

R. N. Coudenhove-Kalergi

Adel

Leipzig 1922

Translated to English using DeepL and my ESL powers in 2026

Table of Contents

Disclaimer

Part One: On the Rustic and the Urban Man.

1. Rustic men - Urban men
2. Junker - Literat
3. Gentleman - Bohemian
4. Inbreeding - Crossbreeding
5. Pagan and Christian Mentality

Part Two: Crisis of the Nobility.

6. Intellectual rule instead of military rule
7. Twilight of the Nobility
8. Plutocracy
9. Blood Nobility and Future Nobility
10. Jewry and Future Nobility

Outlook

Disclaimer from the original edition

Every scheme is a hybrid of truth and untruth: while capturing the essential, it violates the inessential.

Nature knows no pure, no complete forms and types: only transitions and approximations. Nature and art are alive-concept and science are dead. Every schematization of the natural world seeks to adequately express the living through the dead, the organic through the mechanical, the changeable through the rigid: this can only ever succeed incidentally, never completely.

The following classifications and generalizations are based on aesthetic, not mathematical, truth.

Part One:

On the Rustic and the Urban Man.

1. Rustic men - Urban men.

Country and city are the two poles of human existence. Country and city produce their own special types of people: the rustic and the urban.

Rustic people and urban people are psychological opposites. Farmers from different regions often have more in common spiritually than city dwellers from neighbouring large cities. Between country and country, between city and city lies space - between city and country lies time. Among European rustic people, there are representatives of all ages: from the Stone Age to the Middle Ages; while only the cosmopolitan cities of the West, which have produced the most extreme urban type, are representatives of modern civilisation. Thus, centuries, often millennia, separate a big city from the flat countryside that surrounds it.

Urban people think differently, judge differently, feel differently and act differently than rural people. Life in the big city is abstract, mechanical, rational - life in the countryside is concrete, organic, irrational. City dwellers are rationalistic, sceptical and incredulous, while country folk are emotional, credulous and superstitious.

All the thoughts and feelings of the countryman crystallise around nature; he lives in symbiosis with animals, God's living creatures, is intertwined with his landscape, dependent on the weather and the seasons. The focal point of the urban soul, on the other hand, is society. It lives in symbiosis with machines, the dead creatures of man. Through them, city dwellers make themselves as independent as possible from time and space, from the seasons and the climate.

The country dweller believes in the power of nature over man - the city dweller believes in the power of man over nature. The rustic man is a product of nature, the urban man a product of society - one sees the purpose, measure and summit of the world in the cosmos, the other in humanity. Rustic man is conservative, like nature - urban man is progressive, like society. All progress originates from cities and city dwellers. The city dweller himself is usually the product of a revolution within a rural family that broke with its rustic traditions, moved to the big city and started a new life there.

The big city robs its inhabitants of the enjoyment of natural beauty; in compensation, it offers them art. Theatres, concerts and galleries are surrogates for the eternal and changing beauties of the landscape. After a day's work full of ugliness, these art institutions offer city dwellers beauty in concentrated form. In the countryside, they are easily dispensable. - Nature is the extensive, art the intensive form of beauty. The relationship of urban dwellers to nature, which they lack, is dominated by longing, while nature is a constant source of fulfilment for rural dwellers. Therefore, city dwellers perceive nature predominantly in romantic terms, while rural dwellers perceive it in classical terms.

Social (Christian) morality is an urban phenomenon, for it is a function of human coexistence, of society. The typical city dweller combines Christian morality with irreligious scepticism, rationalistic materialism and mechanistic atheism. The resulting worldview is that of socialism: the modern religion of the big city.

For the rustic barbarians of Europe, Christianity is little more than a new version of paganism with a modified mythology and new superstitions; their true religion is belief in nature, in power, in fate.

City dwellers and country folk do not know each other; therefore, they mistrust and misunderstand each other and live in veiled or open hostility. There are many slogans that conceal this fundamental antagonism: Red and Green International, industrialism and agrarianism, progress and reaction, Judaism and anti-Semitism.

All cities draw their strength from the countryside; all countryside draws its culture from the city. The countryside is the soil from which cities renew themselves, the source that nourishes them, the root from which they blossom. Cities grow and die: the countryside is eternal.

2. Junker - Literat.

The epitome of the rustic man is the country gentleman, the squire. The epitome of the urban man is the intellectual, the man of letters.

The country and the city have both produced their specific types of nobility: the nobility of will stands in contrast to the nobility of mind, the nobility of blood versus the nobility of intellect. The typical Junker combines maximum character with minimum intellect - the typical Literat figure combines a maximum of intellect with a minimum of character.

It was not always and everywhere the case that the landed gentry lacked spirit and the urban nobility lacked character: as in modern England, the aristocracy was an outstanding cultural element in Germany during the age of the minstrels, while on the other hand, the Catholic intellectual aristocracy of the Jesuits and the Chinese intellectual aristocracy of the mandarins demonstrated just as much character as spirit in their heyday.

The Junkers and Literats epitomise the contrasts between rustic and urban people. The typical profession of the junkers caste is that of an officer, while the typical profession of the literati caste is that of a journalist.

The officer remained, both psychologically and intellectually, on the knight's stool. Hard on himself and others, dutiful, energetic, steadfast, conservative and narrow-minded, he lives in a world of dynastic, militaristic, national and social prejudices. He combines a deep mistrust of everything modern, of the city, democracy, socialism and internationalism with an equally deep belief in his blood, his honour and the worldview of his fathers. He despises city dwellers, especially Jewish writers and journalists.

The writer is ahead of his time; he represents modernity without prejudice. Ideas in politics, art, economics. He is progressive, sceptical, witty, versatile, changeable; he is a eudaimonist, rationalist, socialist, materialist. He overestimates the mind, underestimates the body and character: and therefore despises the squire as a backward barbarian.

The essence of the Junker is rigidity of will - the essence of the man of letters is flexibility of mind.

Junkers and Literats are natural rivals and adversaries: where the junkers rule, the intellect must yield to force; in such reactionary times, the political influence of intellectuals is eliminated or at least restricted. Where the literati rule, violence must give way to the spirit: democracy triumphs over feudalism, socialism over militarism.

The hatred between Germany's aristocracy of will and the aristocracy of spirit is rooted in misunderstanding. Each side sees only the negative aspects of the other and is blind to its merits. The psyche of the Junkers, the rustic people, remains forever closed to highbrow literati, while the soul of the intellectual, the urbanite, remains alien to almost all Junkers. Unable to learn from each other, the youngest lieutenant looks down with contempt on the leading minds of modern literature, while the lowliest hack journalist feels nothing but superior contempt for outstanding officers.

