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.

2721/5000

(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.

Race, "Ethnos" and "The Fourth Political Theory" ( part 2)

Bruno Cariou from by Elements of Racial Education

It is already a lot to recognize that "The 4th Political Theory of Alexander Dugin is for the Russian Empire, not for European ethno-nationalists", but it is not enough, because, like all proselytism, Eurasism is not to be taken or left: globalism upside down, globalism for the underprivileged, it is to be fought, before it is eventually imposed by force. The second part of Giuliano Adriano Malvicini's essay is no less interesting than the first in this respect, not so much because it shows that Dugin did not read the authorities (M. Heidegger, J. Evola, etc.) that he takes hostage in support of his theses, or has misunderstood them, only because he exposes the radical incompatibilities that exist between the clearly more Asian than European foundations of Eurasism and therefore the additional dangers it poses for a Europe which is already in a state of advanced dissolution.

Like liberalism, an ideology based on the rights of the individual, calls for 'liberation from all forms of collective identity in general (and is therefore) entirely incompatible with ethnos and ethnocentrism and is the expression of a systematic theoretical and technological ethnocide ”,“ ethnocentrism ”and the positive affirmation of“ ethnic identity ”are seen by Dugin as the potential basis of resistance to liberalism. This is why he asserts that "ethnocentrism" can be seen as a positive element of National Socialism, as long as it is neutralized by emptying it of any racial or national connotation. The duginian notion of "ethnos" has nothing to do with race - it makes it clear that it is a purely cultural, linguistic and sociological concept, without any biological basis. As we will see, the Guinean concept of "ethnocentrism", which he claims to derive from the German sociologist Wilhelm Mühlman (who, however, was a racist and a staunch National Socialist), is not to be taken in its current sense. . As for the notion of "ethnos" itself, in The Fourth Political Theory it only touches the surface, defining it as "a community of language, religious belief, daily life and the identity of resources and resources. Goals ". However, he develops it in much more detail in a series of lectures on “ethno-sociology” (a synonym of cultural or social anthropology, or even structural anthropology) (1).

The first part of Dugin's talk gives a very cursory overview of the various national schools of social anthropology, which he sees as an important peripheral scientific discipline that has the potential to challenge and overthrow Western cultural hegemony (c. (ie Western "racism"). Those who know the work of Kevin McDonald and his book "The Culture of Criticism" will be struck by the very positive judgment that Dugin has on figures such as the American Jewish anthropologist Franz Boas, famous for having tried to discredit the notion. of race.

Dugin is particularly interested in the French school of structural anthropology, founded by the French-Jew Claude Lévi-Strauss who was a student of the Russian linguist of Jewish origin Roman Jakobson. This chain is important to Dugin, because Jakobson was not only one of the founders of structural linguistics, but also a Eurasist. Structural anthropology is also an important link between the study of pre-modern forms of rationality and post-structural thinking on the one hand and between conservative "holistic" thinking and postmodern relativism on the other. The structural method - the conception of a culture as a system of synchronic relations - is assimilated by Dugin to the global organic vision of society which characterizes conservative thought. Dugin also claims that his concept of “ethnos” is also based on the work of Russian ethnologist Sergey Shirokogorov who studied the archaic tribes of the Siberian tundra.

Shirokogorov's work also forms a link between the concept of “ethnos” and the political ideology of Eurasism.

Dugin proposed “ethnos” and “civilization” as possible subjects of the “fourth political theory”. For Dugin, the “ethnos” and not the individual is the social “atom” (the simplest, most elementary form of social being). The "ethnos" is only fully embodied in primitive hunter-gatherer societies and Neolithic agrarian societies. The ethnos, again, is not a racial group. The essence of "ethnos", as Dugin defines this term, is not a biological fact, but a social, symbolic and linguistic structure. He is always careful to stress that ethnicity is a cultural phenomenon and is not defined by blood or race. It is similar to the phenomenological concept of the prelogical "world of life" (Lebenswelt). The “world of life” is prelogical in the sense that it is the horizon of common understanding of a community. The idea of ​​“world of life” allows Dugin to link the notion of “ethnos” to the Heideggerian concept of Dasein as being-in-the-world. This point is important because Dasein is supposed to be the "subject" of the "fourth political theory". The ethnos is therefore apparently a specific type of Dasein.

