

Reorganisation of our Thinking

by Richard Walther Darré, 1940

Translated by Victor Van Brandt

Rarely has a century been so unambiguous about its fundamental task from the very beginning as our century. In 1900, three scholars independently of each other found scientific proof of the fact that properties are inherited according to the life-laws; these were the Germans v. Tschermak and Correns and the Dutchman de Vries. These discoveries were made independently and also uninfluenced by each other. The whole scientific world took part in these discoveries. But only a few scholars already had an inkling of the intellectual upheavals they would trigger; even the boldest minds among them could hardly have imagined the extent of these intellectual upheavals.

The scientific world had not yet recovered from its surprise when it received another piece of news of an equally surprising nature, namely the fact that the discoveries of 1900 were not so new at all, but had already been found before, only they had never been taken seriously before. Already 25 years earlier, another German, the Augustinian prelate Gregor (Johann) Mendel, in quiet scholarly work, had arrived at the same research results as the above-mentioned three scholars, but without meeting with understanding from his contemporaries. Whereas it had hitherto been impossible to agree on which of the three scholars should be accorded the honour of the first discovery of the life-law fact of the inheritance of characteristics, this embarrassment was now removed. It was clear that this honour should go to the Augustinian prelate in Brno in Moravia, Gregor Mendel. It was therefore agreed that in future the process of the inheritance of characteristics should be called "Mendelism" in order to link the fame of the discovery of this fact with the name of Mendel for all time.

But these discoveries would perhaps only have caused a stir in the scientific world of scholars had it not been for a similar event that stirred the spirits of Germany immediately before the turn of the century. An Englishman who had chosen Germany as his adopted country had given a scathing account in German of the intellectual currents of the closing century and had proved the fact of race as the shaping principle of history, if not yet scientifically proven, at least historically. Houston Stewart Chamberlain in his work: "The Foundations of the

19th Century”. His work shook minds to an extent we can hardly imagine, called for a decision, swept away traditional concepts and thus actually prepared the ground for the new ideas of race and blood to germinate and take root. For many years, his work was virtually the bible of all ethnic Germans.

Both events, although born on different intellectual levels and starting from different premises, have, interacting and mutually stimulating, initiated and started a triumphant march of race and blood thought through the intellectual life of our folk to a previously unimaginable extent. While “Mendelism” conquered the scientific world in an unbelievably short time, Chamberlain revolutionised the whole edifice of thought in the educated world with his “Foundations”. Even before the World War of 1914, both events, which began abruptly at the turn of the century, had shaken up our folk and are still in the process of literally turning our worldview and our thinking upside down and reshaping them.

The speed of this intellectual development is perhaps best illustrated by the fact that 35 years later we already had legislation in Germany to eradicate Jewish blood from our folk’s body and to prevent hereditarily inferior offspring. In order to be able to judge the miracle of this intellectual rethinking process at least to some extent, one should bear in mind that today only 40 years have passed since the turn of the century, 20 years of which were actually not conducive to a calm, intellectual development due to the world war and internal political turmoil.

It is good and necessary to remember these facts occasionally. For the extraordinary speed with which the effects of this new knowledge of the inheritance of qualities are spreading within our folk means that it still often catches the individual unprepared and therefore makes him head-shy. Even where one knows or at least begins to suspect that the new knowledge of heredity places one in the midst of the intellectual upheaval of the time, it is difficult to save oneself in the whirl of these intellectual conflicts on a well-thought-out standpoint.

The author of these lines admits that this is how he felt at first; he had not yet met anyone who felt differently. Certainly, it is relatively easy to understand that the Jewish question is no longer a question of religion, but a question of blood. The whole Jewish question is thus abruptly answered, because although one can still discuss how the Jews are to be treated, one no longer needs to argue about whether they can be turned into Germans by some environmental influence, a controversial question that has agitated our folk throughout the 19th century. It is also easy to see, for example, that the whole question of criminals is put into a new light by the new doctrine of heredity; the real criminal is hereditary, and the development of prisons and penitentiaries is in future only proof for a state that

its statesmen are incapable of distinguishing the herb from the weed and also—of weeding the weeds.

Much more exciting than all these mental conclusions, which lead to processes of purification within our folk's body, so to speak, is the realisation that from the talents of our folk, its great men in state and army, in economy and art, in trade and in the civil service, have also inherited *their* talents. What is so shocking about this realisation is the mental conclusion that must be drawn from it. We do not owe our great men to chance or to a special grace of Providence. Rather, our great men are part of the heritage of our folk in the household of its blood.

We do not deny the grace of God in the life of the individual citizen of the earth, which protects and conditions his destiny. Nor do we imagine that we can explain the miracle of genius by looking for it in the inheritance of the qualities of his ancestors alone. We do not deny the fact of a divine power superior to us human beings. But we must nevertheless state that no genius of our folk has yet been found who has not expressed his genius in qualities and dispositions which can also be found in his ancestors. In other words: We do not deny that genius owes its existence to special divine grace, but we maintain that a genius is always able to work out only within the framework of those qualities which his ancestors have inherited.

This realisation is both exciting and exhilarating. For it makes us aware that we ourselves, but also our folk, go back to the fact of qualities that we owe to the blood of our ancestors. Thus, all things around us, our public life as well as our own, receive a completely new illumination and evaluation. For the achievements of our German folk in the present day cannot then be separated from its achievements in its history. This means that the whole idea of the nineteenth century of the eternal progress of mankind is correct in all things that we humans are capable of inventing and shaping, but that this idea of progress does not apply to our blood, but that it determines the talent budget of our folk as a fixed quantity. If we still achieve something as a folk today, we owe it to blood streams that have already been active throughout German history. And in the future we will only be able to achieve and shape as much as we will still have this German blood at our disposal through our children and grandchildren. The decisive realisation:

Folk community is blood community.

This raises the crucial question: What are we actually doing in order to preserve and increase this irreplaceably precious folk treasure, which is bound to this German or its kindred blood, our folkish vitality?

For this is clear: if all qualities are so much conditioned by the ancestors, then we can ponder about the divine grace to which our ancestors once owed these qualities in ancient times. But we cannot well doubt that it is not in our hands to preserve and increase hereditarily valuable qualities other than by the process of procreation and birth according to the life-laws. Above all, however, it can no longer be doubted or disputed that any, but also any artificial generation of human hereditary characteristics which could supplement the endowment of our blood belongs to the fabulous realm of fools who are alienated from reality. What we are and what we can still become as a folk is determined by our blood.

