

Vänsternationell

THE NATIONAL-COMMUNIST ALTERNATIVE

By Luc Michel

Translation by Bolivian NB comrade Jorge Morón

"You make the cause of the nation the cause of the people and the cause of the people will become the cause of the nation." V.I. Lenin

Let us imagine a laboratory: in this laboratory a matter prevails, in this matter a big-bang prevails and inside this big-bang, a chain of chemical reactions of an extraordinary violence [unwinds]. Some molecules come undone, others are formed, [and] a formidable process of fission, combustion, reconstruction, corpuscular combustion [develops]; at the end of which appears a synthesis of products of unknown nature. Who could have foreseen the synthesis of the "national" and of the "social" in 1920? Who, before Barres, could have imagined the encounter, the mere encounter, of the two terms? Because, well, it's at this point where we find ourselves now.

Europe 'mutatis mutandis', is at this point. [It] doesn't return, it invents, it doesn't meditate, it improvises. It doesn't repeat old formulas: it burns them, it turns them to ashes and from the fragments, combined crazily, it forms new unknown products. Nationalism is found in it, certainly, as are fragments of populism, remains of anti-Semitism and some good-old communism, less dead than it seems. All of these are blended, and passed through the big-bang test. In the heart of the tumult, even as unlikely as it was in its time, is the Fascist synthesis. This is a monster that the new Europe cracks under our eyes, although for the time being it does it behind our backs. He still has no name, this monster, nor has it a face. The hypothesis is only that it exists or that it will exist one day." (B.H. Levy, "enser L'Europe" en "Le Monde des débats 1993").

In the summer of 1993, the great press discovered what it called the temptation or the danger of National-Bolshevism. From Paris to Moscow, our journalists seemed to have discovered a new phenomenon. Their flagrant lack of culture did not allow them to be acquainted with the remarkable thesis about national-bolshevism written by professor Louis Dupeux fifteen years ago (1).

From "Liberation" (Paris) to "Soir" (Brussels), through to "Le Monde", they opened a true debate on the topic. They multiplied articles, often contradicting themselves on the topic of national-bolshevism and the fusion between nationalists and communists. Thus, "Liberation" titled an article, "The National- Bolshevik Galaxy" and spoke of the "extraordinary ideological convergence that has taken place during these last months between some communist intellectuals and the extreme right." It underlined that "the approach [was made] on behalf of their hate for the socialist left, America and Zionism" (2). "Soir" on the other hand, spoke of an alliance between browns and reds and subtitled [its article] "Political fiction or politics without fiction?" (3).

Despite its first political expression in between the two world wars, national-bolshevism had already become a European political reality by the mid 60's thanks to Jean Thiriart's Jeune Europe and its evolution in 1965 towards national-communist theses (4). From the 80's on, with the Parti Communiste National-Européen (P.C.N) (5), national-bolshevism would find a new political

expression. Today, next to the already mentioned P.C.N., numerous currents postulate theses that favor an offensive coalition between revolutionary nationalism and Leninist communism against the System, the New World Order and American hegemony; such as the Nouvelle Resistance in France, Orion in Italy, European Alternative in Spain and the National-Bolshevik Front in Moscow.

The great press has been interested, on the other hand, on the marginal aspects of the national-Bolshevik phenomenon. In the French case, the common road of communist intellectuals and of the extreme right has been underlined together with the political project of Russian communist militants and national-revolutionaries. [However], national-bolshevism is much more. Above all, it's a political desire to overcome the dividing lines between the Right and the Left, between the anti-fascism and the anti-communism maintained by the System so as to divide opposition; and it's a will to offer a political alternative to the decadence of the contemporary world. Such are the different aspects of what "Liberation" calls the "national-Bolshevik galaxy."

Never having been faced with such politically unqualifiable phenomena, the specialists of the "pret-a-penser" and of intellectual conformism, have preferred to include it in a very comfortable bundle under the generic name of "extreme right", showing, by this, their lack of historical culture and politics and their inability to consider today's reality outside of the traditional outlines in which socio-political thought is framed and reduced [today].

THE BIRTH OF NATIONAL-BOLSHEVISM.

National-bolshevism, independently of its precursors to which we shall return and the first of which is George Sorel, was historically born in Germany with the shock caused by the collapse of the Second Reich in 1918 and due to the rising crisis emanated by the creation of Bolshevik Russia in 1917. From its birth, German national-bolshevism presented the two tendencies that we have already underlined: on one hand, the collaboration between nationalist and communist intellectuals and, on the other, an authentic national-revolutionary movement that united Leninist ideology with nationalist content. National-bolshevism was born to overcome the international order imposed by Versailles, whose victims were mainly Soviet Russia and Germany, as well as Italy. Beyond ideological options, the weight of the order created in Versailles, dictated by the U.S. President Wilson, imposed an even situation upon the German nationalists and the Russian communists. Before even building a theoretical construction or a revolutionary political construction, German national-bolshevism would first be a nexus between German and Russian frustration in regards to the Versailles order. Faced with the looting and the dismemberment of Germany and of Russia on the part of the 1918 winners and the excessive demands made by the winners of 1918, numerous German intellectuals openly declared that the Bolshevik regime [then] recently implanted in Russia was preferable to the humiliation and the ruin imposed on their German homeland.

"The sought-after national Bolshevism is born from a fever caused by the encounter of two fears, but in circumstances objectively unfavorable..., [it's] a heroic solution, reducent for a minority of idealists, it sinks its roots in a genuinely 'German' reactionary tradition. In this way, it extends beyond a simple combination of circumstances and, it's for this reason, that this "temptation" would survive and express itself in a time in which the internal and external situation offered a prospective of radical loss of legitimacy in a concrete order before the eyes of the extreme right belonging to the conquering West" (6).

The great Germanist Eltzbacher, law professor in Berlin, would be the first one to speculate about this position in April 1919, in a proclamation that would constitute the first coherent doctrinal manifestation of national-Bolshevism.

Professor Paul Eltzbacher's ideas found an attentive eye in the Soviet field. Karl Radek, put in charge by the First Communist International -the Comintern- of the preparation of revolution in Germany, would favor the alliance between German reactionaries and Russian communists.

In November 1919, Radek declared "This is the reason why honest nationalists as Eltzbacher, displeased by the peace of Versailles [and] who have looked for a union with Soviet Russia in what they have called national bolshevism, have been totally isolated today."

THE NATIONAL-COMMUNISM OF HAMBURG.

The coalition between nationalism and Leninist communism, within a common political formation, would respond quickly to this first national-Bolshevik intellectual convergence, which is [in itself] the authentic essence of Bolshevism .

From 1919 [on] it would be embodied in a national-Bolshevik current developed, at first in Hamburg, by the leaders of the Soviet revolution Heinrich Laufenberg and Friedrich Wolfheim (7). In this city, they derived radical national-communist positions in alliance with those of the [then] marked national tendency. In 1919-20 Wolfheim and Laufenberg encouraged a national-Bolshevik current that competed with the positions of the "Spartans" (left revolutionaries) who called for the formation of the German Communist Party, K.P.D.; [they did so] in Germany and in the heart of the First International.

After being expelled by this party in October 1919, they immediately formed a dissident communist party, the K.A.P.D. or German Worker's Communist Party (8). Through this party, which would be represented in the Comintern up until 1922, Wolfheim and Laufenberg defended the idea of creating a German Red Army to re-launch the war against the winners of Versailles.

After the victory of national-socialism in 1933, some national- Bolshevik structures survived the political and intellectual apparatus of the Third Reich. [Amongst these was] in particular, the Fichte-Bund, created in Hamburg following the line of the K.A.P.D. [This structure] would end up integrating itself into and surviving the core of the Third Reich. Directed by professor Kessemaier of Hamburg, this university and intellectual movement had many parallel [formations] in Europe. Among them was a young man from Lieja who had emerged from the lines of extreme communism, a certain Jean Thiriart, to whom we shall return later on...."

THE GERMAN NATIONAL-BOLSHEVISM OF THE 20s AND 30s.

Starting from the mid twenties up until the arrival of national- socialism in 1933, national-Bolshevism would become an important part of the intellectual panorama of the Weimar Republic. There were numerous intellectuals that would embrace national-Bolshevik positions.

In the first place, we must name Ernst Niekisch, who would be the most celebrated and the main

representative of the German national- Bolshevik current.

Coming from the German socialist current, Niekisch, would evolve towards national-Bolshevik and neo-nationalist positions, in particular, through the magazine which he formed: "Widerstand" (Resistance), which held a considerable influence specially over the German juvenile movements previous to 1933. Niekisch's current was composed of former-social-democrats and syndicalists to whom numerous representatives of the average neo-nationalist [movements] were added. After 1933, Niekisch express himself, every time with more force, against the positions of Hitler, which would [subsequently] cause the closing of the magazine and his enclosure in a concentration camp from which he would [only] emerge in 1945.