Through this double misunderstanding of foreign mentalities, militaristic Germany first underestimated the resistance of the urban masses to war, then revolutionary Germany underestimated the resistance of the rustic masses against the revolution. The leaders of the country misjudged the psyche of the city and its inclination towards pacifism - the leaders of the cities misjudged the psyche of the rural population and its inclination towards reaction: thus Germany first lost the war, then the revolution.

The contrast between the squire and the man of letters stems from the fact that these two types are extremes, not the pinnacle of aristocracy by blood or intellect. For the highest manifestation of aristocracy by blood is the grand seigneur, and that of aristocracy by intellect is the genius. These two forms of aristocracy are not only compatible: they are related. Caesar, the epitome of the grand seigneur, was the most brilliant Roman; Goethe, the pinnacle of genius, was the most grand seigneur of all German poets. Here, as everywhere else, the middle classes diverge most strongly, while the pinnacles converge.

The consummate aristocrat is both an aristocrat of will and spirit, but neither a squire nor a man of letters. He combines foresight with strength of will, judgement with energy, intellect with character. In the absence of such synthetic personalities, the divergent aristocracies of will and spirit should complement each other rather than fight each other. In Egypt, India and Chaldea, priests and kings (intellectuals and warriors) once ruled together. The priests bowed to the power of the will, the kings to the power of the mind: brains set the goals, arms paved the way.

3. Gentleman - Bohemian.

The aristocracy and intellectual elite of Europe created their own specific types: England's aristocracy created the gentleman; France's intellectual elite created the bohemian.

Gentlemen and bohemians are united in their desire to escape the dreary ugliness of bourgeois existence: the gentleman overcomes it through style, the bohemian through temperament. The gentleman counters the formlessness of life with form, the bohemian the colourlessness of life with colour.

The gentleman brings order to the disorder of human relationships - the bohemian brings freedom to their lack of freedom.

The beauty of the Gentleman's ideal is based on form, style and harmony: it is static, classical and apollinic. The beauty of the Bohemian ideal is based on temperament, freedom and vitality: it is dynamic, romantic and Dionysian.

The gentleman idealises and stylises his wealth - the bohemian idealises and stylises his poverty.

The gentleman is rooted in tradition, the bohemian in protest: the essence of the gentleman is conservative - the essence of the bohemian revolutionary. The mother of the gentleman ideal is England, the most conservative country in Europe - the cradle of bohemianism is France, the most revolutionary country in Europe.

The gentleman ideal is the way of life of a caste - the bohemian ideal is the way of life of individuals.

The ideal of the gentleman extends beyond England to the Roman Stoa - the ideal of the bohemian extends beyond France to the Greek Agora. Roman statesmen approached the gentleman type, Greek philosophers the bohemian type: Caesar and Seneca were gentlemen, Socrates and Diogenes were bohemians.

The focus of the gentleman lies in the physical and psychological - that of the bohemian in the spiritual: the gentleman may be a fool, the bohemian may be a criminal.

Both ideals are human crystallisation phenomena: just as crystals can only form in a non-rigid environment, these two ideals owe their existence to English and French freedom.

In imperial Germany, this atmosphere for the crystallisation of personality was lacking: therefore, it could not develop an equivalent ideal. Germans lacked the style to be gentlemen, the temperament to be bohemians, and the grace and suppleness to be either.

Unable to find a way of life that suited him in reality, the German sought ideal embodiments of the German spirit in his poetry: he found the young Siegfried as his physical and psychological ideal and the old Faust as his spiritual ideal.

Both ideals were romantically out of step with the times: in the distortion of reality, the romantic Siegfried ideal solidified into the Prussian officer, the lieutenant, and the romantic Faust ideal into the German scholar, the professor.

Organic ideals were replaced by mechanical ones: the officer represents the mechanisation of the psyche: the frozen Siegfried, the professor represents the mechanisation of the intellect: the frozen Faust.

Wilhelmine Germany was prouder of none of its classes more than of its officers and professors. It saw them as the flower of the nation, just as England saw its political leaders and the Romance peoples saw their artists.

If the German people desire higher development, they must revise their ideals: their actions must break away from military one-sidedness and expand into political and human versatility; their spirit must break away from purely scientific narrowness and expand into the synthesis of the poet-thinker.

The 19th century gave the German people two men of the highest calibre who embodied these demands for a higher Germanism: Bismarck, the hero of action; Goethe, the hero of the spirit.

Bismarck renews, deepens and revives the Siegfried ideal, which had become kitschy - Goethe renews, deepens and revives the dusty Faust ideal.

Bismarck had the good qualities of the German officer - without his faults, Goethe had the good qualities of the German scholar - without his faults. In Bismarck, the superiority of the statesman overcomes the narrow-mindedness of the officer - in Goethe, the superiority of the poet-thinker overcomes the narrow-mindedness of the scholar: in both, the organic ideal of personality overcomes the mechanical, the human being overcomes the puppet. Through his exemplary personality, Bismarck did more for the development of German culture than through his founding of the empire; through his Olympian existence, Goethe enriched the German people more than through his Faust: for Faust, like Goetz, Werther, Meister and Tasso, is only a fragment of Goethe's human doing (*Menschentuni*).

Germany should be careful not to trivialise and belittle its two living role models: turning Bismarck into a sergeant and Goethe into a schoolmaster.

By following in the footsteps of these two pinnacles of German humanity, Germany could grow and flourish; from them it can learn active and contemplative greatness, energy and wisdom. For Bismarck and Goethe are the two focal points around which a new German lifestyle could be formed - one that would be equal to Western ideals.

4. Inbreeding - Crossbreeding.

Most rustic people are the product of their environment, while urban people are hybrids.

The parents and ancestors of farmers usually come from the same sparsely populated area; those of aristocrats from the same small upper class. In both cases, the ancestors are related by blood and therefore usually similar to each other physically, psychologically and intellectually. As a result, they pass on their common traits, tendencies, passions, prejudices and inhibitions to their children and descendants to an increased degree. The traits that result from this inbreeding are: loyalty, piety, family spirit, caste mentality, consistency, stubbornness, energy, narrow-mindedness; power of prejudice, lack of objectivity, narrow horizons. Here, one generation is not a variation of the previous one, but simply a repetition of it: preservation instead of development.