Such considerations and insights are only the mental consequence of given scientific facts which the turn of the century allowed us to find; they seem simple and almost self-evident, but they are nevertheless of stirring force when one thinks them through and realises the consequences. Just think about it: the valuable and essential heritage of our folk, its blood, is a national treasure that is unique and cannot be recreated. What is not preserved through procreation and birth is irrevocably gone: it is as if one thoughtlessly throws a precious treasure or the preciousness of jewels into the ocean, where it is deepest. No power in the world can bring these jewels back to the light of day: they are gone forever and irrevocably. Exactly the same is the case with the hereditary traits of our folk when they die off without descendants. A man or a woman who would throw their treasures or jewels into the sea without sense or reason, so that they would be gone for ever, might rightly be called insane or stupid: of this there would be no doubt! And whoever would do the same with the imperial jewels or other treasures of a unique kind of our folkish wealth would, if the madhouse did not take pity on him, be sure of an embarrassing trial for behaviour harmful to the folk.

But how do we deal with the much, much more precious heritage of our ancestors? But what do we do with this unique and singular preciousness which our ancestors have entrusted to our faithful hands in our hereditary properties, in our blood? Everybody asks himself; everybody looks around in his own environment; the answer will generally be shameful enough.

Human beings cannot be produced in retorts. God has spread a veil over the mystery of the origin of life, which human hands will never remove, even if man explores the processes of life himself in every detail. This denial of the ultimate knowledge of the origin of life itself is a fundamental law of human life as such and part of the order of existence as God has placed it in this world.

There are many people today who do not want to think through to the end such questions about the value and loss of hereditary genetic material. They say: We

are inventing so much, things are progressing so wonderfully in all fields, why shouldn't a genius succeed in inventing "hereditary materials" in the chemical laboratory, just as they have invented aeroplanes and railways, telephones and radios! Those who ask such questions forget that we can invent an infinite number of things concerning the material goods of this world, but we are not allowed to discover the secret of life. Our language, by the way, also tells us that we only "discover" or "invent" what was somehow already there before, because one time we "uncover it" and the other time we "find it"; it is therefore already there, only not yet known to us and not first created by us. Our great natural scientists, our physicists and chemists know this very well. Here we have limits that we humans are not able to transcend.

That is a fact we just have to come to terms with, no matter how enthusiastic we may be about all inventions and how intoxicated we may be by the technical progress of the time. In questions of blood, as far as we understand human hereditary characteristics, all frenzy of progress stops. In matters of blood, only the given, the hereditary property of our ancestors, which God has entrusted to our faithful hands, is valid.

The only and true wealth of our folk is its good blood. We can lose the material goods of this world as a folk and as individuals; that is not so bad as long as the old German blood is still present, because it can recreate them at any time.

That was the fundamental miscalculation of the scornful victors of Versailles; they allowed their folks, above all the Jews, to plunder us and thus believed that they had struck us to the core. But they forgot our blood and overlooked the fact that this blood knew how to recreate what their feelings of envy and inferiority had robbed us of. More dangerous and truly characteristic of the nature of things was Clemenceau's harsh word: "There are 20 million too many Germans in the world!" Only when the life-source of valuable blood begins to dry up in our folk does our nation really become devalued and in truth become poor and inferior. What the peace treaties of Münster in 1648 and Versailles did not achieve, namely the elimination of our folk from the history of Europe, an indifference on our part towards our blood values could certainly achieve.

Again and again, one encounters people who would like to avoid this final rethinking of our folkish conditions of existence and blood-value realities. Out of an often-unconscious mental comfort, one would like to persist in cherished ideas: Everything went well until 1940, why should it not continue to go well in the future? What is the point of all this unpleasantness, these references to folkishly responsible thoughts about the future! One simply does not want to look responsibly into the future, one wants to become intoxicated with contemporary

progress and successes and believes that one can disregard the life-laws of one's blood with a wave of the hand.

Today we have the concept of the folk's good. We have the concept of the folk's pest. We have fast-working special courts to strike at the folk's pest who attacks the folk's property. But these measures only serve the material values of our national property or its mental health, but they do not yet serve its precious blood. Certainly, since the "Nuremberg Laws" we have taken a step forward in the field of blood, in that we are now trying to keep away from our folk the blood that is most dangerous to our blood, the blood of the Jewish folk. This is undoubtedly a huge step forward in this new territory of blood issues and an extraordinary revolutionary act in our time. But the Nuremberg laws are only a preventive measure and not yet a constructive measure in the sense of increasing the good blood of the German kind.

We ask not to be misunderstood: It is always the case that the best soil allows even the horniest weeds to proliferate if the farmer does not take precautionary measures to weed them out or otherwise destroy them. The harvest yield of a field presupposes the destruction and keeping away of the weeds just as much as it is conditioned by the careful care of the field and its fruits. In this peasant sense, our Jewish laws are a prerequisite for making the field of German blood ready for sowing by freeing us from the weeds of Jewish blood. But we still have the task of cultivating and caring for our blood in order to cultivate the field of the German way of life and thus bring forth fruit and harvest for our folk.

In these matters of nurturing and caring for the German blood, we are still at the beginning. It was already mentioned at the beginning that this is essentially connected with the extraordinary speed of development of all the questions that play a role in this new field. Since the turn of the century, the new insights have been rushing along as if in giant strides. We must first understand and learn to come to terms with the fact that a complete reassessment of all values has begun with the discovery of the inheritance of qualities, in short, with the idea of blood, before we can come to a clear affirmation of these questions. We only slowly realise, like someone who, still drowsy between sleep and the beginning of awakening, begins to find himself again and only slowly understands and grasps his surroundings, that we have entered a new world of knowledge and thus also a world full of new standards. It is a new world of thoughts that almost confuses and dazes us. And yet we recognise with a sense of foreboding and knowing that it is the world of our new reality, to which we must take a stand inwardly and outwardly and which fate has somehow assigned us to master. Out of the dance

of death of the ideas of a vanishing world of thought rises anew the worldview of the value and eternity of blood and its holiness for our folk.

Blood is our folk's only wealth.

That is a terrible sentence, but also a fruitful one at the same time. This realisation strikes us like a thunderbolt. What are laws, what is the economy, what do inventions mean if they are not preserved in generations or cannot be further developed by the blood that once created them! Nothing is eternal in this world that is formed from the stuff of this world. But the blood of a folk can be preserved eternally if the folk profess the life-laws of their blood and want to serve them, i.e. consecrate their lives. We are the only folk in Europe to have had a tangible and continuous history spanning a thousand years since the time of the migration of folks. Which legal institution, which form of government, which type of economy could boast of having been decisive in this thousand-year process of the life of our folk! What still gives us existence and life today as a folk and as a Reich is eternally the same blood that built up the state of the Middle Ages just as it is now preparing to build up Adolf Hitler's Third Reich and lead it towards a new millennium. The institutions of our folkish life are nothing, the blood of our folk is everything.

