

Our Struggle is My Struggle: Solidarity Feminism as an Intersectional Reply to Neoliberal and Choice Feminism.

Abstract

The women's movement has long been pluralistic, yet in recent decades has diversified further along lines of individual choice versus collective action. This has been enabled by new opportunities for women that were not universally accessible. As a result, a form of "choice feminism" has developed in some feminists, especially in contexts in which neoliberalism is dominant, while calls for intersectional allyship, inclusion, and solidarity have grown louder in others. Responding to this tension, many scholars, particularly those within the field of social work, have shown that choice feminism is characterized by a number of problematic themes that can, paradoxically, reinforce oppression for marginalized people. Particularly, it can offer a heuristic of choice that is used to justify feminist decisions that benefit a small set of women at the expense of standing in solidarity with others and remediating oppression. This complex problem may benefit from a detailed interrogation of allyship and its attendant repercussions. Consequently, this paper forwards a framework for solidarity feminism—that is, an approach to feminism that centers solidarity against oppression— by favoring inclusive values-based allyship over choice feminism as an intersectional means to address one aspect of the enduring universalism problem within the feminist movement.

Keywords: solidarity feminism; choice feminism; neoliberal feminism; solidarity; allyship; intersectionality

In 2005, Linda Hirshman coined the controversial term "choice feminism," which she went on to develop and problematize in her (2006) book, *Get to Work: A Manifesto for Women of the World*. For Hirshman, choice feminism claims that whatever a woman freely chooses is (intrinsically) feminist. Choices available to a feminist under choice feminism include, in her words, decisions to "work, stay home, have ten children or one, marry or stay single" (Hirshman, 2005). Obviously, choice feminism spawned considerable controversy. For example, Michael Ferguson, who is one of its strongest critics, describes it as capturing "the widespread belief in the US that the women's movement has liberated women to make whatever choices they want" (Ferguson, 2010, p. 247) and Claire Snyder-Hall (2010), who is far less critical, describes it as "the idea that

[THE FIRST PERIOD OF DEVELOPMENT OF THE NATIONAL SOCIALIST GERMAN WORKERS' PARTY](#)

IF AT THE END of this volume I describe the first period in the development of our movement and briefly discuss a number of questions it raises, my aim is not to give a dissertation on the spiritual aims of the movement. The aims and tasks of the new movement are so gigantic that they can only be treated in a special volume. In a second volume, therefore, I shall discuss the programmatic foundations of the movement in detail and attempt to draw a picture of what we conceive of under the word 'state.' By 'us' I mean all the hundreds of thousands who fundamentally long for the same thing without as individuals finding the words to describe outwardly what they inwardly visualize; for the noteworthy fact about all reforms is that at first they possess but a single champion yet many million supporters. Their aim has often been for centuries the inner longing of hundreds of thousands, until one man stands up to proclaim such a general will, and as a standard-bearer guides the old longing to victory in the form of the new idea.

feminism should simply give women choices and not pass judgment on what they choose” (p.255). Choice feminism, which arose in the liberal branch, incorporates quotidian, typically gendered decisions from behavior and dress to profound lifestyle choices. These have been summarized critically by Ferguson (2010), who wrote, “The view that today all choices are feminist can be invoked to support decisions to wear lipstick and high heels, to participate in Girls Gone Wild!, to sleep with men, to enjoy pornography, to not have children, to hire a maid, or to adopt a gendered division of labor” (2010, p. 247).

For Ferguson, then, the central problem with choice feminism is that it allows for sidestepping demanding political work of feminism to dismantle gender roles, alongside other forms of oppression, and focus upon one’s own pleasure and fulfillment. It does so by considering “feminist” even those activities and beliefs that work against broader feminist aims. Ferguson is not alone in her criticism. Park et al. (2017) raise concerns that some feminist social work scholars use the term feminist for their “ ” work without any engagement with feminist theory or scholarship. Bay-Cheng (2012) stressed the need to de-personalize and repoliticize sexuality, particularly among adolescent girls. The current “popular empowerment discourse,” she argues, is not consistent with a genuine empowerment argued for by feminist social work scholars who seek collective social change.

Among critics of choice feminism, Ferguson may be most forceful and Hirschmann (2010), who called it “choosing betrayal,” may be most derisive. Because Ferguson (2010) argued that choice feminism inherently arises from a fear of getting one’s hands dirty with feminist politics, it follows that choice feminism diffuses and weakens feminism as a movement and intrinsically perpetuates inequality by refusing to challenge the status quo (Kirkpatrick, 2010). Put simply, choice feminism maintains the dominant system for the sake of individualistic goals and pleasures and due to fears of offending, being criticized, or otherwise being ostracized by/from a patriarchal society. It declines to render (critical) judgment upon women’s choices even if those ultimately undermine women’s equality. Moreover, choice feminism attempts to simultaneously placate feminists and (patriarchal/oppressive) mainstream society while in the process rendering collective political action all but impossible (Ferguson, 2010).

Ferguson’s critique is significant and largely sound. It is all but impossible to seek equality for women so long as women are

not recognized as a class of people who are oppressed for being women. Nevertheless, compelling concerns about universalism have been raised (Marso, 2010). Specifically, how can feminism be universalized to all women, by which is meant made to work on behalf of all women, if women have divergent experiences? So, Snyder-Hall (2010, p. 260) argued for the empowering potential of pluralism, self-determination, and non-judgmentalness but acknowledges this ultimately presents an individualistic approach to feminism that fails to recognize women as a class and inhibits collective action to change the structure of society (cf. Snyder, 2008). This indicates that the problem of universalizing feminism is that it has been the wrong approach all along; feminism should seek inclusion of all marginalized groups and solidarity against oppression—not universality, which has often stood as a de facto proxy for privileging the dominant conception of feminism and urging all marginalized “sisters” to “get in line.” Therefore, while Synder-Hall’s defense of choice feminism at the individualistic level is problematic, her advocacy of pluralism becomes a much stronger argument when considered in an intersectional light (cf. Edwards, 2006, p.54).

The importance of an intersectional approach built on plurality, self-determination, and non-judgmentalness becomes clear when remembering that not all women have the same experiences of oppression—there is no universal woman. These experiences vary not only in terms of gender, but also race, religion, sexuality, class, ability, and the ways in which those intersect (Collins, 1990). These indispensable contributions to feminism problematize the simplistic notion of women, privilege, and oppression as monolithic entities.

For this reason, intersectional feminism has been misunderstood at times through the application of a lens of “universal womanhood” within materialist and Marxist (see Mitchell, 2013) feminism. It has also been misunderstood more generally by opponents to feminism (cf. Dhamoon, 2010). It has thus sometimes been unfairly seen as divisive rather than unifying (cf. esp. Carbin & Edenheim, 2013; Davis, 2008; McCall, 2005; Nash, 2008). Ultimately, this attitude lies in opposition to the capacity intersectionality has to reach across multiple dimensions of lived oppression. Boucher (2017, p. 25), of note, discusses the importance of an intersectional approach to social work practice while acknowledging the difficulty of doing so within cohesive alliances for women’s issues.

This paper addresses a definitive aspect of this debate: it suggests a step towards reconciliation between choice

feminism and the need for collective action on behalf of women by prioritizing the intersectional understanding of the pluralistic nature of women's oppression. It then considers the arguments of Catherine Rottenberg (2014, 2017), who, in documenting the rise of neoliberal feminism, counters views that blame liberalism for a selfishly individualistic approach to feminism. Though we do not seek to defend liberalism per se, we agree with Rottenberg (2014, pp. 421–422) that selfishness in choice feminism is a product not of liberalism but of unrecognized privilege accorded those who benefit from neoliberalism. Though in different ways, liberal feminists such as Ann Cudd (2006), Marilyn Friedman (2003), and Diana Meyers (2004) reinterpreted choice as individualistic and rooted in autonomy, to choice seen as relational. As Friedman wrote, "what counts for autonomy is someone's perspectival identity, her wants, desires, cares, concerns, values, and commitments" (2003, p. 11). As such, Cudd's "deformed desire"—in which "the oppressed come to desire that which is oppressive to them...[and] one's desires turn away from goods and even needs that, absent those conditions, they would want" (2006, p. 181)—is particularly key to a liberal feminist rendering of female/oppressed autonomy as relational. Following Rottenberg (2014, p. 426), these crucial nuances of liberal feminism were "expediently elided," however, and replaced under neoliberalism and replaced by treating "climbing the power hierarchy...[as] the feminist objective" (emphasis original). Drawing on this crucial distinction, we add to and move beyond Rottenberg using the hermeneutic of intersectionality and the concepts of allyship, particularly in a values-based commitment to solidarity and antioppression. Finally, by considering allyship models as they have been applied in social work previously, we conclude by offering an eight-point framework toward renewing feminist solidarity.

Neoliberal Feminism

Rottenberg (2014) accurately describes individualistic choice-feminism approaches as neoliberal feminism, defined as

a dominant political rationality that moves to and from the management of the state to the inner workings of the subject, normatively constructing and interpellating individuals as entrepreneurial actors. New political subjectivities and social identities subsequently emerge. One of the hallmarks of our neoliberal age...is precisely the casting of every human endeavor and activity in entrepreneurial terms. (pp. 420–421)

In practical terms, neoliberalism translates into less accessibility for many women, for example, poor women who cannot easily afford or access childcare. Ultimately, these and other issues helped lead intersectional analyses to critique liberal feminists for failing to understand the intersectional nature of oppression (Collins, 1990), which then problematized universalizing approaches to feminism as representing relationally privileged interests ahead of marginalized ones (cf. hooks, 2000, 2014). In Rottenberg's (2014, 2017) view, the essential difference between liberal feminism and neoliberal feminism is that the former critiqued liberalism to make it more inclusive while the latter offers no critique whatsoever against neoliberalism and, instead, settles into and enjoys its putative benefits (2014, p. 419). Specifically, the neoliberal feminist is neoliberal

not only because she disavows the social, cultural and economic forces producing this inequality, but also because she accepts full responsibility for her own well-being and selfcare, which is increasingly predicated on crafting a felicitous work-family balance based on a cost-benefit calculus. The neoliberal feminist subject is thus mobilized to convert continued gender inequality from a structural problem into an individual affair. (Rottenberg, 2014, p.420)

The focus of neoliberal feminism, as Rottenberg (2014) notes, is on achieving happiness by balancing work and family life in a highly individualized, responsabilized, status-quo-preserving "feminism." It assumes all women have the same access to rewarding and well-remunerated careers that, for example, cover the costs of child-care. Thus, neoliberalism is a matter of class and capitalism and has much in common with Genz's (2006) postfeminism. Genz (2006) describes postfeminism as "entrepreneurial" and part of a centerleft "third way." This manifests in micro-politics and, she argues, yet again reduces feminism to an individualism deeply embedded in consumerist systems (p. 333).

While some feminists have been more optimistic and sympathetic to pressures on young women by arguing for accommodating neoliberal realities, more have not (McRobbie, 2015). Brooks (1997), for instance, in her in-depth study of postfeminisms, argues that accommodation can have some benefit in breaking away from older feminisms and producing a "non-hegemonic feminism capable of giving voice to local, indigenous and post-colonial feminisms" (p. 4). Critics, such as Rottenberg, Genz, and others, however, share a rich scholarly pedigree, most notably in following Featherstone (1996), who directly linked consumerist feminism with neoliberalism. This

vein of research culminated in Banet-Weiser (2015, p. 191), who tracked these developments and argued that a model of empowerment that sees girls as consumers/commodities fails to address socioeconomic systems that disempower women. In this vein, Goodkind (2009) argued that neoliberal feminism is particularly problematic within social work and, with Ballentine, explained that this problematic “version of empowerment has been enabled by what has variously been called choice feminism, postfeminism, or commercialized feminism, that is, a neoliberal cooptation of feminist principles and goals” (Goodkind & Ballentine, 2017, p. 429).

While this buttresses Snyder-Hall’s advocacy, Rottenberg is quick to point out the ways in which the inherent neoliberalism supports a Western-centric imperialist mindset. This mindset, she argues, sees the Western understandings of liberalism, happiness, and achievement as exemplified by the American Dream and achievable to all women rather than only a more privileged subset. Further, neoliberal feminism uses these neoliberal ideals to claim moral superiority over other cultures—which have often been dominated by imperialist/colonialist Western neoliberal approaches to “liberalism”—with different understandings of gender and sexuality” (2014, p. 420). We see this, for example, in western attempts to “liberate” Muslim women who choose to wear the hijab. While Snyder-Hall’s (2010) argument for the importance of pluralism, self-determination, and (cultural and sexual) non-judgmentalness is robust, our point of departure is in her arguing for choice feminism and claiming this entails that feminism cannot be collectivist (p. 260). To achieve broad political aims and social reformation, feminism must be a united force on behalf of all women. The central question thus remains: How can feminism become inclusive enough to combat a steadfastly patriarchal oppression that affects all women because they are women while at the same time recognizing and working for the most vulnerable women—women of color, lesbians, religious minorities, trans women, queer women, disabled women, and above all those women who are several of these simultaneously? For this, we argue, we need to center feminism on the concept of solidarity rooted in values-based allyship.

Allyship and Solidarity Feminism

The concept of allyship—in which the rights of marginalized and oppressed groups are supported by people in more privileged positions—is related to but distinct from solidarity and more complex than it appears (Reicher et al., 2006). Both share in

common a requirement for recognizing that while individuals can share the same or similar goals, different experiences, thus different priorities, also exist. This necessary turn to positionality is captured by Kristie Dotson's (2014) development of Plato's Allegory of ' ' the Cave as a tool for explaining the epistemic oppression and exclusion suffered by those unfavorably positioned within society. Dotson argues that only by increasing the range of shared epistemic resources—by recognizing that some experiential knowledge is missing —can such oppression be addressed. However, allyship can be both limited and problematic, even reproducing power dynamics when people claim for themselves the title of “ally” and the relational power and privilege that go with it (Edwards, 2006; Mullaly, 2009; Gibson, 2014). That is, the type of allyship taken up by feminists matters.