Before his death he participated in the bringing to birth of the German Democratic Republic within which he saw the exaltation of the communist and Prussian values that were as ever his.

KARK RADEK AND "THE TRAVELER OF NAUGHT".

"In the year 1923, I remember having witnessed a new great wave of national-bolshevism, in the vague and vulgar sense of the contacts between nationalist and communist. The origin of this wave, in fact very quarrelsome, is Schlageter's line in the midst of which the German Communist Party (K.P.D.) intends to "win over the middle classes thorough proletarianization" using the patriotic subject deliberately. In the course of this campaign one could see the leaders of the party compromised, even to look for a debate, with the qualified elements of Fascists or "pro-fascists". The social- democrats and the bourgeois parties once again re-launched the old accusation about a convergence between the two extreme ends... the herald of this new line was Radek" (9).

The German national-bolshevism of the early 20's is unquestionably [shaped after] the figure of the International Communist Karl Radek. Put in charge by the Comintern of organizing and coordinating the Bolshevik revolution in Germany, Radek understood (10) the benefit that could be extracted from the national-Bolshevik phenomenon and he never stopped favoring it. When in 1925, the French and Belgian armies occupied the basin of the Rhur, as a response to the lack of payment of war reparations from the part of bled-out Germany, an important resistance movement was organized by French national- revolutionaries.

The leader of one of these, Leo Schlageter, was captured and executed by the French army; Schlageter became the first hero of national-socialism (11). Upon his death, Karl Radek pledged a homage to him in a surprising speech made before the representatives of the International Communist gathered in Moscow. Karl Radek announced: "most of the German people are men that work and consecrate themselves to the fight against the German bourgeoisie. If the patriotic atmospheres of Germany don't decide to make theirs the cause of this majority of the nation and to constitute in this way a front against the capital of the Entente and German capital, then the road opened up by Schlageter will be the road to nothing."

In this same speech, pronounced in Moscow the 20th of June 1923, Radek also spoke of Schlageter as the traveler of naught, in relation to the title of a novel of the time (12).

Radek's speech would have enormous repercussion in Germany. It would constitute the origin of numerous cohabitations and debates between German intellectuals of the extreme right and

communist leaders, with Radek as the head [of them].

This situation can't but, at least, make us think about the current debate in course carried out, particularly, in France and which in the summer of 1993 the great press denounced as "national-communism".

Warner Lerner, biographer of Karl Radek, evokes in an impressive way the action of this last one: "In 1923 Karl Radek attempted to use the recently created Nazi party to destroy the Weimar Republic and favor the communist revolution. Radek gave the Nazis their first hero, Schlageter, shot by the French in the Rhur, and he made in his memory a celebrated speech, approved by Stalin and Zinoviev. Radek expressed the conviction, shared by the leaders of the Comintern, that the crushing majority of the nationalist masses do not belong to the field of the nationalists, but to that of the workers, and that hundreds of Schlageter's would unite themselves to the field of the Revolution. On the other hand, Hitler trusted his comrades with the conviction that a communist could always become a good Nazi, but that a social-democrat could never be one" (13).

THE RESURGANCE OF NATIONAL-COMMUNISM IN THE 60's: JEUNE EUROPE AND JEAN THIRIART.

To [better] view the new current of national-communist tendency we first must look at the 1960's with the transnational organization "Young Europe" and Jean Thiriart's work. The current intellectual climate is characterized by meek conformism. One of the stupidest manifestations of this is the marked will of giving to each political current a label that locates it in one of the conventional compartments that extend from the extreme right to the extreme left.

And when a revolutionary movement is located outside of this system of classification "rien ne va plus". Pseudo-explanations arrive about "the convergence of the ends" and other fantasies coming from the apolitical or, simply, from intellectual dishonesty.

The organization Young Europe didn't escape this phenomenon and it has been classified for more than 30 years as extreme right, that is to say Fascist, in a rejection of any objective reality. If on the contrary, this European organization is studied through its real history [and] its publications, the reality is other: we are before an original and unclassifiable revolutionary movement that is located outside of the "right" or "left" conformism and which picks as its positions, socio-politically as well as in foreign policy, from the national-communist or national-Bolshevik synthesis of the 20's and 30's (14).

An "organization for the formation of a political frame" [and] a revolutionary party of the vanguard, Young Europe reminds us of the Bolshevik Party after 1903, because of its methods and its political project: "A revolution demands the conjunction of diverse factors: having a global ideology (and not only a small electoral program), being a determined group, being organized, homogeneous, disciplined, that is to say to be an action party; to finally find a point of crisis,... We have an ideology, we are preparing an organized group, the point of crisis we await" (15).

Former-Stalinist militant at the beginning of his political career previous to the war (16), Jean Thiriart, founder and main theoretician of Young Europe, structured his movement following the principles of the strictest Leninist organizational orthodoxy and its hierarchy derives directly from "

democratic centralism". Also, in a number of occasions, Thiriart would openly recognize the influence that Lenin exercised over him (17).

Starting in 1960, the doctrine of the movement, "National-European Communitarism" whose social character was affirmed from the beginning, derived from national-communist positions. If in the first years of the movement, Thiriart would have a right-wing orientation (fundamentally Franco-Belgian) which feeds on virulent anti-communism, from 1960 on he affirmed the ideological positions that were in direct line with those that he would defend from the eighties on, under the generic name of "the Euro-Soviet School". [This called for] the creation of a Great Europe [extending] from Dublin to Vladivostok, National-communism and a collaboration between the USSR and Western Europe. In 1962 Thiriart wrote: "In my view, there are big chances that in the next twenty-five years the following blocks may be formed: the two Americas (subsequently he would return to the idea of seeing a Latin America liberated from the Yankees), the Asian block, China-India, and the Europe-Africa- U.S.S.R. block which would allow us to no longer write about 'from Brest to Bucharest' but about 'from Brest to Vladivostok'. Geopolitics is already underlining this future" (18).

After the definitive elimination of the right-wing sector of the organization in 1964, Thiriart would lead Young Europe in a direction in which two general orientations dominate: on one hand, radical anti-Americanism and, on the other, a progressive approach to national-communist positions. Thiriart sees Communitarism as surpassing communism and not as its opponent, this is a typical national-Bolshevik posture. In 1965, he defined Communitarism as "national-European socialism" and he added that "in the mid century, communism will become, wanting it or not, Communitarism" (19). In this, history has had to agree with him given that before the fall of the Soviet block, the economic reforms that were introduced in Hungary and Romania took communist economy towards Communitarism (20).

In 1984, Thiriart would clearly specify that Communitarism is "European communism without Marx" (21). This ideological evolution would be translated into facts in two different ways: a progressively more pro-soviet vision which would lead to the creation of the Euro-Soviet Doctrinal School and, on the other hand, an approach from the part of the organization towards the regimens of Eastern Europe, specially to Tito's Yugoslavia and Ceausescu's Romania. In an article titled "World Chess Board and National- communism" (22), Thiriart affirms that "the revolutionary concept of the next years will be the creation of a socialist Europe of a revolutionary type, our communitarist Europe in whose construction the militant blocks of eastern Europe must play an important role."

In the summer of 1966, Thiriart would travel to Romania and Yugoslavia, multiplying his official contacts [there]. In August of 1966, the Yugoslavian government's official diplomatic magazine *Medunarodna Politika* published, in Serbo-Croat, a long article of Thiriart's entitled "Europe do Bresta do Bucaresta" (23). The European national-communists theses of Young Europe were of visible interest, [and] at the highest level. The most spectacular of all these high level contacts was the encounter between Chou En Lai and Jean Thiriart, organized by Ceausescu's services in the occasion of the Chinese Prime Minister's visit to Bucharest in the summer of 1966 (24).

In spite of these tactical successes, the organization would break up in 1969, with Thiriart's retreat from militant politics for more than 10 years.

The reasons for this failure was, fundamentally, the absence of a revolutionary political land during the "Golden Sixties" [and] the exhaustion of the organization's human, material and financial resources.

On the other hand, the organization's alliances and its practical possibilities of success were what led Thiriart to consecrate an important part of his doctrinal thought to the role that the communist regimens of eastern Europe, and even the USSR, could play in the European unification process. A position which reminds us of the national-Bolsheviks of the twenties who expected the Soviet Union to play a decisive revolutionary role in Germany, as well as to impulse a revenge against the Entente countries.