We could lose everything in the Peace of Münster in 1648 and in the Peace of Versailles in 1919, we could be humiliated as a folk, we could be plundered, in short, we could become a laughing stock to the folks of the world. We could fall so low that the German would be ashamed of himself. None of this was decisive. For we were able to rise again because we still had a core of good blood at our disposal, which was sufficient to initiate and enforce our folk's resurgence. But: Germany's future now also depends on this core of good blood.

And this realisation of the unconditionality of this single value of our folkish treasure touches the heart and for a moment makes one hold one's breath: The moment of realisation of the unalterable fate of this fact shakes every thinking member of the folk.

But what about us? Are we aware of our present condition and all the consequences? The answer is quickly given; undoubtedly: no! Certainly, individuals are already aware of the facts and are striving for ways and means to master the tasks given to us with regard to the future of our folk. But these individuals within our folk are like the peaks of the mountains at the rising of the dawn: they are the first to sense the sun and the first to be illuminated by the sun, but the night only slowly recedes from the valleys.

If we were to draw up a budget for our blood-value heritage today, we would be shocked. We would not be frightened because this budget would no longer open up any prospects of being able to keep our folk alive in the future. Oh no! On the contrary! We still have generations and blood values that hardly any other folk can even present to us. But we must be appalled at the thoughtlessness and the bottomless carelessness with which wide circles of our folk still allow the precious heritage of our folk, the precious blood of our ancestors, to dissipate without preserving this valuable national heritage in descendants. We preach in all things of our folkish existence that the common good must take precedence over self-interest. But we are only very slowly beginning to realise the application of this principle to the really only valuable asset of our folk, its blood, and are hardly getting beyond the discussion of this question.

In matters of blood, unfortunately, it is still the case, and in part even legally valid, that self-interest can take precedence over the common good. Adolf Hitler's National Socialist idea is only slowly gaining acceptance here. Where we have at least managed to do some weeding (e.g., the Law for the Prevention of Hereditary Diseases, Nuremberg Laws, etc.), the German folk in their broad masses still approach such questions very timidly. In any case, legislation is still lacking which would direct the cultivation and increase of the valuable bloodlines of our folk according to the principle that the common good must take precedence over self-interest. The transformation of our current law according to this point of view would be a revolutionary step of the first order.

We Germans cannot avoid the affirmation of the question of blood and the mastery of the task of preserving the precious blood. But we will first have to come to the intellectual realisation of the importance of blood before we can one day muster the strength to bring this realisation to life in our folk through appropriate measures in the field of legislation. Only when we make blood the prerequisite, the basis and the axis of all our considerations, can the turning point occur in our folk and the time of the negation of the idea of blood be turned into a time of the affirmation of the idea of blood. Only then will the reorganisation of our thinking have begun, and our worldview will have been reoriented *from* the life-law of the blood *towards* the life-law of the blood. Then we will understand that this century will be a century of blood thought, i.e. that it will be a century of rediscovering the life-laws of our folkdom.

If we are asked how this reorganisation of our thinking should begin, we answer: We will not do justice to this new task of our worldview thinking by intellectually stimulating discussions about the pros and cons. We must begin with the reorganisation of our thinking within ourselves. For only when we attain

complete clarity within ourselves can this inner clarity about our will be translated into appropriate action. Only then will all discussions about the measures to be taken fall on fertile ground. We must free ourselves in our world of imagination from all the dross of a traditional education and schooling which allows us to think past the idea of blood. In the sphere of our public life, in the field of legislation, in the field of economy, art, science, etc., our conceptions must receive their value from the blood, i.e. exclusively from the German folk. But whoever denies the idea of blood is in future an enemy of the German folk.

We must place the German folk in the foreground of all our considerations. For this German human being is, after all, the bearer of German blood. Seemingly a simple demand. To many, this demand may already seem self-evident. And yet it is a demand which initiates and conditions the greatest intellectual upheaval in all areas of our public life, especially in constitutional law, public and private law, economic law, social legislation, in short, in almost all areas of our national life, and which has already begun to be realised in some areas since 1933. The effects of this intellectual upheaval, however, are so extensive that we can sense them, but cannot imagine them in their full extent. In particular, we do not believe that this reorganisation of our thinking from the blood idea will soon find expression in corresponding measures. The revolution of all traditional intellectual foundations from the blood idea is far too enormous for that. Our century will perhaps only suffice to work out the intellectual foundations on which our children and grandchildren will be able to build and justify their state measures for the preservation and increase of our precious blood.

But what we today can already begin to work out these intellectual foundations is already twofold:

First:

We will develop a new relationship with our ancestors. For what we bring with us into this world in terms of dispositions, what we are able to prove in the struggle for life, we owe to our ancestors who have passed them on to us. Certainly, it is what we acquire ourselves by means of knowledge and will in the confrontation with the environment around us that finally makes us a personality. The extent of our consciousness, i.e. our capacity for cognition and our will, determines our destiny. But the hereditary dispositions that influence our cognitive ability and whose framework even the hardest will cannot break in order to become a personality in this world are nevertheless the prerequisites of our existence and are born with us: we owe our hereditary dispositions to our ancestors.

One can also express this insight in the sentence:

Remember that you owe the preconditions of your existence to your ancestors!

Certainly, we can squander the heritage of our ancestors irresponsibly or use it responsibly in the struggle for life; we can desecrate it or honour it! In this respect we are undoubtedly masters of our will! In this we have been given the confidence by God to be the master of our destiny and to be able to let our will prevail. In this, God has clearly raised us far above the animal. The will is the divine spark in us to develop powers and to have a formative effect in our environment. But this will is bound twice: on the one hand to God's set order in this world and on the other hand to the hereditary abilities of the acting personalities. We cannot get out of the framework that the hereditary dispositions of our ancestors have set for us. And this should never be forgotten if we are not to be denied success on our path through life! One should neither overestimate nor underestimate both the will and the hereditary dispositions; only the interaction of the two elevates the human being to a personality.

But we can only honour our ancestors if we keep them alive in our consciousness and in the consciousness of our descendants. If we do not know who and what our ancestors were, we cannot visualise them and therefore cannot honour their memory.