In the big city, different peoples, races and classes come together. As a rule, urban dwellers are a mixture of various social and national elements. In them, the contrasting character traits, prejudices, inhibitions, tendencies and world views of their parents and ancestors cancel each other out or at least weaken each other. As a result, mixed-race people often combine lack of character, lack of inhibition, weakness of will, inconsistency, irreverence and disloyalty with objectivity, versatility, intellectual alertness, freedom from prejudice and broad horizons. Mixed-race individuals always differ from their parents and ancestors; each generation is a variation of the previous one, either in the sense of evolution or degeneration.

The inbred human being is a single-souled person - the mixed-race person is a multi-souled person. In every individual, his ancestors live on as elements of his soul: if they are similar to each other, his soul is uniform and monotonous; if they diverge from each other, the person is diverse, complex and differentiated.

The greatness of a mind lies in its breadth, that is, in its ability to encompass and embrace everything; the greatness of a character lies in its intensity, that is, in its ability to desire strongly, with focus and consistency. Thus, in a certain sense, we are contradictory and inconsistent.

The more pronounced a person's ability and inclination to view things wisely from all sides and to take a non-judgmental stance on every point of view, the weaker their impulse to act decisively in a particular direction tends to be: for every motive is countered by counter-motives, every belief by scepticism, every action by an awareness of its cosmic insignificance.

Only the narrow-minded, one-sided person can be energetic. But there is not only unconscious, naive narrow-mindedness: there is also conscious narrow-mindedness. The heroic narrow-minded person - and this type includes all truly great men of action - voluntarily switches off all aspects of his personality except the one that determines his action. He may be objective, critical, sceptical and superior before or after his action, but during the action he is subjective, faithful, one-sided and unjust.

Wisdom inhibits action - action denies wisdom. The strongest will is ineffective if it is directionless; even a weak will produces the strongest effect if it is one-sided. There is no life of action without injustice, error, guilt: those who shy away from bearing this odium should remain in the realm of thought, contemplation, passivity. Truthful people are always silent: for every assertion is, in a sense, a lie. Pure-hearted people are always inactive: for every action is, in a sense, wrong. But it is braver to speak, at the risk of lying; to act, at the risk of doing wrong.

Inbreeding strengthens character, weakens the spirit - crossing weakens the character, strengthens the spirit. Where inbreeding and crossbreeding come together under favourable circumstances, they produce the highest type of human being, combining the strongest character with the sharpest mind. Where under unfavourable circumstances inbreeding and mixing meet, they create degenerate types with weak character and dull minds.

The people of the distant future will be mixed race. Today's races and castes will fall victim to the increasing overcoming of space, time and prejudice. The Eurasian race of the future, outwardly similar to the ancient Egyptians, will replace the diversity of peoples with a diversity of personalities. For, according to the laws of heredity, the diversity of ancestors increases with the diversity of descendants, and the uniformity of ancestors increases with the uniformity of descendants. In inbred families, one child resembles another: for all represent the one common family type. In mixed families, the children differ more strongly from one another: each forms a new variation of the diverging parental and pre-parental elements.

Inbreeding creates characteristic types - crossbreeding creates original personalities.

The precursor of the planetary human being of the future in modern Europe is the Russian, a Slavic-Tartar-Finnish hybrid, because he has the least racial characteristics of all European peoples and is therefore the typical multi-souled human being with a broad, rich, all-encompassing soul. His strongest antipode is the insular Briton, the highly cultivated single-soul human being, whose strength lies in his character, his will, his one-sidedness, his typicality. Modern Europe owes him the most closed, most perfect type: the gentleman.

5. Pagan and Christian mentality.

Two forms of soul struggle for world domination: paganism and Christianity. These forms of soul have only very superficial connections with the confessions that bear these names. If the focus shifts from the dogmatic to the ethical, from the mythological to the psychological, Buddhism transforms into ultra-Christianity, while Americanism appears as modernised paganism. The Orient is the main bearer of Christian mentality, the Occident the main bearer of pagan mentality: the "pagan" Chinese are better Christians than the "Christian" Germanic peoples.

Paganism places energy at the top of the ethical value scale, while Christianity places love there. The Christian ideal is the loving saint, the pagan ideal the victorious hero. Christianity wants to transform homo ferus into homo domesticus, the predator man into the domesticated man - while paganism wants to transform man into the superman. Christianity, wants to tame tigers into cats - paganism wants to turn cats into tigers. The main proponent of modern Christianity was Tolstoy! The main proclaimer of modern paganism was Nietzsche.

The Germanic Edda religion was pure paganism. It lived on under a Christian mask: in the Middle Ages as chivalry, in modern times as an imperialist and militaristic worldview. Officers, squires, colonisers and captains of industry are the leading representatives of modern paganism. Strength, bravery, greatness, freedom, power, glory and honour: these are the ideals of paganism; while love, gentleness, humility, compassion and self-denial are Christian ideals.

The antithesis: paganism-Christianity does not coincide with the antithesis: rustic man - urban man, nor with: inbreeding-crossbreeding. Undoubtedly, however, rustic barbarism and inbreeding favour the development of pagan, while urban civilisation and mixture favour the development of a Christian mentality.

Universally valid pagan individualism is only possible in sparsely populated areas, where individuals can assert themselves and develop ruthlessly without immediately coming into conflict with their fellow human beings. In overpopulated areas, where people jostle against each other, the socialist principle of mutual support must complement and, in part, supplant the individualistic principle of the struggle for existence.

Christianity and socialism are products of international cities. Christianity began as a world religion in the racially diverse cosmopolitan city of Rome, while socialism originated in the ethnically mixed industrial cities of the West. Both expressions of Christian mentality are based on internationalism. Resistance to Christianity came from the rural population (pagans); just as today it is the rural population that offers the strongest resistance to the realisation of a socialist way of life.

Thinly populated, northern regions have always been centres of paganism, while densely populated southern regions have been breeding grounds for Christian sentiment. When people talk today about the contrast between Eastern and Western mentalities, they usually mean nothing more than the contrast between people of the South and people of the North. The Japanese, as the most northern of the Eastern cultures, are in many ways similar to Westerners, while the mentality of southern

Italians and South Americans is Eastern. For the states of the soul, latitude seems to be more decisive than longitude.

