Race, "Ethnos" and "The Fourth Political Theory"

by Bruno Cariou, from Elements of Racial Education

Each camp has spies in the other camps, in particular in time of war and, always in time of war, the men, in each camp, tend, by opportunism, to caress the authorities in the direction of the hair, to adhere sentimentally. to the ideology and propaganda of the regime, as long as all is well, for, when the going gets tough, to turn over their jacket, or at least, all not being able to deny the ideas which they do not have , to make the eyes soft at the enemy camp and, to use a typically biblical expression, to sell him his birthright for a plate of lentils, as soon as the tide turns, that the victory changes sides. With their country invaded, occupied, legitimately or not, for its own good or not, the opportunists immediately collaborate with the invader, no matter who the invader is, whether the invader occupies another's territory legitimately or not. for the good of others or not. Their country invaded, their country occupied by frogs, the opportunists would swear allegiance to the frogs. Their country invaded, their country occupied by vacuum cleaners, the opportunists would swear allegiance to the vacuum cleaners. As soon as his country was, rightly or not, liberated and occupied by the opposing camp, the opportunist joined the opposing camp, waiting to pursue his career with impunity under the occupier, a career which, provided that the The occupier judges that, of all the viziers he has at his disposal, he is the most qualified to take the measures necessary for the definitive enslavement of the country, can lead him under the paneling of the Republic. Inevitably, he gets caught up in his past, preferably in the paneled twilight of his life. In most cases, the past in question is fascist; It is extremely rare for an opportunist to get caught up in a communist past, but it is extremely common for an opportunist journalist to pin an opportunist politician for his fascist past and for the opportunist journalist to argue from that past to conclude that the opportunist politician does not he has never ceased to be fascist and, generalizing, that fascism, under the guise of democracy, is still in power. For example, Liberation reveals in 1995 that Bernhard de Lippe-Biesterfeld, prince consort of the Netherlands from 1950 to 1980, was a member of the NSDAP from 1933 to 1936 and, as, on the other hand, it is revealed in the process that Bernhard de Lippe-Biesterfeld was chairman of the board of the Bilderberg club, one of the flagships of globalism, from 1954 to 1975, all the budding Sherlock Holmes on the planet deduce from this that the Bildeberg club can only be a benchmark of " Fascists ”, of“ Nazis ”(a few films on the subject have already left Hollywood studios). The NSDAP was not infiltrated by stateless high finance agents, none of those who resisted in the Third Reich were among the 5.5 people included in the NSDAP in 1936, the administration and diplomacy under National Socialism were not riddled with traitors and allied spies (\*). “Nazism” is still alive and well; the Fascists are in power incognito, as proven by the nationalist and racist policies of the governments which have been at the head of European countries since the end of the Second World War: national interests have never been so safeguarded there, national values ​​too exalted, to say nothing of racial laws and anti-immigration laws, each equally drastic.

The reductio ad hitlerum is one of the main characteristics of all the mediatized bedridden forms of "conspiracy theory", of which one should not think that all the senile tenors are schizophrenics - although only a true schizophrenic is able to make a schizophrenic public. , if this audience is not already and, in this case, to aggravate his schizophrenia. Conspiracy theory is one of the preferred mediums of globalist propaganda. In power, the pseudo-globalist elites advertise globalism, in the same way that in power nationalists would advertise nationalism. There is nothing very natural about this. What is less is to present oneself as an opponent of globalism, while making, in one form or another, propaganda for the values, at least for certain values, of globalism. This is the case with all current media or media anti-globalists whom extremists can easily label as "far right". The incoherence of their positions is explained by the fact that they are either former Marxists or religious. What the media qualify as "extreme right" no longer exists since the end of World War II, from which, in any case, all organized political groups, from parties to small groups, have been more or less infiltrated. by the winners (\*\*). At the same time, the entryism of the Marxists into the world of Right-wing intellectuals was such that they replaced the right-wing thinkers worthy of the name who were part of it and that it is their hybrid thought that they are trying today. to pass off as Right-wing principles, often successfully, their public falling on the whole, for lack of critical and discriminating power, no doubt also for lack of "race", under the spell of their "dialectic", including a a minimum of discernment is enough, however, to identify the suiffeux sophisms, the gross confusions, the wobbly paradoxes, the mechanical subtleties; everything and its opposite can be said in the same text, or even in the same sentence.

We present below what constitutes to our knowledge the first substantial and detailed critical analysis of the thought of one of these "old" Marxists (\*\*\*).
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Alexandre Dugin designated liberalism as the enemy of the "fourth political theory", or rather, since the enemy can only be a current group of people and not an idea or an ideology, he designated as enemies all those who are in favor of the world hegemony of liberalism (ie the hegemony of the “West”). "If you are in favor of liberal world hegemony, you are the enemy" is one of its slogans.

What does Dugin mean by "liberalism"? By "liberalism" he does not mean the ideology of those Americans call "liberals." The term "liberal" does not have the same meaning in Europe and the United States. The "Liberals" in the United States are on the left: they vote for the Democratic Party and are in favor of a welfare state and a regulated economy. In Europe, they would be considered social democrats. Ideologically, they are egalitarian and tend to criticize savage capitalism. They oppose "racism", "sexism" and "homophobia" from an egalitarian perspective. They view prison sentences as a method of therapy and socialization rather than a form of punishment. They believe in "social justice" rather than punitive justice. They believe that human beings are fundamentally good and can be saved through "social work". They believe in social conditioning rather than personal responsibility. They believe that human beings can be saved in this world. They tend to favor a strict separation of church and state, while advocating an egalitarian worldview that is essentially a form of secularized Christianity.

In Europe, the "liberals" are on the right: generally opposed to the welfare state, they are in favor of the market economy, the privatization of infrastructure and an unregulated economy. Traditionally, they also support various conservative social policies, with an emphasis on individual responsibility as a corollary of the notion of individual rights. In other words, liberalism is a bourgeois ideology, favorable to a capitalist economy, based on the Enlightenment ideology of individual rights. Today, however, the opposition between left and right is less and less clear and is gradually being replaced by consensus. The social policies of European liberal parties often coincide with those associated with the post-Sixty-Eight libertarian left. Liberal, pro-capitalist parties oppose "racism", "sexism" and "homophobia" from the standpoint of individualist libertarianism. They oppose the categorization of human beings. Everyone should be treated as a person, in an impartial manner. Ideas of national, religious or sexual identity are a thing of the past. National borders and ethnic communities, insofar as they limit the freedom of the individual, must be abolished. The freedom of the individual must be defended, as long as this does not interfere with the rights of other individuals. This is the liberalism that Dugin called the enemy: globalist capitalism based on the ideology of human rights.

Today, it is increasingly evident that the egalitarian social democratic left and the bourgeois liberal right both have their roots and foundations in human rights ideology. All the institutional parties of left and right today tend to favor multiculturalism, immigration, gay rights and separation of church and state. Overall, they are all in favor of gender equality and, at times, liberalization of drugs. The "right" justifies these policies by individual rights and the "left" by egalitarianism. In addition, the leftist middle-class “revolutionaries” of the late 1960s and early 1970s often shifted from the communist left to the liberal right, after realizing that their membership of the left was based on an ideological misunderstanding. They were essentially libertarian bourgeois who thought they were communists.

The difference between the "left" and the "right" today in Europe lies in the interpretation of one and the same fundamental anthropological and ideological heritage, that of the Enlightenment. It would be more accurate to speak of "liberal-egalitarian hegemony" rather than simply "liberal hegemony". Liberalism and egalitarianism are based on the ideology of human rights, but emphasize different aspects of them. Right-wing liberals insist on the individual aspect of human rights. Left-wing egalitarians insist on the universal aspect of human rights. These two conceptions of humanity - the universal man and the individual man - are abstractions: defined only in a negative way, they both embody abstract freedom. The universal man and the individual man are defined as not belonging to a group or category (ethnic or otherwise). Since man is universal, "he" cannot be defined by, or limited to, any particular ethnicity, gender, or other particular category. On the other hand, the individual cannot as such be included in a category or defined as belonging to a collectivity (national ethnicity, sex, etc.), as this would violate his individuality. The individual is therefore every human being; it virtually corresponds to all of humanity. The individual is universal (as a representative of "humanity" as such) and all human beings are, as such, individuals (1). In other words, the "universal man" can only be the "individual man". Egalitarianism and individualism ultimately boil down to the same thing.