It has become customary today to quote the final stanza of the old morality poem from the "Edda" (67-69):

*Cattle die,
Kinsmen die,
And you yourself will die;
One thing I know
That never dies:
The fame of a dead man's deeds.*

Here one always wants to ask: with respect, when, and by whom?

For if the heroes forgot to beget offspring, no one would be able to bear witness to the glory of their deeds. The Germanic folks at the time of the Edda knew this very well. And that is why the moral poem begins, significantly, with the following stanza:

A son is better,

Though born late

After the householder's entrance:

There is not a memorial stone

On the roadside

Unless a kinsman sets it.

One should no longer mention the final stanza of the old morality poem from the Edda without also mentioning its premise, namely the opening stanza.

It is only since 1933 that many people have become aware of who they actually descended from, due to the obligation to provide proof of ancestry under the Reich's law; many people have thus gained a completely new relationship to the past, but also to the present. Today, many people look back on their ancestors with pride and feel that they are once again a link in a chain. People are happy to honour the memory of our ancestors again. But what is still lacking in many cases is the possibility to honour the places where our ancestors are buried.

Many burial sites can no longer be found today, many are difficult to reach, many have been levelled in the course of sober considerations of expediency. That is unfortunately a fact. But we have to come to terms with this fact, because it is a given.

But if you want to honour your ancestors, you will be able to honour them in other ways than just by taking care of the burial places. You can always dedicate a corner in your home to the memory of your ancestors. One can keep the ancestral tablet at this place, also one can keep or hang up the pictures of the ancestors here. In quiet hours, one can then converse with one's ancestors in such places and give account to them. Whoever, in the course of time, allows this to become an established custom and spends his hours of celebration in this quiet corner of his home, will soon notice what a deep and lasting spiritual source of strength arises from such an account before his ancestors.

Basically, such an inner dialogue with our ancestors is nothing new to us Germans: it was actually always natural for our ancestors to proceed in this way. Our language has also preserved for us the fact of how our ancestors thought of this dialogue with the ancestors. The German language attributes everything that we know from within ourselves, without being able to attribute it to external circumstances, to the voice within us.

Our ancestors believed that this inner voice goes back to our ancestors, who speak out in us in this way. When our "ancestors" speak up in us, we "suspect"

something and call it a “hunch”. Whether we of today want to or are able to recognise such connections is irrelevant compared to the fact that our ancestors understood and comprehended the connections in this way, and our language has preserved these connections for us very clearly.

It would be especially nice if the custom of burying the farmer and the farmer’s wife on their own land were to become established on our hereditary farms. What a source of spiritual strength it must be for the grandchildren when they can approach the graves with reverence and remember those to whom they owe their existence and who worked and farmed the fields before them. Only then would the idea of blood and soil experience its true consecration, when the farmer’s plough once again breaks the soil in the area of his ancestors’ graves, when the farmer performs the work on his farm in memory of his ancestors and fulfils his life in the awareness that he himself will once again become the ancestor of his soil.

What a happy thought to know that one is buried in one’s own land, to which one dedicated one’s life’s work, revered by one’s descendants, but also giving blessings to one’s grandchildren in their work, which has also been the work of one’s own life.

Second:

We will have to ensure that we produce descendants who are worthy of us or who surpass us. The sentence: *Remember that you have ancestors!* also entails the further sentence: *Remember that you shall become an ancestor!*

Here we stand at one of the most decisive worldview and intellectual turning points of this century. Either we take seriously the realisation of the importance of blood and draw from this, in a cool and objective manner, the conclusions with regard to the descendants of the German folk and, if necessary, do not shy away from completely new ways and means, or we no longer manage to do this, then the end of the history of the German folk has come. Whoever, in this century of hereditary doctrine, is not able to think through to the end such mental conclusions, either does not want to think in terms of the life-laws or, out of mental cowardice, shrinks from mental conclusions which are inconvenient to him; perhaps he shrinks from such thoughts only because they are novel and not conventional. This is also an iron basic law of our folk: There is no German history without sufficient German blood!

If the idea of blood is to become the axis of our worldview, the child must once again become the meaning and purpose of our existence: It is the children of our blood that matter! For if the blood of our folk is the only real wealth, its children

are also the only guarantors of its living eternity. And with this statement we are already in the midst of the intellectual upheaval of our time, an upheaval that can perhaps be called the most revolutionary imaginable.

We have become accustomed to speaking of the coming into being and passing away of folks, as of something unchangeable. Especially since Spengler's "Decline of the West", a scientific school has been built on this line of thought, which allows folks and individuals to come into being, to mature and to perish again. The history of the German Reich alone should prove the inadequacy of this school of thought. For if we find ourselves in the midst of a world war again today, it is not because we are already visibly growing old, but because the world envies the vitality of our folk. But our folk is the oldest historical folk in Europe, if one takes the introduction of Christianity among the Germanic folks as a time standard. And the folks fighting us are all historically more recent. Spengler's theory and the folkish preconditions of this world war contradict each other.

However, the proof against the view that folks are mortal like individuals is China. This folk has lived for millennia and will probably live for millennia to come. But it is precisely with this folk that the cause and effect of this phenomenon are quite obvious. By making the procreation of a large number of descendants for the purpose of securing ancestor veneration the basis and prerequisite of a Chinese worldview, Confucius ensured the living eternity of his folk through a large number of children. Therein lies the whole secret of the overflowing vitality of the Chinese folk, which multiplies independently of state forms or state shocks and thus easily compensates for all strokes of fate, devastation and losses. The Chinese folk and their moral teachings refute Oswald Spengler.

Ancestor veneration in Shintoism has had the same effect in Japan. The Japanese folk, too, have remained alive and energetic for thousands of years as a result of their ancestor veneration. The Japanese have families whose recorded family history spans much longer periods of time than we have German historical sources with the entry of the Cimbri and Teutons into history. Imagine, for example, that the descendants of Hermann the Cheruscan were still sitting on their ancestral estate, where the Cheruscan prince had already been born, and taking care of the diaries of their great ancestor. Judging by such an example, one gets an idea of the moral strength of this Japanese cultivation of the family tradition and its veneration of ancestors.

If we as the German folk really want to enter into a new, millennial history, then we must quite decisively re-learn the questions of the preservation of the folk—and these are questions about our descendants. Like the Chinese and the Japanese,

we must once again include procreation and the result of procreation, the child, firmly in our worldview and orient the whole question of the German child towards the living eternity of our folk.