JEAN THIRIART AND NATIONAL-BOLSHEVISM.

Unquestionably, Jean Thiriart appears as a continuation of the diverse German national-Bolshevik and national-communist currents of the 20's and 30's. There are, certainly, differences which are in great measure rooted in the evolution of the political and international context existent before World War II and after the sixties.

An apparent fundamental difference lies in the national element. Thiriart completely rejected [the idea of a] small German nationalism and [instead] defended the idea of a pan-European nationalism and community. [One must] add that Thiriart's thought derives directly from the theory of "big spaces", which sees in the construction of big economic blocks an answer to the challenge of the present times. Thiriart is equally in favor of the autarchic economic blocks and of auto-centralization, the prophet of which was the German Friedrich List. We must put this position in context in regards to the national-Bolshevik current, and particularly in relation to Niekisch, who proposed the constitution of a "German- Slavic block from Vladivostok to Flessing". Thiriart proposes the creation of a "Great Europe from Rijkjavik to Vladivostok". The difference in positions, [however], derives mainly from anti-Latin and anti-Roman attitudes, because Niekisch saw in these the power of the Entente and therefore [he believed them] responsible for the decadence and ruin that Germany and the Soviet Union suffered from. In a study published in 1982 and titled "L'Unione Sovietica nel pensiero di Jean Thiriart", Jose Cuadrado Costa also responded positively to attributing the national-Bolshevik current of the 20's and 30's to Thiriart. Cuadrado added: "Thiriart, guided by his pragmatism and his revolutionary will, has defined in the last numbers of "The European Nation" the essential lines of what we could refer to as national-bolshevism in a European dimension" (25).

It's this thought that would comprise the point of origin of a new national-Bolshevik political and doctrinal current in the early 1980's.

THE SO-CALLED NAZI-MAOISM: REALITY BEYOND INSULT.

One cannot speak of the national-communist synthesis without remembering what the big newspapers have called, in an inappropriate and unjust way, Nazi-Maoism.

TThe 27th of April 1978, the "right-thinking" organ "L'Unita", the newspaper of the Italian Communist Party, published a front page article titled "The language of Freda and of the Red

Brigades”: an extract of a 1968 booklet written by the theoretician of “Disintegration of the System”, Franco Freda (26).

“L’Unita” rediscovered expressions used in this text, which seemed to have been extracted from one of the numerous official statements of the Red Brigades, that revealed “truly impressive passages due to the language used by one of the leaders of a subversive group of the time [compared to the language] of today’s subversive leaders” (27).

This was a beautiful example of what the press would call Nazi- Maoism. Let us make it known that this term, Nazi-Maoism, derives more from insult than political science, it can only be attributed to journalists. No political currents have ever used this word or claimed it as their own. Let us see, then, what it really refers to.

The so-called Nazi-Maoist current was embodied mainly in the diverse fractions of “Lutte du Peuple” who were direct derivatives of the remains of Young Europe from whom they assimilated a part of its doctrine. “Jean Thiriart... is not a proper teacher, but he is still a very serious reference point for all that concerns Europe” (28).

Lutte du Peuple was born together with its Italian faction Lotta di Popolo. This organization split from the coalition of Giovane Europa, representatives of Thiriart in Italy and its diverse student groups. Swiftly after, sister organizations of it were created in Spain, Germany and France.

The French faction, the most important after the Italian, the “Organisation Lutte du Peuple” (O.L.P.) was founded in 1971 by some left-wing nationalists originated from “Ordre Nouveau” and from European socialists from “Pour une Jeune Europe” (not to be confused with the Thiriart’s Jeune Europe with whom they didn’t hold any bond). Their leader was Yves Battaille. “In Italy they made contact with diverse extra-parliamentarian groups, but in particular with the most advanced elements in European nationalism, these last... created the organization ‘Lotta di Popolo’. Returning to France, these new European militants built the bases of a new movement: it was not more than a replica of “Lotta di Popolo”. The French faction of the O.L.P. he had been born” (29).

The German faction is the “N.R.A.O”, the National Revolutionare Aufbau Organisation.

As Yannick Sauveur, author of one of the rare and serious socio- political studies of the O.L.P., insists “If one definitively admits to the reality of a Nazi-Maoist current, we should state that it is not simply a conversion of national-Bolshevism, since Nazi-Maoism is not the national-bolshevism of the seventies. The national dimension has changed. It is no longer Germany, but Europe. In the same way that Bolshevism is not the same type as that of the thirties. It’s now Mao’s ideological and practical contribution... that are unquestionably considerable. Finally, the community and unity of Europe that the O.L.P. wants to carry out is, no more and no less, the translocation of the work of Mao adapted into the European field and to the mentality of the European people” (30).

The diverse factions of the O.L.P. disappeared by the mid seventies without leaving any heirs and without being able to resuscitate or empty its waters into a political alternative. The French [case was] due to weakness, the Italians due to the blows exerted by an ultra- repressive power.

THE CURRENT NATIONAL-COMMUNIST SYNTHESIS.

After the disappearance of Young Europe in 1969 and the successive disappearances of the similar French and Italian groups, one must look at the eighties to see the ideas of Thiriart resuscitate and to see a new political current that can qualify as national-communist or national-Bolshevik.

In June of 1984, in Charleroi, the National European Community Party, P.C.N, was founded. From its creation this party categorically rejected the "right" and "left" qualifications and offered a synthesis that may be called national-communist (31).

The points that stand out from this new party were the personality of its founders and the firm coalition between Europeanism and socialism.

The new party, from its foundation, assumed in its entirety the doctrinal positions of Young Europe post-1965 (the time period to which the P.C.N refers to with its new name and with that of its magazine "La Nacion Europea" [the European Nation]) and defended the communitarist thesis in regards to a united and communitarian Europe.

The party participated in the Belgian legislative elections of 1985 and it is not by chance that the only published interview of the president of the party appeared in the newspapers in the occasion of these elections. [The publications were made] in the socialist newspaper of Charleroi, "Le Peuple", in a favorable interview entitled "L'Europe jusqu'au Vladivostok" (32).

From 1988, the P.C.N. continued developing its unitary, anti-system project coming closer to the association Europe-Ecologie.

In the Belgian legislative elections of November of 1991, the party would continue its road and would present, under its initials, an electoral platform opened to the many formations of the extreme right, as the "League Le Pen" or the remains of the "P.F.N" of Brussels, and left nationalist like the "Alliance Republicaine Nationaliste Wallone" or the "Association Europe-Ecologie" (33).

Honest journalists that have busied themselves with this original formation have not failed to underline its strangeness in regards to traditional political clarifications.

After C. Boursellier dedicated a big section in his book "Les ennemis du systeme" to the national-communist current (34), Manuel Abramovicz would describe the anti-system positions of the party in an article published in the monthly "Republique" (35).

The opponents of the P.C.N. have also recognized its atypical character. "The Anti-semitism World Report" 1993, published by the "Institute of Hebrew Matters" writes that "the P.C.N. is not an extreme right organization..." (36).

The new party's marked orientation towards the east is equally characteristic of national-Bolshevik positions. The magazine that would serve as the P.C.N.'s main means of expression, "Conscience Européenne", would include, in 1983, a bilingual supplement in French and Russian titled "Russia is also Europe." Since its foundation the party defended the idea of a coalition among the two Europe's, the Western one and the one then formed by the Soviet block. The party would [also]

defend a theory according to which the interior oriental borders of the USSR were also those of Europe.

Since 1983, the main contemporary national-communist or national- Bolshevik currents have adopted the doctrinal work developed by Jean Thiriart and the P.C.N. In this way, in Russia the magazine "Elementy" or the National-Bolshevik Front make reference to "the ideas of Thiriart" (37). In France, the movement Nouvelle Resistance, born from the break-away national-revolutionary section of the extreme right movement Troisième Voie, would make important references to Thiriart and the work of the P.C.N. (38). These defend, more than ever, the anti-system positions and the will of a national-communist synthesis which [together] have comprised as their goals from the moment of their foundation. This is particularly so, through their desire to create a Black/Green/Red United Front to contain national-revolutionaries, national-communist and environmentalist for a unitary anti-system movement (39). In Italy it's the magazine "Orion" which assumes national-communism explicitly. In Italy, official representatives of the Russian opposition forces, Communist Party included, maintain regular exchange and collaboration contacts with groups of the revolutionary left and the Communist Refoundation Party, some of whose exponents collaborate regularly in Orion. In Spain, this current is represented by the European Alternative association that publishes the magazine "Tribuna de Europa" (European Tribune)."

EMERGING OF THE NATIONAL-BOLSHEVISM IN RUSSIA.