It would therefore be more correct to speak of "liberal-egalitarian hegemony" than simply "liberal hegemony". This hegemony is both political and metapolitical. All the major political parties established in Europe today gravitate towards this liberal-egalitarian center. Some groups find themselves marginalized. As the center is the bourgeois, rational, human individual, the exclusive heir to the Enlightenment, posing reason as the characteristic trait of humanity, those who in one way or another deviate from the center are at various seen as less than human, irrational and unenlightened. The marginalized are seen as irrational, "crazy" and "extremist". They are de-humanized, silenced and excluded from the political sphere. These groups include all those outside of liberal modernity, such as religious conservatives (mostly Christians and Muslims), who oppose gay rights and the separation of church and state. Christian religious conservatives are not, however, completely marginalized - they are still present in established political parties, although their influence is weaker and weaker. Another marginalized group is the Communists, who oppose the concept of individual rights, free enterprise and private property. However, they too are not completely marginalized, especially in universities and cultural institutions. When the need arises, they are allowed to enter coalition governments. They also have a common basis with institutional political parties through the egalitarian universalist aspects of their ideology, which has its roots in the Enlightenment. Much more marginalized and demonized are the nationalists, who oppose, to varying degrees, universalism (to the extent that they oppose immigration), to free trade (to the extent that they want to protect national economies) and individualism (to the extent that they consider national and ethnic identity to take precedence over individual identity in some cases). Finally, the most marginalized and "untouchable" group of all are racists and racial nationalists, who oppose not only universalism but also egalitarianism. However heterogeneous these groups may be, they are often lumped together by the liberal center.

Alain de Benoist, Dugin and Alain Soral want to create an "alliance of the periphery against the center", that is to say more or less marginalized groups against the political establishment. In practice, this therefore means not so much an alliance between the radical left and the radical right as an alliance between religious conservatives (mainly Muslim and Orthodox) and the former communists (2). A good example in Western Europe is Alain Soral and his Equality and Reconciliation, which seeks to found an alliance between Muslim immigrants and French patriots. The name of Soral’s movement already indicates that criticism of egalitarianism is not on the agenda. Racism or racial nationalism either. Dugin too avoids any criticism of egalitarianism, downplaying the real differences between left and right in order to focus entirely on attacking "liberalism" (3). The notion of "liberalism" - intentionally ambiguous for him, this term sometimes refers to capitalist economic individualism, sometimes to the moral individualism of homosexual rights activists and that of the laity - plays the role of a central pole. opposition which is supposed to artificially unify into a single (purely utopian) group groups which are otherwise deeply heterogeneous.

Dugin who calls for a "crusade against the West" does not oppose liberalism as it is at the origin of the destruction of the white race. On the contrary, he often seems to identify liberalism with the destruction of the white race. Its primary stated goal is to destroy liberalism, even if that must mean burying the white race with liberalism. As he puts it in The Fourth Political Theory, “liberalism (and post-liberalism) can (and must) be rejected. And if, behind it, stands the full power of the inertia of modernity, the spirit of the Enlightenment and the logic of the political and economic history of the European world of the last centuries, it must be rejected at the same time. as modernity, the Enlightenment and the European world. Moreover, only the recognition of liberalism understood as a destiny, as a fundamental influence, the very march of the history of Western Europe, will allow us to really say "no" to liberalism (4). He also defines the race which is the subject of the Fourth Political Theory as a "non-white European" race (5). He predicted anti-white pogroms on a global scale as retribution for white race wrongdoing, pogroms that will not target the Russians, however, because they are not, he says [http: // www. arcto.ru/article/1289], completely white.

In other words, Dugin is not a white nationalist. Dugin said he views race as a social construct (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7X-o_ndhSVA>). This statement may seem ridiculous to us, but everything suggests that it is rather sincere. It fits with its postmodern and relativistic theoretical orientation as well as with its previous statements about the unrealistic and potentially dangerous nature of the idea of ​​white solidarity:

“When it comes to the myth of 'the solidarity of the white race', it is a complete utopia that not only leads to the Holocaust of the Jews, but also to the genocide of the Slavs. The remains of the Third Reich are the basis of this miserable, contradictory and utterly false conception. The Anglo-Saxon world is a socio-political and cultural reality. The people of central Europe are something different. The eastern world of Orthodox and Slavic Christianity is a third reality. I am sure that many non-white peoples of Eurasia are a thousand times closer to us in spirit and culture than Americans. "(6). In short, Dugin is of the view - like many Jews - that any form of positive racial identity among whites will inevitably and fatally lead to "a new holocaust."

Presumably, Dugin, following in the footsteps of Alain de Benoist, sees the concept of race - and the phenomenon of racism - as a product of the Enlightenment, a modern phenomenon, and for Dugin "modern" always means "bad." It is correct that the concept of race was formulated in the context of the Enlightenment. But that in itself is not a sufficient reason to reject the notion of race. Race was a biological fact even before the concept of race was developed, just as DNA existed before it was discovered by scientists. A follower of social and linguistic constructivism, Dugin may dispute the idea that race exists in the absence of a concept of race. Philosophically, Dugin believes that nothing exists outside of language and social relations. Relativism, which is the hallmark of postmodernism, is, according to Dugin, philosophically compatible with traditionalism, for it asserts that "from the point of view of 'integral tradition' the difference between the 'artificial' and the 'natural' is generally quite relative, since tradition has never known anything like the Cartesian or Kantian dualism of the "subjective" and the "objective" (7). Dugin attempts to interpret postmodernity - with his relativist critique of the universalism of Enlightenment reason, in other words of the foundation of the project of modernity - as a phenomenon that paves the way for a resurgence of pre-thought patterns. -modern and traditional pre-rationalists. Dugin's relativistic approach is an integral part of the entire Fourth Political Theory project, as it is the philosophical basis for the idea of ​​an ethno-pluralist multipolar world.

It may be that Dugin subscribes to the idea that, for the biological notion of race to be meaningful, that is to say for it to be possible to classify such and such individuals as belonging to such and such a race, he there must be a racially pure person who could embody a standard of comparison, an ideal standard. Since, genetically, such an individual may not exist, the concept of race is supposedly devoid of scientific basis and turns out to have only social significance.

As Dugin considers race as a construct, he can freely manipulate and extend the concept of "racism" to include different forms of discrimination that this term does not normally cover: cultural, civilizational, technological, social, economic and even cinematographic and clothing. . The concept of "racism" is broadened and watered down (it becomes synonymous with discrimination on the basis of norms that are subjective or relative), to the point that almost anyone can claim to be the victim. Since he defines racism as "any attempt at subjective assessment of the state of a theory," he can argue that, in addition to National Socialism and Fascism, Communism and Liberalism are racist because they pose a certain political subject as normative (the proletariat or the enlightened bourgeois individual). There are undoubtedly racist elements in Marx's writings. He favored colonialism as a means of modernizing and industrializing non-European nations, which was a necessary prerequisite for the final transition to communism. He was also convinced that certain races were doomed to disappear, because they were inherently incapable of surviving the inevitable historical evolution towards communism.

Dugin also turns anti-racism against modernity and progressivism. It is "racist" [on the part of a white], for example, to pass negative judgment on immigrants from black Africa or the Middle East because they are unable to adapt to technologically modern Western societies. advances. In fact, the traditional Arab and African conceptions of women, homosexuality, child rearing - along with their rejection of evolution and their religious views - are seen by Dugin as a sign of their spiritual superiority ( 7). Moreover, he sees the very idea of ​​progress as inherently racist, as it implies that modern society (Western society) is normative and superior to traditional non-Western societies. It is not, he says, because they are incapable of building civilizations that these must be regarded as societies frozen in archaic social forms. On the contrary, if they are unable to do so, it is because they are more spiritual and have preserved the tradition better than the white race (8).