Today we suffer from the fact that in all questions of the child we value too much the outward appearances which are connected with the procreation of the child, but do not make the result of the procreation, namely the child, exclusively the standard of value of all our considerations in this question. One will not be able to deny that even today, according to the general opinion, it is more important to many people to determine under what circumstances a child was born than to ask, for example, about the hereditary value of a child. The question “born in wedlock” or “born out of wedlock”, for example, still plays a major role, in many cases even the decisive role. Only a few people first ask the question about the hereditary value of a child before they subject the circumstances of its birth to an assessment. And even though the folk community may not and cannot be indifferent to questions of morality and propriety in these matters, the only decisive factor for the folk community is the blood value of the child born, since as an adult it will one day become a member of the folk community.

This is only stated here as a fact and a given state of our ideas about questions of the German child. This is in no way intended to blur the concept of marriage or to give the word to illegitimacy. The word “marriage” originally received its essence from the word “eternity”. Marriage served our ancestors as a concept and as an institution to continue a lineage in eternal sexual succession, i.e. to keep it alive into eternity. The purpose of the old German marriage was the child. The old land laws still state this unequivocally.

It was not until the Civil Code, introduced in 1900, with its rational principles of a law alien to the kind, that the child was set aside as the meaning and purpose of marriage in favour of the self-referentiality of the two spouses. Liberalism as a worldview has re-evaluated everything here as well and has let self-interest take precedence over the common good. In the question of marriage, too, it will be important to make the word “common good comes before self-interest” the guiding principle.

In this context, it should be pointed out that today’s novel literature, which makes the self-reference in the relations of the sexes to each other the basis of its considerations, has as its prerequisite the worldview revaluation of all feelings, as it was brought about by the liberal age. There is a fundamental difference in the way of looking at things whether one sees in marriage a task to which two people submit in order to procreate their blood, or whether one sees in marriage an institution which is to serve the ego-related satisfaction of desire of two people,

no matter whether in a spiritual or in a physical relationship. The way was only opened for the flood of modern fiction when the feelings of the lovers towards each other became the main thing, but the result of their love, the child, became a subordinate or even unimportant question.

There is no doubt that this liberal development of our emotional life has also had its good side; it probably even had to be in order to dissolve rigid forms of our social life within our folk community and thus to clear the way for ideas of the life-law within our folk community. But there is no doubt that the overvaluing of the “I”-relatedness in all questions of love has in many cases turned marriage into what we unfortunately often encounter today. Today’s marriages often give the impression that the God-given sexual instinct of the sexes has, so to speak, only been allowed to operate within a socially possible framework because no other way out was known. Anyone who professes to be of blood can only describe such an external marriage, based on ego-related ideas, as immoral, unless it is forced for health reasons. Such marriages are shameful for our folk.

If such externalities, which are like a numb nut, are legally recognised in public life—and that is what we are doing today—then we should not be surprised if the issues of divorce and the aversion to marriage begin to run rampant. The meaning of marriage has been lost and the principles of law have followed. For here it is more a question of the worldview prerequisites of our current law than of the current legal provisions. If one tolerates that pure ego-reference brings two people together in a marriage, and both people no longer understand marriage as a task to their blood, then it is also impossible to see why such people should not part again when they have satisfied their longing and have nothing new to give each other in this relationship. Thought through to the last detail, one can then no longer condemn it if the coming together of man and woman is sought in ways that are not even burdened with the awkwardness of marriage and divorce.

Whoever wants to improve and heal here must go to the root of the evil and must not be content with having clamoured over the manifestations of the evil. We must also overcome liberalism in the relations between the sexes and subject marriage to National Socialist principles, i.e. we must restore marriage as an institution that is called upon to secure the living eternity of our folk and no longer serves selfish interests. Then the value of marriage in the eyes of our folk will rise again, and many unpleasant phenomena of today will disappear by themselves. So if today’s marriage often no longer corresponds to its old German meaning and purpose, then it is not marriage as such that is to blame. We ourselves are to blame for the fact that marriage has begun to lose its meaning and has been degraded to an externality. This disastrous development was initiated by

liberalism as a worldview, and the law in force has justified this development. Our task now is to restore marriage to its old, German meaning and purpose, i.e. to place it again at the service of the succession of the generations. The child must again be made the meaning and purpose of marriage and thus marriage must be restored to its old place in German national life.

Our folk are thoroughly imbued with the feeling that things are not in order in this regard:

Our folk are looking for the child again!

Our folk are guided in this by a very secure feeling for life. Our folk feel that both their ancient culture and their present achievements are based exclusively on qualities which they owe to their own blood or to blood values which are similar or at least related to their own kind. And our nation feels that it can only maintain its high culture and maintain its position in the centre of Europe if it preserves this creative blood. But this blood is only transformed in the existence of our folk through the quantity and goodness of the children born of its blood. One could also express it with an economic term, that such blood-value predispositions of our folk, which do not come to fruition in children, can be regarded as investments that do not bear interest.

Our folk want to become a child-rich folk again, because they feel quite certain that the only real and imperishable wealth they can leave to our descendants is a multitude of high-quality and healthy children and grandchildren, who will then keep our heritage alive by virtue of their dispositions.

Many different ways are being discussed and recommended today to make Germany a child's country again. A large number of people shy away from the confusing newness of the task and believe that salvation can be found in a spasmodic adherence to outward appearances in marriage evaluations. People gaze at the "good old days" and believe that they have found the panacea in an exaggerated evaluation of the outward appearances of a marriage, in order to be able to return to a lucid state of happy families with many children. These circles overlook the fact that they sanctify the nutshell and forget that the nut is the essential thing if a nut tree is to grow; what use is the nutshell if the nut is hollow? These circles also forget that the "good old days" could not have been so good if they have left us a legacy of a state in which we first have to search laboriously for ways and means to make the rich blessing of children in a marriage the prerequisite of our national consciousness. Clinging to the externals of the forms of marriage will not bring us back a morality that will make German marriages child-rich again. It is not the outward appearance of marriage that matters, but the

value of marriage for our folk in terms of the life-law. We must give marriage back its old meaning and restore it to its old purpose. From this point of view, marriage can be renewed as an institution responsible to the folk; no other standard can be used to evaluate marriage. The supreme law must be restored:

The meaning and purpose of marriage is the child!