The current debate in the big newspapers about national-bolshevism, has, in large part, emerged from the national-Bolshevik current in Russia. It is not by chance that this [current] is in first plane [there] due to the deep crisis that has crossed Russia since the explosion of the Soviet Union and due to the imperialist stratagems supported by Gorbachev and Yeltsin which have led the Russian people to support radical solutions that are not, as of yet, possible in Western Europe. On the other hand, [this is the case also] because the political territory there is favorable for a union of the system opposition, be it national-revolutionary or national-communist, before the common opponent and before the serious threats that hang over the future of Russia.

It was normal that the forces that personified order, progress and the future would together react against cosmopolitanism and imperialistic dominance. In this way, the big newspapers have been able to make attractive banners about the alliance amongst the "browns" and the "reds" and write tendentious articles dedicated to distort reality.

The Russian political reality is a remarkable example of two aspects of that movement that at the time is being called "the national- Bolshevik temptation". On the first place, there is a collaboration among the national-revolutionaries, extreme right and old communist apparatus forces. This is the only aspect that at the moment the journalists of the System underline. This collaboration found its political expression in the creation of the Front of National Salvation.

The second feature of the national-Bolshevik reality, the true essence of this political current, also found its public attainment in May of 1993, in the construction of the National-Bolshevik Front directed by Alexander Dugin and Edward Limonov.

The foundation manifesto of this movement gathers the deep concerns of the national-Bolshevik

current in Europe. It is also necessary to stress the fact that it underlines the precursor role of Young Europe in the diffusion of national-communist ideas in today's Europe: "The political struggle in Russia has arrived to a critical point. The resistance phase is out, therefore the traditional opposition (purely emotive and of protest) has expired. The period of resistance has finished, the period of national salvation has begun. The new stage demands new methods, new forms and new instruments of fight. It is for this reason that we consider it necessary and urgent to create the political and ideologically radical structure of a new type that responds to the demands of History. This will be national-bolshevism" (40).

This manifesto specifies the new movement's concerns which are the same as those of the national-Bolshevik current in Europe. "What is national-Bolshevism? It's the coalescence of the most radical ways of the social struggle and of the national fight, this is what national-Bolshevism is. Up to now the two ideologies, the national and the social, have been able to understand each other by means of commitments and temporary and pragmatic unions: in national- Bolshevism they will unite into an inseparable entity. Tentative unions of the two currents have already been attempted in the past, from the Jacobeans, through Ustrialov, Niekisch, and Thiriart's Young Europe. We have the determination to carry out this extremely important convergence. The social revolution is synonymous with the national revolution and the national revolution is synonymous to the social revolution" (41).

With this manifesto the circle has come to a close. From the precursory Niekisch to Thiriart, the National-Bolshevik Front, constituted by the National Radical Party, the National- Revolutionary Front of Action, the Movement of the New Right, the Movement to Support Cuba and the Communist Youth's Union, carries out in Russia the hopes nurtured by some thinkers and ideologists of the vanguard during the twenties.

NATIONAL-BOLSHEVISM AND FASCISM.

It's necessary to remember the existent relationships between national-bolshevism and fascism, the both of which were born in the same historical time. We determinably reject the Marxist historiography which, essentially for tactical reasons and later for propagandistic ones, in the early 20's denounced fascism as a bourgeois and reactionary ideology.

It's certain that fascism, just like revolutionary-nationalism, national-bolshevism or Marxist-Leninism, belongs to the socialist school. In particular [since] it was born as Leninism was, from the White currents of the XIX century.

Fascism was born within the left with Mussolini and under Georges Sorel's influence. It was, in fact, the result of a Marxist and socialist revision; whereupon the role played by the hard-working class in the class struggle was replaced by the nation. This would be, on the other hand, the typical road that led from the socialism to fascism during the thirties [and the one] which Marcel Deat and H. De Man would also follow.

It is not necessary to fall into summary analyses about fascism, which usually tend to relegate it as a movement from the extreme right. Particularly, one must not be deceived by the recovery of Fascist symbology carried out by certain reactionary movements of the extreme right. The example of Francisco Franco's Spain comes to mind. Before the Civil War of 1936-39, the Spanish Phalange

of Jose Antonio Primo de Rivera was qualified by the Spanish right as "Bolshevism from the right". Once the civil war ended, the right reactionary Francoism appropriated the Phalange allowing Jose Antonio to die under the bullets of a republican execution platoon.

The remnants of the Phalange, having emptied out its revolutionary and social content, reduced themselves to a group of mere external decor. They only served as an excuse for a reactionary regime that mostly depended on the Church and the Army.

On the other hand, fascism fundamentally differs from national- bolshevism. Even if the two are an alliance between a social ideology and a national one, their fundamental difference lies in their relationship with Marxism. For the Fascist movement, Marxism is a rival in the road to revolution. Therefore it is necessary to neutralize it and knock it down; hence the importance given to anti-communism within Fascist ideology. For national-bolshevism, on the contrary, Marxism or communism are not rivals, they are at least allies and at best tendencies that are necessary to integrate into a unitary movement. This is the deep sense of the national-communist fusion which wishes to carry out national-bolshevism. This is the national-Bolshevik and national-communist political and doctrinal journey, as it was in the 20's and 30's, as it is today.

NATIONAL-BOLSHEVISM AND NATIONAL-SOCIALISM: TWO UNYIELDING OPPOSITIONS.

One must remember the relationship between national-bolshevism and national-socialism, since both were born in Weimar Germany during the early twenties.

What we have said about the relationships between fascism and national-Bolshevism, is also valid in this case.

One must also refer to the classic distinction made by the Italian historian Renzo de Felice (42) who locates the origins of Italian fascism in the left and those of German national-socialism to the right. These two movements begun their road from two different sides, only to arrive to a similar solution: the realization of an ideology of socialist and national types.

The mark left on the extreme right by national-socialism is undeniable, [specially] when one examines its racist content. It's clear that the foundations of extreme right thought from the pan-Germanist and racist movement of the XIX century are present from the beginning in the heart of national-socialism. These are what mark the deep divergence between national-bolshevism and national- socialism. This racist practice which consists, in particular, on the rejection of the Slavic world and on the view of eastern Europe only as a vital territory for Germanic expansion, obviously placed national-socialism and national-bolshevism in two completely opposed sides.

After the advent of the Third Reich, national-Bolsheviks clearly pronounced themselves in opposition to national-socialism. Most of them were persecuted and captured. Wolffheim would die in a concentration camp, while Niekisch would emerge under painful conditions in 1945. Under the Third Reich, national-Bolsheviks were in declared opposition to the regime.

They were the ones, particularly, who supported the Soviet espionage net, inappropriately called "Red Orchestra", an appellative that referred to those who were not communists but national-Bolsheviks.

Some national-Bolsheviks made a space for themselves in the Third Reich and continued defending, according to the measure of their possibilities, the theory of an opening to the east. This would be the particular case of the Bund Front, directed in Hamburg by doctor Hessemaier, of whom we have already spoken.

This was the case, above all, of Joseph Goebbels, former national- Bolshevik militant who would look at the socialist movement and think of carrying out the pending social revolution. During the Third Reich, doctor Goebbels maintained strong sympathies towards the USSR, and at the end of the war when most of the German leaders attempted a separate peace with the Anglo-Saxons so as to follow the war in the east, Goebbels attempted to work in the opposed sense. Speaking of which, one cannot but mention surprising words, extracted from his diary in 1925: "no Czar has ever understood the Russian people as Lenin has. He has given to Russian citizens that which he has always seen in Bolshevism: freedom and property" (43). It was later added: "a tie with the west means to surrender forever. We, therefore, remain besides Russia in the fight for freedom" (44).

MARXISM-LENINISM AND NATIONAL-BOLSHEVISM.

One must [also] remember the relationship between Marxist-Leninism, as a political ideology, and national-Bolshevism.

If communist leaders showed, as Karl Radek did, their interest for national-Bolshevism, the official Marxist-Leninist school rejected this tendency. In 1919, the Spartans, the official current represented in the First International, begun to expel national- Bolsheviks from their ranks. This was the origin of the division within the K.A.P.D., already spoken about in regards to the Hamburg group of Laufenberg and Wolffheim. After 1920, these [people] were excluded from their party, the K.A.P.D., [all together]. From then on, until the early thirties, national-bolshevism in Germany would only become a tendency reserved for the nationalist field.

The Marxist-Leninist school was (and will always be) extremely to displeased with national-bolshevism. Indeed, it viewed it as a lacking point in its own doctrine.

