



The National People's Party (UK) Understanding National Bolshevism

Peter Wilberg

The platform of the **National People's Party** in the U.K. aims to provide a new *political-economic focus* and a *new spiritual-philosophical foundation* by which to more clearly define **National Bolshevism** – as Social Nationalism, National Marxism and National Communist – anti-capitalist, anti-fascist, anti-racist, antiZionist – and above all directed against the domination of all nations by the international banking and monetary system and its political puppets.

The 'National Bolshevism' or 'Social Nationalism' of the NPP opposes *both* the pseudo-nationalist, racist ideologies of many ultra-right parties *and* the pseudo-Marxist ideologies of 'international' socialism propagated by ultra-left Trotskyist parties. Social Nationalism is essentially Monetary Nationalism – free of the racist ideology of 'National Socialism' and instead affirming the sovereign right of nations to issue their own interest-free money and inject it directly into the real economy without having to borrow from private and international banks – as Lincoln sought to do by issuing 'Greenbacks' – until Rothschild backed King George in his war on the colonial rebels – and gained control of the Bank of England in return!

In contrast to racist nationalism and socialist internationalism the National People's Party recognises that since the fall of the Soviet Union and the global deregulation of banking, the *class struggle* has itself become an essentially *national struggle* of *all peoples* against the power of the banks and the global dominance of *international finance capital* and its puppet politicians in different countries. Corporate *wageslavery* is now compounded and aggravated by *debt slavery* – the surrender of *national sovereignty* through enforced 'sovereign debt'

to the feudalistic institutions of international finance capital – the U.S. Federal Reserve Bank, the European Central Bank, the IMF, the World Trade Organisation, the World Bank and the Bank of International Settlements in Basel. All this is justified by politicians and the press through an almost religious deference to the 'stability' of what it vaguely called the 'financial markets'.

National Bolshevism recognises that we live in an era characterised by the total global *financialisation* of capitalism, allowing international ‘money capitalism’ (Marx) to become totally parasitic on industrial capitalism. This is leading to the ruination of *entire national economies* (such as those of Greece, Spain and Italy) on a scale not seen since the debts imposed on Germany by the Versailles Treaty. Yet bourgeois economists and the capitalist media continue to propagate the ‘Big Lie’ of a ‘global financial crisis’ – which in essence is nothing but a crisis of private international banks themselves. These vampire banks are now being handed *trillions of Euros* by European central banks to rescue them from *their* crisis – itself an inevitable result of their greed to accumulate money purely as *debt and interest*. The result is that the peoples of Europe and the U.S.A. are now being plunged into poverty, joblessness and homelessness on a scale unprecedented since the Great Depression of the thirties.

No one however – even on the socialist Left or nationalist Right – yet *dares* to suggest the only real ‘solution’ to this ‘global financial crisis’ – namely the creation of *fully state-owned* National People’s Banks, each of which is free to affirm the *sovereign right of all nations*. This is the right to issue their own interest-free money *without* having to borrow it from private and international banks – a right long since *surrendered* by governments to the private international banking system.

Whilst supporting the educational efforts of movements for radical ‘monetary reform’ such as ‘**Positive Money**’ and the movements for Monetary Reform and Public Banking in the United States, the National People’s Party rejects their essentially naive assumption that the right of nations to issue their own sovereign, debt-free money can be achieved simply through rational persuasion aimed at parliamentary politicians of both left and right – thus ignoring the fundamental conflict of interests between the working peoples of all nations and the instruments and beneficiaries of international finance capital. True national democracy is not false parliamentary democracy but economic democracy – the democratisation of the workplace and industrial corporations. True international democracy means defying the threats and indirect dictatorship of the financial markets. Neither form of democracy can be achieved by anything else than a national ‘dictatorship of the proletariat’ i.e. ‘national socialism’ or ‘national bolshevism’ in the literal, Marxist sense of these terms – shorn of the crude historical distortions of anti-semitism, racism and ethnicism – all of which only submit the people of all nations to the trick of ‘divide and rule’.

For the fact remains that despite its ideologically debased and genocidal crimes against Jews, Roma, Communists and Socialists, a Social Nationalist dictatorship over the banks was a *necessary precondition* for defying the dictatorship of international banks, enabling the issue of a form of *sovereign credit and currency*. The economic success of this measure – despite the massive retribution it brought in the form of worldwide trade boycotts – is now acknowledged by economists worldwide who otherwise have no sympathies for Hitlerism whatsoever:

“The Nazis came to power in 1933 when the German economy was in total collapse, with ruinous war-reparation obligations and zero prospects for foreign investment or credit. Through an independent monetary policy of sovereign credit and a fullemployment public-works program, the Third Reich was able to turn a bankrupt Germany, stripped of overseas colonies, into the strongest economy in Europe within four years, even before armament spending began.”

