[Ljotić was the leader of the Yugoslav National Movement which also used the name Zbor (Rally). Ljotić professed a strong Serb nationalist ideology and advocated a centralized, corporate state similar to Mussolini's Italy. His organization had its own youth movement that was known as the White Eagle.]

We are fighting, first of all, for a different concept of politics. Among the people, this word has gained the connotation of something false, filthy and sordid. For a long time now, the people have thought that politics is like a manure pile at the rear of a peasant courtyard, a thing necessary, but neither clean nor dignified.

The first consequence of such belief has been that a vast number of honorable people decided that there is no place for them in politics, just as clean, well-dressed people make sure to keep away from manure.

The second consequence has been that those honorable people who nevertheless were in politics were swamped and overrun by those whose actions had given rise to this belief among the people.

And the third and worst consequence has been the slow but steady erosion of national moral standards. The nation has been losing faith and its old moral values. Honesty and personal honor have begun to look like obstacles to advancement in life. . . .

We want to stop the continued moral decline of the nation. We want to restore to honor our former high national principles.

It is therefore necessary to put an end to the belief that politics is dirt and manure, to put an end to the conviction that politics is personal advantage and corruption. Instead, the belief must arise in all our nation that politics is a toilsome struggle and an honorable service in which no one may seek personal advantage, much less enrichment.

Consequently, power must be made dependent on such personal answerability, that all weaklings and cowards, all scoundrels and egoists will flee to the rear, as once they fled from the war front. That is where they still belong.

This is the first, and fundamental, principle of our struggle.

We fight therefore for a national, popular politics, and against the politics of parties, cliques and factions.

It has come to pass that nothing in the country can be accomplished without the recommendation and intercession of a political party. NO one can get his rights according to law, but only at the recommendation of someone influential. Obligations are avoided and responsibilities are canceled, not according to the law but at the intercession of someone influential. . . . All this
means that we have no lawful and permanent state and national policy, but that the state is run by party, faction and clique politics.

The lack of such national and state policy has brought heavy consequences. Throughout the land, this kind of government has produced bitterness and unrest. Today, our nation, thanks to such government, is insufficiently united, and lacks solidarity.

But we are for national unity . . .

In social and economic affairs, we fight for the right of the people to take affairs into their own hands. We demand that, in these respects, no general national policy be planned or carried out without the active participation of representatives of national professional organizations. . . .

National forces cannot develop in either the economic or the social field until the people stand on their own feet and implement the principle of self-help. The state retains over this whole enormous area the right of supervision in the framework of the social and economic plan, and the right to regulate relations between the professions.

In this regard, we fight for the principle that politics must not be separated from national social and economic life. At present, it is so separated. Today, it is thought that there exists some pure politics unconnected with social and economic question. Today, people who have no contact with national needs, who have no understanding of real social and economic national problems, rise through elections to the highest offices. We fight for a political system in which this would become impossible.

We are deeply convinced that many contemporary social and economic difficulties would not exist if such a system were in effect. This is the third principle of our struggle.

We fight, finally, because, although it looks like we live in cowardly times, we believe that many think as we do, are dedicated to these aims, ready for sacrifice, and confident of victory. This is the fourth and last principle of our struggle.

**The Ideals of Contemporary Youth (1942)**

One hundred and fifty years ago, the French Revolution enthroned an idea which promised the individual strength, prosperity, happiness and peace. This idea took the individual as the measure, elevated him to the highest throne, to the altar, and proclaimed: hitherto it had always been believed that human happiness must be pursued by a collective, the family, the nation, the state and the individual was forgotten. Henceforth, men will aim at individual happiness. And since human society is merely a collection of individuals, a million happy individuals will make a happy society of one million men.

Having thus turned the social order upside down, this principle of individualism gave birth to materialism, capitalism and political democracy, and thus created contemporary materialistic-democratic-capitalistic society. For 150 years, the individual has reigned. The individual
displaced humanity as the standard, and thereby destroyed the hitherto existing self-protective systems of all nations. He has reigned, more or less, generally, and it has taken 150 years to show that unfortunate humanity, which was induced to follow this decoy, has lost its way.

The individualistic idea promised individual happiness. Why should men march toward collective happiness? Better to pursue the happiness of the individual, since happy individuals equal a happy collective. But 150 years have shown that this road leads nowhere. Because all the difficulties and breakdowns and chaos through which we are passing today are a consequence of this enthronement of individualistic thought in human society. Because those who established this idea as the new standard lost sight of one important fact: Human society is not merely a collection of individuals. It is an entity of a higher order, which cannot be expressed as the arithmetical sum of the individuals that compose it. Even if all of us who live today in this country were to gather together, even if we all answered the roll call, this still would not make a nation. A nation is a being of a higher order, existing independently of those individuals of whom it is temporarily composed. It is not a physical being, with a head, arms, legs, eyes. It is a moral and historical entity, which lives and acts in human history, carrying its national symbols.

A nation is an entity which has a past and a future, and which at a given moment is not a simple sum of its members. Therefore it is impossible to make happy a nation through the direct happiness of individuals. However, individualistic thought says: "You, the individual, are your own purpose, therefore seek your own happiness." But millions of individuals, driven by their egoism, collected together did not make a happy society, but instead created chaos. To tell a mass of millions of men: "Let each of you chase his own happiness!" means to direct them into a path in which chaos and confusion will reign exactly as we observe today. And this, I repeat, derives from one erroneous idea: that human society is a simple sum of individuals. And thus it is, and had to be, that the individual, pursuing heedlessly his own happiness, injures society, and through the calamities of society injures himself. . . .

If we now return to our previous question: how can the builders of life, the ardent individuals, those who are the light and the salt of the earth, how can they become strong, then in the light of the preceding exposition of the evil consequences of the enthronement of individualism in the Christian world, we shall perceive that his will be possible only when we shall replace the individualistic idea with another idea: the organic idea.

The organic idea arises from the fact that the individual, as a rule, does not live outside human society. On the contrary, the individual needs society for his own benefit. Therefore the individual, contrary to the individualistic idea, cannot consider first his personal interests, but must keep before his eyes, first of all, the interests of the society to which he belongs. Subordinating himself to the collective, the individual will promote the development of the collective, and through it, his own. From this fact, it follows that the human collective (in the first place, the family and the nation, as natural phenomena which a man enters by being born) is not a simple collection of its members, but has its existence independently in many respects from theirs, since it exists and endures, outliving them, just as it existed before them.
Although the individualistic idea directed the individual to consider only his own happiness . . . life has shown that a million collected egoisms produce general misfortune, and simultaneously individual misfortune.

On the contrary, if the organic idea that the individual must consider the interests of the totality becomes the ruling system, this will achieve the happiness of the collective, and through this, the individual will also achieve personal happiness.

Therefore we must replace the individualistic idea with the organic idea. We fight against the first and for the second. Let us reemphasize, by strengthening the collective, we shall also make the individual strong.

Individualistic thought gave birth to democracy, capitalism, Marxism and Bolshevism, materialism and atheism. Capitalism and Marxism are brothers, deriving from the same, individualistic world view. . . . Neither individualism, nor capitalism, nor Marxism can solve social distress. Neither can democracy, which is merely political individualism. Capitalism is the economic system, democracy is its political weapon and its expression in politics. . . .

Only organic thought, which shows the individual his place in the family, in the nation, in the state, in humanity, in the universe, can solve the hopeless contemporary situation. Only the organic idea, which explains man's place in the world: whence he came, why he is here, whither his destiny, which are the means to his fate only this idea can discover the way and find the ideal.
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