From the point of view of [those at the head of] the modern West, all societies inherently aspire to the normative type of modern Western society, but have simply not yet succeeded in achieving it. Rightists see this failure as proof of the racial inferiority of non-Western populations, while leftists explain it as a consequence of colonial exploitation and Western imperialism. They all start from the implicit premise that Western modernity is the most advanced and desirable form of society. It is true that, in Western societies, "modern" is more of a positive term. It is more or less synonymous with dynamic, young, enlightened and "open minded". It is the anthropological norm, in the sense that those who either reject it or do not respect it for one reason or another are considered backward, stupid, infrequent, etc. This is arguably a social - and therefore also a political - disadvantage for conservatives of all types, which they share with non-Western immigrants in Western societies. Dugin concludes that conservatives should ally with immigrants, especially Muslim immigrants, against the white liberal establishment (not the Jewish establishment - Dugin does not believe that the Jews are responsible for Western decadence, he believes that the Western “decadence” is simply the full manifestation of the essence of the West and the perverse nature of the white race).

However, whatever efforts most "progressive" Westerners themselves make to try to get rid of racism, through a mechanism that psychoanalysts call "the return of the repressed" it cleverly returns through the back door, taking new unconscious forms, so that, as Dugin rightly points out, political correctness itself "turns into a totalitarian method of purely racist political exclusions". In addition to white "racists", religious conservatives and nationalist conservatives are subjected - with impunity - to forms of social exclusion, aggression, overt contempt, intimidation, physical and psychological violence which are clearly a expression of these models of behavior which, in all other contexts, are denounced as "racist". These groups, which are often made up of “outsiders” of white society, the most socially and economically vulnerable groups, including the working class, the unemployed, rural dwellers and retirees, are systematically looked down upon by the establishment. , its journalists and its "intellectuals", who regard them as culturally, morally, intellectually and even biologically deficient ("the little whites", "the consanguines", and so on).

Dugin's mania for speaking out against racism strangely resembles an intentional parody of contemporary political correctness, which sees discriminatory norms everywhere and it is possible that, while accepting the postmodern deconstruction of the notion of race, he intends to do so. transform into a deconstruction of the term “racism” itself, extending its meaning to the point of absurdity, to the point of emptying it of its meaning and turning it against itself. Rather than trying, as most conservatives do, to resist postmodern relativism by upholding certain absolute moral standards, the authority of Western tradition, and universal objective standards of rationality, his strategy seems to be to move beyond the last residues. modern ideological assumptions by pushing them to their extreme postmodern conclusions.

However, in The Fourth Political Theory, Dugin condemns racism and especially German National Socialism, not only for epistemological reasons, but also for moral reasons. Dugin's condemnation of the consequences of racism is considered simply axiomatic and is not subject to any philosophical criticism. It is not clear on what moral basis this condemnation of Western racism is compatible with absolute cultural relativism, the refusal from any universal point of view allowing normative judgments (including moral ones) to be made on other cultures. Are slavery and genocide only morally reprehensible when they are the work of modern Westerners and are they not when they are the work of other groups? Dugin seems to think so, as evidenced by the following statement he made on Facebook about the slavery and exploitation (for food!) Of black Africans by other black Africans:

“There are African tribes along the Atlantic coast who raise human slaves to eat them. I find that quite reasonable and fully responsible. If we kill animals with our hands, watch them suffer and die, butcher and dismember them, touch their internal organs - or at least if we imagine these acts every time we eat, we are completely sane and we could. possibly go further and adopt - in wars - the same attitude towards men. In war, taking responsibility for the act of killing is essential. Eating animal food carries a very similar responsibility (9). But animal means sensitive, which implies suffering. Let's do it with all responsibility - eat and fight, in short - responsibility for the murder. Or we abstain. The choice is free. "

We can assume that this is a sincere statement and not just a banal will to "shock the bourgeois". It is entirely in accordance with Dugin's cultural relativism (the affirmation of the need to suspend all normative judgment on other cultures, because there is no universal norm that allows them to be made), but one may wonder how this kind of moral relativism is philosophically compatible with claiming to be Christian. Dugin apparently criticizes bourgeois moral hypocrisy, that is, the refusal to take responsibility for the murder and exploitation that are the conditions of bourgeois society. Dugin continues as follows:

"To kill or not to kill (to eat or not to eat):" Do whatever you want ", but never lie (to come back to the subject of vegetarianism and cannibalism) What is good or bad depends on the set of values accepted in society… we live in one society, others live in other societies. Every society kills, murders and commits acts of violence -… on human beings or animals But some societies recognize this and integrate death, murder and violence into their sacred concepts. Other societies, which do the same or worse hypocritically, deny it, call for non-violence, tolerance and the promotion of peace through war and assassination. So I don't judge violence per se, which depends on culture - some cultures sanctify it, others not - but every human group commits the same acts - kills, tortures and eats. I have therefore only emphasized the fact that the peoples who do so are consciously more civilized and cultured, more honest and spiritually developed, less infantile and more mature than those who commit the same act without realizing it or without denying its cannibalistic nature (10). Killing (and eating) is what the world - God - man - the beast rests on. This is the meaning of the priesthood. The priest is the primary killer. Existence is painful. We have to accept it as it is. We cause the pain, we feel the pain. This is a completely normal situation. Cannibalism is not "a disgusting exception" nor "a horrific sign of moral depravity". In a way, it's natural. Indian tradition states that the kshatriya eat the Vaishya (11). The Vedic hymns are full of metaphors (12) which denote the act of eating (killing, devouring). I'm just trying to point out that we are responsible for what we eat, what we kill and destroy. The African and Oceanian tribes give us an example that I find beautiful and pure ”. (13).

Given that he accepts moral relativism, it is not very clear how Dugin can condemn at the same time the extermination and the enslavement of Slavs or Jews by National Socialism, nor, for that matter, slavery. and the genocide of other populations by European settlers - practices which, historically, are not unique to Western Europeans (cf., for example, the Old Testament). What universal moral standard does it refer to? The ideology of universal human rights? Probably not. Christian morals, which he refuses to apply to West African cannibals and slave traders? It is difficult to determine how he can accuse the racists of incoherence, since all combative supporters of racial supremacy make no secret of their intentions. Finally, it is not clear how Dugin can without hypocrisy condemn National Socialism from a moral point of view, while rehabilitating figures like Stalin and Pol Pot by calling them "national communists".

Although Dugin sees "racism" as a quintessentially Western "disease", it is not particularly difficult to find examples of it among traditional or archaic non-Western societies, especially if one defines racism as attitude of “seeing one's own ethnic group as normative”. This is especially true of tribal societies, where the name of the tribe often simply means "humanity" and members of other tribes are seen as more or less non-human or as sub-human. For example :

“An instructive case is that of the Yanoama tribe of the Amazon Basin, whose name means 'humanity' and who regard all others as inferior beings, subhumans (nabä). They go even further: the members of a Yanoama village usually accentuate the small differences in dialect that separate them from those of the inhabitants of other villages and laugh at them because they consider them less completely Yanoama than they do, c 'that is to say, a bit like sub-humans ”(14).

Furthermore, Dugin makes no distinction between the recognition of race as reality and racism in the sense of racial supremacy. An example of imperialist racism (white supremacism) would be this statement made by Winston Churchill in 1937:

“I do not accept that the dog in the feeder is finally entitled to the feeder, even if he has been lying there for a very long time. I do not accept this right. I don’t accept, for example, that the Redskins of America or the black people of Australia have been done any great harm. I don't agree that these people have been wronged simply because a stronger race, a higher rank race, or at least a more knowledgeable race, to put it that way, come and take their place (15. "

The vast majority of American "white nationalists" or European ethno-nationalists today, however, are much less "racist" or "supremacist" than Winston Churchill. Even those who believe that the white race is naturally superior to other races, as opposed to simply acknowledging the reality of racial specificity, generally do not see this superiority as a moral justification for the slavery or genocide of other races. For the most part, contemporary racists simply assert the right to racial separatism and the right of every race to build a society in line with itself and to cultivate its unique characteristics and possibilities.