Economist Henry C. K. Liu, AsiaTimes (May 24, 2005).

“Germany issued debt-free and interest-free money from 1935 on, which accounts for Germany’s startling rise from the depression to a world power in five years. The German government financed its entire operations from 1935 to 1945 without gold, and without debt.”

Sheldon Emry *Billions for the Bankers, Debts for the People*

“... the National Socialists, who came to power in 1933, thwarted the international banking cartel by issuing their own money. In this they took their cue from Abraham Lincoln, who funded the American Civil War with government-issued paper money called ‘Greenbacks’. Hitler began his national credit program by devising a plan of public works. Projects earmarked for funding included flood control, repair of public buildings and private residences, and construction of new buildings, roads, bridges, canals, and port facilities. One billion non-inflationary bills of exchange, called Labour Treasury Certificates, were then issued against this cost. Millions of people were put to work on these projects, and the workers were paid with the Treasury Certificates. This government-issued money wasn’t backed by gold, but it was backed by something of real value. It was essentially a receipt for labour and materials delivered to the government. The workers then spent the Certificates on other goods and services, creating more jobs for more people. In this way the German people climbed out of the crushing debt imposed on them by the international bankers. Within two years, the unemployment problem had been solved and the country was back on its feet. It had a solid, stable currency, no debt, and no inflation, at a time when millions of people in the United States and other Western countries were still out of work and

*living on welfare. Within five years, Germany went from the poorest nation in Europe to the richest. Germany even managed to restore foreign trade, although it was denied foreign credit and was faced with an economic boycott abroad. It did this by using a barter system: equipment and commodities were exchanged directly with other countries, circumventing the international banks. This system of direct exchange occurred without debt and without trade deficits. Although Hitler has rightfully gone down in infamy in the history books, he was quite popular with the German people, at least for a time. Stephen Zarlenga suggests in *The Lost Science of Money* that this was because he temporarily rescued Germany from English economic theory — the theory that money must be borrowed against the reserves of a private banking cartel rather than issued outright by the government.”*

(Ellen Brown [‘How a Bankrupt German solved its Infrastructure Problems’](#))

The German Communists of course, would have gone even further than the National Socialists, promising in their Manifesto that once in power:

“...we will ruthlessly put a stop to the machinations of the bank magnates who impose their will on our land today. We will implement the proletarian nationalisation of the banks and annul all debts to German and foreign capitalists.”

In the post-war years, it was only through its publicly owned ‘Landesbanks’ (which played a vital role in Germany’s ‘Economic Miracle’) that the monopoly of profit-hungry private banks over the money and credit supply of the country was hindered for several decades. That is why it is no surprise that since the nineties the private Deutsche Bank AG, together with the IMF and European Commission put enormous pressure on the German government to privatise these public banks – which were began in the 18th century as non-profit institutions to offer low-interest credit to individuals and to small and medium-sized enterprises. The result of this pressure was that in 2001 the European Commission succeeded in removing state credit guarantees from the Landesbanks – in order to push their still unusually high market share of the banking system in Germany into the hands of the big private banks and turn them into instruments of deregulated speculative trading.

The term ‘National Bolshevism’

Though in pre-war German (unlike in Russia today) the term ‘National Bolshevism’ was not the name of any organised party or group in Germany – it was in Germany that it had its roots, the very terms ‘National Communism’ and ‘National Bolshevism’ having first been coined by the German communists Heinrich Laufenberg and Fritz Wolffheim (the latter himself Jewish by birth) at the end of the 1st World War. What defined their stance was an appeal to German workers’

councils and soldiers, now freed from the dictates of the Kaiser and his generals, to reject the Versailles Treaty and instead continue the war against the Anglo-French entente – yet this time as a *national revolutionary war* – conducted in alliance with Soviet Russia against international finance capitalism.

Although their appeal to Lenin to follow this line was rejected, it was his slogan that they used to define ‘National Bolshevism’: *“Make the question of the people a question of the nation; then the question of the nation will become the question of the people!”*

‘Laufenberg and Wolffheim were expelled from the KPD after they attempted to resist the leadership of Wilhelm Pieck. Radek, after showing initial enthusiasm, soon also denounced Laufenberg’s ‘National Bolshevism’ vehemently. Laufenberg went on to become a founder member of the **Communist Workers Party of Germany (KAPD)**, joining Wolffheim at the Heidelberg conference establishing the party. By 1920 however he had been expelled from the party, with his national Bolshevism the official reason for his departure. Laufenberg was mourned as a pioneer of National Bolshevism by [Ernst Niekisch](#) who wrote that “in 1919 Laufenberg already thought in terms of continents”.’

