

Why the Renaissance must prevail over the Conservative Revolution

by Helga Zepp-LaRouche

The following is the edited text of Mrs. Zepp-LaRouche's address to the International Caucus of Labor Committees-Schiller Institute conference in Eltville, Germany on Dec. 10. The citations from German authors have been translated by EIR.

I will try to show certain aspects of the "Conservative Revolution" in the context of the historical tradition, in which the presently emerging Conservative Revolution faction has to be located. The fact that right now (not only in the United States, but especially there, with the recent election results) a new Conservative Revolution movement has crystallized, is a strategic fact, which one really has to fully understand. I will demonstrate that especially that part of the Republican Party around such people as Newt Gingrich, Phil Gramm, William Weld, and others, are in an unbroken tradition with people like Nietzsche, the Nazis, fascism—a tradition that goes without interruption to the ecology movement and New Age. I want to give you a sense of what to expect concretely if we do not defeat this new Conservative Revolution in the next 18 months, between now and the next U.S. election.

Let me start with Gingrich's endorsement of the futurologists Heidi and Alvin Toffler. They have written a couple of books which have become the cult books of this current, in which the main (and not very profound) thesis is that the whole world, all the parties, all the institutions in different countries, are engaged in a fight between what they call the "Second Wave" and the "Third Wave." The First Wave was the agricultural age, the Second Wave is the so-called industrial age, and the Third Wave is supposedly the information age; surpassing industry and all the values associated with the time of the Industrial Revolution and the industrial age.

For example, Gingrich writes in the preface to the latest book of the Tofflers [*Creating a New Civilization: The Politics of the Third Wave*], that the infamous Persian Gulf war against Iraq represented the first successful war of the Third Wave against the Second Wave, because it proved that an army based on the information age could successfully eliminate an army of the Second Wave—the backward, poor, industrial Iraqi Army. You have to remember the cold-blooded murder, in which the Iraqi Army was annihilated in 24 hours. Over 120,000 sorties were flown afterwards with the idea of bombing Iraq back to the Stone Age, according to the

principle: Bomb now, die later. We know that this resulted in 1 million people dying as an aftereffect of the destruction of the infrastructure in Iraq.

This was supposedly only the first successful war of that kind, so you get an idea what is supposed to follow.

While that is a highlight on the foreign policy side, what such people as Gramm, Gingrich, Jesse Helms, Weld, and others are proposing for the United States domestically is no less eerie. They are now in an orgy, proposing more applications of the death penalty. They want public executions broadcast on TV—an idea being pushed by a judge in Ohio. They want to eliminate the idea of parole. The United States already has the largest prison population in the world, even larger than Russia. And we know from our own prisoners—Mike Billington, Anita Gallagher, Paul Gallagher, Larry Hecht, and Don Phau: If you eliminate the hope of parole, if you throw away the key for people in jail after they have committed a felony or some crime three times, you will undoubtedly create an explosion in the prisons. They also are pushing the privatization of prisons, which is exactly the model of Auschwitz concentration camps: Turn prisoners into slave laborers, reduce the cost, of course, and get the maximum work out of the prisoners.

They also want to eliminate welfare. Some 7.8 million children in the United States depend on welfare. Gingrich came up with the great idea of making their mothers or both parents work and of putting the children into orphanages. Of course this would cost money, too, while he wants to cut the budget at the same time, so it is a completely unrealistic conception. They want to have tax relief for speculative gains, making speculation more profitable. I won't go into further details, but the so-called "Contract with America" is an absolute nightmare for the United States domestically. And it would be extremely dangerous for the rest of the world, if the United States were to become a full-fledged fascist state, in the context of the situation in Russia, Ukraine, the Balkans, and all the other crisis spots around the world.

The nature of the beast

To destroy this Conservative Revolution over the coming 18 months, it is first of all most important to document what the Conservative Revolution has been historically. We shall document it in all its manifestations—how it will affect the



Helga Zepp-LaRouche and Lyndon LaRouche at the Dec. 10-11 ICLC-Schiller Institute Conference in Eltville, Germany.

education system, the prisons, the economy, and so forth. And by producing pamphlets on these different aspects, we will create a reservoir of knowledge both in the United States, where this will give the natural leaders of different constituencies the necessary ammunition to understand what is going on, and will also give people around the world a very clear understanding. But at the same time—and this is also part of defeating the Conservative Revolution—we have to create constituencies for a new renaissance. We have a very clear idea how to do that.