As to the historical validity of Dugin's interpretation of National Socialism as a project of world domination (the creation of a "planetary Reich" analogous to world communism or world liberalism), it is questionable to say the least. Not all National Socialists accepted the idea of ​​Germany's world domination, as this statement by Leon Degrelle demonstrates:

“German racism has been deliberately distorted. It was never directed against any other race. It was pro-German racism. He was anxious to make the Germanic race a strong and healthy race in every way. Hitler had nothing to do with millions of degenerates, if he was within his reach to do without them. Today alcoholism and drug addiction are spread everywhere. Hitler cared about the good health of Germanic families, made sure that they raised healthy children to renew a healthy nation. German racism meant a rediscovery of the creative values ​​of their own race, a discovery of their own culture. It was a search for the excellent; a remarkable idea. National Socialist racism was not against other races, it was for its own race. He aimed to defend and improve the breed and wanted all other races to do the same for their own race. "

The claim that the concept of race has no biological basis, or that if it does, it cannot help explain contemporary reality, is obviously wrong. But Dugin follows postmodern thinkers like Foucault and Althusser in arguing that besides race all political subjects are constructs. Race is a product of society and not vice versa, society is a product of race. Man, according to him, exists as a subject only in the political realm. “What man is does not come from himself as an individual, but from politics. It is politics that defines man. It is the political system that gives us our shape. In addition, the political system has intellectual and conceptual power as well as unlimited potential for transformation. “In other words, the subject does not create himself, he is not a natural given like the race or the individual. The subject is a construction, which only exists in a political system.

It follows that, ultimately, there is no sovereign subject who creates or exercises control over the system. On the contrary: subjects exist only as functions, produced by political structures without a subject. As the political system shifts from one historical paradigm to another - from traditional society to modern society, for example - it builds the normative kind of subjectivity it needs to function. “The political notion of man is the concept of man as such, which is implanted in us by the state or the political system. The politician is a special way of relating man to this state and the political system. […] We believe that we are causa sui, that we have self-generated and only then do we find ourselves in the political sphere. In fact, it is politics that constitutes us. […] The anthropological structure of man changes when one political system replaces another ". In other words, the subject cannot bring about a political paradigm shift on their own initiative - it is the new paradigm that will give birth to a new subject through a process of "questioning". The study of anthropological evolution from the type of man belonging to traditional society to the type of man belonging to modern society leads to the relativization not only of modern man, but of modern rationality as such. This relativization of modernity is “postmodernity”. The modern idea of ​​progress towards a unified humanity on the basis of Universal Reason turns out to be an illusion, which implies that traditional societies are placed on the same level as modern society.

In short, the argument is this: the subject cannot break the system (lead a revolution or bring about a "paradigm shift") and overcome it, if he is himself a product of the system, which does not 'exists only within the limits of this system. This is why class, race and the individual, all of which are constituted and defined subjects within the framework of modernity, have failed to overcome the crisis and dead ends of modernity. In short, the subject should be based on some sort of Archimedes point outside the political system, in order to have the necessary leverage for radical political action. One would have to be a "radical subject" and, for Dugin, the "radical subject" can only be chaos. Chaos is freedom which has not yet been confined within the confines of the bourgeois humanist conception of the individual. The disintegration of the liberal individual is not the negation of freedom, but the revelation of the essence of freedom as sovereign anarchic chaos.

The political subject acts in the field of politics. Ideologically, however, it must be grounded in an area prior to and above politics. In other words, the object of politics must go beyond the sphere of politics in order to be able to control, define and found it. For example, liberal ideology postulates the existence of the individual before the existence of the social order, in order to base the political order on the individual and his natural, universal rights. The National Socialists consider that race is a biological datum prior to and superior to politics and that the State has meaning only insofar as it is an instrument for the protection and preservation of race and for updating and improvement of its potential. This means that, for National Socialists, the race transcends the political domain, subordinating it to itself. The political consciousness to which they strive to awaken others is racial consciousness, in the same way that Marxists tried to sensitize the proletariat to class consciousness (16). For Marxists, the means of production go beyond the political domain, of which they form the material basis and the driving force. A class constitutes itself as a political subject by taking control of the means of production.

"The definition of a historical subject is the fundamental basis of political ideology in general and defines its structure."

For example, for nationalism, the real subjects of history are the nations, seen as a kind of super-people with a will and a destiny of their own. History is the history of nations. Identity is essentially national, and the friend / foe distinction (which is constitutive of politics, as Carl Schmitt has shown) depends on national borders. For racism, on the other hand, the real subjects of history are the different races, locked in a Darwinian struggle for life. The view of history is determined by modern concepts of biological evolution and progress. Identity is predominantly racial, and the friend / foe distinction has a racial basis. For Marxism, the subjects of history are classes, again seen as forms of collective subjectivity and, therefore, the whole of history has been interpreted as the history of class struggle. Identity is class identity, and the friend / foe distinction is determined by class.

The political subject is also a historical subject. This means that every modern political ideology corresponds to a "grand narrative" - ​​a global interpretation - of history. History as a whole is considered to be created by the action of a certain historical subject. It then becomes evident that political ideologies are secular substitutes for a theological interpretation of history and that the historical subjects they posit in principle are substitutes for divine Providence, the transcendent subject of history. As Carl Schmitt has shown, all fundamental concepts of politics are secularized theological concepts.

The place of the political subject - the void left when God withdraws from the world and from history - is a place of contestation between different modern political ideologies. Each fought to occupy this vacant place with their own concept of political subject. Each claimed to have mastered the destructive and creative forces released by modernity and to have fully actualized modernity. Communism saw itself as the final, inevitable and culminating stage of modernity, for which industrial capitalism had only paved the way. Liberalism regards the progressive liberation of the individual as well as the processes of secularization, modernization and globalization as a historical necessity. Fascism saw itself as a vanguard, a revolutionary movement, rejected bourgeois liberal democracy as an outdated residue of the twentieth century and asserted that the organic state was the only adequate form for mobilizing the masses in modern societies. Italian fascism and German National Socialism both modernized and revolutionized their respective countries, which contributed to their political success. Fascism in its early days was influenced by the avant-garde modernism of Futurism, which called for the nihilistic destruction of the past and unconditionally worshiped modern technology and "progress."

(This is what led Evola to reject Futurism as a form of "Americanism" Marinetti retorted that his ideas were as far removed from his as those of an Eskimo. Strangely - for someone who claims to be a traditionalist ( 17). Dugin considers Futurism to be one of the admirable elements of the first fascism, which he wishes to take on board)

Each of these political systems, therefore, claimed to be the most appropriate form for technologically advanced, modern society. This form corresponds to a certain human type, an embodiment of a certain political project, the normative "man of the future": whether it is the homo soveticus, the new fascist man, the purified racist Aryan superman, or the enlightened bourgeois individual (18). In other words, each of these ideologies or "political theories" posited in principle a normative subject as the basis of its political vision and its interpretation of history. The transition to modernity in its full development was not only a political revolution, but also an anthropological revolution, the creation of a "new man".

According to Dugin, in the crisis of the end of modernity, besides race and class, the nation-state ceases to be an authentic political subject, even if it recognizes that the will to preserve national sovereignty is, in the current situation, a natural place of resistance to globalization. The “de-sovereignization” of the nation corresponds, philosophically speaking, to its desubjectivation. However, Dugin sees this “de-sovereignization” / de-subjectivization as inevitable and even as inherent in the very nature of the nation. He fully accepts the postmodern idea that the nation is an artificial, ideological and political construct, an "imaginary community" created to unify modern fragmented societies. The nation is, in his view, simply a sham, an artificial substitute for the lost totality of mainstream society (he seems to see the race itself as a modern sham of "ethnos"). Historically, its emergence corresponds to the precise moment when traditional society enters into crisis. This is a compromise, a form of transition, a ruse (19). In addition, he sees the nation as a device to facilitate the transition from pre-modern traditional society to modern civil and liberal society. As a result, the nation cannot be a lasting force of resistance to liberal globalization. He sees the nation as a device of power adapted to the production of a certain normative, standardized type of political subject: the bourgeois individual (the citizen). In doing so, it destroys organic ethnic, regional communities (for example, by the abolition of regional dialects in Italy and France and the imposition of a standardized national language) as well as the liquidation of the last residues of traditional elites (the aristocracy). Thus, the concept of "ethno-nationalism" is, in his view, ultimately an absolute contradiction in terms: the nation is inherently "ethnocidal". It destroys the ethnic group and replaces it with a "demos". Nationalism, according to Dugin, must be condemned not only because it has been the cause of so many wars, but because the nation itself is inherently violent - violent in the sense that it is an arbitrary construct without a transcendent basis, sacred. Its violence is the violence of modernity itself (admittedly this is true of many countries, perhaps more particularly of the nation of Israel, which is a completely modern artificial construction, as arguably is idea that Jews are a unified and homogeneous race or ethnic group). To date, however, there is no indication that the idea of ​​a Russian-dominated Eurasian Empire would be less artificial, violent or "ethnocidal."