It is not only geographical location that shapes the soul of a people; historical development also plays a decisive role. The Chinese and Jewish peoples feel more Christian than the Germanic peoples because their cultural past is older. The Germanic people are closer in time to the savage than the Chinese or the Jews; these two ancient civilised peoples were able to emancipate themselves more thoroughly from the pagan natural way of life because they had at least three millennia longer to do so. Paganism is a symptom of cultural youth, Christianity a symptom of cultural age.

Three peoples: Greeks, Romans and Jews each conquered the ancient cultural world in their own way. First, the aesthetic and philosophical Greeks in Hellenism; then the practical and political Romans in the Roman Empire; and finally the ethical and religious Jews in Christianity.

Christianity, prepared ethically by Jewish Essenes (John) and spiritually by Jewish Alexandrians (Philo), was regenerated Judaism. To the extent that Europe is Christian, it is Jewish (in an ethical and spiritual sense); to the extent that Europe is moral, it is Jewish. Almost the entire European ethics is rooted in Judaism. All the champions of a religious or irreligious Christian morality, from Augustine to Rousseau, Kant and Tolstoy, were Jews by choice in the spiritual sense; Nietzsche is the only non-Jewish, the only pagan ethicist of Europe.

The most prominent and convincing representatives of Christian ideas, which in their modern rebirth are called pacifism and socialism, are Jews.

In the East, the Chinese people are the ethical par excellence (in contrast to the aesthetic-heroic Japanese and the religious-speculative Indians) - in the West, it is the Jewish people. God was the head of state of the ancient Jews, their religious law was the civil code, sin was crime.

Judaism has remained faithful to the theocratic idea of identifying politics and ethics throughout the millennia: Christianity and Bolshevism are both attempts to establish a kingdom of God. Two millennia ago, it was the early Christians, not the Pharisees and Sadducees, who were the heirs and renewers of the Mosaic tradition; today it is neither the Zionists nor the Christians, but the Jewish leaders of socialism: for they too want, with the utmost self-denial, to eradicate the original sin of capitalism, to deliver people from injustice, violence and servitude, and to transform the atoned world into an earthly paradise.

For these contemporary Jewish prophets, who are preparing for a new world era, ethics is paramount in everything: in politics, religion, philosophy and art. From Moses to Weininger, ethics was the main concern of Jewish philosophy. This fundamental ethical attitude towards the world is one of the roots of the unique greatness of the Jewish people - but at the same time it carries the danger that Jews who lose their faith in ethics will sink into cynical egoism, while people of a different mentality, even after losing their ethical attitude, still retain a wealth of chivalrous values and prejudices (honourable man, gentleman, cavalier, etc.) remain, protecting them from falling into chaos.

What mainly separates Jews from average city dwellers is that they are inbred people. Strength of character combined with sharpness of mind predestines the Jew in his most outstanding specimens to be the leader of urban humanity, the false as well as the true intellectual aristocrat, to the protagonist of capitalism as well as the revolution.

Part Two:

Crisis of the Adel.

6. Intellectual rule instead of military rule.

Our democratic age is a pitiful interlude between two great aristocratic eras: the feudal aristocracy of the sword and the social aristocracy of the mind. Feudal aristocracy is in decline, while intellectual aristocracy is on the rise. The interim period calls itself democratic, but in reality it is ruled by the pseudo-aristocracy of money.

In the Middle Ages, rustic knights ruled over urban citizens in Europe, pagan mentality over Christian, and hereditary nobility over intellectual nobility. The superiority of knights over citizens was based on physical and moral strength, power and courage.

Two inventions conquered the Middle Ages and ushered in the modern era: the invention of gunpowder signalled the end of knighthood, while the invention of the printing press heralded the dawn of intellectual supremacy. With the introduction of firearms, physical strength and courage lost their decisive importance in the struggle for survival: in the battle for power and freedom, the mind became the decisive weapon.

Printing gave the mind a means of power with unlimited reach, placing the writing world at the centre of the reading world and thus elevating the writer to the spiritual leader of the masses. Gutenberg gave the feathers the power that had been taken from the blacksmiths. With the help of printing ink, Luther conquered a greater empire than all the German emperors.

In the era of enlightened despotism, rulers and statesmen obeyed the ideas that originated from thinkers. The writers of that time formed an intellectual aristocracy in Europe. The victory of absolutism over feudalism marked the first victory of the city over the countryside and, at the same time, the first stage in the triumph of the intellectual nobility and the downfall of the military nobility. The medieval dictatorship of the countryside over the city was replaced by the modern dictatorship of the city over the country.

With the French Revolution, which broke with the privileges of the hereditary nobility, the second era of intellectual emancipation began. Democracy is based on the optimistic assumption that an intellectual aristocracy can be recognised and elected by the majority of the people.

Now we stand on the threshold of the third epoch of modern times: socialism. It, too, is based on the urban class of industrial workers, led by the intellectual urban aristocracy of revolutionary writers.

The influence of the blood aristocracy is waning, while that of the intellectual aristocracy is growing.

This development, and with it the chaos of modern politics, will only come to an end when an intellectual aristocracy seizes the means of power in society - gunpowder, gold, printing ink - and uses them for the benefit of the general public.

A decisive step towards this goal is Russian Bolshevism, where a small group of communist intellectual aristocrats rule the country and consciously break with the plutocratic democratism that dominates the rest of the world today.

Plutocracy is intellectual pseudo-aristocracy. Plutocracy was also a stage on the path from the nobility of the sword to the nobility of the mind. Like intellectual aristocracy, plutocracy is based on intellectual superiority. It is individualistic intellectual nobility, not socialist intellectual nobility. It is the precursor to a coming form of government whose leaders combine the energy and intelligence of the plutocrats with a social mentality, a sense of responsibility and idealism.

The struggle between capitalism and communism for the legacy of the defeated aristocracy is a fratricidal war between the victorious intellectual elite, a battle between individualistic and socialist, egoistic and altruistic, pagan and Christian mindsets. The general staff of both parties is recruited from Europe's intellectual leadership: the Jewish community.

Capitalism and communism are both rationalistic, both mechanistic, both abstract, both urban.

The sword nobility has finally played its last card. The influence of the spirit, the power of the spirit, belief in the spirit, hope in the spirit is growing: and with it, a new nobility.

7. Twilight of the nobility.

In the course of modern times, the nobility of blood was poisoned by the court atmosphere, the nobility of spirit by capitalism.

Since the end of the age of chivalry, the high nobility of continental Europe, with few exceptions, has been in a state of progressive decadence. Through urbanisation, it has lost its physical and spiritual virtues.