The Comintern, the Communist International then directed by Lenin, developed two different tactics in regards to the world revolution. For developed countries, it was to launch a Soviet-type revolution by proletarian forces. Contrarily, for colonized countries or semi- colonized ones, which today we would call developing, the First International and Lenin, himself, developed a national-revolutionary or national-communist type of strategy. It was about attempting to create a unity amongst nationalist and communist revolutionaries. Mao, [in turn] would give this theory its full development and create for it an unexpected historical posterity.

Germany in the twenties, a developed and capitalist country, was, evidently, not able to enter this Leninist category.

The positions of the first national-Bolsheviks in regards to the confrontation with communism is also multiple. The national- communism of Hamburg, for example, represents an authentic coalition between nationalist values and Leninist ideology. National- Bolsheviks originated in other atmospheres, as Niekisch was for example, would develop political tendencies that would have a

unity of nationalist and communist revolutionaries in a single road against the Weimar Republic. [In relation to] foreign policy they favored a union between Germany and the USSR against the Entente powers so as to avenge and bring about the rebirth of the German homeland.

It would be necessary to speak of professor Friedrich Lenz's current, and his magazine "Der Vorkämpfer", so as to be able to view the reappearance of genuine national-communism. In fact, between 1930 and 1933, Professor Lenz developed an original synthesis that would fuse Marxist and nationalist ideology. Beginning with Marxist concepts, he developed an interesting economic theory which originated from Marx's theories and those of Friederich List, the great German theoretician of "economic nationalism."

Particularly, Lenz wrote: "We have as an objective, like Hegel says, to seal our times by means of thought, so as to acquire the knowledge of systematic bases. That is to say, starting from the theory, so as to have the capacity to order social contradictions politically. In this synthesis, Hegel would be supplemented by Lenin and List by Marx. No analysis of the international structural transformations may escape such guides" (45).

This is, behind the work of the Hamburg group, a typical example of the coalition between Marxism and revolutionary-nationalism. In regards to the theories of Marx, Lenz affirmed particularly that "its scientific analysis of the economic reality is also an indispensable weapon for nationalism" (46).

Therefore, two divergent tendencies are distinguished, in regards to Marxism-Leninism, within the heart of what one commonly calls the national-Bolshevik current.

On one hand, one tendency sees in it nothing more than a tactical ally. This was the heart of the debate between intellectuals from the extreme right and communists in the twenties, as it [still] is today. These intellectuals from the extreme right remained, nevertheless, fundamentally opposed to Marxism.

The second tendency, apparent in the Wolffheim and Laufenberg group as well as in that of professor Lenz, attempts a doctrinal coalition using common concepts both from nationalist ideology and Marxist-Leninism.

Jean Thiriart's doctrinal works of the early eighties and those developed in the same period by the P.C.N., assume this last tendency. For this purpose, this party presents Communitarism as an "ideology of synthesis that wishes to fuse Marxist-Leninist ideologies and national-revolutionary ones into a synthesis of doctrinal offensive: the socialism of the XXI century" (47).

THE CONSERVATIVE REVOLUTION AND NATIONAL-BOLSHEVISM.

The relationship between the Conservative Revolution and national-Bolshevism should be clarified.

The term Conservative Revolution, in fact, is designated to a political current present in Weimar Germany; it was called this due to the study that Armin Mohler consecrated to it in 1950 (48). The expression was previously used by Arthur Moeller Van Den Bruck, a theoretician of the time.

In his thesis about national-Bolshevism, Professor Louis Dupeux dedicates a big section to the analysis of the relationships between this current and the Conservative Revolution, which he qualified as "ideological sustenance to national-bolshevism" (49). This is the main criticism that can be made to his work. For professor Dupeux, national-bolshevism is a radical tendency derived from the Conservative Revolution. This relationship is established according to a number of convergences in symbols and common vocabulary present in both tendencies. However this assimilation is completely inadequate.

In fact, the Conservative Revolution, in which we will find the thought of Moeller Van Den Bruck (50) or of Spengler (51) on the first plane, is based mainly on a fundamental rejection of Bolshevism and in a romantic and idealized vision of a past golden age. And these are present, besides the characteristics of the conservative movements in Europe, particularly in France.

Contrarily, national-bolshevism is not only a revolutionary ideology that looks for an alliance or doctrinal coalition with Bolshevism, but rather the national-Bolshevik theses are surprisingly up-to-date (they never look to the past), be they the theses in favor of an autarchic economy, big spaces, power economy, the State's definition or in favor of technocratic glorification.

Therefore, the question of vocabulary convergence or of relationships among individuals, should not deceive us. For example, the fact that both social-democrats and Bolsheviks refer to Marxism, does not mean that they both belong to one political school.

On the other hand, let us stop looking at the current positions of the heirs of national-Bolshevism and of those of the Conservative Revolution. Today, the main national-communist currents in Europe define themselves as declared enemies of the conservative extreme right. They do so expressively, originating from the same positions their predecessors in the 20's and 30's did (52).

REVOLUTIONARY-NATIONALISM AND NATIONAL-BOLSHEVISM: TWO CURRENTS FROM ONE SAME FAMILY.

It is also indispensable to specify the relationships between revolutionary nationalism and national-bolshevism. Revolutionary nationalism, was an important political current present in most European countries during the twenties. In Weimar Germany, and in particular with the Junger brothers and their "neo-nationalism", it represented an intellectual and political current of important resonance.

National-bolshevism should be located at the same time inside and outside this current, which represents the most revolutionary expression. On the other hand, it was the national-communist Laufenberg who used the expression of "Revolutionary Nationalism" for the first time: "Inside the German National Party a repair of the most active idealistic intellectual atmospheres, who have always been big defenders of the national idea, has begun and, in its midst, its vanguard today recognizes that under the national objective's general current conditions, these cannot be carried out but by revolutionary means. The intellectual laboratories are, in this way, attracted to the communist movements... The national- revolutionary and social-revolutionary movements approach one another: they don't have a common organization, but their political encounter is carried out in practice" (53).

Now-a-days, these two political currents are always closely bound to each other. The current national-communists have located themselves inside the national-revolutionary field. This is, for example, the road chosen by the Nouvelle Resistance in France, the National- Bolshevik Front in Russia, Orion in Italy and European Alternative in Spain, who openly present themselves as a synthesis between national-communist ideologies and national-revolutionaries ones.

It would also be convenient to specify the relationship between these two currents. National-communism is, in fact, a radical and ultra-revolutionary development of revolutionary nationalism itself. Revolutionary nationalism maintains certain apprehensions in its relationship with Marxist-Leninism, whom it considers at best as a simple ally.

National-communism carries out an offensive coalition between two ideological currents in a dynamic synthesis.

NATIONAL-BOLSHEVISM AND "NAZISM OF LEFT".

One must necessarily analyze what has been called "left nazism", whose most outstanding figures were the brothers Otto and Gregor Strasser, representatives of the socialist and revolutionary wing of the national-socialist movement. These two were opposed to Hitler from the beginning of the movement. Gregor was murdered during the purge of July 30, 1934 (the celebrated "night of the long knives") while his brother Otto would go on to encourage a national-socialist left-wing movement to resist the Hitler regime, the "Schwarze Front" (Black Front) (54).

At the beginning of the sixties, which is of most interests to this study, Otto Strasser, conquered by the European unitary cause (55), would grant two interviews for the publications of Young Europe. In these he would manifest his sympathies (56).

However, left-wing nazism was not part of the national-Bolshevik current. [This current] proved its desire for an opening to the east and opposed all "crusades" against the USSR (in this it opposed Hitler's theory of "Drang nach Osten"); it also manifested a remarkable socialist desire. But its position in relation to Marxist- Leninism take it fundamentally away from national-Bolshevism. In fact, the national-socialist Strasserians would eliminate the proletarian masses from Marxism and take them [instead] to the national-socialist filed. It is not, then, about an alliance or fusion with communists.

Professor Dupeux wrote in this sense: "It is not correct to assimilate Otto Strasser to national-bolshevism like many authors have done during his time and today" and he adds: "If the left-wing national-socialist sincerely referred to the class struggle and looked for a cohesion of the proletarian masses, its implicit objective was their consolidation or rather their development into the middle classes" (57).

The expulsion of the Strasser brothers from the national-socialist party (N.S.D.A.P.) wouldn't prevent certain left national-socialists from taking a place within the party. This was the case, particularly, of Doctor Goebbels, Gregor Strasser's former- secretary, who would become Minister of Propaganda and Popular Culture, without, however, giving up his socialist and revolutionary orientations.

NEITHER LEFT OR RIGHT: THE NATIONAL-BOLSHEVISM AGAINST THE SYSTEM.