(The new post-war European order prepared by the dominant Waffen SS faction was not based on the nation-state, but on a pan-European federation of culturally autonomous regions. Dugin omits to mention this fact, but he does must say that his characterization of National Socialism is tendentious)

As for the fascist notion of the organic state, based on the Hegelian philosophy of the state, Dugin does not explain the reasons why he rejects the credible idea that it might be suitable for the political subject. In general, Dugin simply takes the defeat of the second and third political theories as axiomatic, without providing anything that resembles strong arguments. According to him, modernity has been fully actualized in liberal society, and as a result, ideological rivalries in modernity are over. This view probably applies more to communism than to fascism. The death of communism was, as Dominique Venner wrote, an "inglorious disappearance". Its collapse is due to its own bureaucratic inertia and its inability to manage economic development. By contrast, fascism and National Socialism were spectacularly successful political experiments, and perhaps for this reason they had to be destroyed militarily by their international competitors. Dugin clearly attributes the defeat of National Socialist Germany to its anti-Russian and anti-Communist policies. As Dugin sees these two policies as linked to the infection of National Socialism by Atlanticism and Anglo-Saxon biological racism, he considers that the defeat of the third way is the consequence of ideological errors and not simply a contingency. historical. In his eyes, apart from the fact that National Socialist Nordicism was a vulgar and materialist misinterpretation of the traditional doctrine of the North as a pole of tradition, National Socialism was anti-Communist and anti-Slav because it was anti-Eastern. , that is, pro-Western (modern). Today, according to the Eurasists (who in this respect are the heirs of National-Bolshevism), European nationalists are repeating the disastrous mistakes of German National Socialists, when they again oppose the 'East' under the form of Islamization. Usually, eurasists try to downplay the idea of ​​a "clash of civilizations" or any claim that there is clear opposition between Islam and European civilization. They accuse nationalists who view Islam as incompatible with European values ​​of confusing "Europe" with "the West". Any interpretation of European history that the values ​​of the Enlightenment are rooted in European tradition itself - in classical Greece, for example (20) - is accused of attempting to legitimize the "West" by inventing historical precedents. and by falsifying the true European tradition (21). Liberalism has triumphed because it can legitimately claim to be the most successful actualization of the potential of modernity. Liberalism has indeed succeeded in modernizing the West to a much greater degree than communism has succeeded in modernizing the countries of the Eastern bloc, so that the "West" and in particular the United States are now more or less synonymous with modernity. In the decades following World War II, capitalism, using economic means, modernized Western European societies to a degree that fascism never imagined, making third-way ideologies appear archaic and obsolete in comparison.

It is possible that Dugin is following in Heidegger's footsteps by seeing nationalism as a kind of "anthropologism" (cf. "Letter on Humanism"). What Heidegger means by this is that nationalism, like Marxism, places man, rather than Being, at the center of history. Nationalism is "subjectivism" in the sense that it considers man as the subject of history. In this sense, nationalism is indeed a modern phenomenon, for modernity, for Heidegger, is essentially an epoch in the history of metaphysics which is dominated by the philosophy of the subject. It starts from Descartes' cogito: the rational subject as a solid foundation for philosophy and science. Descartes identifies the subject with reason (ratio). This view became the metaphysical foundation of the Enlightenment and its anthropology (22)

Why does Dugin give the Heideggerian concept of Dasein the central role in the fourth political theory? Heidegger developed his analysis of Dasein to try to overcome the abstractions of the metaphysical concept of subject. Therefore, his "analysis of Dasein" offers the possibility of going beyond modern political ideologies based on various interpretations of the subject. Dasein is beyond, or before, the subject-object division. Dasein is not the rational subject as the abstract foundation of the notion of universal man. Dasein is the historical, spatiotemporal structure of concrete existence. The subject is outside the world and is related to the world as a system of objects. Dasein has always existed in the world, it is involved in it, it struggles there. The world, to use Heidegger’s very expression, is a collection of meaningful relationships. Everything refers to other things in an endless circular web of relationships. The relationship of Dasein to these things is one of understanding and interpretation and not (essentially) of objectification.

The subject is reason, that is, it is defined by its relation to a cause and an ultimate foundation (Grund). Dasein is defined by its relation to finitude, death and the abyss (Ab-Grund). However, it is not clear how Dasein, which Heidegger says is precisely not the subject, can be called the "subject" of the Fourth Political Theory. Dasein is not a subject who arbitrarily imposes his will, creates himself from nothing, or freely makes history. It is part of a cosmic process which transcends man and his action. Man does not decide the history of Being. Heidegger does not care to re-elaborate or modify the concept of subject, any more than he does not care to bring man back to "God and to tradition" as metaphysical foundations, but tries to go beyond metaphysics itself. even, that is to say, all thought taking as “foundation” (Grund) the Being of beings. It also means that Heidegger is far from conceptions of "traditionalism".

Since Dugin invokes Heidegger and the analysis of Dasein, one can assume that his critique of liberalism and the West hides an attempt to critique modernity as such (identified with the West). The Heideggerian critique of modernity is linked to an attempt to go beyond the philosophy of the subject. For Heidegger, modernity, when the humanitarian masks of the Enlightenment fall, is technological nihilism and this nihilism is the fatal consequence of Western metaphysics. Western metaphysics, however, is the foundation of Western civilization as a whole (23).

Heidegger's critique is not simply political. He criticizes Bolshevism, liberalism (which paved the way for Bolshevism) and other modern ideologies for failing to capture not only their own essence, but the essence of modernity itself: technological nihilism. The emancipation of the subject is not the goal of technological development. Quite the contrary - the emancipation of the subject is a means of emancipation of technology. The last glimmers of transcendence have faded into the world, so that technology can pursue, in complete freedom and on a planetary scale, the infinite circular self-reinforcement of its productive power, sucking everything in its whirlwind, with no other ultimate goal than power for itself. The West becomes das Abendland (24), the side where the sun sets, the realm of the darkening of the divine, of the withdrawal of the gods. Technology like Gestell is not mastered by man (the subject), but turns out to be the impersonal fate of Being itself. Man as a subject can never master technology, but as a subject he is "subdued" by technology, to the extent that the essence of technology like Gestell constitutes man as subject. Technological development has no inherent inherent limit, and no border can be arbitrarily set there as long as thought remains confined within the framework of the subject's philosophy (humanism) and technological calculation (the ultimate deviation from the Western logos. ) (25). But, even as modern technology fully actualizes its dominance, the subject it spawns goes into crisis, begins to "disappear." It is liquidated in a system of purely functional relations deprived of a center, of fixed norms and of solid foundations. The essence of the object turns out to be a kind of limit, which initially was a necessary condition, but is now only an obstacle to be overcome. For Heidegger, this threshold, this ultimate crisis of nihilism - provoked by technology itself - opens up the possibility of thinking the essence of man and of Being in a much deeper dimension, beyond object. Instead of thinking of man as a subject, Heidegger tries to think of the historicity of Dasein. This is why the "inner truth" of National Socialism meant for him the confrontation between modern technology and the "historical man" (ie man, but not as a subject).

For Heidegger, Western modernity and materialism are not, as the traditionalists assert, the consequence of a mysterious crisis in the traditional society of medieval Europe. On the contrary, he sees the passage from the Middle Ages to the modern era as an evolution rather than a radical break with the traditional past. For Heidegger, medieval scholasticism, by wrongly assimilating the Greek logos to ratio and by proposing an onto-theological synthesis of Greek philosophy and Christianity, prepared the ground for Descartes' rationalism. In a sense, Heidegger develops Nietzsche's idea that nihilism is not so much a break with Christianity as a revelation of the nihilistic essence of Christianity. As a Christian and a traditionalist, Dugin systematically avoids the anti-Christian aspect of Heidegger's thought, without being able to criticize it. For Heidegger, as for the majority of conservative revolutionaries, the origin of modernity is Christian, or rather it lies in the "onto-theological" synthesis of Christianity and Greek metaphysics. It is the Christian conception of the "sovereignty" of God over the world as creation that determines the modern notion of the object, just like the Christian notion of the free individual in personal relationship with God and the Christian problem of the salvation of the object. the immortal soul of all individuals is the origin of modern mass individualism. It is God as "supreme being" - both causa sui and causa prima, first cause, sovereign over all other beings and "creator" of the world - who is at the origin of the sovereign subject whose relationship to things is. that of manipulation and instrumental objectification. Modern secular humanism is onto-theological: it has its origin not in Greek thought, but in Christianity and the Christian interpretation of Greek thought.