Another way, which is also often discussed today, leads to the child in the result, but does not satisfy in its preconditions. We mean those views which no longer want to condemn an illegitimate mother, if one believes that from the point of view of the folk one can affirm the child born in this way. This is undoubtedly a great step forward compared to the question of the illegitimate child, but it is not yet a clear position on the question of the illegitimate child's mother. This view can easily have more of an injurious effect on the illegitimate mother than an uplifting effect on her soul, because one gets stuck—perhaps unconsciously—in the condemnation of the illegitimate mother's deed and, as it were, only accepts the illegitimate child's mother out of a sense of folkish responsibility towards the child. Such an attitude is certainly more responsible for the folk and, seen from the point of view of blood, also more justified than that of those people who judge the illegitimate child only from the point of view of a purely external marriage and therefore condemn it wholesale. But this attitude remains only a half-measure, because although it has come to recognise the child, it does not take a clear position towards the mother. And this thoughtless half-measure in the conception of the illegitimate child is felt very clearly: rejoicingly by those illegitimate child mothers who only thoughtless carelessness allowed to give life to a child, bitterly by those German girls of good character who, fully aware of the consequences of their step, give life to one or even several children because fate itself denied them the possibility of fulfilling the meaning of their womanhood in marriage and of passing on the inherited blood in children.

A third way to make Germany a children's country is also being discussed a lot today. It seems to be very simple, but it could easily become a disastrous path. What is meant is the following: It is said, for instance, that the sexual instinct as such is a fact which to deny is to be unworldly; it is now asserted that sooner or later every healthy girl will somehow find her way to a man. One reckons with this fact and places oneself, so to speak, on this ground of the given facts. One takes the circumstances as they are, so to speak. And now the situation is correctly described to the effect that everyone in society knows what is going on and accepts it, but that the whole thing is condemned at the moment when the God-given product of such a coming together of man and woman becomes visible in a child. Here one wants to intervene, but not in such a way that one fights the

relations of the sexes, which are to be accepted as a fact, but by working towards making this process, which is perhaps to be regretted but not to be denied, useful, so to speak, for the whole of the folk by means of births taking place. The most important thing about this view of things is undoubtedly the courage to make a clear decision, which this statement presupposes. For it is beyond all doubt that the present attitude of society, which tacitly tolerates sexual relations between the sexes but condemns the illegitimate child, is repugnant hypocrisy. It is therefore necessary to demand a clear either-or here: either the preconditions cease, or the children of these preconditions are recognised. But it seems to us that this is not yet the decisive point in the whole question.

It is a life-law par excellence that the more highly developed a kind is, the more the young require if they are to grow up and flourish. Applied to the high-quality blood of our folk, this means: it is not at all primarily a matter of discovering, as it were, the free intercourse of the sexes, and of standing on the ground of this fact, demanding only the birth of children in return. Rather, the protection of mother and child until the child matures is the decisive task, the preconditions of which must be clarified if one believes that one can take the above standpoint at all.

A German child is not only born and somehow raised to become a German. A German child wants and needs the spiritual care of its parents, if possible, but at least of its mother, in order to mature spiritually into a fully-fledged German.

The whole thing stands and falls with the will of the folk community to recognise the illegitimate child mother and her child or not. If the folk community does not find a justified and moral relationship to the illegitimate child mother, then all affirmations of the preconditions are of no use, because then these preconditions are immoral in the imagination of the folk community.

National socialism is the nurturing of the blood and thus the care of the child; liberalism is always the self-referential relationship of the sexes to each other. We can only be National Socialists or we are not National Socialists. If we admit to this principle, then there is only one way out of the conflict of opinions. We must reorganise our thinking and find a new relationship to the child. We must take the standpoint that our commitment to the idea of blood implies a commitment to the child, if all talk of the idea of blood is not to remain mere lip service. But—and this thought is decisive—we do not profess the child as such, but rather, in accordance with the insights of this century and in awareness of the irreplaceability of our precious blood,

the child who is responsible for our ancestors.

The child born within our folk community should be able to answer to the ancestors. This is the moral demand of our time. If the child can be answered for by both parents before the ancestors, the child and its mother are sacred to us. Under which external circumstances the birth of such a child came about is then a question of second order.

Marriages which are deliberately kept childless, unless health circumstances force this, or marriages which give life to children who cannot be called ancestor-responsible children, are then judged no differently than the production of a child of inferior or even foreign blood, which has taken place out of irresponsibility.

We believe that the concept of the “ancestor-responsible child” can provide a standard for finding a clear standpoint in today’s confusion of opinions on the question of the illegitimate child and for creating new foundations which can serve to build up a German morality which is appropriate to the kind and responsible for the kind.

Ancestor-responsible child means the fundamental recognition of the breeding idea. For if one wants to answer for a child before the ancestors, it must also be born under conditions that can make it stand before the ancestors.

Breeding is applied knowledge of heredity.

Since we have learned in this century that human characteristics are hereditary, it is a consequence of common sense to subject ourselves to the laws of breeding. While a quarter of a century ago, and even into our own time, it may have smacked of devaluation to try to apply the idea of breeding to human beings, today the new knowledge of heredity and with it our knowledge of the sanctity of our blood force us to elevate breeding to the basis of state reason. Breeding as applied knowledge of heredity must become the ultimate goal of striving humanity: This is the task of our time.

When Nietzsche forebodingly demanded: “You should not plant yourself away, but upwards”, his visionary hope now becomes for us a knowing and thus obligatory attitude towards our folk and our blood. One can almost predict that the 20th century will not be the century of technology. Rather, the idea of blood and the knowledge of heredity will become the mainstay of our century and will ultimately shape its face. This century will find its expression in the demand for ancestor-responsible breeding and its affirmation within our folk.

It is ordained by Providence that the seed of the man in the womb of the woman becomes the germ from which the fruit develops and a new human being finally comes into being. This law for the preservation of the kind is carried out in the eternal cycle of existence.

The woman is like the field that needs the sower in order to grow grain. And as the field determines the goodness of the fruit, so the woman determines the value of the child. Certainly, even a good field fails if it is badly tended or receives bad seed; but it is also certain that the best seed is of no use if the field is useless. Another parable can also be chosen: Just as a good or bad mirror can reflect the image well or badly, so the blood of the mother determines the nature of the child. The blood of the mother determines how the father finds himself in his son. Where the mother's blood is good, the father will find his essence again or even surpass it; where the mother's blood was inferior, sick or rotten, the son will not reach the father or even bring him shame.