Although the notion of ethnos cannot be fully applied to archaic societies, it continues to exist as a residual stratum in modern societies, in the form of timeless symbols and archetypes of the collective unconscious. In modern times, the ethnic “world of life” has disintegrated and society is increasingly transformed into an economic system governed by an instrumental, technological rationality. Taken as an interpretive paradigm, the ethnos is conceived as the “normal” type of society and modern society is seen as a deviation or distortion from this original norm. The methods of social anthropology, developed specifically for the study of primitive societies, can therefore be used as a fundamental tool for interpreting modern societies - something that semioticians like Roland Barthes and Jean Baudrillard had already tried to do. . The non-individualistic, non-utilitarian gift economies of primitive societies, based on symbolic exchange and honor, are presented as the basis of an economic system that could be an alternative to the modern liberal capitalist economy.

It is impossible to understand ethnos correctly using historical methods. One of the characteristics of primitive, archaic societies is that they are a-historical, or prehistoric. They don't have any written documents. They live in mythical time - in the sense in which Mircea Eliade understands it and not in historical time: they live in the time of the eternal return of the same. The ethnos (of primitive society) is not a historical community, but a social structure which reproduces itself indefinitely.

This means that it must be studied following the methods of structuralism, which, having been developed in the field of linguistics, were later applied to the social sciences. Structuralists consider primitive societies as systems of oppositions that must be studied in a global and synchronic way, like a language. They cannot be adequately interpreted from a causal point of view, whether as the result of biological evolution (Dugin rejects evolutionary interpretations of culture because he considers them contaminated by modern "racist doctrine" Of progress) or as the consequence of historical processes. The ethnos is quite simply a phenomenological given. Although it often seems to be a purely theoretical, artificial and utopian construction, Dugin assures that it is empirically validated by ethnological studies on archaic societies.

Instead of being interpreted historically, ethnos must be interpreted spatially (synchronic). The spatial structure of the ethnos, however, is first and foremost an expression of the specific landscape in which it inhabits. The landscape should not be understood from a merely material or naturalistic point of view. The ethnos landscape is a sacred landscape. It is not only the natural environment of a tribal group, it is also the symbolic mythical space in which the natural environment is inscribed. The concept of "nature", even in its anti-modern romantic form, already presupposes the separation and alienation of man from the cosmos as a primordial whole. The world of innocent man, primitive, of the ethnos, is a whole prior to conceptual oppositions such as the artificial and the natural, the subject and the object, the symbolic and the real, language and things, thought and experience, the individual and society (and, in this sense, it has characteristics in common with the postmodern world, in which the boundaries between the virtual and the real, the natural and the technological are blurred) .

What Heidegger calls "a world" is a space of possibilities and not an assemblage of objects observed from the outside. There is no transcendent, independently existing subject who then ventures out into the world, no objective world which opposes an abstract, detached subject. Being-in-the-world comes first and the subject and his "sensory data" are extracted from him by philosophers. The opposition between subject and object conceals the primordial unity of being-in-the-world, which is irreducible to the subject-object relation. Concrete being-in-the-world is studied phenomenologically, with the aim of discovering its temporal and spatial structure.

The fundamental polarity of the ethnos is not the polarity of subject and object, but the polarity of the sacred and the profane. The polarity of the sacred and the profane corresponds to the polarity of the exceptional and the normal. The profane is the normal and the sacred is a crisis in the normal course of events - an exception which suspends the oppositions which structure social reality, transcends it and traces its limits. The sacred is both exceptional and fundamental, both dangerous and salvific (“Wo ist aber Gefahr, wächst / Das Rettende auch”). This is the outer limit of the world, but also the dark soul of things. The sacred marks the impassable limits of common life - impassable insofar as whoever crosses them would cease to be part of the community, or would become other (for example, by undergoing an initiation). The sacred is a paradigm common to nature and to society, which designates the primordial totality which transcends and includes them. The sacred is normative in the sense that it is a limit which unites and brings together all the distinct regions of the world and determines their "dimensions". The dimension of the sacred belongs to the structure of being itself and can therefore never be entirely eliminated, even in the most secularized of modern societies: it can only be displaced and deformed.