Now, what is the nature of this latest expression of the Conservative Revolution? Heidi and Alvin Toffler, for example, work extremely closely with the Stanford Research Institute in Palo Alto, California, which must be regarded as one of the key think-tanks of the Conservative Revolution. It is the same institute which published a popularized version of a previous study on the New Age, namely, the book by Marilyn Ferguson about the Aquarian Conspiracy. Her main idea was the same concept, but she did not call it Second and Third Wave; rather, she called for replacing the “Age of Pisces,” which is the age of Christianity of the last 2,000 years, with the “Age of Aquarius,” which is supposedly the new era of irrationality. Basically, the Tofflers are making the thesis that the new Third Wave civilization would be highly technological but completely anti-industrial at the same time, and that the main conflicts in society today would emerge from the useless efforts of representatives of the industrial age to preserve the core institutions characteristic

of that historical period: namely, for example, the nuclear family, the idea that you have a mother, a father, and children—that should go. Instead you can have all kinds of other combinations—two men, three women, five children, whatever.

Also, mass public education should go, according to these people. They want to eliminate big corporations and big trade unions; they want to eliminate the nation-state, and claim that the chief conflict in this era will be between those who try to defend these old values and those who are willing to go with the new values, and that the conflict of the Second with the Third Wave will be stronger than any previous conflict among representatives of the Second Wave, such as the historic conflict between Americans and Russians, between communists and anti-communists, and so forth.

They say that this is a new vision—they call Gingrich the new *visionaire*—but one can prove that this is absolutely nothing new. What Gingrich, the Tofflers, and others are talking about, is the essence of that spectrum of Conservative Revolution tendencies of which the Nazis were only one example. As a matter of fact, if you read these Toffler books, they are extremely watered down plagiarisms of a thousand similar books published by the Conservative Revolution during the 20th century, and the writing is as thin as a brew from coffee grounds which have been reused 100 times over.

Locate this new American phenomenon in the context of the Anglo-American Conservative Revolution, which we documented in “The Coming Fall of the House of Windsor”

[*EIR Special Report*, Oct. 28, 1994]. We demonstrated that the British monarchy is the current leadership of this phenomenon, and that around the leadership of the British monarchy you have the so-called Club of the Isles, a body of leading oligarchs, who use, among other things, the World Wildlife Fund [WWF, now the World Wide Fund for Nature] as an operation of British intelligence and as an instrument of the Conservative Revolution. Then it becomes more clear and more interesting.

Many people, when they first hear statements by Prince Philip that he wants to be reincarnated as a deadly virus in order to help reduce world population, become a little bit puzzled, and they say, "This sounds very strange. How could somebody—after all, a prince, a top person in England—how could he have such crazy ideas?" Well, as you will see, this is the Conservative Revolution: If Prince Philip says that he wants to go back to the pre-Christian pagan cults, because those are more suitable to deal with the problem of overpopulation than is Christianity, which does not permit certain radical solutions; or, if you think about the mythical importance these circles attribute to the so-called wilderness; then all of these things are really incomprehensible from the standpoint of reason, common sense, and normal people. They are only understandable if you dig into the lower jungles of craziness of the Conservative Revolution, which I hope I will be able to make quite clear.

A reaction against the Council of Florence

The name Conservative Revolution historically was first used by Hugo von Hoffmannsthal and later coined by Moeller van den Bruck, the famous author of the book *The Third Reich*, from which the Nazis actually took the name. What they meant by this, was to describe an oligarchical tendency, which emerged at the beginning of the 19th century, against different aspects of the influence of the Renaissance tradition. That is because it was around this period of the turn from the 18th to the 19th century, when different aspects of the influence of the Renaissance became politically more relevant than at any previous time.

Why do we attribute such enormous importance to the Golden Renaissance of the 15th century? The major achievement, and what really makes it a watershed between the Middle Ages and modern times, was, first of all, that mainly through the efforts of Nicolaus of Cusa and his famous book *Concordantia Catholica*, for the first time in history the principles were defined, on which the sovereign nation-state could be built. Most important was the idea that only in a nation-state, in which the representative government would create accountability for those who are the representatives of the people, and who are accountable in practice not only to the people but also to the government, was the possibility created for the individual to participate in government. This was a radical break with all previous periods—and I am not saying that there were not positive things in different aspects

even of the Middle Ages, of the Carolingian period, of the Salian kings—but it was a radical break insofar as for the very first time, the possibility for each individual to participate in self-government was defined. This was an important step in breaking with the empire, with the oligarchical system.