“Laufenberg ... who in pre-war times had already made his name as a historian of the Hamburg workers’ movement, sickened by the dividedness of the working class and the impotent fight of all against all whilst the nation suffered unspeakably under the oppression of the victorious powers, demanded, together with his friend Wolffheim, the building up of a free and cohesive people’s organisation to bring down exploitative international finance capitalism. They sought to win allies from all strata among the freedom-loving people, conspiring also with officers, because only the unity of soldiers and workers could free the nation. The official parties defamed both determined heads as ‘National Bolsheviks’... “

Berliner Volkszeitung

‘Social Revolutionary Nationalism’ versus ‘National Socialism’

The failure of the ‘National Communism’ of Laufenberg and Wolffheim was by no means the end of the story as regards the story of National Bolshevism in Germany i.e. the principle of uniting factions from both Right and Left, including dissident members of both the Nazi and Communist parties. In 1930 a new step in this direction was initiated under the banner of a new, ‘Social Revolutionary Nationalism’ – this time from associations of the nationalist Right and Nationalist youth. Hence the following press declaration from ‘Die Kommenden’ (‘The Ones to Come’) a weekly

journal of the Association of National Revolutionary Youth
[BündischNationalrevolutionären Jugend].

“On Ascension day 1930, what for long had been a loosely connected group of young National Revolutionaries who saw socialism as the essence of true nationalism were called together from different parts of the country to form a ‘Socialist Revolutionary Nationalist Group’ [‘Gruppe social revolutionärer Nationalisten’ or GSRN]. The group does not wish to form a new organisation but to create an umbrella embracing all young people with a similar world-view from diverse nationalistic groupings and associations – including both National Socialists and people from the ‘left’ – under the slogan of ‘Nation and Socialism’ and its realisation in the form of a state based on people’s councils.”

The aim of the Group was not only to build an “Anti-Capitalist Front of youth from both Right and Left” but an Anti-Fascist one – hence also the use of the term ‘Socialist Nationalism’ instead of ‘National Socialism’. And as its founder **Karl Otto Paetel** points out, the fact that it included in its ranks card-carrying members of Hitler’s National Socialist Party was so that the Nazi party could itself be infiltrated and its leadership ultimately overtaken, and its programme transformed into a thoroughly socialist one free of fascist elements. Indeed a new, more radically socialist manifesto for the National Socialist Party was distributed at a Nurenburg Party Conference. This concluded with the following words:

“Since total control over the whole of German industry lies today in the hands of organs of international finance capitalism, the national revolution is directed unconditionally against international finance capitalism. As a result, any fully realised German revolution will immediately call forth the use of all powers and means by America and its leagues of countries against the German worker’s and peasants’ state. The first task of National Socialist foreign policy is therefore the organisation of a revolutionary defence against the imperialist powers, unity with the Soviet Union and support for revolutionary movements in all countries of the world that oppose international finance capital.”

When, in 1931, a circular was sent out to a range of seemingly ‘right-wing’ individuals, parties and nationalist associations in Germany asking if they would support an imperialist war on the Soviet Union, the answer was mostly a resounding ‘NO!’. Only a Nazi spokesman responded ambiguously – saying they couldn’t seriously imagine any European country attacking Russia (!!!). Another Nazi group said it was “too busy with urgent organisational work” to answer the question. And as we know in retrospect, Hitler was already planning a German war on Russia when, after coming to power, he signed the Nazi-Soviet pact.

On the very day that Hitler was appointed Chancellor – January 30, 1933 – the first explicit ‘National Bolshevik Manifesto’ was released in Germany by [Karl Otto Paetel](#) – only a few copies of which found their way to interested readers before the majority were seized. The Social Revolutionary Nationalists soon went underground, as did the German Communist Party – with whom Paetel himself insisted an alliance was now vital. Once in power Hitler did indeed offer a model for confronting the power of international *finance capitalism* – but only by also firmly allying himself with the captains of German *industrial capitalism* and effectively establishing a fascist and ‘National Capitalist’ state in place of a truly ‘National Socialist’ state.

National Bolshevism, National Socialism and ‘Strasserism’

As Karl Otto Paetel points out, the term ‘National Socialism’ was not invented by Hitler and only achieved notoriety through its incorporation into the official designation of the Party he came to lead, i.e. the ‘German National Socialist Workers Party’. Until *this* party achieved the status of a successful mass movement and political organisation, terms such as ‘German socialism’, ‘socialist nationalism’, ‘national communism’ – and ‘national socialism’ – were all but symbols of a general recognition that the suffering of the German people and their interests as a nation could not be realised except on a socialist anti-imperialist basis. In actuality however, the NSDAP welcomed in its ranks “monarchists and republicans, Christian and anti-Christians, social revolutionaries and social reactionaries ... groups that felt themselves as right-wing nationalist and as left-wing German socialists...”. Yet the greater Hitler’s control over the party the more it seemed to veer away from a fully socialist platform – not least through Hitler’s singling out ‘Marxism’ as one of its chief enemies. The left-wing of the Party, disturbed by this tendency, eventually found a figurehead in Otto Strasser. Persuaded to join the Party in 1925 by his brother Gregor Strasser – who would later become a murder victim of Hitler’s ‘Night of the Long Knives’ – Otto Strasser announced on the 4th July, 1930 that “The socialists are leaving the NSDAP”.