The space of the ethnos is structured by the relation between a sacred center (pole) and a profane margin. Here, Dugin draws on Mircea Eliade's work on the symbolism of the center. According to Eliade, the sacred space is founded and organized from a central point characterized by a “hierophany”: a revelation of the sacred. The center is symbolically designated by the erection of an axis mundi, an axis that connects the different dimensions (or regions) of the cosmos (2). The space is therefore not homogeneous, but differentiated by a sacred vertical central axis (or core) and a secular horizontal periphery (or margin). Traditional cosmogonies often describe the cosmos as emanating from a central point. Still according to Eliade, the center is the point where a vertical movement between the different ontological planes or cosmic regions - between profane space and sacred space , between heaven and earth, gods and mortals, the realm of alive and dead - can happen. It is the pillar of the world, the mountain sacred ed - Yggdrasil, Olympus, Meru Irminsul. To climb a mountain, a cosmic tree or a pillar is to go from one ontological plane to another. Yggdrasil connects the nine worlds to each other and allows one to move between them. The sacred center is also the backbone of the yogi, the Vedic sacrificial pole, a lingam, or a sacred tree. It is the Christian cross, a symbol of gathering. It is the altar on which the redemptive sacrificial death of Christ is reconstituted and the churches and temples are oriented around the centrality of the altar. The axis is the totem, the "master signifier" which gathers the tribe around it. A cornerstone or the central column of a building is another form of the sacred center. The axis unites in itself the symbolism of transcendence and foundation. He is the column that sustains the “house of being”. The center allows man to remain in the world (the English word "house" is related to the Old Norse word heimr, "world"), it is the pole which gathers, unifies and orders a cosmos. According to Eliade, its "temporal" counterpart is the sun at its zenith - which, for Nietzsche, was a symbol of the revelation of the unity of Being and Becoming in an eternal cosmic return.

As modern society revolves around the pole of the “sacred” and inviolable individual, each ethnos is united around a sacred axis. The ethnos see themselves as living near the sacred center of the world. It is the proximity of this starting point, this source of power and this pole of attraction, which roots the ethnos in a landscape. It is not primarily defined by borders - by the exclusion of the "other", the enemy - but by the centripetal pull of a pole of transcendence.

Each civilization, while encompassing several ethnoi, is also organized around a pillar, which undoubtedly constitutes one of the poles of multipolarity. Dugin says that the symbol of Eurasism, eight arrows radiating from a central point, is a symbol of the ethno-center. These beaming arrows are not only a symbol of Russian ambitions for imperialist expansion. They also symbolize the Eurasian origin of the tradition and its subsequent spread to the rest of the world. Dugin asserts that "excavations in Eastern Siberia and Mongolia prove that it is exactly here that the oldest centers of civilization were located." Finally, he brings a postmodern touch by stating that the symbol of Eurasism is also a symbol of chaos invented by British science fiction and fantasy novelist Michael Moorcock in his 1970 novel The Eternal Champion. This is undoubtedly an allusion to his own concept of “chaotic logos” and perhaps also to “right-wing anarchism” and his conception of sovereignty.

Each ethnos is a "logos". Heidegger, in a phrase that has remained famous, noted that the Greek word logos (speech) is related to the verb legein, an agricultural term meaning "gathering," "harvest" (the ethnos, remember, is a society of hunters. - gatherers or an archaic agrarian society) (3). The logos brings together everything that has become intelligible by being named, including the dead and gods, in a single space or “place” (Ort). In this sense, language is the “house of being”. It is an organization of space and time, which includes the landscape and the cycle of the seasons by means of a calendar, a map and a taxonomy. Space, time, man and nature are brought together in an identical, permanent, unique form: one world. Dugin identifies this form with the ethnos, which strives to conserve and reproduce itself as a world and not as a biological entity (although he does not specify why the biological conservation of the race is not a necessary element of the preservation of the ethnos world). He also identifies the ethnos with a specific language.