But because all this is so, the woman of good nature, the healthy girl of precious blood, must again become for us what she already was for our ancestors: holy! The word "holy" says that it should bring us "salvation": just as "mighty" brings us "power" and "wrathful" brings us "anger". The well-disposed, healthy girl of our blood is to bring us "salvation" again. In her we want to venerate the most beautiful, because most promising expression of our own kind. Whoever irresponsibly attacks her is a pest of the folk: this must also be elevated to the new law of a new age.

These are all completely new points of view that require a reorganisation of our thinking on the widest scale. For example, if we think it through to the end, the healthy beauty of the female of our blood, which is appropriate to our kind, is no longer just a question of artistic taste or ego-related enjoyment of art, but becomes an expression of our most sacred goods anchored in our blood. Beauty as an expression of the kind is thus both a task and an obligation. The education of the folk to recognise the beauty of the breed and its recognition in itself thus becomes a noble task of the state, which is all the more comprehensive the more clearly the state acknowledges the blood of its folk.

We do not want to be misunderstood: We do not deny the soul when we affirm the beauty of our breed as a question of blood that is obligatory for the folk. We only believe that the soul is just as subject to the condition of the kind as the body. For how else could it be explained that there are cowards and heroes, unpatriotic fellows, and dutiful defenders of the folk! Only from the harmony of body and soul does consciousness arise as the beginning and basis of human understanding and formative reason. Only out of consciousness does man shape the world around him into that order which his inner voice commands him and which is therefore undoubtedly of spiritual origin.

We therefore do not deny the soul when we affirm the body. We only assign to both, to the body as well as to the soul, the corresponding share in the coming

into being of the perfect man of his kind. A noble soul may illuminate and transfigure an ignoble body, a noble body without a noble soul may seem embarrassing: the former may delight, the latter offend. Such observations may play a major role in the evaluation of individual human fates, indeed they may often be of decisive importance in the evaluation of a person. Nevertheless, this does not relieve us of the task of considering and evaluating body and soul in questions of kind, i.e. in questions of blood. And thus, with all affirmation of the soul, the perfection of the body, if it is an expression of beauty appropriate to the kind, becomes the obligatory basic idea of an ancestor-responsible breeding task on our blood.

We have already said above that it is so ordained by Providence: Man procreates only through woman. The woman is therefore decisive for the hereditary level of perfection of the children born from her. Just as the track switch determines the direction of the rails on which the train can travel, the blood of the woman determines the hereditary value and thus the developmental possibilities of her children. The woman is the preserver, multiplier and protector of our blood, just as she is able to determine the developmental direction of a gender to its detriment through her blood, or at least to restrict the developmental possibilities of a gender.

It is a fundamental life-law that a man should prove himself by performance which corresponds to his innate nature, in order to be able to stand before his nature. The law of man's nature in the struggle for life is called achievement: and not achievement per se, but achievement for his blood and for his folk. It is always ridiculous for a man to refer to his ancestors without at the same time showing himself equal to these ancestors through his own achievements. Ancestors are always only a record of achievements, never a proof of achievements. Only performance in keeping with the kind proves the man. Noble nature and noble form, even noble ancestors may arouse hopes in the man, but proof of his nature always remains only his kind-appropriate performance.

The meaning of knighthood was originally rooted in this idea.

The medieval master craftsman's examination, which admitted the journeyman to the ranks of the master craftsmen only after he had passed a test of his craftsmanship and soul, was also based on such considerations. These principles are still alive today in the officer corps of our army.

The woman's achievement for her folk and her kind are her children. If there are no special circumstances that make childlessness necessary, this principle applies. However, children are linked to preconditions which a mature girl can only prove

as a wife and mother, but not as a virgin. The woman's noblest achievement, the child, is therefore difficult or even impossible to test before marriage or before any choice of husband, since at best one can only ascertain the pregnancy that has occurred, but thus knows nothing about the child to be expected. The value of a girl as a mother is initially not directly ascertainable for a man. The man must start from indirect considerations in order to come to an evaluation.

Beauty and grace, health and nobility of blood are, for example, performance characteristics in the young girl of our kind, which a man can hold to if he wants to form a picture of the future mother of his children who will be answerable to his ancestors. The knowledge of the bodily and intellectual values of a young girl is therefore one of the most essential prerequisites for a man not to be stupid in the face of the questions of the procreation of his blood and thus the questions of the regeneration of our folk. The breed-appropriate man of our folk who wants children will have to be trained in the future to be able to recognise and judge the selection example of the female of his breed.

This statement also means, in principle, a commitment to the body as the kind-appropriate expression of our blood. Here the reorganisation of our thinking from the idea of blood will have very far-reaching consequences if we do not want to get stuck in the realm of purely intellectual arguments. We do not serve the vital laws of our blood if, instead of integrating them into the reality of our environment and classifying them in such a way that they become fruitful for us, we always discuss them mentally from paper to paper. The knowledge of the law of blood forces us to recognise the body as an expression of our kind. If one does not do this, or is unable to do it, or is too cowardly to do it, all talk of blood ultimately remains only a half-measure. To know what is right and not to do it is cowardice or inferiority.

The confession of the body includes the body as a whole. To affirm the visible part of the body in the play of fashionable unveilings or coverings is not yet a confession of the body. Let us be quite clear about this too. The body as a whole is given to us by God, not only what the whims of fashion allow us to show.

It is important to reintegrate the body into the order of our existence, especially our daily life. In the final analysis, this means affirming nakedness in principle. However, it does not mean affirming nakedness for its own sake, but it means affirming nakedness for the sake of the significance of the blood and thus allowing this blood to become a living reality. Seen in this way, the whole thing then becomes a question of the inner attitude towards nakedness, but is thus far from being a matter of actions in the field of nakedness. The latter is a question of tact and propriety and does not belong within the scope of these reflections.

But this inner decision on this question is necessary because the life-laws of the blood do not tolerate half measures and require a clear statement. The only thing that is certain is that anything that simply equates nudity with immorality is nonsense.

Our ancestors were a body-affirming folk who thought in these matters without being educated. This attitude was not barbaric primitiveness, as people like to make it out to be. The custom of our ancestors' uninhibited affirmation of the body continued in Germany until the Thirty Years' War and in Sweden and Finland until our own time. We are very well informed about the conditions of our Germanic ancestors in this respect. Thus, for example, they say:

Tacitus (20):

“Throughout the crowd, naked, the youth grows up to the limb structure, to the bodily form, which we admire.”

Caesar (Gallic War, Book VI):

“From childhood they strive for exercise and hardening. He who abstains from sexual intercourse the longest reaps the greatest praise; they believe that this increases growth, increases strength and strengthens the sinews. To have had intercourse with a woman before the age of twenty is one of the most shameful reproaches; and yet there is no secrecy in these matters, since they bathe together in the rivers and dress in such a way that a large part of the body remains naked.”