In the age of feudalism, the nobility was called upon to protect its land against enemy attacks and the encroachments of the ruler. The nobleman was free and self-confident in relation to his subordinates, his equals and his superiors; as king of his own land, he was able to develop his personality freely in accordance with chivalric principles.

Absolutism changed this situation: the opposition nobility, free, proud and brave, insisted on its historical rights and was, as far as possible, eradicated; the rest were drawn to court and forced into a glittering servitude. This court nobility was unfree, dependent on the whims of the ruler and his camarilla, and thus lost its best qualities: character, desire for freedom, pride, leadership. In order to break the character and thus the resistance of the French nobility, Louis XIV lured them to Versailles; the great revolution was left to complete his work: it took away the outdated privileges of the nobility, who had surrendered and lost their advantages.

Only in those European countries where the nobility, true to its chivalrous mission, remained the leader and champion of national opposition to monarchical despotism and foreign rule did a noble type of leader survive: in England, Hungary, Poland and Italy.

Since the transformation of European culture from a chivalrous-rustic to a bourgeois-urban one, the hereditary nobility has lagged behind the bourgeoisie in intellectual and cultural terms. War, politics and the administration of their estates took up so much of their time that their intellectual abilities and interests were often stunted.

These historical causes of the decline of the nobility in modern times were further exacerbated by physiological factors: alcohol and syphilis undermined the former physical superiority of the nobility, compounded by the degenerative effects of excessive inbreeding, which the English nobility avoided through frequent intermarriage with the bourgeoisie. Instead of the harsh military service of the Middle Ages, the modern era brought the nobility a mostly idle life of luxury; from being the most threatened class, the nobility gradually became the most secure thanks to its inherited wealth. The combination of all these circumstances led to the decline of the physical, psychological and spiritual type of the former nobility.

The intellectual elite could not replace the aristocracy because it too is in crisis, in a state of decline. Democracy arose out of embarrassment: not because people did not want an aristocracy, but because they could not find one. As soon as a new, genuine aristocracy is established, democracy will disappear of its own accord. Because England has a genuine aristocracy, it has remained aristocratic despite its democratic constitution.

The academic elite of Germany, a century ago the leaders of the opposition against absolutism and feudalism, the champions of modern and liberal ideas, has today sunk to become the mainstay of reaction, the main opponent of intellectual and political renewal. This pseudo-intellectual aristocracy of Germany was the advocate of militarism during the war and the defender of capitalism during the revolution. Its watchwords: nationalism, militarism, anti-Semitism, alcoholism, are also the slogans in the fight against the spirit. The academic intelligentsia has misjudged, denied and betrayed its responsible mission: to replace the feudal nobility and prepare the intellectual nobility.

The writing intelligentsia has also betrayed its guiding mission. It, which was called upon to become the spiritual leader and teacher of the masses, to supplement and improve what a backward school system had neglected and ruined, has in its overwhelming majority debased itself to become the slave of capital, the corruptor of political and artistic taste.

Her character broke down under the pressure of having to represent and defend the convictions of others rather than their own - their minds became dulled by the overproduction that their profession forced upon them.

Like the rhetoricians of antiquity, modern journalists are at the centre of the state machinery: they influence voters, voters influence MPs, MPs influence ministers. Thus, the Journalists bear the greatest responsibility for all political events: and it is precisely he, as a typical representative of urban characterlessness, who usually feels free of any obligation or responsibility.

School and the press are the two points from which the world could be renewed and refined without bloodshed or violence. School nourishes or poisons the soul of the child; the press nourishes or poisons the soul of the adult. Today, both schools and the press are in the hands of an unspiritual intelligentsia: returning them to the hands of the spirit would be the highest task of any ideal politics, any ideal revolution.

The ruling dynasties of Europe have been ruined by inbreeding, the plutocratic dynasties by living the good life. The blood aristocracy degenerated because it became a servant of the monarchy; the intellectual aristocracy degenerated because it became a servant of capital.

Both aristocracies had forgotten that every privilege, every honour and every exceptional position comes with responsibility. They had forgotten the motto of all true nobility: "Noblesse oblige!" They wanted to enjoy the fruits of their privileged position without bearing its responsibilities; they felt themselves to be masters and superiors, not leaders and role models for their fellow human beings. Instead of showing the people new goals and paving new paths, they allowed themselves to be abused by rulers and capitalists as tools for their interests: they sold their souls, their blood and their brains for a good life, honours and money.

The old nobility of blood and intellect has lost its claim to be regarded as aristocracy any longer, for it lacks the signs of all genuine nobility: character, freedom, responsibility. The ties that bound them to their peoples have been severed: by class prejudice on the one hand, and educational prejudice on the other.

It is in keeping with historical nemesis that the great deluge originating in Russia will, by bloody or bloodless means, purge the world of the usurpers who seek to maintain their privileged positions, even though they have long since lost the conditions that once made them possible.

8. Plutocracy.

Given the decline of the aristocracy of blood and intellect, it was not surprising that a third class of people provisionally seized power: the plutocracy.

The constitutional form that replaced feudalism and absolutism was democratic; the form of government was plutocratic. Today, democracy is a façade for plutocracy: because the people would not tolerate naked plutocracy, they are given nominal power, while the real power remains in the hands of the plutocrats. In republican as well as monarchical democracies, statesmen are puppets, capitalists are the puppet masters: they dictate policy guidelines, they control voters by buying public opinion, and ministers through business and social relationships.

The feudal social structure has been replaced by a plutocratic one: it is no longer birth that determines social status, but income. Today's plutocracy is more powerful than yesterday's aristocracy: for no one stands above it except the state, which is its tool and accomplice.

When true nobility still existed, the system of aristocracy based on birth was more just than today's aristocracy based on money: for at that time, the ruling caste had a sense of responsibility, culture and tradition - whereas the class that rules today is devoid of any sense of responsibility, culture or tradition. Isolated exceptions do not alter this fact.

While the worldview of feudalism was heroic and religious, plutocratic society knows no higher values than money and the good life: a person's worth is measured by what they have, not by who they are.

Nevertheless, the leaders of plutocracy form, in a certain sense, an aristocracy, an elite: for the acquisition of great wealth requires a number of outstanding qualities: energy, prudence, wisdom, presence of mind, initiative, boldness and generosity. Through these virtues, legitimise the successful big businessmen as modern conquerors, whose superior willpower and mental strength brought them victory over the masses of inferior competitors.