Secondly and equally important, Nicolaus of Cusa is correctly called the father of modern science. If you read his work *De Docta Ignorantia*, for the first time we have the definition of the Socratic method and the idea of intelligibility of the laws of creation.

Thirdly, associated with that, in this period the work of Cusa and the other fathers of the Council of Florence defined the obligation of the sovereign nation-state to foster the common good through the application of scientific progress for the benefit of the population at large. This was likewise an idea which had not existed before then. Thus, the Renaissance ended practices which had been based on the oligarchical assumption that society would be forever divided into three classes: a tiny group of oligarchs; the lackeys of oligarchs, the hangers-on-to-power, those who profit from the evil system, which helped the oligarchical system to function; and, lastly, the 90 to 95% of the population, the underlings, serfs, slaves, and so forth.

It was especially the unity of the church accomplished at the Council of Florence, reestablishing in the context of the other abovementioned factors, the possibility for the individual to access the *Filioque*—the idea that, in practice, each individual person could participate directly in God's creative reason—which created the modern age. This *Filioque* principle gave each individual a sense of sovereignty and of limitless perfectibility, which indeed broke the rules, broke the system which had existed before that time. And it was exactly that new, sovereign authority of the individual, against which the Conservative Revolution was mobilized.

The reason why this occurred especially at the beginning of the 19th century, is because this period, in many respects, was a nightmare for the oligarchs. First of all, the American Revolution was in fact the first time that the principles which Nicolaus of Cusa and others had established in the 15th century—the idea of individual, inalienable rights based on natural law—was put into a constitution. It was the first time that a government was established—with some imperfections—in which a republican representative system was established, and which no longer had any place for oligarchs, princes, or baronesses. This was a fact over which the oligarchies, especially the British, George I, went crazy, because it was a threat to their system.

There was another development, which was equally threatening, and that was the Weimar Classic, the beautiful humanist renaissance and Classical period exemplified by Friedrich Schiller, along with the revolution in music from Johann Sebastian Bach to Johannes Brahms. The image of man prevailing during that period gave man greater possibilities for self-perfection than at any time before. If you look at

the lofty conception of man, as it was developed by Schiller or the Humboldt brothers, the idea of mass education on the basis of these ideas was, from the standpoint of the oligarchs, what they feared most. Humboldt had, from a practical standpoint, put the beautiful image of man into an education system for everybody. That was exactly what they feared the most.

Thirdly, you had the beginning of an industrial revolution associated with the idea of mass education.

So the oligarchs feared, and correctly so, that their system was coming apart. And from here you can follow the emergence of the Conservative Revolution in every country in Europe. It must be said that the Congress of Vienna of 1815 and the so-called restoration period was indeed a temporary victory by the Conservative Revolution. If you look at the Carlsbad Decrees, in which, for example, the writings of Schiller and others were banned, this was an exemplary "reactionary reaction."

Armin Mohler, who for many years headed the Siemens Foundation, wrote *the* standard book about the Conservative Revolution. It is actually a very insightful book, because he is part of it. He pointed out that the Conservative Revolution defined a particular world: "We should like for the moment to describe this [world] as one world, which does not place at its center that which is unchangeable in man, but rather believes it possible to change the character of man. Therefore it proclaims the possibility of step-wise progress, in the belief that all things, relations, and events can be fathomed by the Understanding, and seeks to take each object as a particular, in order to understand it with reference only to itself."

Romanticism: tool of the Conservative Revolution

Against the idea of intelligibility through reason and the perfectibility of man, which just had experienced a high point in the Classical period—just think of the groundbreaking revolutions in Classical art, in musical composition, the Humboldt brothers, the definition of new faculties of science which had not existed before then—the Conservative Revolution very deliberately sponsored a counter-movement: romanticism. Romanticism, the emotional exaggeration of all expressions of life, promotes an emphasis on the natural instincts versus reason, a mystical fascination with the Middle Ages versus Classical and Renaissance periods, and the idea of mental and emotional escapism. Heinrich Heine later characterized the emergence of romanticism against the Classical spirit as a disgusting mixture of Gothic insanity and modern lies. Romanticism was the ideological and emotional basis for the emergence of the "youth movement," which then, with the help of the First World War and the Depression, led directly to the ideology of the Nazis. And today, too, romanticism is the basis of ecologism and the New Age.