As each ethnos is a "logos" - in the sense of the structure of language, thought and social relations - it becomes the basis of a kind of cultural and linguistic relativism. The Universal Reason for the Enlightenment is not the only reason. There are many different valid "rationalities" (although "reason", "rationality" and "logic" are already deviations from the original meaning of "logos"). The “fourth political theory” rejects the “epistemological hegemony” of the West. Dugin argues, for example, that Sub-Saharan Africans should not be seen as inferior because they do not live up to the standards and standards of the modern West. Western conceptions of Reason, the Enlightenment and "emancipation" are not the universal goal that "humanity" consciously or unconsciously strives to achieve, with ethnic and cultural differences considered. as simple particularistic obstacles to be overcome along the way. The predominance of the Western form of rationality tends to exclude all other forms of rationality and deny them legitimacy. Dugin, like the other postmodernists, wants to relativize the Western logos by considering it only as one of the many possible logos, without any legitimate claim to a privileged status. The relationship between these logoi is non-hierarchical, anarchic and pluralist. To the extent that a subject is a kind of rationality, there are many different types of subjects - and not just the enlightened, Western, modern version of humanity defined by Western rationality. In other words, Dugin reiterates the postmodern critiques of Western culture, which anyone who has attended a Western university knows ad nauseam. The global political hegemony of the West is founded on the hegemony of Western reason. Western rationality (technological rationality) not only allowed Western man to subjugate his natural environment, but it allowed the West to subjugate the rest of the world. It forced other peoples to adopt the Western model or to remain colonial subjects of the West.

According to Enlightenment ideology, reason is universal and is characteristic of universal human nature, of man as a rational animal. The reason is what all human beings have in common, a common standard on the basis of which it is possible to neutralize and smooth out conflicts and make the world harmonious. This is the telos - the goal and the end point - of history, which is achieved by progressive universal enlightenment. When this goal, this ideal end point , is reached, conflicts and therefore real politics will cease to exist. But some critics of the Enlightenment have argued that reason can neutralize neither the struggle for power nor the conflictual dimension of reality and that reason is itself an instrument of power and domination. The only genuine freedom is an essentially political freedom, which contains within itself the possibility of conflict - conflict which cannot be neutralized by a common standard or a common foundation in universal reason.

The emphasis is therefore placed, not on universal reason gradually overcoming the dark demons and dark ghosts of mythology and irrationality to unify humanity, but on the specific world of each ethnos, on what is before the separation between reason and intuition, logos and myth. Each ethnos identifies with the world (the cosmos), or at least considers itself the center of the world, insofar as it believes to live near the “sacred center”. The ethnos is a society anchored in a mythical space-time, a sacred geography. The ethnos not only dwells in a space, but is itself a living space, in a sense which, however, is not that which Haushofer gives to the term Lebensraum. It is “a living space”.

The sacred in itself is an abyss, a chaos. Outside the ethnos universe there is only terrifying chaos, an abyss of nothingness, the residue of creation. It cannot be eliminated, it can only be kept at a distance and circumscribed by a border. Chaos cannot manifest itself directly. It can only reveal itself by concealing itself, by taking on a paradoxical form or figure: by presenting itself under the appearance of a "nothingness that is". He seizes or takes possession of an individual, who then becomes his recipient and his personification (as in the case of shamanic possession or in the case where the totemic figure represents the founder of the tribe). Hence, the anonymous forces of the outside world are socialized and can address the community, donning the personae ("masks") with demons, spirits or gods. Thanks to this personification, the sacred becomes a “subject” who can have symbolic exchanges with the community. The shaman, or healer, is the central figure of tribal or "ethnic" society, who mediates between the ethnos and the afterlife - the sacred realm of the dead, demons or gods. The shaman is both an introductory and "conservative" figure, a guardian who works for the preservation of cosmic order and fights the demons and evil spirits of the chaotic outside world. Its job is to resolve the various crises that the ethnos and its members go through on a regular basis. The shaman not only heals the individuals of the tribe, but above all heals the tribe itself and the cosmos, reunites them, restores the cosmic order based on the sacred. He or she is able to move from one ontological plane to another by climbing the axis mundi, the sacred pillar, the mountain or the tree of the world.

Eliade believed that shamanism originated in Eurasia. In prehistoric times, it would have served to transmit the elements of the primordial tradition to pre-Columbian America and to other regions. Eliade considers the shaman to be a kind of proto-sovereign, in the sense that he / she is able to bind and untie by magic. He / she occupies a "frontier" position - he / she resolves crises in the normal order of the tribe and the cosmos, but he / she only does so to the extent that he / she communicates with the outside world, dangerous and chaotic. He / she possesses characteristics similar to those which, according to Carl Schmitt, define sovereignty - the power to suspend the normative order, not to destroy it, but to save it from dissolution and chaos.