Followed by a few hundred more deserters, he formed a ‘Combat League of Revolutionary National Socialists’ with a new symbol (hammer and sword), a new salute (Hail Germany!), a program that included nationalisation of the banks, belief in allying with the Bolsheviks in the Soviet Union and also support for the antiimperialist struggles of people in countries East – for example China and India. He also coined the term ‘Black Front’ as an umbrella term in order to suggest the existence of a hidden ‘Order’ of far greater numbers embracing dissident national revolutionary groupings and still-existing members of the S.A. and NSDAP.

Yet from his own words we can see how his own relation to Marxist socialism remained ambivalent:

“According to its essence, we understood and understand National Socialism as equally hostile to the capitalist bourgeoisie as to international Marxism, and see its task as the overcoming of both, notwithstanding the fact that in Marxism what in essence is a proper feeling for socialism is bound to the false teachings of liberal materialism and internationalism, and that in the bourgeoisie what in essence is a proper feeling for nationalism is bound to the false teaching of liberal rationalism and capitalism ... We therefore saw and are seeing no essential difference in our opposition to Marxism and the bourgeoisie, as the liberalism working in both makes them equally into our enemy. For this reason we perceived the increasingly one-sided slogan of the leadership of the NSDAP “against Marxism” as a half-truth, and were filled increasingly with the concern that behind this there was a sympathy for the bourgeoisie, which with the same slogans, pursues its own capitalist interests with which we never have and still do not have anything in common.”

The idea of Marxism as merely having a proper “feeling” for socialism – rather than being the deepest, most incisive, comprehensive and radical critique of capitalism ever articulated – and hence the most solid foundation for ‘socialism’ – is both curious and self-evidently questionable, together with its identification with “liberal materialism” (?) and “internationalism”. For at the same time as Strasser was writing, Stalin, under the banner of Leninist Marxism or ‘Marxist-Leninism’, had already, in opposition to Trotsky, consolidated the concept of ‘national socialism’ through the principle of first-of-all building up and defending ‘socialism in one country.

Strasser’s basic misunderstanding of Marxism and seeming lack of awareness of its Leninist and Stalinist interpretation prevented him from drafting his own politiceconomic program on the basis of a solidly socialist Marxist or Leninist foundation.

We see here the same misunderstanding – or plain lack of knowledge and understanding – of both Marx and Marxism that is to be found in the writings of Hitler’s own principal economic mentors, in particular Gottfried Feder, whose writings were principally aimed against usury – interest-bearing loan capital and what he called ‘Mammonism’. Thus Feder wrote:

“It is astonishing to see how the socialist thought-world of Marx and Engels ... halts, as if by command, before the interests of loan capitalism. The sacredness of interest is taboo; interest is the holy of holies ...”

One need only contrast these words with those of Marx himself, who railed against usury and against what Feder call Mammonism – which Marx himself called “the Monotheism of Money”.

“Usury centralises money wealth,” Marx states. “It does not alter the mode of production, but attaches itself to it as a parasite and makes it miserable. It sucks its blood, kills its nerve, and compels reproduction to proceed under even more disheartening conditions. ... usurer’s capital does not confront the laborer as industrial capital,” but “impoverishes this mode of production, paralyzes the productive forces instead of developing them.”

“Under the form of interest the whole of the surplus over the necessary means of subsistence (the amount of what becomes wages later on) of the producers may here be devoured by usury...”

On the other hand, it is true to say that in his own time Marx was unable to foresee the *increasingly* ‘parasitic’ role that usury capitalism would come to play in impoverishing national economies and diverting the profits of industrial capitalism into the wholly unproductive sphere of financial speculation – a ‘casino economy’ totally divorced from the real economy and sucking surplus capital from both industry and the working class. Today this process has reached its apotheosis, one made possible, as would be expected from a Marxist perspective, by technological developments in the means of production – in this case however, *the means of production of money itself* – its digitisation in electronic form. Thus Feder’s emphasis on the catastrophic effects of the ever-more unsustainable *interestburden* placed by usury capital on both producers and consumers, both industrial capitalism and the working class – resulting also in the impoverishment of the middle class – has an even greater validity today than in his own time. And it is to be noted that he too insisted – as Marx had already done in *The Communist Manifesto* – that the state take over the role of providing *interest-free money* for investment in industry, infrastructure, technical innovation, culture, education and social welfare.