Speaking of national-Bolshevism, professor Dupeux wrote: "national- bolshevism is certainly the most ambiguous creations of the Wiemar Republic's political vocabulary" (58).

Doubts have assaulted historian and journalist when they have tried to characterize national-Bolshevik positions. "Is it the extreme right of the extreme left or of the extreme left of the extreme right"?

In 1960, the first important book, written by Otto Ernst Schuddekop, was consecrated to this reality, which was titled "Liben leute von rechts", roughly translated to "the people of left of the right" (59). A title that reveals all the phenomenon's ambiguity when one attempts to explain it with the traditional political board categories of the western regimens of modern time. Are national- Bolsheviks Fascists from the extreme left or Bolsheviks from the extreme right?

The absurdity of the question and the words used clearly exemplify that the left/right political classifications is completely incapable of reflecting the reality of revolutionary and atypical ideologies as the national-Bolshevik and national-communist ones.

One cannot but think of the great Spanish philosopher Ortega y Gasset's celebrated quote, frequently cited by contemporary national- Bolsheviks: "being from the left or being from the right are two options presented to imbecile men, both are forms of moral 'hemiplejia'" (60).

National-bolshevism or the "convergence of the ends, passing from one to another, the fusion of representatives of both [ends]" is an incomprehensible phenomenon to those who reason with the classic political classifications of the regime, which spreads from the extreme right to the extreme left, and where right and left are presented as opposed and unyielding fields. Fascism, Stalinism, Bolshevism or the extreme right can never meet and all convergences appear, to the eyes of the specialists of the conformist "pret- a- penser", as unnatural.

The Polish writer Malynske proposes the union and the historical compromise between the ends and denounces the union of interests between the bourgeoisie, the beaurocracy and syndicalist parties as a coincidence: "the blocks of the extreme right and the extreme left should rise against this block of democratic insolence, of financial rapacity and of dominance" (61). He equally accentuates the "certain deep likeness between those that call themselves extreme right and extreme left, because, as strange as it may seem, it seems that they are in fact the two parts of the contemporary social field between which, if one doesn't look superficially, unyielding interests do not exist, nor do aspirational antithesis. On the contrary, this irreducibility and this antithesis necessarily exists between these two currents and the bourgeoisie" (62).

A PRECURSOR: GEORGES SOREL.

One cannot remember the different national-Bolshevik or national- communist currents, be they from the thirties or from current time, without remembering Georges Sorel, the great socialist and revolutionary theoretician of syndicalism (63).

Georges Sorel is an almost unique figure within late XIX and early XX century French intellectuality.

Since 1907, Georges Sorel, opponent of the bourgeois demo- plutocratic regime and of the dominant liberal system in France, would be the soul of an approach between those who in the extreme right and extreme left rejected the system. That is, [an approach between] the nationalists, whose emblematic figure was Maurice Barres, the monarchists of Charles Maurras, and revolutionary syndicalist leaders proceeding from the left white stream (64).

Through the magazines, "Revue critique des idées et des livres" (1907), "La cite française" (1910) and later "L'Indépendance" (1911- 1913), Georges Sorel would be the artisan of an important intellectual agitation in which theoreticians of integral monarchic maurraisan nationalism, such as the national-revolutionary Maurice Barres, pre-Fascists like Georges Valois, as well as numerous syndicalists and theoreticians of the extreme left, in particular Eduard Berth and Daniel Halevy, would participate.

The influence and the repercussion exercised by Sorel in Europe were frequently recognized over Lenin. Mussolini would always recognize the debt he owed this great socialist theoretician. He came from the revolutionary socialist fields of the start of the century. After the war, Georges Sorel's influence would also be felt in Georges Valois' French Fascist movement.

But mainly, his theories found an important continuation in the national-revolutionary and national-Bolshevik tendencies which appeared in Germany during the 20's and 30's (65).

Sorel theorized the "general strike" in which he saw the means to demolish the bourgeois regime. One cannot but assimilate his conceptions to those of the national-communists Wolffheim and Laufenberg. For these, parliamentary action would disappear when being faced with "mass strikes" capable of forcing the bourgeois state to retire progressively until the proletariat exercised its dictatorship definitively.

Georges Sorel didn't live to see the important effects of his doctrinal influence, he would die in 1922 without seeing the development of the USSR nor Mussolini's victory in Italy. The day of his death the Bolshevik Government of the new Soviet State and the Italian Fascist State both tried to take charge of his funeral. [This being] the final image of a surprising destiny which serves to show us what the notions of "right" and "left" represent for a revolutionary thinker.

Sorel was, with Georges Valois particularly, the encourager of the "Circle Proudhon" which contained monarchists, nationalist and revolutionary syndicalists.

A road that can't but remind us of the current Russian patriotic opposition which contains communist, nationalist-revolutionaries and Russian monarchists. To this respect, the No. 1 edition of the magazine "Elementy", by Alexander Duguin, is particularly relevant, which depicts the three flags of the patriotic opposition united: the communist red flag, the monarchists' tri-colored flag (66) with the bicephalous eagle and the national revolutionaries' black flag (67).

FROM CONFORMISM TO INSULT: THE CURRENT "DEBATE" IN THE PRESS.

In the introduction of this article we remembered the journalistic phenomenon that national-

Bolshevism provoked in the summer of 1993.

A pseudo-debate arose in the big French newspapers, from "Liberation" (67), "Le Monde " (68), "Globe" (69) and "L'Evenement de Jeudi " (70) which then made its way to newspapers from other countries like those of Belgium, Italy and Spain (71).

This debate arose as an internal settling of accounts from Georges Marchais as head of the [French Communist] party. A press campaign that had risen months earlier in Germany also originated from a great political scandal arisen by the encounter between one of the vice-presidents of the Socialist Democracy Party, the P.D.S. (the new name of the German Communist Party) and one of the members responsible for National Offensive, a formation classified as extreme right.

In respects to this, German journalists spoke of national-bolshevism and, in this sense, denounced the "temptation" that exists in Germany. "Der Spiegel" , especially, consecrated several articles [to this topic].

This German debate echoed some time ago in the occasion of an article's publication in edition No. 87 of the magazine "Les dossiers de l'Histoire" titled "National-Bolchevisme, un spectre allemand" (72). Contrary to the articles already mentioned, this article was a more serious study, having been clearly assisted by professor Louis Dupeux's thesis, although without ever mentioning it. This article, however, lacked historical depth, since it saw national-bolshevism only as a German tentative, both during 1929-30 and today. The authors of the article visibly ignored the expansion of the national-Bolshevik phenomenon in Europe during the sixties and, particularly [ignored], today's reality in several European countries.

The pseudo-debate in the big newspapers is only preoccupied with a polemic end, (for the internal use of the French Communist Party, where it gave way to an argument against the opposed factions), the convergence between certain intellectuals of the new right, like Alain de Benoist, and communist intellectuals. These articles also "accuse" some non-conformist magazines, like "Le Choc du Mois" or "L'Idiot International" published in Paris by the brave non- conformist Jean-Eden Hailler, who is endowed with a special talent, (73) where thinkers classified as both "communist" and "extreme right" write.

Be it due to ignorance or wishing to censure, the journalists that write these articles continually avoid speaking about the national- communist phenomenon's other reality, [which has been seen at] the end of this XX century; that is to say, of the different political realities like the organizations integrated into the European Liberation Front.

The majorities of these articles' lack of dignity doesn't deserve our wasting time on them, since they easily fall into insult and political offence.

In this sense, it's still necessary to reveal the "pearl". In the weekly "Globe" of July of 1993, a certain Laurent Dispot directed an open letter to Georges Marchais, qualifying him as a "Messerschmit national-communist" (74) and took refuge on the old fable about "the party of shot people" (the author doubtlessly ignores that the collaboration was, in great measure, a matter of the left and the extreme left, communists included). Dispot proposes as a remedy to the "national-communist danger" which he denounces, a united Europe and what he calls a "European

socialism". What is truly remarkable is that in these articles which pretend to be well researched, journalists simply ignore that in the most contemporary national-communist movements, from Lisbon to Moscow, this European construction is defended in the line of Young Europe and in a much deeper sense than the shy advances that European social-democracy present as universal panacea. The author [of this article] has, certainly, never heard of Jean Thiriart or the Euro-Soviet School.

The general tone of this press campaign proves itself when, in repeated occasions, "The totalitarian languages" of Jean Pierre Faye is used as a reference (75). [This work], published in 1972 was compiled on the base of incomplete and often self-interested documentation; its a work full of errors which professor Louis Dupeux has already denounced in his thesis. What is symptomatic [of this whole situation] is that this last reference work, the only one existent up to today, is not cited a single time in the numerous articles which appeared in the press during the summer of 1993.