The Conservative Revolution liked romanticism because it enabled them to use youth as a battering-ram against tech-

nological progress. They played around with the romantic longing for death as a useful pathology, because once you get people to play around in this pathological way with a death-wish, then their respect for the life of other human beings is greatly diminished.

The question we have to ask ourselves—and this is a question I been struggling with for a long time—is, "How was it possible that this beautiful period of the German Classical culture of Weimar, of Schiller, of Beethoven, was per-

Go to any university in the United States or in Germany today, and you will find that there is a gigantic Nietzsche revival. Incredible efforts are being made to whitewash Nietzsche, saying that he had nothing to do with the Nazis. As everybody knows, Nietzsche went insane in the third stage of syphilis. However, from reading his writings, I have concluded that that he was insane all along.

verted and turned into its opposite?" It is extremely important that we study and understand this, if we want to prevent anything like this from reoccurring in the future.

An important stepping stone in this was Arthur Schopenhauer, who was not only a philosopher of romanticism and spiritually very close to people like Thomas Hobbes and John Locke and their bestial conception of man, but was also the first to create a philosophical system of pessimism! He proclaimed reason's inability to know anything, and degraded reason to the status of a mere vehicle by which to reach goals set by an irrational will. This naturally led to beginning to deny that there is any meaning to life, and led to a pessimism which was not only irrational, but also immoral. Because, if life is not regarded as something fundamentally positive, then progress in the process of cognition, or in deeds, in action, is not possible. Schopenhauer thus attacked the Platonic and the Christian teaching of virtue.

But Schopenhauer was just a stepping stone, and there is no question that the absolute breaking point, without which you cannot understand anything about history afterward, was Friedrich Nietzsche—whose favorite philosopher was Schopenhauer.

Go to any university in the United States or in Germany today, and you will find that there is a gigantic Nietzsche

revival. Incredible efforts are being made to whitewash Nietzsche, saying that he had nothing to do with the Nazis, that he was misunderstood, or that it was only his evil sister who falsified his work. As everybody knows, Nietzsche went insane in the third stage of syphilis. However, from reading his writings, I have concluded that that he was insane all along.

Nietzsche was a passionate hater of the humanist conception of man; he hated Plato, Schiller, and Beethoven. He denounced Schiller as the "moral trumpeter of Säckingen"; he (correctly) blamed Plato for having developed the scientific method leading to scientific progress; he totally denied the scientific and humanist explanation of the unity of human development.

Nietzsche was engaged in a very conscious effort to undermine the Socratic spirit. What he did first was reinterpret history, methodically replacing all Socratic elements with a Dionysian conception. Instead of emphasizing the Classical Greek contribution of Socrates, Plato, and others, he replaced it with an emphasis on Dionysian destruction. He emphasised all periods in history during which irrationalism existed in an organized form.

He said that Dionysian man can most easily be understood through the analogy to the ecstasy of drunkenness or intoxication: "Either through the influence of narcotic beverages, to which hymns are composed by all men and peoples of antiquity, or with the powerful arrival of spring which lustily penetrates all of nature, these Dionysian urges grow, in whose intensity the subjective fades away into total self-forgetfulness. In the German Middle Ages also, ever-growing masses of people, under the same Dionysian power, rolled from place to place, singing and dancing. In these dances of St. John and St. Vitus, we recognize the Bacchic choruses of the Greeks, with their prehistory in Asia Minor, going back to Babylon and the orgiastic Sakeans."

If you think that this fostering of Dionysian orgies is only a problem of times past, just think of the horrifying pictures some of you may have seen on TV a couple of weeks ago of the so-called "Woodstock II" festival, where people were rolling naked in the mud. Or think about the so-called musical "Hair," which celebrates the arrival of the Age of Aquarius and describes the experiments of the Huxley brothers with LSD. Or just think about certain hard-rock video clips, where people are wallowing in a mindless fashion.