Among cogent analyses, perhaps most incisive is a taxonomic account by Glenda Russell and Janis Bohan (2016), which mirrors that of Keith Edwards (2006), who has produced what is among the most important essays on the topic. Edwards characterizes allyship in three fundamental stages, that based in selfinterest, on guilt, and upon a philosophical commitment to the values of social justice. Russell and Bohan offer a refinement that considers allyship in terms of relationship-based versus values-based allyship, on the one hand, or identity-based versus opinions-based allyship, on the other. These dichotomies have many similarities. Indeed, “values-based” and “opinions-based” notions of allyship seem almost indistinguishable except that values can be argued to “run deeper” (i.e., to carry more affective influence) than opinions. These are, then, a deeper and more superficial approach to Edwards' (2006) commitment-to-justice allyship. They also accord with Viraj Patel (2011), who rejects a white/non-white binary that retains the capacity to perpetuate a racial hierarchy and instead argues for a values-based inclusive allyship which is inclusive of all racialized people, including recognizing that white people can be victims of white privilege. “Relationship-based” and “identity-based” allyship are less similar. In the former case, people are motivated toward allyship with a specific identity group by compassion for the suffering of people they know and care about, i.e., through the self-interested (per Edwards) impacts of personal relationships that inform compassion for those afflicted by oppression, say by having a lesbian sister. By contrast, “identity-based” allyship need not entail a personal relationship to mediate compassion, but it nevertheless requires a specific interest in an identity group, which Edwards observes is often connected to (privileged) guilt (cf. Gibson, 2014, pp. 206–207). For example,

“straight allies” for the LGBT movement whose allyship is predicated upon interest in promoting the welfare of LGBT people individually and as a group, are identity-based allies.

Allyship, as such, routinely manifests problems in that it intrinsically assumes a power dynamic of a superior ally to oppressed/inferior others (see esp. Gibson, 2014, pp. 205–208). The manifestations of these inherent power dynamics rapidly complicate under intersectional heuristics in terms of ally behaviors and positionalities (Edwards, 2006, p. 54; cf. Mullaly, 2009). There is also the persistent problem in which people, out of self-interest or for better but thoughtless reasons, label themselves “allies” to an oppressed group which does not see them in that light and has not named them as such (Edwards, 2006). This can give the ally, or allow her to assume, an often-undeserved veneer of innocence. Consider how Julie Greenberg (2014) distinguishes solidarity from allyship by reflecting upon how identity-based allyship has led her to defer to the ideas of People of Color because of their identity. This led to what were, for her, predictable failures caused by her own presumptive approach to allyship. It also has significance for social work and related domains of study: Greenberg’s presumptive identity-based allyship led her to believe she had set up for failure the very people she intended to help, “In our effort to be anti-racist allies, the white clergy in the group had in many ways set up this African American leader to fail by outwardly endorsing her proposal even though we lacked the enthusiasm necessary to implement it” (Greenberg, 2014, p. 15). In this way, allyship is often tokenizing (Russell and Bohan, 2016). It can also be exploitative by pushing minorities into the unwanted role of spokesperson for an oppressed group for the benefit of more privileged (white) people. Per Gibson, “Having to live every day with minority stress, [minorities] communicate having little to no energy to advocate for other oppressed groups” (2014, p. 207). That is, allyship—especially being an ally—is deeply problematic without a careful consideration, especially of its interactions with inclusion (Gibson, 2014, p. 205). Here, solidarity distinguishes itself from allyship, its limitations (see esp. Edwards, 2006, pp. 52–55), and problematics by being active (cf. Gibson, 2014, p. 203), principled (Reicher et al., 2006), and apositional. Anyone can stand in solidarity with any oppressed other, no matter her relative privilege, and to stand in solidarity is an action. Hence, principled values-based allyship should progress, per Edwards (2006), away from self-interest, guilt, and self-designation and toward principled solidarity with all advocates for social justice.

These two ideas—the perpetuation of hierarchy and the failure to effectively help by excessive focus on identity over values—are synthesized in the deep analyses of motivations for allyship done by Edwards (2006) and Russell and Bohan (2016). The latter argue that a relationship- or identity-based allyship frequently results in paternalistic “rescue missions” that treat oppressed groups in tokenistic ways. Previous work on allyship, they claim, has been too individualistic and failed to realize the potential of collective action and solidarity, which an inclusive values-based allyship can produce. As they note, “The virtually exclusive focus on the individual is perhaps ironic when one considers that allies represent a central concept in collective action” (Russell & Bohan, 2016, p. 337). And,

By contrast, allies who approach their activism with a values- or principle-based identity perform such work exactly because they see sexual prejudice as an example of a broad violation of universal principles of justice and rights... allies should be attentive to practices that tokenize, infantilize, or marginalize... [and that] unduly center... those in dominant or privileged societal positions... the differences in perspective that derive from including differing identities in the conversation allow for richer discussion, problem solving, and action. Thus, discussions of positionality should be common. (Russell & Bohan, 2016, 346–350)

It should therefore be clear how an inclusive values-based approach to allyship, by foregrounding the right values (like solidarity and anti-oppression), can help to resolve the conflict between disparate forms of feminism without resorting to atomizing solutions like choice feminism, particularly given its invitation to neoliberal corruption (McRobbie, 2015; Rottenberg, 2014, 2017).

The operative value for feminism—as an anti-oppression movement and a philosophy for feminist social work—is overcoming oppression. Thus, the ideal values to foreground within feminism must be fundamentally inclusive and intersectional (Boucher, 2017). Because we all are complicit in relational oppression in one form or another, a turn toward solidarity and acknowledging that we are all complicit in oppression in fluid and multiple ways is needed (Carbin & Edenheim, 2013). This acknowledgement is, in fact, why solidarity works. Thus, a solidarity feminism rooted in scholarship on allyship, and the complexly interwoven, relational, shifting, and fluid dynamics of privilege and oppression may provide a needed site for feminist cohesion (Carbin & Edenheim, 2013; McCall, 2005). Particularly, it can facilitate resolution between those forms of

feminism that foreground collective action on behalf of women as a class and those which seek pluralism and self-determination while working within an intersectional framework. As Suzanna Walters (2017) writes, “both the charge of fragmentation and lockstep identity party-lines are parodies that miss the theoretical richness of intersectional feminism and its manifestation in complex and successful political coalitions.”

Ultimately, the aims and tasks of complex movements like intersectional feminism are so broad that they only have hope of being achieved through shared values against oppression. This requires solidarity, particularly within the realms of social work, which aims to support the most vulnerable with consistency and efficacy. To achieve this goal in praxis, it becomes necessary for feminists to create a clearer image of those ideas and aspirations conceived under the rubric of equality, particularly as it applies to women of every race, sexuality, nationality, ability status, class, and creed. As Rottenberg (2014, p. 419) writes, “What does it mean, many longtime feminists are asking, that a movement once dedicated, however problematically, to women’s liberation is now being framed in extremely individualistic terms, consequently ceasing to raise the specter of social or collective justice?” It is the same fundamental objectives—generating inclusion, recognition, and equality—that millions of women inwardly visualize and unite around, though outwardly as individuals they differ. Solidarity feminism provides a means for this realization.

The Individuating Role of Privilege

Rottenberg (2014, 2017) persuasively argues for an organized solidarity around the most marginalized rather than around the small percentage of successful white women who, as feminists and feminist scholars, have historically dominated the movement. Feminists and scholars must recognize a central fact about all societal reforms: at first they are only advocated by a relative few, though many support the general aims as core to their ambitions. What brings reforms to fruition is a movement that can stand up and “think together,” as Rosalind Gill (2016) phrased it—and thus create change in terms of transformative ideas. There may be no “universal woman” to define a one true feminism, and under intersectional heuristics neither privilege nor oppression can be regarded as totalizing because they are relational and shifting, but standing in solidarity against oppression in all its forms remains one such transformative idea.

The fact, as bell hooks (2000, 2004, 2014) has eloquently articulated, is that obtaining a basic change in conditions is something the majority of women desire, which ultimately discloses a current of discontent under which all women suffer, even if not equally. This discontent is manifest in many ways, and only some of these are reified as feminist and then lauded under neoliberal and choice feminism (Ferguson, 2010); this appears to be the case despite the way in which such disunity “hollows out the potential” for collective feminist reform (Rottenberg, 2014, p. 420). We all have our privilege and our oppression, however. For some women, our discontent is anguish and lack of hope while other women are marred by violence. Some are marginalized, and others have no choice but to deal with their anger and indignation in effected silence. Where one woman can express herself only through her exasperation, others go off individually in impassioned excesses. These multiplicities bear out a single concern: the inner dissatisfaction felt by so many women remains women’s lot under a multivariate matrix of dominance, which individualized neoliberal/choice feminism cannot address.

Of course, feminism was never meant to appeal to the satisfied and contented. It was meant to embrace the marginalized, the oppressed, people excluded from contentedness, and to liberate them. In Rottenberg’s (2014) phrasing, feminism was never meant to be about finding some happy balance, which “neutralizes the radical idea of collective uprising by atomizing the revolutionary agents and transferring the site of activity from the public arena to each individual’s psyche, but also conceptualizes change as an internal, solipsistic and affective matter” (p. 426). Feminism was meant to destabilize deeply rooted systems of dominance, power, and oppression. For Rottenberg, feminism cannot be superficial, then; it must grow deep roots. Individuated neoliberal and choice feminism cannot accomplish these goals. As she notes, neoliberal feminism is “so individuated that it has been completely unmoored from any notion of social inequality and consequently cannot offer any sustained analytic of the structures of male dominance, power, or privilege” (Rottenberg, 2014, pp. 425–426). Of note, for Ferguson the same problem applies to choice feminism: “Choice feminism will continue to have broad appeal to feminists because it gives us an easy way out of the dilemmas of politicizing the personal” (2010, p. 250). That is, neoliberalism and choice feminism remove the imperative to solidarity and mire feminism in superficiality. It is only by more unified action that strikes to the roots of multiplicities of

The fact that millions bear in their hearts the desire for a basic change in the conditions obtaining today proves the deep discontent under which they suffer. It expresses itself in thousandfold manifestations with one in despair and hopelessness, with another in ill will, anger, and indignation; with this man in indifference, and with that man in furious excesses. As witnesses to this inner dissatisfaction we may consider those who are weary of elections as well as the many who tend to the most fanatical extreme of the Left.

The young movement was intended primarily to appeal to these last. It is not meant to constitute an organization of the contented and satisfied, but to embrace those tormented by suffering, those without peace, the unhappy and the discontented, and above all it must not swim on the surface of a national body, but strike roots deep within it.

<p>oppression that feminism can have any hope of overcoming oppression in all its forms.</p>	
<p>This is why Patel (2011, p. 86) rightly calls for an allyship that is inclusive of “ all people.” It is why even liberal feminists like Friedman (2003, p. 71) call for “collective autonomy” in which autonomy for one recognizes the needs of the other. It is also why for Rottenberg (2014, pp. 433–434), feminism cannot be neoliberal or based in mere choice and thus be “most relevant for ‘high potential’ upwardly mobile women,” though a more inclusive and unified feminism is not an easy goal to achieve. Indeed, it is this challenge that leads Ferguson (2010, p. 250) to argue that for feminism to truly align with its anti-oppressive ambitions, feminists must acknowledge “the difficulty of living a feminist life.” That is, feminism needs to not be about making individuated choices but choices that foster inclusive values-based allyship and foreground intersectional values against all forms of oppression and domination—even when this makes the lives of (privileged) feminists more difficult.</p> <p>Feminism Divided</p> <p>There is a type of feminist whose views are more broadly attuned to range of oppression and dominance conditions. These feminists approach feminism primarily through inclusive values-based solidarity rooted in intersectional anti-oppression values, and aim to overcome patriarchal and oppressive domination (cf. Ferguson, 2010; hooks, 2004; Rottenberg, 2014, 2017). They reject the belief that their privilege is “just so” and therefore actively refuse the promotion of privileged interests for themselves; meanwhile, with what privilege they have, they work inclusively on behalf of marginalized groups outside their own (Carbin & Edenheim, 2013, esp. p. 245). These are feminists who understand Patel’s (2011) call for inclusive allyship and enact it by being “philosophically committed” to social justice (Edwards, 2006). They see both as integral to a successfully universal feminism without which an anti-oppressive society is both unthinkable and impossible.</p>	<p>*.....*.....*</p> <p>In purely political terms, the following picture presented itself in 1918: a people torn into two parts. The one, by far the smaller, includes the strata of the national intelligentsia, excluding all the physically active. It is outwardly national, yet under this word can conceive of nothing but a very insipid and weak-kneed defense of so-called state interests, which in turn seem identical with dynastic interests. They attempt to fight for their ideas and aims with spiritual weapons which are as fragmentary as they are superficial, and which fail completely in the face of the enemy's brutality. With a single frightful blow this class, which only a short time before was still governing, is stretched on the ground and with trembling cowardice suffers every humiliation at the hands of the ruthless victor.</p> <p>Confronting it is a second class, the broad mass of the laboring population. It is organized in more or less radical Marxist movements, determined to break all spiritual resistance by the power of violence. It does not want to be national, but consciously rejects any promotion of national interests, just as, conversely, it aids and abets all foreign oppression. It is numerically the stronger and above all comprises all those elements of the nation without which a national resurrection is unthinkable and impossible.</p>
<p>The problem, however, is that no fundamental remaking of society—thus no true equality for sex, gender, race, ability, status, sexuality, identity, creed, class, and so on—has any hope of occurring except through the remaking of extant systems of power (cf. Foucault, 2008). The prerequisite for this is not in feminist choice, as some feminists argue (Frieden, 1963; Hirshman, 2005, 2006; Snyder-Hall, 2010), but in solidarity that</p>	<p>For in 1918 this much was clear: no resurrection of the German people can occur except through the recovery of outward power. But the prerequisites for this are not arms, as our bourgeois 'statesmen' keep prattling, but the forces of the will. The German people had more than enough arms before. They were not able to secure freedom because the energies of the national instinct of self-preservation, the will for self-</p>