The shaman personifies the primordial, permanent struggle or conflict, activity and dynamism that underlies the static structure of the ethnos.

The dynamics of the ethnos are opposed to the novelty. He sees any change as a crisis, an entropy, which weakens the stability of the cosmos. The ethnos is inherently conservative and antihistoric, in the sense that its only purpose is to maintain homeostasis, to work to maintain its identity with itself. Its main concern is self-reproduction. Again, this is not about biological conservation and racial self-reproduction. By reproducing, the ethnos ritually restores and maintains the order and balance of the cosmos and the flow of its circular economy. Its existence is centered on the cycle of the seasons, of sowing and reaping, of birth and death. The ethnos' time is therefore not linear (4) and irreversible (historical), but sequential, circular and reversible. To use Armin Mohler's terminology, we could also call ethnos' space-time a "sphere" (Kugel). It is a plenitude, which therefore does not yet know the duality of time and eternity, of matter and spirit, of man and of nature, of the individual and of society, etc. The individual is not considered distinct from the ethnos and the ethnos is identified with the world. This world transcends and survives the individual. The main concern of the individual is not self-preservation, but the preservation of the ethnos / world.

As the time of the ethnos is the eternal return of the same, death is not an irreversible event. The souls of ancestors return to their descendants. The individual as a mortal being, historically unique, does not exist. Children are potentially destabilizing elements, foreign elements that threaten the cohesion of the tribe and are assimilated into it by initiation. When they are initiated, in adulthood, they become reincarnations, or personifications, of their ancestors. (Prior to initiation, children were considered both dangerous and sacred by many early tribal groups.) Individuality does not have a positive meaning for the ethnos. In this sense, the ethnos is the opposite of modern society, in which the individual is defined as opposed to the community. Instead of the individual, it is the ethnos as a whole which is the normative unit, the “man”. In other words, he can be looked at as a kind of "subject".

At this point, however, it becomes unclear how all of this can have anything to do with Dasein, since Dasein is defined precisely by its historicity, finitude, and lethality. For Heidegger, men are, in their deepest and most fundamental essence, mortal. The lethality of Dasein is not the consequence of the loss of faith or nihilism of modern Western man. In a sense, the essence of man - Dasein - is finitude and finitude is not simply a human characteristic , but part of the essence of being itself. Dasein as finitude belongs to the structure of being itself, so that the question of Dasein is a necessary step in approaching the question of being. Heidegger does not develop his concept of Dasein as a philosophical anthropology, but as part of his ontological project. Dugin speaks of Dasein, but separates the term from the question of being. In doing so, Dugin effectively empties the term of its meaning. Nowhere does he show that he really understands what Heidegger means by Dasein, nor what is at stake in "Being and Time".

The forgetting of being is not a human error - let alone the mistake of mankind ed Western - but part of the essence of being. The essence of nihilism is by no means human error or anything that has been created by human beings. Furthermore, only complete nihilism, which coincides with the end of Western metaphysics and the planetary domination of modern technology, opens up the possibility of the question of being in the Heideggerian sense. Contrary to what traditionalists think, nihilism cannot be overcome by a return to metaphysics, since nihilism is itself the final actualization of metaphysics. The essence of metaphysics is the movement of transcendence (Übersteigen). The history of metaphysics is the event of transcendence, of the transcendence of being through being. It is in this sense that Heidegger defines metaphysics as “the history of being”. All metaphysical concepts are structured by the fundamental ontological difference between being and being, namely the transcendence of beings through being, through which beings are united, immobilized and held in suspense by the withdrawal of the to be.

The historicity (Geschichtlichkeit) of Dasein is founded on the irreversible and irreplaceable event (Geschehnis) which makes Dasein itself. Dasein is not only mortal, but also "born" (gebürtig). Birth is the essence of historicity (Geschichtlichkeit). Birth is an "event" (Geschehnis) in the ontological sense, it is an absolute beginning, an absolute interruption, or rupture, with the past (even if, ontologically, it is of course a natural event, which is part of of a continuous chain of causes and effects). Man has a history because man as Dasein is himself history.