‘Naz-Bol’ versus ‘Nat-Bol’

In contrast to the National Bolshevik Party in Russia, what is termed ‘Naz-Bol’ by some confused German ideologists today – a term they use quite explicitly to mean ‘Communo-Nazism’ or *Nazi Bolshevism* – has nothing to do with true *National Bolshevism* or ‘Nat-Bol’. The difference is clearly shown by the fact that all the leading individuals and groupings that could have been described as ‘National Bolshevik’ in inter-war Germany, including the principal

'socialist' hero of these new 'Nazi-Bolsheviks' or 'Communo-Nazis' – Otto Strasser – were ruthlessly hounded when Hitler came to power – leading not only to the exile of Otto Strasser himself but also the murder of his brother, Gregor Strasser – himself still a member of the Nazi party at the time. Then again, the the chief 'nationalist' hero of today's German 'Naz-Bols' – **Ernst Niekisch** – was himself active in the underground anti-Nazi resistance ('Resistance' being the title of one of his most famous books) and after his arrest in 1937 was sentenced to life-long imprisonment by the Nazi high court for 'literary treason'. As for Fritz Wolffheim, he died in a Nazi concentration camp – as did many others.

All the founding figures of National Bolshevism, together with the soldiers, workers and youth who followed them, had been intelligent 'wanderers in limbo' – unable to go along either with the racist simplifications and pseudo-socialism of the Nazis (together with their brutal imperial suppression of the sovereign rights of other nations) or the Communist Party (which had accepted Lenin's advice to accede to the ruinous Versailles treaty).

What made the fanatical racial and political anti-semitism of Hitler both absurd and quite irrelevant to the valid political and economic meaning of the terms 'National Bolshevism' and 'National Socialism' is that, as Marx himself wrote in his essay 'On the Jewish Question':

“Money is the jealous god of Israel, in face of which no other god may exist. Money degrades all the gods of man – and turns them into commodities. Money is the universal self-established value of all things. It has, therefore, robbed the whole world – both the world of men and nature – of its specific value...The god of the Jews has [therefore] become secularized and become the god of the world.”

“The Jew has emancipated himself in a Jewish manner, not only because he has acquired financial power, but also because, through him and also apart from him, money has become a world power and the practical Jewish spirit has become the practical spirit of the Christian nations. The Jews have emancipated themselves insofar as the Christians have become Jews ... Captain Hamilton, for example, reports:

‘The devout and politically free [Christian] inhabitant of New England makes not the least effort to escape from the serpents which are crushing him. Mammon is his idol which he adores not only with his lips but with the whole force of his body and mind. In his view the world is no more than a Stock Exchange, and he is convinced that he has no other destiny here below than to become richer than his neighbor. Trade has seized upon all his thoughts, and he has no other recreation than to exchange objects. When he travels he carries, so to speak, his goods and his counter

on his back and talks only of interest and profit. If he loses sight of his own business for an instant it is only in order to pry into the business of his competitors.'

Indeed, in North America, the practical domination of Judaism over the Christian world has achieved as its unambiguous and normal expression that the preaching of the Gospel itself and the Christian ministry have become articles of trade, and the bankrupt trader deals in the Gospel just as the Gospel preacher who has become rich goes in for business deals.

Marx then cites Beaumont:

"The man who you see at the head of a respectable congregation began as a trader; his business having failed, he became a minister. The other began as a priest but as soon as he had some money at his disposal he left the pulpit to become a trader. In the eyes of very many people, the religious ministry is a veritable business career."

According to Marx then, the *total economic secularisation* of Judaism throughout supposedly 'Christian' capitalist societies rendered the entire racial dimension of Jewishness together with the surviving ritualism of bearded religious Jews – constantly caricatured in Nazi propaganda images – a wholly irrelevant and marginal phenomenon.

Conversely, Franz Schauwecker wrote of "German-ness" as having nothing to do with bodily appearance or racial 'science' but as a belief in the fulfilment of a particular "soul value".

"This piety of the Germans rests in the German sermons of Eckehart, in the fugues, preludes and chorales of Bach, in the Sonatas of Beethoven, in the deeds of Frederick the Great and the Hohenstaufen dynasty, in the great world-feeling of Goethe and in the German armies ... The realm of the Germans is the realm of God."

Today it is not German Nazism but Zionist Nazism – *Zionazism* – that continues Hitler's tradition of rejecting the very notion of a 'German Jew' – the basis of his antisemitism. It is Zionazism that has turned the Palestinians into its own 'Jews' – elements 'foreign' and dangerous to the 'nation'. This is not surprising. For not only did the Zionist movement *model* itself on German National Socialism of the Hitler variety – it also actively *encouraged* the Nazis to maintain and even step up their persecution of the Jews in Germany – precisely so as to encourage their flight to and occupation of Palestine, leading to the ruthless expulsion of Palestinians from their own land, along barely concealed dreams of and attempts at their genocide.