<p>comes with effective allyship (cf. Carbin & Edenheim, 2013; Reicher et al., 2006; Russell & Bohan, 2016). This is because activism by and for oppressed people has spanned centuries and should have been sufficient to achieve its aims, but oppression lingers because dominant groups have exploited the oppressed's lack of solidarity and common cause. As hooks poignantly articulates, "Clearly we cannot dismantle a system as long as we engage in collective denial about its impact on our lives" (2004, p. 3).</p>	<p>preservation, were lacking. The best weapon is dead, worthless material as long as the spirit is lacking which is ready, willing, and determined to use it. Germany became defenseless, not because arms were lacking, but because the will was lacking to guard the weapon for national survival.</p>
<p>The solidarity in inclusive allyship is the best means by which anti-oppressive goals can be achieved because activism is nearly worthless when it chooses its fights within itself as much as it does with the systems it seeks to change (cf. Carbin & Edenheim, 2013). That is, feminism has limited its own success—not for a lack of ambition or effort—because it has failed to stand in solidarity against oppression (cf. Greenberg, 2014; hooks, 2000). Centering solidarity in feminism is the imperative for overcoming oppression; as dominant forces in society (or feminists ourselves under neoliberalism and choice feminism) fragment feminism into several discordant factions, feminists will keep trading the chance to generate outward change for contributing to internal disputes (Walters, 2017). Thus, the question of improving (or, at this point, regaining) feminism's effectiveness as a liberatory movement is, at root, a question of maintaining solidarity with other oppressed groups. This is the case for no other reason than because movements derive their success less from performativity than from a clearly recognizable moral orientation (Reicher et al., 2006). Indeed, for Ferguson, feminism fundamentally requires not overcoming judgmentalness but making the right judgments: If we are to take seriously the premise that the personal is political, then we have to resist " ' the notion that to critically analyse the politics of the personal is necessarily to be judgmental" (2010, p. 251).</p> <p>Ultimately, developing a solidarity feminism depends on feminists' ability to link arms with co-constituted anti-oppression movements (hooks, 2014) (and being led by needs articulated from within oppression, which must be heard on their own terms [cf. Dotson, 2011], rather than by presumptions about those needs [Greenberg, 2014]). This capacity is determined mainly by the visible presence of a perfervid will for emancipation from oppressive dynamics. In this, it requires courage and commitment from more privileged feminists to put aside their interests and accept personal sacrifice and adversity from those outside the movement who</p>	<p>If today more than ever our Left politicians are at pains to point out the lack of arms as the necessary cause of their spineless, compliant, actually treasonous policy, we must answer only one thing: no, the reverse is true. Through your anti-national, criminal policy of abandoning national interests, you surrendered our arms. Now you attempt to represent the lack of arms as the underlying cause of your miserable villainy. This, like everything you do, is lies and falsification.</p> <p>But this reproach applies just as much to the politicians on the Right. For, thanks to their miserable cowardice, the Jewish rabble that had come to power was able in 1918 to steal the nation's arms. They, too, have consequently no ground and no right to palm off our present lack of arms as the compelling ground for their wily caution (read 'cowardice'); on the contrary, our defenselessness is the consequence of their cowardice.</p> <p>Consequently the question of regaining German power is not: How shall we manufacture arms? but: How shall we manufacture the spirit which enables a people to bear arms? If this spirit dominates a people, the will finds a thousand ways, every one of which ends in a weapon ! But give a coward ten pistols and if attacked he will not be able to fire a single shot. And so for him they are more worthless than a knotted stick for a courageous man.</p> <p>The question of regaining our people's political power is primarily a question of recovering our national instinct of self preservation, if for no other reason because experience shows that any preparatory foreign policy, as well as any evaluation of a state as such, takes its cue less from the existing weapons than from a nation's recognized or presumed moral capacity for resistance. A nation's ability to form alliances is determined much less by dead stores of existing arms than by the visible presence of an ardent national will for self-preservation and heroic death-defying courage. For an alliance is not concluded</p>

wish to maintain other forms of privilege and thus oppression (Ferguson, 2010). Such alliances are only formed by people who share an inclusive values-based vision (Edwards, 2006) and who are willing to act (Gibson, 2014). If overcoming oppression represents a question of regaining solidarity through allyship against all systems of dominance, it is equally clear that such a goal cannot be achieved by disparate movements that travel roughly in a similar direction (cf. hooks, 2014). That is, mere intersectional feminism may not be enough unless it is reconstituted as solidarity feminism. As substantive as internal disputes in feminism may be, exacerbated by neoliberalism and choice feminism as they are, and adequate to liberation as any one theoretical approach appears, these engagements have unfortunately provided relatively limited emancipatory power against entrenched systems of domination. Rather than by resolving these disputes, deeply rooted oppression can only be addressed by setting internal conflicts aside and adopting a single feminist identity bound by a single broad-reaching principle, such as solidarity (Reicher et al., 2006).

with arms but with men. Thus, the English nation will have to be considered the most valuable ally in the world as long as its leadership and the spirit of its broad masses justify us in expecting that brutality and perseverance which is determined to fight a battle once begun to a victorious end, with every means and without consideration of time and sacrifices; and what is more, the military armament existing at any given moment does not need to stand in any proportion to that of other states.

If we understand that the resurrection of the German nation represents a question of regaining our political will for self-preservation, it is also clear that this cannot be done by winning elements which in point of will at least are already national, but only by the nationalization of the consciously anti-national masses.

A young movement which, therefore, sets itself the goal of resurrecting a German state with its own sovereignty will have to direct its fight entirely to winning the broad masses. Wretched as our so-called 'national bourgeoisie' is on the whole, inadequate as its national attitude seems, certainly from this side no serious resistance is to be expected against a powerful domestic and foreign policy in the future. Even if the German bourgeoisie, for their well-known narrow-minded and short-sighted reasons, should, as they once did toward Bismarck, maintain an obstinate attitude of passive resistance in the hour of coming liberation - an active resistance, in view of their recognized and proverbial cowardice, is never to be feared.

It is different with the masses of our internationally minded comrades. In their natural primitiveness, they are more inclined to the idea of violence, and, moreover, their Jewish leadership is more brutal and ruthless. They will crush any German resurrection just as they once broke the backbone of the German army. But above all: in this state with its parliamentary government they will, thanks to their majority in numbers, not only obstruct any national foreign policy, but also make impossible any higher estimation of the German strength, thus making us seem undesirable as an ally. For not only are we ourselves aware of the element of weakness lying in our fifteen million Marxists, democrats, pacifists, and Centrists; it is recognized even more by foreign countries, which measure the value of a possible alliance with us according to the weight of this burden. No one allies himself with a state in which the attitude of the active part of the population toward any determined foreign policy is passive, to say the least.

To this we must add the fact that the leaderships of these parties of national treason must and will be hostile to any resurrection, out of mere instinct of self-preservation. Historically it is just not conceivable that the German people could recover its former position without settling accounts with those who were the cause and occasion of the unprecedented collapse which struck our state. For before the judgment seat of posterity November, 1918, will be evaluated, not as high treason, but as treason against the fatherland.

Thus, any possibility of regaining outward German independence is bound up first and foremost with the recovery of the inner unity of our people's will.

But regarded even from the purely technical point of view, the idea of an outward German liberation seems senseless as long as the broad masses are not also prepared to enter the service of this liberating idea. From the purely military angle, every officer above all will realize after a moment's thought that a foreign struggle cannot be carried on with student battalions, that in addition to the brains of a people, the fists are also needed. In addition, we must bear in mind that a national defense, which is based only on the circles of the so-called intelligentsia, would squander irreplaceable treasures. The absence of the young German intelligentsia which found its death on the fields of Flanders in the fall of 1914 was sorely felt later on. It was the highest treasure that the German nation possessed and during the War its loss could no longer be made good. Not only is it impossible to carry on the struggle itself if the storming battalions do not find the masses of the workers in their ranks; the technical preparations are also impracticable without the inner unity of our national will. Especially our people, doomed to languish along unarmed beneath the thousand eyes of the Versailles peace treaty, can only make technical preparations for the achievement of freedom and human independence if the army of domestic stoolpigeons is decimated down to those whose inborn lack of character permits them to betray anything and everything for the well-known thirty pieces of silver. For with these we can deal. Unconquerable by comparison seem the millions who oppose the national resurrection out of political conviction - unconquerable as long as the inner cause of their opposition, the international Marxist philosophy of life, is not combated and torn out of their hearts and brains.

Regardless, therefore, from what standpoint we examine the possibility of regaining our state and national independence,

	<p>whether from the standpoint of preparations in the sphere of foreign policy, from that of technical armament or that of battle itself, in every case the presupposition for everything remains the previous winning of the broad masses of our people for the idea of our national independence.</p> <p>Without the recovery of our external freedom, however, any internal reform, even in the most favorable case, means only the increase of our productivity as a colony. The surplus of all so-called economic improvements falls to the benefit of our international control commissions, and every social improvement at best raises the productivity of our work for them. No cultural advances will fall to the share of the German nation; they are too contingent on the political independence and dignity of our nation.</p> <p>Thus, if a favorable solution of the German future requires a national attitude on the part of the broad masses of our people, this must be the highest, mightiest task of a movement whose activity is not intended to exhaust itself in the satisfaction of the moment, but which must examine all its commissions and omissions solely with a view to their presumed consequences in the future.</p> <p>Thus, by 1919 we clearly realized that, as its highest aim, the new movement must first accomplish the nationalization of the masses.</p>
<p>Eight Steps Toward Renewing Feminist Solidarity</p> <p>In order to effect a renewed internal solidarity within feminism, we turn our attention to the demands of allyship, so it can create an intersectional-values-based solidarity feminism that draws on the words of bell hooks:</p> <p>It is obvious that many women have appropriated feminism to serve their own ends, especially those white women who have been at the forefront of the movement; but rather than resigning myself to this appropriation I choose to re-appropriate the term “feminism,” to focus on the fact that to be “feminist” in any authentic sense of the term is to want for all people, female and male, liberation from sexist role patterns, domination, and oppression.(hooks, 2014, p. 195)</p> <p>To this end, eight basic points to outline inclusive allyship feminism follow. These have been derived from our own</p>	<p>From a tactical standpoint a number of demands resulted from this.</p>

analyses and experiences and have been refined and prioritized by considerations of Edwards's (2006) three-phase model of allyship, Mullaly's (2009) advice about putting allyship into practice, and Gibson's (2014) development of how the "Ally Model" can be applied in social work pedagogy. Among these, particular attention was given to Edwards's (2006) indication that allyship tends to proceed from a position of self-interest (as in relationship allyship) through guilt (as occurs in identity-based allyship) to principled philosophical commitment (as in values-based allyship). Gibson's (2014) clarifications about the roles of awareness, attitudes/beliefs, and actions/skills further informed this prioritization. For her, awareness is necessary but not sufficient and requires conscious decision-making and dialogic reflection in addition to a commitment to (skillful) action. The points below therefore generally follow a framework (both within par - ticular points and overall) of beginning with awareness, influencing attitudes, and encouraging action while integrating a praxis that takes a potential partner in solidarity from self-interested allyship through guilt (as an opportunity for positive outcomes) to principled commitment to values-based solidarity. Finally, recognizing the problematics (Edwards, 2006, pp. 52-55) and limitations (Gibson, 2014, – pp. 205–206) of allyship overall, however, the points below seek to extend this theoretical model by coaxing it toward solidarity in anti-oppression and purposefully end by a reminder that even under these conditions, limiting problematics remain.

First, there is room for a limited choice feminism within a feminist movement that recognizes feminism must be organized through allyship and around solidarity against oppression (cf. Reicher et al., 2006). Allyship need not mean renouncing individual focuses (Kirkpatrick, 2010; Snyder-Hall, 2010). Divergent interests are coequal with schisms and are, indeed, the natural consequences of earnestly dealing with broadscale societal problems. The issue, then, is not with subdividing efforts according to the varying interests of individual feminists. (This is not inherently opposed to a solidarity feminism because such efforts present opportunities for unity under every concern that might affect liberation). That is, there is room for unity within intersectional values and even under (limited) choice within feminism. The key, however, lies in articulating its limitations.