Death, for Heidegger, is not simply a natural event, a consequence of the fact that our bodies are part of the natural world and are conditioned by its cycles of growth and decline. On the contrary, the mortal character of man separates him (like Dasein) from the natural domain. It has the power to wrest Dasein violently from the automatisms of inauthentic social relations, the affairs of daily life and the deceptions of false subjectivity. Heidegger calls this inauthentic and somnambulistic existence das Man. Das Man is not responsible for its existence. He observes the existence from the outside, like a kind of spectacle. Death never "addresses" das Man, but always concerns someone else. In a sense, the "object" - abstract humanity - is das Man - a floating ego detached from concrete, finite, historical existence. The traumatic truth of being-for-death, the existential anxiety attack, isolates Dasein and liberates it at the same time, but not in the sense that the "subject" would be free because he would be floating in a unconditioned transcendent realm, somewhere outside or beyond the objective world.

Finitude, for Heidegger, is not simply a naturally fixed limit on freedom, power and life. The limits that isolate and release Dasein are not just negative or privatory, but can be positive and active - active in the sense of overcoming power . The limit transcends or overcomes what it limits. The "Transcendence" of Dasein is being-for-death and not the transcendence of a subject suspended above concrete existence. The individuality of authentic Dasein is not the basis of irresponsible arbitrary freedom, of hedonistic selfishness. The finitude of Dasein only has meaning as historical responsibility. The genuine freedom of Dasein is not an unconditional liberation from time and history, but the very essence of historicity (Geschichtlichkeit) itself as an event (Geschehnis). Thanks to historical existence, the finitude of Dasein becomes the source of a potential renewal and of the refoundation of the historical community in which it was born. Insofar as the limit of Dasein is active, it is a matter of a decision and Dasein is summoned to affirm it, to take responsibility for it and to anchor it in the being-as-everything that it forms the project of becoming.

Heidegger would regard the historicity of primitive, tribal Dasein as only existing as something undeveloped or preconscious. Only Western man has a deep experience of the fundamentally historical essence of Dasein as event (Geschehnis), which corresponds to being as event (Ereignis). However, this experience remained unthinkable and did not receive a philosophical formulation, because thought remained trapped in the categories of metaphysics, subjectivism and Christian humanism. However, Dugin tries to relativize the Heideggerian notion of Dasein, claiming that it only applies to Western Europeans. In doing so, however, Dugin turns out to be more relativistic and postmodern than a Heideggerian. By giving absolute ontological priority to language, he removes any foundation from the concept of Dasein. For Heidegger, man does not exist as Dasein because he has a language, but he has a language, because he exists as Dasein. In other words, Dasein as event (Geschehnis) is ontologically prior to language and social life. It follows that the existential structure of Dasein cannot itself be determined by the structure of language and society. The Heidegger's position is in absolutely opposite direction to that of social constructivism, which is simply a form of subjectivism, which designs the reality - including the man himself m ven - created as a pure and simple éation of man. It goes without saying that Heidegger is also opposed to Marxism, which interprets the emancipation of humanity as the self-production of humanity.

As the ethnos, according to Dugin, ignores irreversible, historical time - knows only cyclical time, the eternal return of the same - it is intrinsically opposed not only to any novelty, but to all forms of accumulation. The ethnos ritually destroys (sacrifices) the accumulated resources that could jeopardize its homeostasis and its symbolic balance. He sees as dangerous and problematic not only the deficit, but also the excess of production. In this sense, its economy is anti-capitalist. It constantly interrupts the linear time of accumulation. Accumulation is seen as a wrong, a debt to the gods, which must be repaid. To sacrifice something - to destroy an accumulated surplus - is to give to the gods. The ethnos strives to maintain social and cosmic balance as well as the balance between society and nature. Society is naturalized and nature is socialized. Together, they form a sacred whole, a circular economy.