Nietzsche describes this and says: "There are people, who from lack of experience or from dullness turn away—either ridiculing or pitying—from these phenomena as 'maladies of the vulgar,' and think themselves in good health; but these poor people have no idea how superficial and impalpable just this 'health' looks, when the glowing life of Dionysian enthusiasts stormily passes over them."

Isn't that the way a good part of our contemporaries feel about life, then they think that people who do not indulge in such ecstasies, but who are truth-seeking in their own field,

or who are just trying to lead a good moral life, are completely colorless, and that it is only people who engage in orgies and Dionysian things who live the real life? This self-propulsion into self-forgottenness, the Dionysian feeling, the ultimate other-directedness, means the individual no longer exists.

Nietzsche says: "Under the magic [power] of the Dionysian, not only is the bond between man and man restored, but alienated, hostile or subjugated nature can also again celebrate her feast of reconciliation with her prodigal son, man. The earth willingly offers up her gifts, and the wild beasts peacefully approach the cliffs and the deserts. Dionysus' wagon is covered with flowers and wreaths; under his yoke stride panther and tiger."

What Nietzsche describes here is the spirit of flower-power, Woodstock, and similar things. Nietzsche says, "[Let us] transform Beethoven's song of praise, the Ode to Joy, into a painting, and [let not] our imagination fail us when millions sink awestruck into the dust. Now the slave is a free man, now are broken all the hostile, strict boundaries which necessity, arbitrariness, or impertinent fashion have put between people. Now from the bible of world harmony, everyone feels himself not only united with his neighbor, reconciled, melted into one with the other; as if the veil of Maja had been rent asunder, and now only flutters in tatters around the mysterious, primordial One: Singing and dancing, man expresses himself as a member of a higher commonality: He has forgotten how to walk and to speak, and in dancing is on the way to flying up into the skies."

Giving up one's own identity to a higher commonality is not only characteristic of the Nazis, it is also the sentiment of the New Age, the Age of Aquarius. This idea of giving up one's sense of identity is obviously the opposite of the sense of identity of the individual in humanism, where the individual contribution to creative power and creative development is emphasized.

It is quite natural that Nietzsche, from that standpoint, would violently attack the Humboldt education system and the idea that each human being should have the entire knowledge of 2,500 years of European history—which he attacks as "*Bildungsballast*," excess educational baggage. That also is a characteristic of the Conservative Revolution; just think of Alexander King and his attacks on the Humboldt education system, which influenced the education in the entire OECD [Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development] countries.

Nietzsche hated Christ

Nietzsche obviously realized that Christianity represented the biggest problem for him, because Christianity defined the idea of man's participation in God through creative reason. Nietzsche is most famous for his dictum, "God is dead." At the end of his somewhat autobiographical scribbling "Ecce homo," he puts forward the slogan "Dionysus against the Crucified." Karl Loewit, one of the first phenomenolo-

gists, said that Nietzsche's main idea is a thought-system which starts with the death of God, where in the middle of the system nihilism emerges, and where at the end, in the surmounting of this nihilism, stands "the eternal return of the same."

This leads us to the heart of the Conservative Revolution. If you compare Nietzsche, Prince Philip, the Tofflers, and others of this sort, what do they mean with their attack on what they call the "linear world" (a notion used by all of them)? Romano Guardini, who was originally associated with the Conservative Revolution but later clearly broke with it, wrote a book, actually first an article, in 1935, entitled "Der Heilsbringer" ("The Savior"), which was an attack against the führer ideology of the Nazis. Guardini's main concept was that all religions before Christianity were cyclical, as there is a cycle of nature, a cycle of the times of the day, of the year, of light and darkness, a cycle of getting up in the morning and going to sleep in the evening, a cycle of spring and autumn, of rising up and sinking down, of being born and dying. And while "Birth and death may appear absolute . . . the particular form is only transitional." Pagan gods, which are such saviors, were idols of pre-Christian cults, such as Osiris, Mithra, Dionysus, Baldur. They all are only saviors within this idea of a cyclical conception of nature.

Guardini correctly pointed to the fact, that the emergence of Jesus Christ was the detonator of this cycle, because Christ comes from above; and he quoted the Gospel of St. John, 8:23: "You are from below, I am from above, you are of this world, I am not of this world." The emergence of Christ, says Guardini, is the result of a unique and non-recurring hour, an absolute break with this cyclical conception. Christ is not like the other saviors, he is not the son of the world and nature, but God is the Creator of the world, resting only in Himself. In Mohler's words: "The uniqueness of the hour therefore is the Archimedean point from which Christianity seeks to turn upside down the image its opponents have of the world. But it is naturally also the point, where every crucial assault on the Christian world-view begins."