Both theoretically and practically, overcoming oppression and liberating oppressed groups cannot be accomplished by reducing greater privilege—which privileged groups will successfully reject through their greater access to power—but

by acting to increase the rewards of “privilege” for those excluded from it. This was the heart of the Civil Rights movement, Gay Pride, and feminism, and here lies the strength of inclusive allyship for solidarity feminism. In turn, however, such a process will almost never be upheld by those benefiting from privilege because privilege preserves itself (Bailey, 2017). This reinforces neoliberal oppressions (Rottenberg, 2014, 2017) and trivializes feminism by the choices of the relationally and momentarily privileged (Ferguson, 2010; Hirschmann, 2010; cf. Snyder-Hall, 2010, p. 255). It can only be effected by oppressed groups fighting for equality and justice in their access to societal opportunities that dominant groups take for granted (hooks, 2004). Ideally this would occur alongside more privileged allies willing to do the work, which requires sacrifices and some renunciation of choice by the relatively privileged for the more deeply oppressed (Ferguson, 2010; Friedman, 2003; Rottenberg, 2014). Those graced by privilege would do well to remember that their advantages were not organized into society by means of some great force that came ex nihilo to shape society, but that privilege establishes itself through its own dominance by working from within its own privilege (Dotson, 2011, 2014). That is, privilege once established sustains itself, rendering the myth of meritocracy a pleasant salve for privileged guilt in those who have been positioned into their advantages by structures of power in which they are necessarily complicit (Rottenberg, 2017).

History has shown that members of oppressed groups cannot and will not be raised out of oppression (Dotson, 2011, 2014; Foucault, 2008). They will not be granted privileges in an unjust and unequal society, not least by feeble scenes of fraternization that ultimately define self-interested relationship-based allyship (Edwards, 2006; Russell & Bohan, 2016). As Ferguson (2010, p. 251) instructs, the personal is political— hence feminism cannot fear politics and thus abnegate itself in the name of choice—it requires sacrificial work to raise consciousness about privilege (cf. Gibson, 2014) until every difference, even the most outrageous, is effectively redressed (hooks, 2000, 2014). For feminism to undertake such a goal, it needs to build support from among the relatively oppressed through listening, solidarity, and inclusion and appeal to relatively privileged allies by awakening their compassion until they understand the problem and thus internalize the need for change.

Among the obstacles to inclusive values-based allyship, the most severe is convincing relatively privileged allies to take up, at their own cost, causes of oppressed groups. As Friedman points out, “collective action may require some suppression of

the individual autonomy of at least some of its participants. Group solidarity can sometimes be antithetical to autonomy” (2013, p. 71). It isn’t in defense of their own right to liberation but in the dispersed interests and attitudes that are, from within a relatively privileged engagement, incidentally inimical to the greater needs of more or differently oppressed peoples. This is the danger of the purely personal that rests at the heart of choice feminism: if the personal is political, and the personal underestimates the need to overthrow oppression in all its forms, not just one’s own, then the selfishness inherent in such a “feminism” renders it in many ways anti-emancipatory and thus self-defeating (Ferguson, 2010). That is, under allyship that can enact a broader solidarity project, many individual feminists will lose sight of various struggles taking place over purely personal matters—as has produced schisms between radical feminists and trans activists and between some LGBT activists and queer theorists. It is this “disjuncture between our political principles and our personal lives that produces dilemmas for feminists” (Ferguson, 2010, p. 249). For Friedman, “It is therefore crucial to consider the ways in which personal autonomy might undermine the collective struggles those groups need to undertake in their fight against oppression” (2013, p. 71).

This is why, for Ferguson (2010, p. 248), “Choice feminism hopes to defuse these criticisms by representing feminism as a nonthreatening, capacious movement that welcomes all supporters—however discordant their views—while demanding only the thinnest of political commitments.” As Rottenberg (2014, p. 432) points out in criticizing the feminist “happiness industry,” however, this stands to favor those with greater access to privilege in terms of pursuing their own work/life balance at the (often inadvertent) cost of generating, perpetuating, or ignoring oppression. Put more plainly, a movement that sincerely wishes to liberate marginalized groups from oppression and tear them away from existing structures of dominance— which should be feminism—must renounce, even sharply attack, the very idea that privilege is granted from the more privileged to the more oppressed. Because privilege, at best, typically renders one oblivious to the full extent of their privileged status (see Dotson, 2014), such an assertion is not only false, it is a (un)conscious lie (Bailey, 2014; Dotson, 2011).

As certain as any given person “sins” against a movement predicated on allyship when, without considering the ways her actions may aggravate the plight of others, she raises acquisitive demands that serve her own causes narrowly, a choice feminist likewise breaks the affective threads of allyship

<p>when she applies influence to her own benefit in a selfish or exploiting way. A conventionally beautiful woman may choose to become a model, actress, or porn star, and she may see it as a feminist act that she can rise to neoliberal success in this way, but at what cost to those whose oppression she ignores? Hence, choice feminists may fall victim to a force like internalized misogyny and thereby betray others for their own gains (Hirschmann, 2010), or turn to (trivial) neoliberal concerns accessible only by the most upwardly mobile and privileged among women (Rottenberg, 2014). Such a choice feminist has no real right, then, to designate herself champion against oppression and spoils her right to claim allyship with an oppressed community (Gibson, 2014). Rather, she mishandles her privilege, fails her allyship, and induces social injustice (Greenberg, 2014). And she does this while provoking future conflicts in such a way that too frequently end in harming the effort to remediate oppression. As Ferguson (2010, p. 250) asks, "This is a vision of a world in which we all get along not because we agree, but because we studiously avoid conflict. What good is a political consciousness if we are afraid to use it?"</p>	
<p>Second, then, in creating solidarity for overcoming oppression, sacrifices will be necessary, and, though we must remain aware of the real and material barriers feminists and others may face that limit their potential for activism, no accessible sacrifice that abnegates neoliberalism should be considered too great. As Ferguson (2010, p. 251) remarks, "Feminists need to publicly make judgments about personal matters—sex, career decisions, dress and makeup, power in intimate relationships—because reimagining our personal lives is an essential component to a feminist reimagining of the world we share." Whatever compromises are made by neoliberal feminists for the causes of oppressed people, they do not stand in significant proportion against the potential gain of those oppressed, including women, if oppression is considerably remedied.</p> <p>Only myopic selfishness, as often arises in neoliberal and choice-centered contexts, can forward individual autonomy over collective autonomy and thus prevent understanding that genuine liberation requires achieving liberation for all. This cannot occur unless, through right allyship and solidarity, feminism can be solidified internally first.</p> <p>Put another way, if more feminists had, rather than becoming distracted by seductions of choice, the baubles of neoliberalism, or male approval, implacably guarded the interests of</p>	<p>(1) To win the masses for a national resurrection, no social sacrifice is too great.</p> <p>Whatever economic concessions are made to our working class today, they stand in no proportion to the gain for the entire nation if they help to give the broad masses back to their nation. Only pigheaded short-sightedness, such as is often unfortunately found in our employer circles, can fail to recognize that in the long run there can be no economic upswing for them and hence no economic profit, unless the inner national solidarity of our people is restored.</p> <p>If during the War the German unions had ruthlessly guarded the interests of the working class, if even during the War they had struck a thousand times over and forced approval of the demands of the workers they represented on the dividend-hungry employers of those days; but if in matters of national defense they had avowed their Germanism with the same fanaticism; and if with equal ruthlessness they had given to the fatherland that which is the fatherland's, the War would not have been lost. And how trifling all economic concessions, even the greatest, would have been, compared to the immense importance of winning the War!</p> <p>Thus a movement which plans to give the German worker back to the German people must clearly realize that in this question</p>

<p>oppressed people— especially those dominated by racism, colonialism, imperialism, ableism, homophobia, classism, and all other manners of oppression that intersect with feminism and if in matters of — remaking society more feminists had avowed only their commitment against all oppressions with equal intensity as they defended their will to female choice, and if with equal firmness they had demanded justice for all those oppressed by systems of power (cf. hooks, 2000), today we would very likely have equality. And how exiguous all concessions to this choice-based pet project or that neoliberal aim—even the greatest among them—would have been as compared against the greater importance of disrupting oppressive systems of dominance. Ultimately, a feminism that hopes to overthrow oppression by remaking society in a way that is free of it, however unrealistic that ideal may be in practice, must apprehend that making sacrifices of choice, individual autonomy, and opportunity are of minor importance so long as they imperil the opportunity for others to be freed from oppression.</p>	<p>economic sacrifices are of no importance whatever as long as the preservation and independence of the national economy are not threatened by them.</p>
<p>Third, a movement seeking cultural reform cannot succeed only by raising awareness, applying scholarship, or convincing privileged people (mostly white men) in power. It must find/create its own cultural and political influence. Power cannot be of the self-perpetuating neoliberal sort that Rottenberg (2014) critiques, but instead must take a form consistent with Ferguson (2010), who draws neither on neoliberalism nor selfish choice but upon intersectionality, thus allyship. Still, a recognition of every marginalized person’s right to power is justified. Every movement that might help raise people from oppression has a duty, not merely a right, to take steps through which it can translate its theories into praxis. In this way, choice feminism is deficient in that it is too individuated to secure such means in any one concentrated place (Hirschmann, 2010). Liberation is not liberation if all it achieves is freedom of choice for a small number of privileged women, as choice feminists believe; it must dismantle the systems by which oppression limits the opportunities of others. That is, if feminism is to stand against oppression it cannot only enable the choices of its most privileged advocates (Ferguson, 2010).</p>	
<p>Fourth, for feminism to achieve solidarity, it must change culture. To accomplish this, it must change the discourses defining culture. Feminist education must therefore take place indirectly through social uplift —“feminist politics are made, not</p>	<p>(2) The national education of the broad masses can only take place indirectly through a social uplift, since thus exclusively can those general economic premises be created which permit the individual to partake of the cultural goods of the nation.</p>

<p>born” (hooks, 2000, p. 7)—which is best achieved by a philosophical commitment to inclusive values-based allyship and solidarity (cf. Edwards, 2006; Patel, 2011; Russell & Bohan, 2016), particularly in a way that listens (Dotson, 2011; Greenberg, 2014) and acts upon the awareness it has raised (Gibson, 2014). By exclusively pursuing this approach a feeling of liberation can be generated that permits all oppressed people to fully participate in a state of justice.</p>	
<p>Fifth, though change may come in stages, feminism cannot limit itself to half-measures in solidarity or be selfish. These manifest under choice feminism (Ferguson, 2010), for example, by placing emphasis upon a so-called objective standpoint (cf. hooks, 2000, p. 8) or through pursuit of aims that appear feminist but actually support neoliberalism (Rottenberg, 2014, 2017). Though what constitutes justice is itself multi-farious and pluralistic, only a single-minded alignment with solidarity for effecting the goal of justice will suffice (cf. Hirschmann, 2010; hooks, 2000; Patel, 2011; Russell & Bohan, 2016). That is to say, under neoliberal approaches, society will not be made “feminist” in the true sense (Rottenberg, 2014; pace Snyder-Hall, 2010) but only “feministic” with many limitations. This is the state in which we now find ourselves. Neoliberal oppression can only be countered by an effective antidote to neoliberalism—which Rottenberg demonstrated that neoliberal “feminism” cannot provide. Only the blinkering of privilege (cf. DiAngelo, 2011; Dotson, 2014) could underestimate the need for solidarity and regard choice feminism as a workable solution (Rottenberg, 2014, p. 428). Most people are neither scholars nor activists—indeed, few even consider themselves feminists (Houvouras & Carter, 2008). As such, they possess little understanding of abstract theoretical knowledge, and this directs their opinions toward the affective, which is where their compassion and frustration lies. In this sense, individuals are receptive to appeals in one direction or the other but never to a “nuanced” halfway point between the two. Allyship is a means by which compassion can be directed toward more oppressed others in stages (Edwards, 2006), whereas, as Rottenberg (2014, p. 428) explains, neoliberalism and choice limit compassion and foster “forgetting” toward groups outside one’s own.</p> <p>Still, people’s emotional disposition enables their compassion while rendering considerable stability. This can support the status quo, as it does under neoliberalism (Rottenberg, 2014) and choice feminism (Ferguson, 2010), but it also conditions affective solidarity that can be directed through inclusive</p>	<p>(3) The nationalization of the broad masses can never be achieved by half-measures, by weakly emphasizing a so-called objective standpoint, but only by a ruthless and fanatically one-sided orientation toward the goal to be achieved. That is to say, a people cannot be made 'national' in the sense understood by our present-day bourgeoisie, meaning with so and so many limitations, but only nationalistic with the entire vehemence that is inherent in the extreme. Poison is countered only by an antidote, and only the shallowness of a bourgeois mind can regard the middle course as the road to heaven.</p> <p>The broad masses of a people consist neither of professors nor of diplomats. The scantiness of the abstract knowledge they possess directs their sentiments more to the world of feeling. That is where their positive or negative attitude lies. It is receptive only to an expression of force in one of these two directions and never to a half-measure hovering between the two. Their emotional attitude at the same time conditions their extraordinary stability. Faith is harder to shake than knowledge, love succumbs less to change than respect, hate is more enduring than aversion, and the impetus to the mightiest upheavals on this earth has at all times consisted less in a scientific knowledge dominating the masses than in a fanaticism which inspired them and sometimes in a hysteria which drove them forward.</p> <p>Anyone who wants to win the broad masses must know the key that opens the door to their heart. Its name is not objectivity (read weakness), but will and power.</p>