A New Spiritual and Philosophical Foundation for National Bolshevism

The National People's Party is not anti-semitic or racist, and nor does it draw on socalled 'Folk' history, religions and identity. Instead it is Marxist through-and-through – and yet it adds a *soul–spiritual* dimension to Marxism, taking its cue from Marx's essay 'On The Jewish Question'. For it was in this essay that Marx recognised that the essence of Judaism in his time no longer had anything at all to do with being religiously or 'racially' Jewish at all, but was essentially a hidden secular religion – a 'Monotheism of Money' that now pervaded all capitalist countries and cultures, of whatever religion or ethnicity.

So whilst it was historically true that many Jews were *forced* to practice usury and became bankers through being banned from other trades by their Christian rulers (who themselves were proscribed by their religion from practicing usury) and though many notorious banksters such as the Rothschilds were indeed Jews, many others such as J.P. Morgan were not. The even more fundamental reality is that in principle the modern international capitalist banking system has never been dominated by individuals of any religion or race – but rather has always served to *eradicate or marginalise all ethnic cultures* – including both Islam, Christianity and even orthodox religious Judaism itself. Hence the motto that 'Anti-semitism is the socialism of fools'.

Marx was neither a crude, atheistic 'materialist' nor a 'positivist' or 'objectivist' scientist. This was made clear in his *Theses on Feuerbach* – in which he criticises all previous forms of materialism for not recognising the essentially *subjective* nature of sensuously perceived actuality and human sensuous activity. Yet whilst not being a materialist in the conventional sense, Marx implicitly recognised two forms of 'immaterialism' – one *religious* and the other economic and *monetary*.

What Marx recognised was that money has its roots in the seemingly intangible or immaterial nature of the 'exchange value' of commodities – as opposed to their sensuous or 'material' reality and use-value as objects. When the 'sell to buy' formula of simpler market economies that Marx termed Commodity-MoneyCommodity (C-M-C) was superseded by the 'buy to sell' formula of M-C-M (MoneyCommodity-Money) this was reflected in the rise of religious monotheisms which saw God, like Money as having the power to rule man and to create things as material commodities out of nothing.

At first the 'spirit' of money itself i.e. the mysteriously immaterial nature of the *exchange value* of commodities – was 'materialised' in the form a material commodities themselves – such as of gold and other material currencies. Today it

does not even take the form of paper but instead the truly ghostly or immaterial form of mere 'number money', 'digital money' or 'virtual money' – fictitious money literally created out of nothing by private banks. (See 'Marxism and Money Today').

The spiritual dimension of National Bolshevism can be understood as a form of 'reverse Marxism' – one which recognises the God of Money out of which it *seems* all things are 'created' or 'materialised' as but the perverse economic mirror image of an immaterial awareness or 'spirit' – a *divine-universal awareness* of which all things and all beings are *already* a manifestation and expression.

This philosophy opposes a 'Monism of Awareness' to what Marx called the 'Monotheism of Money'. This monotheism is the essence of all forms of religious monotheism which posit a supreme creator god for whom consciousness or awareness itself is a form of *private property* – a God which 'has' rather than IS awareness.

Rejecting religious monotheisms however, does not imply a return to 'pagan' or heathen 'polytheism' – for the multiplicity of gods worshipped in spiritual and religious traditions of the past have today become just a mirror image of the multiplication of consumer brands and commodities. Indeed such traditions have today become marketed as 'spiritual commodities' in themselves – targeted at 'spiritual consumers' in search of a spiritual identity – and eager to attain it through *identifications* of all sorts, whether ethnic, religious, political or national.

On the other hand, it is no less important to recognise that individuals, groups and communities of all sorts – whether ethnic, vocational, linguistic or religious, together with whole 'peoples', may indeed share common leanings and creative potentials, "fundamental moods" (Heidegger), "value-feelings" (Nietzsche) or "qualities of consciousness" (Wilberg) and that these may either be *affirmed and reflected* or *devalued and marginalised* in the national state and its culture.

Therein lies the danger however – for the commercial and/or political branding and marketing of such shared leanings, qualities and value feelings can easily turn into an instrument of the 'One True God' that actually rules internationally – the universal God of Money which is the "devaluation of all values".

"Money is the universal self-established value of all things. It has, therefore, robbed the whole world – both the world of men and nature – of its specific value."

Marx, *On the Jewish Question*

In the *identity-seeking* and *identity-consuming* world of global capitalist economics and culture, Money is the 'One True God'. The Monotheism of Money that rules today world however, is but a perverse mirror image of a different metaphysical reality – one that can only be reflected in a spiritual philosophy that can be called the 'Monism of Awareness' or 'The Awareness Principle'.

This is the recognition that the *ultimate nature of reality* lies, in principle, in a singular ('monistic') and universal *awareness* – one that is not the *private property* of any being or beings, even 'God' understood as a 'Supreme Being'.

