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1.The “Dasein” concept (“occur”) of Martin Heidegger it's a significant anchoring point of your personal reflection about the significant and concrete anthropological existential condition related to the human existence, which is placed between Earth and World.
Do you consider possible to define your thought as a geophilosophy?

I consider Martin Heidegger as greatest philosopher. But there is explicit part in his writings and implicit. He has devellopped the philosophical basis for many different applications that he didn’t make himself. So I found in Heidegger the principles of political philosophy that is given only as the some allusions, hints, remarks, but we can deduce it from the general context of his philosophy. It has almost nothing to do with his personal political engagement. It is something much deeper. So being up to the some degree follower of Third Political Theory his has laid the foundations for Fourth Political Theory and Metapolitics.

The same for geophilosophy. Explicitly he didn’t develop it, but if we consider the full meaning of Da in the Da-Sein, we discover the fundamental dimension of so called geography, or else ambiance, milieu as something existential. I am calling it existential horizon.

Next point. Heidegger himself was convinced in the universal character of Dasein being ethnocentrics as any thinking (or less thinking) person (and Westerners are not exception) – just because our thinking is tied to language, culture, history in the sense of Seynsgeschichte. Heidegger speaking of Dasein as something “universal” means West- European Dasein – Greek and German above all, that correspond in his view to the Beginning and the Ending of philosophical Thought.

But if accept existential character of place (Da) and its ontological links to culture and language we see that each Da (situation, placement, geographical and cultural location) presents different relation to Being (Sein), because of language and culture. So we receive dealing with different Daseins different set of “die Existentialen”. The relation to Death (being-to Death) and the care (Sorge) are variable in different places understood as existential horizons. From there begins the theories of multitude of Daseins that is the core of multipolar philosophy and geosophy that is its ontological (I would say fundamental-onthological) ground.

I have spoken once with direct disciple of Heidegger prof. von Herrmann. He said that Heidegger would disagree with such interpretation of Dasein. But nevertheless in my vision of his philosophy and in my interpretation of phenomenology as such (that was also Eurocentric – Husserl spoke about “european humanity” – very expressive!) we could enlarge the understanding of Dasein recognizing the anthropological difference of culture not only (as rightfully suggests modern Brazilian anthropologist Viveiros de Castro) as different interpretations of the same reality (multiculturalism) but as different interpretations of different realities (multinaturalism). Bieng-in-the-World as existential characteristic of Dasein constitutes different Worlds if we have the multitude of Daseins.

So starting with Heidegger and being absolutely indebted for his thought I apply his ideas to the realms he weither avoided or neglected or explicitly denied. May be me reading of Heidegger is a bit unorthodox but with such great great great thinker the orthodoxy is something doubtful, meaningless and at the end of the day impossible.

2. The civilization process does involve an increasing and dramatic separation between nature and culture. What's your interpretation of the Technical issue facing the ecological sustainibility?

The technic is metaphysic itself. There is nothing technical in technic. It begins with radical line of separation between two realms of being – culture and nature and it ends with killing both – no nature and no culture any more (as now). The only acceptable technic is the philosophical technic – Logos but only when it is fully conscious of its existential roots – fundamental-ontological Logos. I don’t believe in nature without culture and in culture without nature. Culture is natural and nature is cultural. Subject and object are two sides of the same Being-in-the-World and the technic is the artificial and suicidal split of this existential unity.

Ecology is the dead end because it rests inside of the vicious dualism culture/nature. So I think we should revise the main philosophical attitude ecologists are wrong as well as technocrats are.

3. Disproportion is the distinctive sign of the accumulation and dissipation process related to the consumerist society and to the westernization of the world as a whole. What's your reflection about the “measure” and the sense of “limit”?

It is the core problem. Greeks called it ὕβρις is the essential feature of titanism. The Heaven is measure – of space, of time of being. When we loose the Heaven we loose the mesure. Ernst Junger has rightfully described the world of Modernity as the reign of Titan – of «dismisura», of ὕβρις. Thechnic is already ὕβρις it tries to accumulate and thus to break the balance. Marcel Mauss in his the Economy of gift has shown importance of potlach – of the annihilation of the plus-product in the process of sacred orgy. The titanism is the abdication and oblivion of such sacrificial practice. And that is the origins of capitalism and the Modernity. If we want more and more is the dismisura, it is as well abuse and we will pay for thet with accumulation of the less and less something in the shadow. And once it will become apparent as catastrophe, wars and annihilition of the accumulated good (plus product). Capitalism is titanic and dismeasured. It is the revolt of the Earth against the Heaven. But once the Heaven strikes back. The gods reastaure the measure killings Titans and Gigants. That is Conservative Revolution the return of the Measure and the punishment of revolted chtonic powers.