<p>values-based allyship. This is more difficult to discompose than is its conceptual basis (opinion-based allyship). That is, compassion—the awareness of and concern for the suffering and oppression of others, which is the root of solidarity and inclusive values-based allyship (cf. Greenberg, 2014; Patel, 2011; Reicher et al., 2006)—is less likely to dissolve than mere respect (so also, e.g., as through identity-based allyship [cf. Russell & Bohan, 2016]). Likewise, disgust is more powerful than aversion, and thus the aversion of the political afforded by privilege within neoliberalism and choice feminism can be set aside through a disgust of the mistreatment of those already oppressed (Ferguson, 2010). In short, the willingness to “get one’s hands dirty” in creating change comes less in some abstract notion of “feminism” than from an affective “passionate politics” that (re)makes feminism for everyone (hooks, 2000). Willingness acts as an impetus to the centrality of listening to lived experience in effecting the allyship (Gibson, 2014), and it is a key to unlocking compassion. Detached “objectivity,” which is ultimately a weakness that maintains oppression (Dotson, 2011, 2014), then, is not enough; what is needed is a will for inclusion, compassion, and the power to achieve liberation.</p>	
	<p>(4) The soul of the people can only be won if along with carrying on a positive struggle for our own aims, we destroy the opponent of these aims.</p> <p>The people at all times see the proof of their own right in ruthless attack on a foe, and to them renouncing the destruction of the adversary seems like uncertainty with regard to their own right if not a sign of their own unright.</p> <p>The broad masses are only a piece of Nature and their sentiment does not understand the mutual handshake of people who claim that they want the opposite things. What they desire is the victory of the stronger and the destruction of the weak or his unconditional subjection.</p> <p>The nationalization of our masses will succeed only when, aside from all the positive struggle for the soul of our people, their international poisoners are exterminated.</p>
<p>Sixth, feminism requires recognizing that among the most pressing concerns in any society are questions presently relevant about the consequences of particular causes (cf. hooks, 2004). At present, the concern with the broadest causal</p>	<p>(5) All great questions of the day are questions of the moment and represent only consequences of definite causes. Only one among all of them, however, possesses causal importance, and that is the question of the racial preservation of the nation. In</p>

<p>importance to feminism is the matter of understanding and defying oppression in multiple and intersecting forms (hooks, 2000, 2014). So long as many feminists forward individualized personal choice and fail to recognize the importance of intersecting power dynamics and their intrinsic capacity to oppress, they will also fail to realize that entrenched and self-reinforcing dominance in power and the reciprocal docility in subjugation are the exact qualities inherent to all unjust social dynamics. That is, groups that ignore the role of power in generating oppression, of which theirs is but a single part, or that benefit from it and thus refuse to challenge it (Rottenberg, 2014), have no ultimate hope of liberation from it (cf. Collins, 1990). This is the basis of a call to allyship with deep, affective, solidifying roots; without a clear appreciation of oppression, and hence the problem intrinsic to privilege itself—even within feminism itself—there can be no remediation (cf. Ferguson, 2010; Rottenberg, 2017). It is the question of power that is key to understanding culture, and power comes from coalition, and coalition comes from solidarity through allyship (Walters, 2017).</p>	<p>the blood alone resides the strength as well as the weakness of man. As long as peoples do not recognize and give heed to the importance of their racial foundation, they are like men who would like to teach poodles the qualities of greyhounds, failing to realize that the speed of the greyhound like the docility of the poodle are not learned, but are qualities inherent in the race. Peoples which renounce the preservation of their racial purity renounce with it the unity of their soul in all its expressions. The divided state of their nature is the natural consequence of the divided state of their blood, and the change in their intellectual and creative force is only the effect of the change in their racial foundations.</p> <p>Anyone who wants to free the German blood from the manifestations and vices of today, which were originally alien to its nature, will first have to redeem it from the foreign virus of these manifestations.</p> <p>Without the clearest knowledge of the racial problem and hence of the Jewish problem there will never be a resurrection of the German nation.</p> <p>The racial question gives the key not only to world history, but to all human culture.</p>
<p>Seventh, the future of a movement that fights oppression is predicated not on its tolerance, particularly of the intolerable, but upon its intolerance of oppression in all its forms. This is Ferguson’s (2010) point. It is best phrased, however, by hooks in <i>Ain’t I a Woman?</i>, where she asks, “how does one overthrow, change, or even challenge a system that you have been taught to admire, to love, to believe in?” (hooks, 2014, p. 121). It is a common but significant error to believe that feminism can be strengthened by merely forming a coalition with some other similar movement (cf. Walters, 2017). It is true that coalitions of this kind result in an increase in the outer dimensions of feminism, and it follows that superficial assessments will render this as an increase in the capacity to effect change. Historically, however, such a coalition usually leads to internal disagreements and inner weakening that will later render it ineffective—for whatever one can say about the similarities in character of two separate movements, it is, in reality, rarely present. Take, for example, the case of the deep struggles between broader feminism and Black feminism that initiated the need for intersectionality, which arose under insufficiently articulated allyship and porosity instead of solidarity in feminism (Collins, 1990; cf. hooks, 2014). If there were</p>	<p>(6) Organizing the broad masses of our people which are today in the international camp into a national people's community does not mean renouncing the defense of justified class interests. Divergent class and professional interests are not synonymous with class cleavages but are natural consequences of our economic life. Professional grouping is in no way opposed to a true national community, for the latter consists in the unity of a nation in all those questions which affect this nation as such.</p> <p>The integration of an occupational group which has become a class with the national community, or merely with the state, is not accomplished by the lowering of higher classes but by uplifting the lower classes. This process in turn can never be upheld by the higher class, but only by the lower class fighting for its equal rights. The present-day bourgeoisie was not organized into the state by measures of the nobility, but by its own energy under its own leadership.</p> <p>The German worker will not be raised to the framework of the German national community via feeble scenes of fraternization, but by a conscious raising of his social and cultural situation</p>

solidarity between the movements then there would not be two movements in coalition but only one movement based upon the values and conditions of that solidarity. This is why the core notion for solidarity feminism should be inclusive allyship based on a legitimate apprehension of the harms of oppression in all of its manifestations (Mohanty, 2003; cf. Reicher et al., 2006).

Put differently, the capacity for feminism to effect change is exclusively guaranteed by its ability to achieve inner solidarity through allyship. This is the character of a feminism which does not merely seek early or momentary successes, as are provided by choice feminism (Ferguson, 2010) and under neoliberalism (Rottenberg, 2014), but of a feminism for which the enduring work against oppression is elicited by absolute intolerance to oppression as the root of long-term growth. Superficial allyship for particular aims can only produce a feminism that owes its strength to compromises, which leaves them like plants germinated in a conservatory that then lack the hardening to withstand adverse weather and thus defy history (cf. hooks, 2014). The apparent advantage feminism obtains by forming coalitions on grounds other than inclusive allyship is often undone as maturing factions begin to turn to their own interests (Rottenberg, 2014, 2017).

Eighth, and finally, on principle, feminism must endeavor to present itself so that feminists do not view the oppression of others as remote, as can happen under choice feminism, but as the object of their own endeavors. Ferguson (2010) captured this notion clearly and articulated it in her imperative to judiciousness of concern and identification between the personal and the political. That is, oppression is not something feminists should avoid; it is the bedrock upon which feminism is grounded. Part of this work demands feminists not fear criticism and outrage that can follow from challenging privileged systems (cf. Bailey, 2014, 2017; Dotson, 2014). Instead, we must look for these signs, heed Ferguson's admonition not to fear the political, and recognize them as forms of privilege-preserving pushback (Bailey, 2017) and fragility (cf. DiAngelo, 2011).

Feminism and Solidarity

Because of the real and material barriers that prevent many from taking such risks, it may go too far to say that any feminist who is not reproached by more privileged detractors, who is not subject to censures for her contributions, may be shortchanging her feminism. Still, for activists, among the best

until the most serious differences may be viewed as bridged. A movement which sets this development as its goal will have to take its supporters primarily from this camp. It may fall back on the intelligentsia only in so far as the latter has completely understood the goal to be achieved. This process of transformation and equalization will not be completed in ten or twenty years; experience shows that it comprises many generations.

The severest obstacle to the present-day worker's approach to the national community lies not in the defense of his class interests, but in his international leadership and attitude which are hostile to the people and the fatherland. The same unions with a fanatical national leadership in political and national matters would make millions of workers into the most valuable members of their nation regardless of the various struggles that took place over purely economic matters.

A movement which wants honestly to give the German worker back to his people and tear him away from the international delusion must sharply attack a conception dominant above all in employer circles, which under national community understands the unresisting economic surrender of the employee to the employer and which chooses to regard any attempt at safeguarding even justified interests regarding the employee's economic existence as an attack on the national community. Such an assertion is not only untrue, but a conscious lie, because the national community imposes its obligations not only on one side but also on the other.

Just as surely as a worker sins against the spirit of a real national community when, without regard for the common welfare and the survival of a national economy, he uses his power to raise extortionate demands, an employer breaks this community to the same extent when he conducts his business in an inhuman, exploiting way, misuses the national labor force and makes millions out of its sweat. He then has no right to designate himself as national, no right to speak of a national community; no, he is a selfish scoundrel who induces social unrest and provokes future conflicts which whatever happens must end in harming the nation.

Thus, the reservoir from which the young movement must gather its supporters will primarily be the masses of our workers. Its work will be to tear these away from the international delusion, to free them from their social distress, to raise them out of their cultural misery and lead them to the

measures for the impact of one's feminism—for the sincerity of allyship, the conviction to the cause against oppression, and the force of solidarity and (good)will behind it—is evoking the privilege-preserving hostility, pushback, and outrage from positions of privilege (Bailey, 2014, 2017; DiAngelo, 2011; Dotson, 2011, 2014). Dominance and oppression seek to retain their status, power, and dominance over those they oppress, as this is the in - trinsic function of privilege upon society (Bailey, 2017; cf. Ferguson, 2010). Of all the seductions of choice feminism, indulgence and flattery of privilege is the most potent lure away from doing the difficult work against oppression. It therefore must be repeatedly pointed out that privilege always seeks to preserve itself (Bailey, 2014, 2017; Dotson, 2014). Privilege, therefore, always pushes back. This is often through (inadvertent) dishonesty of willful or strategic ignorance (Bailey, 2017; Dotson, 2011), so much so that even the occasional truth that comes out against liberation is mainly intended to cover a greater falsification and thus acts a tool of untruth or epistemic exclusion/oppression (Dotson, 2014). Privilege can therefore lead people to be unwitting masters in deception, especially of themselves, and so we all inadvertently perpetuate privilege. Consequently, every assertion of privilege made against a feminist standing in solidarity against oppression especially every misrepresentation made against — the unmaking of oppression and dominance—can be interpreted a mark of honor upon she who stands in solidarity. This is because privileged fragility will always fight the loss of privilege and dismantling of oppressions, and thus receiving its opprobrium, when it can be done, means one's solidarity was effective. And every such act of solidarity against privileged domination carries with it the diminution of oppression.

For Ferguson (2010), then, this requires a willingness to enjoy the sacrifices of one's feminism (cf. Friedman, 2003, p. 71); for Rottenberg (2014) it is an imperative to relinquish the selfishness inherent in a "happiness project," posing as neoliberal feminism, possible only for the most privileged women. Ferguson asks the requisite hard questions of feminists committed to allyship, ultimately encouraging them to learn to love the emancipatory struggle for what it more deeply represents:

However, if we suspend judgment in the context of our personal relationships, we seem to be failing in courage as feminists—for feminism is precisely about reimagining and reworking the personal... Our political views also exact a demanding standard for ourselves... It can be exhausting to

national community as a valuable, united factor, national in feeling and desire.

If, in the circles of the national intelligentsia, there are found men with the warmest hearts for their people and its future, imbued with the deepest knowledge of the importance of this struggle for the soul of these masses, they will be highly welcome in the ranks of this movement, as a valuable spiritual backbone. But winning over the bourgeois voting cattle can never be the aim of this movement. If it were, it would burden itself with a dead weight which by its whole nature would paralyze our power to recruit from the broad masses. For regardless of the theoretical beauty of the idea of leading together the broadest masses from below and from above within the framework of the movement, there is the opposing fact that by psychological propagandizing of bourgeois masses in general meetings, it may be possible to create moods and even to spread insight, but not to do away with qualities of character or, better expressed, vices whose development and origin embrace centuries. The difference with regard to the cultural level on both sides and the attitude on both sides toward questions raised by economic interests is at present still so great that, as soon as the intoxication of the meetings has passed, it would at once manifest itself as an obstacle.

Finally, the goal is not to undertake a re-stratification in the camp that is national to begin with, but to win over the anti-national camp.

And this point of view, finally, is determining for the tactical attitude of the whole movement.

(7) This one-sided but thereby clear position must express itself in the propaganda of the movement and on the other hand in turn is required on propagandist grounds.

If propaganda is to be effective for the movement, it must be addressed to only one quarter, since otherwise, in view of the difference in the intellectual training of the two camps in question, either it will not be understood by the one group, or by the other it would be rejected as obvious and therefore uninteresting

Even the style and the tone of its individual products cannot be equally effective for two such extreme groups. If propaganda renounces primitiveness of expression, it does not find its way to the feeling of the broad masses. If, however, in word and gesture, it uses the masses' harshness of sentiment and

subject our every thought, our every decision to feminist analysis. (Ferguson, 2010, p. 249)

Understandably, though not quite forgivably, this is not widely considered desirable within choice feminism or feminism maintained under neoliberal aims. As noted by Ferguson, “As long as feminism provokes these criticisms, some feminists will be tempted to adopt some kind of a choice feminist orientation in response... Choice feminism will continue to have broad appeal to feminists because it gives us an easy way out of the dilemmas of politicizing the personal” (2010, pp. 249–250). Identical issues exist within neoliberal feminism for the same reason—an abnegation of responsibility against oppression. As explained by Rottenberg (2014, p. 432), neoliberal feminism, like choice feminism, is “No longer concerned with issues, such as the gendered wage gap, sexual harassment, rape or domestic violence, ambitious individual middle-class women themselves become both the problem and the solution in the neoliberal feminist age” (p. 432). Why? Because it doesn’t need to be; hence the demand for allyship as a solidarity capable of producing a genuinely liberatory feminism.