This superiority of the plutocrats, however, only applies within the earning class - it disappears immediately when those outstanding money-makers are measured against the outstanding representatives of ideal professions. It is therefore fair that a capable industrialist or merchant rises higher materially and socially than his incompetent colleagues - but it is unfair that his social power and prestige are higher than those of an artist, a scholar, a politician, a judge, writer, teacher, doctor, who is just as capable in his profession as those whose abilities serve more idealistic and social goals: that the current social system rewards the selfish, materialistic mentality over an altruistic ideals.

This preference for selfish efficiency over altruism, for materialism over idealism, is the root of the evil of capitalist social structure; while the true aristocrats of mind and heart - the wise and the kind - live in poverty and powerlessness, selfish men of violence usurp the leadership positions to which the former would be called.

Thus, plutocracy is aristocracy in energetic and intellectual terms - pseudo-aristocracy in ethical and spiritual terms; aristocracy within the working classes - pseudo-aristocracy when measured against more ideal professions.

Like the aristocracy of blood and spirit, the aristocracy of money is currently in a period of decline. The sons and grandsons of those great entrepreneurs, whose will, tempered by hardship and hard work, had led them from nothing to power, are mostly languishing in a life of luxury and idleness. Only rarely is paternal competence inherited or sublimated into more intellectual and idealistic pursuits. The plutocratic families lack the tradition and worldview, the conservative, rustic spirit that once preserved the noble families from degeneration for centuries. Weak epigones take over the legacy of power from their fathers, without the gifts of will and intellect through which it was acquired. Power and competence come into conflict, thereby undermining the inner legitimacy of capitalism.

Historical developments have accelerated this natural decline. Buoyed by the economic boom of war, a new plutocracy of profiteers is beginning to undermine and supplant the old plutocracy of entrepreneurs. While the enrichment of entrepreneurs leads to increased prosperity for the people, the enrichment of profiteers leads to a decline in prosperity. Entrepreneurs are leaders of the economy - profiteers are its parasites: entrepreneurship is productive - profiteering is unproductive capitalism.

The current economic boom makes it easier for unscrupulous, unrestrained and conscienceless people to earn money. Luck and ruthlessness are more indispensable for speculation and profiteering than outstanding willpower and intellectual gifts. Thus, the modern profiteering plutocracy represents more of a kakistocracy of character than an aristocracy of competence. The increasing blurring of the boundaries between entrepreneurship and profiteering compromises and demeans capitalism in the eyes of intellectuals and the public.

No aristocracy can maintain itself in the long term without moral authority. As soon as the ruling class ceases to be a symbol of ethical and aesthetic values, its downfall becomes inevitable.

Compared to other aristocracies, plutocracy is poor in aesthetic values. It fulfils the political functions of an aristocracy without offering the cultural values of a nobility. However, wealth is only bearable in the guise of beauty, only justified as the bearer of an aesthetic culture. Meanwhile, the new plutocracy cloaks itself in dreary tastelessness and ostentatious vulgarity: its wealth becomes barren and repulsive.

The European plutocracy neglects - in contrast to the American one - its ethical mission just as much as its aesthetic one: social benefactors of great stature are as scarce as patrons. Instead of finding its *raison d'être* in social capitalism, in the consolidation of the fragmented wealth of the people into generous works of creative humanity - the overwhelming majority of plutocrats feel entitled to build their comfortable lives irresponsibly on mass misery. Instead of being trustees of humanity, they are exploiters; instead of being leaders, they are misleaders.

This lack of aesthetic and ethical culture means that plutocracy attracts not only hatred but also contempt from public opinion and its intellectual leaders: since it failed to become noble, it must fall.

The Russian Revolution marks the beginning of the end for the plutocratic era. Even if Lenin is defeated, his shadow will dominate the 20th century just as the French Revolution, despite its collapse, determined the course of the 19th century: feudalism and absolutism would never have voluntarily abdicated in continental Europe if it had not been for the fear of a repeat of Jacobin terror and the end of the French nobility and monarchy. Thus, the sword of Damocles that was Bolshevik terror succeeded in softening the hearts of the plutocrats and making them receptive to social demands more quickly than the Gospel of Christ had done in two millennia.

9. Blood Nobility and Future Nobility.

Nobility is based on physical, emotional and intellectual beauty; beauty based on perfect harmony and heightened vitality: those who excel in these areas are aristocrats.

The old aristocratic type is dying out, and the new one has not yet been established. Our interim period is sorely lacking in great personalities: in beautiful people, in noble people, in wise people. Meanwhile, epigones of the vanished aristocracy usurp the dead forms of former aristocracy and fill them with the content of their poor bourgeoisie. The strong vitality of the former aristocracy has passed on to upstarts, but they lack its forms, its elegance, its beauty.

Nevertheless, there is no need to despair of the idea of nobility or the future of nobility. If humanity wants to move forward, it needs leaders, teachers, guides, fulfilments of what it wants to become; precursors of its future elevation to higher spheres. Without nobility, there can be no evolution. Eudaemonistic politics can be democratic - evolutionary politics must be aristocratic. In order to ascend, to move forward, goals are necessary; in order to achieve goals, people are needed who set goals and lead to goals: aristocrats.

The aristocrat as leader is a political concept; the noble as a role model is an aesthetic ideal. The highest demand requires that aristocracy coincides with nobility, and leader with role model: that leadership falls to perfect human beings.

Two qualitative races stand out from the European quantitative humanity, which believes only in numbers and mass: the blood nobility and the Jewish people. Separated from each other, they both hold fast to their belief in their higher mission, in their superior blood, in human differences in rank. These two heterogeneous superior races form the core of the European nobility of the future: the feudal aristocracy, insofar as it has not been corrupted by the court, and the Jewish intellectual elite, insofar as it has not been corrupted by capital. As a guarantee of a better future, a small remnant of morally upright, rustic nobility and a small fighting group of revolutionary intellectuals remain.

Here, the community between Lenin, the man from rural petty nobility, and Trotsky, the Jewish man of letters, grows into a symbol: here, the opposites of character and spirit, of Junker and Literat, of rustic and urban, pagan and Christian people are reconciled into a creative synthesis of revolutionary aristocracy.