Guardini correctly notes that, at least for the western world, it is through Christianity that history emerges. Events from now on do not eternally return, but occur only once and not for a second time. The main criticism of the Conservative Revolution against Christianity is that the idea of the permanent progress of man, of nature, of civilization, devalues the present in favor of an always better future moment and future possibility. Mohler blames Christianity: "At any rate, for the West, Christianity became the determinant of destiny. Together with its secularized forms, the doctrine of progress of all kinds, it has created the 'modern world,' against which the conservative revolutionaries are in revolt." As a matter of fact, they correctly note that modern technological civilization would not have been possible without the liberating effect of Christianity, that Christ's redemptive act has freed

man from the sway of nature and has given him an independence from nature and himself which he otherwise could never have reached, because the sovereignty of the individual from now on is based on the sovereignty of God.

This permits man to exert his rule over the world, and Guardini, describing this, says: "Nothing is more wrong than the opinion that the modern dominion over the world in knowledge and technology had to be won by force against the opposition of a Christianity which would rather have kept man in passive submission. The opposite is true: that extraordinary, bold venture of modern science and technology, whose scope, after the most recent discoveries, we find deeply disturbing, has only become possible on the basis of that personal independence which Christ gave to man."

The uniqueness of the person, the uniqueness of the individual deed and action, this is what creates history. But the emergence of Christ has also added one other thing, and that is the depth and the fineness of soul in western civilization. Compared to ancient man, Christianity added one dimension of the mind: a capacity to experience higher emotions (*Empfindungsvermögen*)—a power of creation of the heart, and a power of suffering, which comes from the example of Christ: Gethsemane. In that sense, compared to the ancient Greek period, through Christianity man has become more adult; he has become more fully realized.

From the 'Great Noon' to Aquarius

Nietzsche attacks these linear (as opposed to cyclical) conceptions—they are by no means linear, of course, but that is how progress appears for him. In "Also sprach Zarathustra" ("Thus Spake Zarathustra"), he says, "Everything goes, everything returns, the wheel of being rolls on eternally. Everything dies, everything blooms again, eternally runs the year of being. Everything breaks, everything is being put together, eternally the same house of existence is building itself. Everything leaves, everything greets itself again, eternally the ring of existence remains. In each instance existence begins around every Here. The ball is rolling there, the center is everywhere, curved is the way, the path of eternity."

And in his posthumous papers, Nietzsche says: "He who does not believe in a circular process of the universe, necessarily must believe in a willful god." In "Ecce homo," Zarathustra's final words are: "Come up, come up, Great Noon." This "Great Noon" also has a magical importance for the Conservative Revolution. Theodor Fontane says: "Isn't our time a strange spectacle? On the one side the linear world of progress with its unleashing of nuclear power toward a peak, and its attempts to cover even the last part of the world with smokestacks, railway lines, and cables, on the other side the spokesmen who bear witness to a world of the stillness of noon."

Various representatives of the Conservative Revolution describe this clash between two worlds as an "interregnum." Toffler describes this conflict as one between the Second and

the Third Wave. But already in 1927, Hermann Hesse in his famous, or rather infamous, *Steppenwolf*, wrote: "Real suffering, man's life becomes real hell only where two ages, two cultures and religions overlap. . . . Someone of Nietzsche's character had to suffer the present misery more than a generation ago; alone and misunderstood, he was forced to taste what thousands are suffering today."

Ernst Jünger, the much-hailed so-called philosopher, who is actually the archetype of the Conservative Revolution, said: "We are standing at the divide between two ages, somewhat like the change from the Stone Age to the Bronze Age." And Marilyn Ferguson, in her book *The Aquarian Conspiracy*, said that "we are experiencing a change from the Age of Pisces to the Age of Aquarius," meaning that no longer are reason and progress dominant, but rather feeling—some cosmic feeling, through which all conspirators of this Aquarian conspiracy are united and participating in a cosmic conscience. And all such conspirators recognize each other and have penetrated all realms of life, even the military.

In *Steppenwolf*, Hesse had written earlier: "I lived austerely and fasted for a long time, but now I live under the sign of Aquarius, a dark and moist sign."