In conclusion, the call for feminism is a call to allyship and internal solidarity to stand against privilege, oppression, and dominance in all its forms. It is for feminism to recognize the moral worth and practical strength of allyship and solidarity, then, and to step away from narrower concerns that manifest under choice feminism and in service to neoliberalism that masquerades as “feminism.” Once an oppressed group earns access to privilege and chooses to enjoy and multiply it rather than continue to fight on behalf of others who are more oppressed, as many women have done after choice feminism took root, it loses the best part of its power. There is a moral potency in standing in solidarity on the side of anti-oppression. It is sold on the veneration of privilege. There is both strength and duty in allying through values of inclusion and anti-oppression with those who suffer distress, disgrace, slavery, and compulsion. Feminism’s charge is to find allyship by looking at oppression wherever it arises. We should hold out our hands to each other, and may those who are too proud, privileged, or ashamed to take them recognize the cost of their choices and reconsider their commitments.

expression, it will be rejected by the so-called intelligentsia as coarse and vulgar. Among a hundred so-called speakers there are hardly ten capable of speaking with equal effect today before a public consisting of street-sweepers, locksmiths, sewer-cleaners, etc., and tomorrow holding a lecture with necessarily the same thought content in an auditorium full of university professors and students. But among a thousand speakers there is perhaps only a single one who can manage to speak to locksmiths and university professors at the same time, in a form which not only is suitable to the receptivity of both parties, but also influences both parties with equal effect or actually lashes them into a wild storm of applause. We must always bear in mind that even the most beautiful idea of a sublime theory in most cases can be disseminated only through the small and smallest minds. The important thing is not what the genius who has created an idea has in mind, but what, in what form, and with what success the prophets of this idea transmit it to the broad masses.

The strong attractive power of the Social Democracy, yes, of the whole Marxist movement, rested in large part on the homogeneity and hence one-sidedness of the public it addressed. The more seemingly limited, indeed, the narrower its ideas were, the more easily they were taken up and assimilated by a mass whose intellectual level corresponded to the material offered.

Likewise for the new movement a simple and clear line thus resulted.

Propaganda must be adjusted to the broad masses in content and in form, and its soundness is to be measured exclusively by its effective result.

In a mass meeting of all classes it is not that speaker who is mentally closest to the intellectuals present who speaks best, but the one who conquers the heart of the masses.

A member of the intelligentsia present at such a meeting, who carps at the intellectual level of the speech despite the speaker’s obvious effect on the lower strata he has set out to conquer, proves the complete incapacity of his thinking and the worthlessness of his person for the young movement. It can use only that intellectual who comprehends the task and goal of the movement to such an extent that he has learned to judge the activity of propaganda according to its success and not according to the impressions which it leaves behind in himself. For propaganda is not intended to provide entertainment for

people who are national-minded to begin with, but to win the enemies of our nationality, in so far as they are of our blood.

In general those trends of thought which I have briefly summed up under the heading of war propaganda should be determining and decisive for our movement in the manner and execution of its own enlightenment work.

That it was right was demonstrated by its success

(8) The goal of a political reform movement will never be reached by enlightenment work or by influencing ruling circles, but only by the achievement of political power. Every world-moving idea has not only the right, but also the duty, of securing those means which make possible the execution of its ideas. Success is the one earthly judge concerning the right or wrong of such an effort, and under success we must not understand, as in the year 1918, the achievement of power in itself, but an exercise of that power that will benefit the nation. Thus, a coup d'état must not be regarded as successful if, as senseless state's attorneys in Germany think today, the revolutionaries have succeeded in possessing themselves of the state power, but only if by the realization of the purposes and aims underlying such a revolutionary action, more benefit accrues to the nation than under the past régime. Something which cannot very well be claimed for the German revolution, as the gangster job of autumn 1918, calls itself.

If the achievement of political power constitutes the precondition for the practical execution of reform purposes, the movement with reform purposes must from the first day of its existence feel itself a movement of the masses and not a literary tea-club or a shopkeepers' bowling society.

(9) The young movement is in its nature and inner organization anti-parliamentarian; that is, it rejects, in general and in its own inner structure, a principle of majority rule in which the leader is degraded to the level of a mere executant of other people's will and opinion. In little as well as big things, the movement advocates the principle of a Germanic democracy: the leader is elected, but then enjoys unconditional authority.

The practical consequences of this principle in the movement are the following:

The first chairman of a local group is elected, but then he is the responsible leader of the local group. All committees are subordinate to him and not, conversely, he to a committee.

There are no electoral committees, but only committees for work. The responsible leader, the first chairman, organizes the work. The first principle applies to the next higher organization, the precinct, the district or county. The leader is always elected, but thereby he is vested with unlimited powers and authority. And, finally, the same applies to the leadership of the whole party. The chairman is elected, but he is the exclusive leader of the movement. All committees are subordinate to him and not he to the committees. He makes the decisions and hence bears the responsibility on his shoulders. Members of the movement are free to call him to account before the forum of a new election, to divest him of his office in so far as he has infringed on the principles of the movement or served its interests badly. His place is then taken by an abler, new man, enjoying, however} the same authority and the same responsibility.

It is one of the highest tasks of the movement to make this principle determining, not only within its own ranks, but for the entire state.

Any man who wants to be leader bears, along with the highest unlimited authority, also the ultimate and heaviest responsibility.

Anyone who is not equal to this or is too cowardly to bear the consequences of his acts is not fit to be leader; only the hero is cut out for this.

The progress and culture of humanity are not a product of the majority, but rest exclusively on the genius and energy of the personality.

To cultivate the personality and establish it in its rights is one of the prerequisites for recovering the greatness and power of our nationality.

Hence the movement is anti-parliamentarian, and even its participation in a parliamentary institution can only imply activity for its destruction, for eliminating an institution in which we must see one of the gravest symptoms of mankind's decay.

(10) The movement decisively rejects any position on questions which either lie outside the frame of its political work or, being not of basic importance, are irrelevant for it. Its task is not a religious reformation, but a political reorganization of our people. In both religious denominations it sees equally valuable pillars for the existence of our people and therefore combats

those parties which want to degrade this foundation of an ethical, moral, and religious consolidation of our national body to the level of an instrument of their party interests.

The movement finally sees its task, not in the restoration of a definite state form and in the struggle against another, but in the creation of those basic foundations without which neither republic nor monarchy can endure for any length of time. Its mission lies not in the foundation of a monarchy or in the reinforcement of a republic, but in the creation of a Germanic state.

The question of the outward shaping of this state, its crowning, so to speak, is not of basic importance, but is determined only by questions of practical expediency.

For a people that has once understood the great problems and tasks of its existence, the questions of outward formalities will no longer lead to inner struggle.

(11) The question of the movement's inner organization is one of expediency and not of principle.

The best organization is not that which inserts the greatest, but that which inserts the smallest, intermediary apparatus between the leadership of a movement and its individual adherents. For the function of organization is the transmission of a definite idea - which always first arises from the brain of an individual - to a larger body of men and the supervision of its realization.

Hence organization is in all things only a necessary evil. In the best case it is a means to an end, in the worst case an end in itself.

Since the world produces more mechanical than ideal natures, the forms of organization are usually created more easily than ideas as such.

The practical development of every idea striving for realization in this world, particularly of one possessing a reform character, is in its broad outlines as follows:

Some idea of genius arises in the brain of a man who feels called upon to transmit his knowledge to the rest of humanity. He preaches his view and gradually wins a certain circle of adherents. This process of the direct and personal transmittance of a man's ideas to the rest of his fellow men is

the most ideal and natural. With the rising increase in the adherents of the new doctrine, it gradually becomes impossible for the exponent of the idea to go on exerting a personal, direct influence on the innumerable supporters, to lead and direct them. Proportionately as, in consequence of the growth of the community, the direct and shortest communication is excluded, the necessity of a connecting organization arises: thus, the ideal condition is ended and is replaced by the necessary evil of organization. Little sub-groups are formed which in the political movement, for example, call themselves local groups and constitute the germ-cells of the future organization.

If the unity of the doctrine is not to be lost, however, this subdivision must not take place until the authority of the spiritual founder and of the school trained by him can be regarded as unconditional. The geo-political significance of a focal center in a movement cannot be overemphasized. Only the presence of such a place, exerting the magic spell of a Mecca or a Rome, can in the long run give the movement a force which is based on inner unity and the recognition of a summit representing this unity.

Thus, in forming the first organizational germ-cells we must never lose sight of the necessity, not only of preserving the importance of the original local source of the idea, but of making it paramount. This intensification of the ideal, moral, and factual immensity of the movement's point of origin and direction must take place in exact proportion as the movement's germ-cells, which have now become innumerable, demand new links in the shape of organizational forms.

For, as the increasing number of individual adherents makes it impossible to continue direct communication with them for the formation of the lowest bodies, the ultimate innumerable increase of these lowest organizational forms compels in turn creation of higher associations which politically can be designated roughly as county or district groups.

Easy as it still may be to maintain the authority of the original center toward the lowest local groups, it will be equally difficult to maintain this position toward the higher organizational forms which now arise. But this is the precondition for the unified existence of the movement and hence for carrying out an idea.

If, finally, these larger intermediary divisions are also combined into new organizational forms, the difficulty is further increased

of safeguarding, even toward them, the unconditional leading character of the original founding site, its school, etc.

Therefore, the mechanical forms of an organization may only be developed to the degree in which the spiritual ideal authority of a center seems unconditionally secured. In political formations this guaranty can often seem provided only by practical power.

From this the following directives for the inner structure of the movement resulted:

(a) Concentration for the time being of all activity in a single place: Munich. Training of a community of unconditionally reliable supporters and development of a school for the subsequent dissemination of the idea. Acquisition of the necessary authority for the future by the greatest possible visible successes in this one place.

To make the movement and its leaders known, it was necessary, not only to shake the belief in the invincibility of the Marxist doctrine in one place for all to see, but to demonstrate the possibility of an opposing movement.

(b) Formation of local groups only when the authority of the central leadership in Munich may be regarded as unquestionably recognized.

(c) Likewise the formation of district, county, or provincial groups depends, not only on the need for them, but also on certainty that an unconditional recognition of the center has been achieved.

Furthermore, the creation of organizational forms is dependent on the men who are available and can be considered as leaders

This may occur in two ways:

(a) The movement disposes of the necessary financial means for the training and schooling of minds capable of future leadership. It then distributes the material thus acquired systematically according to criteria of tactical and other expediency.

This way is the easier and quicker; however, it demands great financial means, since this leader material is only able to work for the movement when paid.

(b) The movement, owing to the lack of financial means, is not in a position to appoint official leaders, but for the present must depend on honorary officers.

This way is the slower and more difficult.

Under certain circumstances the leadership of a movement must let large territories lie fallow, unless there emerges from the adherents a man able and willing to put himself at the disposal of the leadership, and organize and lead the movement in the district in question.

It may happen that in large territories there will be no one, in other places, however, two or even three almost equally capable. The difficulty that lies in such a development is great and can only be overcome in the course of years.

The prerequisite for the creation of an organizational form is and remains the man necessary for its leadership.

As worthless as an army in all its organizational forms is without officers, equally worthless is a political organization without the suitable leader.

Not founding a local group is more useful to the movement when a suitable leader personality is lacking than to have its organization miscarry due to the absence of a leader to direct and drive it forward.

Leadership itself requires not only will but also ability, and a greater importance must be attached to will and energy than to intelligence as such, and most valuable of all is a combination of ability, determination, and perseverance.

(12) The future of a movement is conditioned by the fanaticism yes, the intolerance, with which its adherents uphold it as the sole correct movement, and push it past other formations of a similar sort.

It is the greatest error to believe that the strength of a movement increases through a union with another of similar character. It is true that every enlargement of this kind at first means an increase in outward dimensions, which to the eyes of superficial observers means power; in truth, however, it only takes over the germs of an inner weakening that will later become effective.

For whatever can be said about the like character of two movements, in reality it is never present. For otherwise there would actually be not two movements but one. And regardless wherein the differences lie - even if they consisted only in the varying abilities of the leadership - they exist. But the natural law of all development demands, not the coupling of two formations which are simply not alike, but the victory of the stronger and the cultivation of the victor's force and strength made possible alone by the resultant struggle.

Through the union of two more or less equal political party formations momentary advantages may arise, but in the long run any success won in this way is the cause of inner weaknesses which appear later.

The greatness of a movement is exclusively guaranteed by the unrestricted development of its inner strength and its steady growth up to the final victory over all competitors.

Yes, we can say that its strength and hence the justification of its existence increases only so long as it recognizes the principle of struggle as the premise of its development, and that it has passed the high point of its strength in the moment when complete victory inclines to its side.

Therefore, it is only profitable for a movement to strive for this victory in a form which does not lead to an early momentary success, but which in a long struggle occasioned by absolute intolerance also provides long growth.

Movements which increase only by the so-called fusion of similar formations, thus owing their strength to compromises, are like hothouse plants. They shoot up, but they lack the strength to defy the centuries and withstand heavy storms.

The greatness of every mighty organization embodying an idea in this world lies in the religious fanaticism and intolerance with which, fanatically convinced of its own right, it intolerantly imposes its will against all others. If an idea in itself is sound and, thus armed, takes up a struggle on this earth, it is unconquerable and every persecution will only add to its inner strength.

The greatness of Christianity did not lie in attempted negotiations for compromise with any similar philosophical opinions in the ancient world, but in its inexorable fanaticism in preaching and fighting for its own doctrine.

The apparent head start which movements achieve by fusions is amply caught up with by the steady increase in the strength of a doctrine and organization that remain independent and fight their own fight.

(13) On principle the movement must so educate its members that they do not view the struggle as something idly cooked up, but as the thing that they themselves are striving for. Therefore, they must not fear the hostility of their enemies, but must feel that it is the presupposition for their own right to exist. They must not shun the hatred of the enemies of our nationality and our philosophy and its manifestations; they must long for them. And among the manifestations of this hate are lies and slander.