The lack of citation by these articles of the mere names of the 1918 Hamburg national-communist, Wolffheim and Laufenberg, is also very revealing. These men were truly, authentic communist who were in the origin of the first national-communist movement in Germany and Europe. It's also true that the Laufenberg trajectory within the communist doctrinal current is important and extremely uncomfortable for the special conformists of the "pret a penser", as Louis Dupeux underlines: "we can see how the thesis adopted by Laufenberg about the 'crushing majority of the people' will be adopted – twice – by orthodox communists" (76). A thesis that would be the base for the work of Soviet constitutional jurists even today! (77).

The other main characteristic of this intellectual debate is its excessive positivism. In fact, numerous articles are consecrated to figures of the Parisian intellectual atmosphere (the few Russian authors that are mentioned only serve to contribute to the microcosmic Parisian debate). The European dimension of contemporary national-bolshevism, its true political dimension beyond any cenacle of Parisian intellectuals, is completely unknown to this press campaign.

THE NATIONAL-BOLSHEVIK ALTERNATIVE.

The failure of the dominant political system surprises us more and more everyday. The capitalist world economy, under the hegemony of the U.S., has proclaimed its victory over the communist system; but at the same time, it has arrived at the final stage of its decadence. A global scale of this economy is not possible. The impossibility of opening new markets inevitably leads to the formation of economic giants and an [eventual] war amongst them.

The national-Bolshevik dialectics are, in fact, an answer to the current situation of social, economic and political degradation, to the failure of the educational system, to the inability of assuring full employment, to the growth of poverty and unemployment, to the return of the social misery that every day points to the failure of the capitalist system and the partitocracy of pseudo-democrats which embody it. The national-Bolshevik alternative is the answer to the failure of the American model, its pretension of dominating the world economy and its desire to play the role of world policeman.

AGAINST THE DERAILING OF THE SYSTEM'S OPPOSITION. THE NATIONAL- BOLSHEVSK DIALECTICS.

The system's opposition, in all of Europe, has been present since the end of the Second World War. Its formations are often local, of a "poujadista" regional type, that is to say, without possessing any revolutionary will, cohesion or planning. This is what has saved the System up until today. The opposition to the System which comprises of a wide socio-political arch, (the national opposition in the extreme right, the communist opposition in the extreme left, the neo- poujadista opposition of the middle classes and the different environmentalist oppositional currents), does not represent a real threat to the System. These oppositional forces faced against each other, and not coordinated amongst themselves, are reabsorbed by the System movement by movement, protest by protest.

The national-Bolshevik dialectic wishes to respond to the failure of the isolated opposition, a failure that clearly reveals that the opposition lacks more of a brain than a heart and, as was underlined by Lenin, Gramsci and Thiriart, a revolutionary party. Without a revolutionary party, there is no revolution and without a revolutionary, political, organizational and theoretical union, there is no united opposition. The key question about this opposition union against the System and its [eventual] structure is the center of the debate brought about by national-bolshevism, as it was in the early twenties and as it is at the end of the XX century.

BROWN/RED ALLIANCE OR BLACK/RED/GREEN UNITED FRONT?

The system's press, intending to discriminate against the national- Bolshevik alternative, has elaborated big banners about a seditious brown and red alliance, remaining far from all political reality.

Its evident to any lucid, or simply, honest observer that the central point of national-Bolshevism is not, at all, an alliance between seditious Neo-Nazis and archaic communist, but it's about a unity between the opposition to the System's dynamic forces: the brown, or nostalgic Neo-Nazis, don't have any place within this union and they are not more than mere marionettes encouraged by the Washington and Tel Aviv secret services so as to sow hate and the division within Europe.

Today, the purpose of the national-Bolshevik strategy is to organize a revolt, to channel dissatisfaction. Its certain that when the pseudo-oppositional movements located in the extreme right (such as the French National Front or the M.S.I – today Alleanza Nazionale -) or the environmentalists, have given final proof of their inability to organize this revolt and to become an alternative to the System, the road will be finally open for a genuinely revolutionary movement. This will be the hour of national-bolshevism. In this sense, the 1917 Russian Revolution example is full of historical meaning. After the February liberals, after Kerensky, the Bolsheviks and the October Revolution arrived.

TODAY, NATIONAL-BOLSHEVIK MILITANTS PREPARE THEIR OCTOBER IN ALL OF EUROPE

NOTES

Louis Dupeux, "Strategie Communiste et dynamique south conservatrice them differents l'expression sens "National-Bolchevisme" in Allemagne, sous the Republique of Weimar" (1919-1933)", thesis presented in the University of Paris 1 November of 1974, 28 Ed. Libreire Honoré Champion, Paris 1976.

(2) "Les compagnos de route de la galaxie national-bolchevique", Marses, June 29 1993.

- (3) Pol Mathil, Fiction politique ou politique sans fiction? L'alliance gives bruns et you give rouges in Him Soir", July 3/4 1993.
- (4) Joven Europa has more than enough: Yannick Sauveur Jean Thiriart et him National-Communitarisme européen", thesis presented in the University of Perugia in 1978. Third edition in four volumes, Ed. Machiavel, Charleroi 1985 and Dossier Jean Thiriart in Vouloir n° 97, January-March of 1993.
- (5) On the National-European Community Party and their political and doctrinal speech, to consult Manuel Abramowicz's brief and honest synthesis, L'étrange P.C.N". in " République " n° 5, October of 1992.
- (6) Louis Dupeux, op. cit, chapter III Chantage au bolchevisme et bolchevisme allemand au printemps 1919 p. 67.
- (7) November 6 1918 the communist revolution explodes in Hamburg. Militant of extreme left, Wolffheim plays a paper of first plane, taking the head of soldiers and mutineer miners. It is in Hamburg where the Socialist Republic is proclaimed for the first time in Germany. A provisional Council of workers and soldiers taking the control of the revolution. Laufenberg, also him communist militant, is elected president of the Council.
- (8) During the secret congress of the K.P.D. in Heidelberg, in October of 1919, the address spartakista (Levi) he obtains the exclusion of the group of Hamburg fraudulently, opposed to the address of the Party. The excluded is taken to most of those stuck the K.P.D. that quickly loses more than half of their 100.000 members. In April of 1920 to created the K.A.P.D., of which Wolffheim and Laufenberg were the leaders shortly. In the face of the importance of the division the Komitern, in spite of their statute, it should accept the adhesion from this second communist party to the International one. This became a scenario where the K.P.D faced. and the K.A.P.D., the first one of which it was the one that finally it prevailed and heonly stayed.
- (9) L. Dupeux, op. cit., chapter IV 1923, The crise of the Rhur et the ligne Schlageter of the Communist Party Alemnán p. 207.
- (10) The position of Radek in front of the national-Bolshevism radically evolved. In 1919, he is a declared opponent of the national-communist of Hamburg. Four years later, in the breast of the Komitern the politics of the hand defends spread the nationalists.
- (11) May of 1923, 9 the French advice of war of Dusserldorf condemns to death to the lieutenant Schlageter, boss of the frank bodies, for sabotage. Executed Schlageter, it is the first one. This fact will have a strong repercussion in Germany. Hitler made of Schlageter the first martyr of its cause.
- (12) "Der wanderer ins nichts", novel of F. Strawberry that puts in scene the death of a lieutenant of the frank bodies against the communist espartaquistas.
- (13) Warren Lerner, Karl Radek, the lasts internationalist", Standord, 1970.
- (14) on the revolutionary work of Young Europe: Of Young Europe to the Red Brigades", ed. European alternative, 1995.
- (15) Jean Thiriart, Vers a paralysie du Régime in Jeune Europe n° 22, June of 1965, p. 2
- (16) in partiular in 1975, he declared in an interview to the university magazine Them Cahiers du C.D.P.U n° 12: I have begun, very young, like you know a "road", my search of the political Graal in the Communist Party. It was in the times of Stalin."
- (17) to see Marcel Ponthier's reflection, titled "Influences" in The great nation. L'Europe of Brest to Bucarest", Brussels, October of 1965.
- (18) Jean Thiriart, with the alias Tisch, L'Europe et l'U.R.S.S., a Rapallo européen: pourquoi pas?in Nation Belgique/Jeune Europe n° 85, March 2 1962.
- (19) Jean Thiriart, The big nation, l'Europe unitaire of Brest to Bucarest", op. cit., p. 60.
- (20) On the relationships between the Comunitarismo and the socialist economy: Luc Michel Him to bring to an agreement du Socialisme, him l'avenir Socialisme: him Communautarisme national-européen in Jean Thiriart and L. Michel, Him socialisme communautaire special n° of Conscience Européenne. n° 4, 1985.
- (21) Jean Thirirat, 106 questions south l'Europe. Entretiens avec him journaliste espagnol B. G. Mugarza", Ed. Machiavel, 1985.
- (22) Jean Thiriart, Echiquier mondial et national-communisme", in The nation européenne", n° 11, November of 1966, 15 p. 13.