Mohler wrote in his abovementioned book in 1949: "For some others, this notion even congeals into the image of the passing from one aeon to a new one. . . . Knut von Ermsten," another Conservative Revolutionary, "sees this change, for example, in connection with cosmic transformation: We are standing at the shift from one age, of Pisces, to the Age of Aquarius. But for him, National Socialism, whose temporary rules he already takes as a given in a 1922 writing entitled *Adolf Hitler und die Kommenden (Hitler and Those to Come)*, is only a first fever blister which announces such changes. That the fish are a symbol of Christ fits him well in this context."

The Age of Aquarius is the age of Dionysus. Ernst Jünger said already in the 1930s: "We have been marching for a long time toward a magic zero-point, which can only be traversed by him who possesses other invisible sources of power."

According to Mohler, this magic "zero-point" brings us to the center of nihilism. It is the belief in "unconditional destruction, which transforms into unconditional creation, because rot does not occur in the essential core. What remains, what is left over, is our hope," says Jünger.

This idea that destruction is positive because it destroys the weak, the feeble, and gives room for the strong to emerge—this was the Nazi idea, this was the idea of the "*Herrenmensch*" and "master race."

This is also what the infamous former governor of Colorado, Richard Lamm, said: that it is good, if old, sick people die, because they need to make room for the young and strong anyway.

In *Steppenwolf*, Hesse even condones the application of terrorism against the linear world, the world of machines. He said that it is good to depopulate the Earth through the destruction of machines. He associates this, in lengthy descriptions, with a lust for killing. "Yes, there are too many people in the world; in the past, one did not realize that so much, but now they are not only breathing the air, but they want to have a car. Of course, it is not reasonable, what we do, it is infantilism. But war is also a monstrous infantilism. Later, one day mankind will have to learn to control its increase in population through reasonable means; in the meantime, we react rather unreasonably to the unbearable conditions, but we are basically doing the right thing: We are reducing."

If that sounds crazy, this comes from the fact that the Conservative Revolution does not try to be coherent, because they have a fundamental mistrust of coherence in thinking, and they are actually proud of their own irrationality.

Another such Conservative Revolutionary by the name of Quabbe said: "For the conservative, reflection about the axioms of one's thinking is a kind of profanation . . . an attempt to bring the irrational back to the level of rationality, to profane the divine, which is thereby deprived of its allure of the inexplicable."

The heart of ecologism

The continuity of the modern ecologists with the fascists is easily demonstrated. A case in point is the work of Friedrich Georg Jünger, the brother of Ernst Jünger. I want to compare his book *The Perfection of Technology* of 1939, with another book by Robert Jungk, *Der Atomstaat (The Nuclear State)*. Both essentially say that science does not contribute anything to the creation of wealth, that even the smallest amount of work of technology uses up more power than it produces, and therefore: How can the sum of all such activities bring something different than its parts?

Jünger says: "Technology ruins the air, poisons the water, destroys the forest and the animals. It creates a condition in which nature must be protected from rational thinking." And furthermore: The technician "ruins the entrepreneur through inventions which cannot be anticipated. He cares as little for the well-being of the capitalist as for that of the proletariat. He cares neither about profit, nor about interest rates." This is unfortunately the basis of the International Monetary Fund, and the economic doctrine of the Mont Pelerin Society.

But for the Conservative Revolution, the worst is this: "We must realize that technological progress and mass education go hand in hand. . . . Technological progress is strongest in those places where mass education has most progressed. . . . [The masses] are the most usable, docile material for the technician, without which he never could realize his plans. . . . For us, the notion of mass is connected

with heaviness, pressure, dependency, and vulgarization.” For the oligarchs of the Conservative Revolution, the idea of educated masses is a horrible vision, because it would mean the end of that oligarchical elite.

For the same reason, they oppose the idea of the nation-state based on technological progress. And many of them, including Friedrich Hilcher and all the different representatives of the Pan-European Union, want to destroy the nation-state and replace it with regionalism, tribalism, estates. If you look at the present destabilization of many countries, the attempts to rip countries apart—as in Italy, where the Northern League is trying to split up the nation into several parts; or the Chiapas upheaval in Mexico; or similar things around the world—the basis for that is the ideology of the Conservative Revolution.

