enterprise of overthrowing an enemy closer to home. It is no accident that U.S. conservatives, for example, have always been in the forefront of those urging military adventures abroad—from Pearl Harbor and Suez to Vietnam and Iran—all the while remaining conspicuously unconcerned about Zionist control of the United States itself.

One can only smile at the hypothetical spectacle of a V.I. Lenin behaving in a similar reactionary, bourgeois manner. Suppose, for instance, that after the outbreak of hostilities in 1914, he had announced that although he did have certain differences with the Tsar he nevertheless recognized that his patriotic duty lay in coming to the defense of Mother Russia in her moment of crisis, while at the same time suspending opposition to “his” government for the duration of the conflict. Any rational person, communist or non-communist, would have to regard such behavior as stupid and naive in the extreme, if not positively insane. In any event, never would Lenin have achieved political success, nor would his cause now pose the world threat that it does. Yet there are comrades who fail to understand the real reasons for Marxist success and who have yet to resolve the question of state loyalty as unambiguously as did William Joyce in 1939 when, as a National Socialist, he made the conscious decision to leave a Jewish-dominated England in order to fight in defense of the Aryan revolution in Germany—*because he recognized that the citizenship of blood was more important than mere state citizenship.*

* * *

Today there are two equally dangerous ideological forces rampant in the world. One is represented by the leveling doctrine of Marxism-Leninism, or communism. The other is international Zionism, the insidious doctrine of Jewish supremacy over all non-Jews. Whereas in the East, communism is the dominant reality, in the West it is Zionism—aligned with monopoly capital and politically represented by liberalism/conservatism—which exercises effective control and dominance. Consequently, the *destabilization and demolition of the Zionist power structure* must be the primary concern of National Socialists in the Western countries. Only after that abomination has been eliminated can the Movement begin to turn its attention effectively to other tasks.

As National Socialists and revolutionaries, our first task is to challenge the immediate status quo. If we are unable or unwilling to recognize the enemy in our midst as the first enemy to be

fought and overcome, then we are no revolutionaries or true National Socialists, and never will we be able to defeat any other enemies.

Under no circumstances should National Socialists allow themselves to be placed in a position of defending the existing system or of helping to resolve any of its dilemmas, whether in the field of domestic or foreign policy. Any such act runs counter to the revolutionary process and can only serve to perpetuate the present condition. Instead, we must be prepared to welcome every situation, every event and every action which tends to destabilize and dissolve the existing order.

At this late date, nothing can be restored. Therefore, our task does not consist in going back to anything or in bringing back another age. It does not lie in resuscitating a decadent and dying civilization, or in preserving a corrupt system, or in changing or modifying it. All of that is irrelevant now.

Our historic task as National Socialist revolutionaries is, quite simply, to start all over again—*tabula rasa* with a new vision and a new outlook and a new will to create upon this earth a new order and a new culture as a wonderful new testament to immortal Aryan genius. *That* is our mission, and nothing else.

Footnotes

1. Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 327. Translated by Ralph Manheim. Copyright © renewed 1971 by the Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston. Corrections have been made in the translation of this and subsequent quotations, where necessary.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 299.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 298-299.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 394.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 466

6. *Ibid.*, p. 96.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 393.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 648.

“To this System we say: ‘We are no longer deceived by your lies. We shall fight no more of your bloody wars. Instead, we are going to make war on you yourself. And if we must die, then it will be in a *revolution* here at home, and not one of your wars abroad!’ And if this be treason, then we are happily prepared to make the most of it.”

—Matt Koehl