Only the Church intervened in this question in a condemnatory manner, but it never completely penetrated with its view. The Fathers of the Church, for example, state in relation to the bathing of the sexes together with virgins: “that they expose their bodies, which are consecrated to shamefulness and chastity, to eyes greedy for lust”. But only very, very slowly was such a completely un-Germanic conception able to gain a foothold among our folk.

The key to understanding this contrast of views in the history of our folk can only be found in the fact that the Germanic folks considered that the education of their youth to be impartial in all questions of the body meant a means of keeping their breed and their blood healthy, while the Church, perhaps because it could not reconcile the fact of the differing value of blood with the prerequisites of its doctrine of the equality of all that bears human traits, condemned the body, and thus cleared the way for making only the soul the value content of its doctrine. Perhaps it was only the one-sided affirmation of the soul that led ecclesiastical circles to take the view that the body, and in particular everything that could be called the “source of life” in the words of Gustav Frenssen, should only be regarded as a vessel of the instinctual and thus rejected as sin. In any case, it

eventually came about that beautiful and well-behaved girls could virtually become targets and fair game for the persecutory rage of fanatical people. Beauty became a curse. In the most horrible period of German history, the time of the spiritual plague of mass witch hunts, hundreds, even thousands of German girls wasted their lives under mockery and torture, instead of preserving the vitality of their folk as mothers. These witch-hunts were undoubtedly at the expense of the servants of the churches, but it is very doubtful whether they were also at the expense of the teachings of the church. Today, however, there can be no doubt that the cause and execution of this madness is largely at the expense of the people who worship Yahweh and not our God, and who, with these witch-hunts, have carried out a purposeful counter-selection in our blood.

Just as bad in its effects has been another waste of the precious hereditary streams of our blood during the last hundred years: the Jewish desecration of the German woman. The Jew knew how to make the German man lose his way, to alienate him from his own kind and, through the sexualisation of all life, to degrade the noble blood of our women and girls to disembodied matters of lust. Sexuality received its price and finally became acceptable. Nudity, too, was very soon put in the service of Jewish decomposition work. And it was precisely this circumstance that contributed a great deal to confusing the view of our folk in this matter, so that even today many compulsive ideas in the area of the uncovered body can be traced back to this. If the Church had withdrawn masses of the most precious blood from its natural destiny through the persecutions of witches, this path of Jewry in the 19th century, especially in the time immediately behind us, was less bloody, but no less effective in its effect on our national power. The Jewish desecration of the German woman corresponds to the church persecutions of witches; both have a common spiritual father: Yahweh!

There is no doubt that what Tacitus and Caesar tell us about our ancestors, and what we have mentioned above, helped to create the foundations of that irrepressible Germanic strength of the folk which has sustained the last millennium of German history and from which we still draw today. For what we still are and achieve, we owe only to the Germanic blood component within us. We have every reason to return to similar views of the morality of our Germanic ancestors as they have been handed down to us, now that our century has again made us realise the value and significance of blood.

Which path to take here does not need to be discussed here and is also irrelevant, since the tact and sense of propriety of our folk will already find it, once they have recognised that this is also a task that they must somehow master.

We are coming to the end! Our century has opened the door wide for us to glimpse a new territory with new insights. This area still lies largely unexplored before us. And more foreboding than knowing, we feel the new and great tasks approaching us, which the knowledge of the heredity of blood imparts to us.

These tasks must be mastered and will have to be mastered. German people have rekindled the light of the realisation of heredity on the threshold of our century. Germany has been chosen by fate as the scene of this realisation. The German folk will therefore not be able to evade their task of continuing along this path of knowledge and of preserving the light of the consciousness of the sanctity of the blood and of letting it shine brightly among the folks of the world.

In this way the German folk will also one day be able to break the world domination of Jewry: because the domination of Jewry is only possible as long as the gentile forgets his blood laws. For only when the gentile forgets his blood laws can the Jew bring his own blood laws to rule. But with the rejection of Jewish blood alone the question of the blood of our kind is not yet answered, let alone the life-law of our blood mastered: just as little is a field cultivated by destroying its weeds. The affirmation of the life-laws of our blood, the veneration of the ancestors to whom we owe our blood, and the children born of our blood in ancestor-responsible breeding are the new tablets for a new German age. At the end of this path, which we Germans have trodden on the threshold of this century, will be the noble man of the German kind.

The task before us is to bring the modern life of our cities and our technology into harmony with the life-laws of our blood. Blood without soil flows. We know that. We also know that blood without breeding and ancestral responsibility does not last. For us Germans, the law applies that blood without soil cannot keep itself alive in the long run. We must not let our blood seep away in a metropolitan civilisation developed by Jewish liberalism. Our slogan is not directed against the city, but we try to integrate it into the life-law order of our folk and to overcome its characteristics that are deadly for our blood. Blood and soil will then once again become the supporting pillars of a life-law reality of our folk, which will keep the generations of our folk alive into eternity.

We oppose the boastful ideas of 1789, the ideas of equality, liberty, and fraternity, which value the criminal like the noble, and their deification of reason, which is alienating from life, which is embezzling the sanctity of blood, with the law of our blood. In the future, we will understand our folk on the basis of the blood we have inherited from our ancestors. We will divide this folk according to the performance of the individual member of the folk and thus give it a just and life-law order of life. In the idea of the Reich, we let our folk be understood as a whole

and bring it to its state effect as a kingdom. Thus, from the idea of blood, we come to the re-evaluation of all values, a process which, however, gives us the new realisation of the value and essence of the German human being and thus also creates the new basis for a new blossoming of German nature and German culture through this German human being.

Here it becomes obvious that the idea of blood as such will become the supporting idea of the 20th century and that all problems of the 20th century can only be measured by their relation to the idea of blood. The victors in this intellectual confrontation of the 20th century will not be those who, out of everyday convenience, tend to tactical compromise solutions in the questions of blood thought. The winners in this intellectual debate of the 20th century will not be those who, out of everyday convenience, are inclined to tactical compromise solutions in questions of the idea of blood, but those who will have the courage to think through and affirm the idea of blood right down to the ultimate consequences.

At the beginning of all events there is always the will. If only we will first profess our blood and its life-laws unreservedly and unconditionally, then the means and ways will soon be found which are necessary to keep our blood alive into the future. We have to affirm and master our century:

Where there is a will, there is a way!