In any case, following Heidegger, we can agree that race, insofar as it is conceived as a purely biological, human characteristic, is insufficient as a political subject, or rather that it is too narrowly anthropological and must be integrated into a deeper design. It is not quite the same as liquidating the notion of race. This implies the rejection of certain extreme forms of racism, where the biological notion of race plays a reducing role analogous to that of the Marxist concept of material foundation which determines the ideological superstructure (culture, mentality, etc.) of a society.

Man is not the unconditioned, self-generated subject of modern metaphysics. Human existence is conditioned and limited - men are, as Jünger wrote, "the children of the earth" (26). Race is one of the many earthly conditions of human existence. A historical world is not an ex nihilo, arbitrary and unconditional construction. There is, to use Heidegger's expression, a struggle between the world and the earth - the world, an articulated historical space of possibilities and decisions and the conditions set by the unobjectified elementary forces of the earth, whose blood. Blood takes on the meaning of destiny in a historical world (which does not mean that it is an arbitrary historical and social construction). For Heidegger, the limits set by the biological potentialities of human beings are not arbitrary historical creations - what is historical is the figure or constellation of particular relationships that gives them meaning.
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We can also note that the statistical concept of race to which realistic racists refer today is very different from National Socialist racial theories, which were based on the idea of ​​racial purity (27) and which, in form that they take on today (28), are not sufficient as such to give an overall account of the specificity of our civilization or our culture, nor of other civilizations or other cultures. The differences between the mentality of Americans of European origin and the mentality of Europeans underline this clearly (29). Intuitively, however, we understand that race plays a role in the general character of civilizations and that genetic research will increasingly confirm this intuition in the future.

Dugin considers the Marxist concept of class to be useful and "very interesting" as a tool for the ideological critique of the mystifications of liberal bourgeois society. However, he regards Marxist materialism as reductive and recognizes that the class is no longer today a credible contender for political subjectivity (i.e. action), because the class structure of society largely dissolved (probably as a result of the atomization and gentrification of society as a whole - as well as technological developments). He also recognizes that ethnic conflicts are often at the root of class struggle and not the other way around. One wonders why Dugin cannot, in the same spirit, recognize that the concept of race is also legitimate from the point of view of science and heuristically useful, even if it means rejecting an overly simplistic application. In my opinion, this has to do with the fact that he is an ideologue and not a genuine thinker. Eurasism is an ideology specially designed to meet the geopolitical ambitions of contemporary Russia. Russia is a multiracial and multicultural empire, and the Russian identity has been, since the “great patriotic war” against Germany, deeply anti-fascist.

Giuliano A. Malvicini, "Race," Ethnos "and" The Fourth Political Theory "" -

<http://democratia-mortui.blogspot.co.uk/2014/04/race-ethnos-and-fourth-political-theory.html>, translated from English by B. K.

(\*) See, for example, L. Delattre, A Spy at the Heart of the Third Reich.

(\*\*) The trial of members of Nationalsozialistischer Untergrund was held in Munich in May 2013. The group was accused of racially motivated murders. It soon turned out that a number of the members were police informants and had instigated others to commit racist crimes (<http://voiceofrussia.com/2013_05_07/Neo-Nazis-trial> -in-Germany-Several-NSU-members-were-informers-lawyer /) Ten years earlier, one of the co-founders of the NPD (Nationaldemokratische Partei Deutschlands) had to admit to the court that he was "from day one" an informant from the German secret service (<http://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2002/01/npd-j30.html>.

(\*\*\*) <http://www.theoccidentalobserver.net/2014/05/alexander-dugins-4-political-theory-is-for-the-russian-empire-not-for-european-ethno-nationalists/> ( translated into French at <https://www.jeune-nation.com/geopolitique/la-4e-theorie-politique-dalexandre-douguine-est-pour-lempire-russe-pas-pour-les-ethno-nationalistes-europeens>- par-domitius-corbulon.html), which we have just discovered, fully supports it, right up to its conclusion. Incidentally, in the countries of the West where Dugin is having some success, it is too little known that his father was a member of the KGB and that in the late 1980s he was part of Pamyat, a group of agitators. nationalists whom some have suspected of having been, if not created, at least supported by the KGB (<http://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae6abb558.html>). As far as Eurasism is concerned, it may be useful to know that Nikolai Sergeyevich Troubetzkoy (1890-1930), one of the instigators of Eurasism and also one of the leaders of the insurgency of the Decembrists in 1825, was, like his father and grandfather, a Freemason (see Fr. Dennis Stoks, Russian Freemasonry)
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(1) The Stoics and in particular the Phoenician Zeno of Citium, trained in the school of the Sophists, said nothing else. Ed.

(2) Dugin can swear to his great gods that "Eurasism is not universalism; it is a patriotism of the land, of the Heartland (sic), of the Great Continent. Eurasism is not addressed only to Russia, but to all Eurasian peoples who want to preserve their identity and their dignity ”, this surge is contradicted by the Eurasianist desire to make alliance with anti-liberal factions of North African origin or sub-Saharan, unless, of course, the North Africans and black Africans are part of the Eurasian peoples. In practice, this utopian alliance means an inverted globalism. Basically, both liberalism and eurasism see all peoples as dependent on each other and as constituting one human community. The human community of liberalism is formed by the scoundrels above; the human community of eurasism, the scum from below. Ed.

(3) The “left” and the “right”, after having had an illusion until the middle of the 20th century, are today so little distinguished ideologically and politically, as the author of the article, that we cannot fault Dugin on this point. Ed.

(4) The quotes from The Fourth Political Theory are here translated from English. Ed.

(5) At the beginning of the 20th century, the essayist, historian and philosopher Coudenhove-Kalergi, one of the fathers of Europe, as there were the fathers of the Church, already declared: “Man, in the near future, will be a mestizo. ", More exactly a" eurasiatic-negroid "," whose outward appearance will be similar to that of Ancient Egypt [and which] will replace the diversity of peoples with the diversity of individuals ". It is true that the individual in question was himself a mixed race: Austro-Japanese, to make no mistake about it. Ed.

(6) See A. Dugin, "The Magic Disillusion of a Nationalist Intellectual". Apart from the judicious observations made by J. Evola on the resemblances between the United States and the USSR apparently not caught the attention of Dugin, many of his compatriots who, visiting the States United, have noticed and underlined the affinities of the United States and the Russian. "No other nation," said Russian actor and theater director Stanilavsky, "is as deeply attached to [art] as America and, in this regard, Russian and American souls are close." (L. Senelick, Stanislavsky: A Life in Letters, p. 446) Dale E. Peterson, professor of English and Russian at Amherst University in Massachusetts, draws parallels between African-American souls and Russian (see D. Pesman, Russia and Soul: An Exploration). Ed.
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(7) The traditional views of the ancient Romans and ancient Scandinavians on these matters were no less normative than those of these races; the emancipation of women, the acceptance of homosexuality and the passage from education of character to a purely bookish education were the consequences of a Semitization of their respective societies. Transvestite musicians and transvestite musicians entertained Mesopotamian rulers 3,500 years before a transvestite won the 2014 European Broadcasting Union competition and thrilled members of the pseudo-European pseudo-parliament. While it is shown that effeminacy enjoyed a certain public and institutional recognition in pre-Islamic society and in the early days of Arab Islamic society, transvestites, as Semitized as Europe may be, did not. - not yet - this status (“Effeminates of Early Medina”, Journal of the American oriental Society, vol. 111, n ° 4, October-December, 1991, p. 671-693; “Gender Irregularity as Entertainment: Institutionalized Transvestism at the Caliphate Court in Medieval Bagdhad ”, in S. Farmer, Gender and Difference in the Middle Ages, S. Farmer, C. Braun Pasternack eds., pp. 45-72.). On the other hand, it is established that the culture from which Islam emerged knew the "cult of the ephebes" and that homosexual practices were seen there as a symbol of social status - a sign of wealth and / or power, if although it is not surprising that such practices were later widespread among wealthy Muslims and the elite of the Islamic world (<http://trace.tennessee.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1231&context> = utk\_chanhonoproj). Not to mention those whose name is composed with the suffix in -philie. One of the common myths in modern Africa is that homosexuality is not an indigenous cultural practice, but a problem due to the white, even Arab, presence on this continent. However, scholarly research has shown the preponderance not only of homosexual behavior in many traditional African societies, but also the importance of models of identity formation and indigenous cosmogonies which invalidate the idea that this type of sexuality would only have developed through contact with foreign culture (S. Gikandi, Encyclopedia of African Literature, p. 311). Morally, as in any other way, white has no lessons to learn. Finally, Dugin, pro-gay rights, lacks logic in his thinking when he sees blacks' so-called rejection of homosexuality as a sign of their spiritual superiority over whites.