One element coming from the Conservative Revolution is the morbid mythical importance attributed to the so-called “wilderness.” Wilderness has a very special meaning for Prince Philip and the WWF. Mohler says: “It is especially the wilderness which becomes a leitmotiv in the literature of the tradition of Nietzsche.” There, wilderness is counterposed, as a “healing sleep,” to the linear world of destruction. “In the wilderness, the laws of economy do not apply; the wilderness is the backdrop before which the world-feeling unfolds, which we have tried to describe here,” says Mohler. “It emanates from here, and to here it always returns.”

Wilderness is the Great Noon, the magical center of this world. When the Conservative Revolution speaks of wilderness, the image of the Great Noon is meant. Friedrich Georg Jünger adds to the Nietzschean conception of Apollo and Dionysus a third pagan god: Pan, the god of the wilderness. Wilderness has no history, no origin; it is the origin, and is therefore sacred.

But this fascination with wilderness is not a peaceful retreat, it is not a personal thing. The representatives of the Conservative Revolution are ready to kill for it. We discussed the role of Permindex in the assassination attempts against de Gaulle and the murder of John F. Kennedy; a similar role was played by the “Consul Organization” in the 1920s, which in all likelihood killed [Walter] Rathenau and several other people, and which was controlled by the infamous Thule Society, to which Karl Haushofer, Prince Maria Thurn und Taxis, Rudolf Hess, Alfred Rosenberg, and others belonged.

Again, the continuity to today can be documented in many ways, in part even through personal histories. For example, one center of the Conservative Revolution in the 1920s was the magazine *Die Tat*, the largest magazine in the Weimar Republic. Its publisher, Eugen Diederich, also published Haushofer’s *Magazin für Geopolitik* [*Magazine for Geopolitics*], a phenomenon we are witnessing again today. The father of Peter von Örtzen was a collaborator of the group around *Die Tat*; also Carl Jaspers, later the mentor of Armin Mohler, volunteered for the SS. Mohler became the

secretary of Ernst Jünger. So it is all a very close-knit network.

The Conservative Revolution was, however, not a German phenomenon, even if you have a lot of people in it such as Oswald Spengler, Ernst Jünger, the Haushofer brothers, Karl Barth, Martin Heidegger, Moeller van den Bruck, Nietzsche, and Wagner. There were similar people in other countries, such as Dostoevsky and the two Akasakovs in Russia; Sorel, Maurice Barrès in France; Unamuno in Spain; Ebola in Italy; Jabotinsky for Jewry. In the United States, people to be named are Lothrop Stoddard, Madison Grant, and James Burnham. The tradition is continued by the Club of Rome and similar institutions today.

Reincarnation versus Renaissance

The Conservative Revolution consciously defines itself as directed against the renaissances, the Carolingian Renaissance and others, because they were “artificial” and “guided” renaissances, which allegedly had only a limited effect in art and science. They were not the real thing; the real thing was the “reincarnations,” which allegedly go much deeper than renaissances, because renaissances only touch the educational realm, whereas reincarnations fundamentally overturn the forms of life.

Nietzsche’s “eternal return of the same” has been misunderstood many times as an individual reincarnation, as a “transmigration of the soul,” but it is not that: The part goes back into the whole, and out of the whole comes a new part. If Prince Philip’s wish to be reincarnated as a virus were realized, the good news would be that he was no longer Prince Philip. But according to this crazy world outlook, individuals change and the whole always remains the same. In the camp of progress, on the other hand, something is always added. In the Conservative Revolution, everything always remains the same. In the camp of progress, man is fundamentally good. In the Conservative Revolution, good and evil always remain. Or even more precisely, as the so-called poet of the Conservative Revolution, Gottfried Benn, said: Man is not the crowning of Creation, but rather, man is “the pig.”

If the Conservative Revolution representatives consider themselves pigs, fine—they should choose their own destiny. But for the rest of humanity, let us be beautiful souls, let us study the Socratic method in order to create new knowledge, to create ever more daring conceptions of man and the universe. Let’s create a new renaissance, let’s study the Weimar Classic, and let’s teach children around the world to sing, to recreate discoveries of the past in order to be able to create new discoveries themselves.

I believe that it is simply necessary to take a look at the deep jungle and swamp of the enemy’s thinking, so that then, with renewed determination, we can proceed to create a new cultural renaissance around the world.