This awareness is no mere immaterial 'product' of any seemingly 'material' thing such as the human body or brain. It is not an awareness that is 'yours' or 'mine', the *private property* of persons or a product of their brains, but an awareness which is *trans-personal, universal* and the very essence of *the divine* – both *embracing and transcending* individual, group and national *identities*. All things and all worlds, all beings and all bodies, all selves and identities are individualised portions, expressions or embodiments of that divine-universal *awareness* which IS the very essence of what we call 'God'.

From this spiritual-philosophical perspective, 'communism' is not 'collectivism' but a state-less communist society in which, in accordance with the words of *The Communist Manifesto* itself: "*the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all*".

This statement of Marx *simply does not tally* with any form of liberal or bourgeois 'individualism' of the sort which promotes identification with the competitive greed of the individual *ego* or 'subject'. Nor however, does it tally with any attempt to achieve spiritual transcendence through surrender of the ego to identification with a *collective* will or 'subject' – whether personified in the state or in the 'super-ego' of a Leader.

Bourgeois egoism and "the free development of each" are not the same – indeed they are the very opposite of one another. For the road to true individual freedom and fulfilment is not through the power of money but through the innate power and potentials of awareness or subjectivity as a such – understood not as any form of 'ego' or 'subject' but as 'spirit' and 'soul'.

The new *soul-spiritual* principle of National Bolshevism is therefore called 'The Awareness Principle'. This principle affirms neither egotistic individualism nor collectivism; it is *neither* worship of an *individual* ego or subject (human or divine) nor its subservience to a *collective* 'subject'. Instead this Principle is the recognition that each individual is an individualised embodiment of

a *universal* subjectivity or awareness – an all-pervading ‘world soul’ or ‘universal soul’.

Yet there are not just three but *four* dimensions of consciousness or ‘subjectivity’ – the individual, the collective, the universal – and the *inter-subjective* or *relational* dimension. And it is above all this fourth dimension – the manner in which individuals receive, affirm, recognise and relate to one another *as* individuals *within* a nation, state or collective of any sort that constitutes the key axis of revolutionary change, i.e. whether they do so competitively and egotistically *or* in a way that recognises all individuals – and all peoples and cultures – as unique expression of a universal awareness or ‘spirit’ each with its own unique ‘soul’.

National Bolshevism is therefore what I call ‘socialism with soul’ – this being the very opposite of the essentially soul-destroying and soul-less character of capitalism, which (as Marx was so strongly aware) turns relations between human beings into relations between things – commodities – thus emptying human relations of all soul-spiritual depth.

‘Spirit’ and ‘soul’ are in turn but outer and inner dimensions of *awareness*. Thus only by learning to invest ever greater *awareness* in our everyday lives, relationships and the world around us can we transform “the accumulation of capital” into an *accumulation of awareness* – and the new insights it gives birth to.

Historically however, the development of property relations and class society went together with the idea that ‘subjectivity’ or consciousness itself was the *private property* of individual subjects and their ‘ego’ or ‘I’. Yet how can it be, since the very experience of a self or subject, mind or body, ego or ‘I’ assumes an *awareness* of that self or subject, mind or body, ego or ‘I’. This awareness therefore, cannot – *in principle* – be reduced to the property or product of any self or subject, being or body *of which it is aware*. This is ‘The Awareness Principle’ in a nutshell – a philosophy which overcomes the centuries old identification of the soul with an individual or collective ‘subject’ or ego – and instead reintroduces the notion of the divine as a *universal* consciousness or awareness of which all souls are a portion and expression.

In Indian and Asian thought, the notion of consciousness or awareness as something absolute and universal – *subjectivity without a supreme subject* – has long been acknowledged. Thus the Indian god *Shiva* came to symbolise this *absolute and universal* awareness or ‘spirit’, just as the god *Krishna* embodied and symbolised the inner self or ‘soul’ of each individual – something far more rich and many-faceted than the individual ego or ‘subject’.

Today even Western ‘post-modern’ philosophy has finally been forced to catch up with capitalist economic reality and transcend the old Cartesian notion that consciousness is the private property of individual ‘subjects’. For in the era of global financialisation of capitalism, it has become clear that “the invisible hand of the market” – and the financial markets in particular – is not the hand of any one individual, group or political state but is that which *subjects* all individuals and nations to its domination.

Politics itself therefore, no longer has a centre in political personages or ‘subjects’ or in the will of sovereign nation states -for these are all *subjected* to the impersonal rule of money and finance capital. Money and Capital alone and *as such* are the sole real or effective ‘subject’ in the era of finance capitalism – its effective ‘God’ and the basis of the ‘Monotheism of Money’.

‘Socialism’ on the other hand, is understood within National Bolshevism as socialism with *spirit and soul*. This in turn requires a new understanding of “scientific socialism” (Engels) as a *science of spirit and soul* – one which recognises a universal awareness as the absolute underlying reality or ‘soul’ of all things and all beings, all individuals and all cultures, all worlds and universes.