(23) Medunarodna Politika has Belgrade n° 392/393, I Wither 1966.

(24) of Young Europe to the Brigades Red op. cit. and J. Square and L. Michel, Revolution Européene ou Tradition?" special n° of Conscience Européene n° 12.

(25) ?

(26) ?

(27) Claudio Mutti, complementary notes to the second edition of The Disintegration of the System of G. Freda, ed. European alternative. pp. 53-54.

(28) Yannick Sauveur, L'Organisation Lutte du Peuple, a mouvement national-bolchevik"?, Conference of political science Paris, without date, p. 11.

(29) Ibid, p. 3.

(30) Ibid, p. 22.

(31) about the trajectory of the P.C.N. cfr.: Manuel Abramowicz, Him longe goes du P.C.N". in it Carries to an extreme droite et antisemitisme in Belgique from 1945 to nous jours." Editions EPO, Brussels, 1993. pp 45-49 and Thierry Mudry, Quand a homme classé to l'extreme droite utilize him corpus doctrial marxiste-leniniste. The notion of I Left historique révolutionnaire au P.C.N". in " Vouloir ", n° 32, autumn 1986.

(32) L. Michel, P.C.N. européen jusqu'a Vladivostok", he/she interviews in the socialist newspaper Him Peuple 13 and 15 of September of 1985.

(33) Cfr. "L'extreme droite francophone face aux elections du 24 novembre 1991 in Courrier Hebdomadaire du CRISP", n° 1350, May 1992 and Droit of you recover du P.C.N". supplement of the Courrier du CRISP n° 1353, May 1992.

(34) C. Boursellier, Give nationalistes... prosovietiques in Them enemies du systeme Ed. R. Laffent, Paris 1989 and National.communisme: him socialisme sans lutte gives classes in it Carries to an extreme droit, l'enquete", ed. F. Bounin, Paris, 1992.

(35) Manuel Abramowicz, op. cit.

(36) "Belgium" in Antisemitism World Report 1993", Institute of Jewish Affairs, 1993.

(37) Comunicato n° 1 sulla costituzione of the Fronte Nazionale-Bolscevico in Orion", n° 106, p. 32.

(38) C. Bouchet, Résistance européenne, Jean Thiriart's retour", in Nationalisme et République", July 1993.

(39) Cfr. L. Michel, does On go l'opposition nationale-européene?" special n° of Nation Europe", July 1993.

(40) Comunicato n° 1 sulla costituzione of the Fronte Nazionale Bolscevico in Orion n° 106 p. 32.

(41) Ibid.

(42) Renzo of Felize Cles pour comprendre him Fascisme." Editions Seghers, Brussels.

(43) J. Goebbels in Nationalsozialistische Briefe 15 of October of 1925.

(44) Ibid.

(45) L. Dupeux, op. cit. cap. XVII Among Bismarck et Karl Marx, him Vorkämfer p. 433.

(46) Ibid.

(47) Actes du IIème Congrès du P.C.N"., June of 1986, Charleroi, 1986.

(48) Armin Mohler, The Rivoluzione Conservatrice", Akropolis, 1990.

(49) L. Dupeux, op. cit. , cap. I, The revolution conservatrice arriere plan ideologique du national-bolchevisme.”

(50) Arthur Moeller van den Bruck it is in particular the author of a book of great repercussion in the Republic of Weimar titled “The III Reich”, one of the works of reference of the Conservative Revolution. After 1933 Hitler he appropriated of that this expression and he gave him another meaning.

(51) on the theoretical of the Conservative Revolution (and also of the national-socialism) cfr. E. Vermeil, *Doctrinaires of the Revolution Allemande*”, N.E.C., Paris.

(52) on today’s fight of the national-communist ones against the extreme right cfr. “Droit of réponse du P.C.N., in *Him Soir*”, May of 1993.

(53) mentioned by L. Dupeux, op. cit.

(54) Otto Strasser, *Him Front Noir contre Hitler*”, Ed. Marabout, Verviers, 1972.

(55) Strasser was in particular the author of a titled book *Europäische Föderation. Die Schweiz als Vorbild Europas*”, published in 1936, Reso-Verlag, Zürich, where it favours the Swiss pattern as relating for the European unification.

(56) *Nation Europe*”, March 4 1962 and *The Nation Européenne* n° 13, January 15 1967.

(57) L. Dupeux, op. cit. cap. XX *Otto Strasser e’ fait-il national-bolcheviste?*” p. 493.

(58) L. Dupeux, op. cit. cap. I.

(59) Otto-Ernst Schuddekopf, *Linke leute von rechts. Die national-revolutionäre minderheiten a der kommunismus in der Weimarer Republik*, Stuttgart, 1960.

(60) José Ortega y Gasset, “The rebellion of the masses.”

(61) E. Malynski, *L’empreinte d’Israel*”, Paris, p. 38-41.

(62) Ibid.

(63) it has more than enough Sorel cfr. Fernand Rossignol *Pour connaître la pensée de G. Sorel*”, you Embroider, Paris, 1948.

(64) Cfr. Zeev Sternhell, *The droite revolutionnaire, 1885-1914*”, Sevil, Paris, 1973.

(65) Cfr. M. Freund, *Georges Sorel. Der Revolutionäre Konservatismus*”, ed. Vittorio Klostermann, Frankfurt/Main, 1972.

(66) as for the tri-colored flag used by the national-Bolshevik ones in Russia it is not the white one blue and red, designed by the Czar Pedro I in 1667, in favour of an convert to occidentalism of Russia, but the quarter note, yellow and white created in the Czar’s times Alejandro III for a first German minister and that it represented from 1858 to 1883 to the Russian Empire. He/she also appears in the national-Bolshevik manifestations next to this last and the Soviet, other flag representing to the Russia previous at 1667, white San Andrés’ call Flag crossed by two blue crosses. cfr: *Daily ABC*, December 27 1991.

(67) “ *Elementy* ”, n° 1, 1992.

(68) Francois Bonnet, *Them Compagnons of route of the galaxie national-bolchevik and he/she Interviews with Didier Daeninckx, Of fortes convergences ideologiques in Liberation*”, June 29 1993.

(69) it Hulls him it has published a series of articles and interviews it has more than enough eltema from June 26 1993.

(70) Elie Leo and René Monzat, *Quand l’extreme gauche flirte avec l’extreme droite. L’affaire du national-communisme a the française and M. N. “Rouges et bruns: a vieille histoire d’amour in Globe* n° 21, June 30 1993 and special Dossier *The resucée du national-communisme, do give apprentis Hitler? in Globe*”, n° 22, July 7 1993.

(71) Karl Laske and René Monzat, *Au dessus d’un n goes of coconuts mutants in L’Evenemetn du Jeudi* n° 453, July 8 1993. The article is presented with the following “ introduction ”: In the red-brown writing committees and in the colloquys of political alteration, the nationalism of lefts search timidly its road, the new right spreads him the hand.”

(72) Pol Mathil, op. cit. in *Him Soir* 3/4 of July of 1993.

(73) National-bolchevisme: a spectre allemand in Dossier: them neo-Nazi aujourd'hui" Them l'Histoire Dossiers", n° 87, 1993.

(74) Jean-Edern Hallier, debater and talent writer, take a valiant fight against the socialist mafia of I Wall them, Mitterrand, Long and Fabius. It has been worth him a scandalous process where the speculator Walls he tries to ruin him, with the complicity of a numb magistracy, in particular to have published the real judicial file although prescribed by amnesty of it Walls. Hallier L'idiot's magazine avid International of freedom singular and of no-conformism, and equally vigorously committed against the imperialism and their New World Order.

(75) Laurent Dispot, Lettre ouverte á monsieur Goes communiste national Messerschmitt in Globe", n° 7, op. cit.

(76) Jean Pierre Faye, The totalitarian languages", Madrid 1974.

(77) Louis Dupeux, op. cit.

(78) on the argument cfr. Squared José Costa, Reflexions south them ouvres of Clausewitz et Carl Schmitt, Actualité of Clausewitz in Conscience Européenne", n° 16/17, May-June of 1987.

<https://vansternationell.wordpress.com/national-bolshevik-documents/the-national-communist-alternative/>