Regarding the very Christian claim of Dugin and the Eurasists that the "West" is "Evil", it echoes the diatribes of 20th century Slavophiles against "The Rotten West", which, it does not not lacking in spice, themselves find their origin in "the critique of the German Enlightenment Romantics, of certain aspects of the French Revolution and of the very beginnings of modern technical and materialist thought. (E. Benz, The Eastern Orthodox Church: Its Thought and Life, p. 190). Likewise, today Islam, not without a certain nerve, accuses the “West” of all evils. Ed.

(8) How Dugin supposes, as a good traditionalist, that, horrisco audiens, the white race and the black race have the same tradition, naturally “primordial”. Ed.

(9) “The very similar responsibility is connected with the act of eating animal food”. Dugin probably means "meat", but writes "animal food", a slip all the more revealing since it is committed by an individual who is not far from being supporter of cannibalism. In any case, as regards the quotations from texts written by Dugin in English, we have taken the party to respect the syntax, if it is allowed to use this term here, the expression and the style of the author. , to the extent and only to the extent that this does not interfere with the understanding of its formulations. Ed.

(10) “without noticing it or denying its cannibal nature”. Here, Dugin does not appear to follow his own reasoning. Logically, it can only mean the following: "without noticing it or acknowledging its cannibal nature" (without realizing it and without recognizing its cannibal character). Ed.

(11) The reference is not given. Ed.

(12) Precisely, these are metaphors, meta-phores. However, the Rig-Veda was influenced by Tamil literature very early on. Ed.

(13) Diogenes the cynic also found cannibalism, pacifism, prostitution, the pooling of women, etc. beautiful and pure. The Phoenician Zeno of Citium also found it beautiful and pure for a man to eat the flesh of his dead parents. Chrysippus, his disciple, added that observing the way animals live proves that no act is inappropriate, which proves that he would have benefited from writing less and observing animals more. Ed.

(14) B. Lincoln, Death, War, and Sacrifice, p 142.

(15) In C. Ponting, Churchill, p. 254. Ed.

(16) The analogy is only partially and even superficially valid, since class is a purely quantitative concept, while race is a potentially qualitative concept. Ed.

(17) “Any intentional 'traditionalist' must normally affirm himself to be 'anti-modern', but he can nonetheless be himself affected, without suspecting it, by modern ideas in some more or less form. attenuated, and therefore more difficult to discern, but nevertheless still corresponding in fact to one or the other of the stages that these ideas have gone through during their development ”(R. Guénon). Ed.

(18) On the other hand, it should be observed that all the societies of the past also had their "type", their "figure", from Sparta to Rome, from China to Egypt via Christian Europe of the Christian “middle ages”, even if it was not the object of a formulation: it was and, nolens volens, was perpetuated: there was therefore no reason to put it in a formula. The concept of a "new man" has a Biblical origin.

(19) Nationalism is a doctrine based on the exaltation of the idea of ​​homeland or nation and a political movement of individuals who are aware of constituting a national community by virtue of factors, cultural or linguistic, which bind them . While everyone more or less accepts this minimal definition of nationalism, nationalism has assumed various forms, which prove to be difficult to categorize. In general, their classification is based on the distinction between the liberal-democratic nationalism which asserted itself in Europe during the first half of the 19th century and the nationalism of the second half of this century. This one conceived the nation as a coexistence of the community with the other nations on the basis of peace and equality (this point of view is typical, for example, of Mazzini), while this one, linked to the reaction against parliamentary democracy and against democratic and liberal ideology, promoted a national identity and culture and implied a belief in the superiority of one nation over others. The first appears as a form of transition, which accompanies the passage of political power from the aristocracy to the bourgeoisie; it is the degree immediately preceding the international forms of proletarian economic collectivism and the dissolution of all nations in a single human community, even if, for the needs of the globalist cause, the nations, emptied of all sovereignty, continue to exist formally . The second, based on what remains of national consciousness, can, provided it is led by nationalists, put the brakes on globalism and make it possible to reconstitute a state worthy of the name. Dugin is right to criticize and reject the former, although, on the part of a National Bolshevist, this rejection and criticism are not without inconsistency. He does not see, or pretends not to see, the second, which he however knows from his reading of J. Evola. Ed.

(20) If the “values ​​of the Enlightenment” are undoubtedly “rooted… in ancient Greece”, that is to say in the philosophy of ancient Greece, it is to put the finger in the eye until elbow to identify the so-called “Greek” philosophy with values, let's not say European, since the term is anachronistic, but, in a typological sense, Aryan: <https://elementsdeducationraciale.wordpress.com/2013/10/01/> la-liberte-un-concept-desclaves-2 /). Paradoxically, nationalists of this ilk defend Europe on the basis of values ​​or concepts which they ignore to be of Semitic origin and, therefore, do not effectively defend it, but contribute to undermining it even more. Ed.

(21) Paradoxically, Dugin, whether he realizes it or not, is not wrong, insofar as it may well be that what is referred to as the "European tradition" is not also white that we tend to believe today (think carefully about the fact that the name of "Europe" is that of a Phoenician princess, that it has never been used to designate our continent in antiquity, that it was brought back into fashion at the end of the 8th century by ecclesiastics imbued with Levantine culture from the very Christian entourage of Charlemagne and that it was not until the 16th century that he began to be used to designate the whole of our continent. As for the term "European", it is attested for the first time, in its adjectival form (europenses), in L'Histoire Auguste by Ammien Marcelin, where it is not not used in the modern sense, only to reappear in literature until the 8th century, from the pen of a Mozarabic author (that is to say a Spanish Christian ol who, during the Arab domination, had retained, in exchange for allegiance, the free exercise of his worship), which uses it to qualify the troops of Charles Martel who defeated the Muslim Arab army at the battle of Tours and to which, because these troops represented Christendom, it seems to give a religious meaning: the Europenses would therefore be the Christians. Coudenhove-Kalergi does not go four ways: "Christianity, prepared ethically by the Jewish Essenes (John) and spiritually by the Jewish Alexandrians (philo), was a regenerated Judaism. As a Christian Europe, in spirit, is Jewish; as a moral, Europe is Jewish. "Almost all of European ethics are rooted in Judaism. All the protagonists of a morality, religious or not, from Augustine to Rousseau, Kant and Tolstoy, were chosen Jews in the intellectual sense; Nietzsche is the only non-Jewish moralist, the only pagan moralist in Europe. "

(22) It was already germinating in a number of schools of philosophy in antiquity. Ed.

(23) As paradoxical as it may seem to those who allow themselves to be imposed on the terminology of the enemy and go so far as to do so unconditionally, spontaneously, their, "western" is, at best, a purely geographical term and is not in no case can be superimposed on that of “white”, as suggested by the considerations developed in the two preceding notes and those which follow. Ed.

(24) Comme Kwame Anthony Appiah ,, There is no such thing as a western civilization, November 9, 2016, <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/nov/09/western-civilisation-appiah-reith-lecture> ), we consider that Western civilization does not exist, but for reasons radically different from those he puts forward.