 4. Do you consider that the distinction between universal and universalistic could be able to get the difference between cultural pluralism and western assimilation?

The real universality is apophatic as the One of the Plato’s Parmenides and neoplatonist. So we could approach universality only as in tangent. The real universality is not the destruction of the particular, ethnic, national, religiously or culturally limited, but the full realization of the essence of it. The ethnic man is the way to the universal man, the realization of the authentic existence of the concrete Dasein leads to the possible but never taken for granted universal Dasein. So the modern universalism is absolutely wrong. Ti divide peoples into atomic individuals is not the way to the universal. It is one step away from it. Trying to arrive to the figure without any kind of collective (ethnic, cultural, religious and so on) identity we arrive not to the universal man but to the machine, we destroy all what is human in us. So liberal universalism is more particularistic than the natural particularism of different peoples and cultures. With people there is symbolic universality that should be interpreted, discovered. The people is the way to the Man. The individual is something that is equal to himself. In the final case it is absolutely meaningless deprived of language and culture and turned in to the machine.

So assimilationaism is good where there is something into what we propose to assimilate when there is collective identity. Modern occidental assimilationism is the invitation to the absolute loneliness, integration into the “lonely mob”.

5.Does your assumption of the “fourth political theory” begin with the occurred dissolution of the big modern ideological narrations, including liberalism that, apparentely, would look like an undisputed “unique thought” of the contemporaney age?
IN which sense must we get the practical all-pervading nature of individualistic utilitarism related to the “capital form”?

I thing that the most interesting point is the destiny of the concept of individual that is the basis of liberalism, its flag, its subject. It can be called “monad”. The individual monad is the common denominator of modern capitalism – the reign of autonomous monads. But the problem is that monad conserve its “monadity” only being supported by the belonging to the apophatic One. So the monad is monad only when it is the henad in the same time. That means it should be open from above. When we close monad (as it is the case in liberal capitalism) we don’t make it independent from the multitude from below and from henad (apophatic unity – real universality) from above. It is liberal illusion. Affirming monad against integrating Unity we by the same gesture destroy monadness of monad opening the way to the inner multiplicity. So the individual becomes dividual precisely in the moment it is affirmed as individual and nothing else. Nothing means here apophatical One (henad).

So we are living in the world where the monads dissolve themselves. It is the “natural” milieu for our existence. We are living in the dissolution, in liquid society and that is liquidness of capital, new nomadism and diffraction of the personality in the networks of all kind. There is no more subject. The individual (in fact dividual) becomes more and more objective, fragmented and dissipated. So it is not old good utilitarianism because there is no more human individual. We are becoming more and more post-human. Before we will be replaced by Artificial Intelligence we should be turned into robots. In that case we will not remark the last transformation.

The unique thought is not any more human. It is a kind of computer program destined not for users but for its algorithms. We are no more user it is illusion. We are used and abused by the System. And liberalism becomes each day more and more totalitarian. I am calling it Third Totalitarianism.

6. Albert Einstein adfirmed : «We can't solve problems by using the same kind of thinking we used when we created them ». ON that way it cannot be an ideology but a dynamic way of thinking and mutual confrontation in order to face an epocal transiction. What kind of qualities must have a proper “forma mentis” for its confrontation between principles and ruling relativism? Shall we refer to a mutation of “paradigma”?

Exactly. The type of thinking that prevents the solution of the challenges of Modernity and Post-Modernity – more that that correct formulation of these challenges – are three political theories. Nothing can be correctly solved and formulated when we stay on the position of liberalism , marxism or nationalism. The problem is not in the Modernity the problem is the Modernity itself. The Post-Modernity claimed to overcome it but failed drastically. Because of the conservation of the same liberationist, immanentist, titanic and progressist pathos of Modernity, the spirit of Enlightenment. The Post-Modernity wanted only to improve Modernity, make it more Modern. We need some real alternative to the Modernity, and the radical change of paradigm is really needed. First we need to accept or imagine at least something absolutely outside of Modernity. Modernity is absolutely wrong. All its absolutes, values, ideals, truths, conventional wisdoms and so on should be put aside. We shouldn’t fight against them we should simply make a distance – more distance than Post-Modernity is capable of. I think that traditionalism of Guenon and Evola are the excellent examples of what it is all about. They are more post-modern than any ultra-radical philosopher such as Deleuze. Deleuze is fully programmed by the spirit of Modernity, hi is algorithm. So the shift of paradigm should be very radical – more radical than the radicals can imagine.