A step forward in intellectual terms would suffice to place the best elements of the aristocracy, who have preserved their physical and moral health in the countryside away from the depraving influences of court life, in the service of the new liberation of humanity. For their traditional courage, their anti-bourgeois and anti-capitalist mentality, their sense of responsibility, their contempt for material advantage, their stoic training of the will, their integrity and their idealism predestine them for this position. Channelled into more spiritual and freer paths, the strong aristocratic energies that have hitherto been the pillars of reaction could be regenerated to new splendour and produce leaders who combine an unyielding will with greatness of soul and selflessness, and, instead of serving capitalist interests as exponents of the

bourgeoisie (which they detest in their hearts), join forces with the representatives of the rejuvenated intellectual aristocracy for the liberation and ennoblement of humanity.

Politics in Europe was aristocratic for centuries. The high nobility formed an international political caste in which diplomatic talents were cultivated. For many generations, the European aristocracy lived in a political atmosphere from which the bourgeoisie was deliberately excluded. On their latifundia, the nobility learned the art of governing and dealing with people - in leading government posts at home and abroad, they learned the art of dealing with nations. Politics is an art, not a science; its focus lies more in instinct than in intellect, more in the subconscious than in the conscious mind. Political talent can be awakened and trained, but never learned. Genius breaks all the rules: but the nobility is incomparably richer in political talent than the bourgeoisie. For to acquire knowledge, a single lifetime is sufficient: to cultivate instincts, the cooperation of many generations is required. In the sciences and fine arts, the bourgeoisie surpasses the nobility in talent; in politics, the ratio is reversed. This is why even the democracies of Europe often entrust their foreign policy to descendants of the high nobility, for it is in the interest of the state to make the wealth of political talent that the nobility has accumulated over the centuries available to the general public.

The political abilities of the high nobility can be attributed not least to its strong blood mixture. For this national racial mixture broadens its horizons in many ways and thus paralyses the evil consequences of simultaneous caste inbreeding. The vast majority of inferior aristocrats combine the disadvantages of mixing with those of inbreeding: lack of character with intellectual poverty; while in the rare highlights of modern high nobility, the advantages of both meet: character with spirit.

Intellectually speaking, there is currently a huge gap between the extreme right (conservative aristocracy) and the extreme left (revolutionary intellectual aristocracy) in terms of intellectual level, while in terms of character, these apparent extremes overlap. However, everything intellectual and conscious lies on the surface - everything characteristic and unconscious lies in the depths of the personality. Knowledge and opinions are easier to form and reshape than character traits and directions of will.

Lenin and Ludendorff are antagonists in their political ideals: brothers in their determination. If Ludendorff had grown up in the revolutionary milieu of Russian student life; if, like Lenin, he had witnessed the execution of his brother by imperial executioners in his early youth: we would probably see him at the head of Red Russia. Whereas Lenin, raised in a Prussian cadet school, might have become an Uber-Ludendorff. What separates these two related natures is their spiritual level. Lenin's narrow-mindedness seems heroic and conscious, while Ludendorff's narrow-mindedness seems naive and unconscious. Lenin is not only a leader - he is also more inspired, a spiritualised Ludendorff, so to speak.

The same parallel can be drawn between two other representatives of the extreme left and right: Friedrich Adler and Count Arco. Both were murderers out of idealism, martyrs of their own convictions. Had Adler grown up in the militaristic-

reactionary milieu of the German aristocracy, and Arco in the socialist-revolutionary milieu of the Austrian intellectual nobility, then Arco's bullet would probably have hit Prime Minister Stürgk, and Adler's bullet would have hit Prime Minister Eisner. For they too are brothers, separated by the diversity of their acquired prejudices, united by their shared heroic and selfless character. Here, too, the difference lies in their spirit level (Adler is an spiritual man), not in the purity of their convictions. Those who praise the character of one must not disparage that of the other - as happens daily on both sides. Where there is potent vitality, there is a future. The flowering of the peasantry, the landed gentry, has (insofar as it has remained healthy) accumulated and stored a wealth of vital forces in a thousand years of symbiosis with living and life-giving nature. If modern education succeeds in sublimating part of this increased life energy into the spiritual realm, then perhaps the nobility of the past could play a decisive role in the development of the nobility of the future.

10. Jewry and Future Nobility.

The main proponents of both corrupt and honest intellectual elites - capitalism, journalism and literature - are Jews. The superiority of their intellect predestines them to be the main factor in the future intellectual nobility.

A look at the history of the Jewish people explains their lead in the struggle for leadership of humanity. Two millennia ago, Jewry was a religious community composed of ethically and religiously inclined individuals from all nations of the ancient cultural sphere, with a national Hebrew centre in Palestine. Even then, the common, connecting and primary factor was not the nation, but religion. During the first millennium of our era, proselytes from all nations joined this religious community, most recently the king, nobility and people of the Mongolian Khazars, the rulers of southern Russia. From then on, the Jewish religious community closed itself off to form an artificial ethnic community and turned against all other peoples.

For a thousand years, Christian Europe has been trying to exterminate the Jewish people through unspeakable persecution. The result was that all Jews who were weak-willed, unscrupulous, opportunistic or sceptical allowed themselves to be baptised in order to escape the horrors of endless persecution. On the other hand, under these often difficult living conditions, all Jews who were not skilled, clever and inventive enough to survive this most difficult form of struggle for existence perished.

Thus, out of all these persecutions, a small community emerged, steeled by a heroically endured martyrdom for the idea and purified of all weak-willed and spiritless elements. Instead of destroying Jewry, Europe has, against its will, ennobled it through this artificial selection process and educated it to become the leading nation of the future. No wonder, then, that this people, sprung from the ghetto dungeon, developed into the intellectual aristocracy of Europe. Thus, a benevolent providence bestowed upon Europe, at the moment when the feudal aristocracy fell into decline, through the emancipation of the Jews, a new noble race of minds has been granted.

The first typical representative of this emerging future nobility was the revolutionary noble Jew Lassalle, who combined physical beauty with nobility of character and sharpness of mind to a high degree.

The first typical representative of this emerging future nobility was the revolutionary noble Jew Lassalle, who combined physical beauty with nobility of character and sharpness of mind to a high degree: an aristocrat in the highest and truest sense of the word, he was a born leader and guide of his time.

Jewry is not the new aristocracy, but rather it is the seed from which a new, spiritual nobility of Europe is emerging. A spiritually urbane master race is being formed: idealists, witty and sensitive, just and persuasive, brave like the feudal nobility in its heyday, who joyfully accept death and persecution, hatred and contempt in order to make humanity more moral, more inspired, happier.