The term occidens seems to have been used for the first time in the Tusculans, 24, where it means sunset ("occidente sole"). In the Acts of the Martyrs of the East and the West, published in 1748 by Estifan Awwad as-Simani (1771-1782), Archbishop of Apamea, from Chaldaic manuscripts of the 3rd or 4th century AD, the term of "East" covers Persia and that of "West" Palestine (Jean-François Godescard [abbot], Lives of the Fathers, Martyrs, and other principal Saints, new ed., t. 1, freely translated from l 'English, Paris, 1836, p. xix). The meaning of Occident is fixed with the division of the Roman Empire by Theodosius I in 395. Partes occidentis then designates "the territories located to the west of the line Sirmium-Lake Scodra in Europe and of the line which crossed the Gulf of Greater Sirte in North Africa, leaving to the empire of Arcadius the province of Libya II or Upper Libya and to the empire of Honorius Tripolitania, the demarcating line of languages ​​being more generous for the West , since Latin was spoken by almost all the north of the Balkan peninsula with the exception of the province of Scythia ”. After the fall of Rome in 476, “the term Occident designates the provinces of the collapsed empire which are ruled by barbarian kings as managers of the sole emperor, who resides in Constantinople” (Tēlemachos Loungēs, Les embassies byzantines en West: from the founding of the barbarian states until the Crusades (407-1096), TC Lounghis, 1980, p. 1; again, as Voltaire observes, perplexed, [Œuvres complantes de Voltaire, Essay sur les mœurs, t. 2 , Delangle Frères, 1828, p. 193], was the word Occident applied to the Greek Empire or the Orient in certain accounts from the 9th century AD). Tota occidentalis Europa, according to Nithard (858), designates the empire of Charlemagne. In 1690, Furetière defined Occident as “the western part of the European continent; all the countries and peoples who inhabit it ”. It therefore had a relative meaning. It was not until the nineteenth century that the term took, in international politics, the absolute meaning of "group of nations comprising the capitalist countries of Western Europe and the United States". that is to say the member states of NATO, which it has retained ever since. As for us, we retain its astronomical meaning of "region, part of the globe located towards the west, in relation to a given place", by virtue of which an inhabitant of the United States is a Westerner in relation to an inhabitant of the United States. 'Europe, an inhabitant of China a Westerner compared to an inhabitant of the United States, etc.

If we thus understand "Westerner", it is also because of the negative direction of Occidens, of Occidere, to fall, to fall, to be lost, annihilated. As the first Christians, like the Eurasianists, believed that the demons dwelled in the West, it is not surprising that he used this term for apologetic purposes. Lactantius writes: “[…] God ordered and divided the earth into two opposing parts, namely east and west, of which the east is deemed to be like God, who is the light and the illuminator of all things, and who makes us to be born to achieve eternal life. But the West is like the troublemaker and evil spirit, because it offends the light, always induces and brings darkness, and causes men to die and perish by sin. For as the light proceeds from the East, and in light is known the reason for living well, so in the West is darkness, and in darkness is contained death and perpetual damnation ”(Lactantius, Des divines institutions contre les gentilz et idolâtres, 1543, p. xl; Lactantius also said, speaking of the reign of Antichrist: "Then a dreadful desolation will spread throughout all the earth. And the cause of this devastation will be that the name Roman (I hate to say it, but however I will say it because it will be) will be removed from the earth; the Empire will return to Asia, the East will rule again, and the West will be subjugated [Henri-François de Vence, The Holy Bible in Latin and in French, vol. 13, 1750, p. 144]; we have modernized the spelling). Likewise, "[...] the Lord God planted a garden in Eden, on the eastern side" Genesis, 2: 8). On the TO maps, medieval representations of the three continents known at the time, namely Asia, Africa and Europe, Asia occupies the entire upper part of the circle, while Europe and Africa share, one on the left, the other on the right, the lower part (see <https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Carte_en_T#/media/Fichier:T_and_O_map_Guntherus_Ziner_1472.jpg>; https: // www .bl.uk / fr-fr / medieval-english-french-manuscripts / articles / mapping-the-world). How can we better visually express the domination of Asia over the world?

Hence the orientation of Christian buildings, from the first centuries of the Church. From the 6th century, their western towers were dedicated to Saint Michael, the leader of believers and the slayer of demons and devils, in order to protect the entrance. Until the end of the 7th century, the priest, with his gaze turned towards the front of the altar and the entrance to the church, prays ad Dominum towards the east, like the faithful (Jean Fournée, The Last Judgment, with the author, Paris, 1964; Jean Bouhier, Lettres, Paris, 1712, p. 117). Until the 15th century, any religious building was suitable for a prayer to the east. From the third century, baptism is preceded by a formula of "renunciation of the devil and it is turned towards the west, we learn from Jérôme (see Bergier [abbot], Encyclopédie methodique, t. 3, Paris, 1790, . p. 354) recited by the one who was about to receive this sacrament and it was also turned to the east that he made his profession of faith: “In the mysteries of baptism, we first renounce it. who is in the West and who dies in us with sins; and turned to the East, we make a pact with the Sun of Justice by promising to serve it ”(Jérôme, cited in A. Kempeneers [abbot],“ On the symbolic orientation of Christian churches. ”In Annales de l 'Royal Academy of Archeology of Belgium, vol. 25, 2nd series, t. 5, p. 596; in Greek orthodoxy, the catechumen must also raise his hands as if to repel Satan); it was turned towards the west that the "possessed" was exorcised: "You have entered," said St. Cyril of Jerusalem, "into the vestibule of the baptistery, and standing against the West, which is the region of darkness, you were made to stretch out your hand and renounce Satan as if he were present. Then you turned to the East which is the symbolic land of light, and you said: I believe in God the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit (quoted in ibid, p. 397). The idea that the Orians corresponded to Good and the West to Evil and that the West was to be fought in the name of the Oriens is found in the Heliand (or Poem from the Life of Jesus) and the Altsächsische Genesis (see Jürgen Fischer, Oriens-Occidens-Europa: Begriff und Gedanke “Europa” in der Späten Antike und im frühen Mittelalter, F. Steiner, 1957, p. 73), two epic poems composed in Old Saxon and which were intended for “pagans Who had not yet converted to Christianity. Frankish thought was steeped in the belief that the Frankish missionary church represented the Orientals in the struggle against Western "paganism" (Gillian M. Bediako, Primal Religion and the Bible: William Robertson Smith and His Heritage, Sheffield Academic Press, 1997, p. 26).

(25) If technology, of which generations of native Europeans, flattered by the school education they received, flattered themselves to have been the inventors and whose misdeeds have been skilfully used for several decades by the media to make them feel guilty, has developed well on our continent, this obviously does not mean that its premises germinated in the brains of white people, nor does the exhumation of a wooden plane dated 2300 BC in the temple of Abydos five years before one of the Wright brothers made the first controlled powered flight of an airplane means that it was designed by Egyptians or that the discovery of a 2000 year old electric battery in the vicinity of Baghdad a few years ago implies that its designers were of the Semitic race: races, ethnicities, individuals, have migrated over the centuries, nothing says, as long as archaeological research does not establish it, that the place X where an artifact is discovered Y at one time Z was inhabited at the time it was conceived by individuals of the same race as that which inhabited it at the time of discovery; but: in the historical period, there is evidence that many of the inventions which have been attributed to whites for two centuries in the field of technology are in reality only applications of processes which had been developed by non-whites. Ed.

(26) More exactly, the "Worker" "is the son of the earth", the "child of Prometheus". Since Goethe, who had a black ancestor, we all know that the "western man", the white man, is Promethean by nature. We know less that Prometheus, in his capacity as Titan, takes us back to the first settlers of Greece, the Pelasgians, whose rites, customs and beliefs show that they were not a people of Indo-European origin.

(27) The concept of racial purity is to National Socialism what health is to the sick: as is A. Hitler, as certain passages from Mein Kampf attest, was perfectly aware that the German people were far from being racially pure, but did not intend to let them continue to degrade themselves, like the patient, while being aware of his state, far from wishing for his condition to worsen, would like to regain health.

(28) The Waffen SS are certainly not responsible for the more or less fanciful interpretations that dilettantes have given of their post-war principles. Ed.

(29) Perhaps these differences are not unrelated to the fact that, as W. Sombart observed in his time, America is a Jewish country down to its smallest recesses and Americanism a "distilled Jewish spirit" , even if in the meantime the so-called European peoples have largely caught up with the Americans in this regard. Ed.