This new science is neither materialistic nor idealistic in the Hegelian sense, but is ‘subjectivist’ in the absolute sense – based on a ‘Monism of Awareness’ which recognises ‘spirit’ as the pure or transcendent dimension of an absolute and universal awareness and ‘soul’ as its immanent, inner and individualised dimension.

Eurasianism

The recognition of such a universal or ‘transcendental’ awareness has its historic source in both Indian religious thought and in the ‘phenomenological science’ of the German philosophers Edmund Husserl and Martin Heidegger. Hence its essentially Indo-Germanic, Indo-European or ‘Eurasian’ character.

Hence also my books entitled ‘What is Hinduism?’ and ‘Rudra’s Red Banner’ – in which I argue that the split between religious and Marxist philosophies and political movements in India itself is wholly unnecessary – based on a failure to understand the common and revolutionary essence of *both* in undermining the Monotheism of Money.

Yet there is now new evidence to show that Indian religious traditions themselves share common roots with an advanced *pre-Indo-European* (‘pre-Aryan’) civilisation covering the entire area known as *Eurasia*. This pre-historic civilisation had centres not only in the Indus valley, but

also in Sumeria (whose language was neither Indo-European nor Semitic), the Egyptian Middle Kingdom, Crete and Mycenaea, and, as archaeological discoveries show, in RUSSIA – where in 1987 evidence was found in the Southern Urals (the ARKAIM site) of an advanced proto- or pre-Slavic 'Arctic' civilisation referred to by Plato as Hyperborea, and sharing a similar script and scriptures to Sanskrit and the Vedas.

This pre-historic Eurasian civilisation was seeded and guided long ago in the past by the advanced inner knowledge or *gnosis* of their ruler priests. The rebirth in Russia of a future *Eurasian culture and civilisation* – one that will replace the currently dominant global capitalist or 'Atlanticist' culture of the U.S.A.

– was anticipated by the German theosophist Rudolf Steiner, and is promoted by the International Eurasian Movement. Here the word 'international' means what it should, a cooperative 'inter-nationalism' of sovereign states – not least those of Europe and Eurasia – instead of their subjection to global financial imperialism and the global power of a single American 'superstate'. Thus central to any Eurasian concept is a spiritual and political alliance of Germany and Russia of a sort that formed the *geo-political* basis of National Bolshevik groups in interwar Germany – and did so long before the creation of a 'National Bolshevik Party' and 'Eurasian Movement' in post-Soviet Russia. For the truth remains that:

"America ... has created a 'civilization' that represents an exact contradiction of the ancient European tradition. It has introduced the religion of praxis and productivity; it has put the quest for profit, great industrial production, and mechanical, visible, and quantitative achievements over any other interest. It has generated a soulless greatness of a purely technological and collective nature, lacking any background of transcendence, inner light, and true spirituality. America has [built a society where] man becomes a mere instrument of production and material productivity within a conformist social conglomerate."

Julius Evola

In principle, Eurasia and our space, the heartland Russia, remain the staging area of a new anti-bourgeois, anti-American revolution." ... "The new Eurasian empire will be constructed on the fundamental principle of the common enemy: the rejection of Atlanticism, strategic control of the USA, and the refusal to allow liberal values to dominate us. This common civilizational impulse will be the basis of a political and strategic union.

Aleksandr Dugin

The Basics of Geopolitics (1997)

The National People's Party in the U.K. seeks contact and federation with other National Bolshevik groups and parties in both Europe and Asia – offering them as it does a new *religious-philosophical* foundation as well as a new *politicoeconomic* focus – *both* of which serve the revolutionary purpose of overcoming the global religion and global reality of the day – rule by the 'Monotheism of Money'.

Understood in this way, National Bolshevism is socialism of a sort that unites a new *political and economic* awareness with a new *religious and spiritual* awareness. Only such a socialism can also unite Marxism and Nationalism in the form of 'National Communism', 'National Bolshevism' – together with a 'Eurasianist' *philosophy* that totally transcends Western 'scientific' and 'Enlightenment' thinking. One thing must be clear however: Eurasianism is not Putinism, and Putinism itself is Fascism – not National Bolshevism but authoritarian and corporatist National Capitalism – run by a super-rich cronyist and criminal cabal of State Security traitors to Socialism and Communism.

Peter Wilberg

Author, philosopher, founder of The National People's Party in the U.K.

References: Karl Otto Paetel *Nationalbolschewismus und nationalrevolutionare Bewegungen in Deutschland*

See also 'The Eurasian Roots of Indian Spiritual Traditions – Kashmir Shaivism and Russian-Slavic Mysticism'.

<https://nationalpeoplesparty.wordpress.com/about/>