The Jewish heroes and martyrs of the Eastern and Central European revolution are in no way inferior to the non-Jewish heroes of the World War in terms of courage, perseverance and idealism - while in many ways surpassing them in spirit. The

essence of these men and women who seek to redeem and regenerate humanity is a peculiar synthesis of religious and political elements: of heroic martyrdom and spiritual propaganda, revolutionary energy and social love, of justice and compassion. These traits, which once made them the creators of the Christian world movement, now place them at the forefront of the socialist movement.

With these two attempts at redemption of spiritual and moral origin, Jewry has enriched the disinherited masses of Europe more than any other people. Just as modern Jewish community far surpasses all other peoples in its percentage of important men: barely a century after its liberation, this small people now stands at the forefront of modern science with Einstein ; at the forefront of modern music with Mahler; at the forefront of modern philosophy with Bergson; and at the forefront of modern politics with Trotsky. The prominent position that Jewry holds today is due solely to its intellectual superiority, which enables it to triumph over an enormous superiority of privileged, spiteful, envious rivals in intellectual competition.

Modern anti-Semitism is one of the many reactions of mediocrity against excellence; it is a modern form of ostracism applied against an entire people. As a people, Jewry experiences the eternal struggle of quantity against quality, of inferior groups against superior individuals, of inferior majorities against superior minorities. The main roots of anti-Semitism are narrow-mindedness and envy: narrow-mindedness in religious or scientific matters, envy in intellectual or economic matters.

Because they emerged from an international religious community rather than a local race, the Jews are the people with the strongest blood mixture; because they have isolated themselves from other peoples for a millennium, they are the people with the strongest inbreeding. Thus, as in the aristocracy, the chosen ones among them combine strength of will with sharpness of mind, while another part of the Jews combines the shortcomings of inbreeding with those of blood mixing : lack of character with narrow-mindedness. Here, the most sacred self-sacrifice exists alongside the most narrow-minded selfishness, the purest idealism alongside the crassest materialism. Here, too, the rule is confirmed: the more mixed a people is, the more dissimilar its representatives are to one another, the more impossible it is to construct a uniform type. Where there is much light, there is much darkness. Brilliant families have a higher percentage of madmen and criminals than mediocre ones; this also applies to peoples. Not only the revolutionary intellectual aristocracy of tomorrow - today's plutocratic kakistocracy of profiteers also recruits primarily from among Jews, thus sharpening the agitational weapons of the Anti-Semitism.

A thousand years of slavery has, with rare exceptions, robbed the Jews of the gesture of the master race. Constant oppression inhibits the development of personality, thereby removing a key element of the aesthetic ideal of nobility. A large part of Jewry suffers from this deficiency , both physically and psychologically, and this deficiency is the main reason why the European instinct resists recognising Jewry as a noble race.

The resentment with which oppression has burdened Jewish community, gives it a lot of vital tension; but takes away a lot of refined harmony. Excessive inbreeding,

combined with the hyper-urbanity of the ghetto past, had many traits of physical and psychological decadence in its wake. What the Jews' minds gained, their bodies often lost; what their brains gained, their nervous systems lost.

Thus, Jewry suffers from a hypertrophy of the brain and thus stands in contrast to the noble demand for harmonious personality development. The physical and nervous weakness of many intellectually outstanding Jews results in a lack of physical courage (often in conjunction with the highest moral courage) and an insecurity of demeanour: characteristics that still seem incompatible with the chivalrous ideal of the nobleman today.

Thus, the spiritual master race of the Jews under the influence of the slave mentality that has been imposed on it by its historical development: even today, many Jewish leaders still carry the attitude and gestures of the unfree, oppressed human being. In their gestures, down-and-out aristocrats are often more noble than distinguished Jews.

These shortcomings of Jewry, which arose through development, will disappear again through development. The rusticisation of Jewry (a main goal of Zionism), combined with athletic education, will free Jews from the ghetto remnants they still carry within them today. The development of American Jewry proves that this is possible. The freedom and power that Jews have achieved will be followed by an awareness of this freedom and power, an awareness that will gradually lead to the attitude and behaviour of free, powerful people. Not only will Jewry change in the direction of the Western ideal of nobility - the Western ideal of nobility will also undergo a transformation that will meet Jewishness halfway. In a more peaceful Europe of the future, the nobility will shed its warlike character and exchange it for a spiritual priesthood. A pacified and socialised Western world will no longer need rulers and sovereigns - only leaders, educators and role models. In an Oriental Europe, the aristocrat of the future will resemble a Brahmin or mandarin more than a knight.

Outlook.

The nobleman of the future will be neither feudal nor Jewish, neither bourgeois nor proletarian: he will be synthetic. The races and classes in today's sense will disappear, but personalities will remain.

Only through union with the best bourgeois blood will the elements of the former feudal nobility capable of development rise to new heights; only through union with the pinnacles of non-Jewish Europeanism will the Jewish element of the future nobility reach its full potential. The chosen people of the future may be gifted with physically refined rustic nobility, perfect bodies and gestures, and a highly educated urban nobility with spiritualised physiognomies, soulful eyes and hands.

The nobility of the past was based on quantity: the feudal nobility on the number of ancestors; the plutocratic nobility on the number of millions. The nobility of the future will be based on quality: on personal worth, personal perfection, on the perfection of body, soul and spirit.

Today, on the threshold of a new era, the former hereditary nobility is being replaced by a random selection; instead of noble races, there are noble individuals: people whose random blood composition elevates them to exemplary types.

From this accidental nobility of today will emerge the new international and inter-social aristocracy of tomorrow. All that is outstanding in beauty, strength, energy and spirit will recognise each other and unite, according to the secret laws of erotic attraction. Once the artificial barriers erected between people by feudalism and capitalism have fallen, the most beautiful women will automatically fall to the most significant men, and the most accomplished men to the most outstanding women. The more perfect a man is physically, psychologically and spiritually, the greater the number of women from whom he will be able to choose. Only the noblest men will be free to be united with the noblest women, and vice versa - the inferior will have to be content with the inferior. Then the erotic way of life of the inferior and mediocre will be free love, and that of the chosen ones: free marriage. Thus, the new breeding nobility of the future will not emerge from the artificial norms of human caste formation, but from the divine laws of erotic eugenics.

The natural hierarchy of human perfection will replace the artificial hierarchy of feudalism and capitalism.

Socialism, which began with the abolition of the nobility and the levelling of humanity, will culminate in the breeding of the nobility and the differentiation of humanity. Here, in such eugenics, lies its highest historical mission, which it does not yet recognise today: to lead from unjust equality to true equality, to just inequality, to genuine, new nobility, over the ruins of all pseudo-aristocracy.