Any man who is not attacked in the Jewish newspapers, not slandered and vilified, is no decent German and no true National Socialist. The best yardstick for the value of his attitude, for the sincerity of his conviction, and the force of his will is the hostility he receives from the mortal enemy of our people.

It must, over and over again, be pointed out to the adherents of the movement and in a broader sense to the whole people that the Jew and his newspapers always lie and that even an occasional Ruth is only intended to cover a bigger falsification and is therefore itself in turn a deliberate untruth. The Jew is the great master in lying, and lies and deception are his weapons in struggle.

Every Jewish slander and every Jewish lie is a scar of honor on the body of our warriors.

The man they have most reviled stands closest to us and the man they hate worst is our best friend.

Anyone who picks up a Jewish newspaper in the morning and does not see himself slandered in it has not made profitable use of the previous day; for if he had, he would be persecuted, reviled, slandered, abused} befoiled. And only the man who combats this mortal enemy of our nation and of all Aryan humanity and culture most effectively may expect to see the slanders of this race and the struggle of this people directed against him.

When these principles enter the flesh and blood of our supporters, the movement will become unshakable and invincible.

(14) The movement must promote respect for personality by all means; it must never forget that in personal worth lies the worth of everything human; that every idea and every achievement is the result of one man's creative force and that the admiration of greatness constitutes, not only a tribute of thanks to the latter, but casts a unifying bond around the grateful.

Personality cannot be replaced; especially when it embodies not the mechanical but the cultural and creative element. No more than a famous master can be replaced and another take over the completion of the half-finished painting he has left behind can the great poet and thinker, the great statesman and the great soldier, be replaced. For their activity lies always in the province of art. It is not mechanically trained, but inborn by God's grace.

The greatest revolutionary changes and achievements of this earth its greatest cultural accomplishments the immortal deeds in the field of statesmanship, etc., are forever inseparably bound up with a name and are represented by it. To renounce doing homage to a great spirit means the loss of an immense strength which emanates from the names of all great men and women.

The Jew knows this best of all. He, whose great men are only great in the destruction of humanity and its culture, makes sure that they are idolatrously admired. He attempts only to represent the admiration of the nations for their own spirits as unworthy and brands it as a 'personality cult.'

As soon as a people becomes so cowardly that it succumbs to this Jewish arrogance and effrontery, it renounces the mightiest power that it possesses; for this is based, not on respect for the masses, but on the veneration of genius and on uplift and enlightenment by his example.

When human hearts break and human souls despair, then from the twilight of the past the great conquerors of distress and care, of disgrace and misery, of spiritual slavery and physical compulsion, look down on them and hold out their eternal hands to the despairing mortals!

Woe to the people that is ashamed to take them!

* * *

In the first period of our movement's development we suffered from nothing so much as from the insignificance, the unknownness of our names, which in themselves made our success questionable. The hardest thing in this first period, when often only six, seven, or eight heads met together to use the words of an opponent, was to arouse and preserve in this tiny circle faith in the mighty future of the movement.

Consider that six or seven men, all nameless poor devils, had joined together with the intention of forming a movement hoping to succeed - where the powerful great mass parties had hitherto failed - in restoring a German Reich of greater power and glory. If people had attacked us in those days, yes, even if they had laughed at us, in both cases we should have been happy. For the oppressive thing was neither the one nor the other; it was the complete lack of attention we found in those days.

When I entered the circle of these few men, there could be no question of a party or a movement. I have already described my impressions regarding my first meeting with this little formation. In the weeks that followed, I had time and occasion to study this so-called 'party' which at first looked so impossible. And, by God the picture was depressing and discouraging. There was nothing here, really positively nothing. The name of a party whose committee constituted practically the whole membership, which, whether we liked it or not, was exactly what it was trying to combat, a parliament on a small scale. Here, too, the vote ruled; if big parliaments yelled their throats hoarse for months at a time, it was about important problems at least, but in this little circle the answer to a safely arrived letter let loose an interminable argument!

The public, of course, knew nothing at all about this. Not a soul in Munich knew the party even by name, except for its few supporters and their few friends.

Every Wednesday a so-called committee meeting took place in a Munich café, and once a week an evening lecture. Since the whole membership of the 'movement' was at first represented in the committee, the faces of course were always the same. Now the task was at last to burst the bonds of the small circle, to win new supporters, but above all to make the name of the movement known at any price.

In this we used the following technique:

Every month, and later every two weeks, we tried to hold a 'meeting.' The invitations to it were written on the typewriter or sometimes by hand on slips of paper and the first few times were distributed, or handed out, by us personally. Each one of us turned to the circle of his friends, and tried to induce someone or other to attend one of these affairs.

The result was miserable.

I still remember how I myself in this first period once distributed about eighty of these slips of paper, and how in the evening we sat waiting for the masses who were expected to appear.

An hour late, the 'chairman' finally had to open the 'meeting.' We were again seven men, the old seven.

We changed over to having the invitation slips written on a machine and mimeographed in a Munich stationery store. The result at the next meeting was a few more listeners. Thus the number rose slowly from eleven to thirteen, finally to seventeen, to twenty-three, to thirty-four listeners.

By little collections among us poor devils the funds were raised with which at last to advertise the meeting by notices in the then independent Münchener Beobachter in Munich. And this time the success was positively amazing. We had organized the meeting in the Munich Hofbräuhauskeller (not to be confused with the Munich Hofbräuhaus-Festsaal), a little room with a capacity of barely one hundred and thirty people. To me personally the room seemed like a big hall and each of us was worried whether we would succeed in filling this 'mighty' edifice with people.

At seven o'clock one hundred and eleven people were present and the meeting was opened.

A Munich professor made the main speech, and I, for the first time, in public, was to speak second.

In the eyes of Herr Harrer, then first chairman of the party, the affair seemed a great adventure. This gentleman, who was certainly otherwise honest, just happened to be convinced that I might be capable of doing certain things, but not of speaking. And even in the time that followed he could not be dissuaded from this opinion. "

Things turned out differently. In this first meeting that could be called public I had been granted twenty minutes' speaking time.

I spoke for thirty minutes, and what before I had simply felt within me, without in any way knowing it, was now proved by reality: I could speak. After thirty minutes the people in the small room were electrified and the enthusiasm was first expressed by the fact that my appeal to the self-sacrifice of those present led to the donation of three hundred marks. This relieved us of a great worry. For at this time the financial stringency was so great that we were not even in a position to have slogans printed for the movement, or even distribute leaflets. Now the foundation was laid for a little fund from which at least our barest needs and most urgent necessities could be defrayed. But in another respect as well, the success of this first larger meeting was considerable.

At that time I had begun to bring a number of fresh young forces into the committee. During my many years in the army I had come to know a great number of faithful comrades who now slowly, on the basis of my persuasion, began to enter the movement. They were all energetic young people, accustomed to discipline, and from their period of service raised in the principle: nothing at all is impossible, everything can be done if you only want it.

How necessary such a transfusion of new blood was, I myself could recognize after only a few weeks of collaboration.

Herr Harrer, then first chairman of the party, was really a journalist and as such he was certainly widely educated. But for a party leader he had one exceedingly serious drawback: he was no speaker for the masses. As scrupulously conscientious and precise as his work in itself was, it nevertheless lacked - perhaps because of this very lack of a great oratorical gift - the great sweep. Herr Drexler, then chairman of the Munich local group, was a simple worker, likewise not very significant as a speaker, and moreover he was no soldier. He had not served in the army, even during the War he had not been a soldier, so that feeble and uncertain as he was in his whole nature, he lacked the only schooling which was capable of turning uncertain and soft natures into men. Thus both men were not made of stuff which would have enabled them not only to bear in their hearts fanatical faith in the victory of a movement, but also with indomitable energy and will, and if necessary with brutal ruthlessness, to sweep aside any obstacles which might stand in the path of the rising new idea. For this only beings were fitted in whom spirit and body had acquired those military

virtues which can perhaps best be described as follows: swift as greyhounds, tough as leather, and hard as Krupp steel.

At that time I myself was still a soldier. My exterior and interior had been whetted and hardened for well-nigh six years, so that at first I must have seemed strange in this circle. I, too, had forgotten how to say: 'that's impossible,' or 'it won't work'; 'we can't risk that,' 'that is too dangerous,' etc.

For of course the business was dangerous. Little attention as the Reds paid to one of your bourgeois gossip clubs whose inner innocence and hence harmlessness for themselves they knew better than its own members, they were determined to use every means to get rid of a movement which did seem dangerous to them. Their most effective method in such cases has at all times been terror or violence.

In the year 1920, in many regions of Germany, a national meeting that dared to address its appeal to the broad masses and publicly invite attendance was simply impossible. The participants in such a meeting were dispersed and driven away with bleeding heads. Such an accomplishment, to be sure, did not require much skill: for after all the biggest so-called bourgeois mass meeting would scatter at the sight of a dozen Communists like hares running from a hound.

Most loathsome to the Marxist deceivers of the people was inevitably a movement whose explicit aim was the winning of those masses which had hitherto stood exclusively in the service of the international Marxist Jewish stock exchange parties. The very name of 'German Workers' Party' had the effect of goading them. Thus one could easily imagine that on the first suitable occasion the conflict would begin with the Marxist inciters who were then still drunk with victory.

In the small circle that the movement then was a certain fear of such a fight prevailed. The members wanted to appear in public as little as possible, for fear of being beaten up. In their mind's eye they already saw the first great meeting smashed and go the movement finished for good. I had a hard time putting forward my opinion that we must not dodge this struggle, but prepare for it, and for this reason acquire the armament which alone offers protection against violence. Terror is not broken by the mind, but by terror. The success of the first meeting strengthened my position in this respect. We gained courage for a second meeting on a somewhat larger scale.

About October, 1919, the second, larger meeting took place in the Eberlbräukeller. Topic: Brest-Litovsk and Versailles. Four gentlemen appeared as speakers. I myself spoke for almost an hour and the success was greater than at the first rally. The audience had risen to more than one hundred and thirty. An attempted disturbance was at once nipped in the bud by my comrades. The disturbers flew down the stairs with gashed heads.

Two weeks later another meeting took place in the same hall. The attendance had risen to over one hundred and seventy and the room was well filled. I had spoken again, and again the success was greater than at the previous meeting.

I pressed for a larger hall. At length we found one at the other end of town in the 'Deutsches Reich' on Dachauer Strasse. The first meeting in the new hall was not so well attended as the previous one: barely one hundred and forty persons. In the committee, hopes began to sink and the eternal doubters felt that the excessive repetition of our 'demonstrations' had to be considered the cause of the bad attendance. There were violent arguments in which I upheld the view that a city of seven hundred thousand inhabitants could stand not one meeting every two weeks, but ten every week, that we must not let ourselves be misled by failures, that the road we had taken was the right one, and that sooner or later, with steady perseverance, success was bound to come. All in all, this whole period of winter 1919-20 was a single struggle to strengthen confidence in the victorious might of the young movement and raise it to that fanaticism of faith which can move mountains.

The next meeting in the same hall showed me to be right. The attendance had risen to over two hundred; the public as well as financial success was brilliant.

I urged immediate preparations for another meeting. It took place barely two weeks later and the audience rose to over two hundred and seventy heads.

Two weeks later, for the seventh time, we called together the supporters and friends of the new movement and the same hall could barely hold the people who had grown to over four hundred.

It was at this time that the young movement received its inner form. In the small circle there were sometimes more or less violent disputes. Various quarters - then as today - carped at designating the young movement as a party. In such a

conception I have always seen proof of the critics' practical incompetence and intellectual smallness. They were and always are the men who cannot distinguish externals from essentials, and who try to estimate the value of a movement according to the most bombastic-sounding titles, most of which, sad to say, the vocabulary of our forefathers must provide.

It was hard, at that time, to make it clear to people that every movement, as long as it has not achieved the victory of its ideas, hence its goal, is a party even if it assumes a thousand different names.

If any man wants to put into practical effect a bold idea whose realization seems useful in the interests of his fellow men, he will first of all have to seek supporters who are ready to fight for his intentions. And if this intention consists only in destroying the existing parties, of ending the fragmentation, the exponents of this view and propagators of this determination are themselves a party, as long as this goal has not been achieved. It is hair-splitting and shadow-boxing when some antiquated folkish theoretician, whose practical successes stand in inverse proportion to his wisdom, imagines that he can change the party character which every young movement possesses by changing this term.

On the contrary.

If anything is unfolkish, it is this tossing around of old Germanic expressions which neither fit into the present period nor represent anything definite, but can easily lead to seeing the significance of a movement in its outward vocabulary. This is a real menace which today can be observed on countless occasions.

Altogether then, and also in the period that followed, I had to warn again and again against those deutschvölkisch wandering scholars whose positive accomplishment is always practically nil, but whose conceit can scarcely be excelled. The young movement had and still has to guard itself against an influx of people whose sole recommendation for the most part lies in their declaration that they have fought for thirty and even forty years for the same idea. Anyone who fights for forty years for a so-called idea without being able to bring about even the slightest success, in fact, without having prevented the victory of the opposite, has, with forty years of activity, provided proof of his own incapacity. The danger above all lies in the fact that such natures do not want to fit into the movement as links, but keep shooting off their mouths about leading circles in which

alone, on the strength of their age-old activity, they can see a suitable place for further activity. But woe betide if a young movement is surrendered to the mercies of such people. No more than a business man who in forty years of activity has steadily run a big business into the ground is fitted to be the founder of a new one, is a folkish Methuselah, who in exactly the same time has gummed up and petrified a great idea, fit for the leadership of a new, young movement!