7. To Overpass modernity means to criticize the open society without an authoritarian regression. Which kind of social features could have a communitarism if based upon participatory will and voluntarism , eventually combining freedom and political duties?

To overcome the Modernity is not easy. Any alternative will be impregnated by the some modern prejudices. We need be afraid of nothing – including regress, authoritarianism and so on. We are ashamed of all such phenomena because we are still Modern. I like communitarianism. It has in itself something premodern as organic community of people living in the personalized relations to the nature and each other. But we shouldn’t exclude the imagination of Empires, hierarchies and most of all sacredness, We need to restore all three traditional types – Priest, Warrior and Peasant. The economy is the field of peasant. So the peasant community and small manufacturers are the base of the material aspect of society. But outside of Modernity the materiality is the last concern. So the real basis of the society should be the Heaven – spiritual life, sacred values. The Earth should be once more conquered by the Heaven. So the Priests and Warriors should regain its essential position. So we need reverse the Modernity that began with quite opposite with the putting the material over spiritual, the Earth over the Heaven.

8. If we consider Ortega y Gasset, looking at his work named "The rebellion of the masses” , he gets the pivotal point of the XX century era: an era devoid of social types who could be able to adress the destiny of the historical events.

At the same time Cristopher Lasch, with his "The Elite's rebellion", has depicted how the ruling postmodern classes will be reflecting the main features of the indistinct mass.
Which kind or role does the “politic” have inside your philosophical theory?

The Political is the part of the Philosophical. They can not be separated. Any philosophical thought has political dimension. Any political action is rooted in the realm of philosophy. But the Political is expression not the core of the Philosophical. So we need to see its ontological unity with implicit hierarchy. Any political is but instrument in the hand of philosopher. But the political is in the front line and the philosopher is in the shadow.

9. Do you recognize a multilateral geopolitica vision of the international relationships? What's the possible continental connection between Russia and Europe?

I have written about that many books and can not repeat that in few words. The multipolarity is the consequence of my understanding od the plurality of Daseins.

Russia should become independent pole of multipolar world. The Europa should become other pole. We have two different Daseins. We need to respect such difference. May be there is the Third Europe (Eastern Europe) because of very particular features of East-European Logos. Currently I am working over 19 and 20 volumes of my main work Noomahia dedicated specially to the Eastern Europe. But in general I consider Europe and Russia-Eurasia as two separate civilizations with many common features and many differences. The dialogue between them can be very useful for both of us… But it should be dialogue between European Europe and Russian Russia.

10. Contemporaney Physic and Philosophy have revalued the Caos idea, this referred not to a whatever unformed Order but to more complex systems like the multiple results equations.
These, on reality, do refer to a complex order itself, thus (far) difficult to get by natural experience, even if really exhistent.

Do you feed a pessimistic vision about the decadence of the civilization or do you consider history a still open and not determined route?

 The concept of chaos is very profound and demand the whole lecture. I am studying in Ancient culture and in contemporaneous interpretation. Chaos is the world in the state that precedes the Order. That is essential. Such chaos is the possibility of new creation. The moderns understand by chaos the confusion that follows the destruction of the order. It is the case of actual chaos. It is not chaotic in the Greek sense, that is the dead chaos, that has no life inside of it.

I am pessimistic as to status qua. If the things go the same way they are going now it will bring total destruction of the humanity. May be we deserve that. More we acquire more we are doomed.

But before being totally replaced by Artificial Intelligence what globalists and progressists want to do, we can decide otherwise. The only thing that differentiates us from machines (but we are already machines in some way accepting the System as it is) the possibility of decision. The only decision that is real Decision is to exist of not to exist authentically. What we choose the Self of Dasein or das Man of Artificial Intelligence. Now we have the last chance to choose differently. So I believe in the open history. But that chance we will have it before we loose the possibility to die because the essence of Dasein is the being-in-front-of-Death. The immortality project (post-humanism) and Artificial Intelligence are two ways to deprive us of our Dasein. We have nothing to lose except of Dasein. Everything else is already lost.

(taken from [www.ereticamente.net](http://www.ereticamente.net/) with the translation of Stefano Codari)
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