Besides, only a fragment of all these people come into the new movement to serve it, but in most cases, under its protection or through the possibilities it offers, to warm over their old cabbage

They do not want to benefit the idea of the new doctrine, they only expect it to give them a chance to make humanity miserable with their own ideas. For what kind of ideas they often are, it is hard to tell.

The characteristic thing about these people is that they rave about old Germanic heroism, about dim prehistory, stone axes spear and shield, but in reality are the greatest cowards that can be imagined. For the same people who brandish scholarly imitations of old German tin swords, and wear a dressed bearskin with bull's horns over their bearded heads, preach for the present nothing but struggle with spiritual weapons, and run away as fast as they can from every Communist blackjack. Posterity will have little occasion to glorify their own heroic existence in a new epic.

I came to know these people too well not to feel the profoundest disgust at their miserable play-acting. But they make a ridiculous impression on the broad masses, and the Jew has every reason to spare these folkish comedians, even to prefer them to the true fighters for a coming German state. With all this, these people are boundlessly conceited; despite all the proofs of their complete incompetence, they claim to know everything better and become a real plague for all straightforward and honest fighters to whom heroism seems worth honoring, not only in the past, but who also endeavor to give posterity a similar picture by their own actions.

And often it can be distinguished only with difficulty which of these people act out of inner stupidity or incompetence and which only pretend to for certain reasons. Especially with the so-called religious reformers on an old Germanic basis, I always have the feeling that they were sent by those powers which do not want the resurrection of our people. For their whole activity

leads the people away from the common struggle against the common enemy, the Jew, and instead lets them waste their strength on inner religious squabbles as senseless as they are disastrous. For these very reasons the establishment of a strong central power implying the unconditional authority of a leadership is necessary in the movement. By it alone can such ruinous elements be squelched. And for this reason the greatest enemies of a uniform, strictly led and conducted movement are to be found in the circles of these folkish wandering Jews. In the movement they hate the power that checks their mischief.

Not for nothing did the young movement establish a definite program in which it did not use the word 'folkish.' The concept folkish, in view of its conceptual boundlessness, is no possible basis for a movement and offers no standard for membership in one. The more indefinable this concept is in practice, the more and broader interpretations it permits, the greater becomes the possibility of invoking its authority. The insertion of such an indefinable and variously interpretable concept into the political struggle leads to the destruction of any strict fighting solidarity, since the latter does not permit leaving to the individual the definition of his faith and will.

And it is disgraceful to see all the people who run around today with the word 'folkish' on their caps and how many have their own interpretation of this concept. A Bavarian professor by the name of Bayer, a famous fighter with spiritual weapons, rich in equally spiritual marches on Berlin, thinks that the concept folkish consists only in a monarchistic attitude. This learned mind, however, has thus far forgotten to give a closer explanation of the identity of our German monarchs of the past with the folkish opinion of today. And I fear that in this the gentleman would not easily succeed. For anything less folkish than most of the Germanic monarchic state formations can hardly be imagined. If this were not so, they would never have disappeared, or their disappearance would offer proof of the unsoundness of the folkish outlook.

And so everyone shoots off his mouth about this concept as he happens to understand it. As a basis for a movement of political struggle, such a multiplicity of opinions is out of the question.

I shall not even speak of the unworldliness of these folkish Saint Johns of the twentieth century or their ignorance of the popular soul. It is sufficiently illustrated by the ridicule with which they are treated by the Left, which lets them talk and laughs at them.

Anyone in this world who does not succeed in being hated by his adversaries does not seem to me to be worth much as a friend. And thus the friendship of these people for our young movement was not only worthless, but solely and always harmful, and it was also the main reason why, first of all, we chose the name of 'party' - we had grounds for hoping that by this alone a whole swarm of these folkish sleepwalkers would be frightened away from us - and why in the second place we termed ourselves National Socialist German Workers' Party.

The first expression kept away the antiquity enthusiasts, the big-mouths and superficial proverb-makers of the so-called folkish idea,' and the second freed us from the entire host of knights of the 'spiritual sword,' all the poor wretches who wield the 'spiritual weapon' as a protecting shield to hide their actual cowardice.

It goes without saying that in the following period we were attacked hardest especially by these last, not actively, of course, but only with the pen, just as you would expect from such folkish goose-quills. For them our principle, 'Against those who attack us with force we will defend ourselves with force,' had something terrifying about it. They persistently reproached us, not only with brutal worship of the blackjack, but with lack of spirit as such. The fact that in a public meeting a Demosthenes can be brought to silence if only fifty idiots, supported by their voices and their fists, refuse to let him speak, makes no impression whatever on such a quack. His inborn cowardice never lets him get into such danger. For he does not work 'noisily' and 'obtrusively,' but in 'silence.'

Even today r cannot warn our young movement enough against falling into the net of these so-called 'silent workers.' They are not only cowards, but they are also always incompetents and do-nothings. A man who knows a thing, who is aware of a given danger, and sees the possibility of a remedy with his own eyes, has the duty and obligation, by God, not to work 'silently,' but to stand up before the whole public against the evil and for its cure. If he does not do so, he is a disloyal, miserable weakling who fails either from cowardice or from laziness and inability. To be sure, this does not apply at all to most of these people, for they know absolutely nothing, but behave as though they knew God knows what; they can do nothing but try to swindle the whole world with their tricks; they are lazy, but with the 'silent' work they claim to do, they arouse the impression of an enormous and conscientious activity; in short, they are swindlers, political crooks who hate the honest work of others. As soon as one of these folkish moths praises the darkness of

silence, we can bet a thousand to one that by it he produces nothing, but steals, steals from the fruits of other people's work.

To top all this, there is the arrogance and conceited effrontery with which this lazy, light-shunning rabble fall upon the work of others, trying to criticize it from above, thus in reality aiding the mortal enemies of our nationality.

Every last agitator who possesses the courage to stand on a tavern table among his adversaries, to defend his opinions with manly forthrightness, does more than a thousand of these lying, treacherous sneaks. He will surely be able to convert one man or another and win him for the movement. It will be possible to examine his achievement and establish the effect of his activity by its results. Only the cowardly swindlers who praise their 'silent' work and thus wrap themselves in the protective cloak of a despicable anonymity, are good for nothing and may in the truest sense of the word be considered drones in the resurrection of our people.

* * *

At the beginning of 1920, I urged the holding of the first great mass meeting. Differences of opinion arose. A few leading party members regarded the affair as premature and hence disastrous in effect. The Red press had begun to concern itself with us and we were fortunate enough gradually to achieve its hatred. We had begun to speak in the discussions at other meetings. Of course, each of us was at once shouted down. There was, however, some success. People got to know us and proportionately as their knowledge of us deepened, the aversion and rage against us grew. And thus we were entitled to hope that in our first great mass meeting we would be visited by a good many of our friends from the Red camp.

I, too, realized that there was great probability of the meeting being broken up. But the struggle had to be carried through, if not now, a few months later. It was entirely in our power to make the movement eternal on the very first day by blindly and ruthlessly fighting for it. I knew above all the mentality of the adherents of the Red side far too well, not to know that resistance to the utmost not only makes the biggest impression, but also wins supporters. And so we just had to be resolved to put up this resistance.

Herr Harrer, then first chairman of the party, felt he could not support my views with regard to the time chosen and

consequently, being an honest, upright man, he withdrew from the leadership of the party. His place was taken by Herr Anton Drexler. I had reserved for myself the organization of propaganda and began ruthlessly to carry it out.

And so, the date of February 4, 1920, was set for the holding of this first great mass meeting of the still unknown movement.

I personally conducted the preparations. They were very brief. Altogether the whole apparatus was adjusted to make lightning decisions. Its aim was to enable us to take a position on current questions in the form of mass meetings within twenty-four hours. They were to be announced by posters and leaflets whose content was determined according to those guiding principles which in rough outlines I have set down in my treatise on propaganda. Effect on the broad masses, concentration on a few points, constant repetition of the same, self-assured and self-reliant framing of the text in the forms of an apodictic statement, greatest perseverance in distribution and patience in awaiting the effect.

On principle, the color red was chosen; it is the most exciting; we knew it would infuriate and provoke our adversaries the most and thus bring us to their attention and memory whether they liked it or not.

In the following period the inner fraternization in Bavaria between the Marxists and the Center as a political party was most clearly shown in the concern with which the ruling Bavarian People's Party tried to weaken the effect of our posters on the Red working masses and later to prohibit them. If the police found no other way to proceed against them, 'considerations of traffic' had to do the trick, till finally, to please the inner, silent Red ally, these posters, which had given back hundreds of thousands of workers, incited and seduced by internationalism, to their German nationality, were forbidden entirely with the helping hand of a so-called German National People's Party. As an appendix and example to our young movement, I am adding a number of these proclamations. They come from a period embracing nearly three years; they can best illustrate the mighty struggle which the young movement fought at this time. They will also bear witness to posterity of the will and honesty of our convictions and the despotism of the so-called national authorities in prohibiting, just because they personally found it uncomfortable, a nationalization which would have won back broad masses of our nationality.

They will also help to destroy the opinion that there had been a national government as such in Bavaria and also document for posterity the fact that the national Bavaria of 1919, 1920, 1921, 1922, 1923 was not forsooth the result of a national government, but that the government was merely forced to take consideration of a people that was gradually feeling national.

The governments themselves did everything to eliminate this process of recovery and to make it impossible.

Here only two men must be excluded:

Ernst Pöhner, the police president at that time, and Chief Deputy Frick, his faithful advisor, were the only higher state officials who even then had the courage to be first Germans and then officials. Ernst Pöhner was the only man in a responsible post who did not curry favor with the masses, but felt responsible to his nationality and was ready to risk and sacrifice everything, even if necessary his personal existence, for the resurrection of the German people whom he loved above all things. And for this reason he was always a troublesome thorn in the eyes of those venal officials the law of whose actions was prescribed, not by the interest of their people and the necessary uprising for its freedom, but by the boss's orders, without regard for the welfare of the national trust confided in them.

And above all he was one of those natures who, contrasting with most of the guardians of our so-called state authority, do not fear the enmity of traitors to the people and the nation, but long for it as for a treasure which a decent man must take for granted. The hatred of Jews and Marxists, their whole campaign of lies and slander, were for him the sole happiness amid the misery of our people.

A man of granite honesty, of antique simplicity and German straightforwardness, for whom the words 'Sooner dead than a slave' were no phrase but the essence of his whole being.

He and his collaborator, Dr. Frick, are in my eyes the only men in a state position who possess the right to be called co-creators of a national Bavaria.

Before we proceeded to hold our first mass meeting, not only did the necessary propaganda material have to be made ready, but the main points of the program also had to be put into print.

In the second volume I shall thoroughly develop the guiding principles which we had in mind, particularly in framing the program. Here I shall only state that it was done, not only to give the young movement form and content, but to make its aims understandable to the broad masses.

Circles of the so-called intelligentsia have mocked and ridiculed this and attempted to criticize it. But the soundness of our point of view at that time has been shown by the effectiveness of this program.

In these years I have seen dozens of new movements arise and they have all vanished and evaporated without trace. A single one remains: The National Socialist German Workers' Party. And today more than ever I harbor the conviction that people can combat it, that they can attempt to paralyze it, that petty party ministers can forbid us to speak and write, but that they will never prevent the victory of our ideas.

When not even memory will reveal the names of the entire present-day state conception and its advocates, the fundamentals of the National Socialist program will be the foundations of a coming state.

Our four months' activities at meetings up to January, 1920, had slowly enabled us to save up the small means that we needed for printing our first leaflet, our first poster, and our program.

If I take the movement's first large mass meeting as the conclusion of this volume, it is because by it the party burst the narrow bonds of a small club and for the first time exerted a determining influence on the mightiest factor of our time, public opinion.

I myself at that time had but one concern: Will the hall be filled, or will we speak to a yawning hall? I had the unshakable inner conviction that if the people came, the day was sure to be a great success for the young movement. And so I anxiously looked forward to that evening.

The meeting was to be opened at 7:30. At 7:15 I entered the Festsaal of the Hofbräuhaus on the Platzl in Munich, and my heart nearly burst for joy. The gigantic hall - for at that time it still seemed to me gigantic - was overcrowded with people, shoulder to shoulder, a mass numbering almost two thousand people. And above all - those people to whom we wanted to

appeal had come. Far more than half the hall seemed to be occupied by Communists and Independents. They had resolved that our first demonstration would come to a speedy end.

But it turned out differently. After the first speaker had finished, I took the floor. A few minutes later there was a hail of shouts, there were violent dashes in the hall, a handful of the most faithful war comrades and other supporters battled with the disturbers, and only little by little were able to restore order.

I was able to go on speaking. After half an hour the applause slowly began to drown out the screaming and shouting.

I now took up the program and began to explain it for the first time.

From minute to minute the interruptions were increasingly drowned out by shouts of applause. And when I finally submitted the twenty-five theses, point for point, to the masses and asked them personally to pronounce judgment on them, one after another was accepted with steadily mounting joy, unanimously and again unanimously, and when the last thesis had found its way to the heart of the masses, there stood before me a hall full of people united by a new conviction, a new faith, a new will.

When after nearly four hours the hall began to empty and the crowd, shoulder to shoulder, began to move, shove, press toward the exit like a slow stream, I knew that now the principles of a movement which could no longer be forgotten were moving out among the German people.

A fire was kindled from whose flame one day the sword must come which would regain freedom for the Germanic Siegfried and life for the German nation.

And side by side with the coming resurrection, I sensed that the goddess of inexorable vengeance for the perjured deed of November 9, 1919, was striding forth.

Thus slowly the hall emptied.

The movement took its course.