The ethnos is therefore a form of prehistoric primordial communism, where work is a game and man lives in perfect harmony with his natural environment. It is an ecologically sound and harmonious cosmic and social totality, a golden age before the fall of man into history, a paradise in which the entropic destructive force of time is defeated or at least held in check. The ethnos do not know the tension of social stratification or the division of labor, except between the sexes. The relationship between the sexes, however, is also balanced and not patriarchal. The ethnos' space-time, as we have already mentioned, is reversible and this also applies to social relations. There are no hierarchical, asymmetrical relationships within society, but a balance, which is maintained by symbolic exchange. In other words, the ethnos is a democratic and egalitarian society (at least symbolically). As the embodiment of the Golden Age, he represents the primordial perfection of man. The ethnos man is a kind of good savage (a modern concept, if there is one!) Who can be opposed to the evils that would have been caused by Western society since the scientific revolution (5).

The restoration of this primordial unity, which would put an end to linear history and capitalist accumulation in a revolutionary holocaust, is, according to Dugin, the unconscious mythical and eschatological dimension of communism. The revolution abolishes linear time, which is identified with entropy and wear. Dugin apparently thinks that the violence of the communist revolutions should be interpreted as a kind of sacrificial destruction of accumulated wealth (6). Capitalist accumulation is an excess which must be sacrificially destroyed by the liquidation of the bourgeoisie as a class.

The modern age is the age of revolutions, but as Jünger observed, the violence of revolutions - including the Terror of the French Revolution - could be interpreted as a return of the elementary forces of repression under the mask of enlightened modernity. Just as gods, spirits and demons communicate with the tribe by personifying themselves in the shaman, elemental chaos shows itself under the mask, the supposedly rational persona, of the modern revolutionary subject. This is why, for Dugin, the only real problem with communism is that it has failed to understand itself. Its self-interpretation, its “hermeneutic circle”, must be broken. Communism got it wrong on the political subject. He considered the class and not the archaic ethnos as his subject. He wore the mask of a modern, progressive secular ideology. This is why Marxists could not understand why communist revolutions took place in underdeveloped agrarian societies and not, as Marx predicted, in industrially developed societies like Germany (7).

Genuine communism, argues Dugin, is “national-communism” (represented by Stalin, for example) or agrarian communism (represented by Pol Pot). "National-communism" (or "national leftism" as Dugin also calls it) is interpreted as a revolt against the modern Western world, a revolt rooted in local ethnic traditions. National-Communism is a hybrid of the Western rationality of Marxism (8) and the mobilizing force of non-Western ethnic myths. Dugin underlines the "national-communist character of successful Marxist revolutions, which recognized in the nationalist elements a determining factor and a virtue and largely contributed to the success and stability of these revolutions through the archaic national histories of the mobilization of the Marxism as an eschatological myth interpreted nationally ”. “National-Communism”, Dugin tells us, reigned in the USSR, in Communist China, in North Korea, in Vietnam, in Albania, in Cambodia and also in many communist movements in the Third World, in Mexican Chiapas and in Peruvian Sendero Luminoso to the Kurdistan Workers' Party and Islamic Socialism ”. In national communism / leftism, Marxism functions as a universal philosophical framework that allows national movements - local in nature - to communicate with each other and “even to claim universal and planetary breadth; they are transformed, thanks to socialist rationality reinvigorated by nationalism, into a messianic project ”. In his view, “national leftism could certainly have a global future, as, among many segments of archaic humanity, ethnic and religious energies are far from exhausted, no matter what citizens say. the modern, enlightened and rational West ”. Dugin obviously embodies the old leftist, anti-colonialist theme that the Third World and non-whites are the last revolutionary subjects (Third World nationalism, unlike European nationalism, has been glorified by the left as a revolt against the Western imperialism). In reality, the mass immigration to the countries of the West of non-white populations attracted by the earthly “paradise” or the “golden age” of material wealth, religious tolerance, modernity and systems of generous social protection, has long shown that non-white peoples are not the subjects of national communist revolutions, but simply one of the instruments of the anthropological globalist ethnocidal revolution.

Dugin seems to equate the white West with the bourgeoisie and non-white peoples (or Russians, insofar as they are "not completely white") to the revolutionary subject. He believes that the first successful Communist revolution took place in Russia because the "ethnos" retained their primitive vitality more there than in the modern West (remember, Dugin considers Russians to be non-white). His concept of "ethnos" allows him to interpret Russia's backwardness as a positive rather than a source of shame, much as the negative view of the West found in traditionalist writings allows Muslims to see their societies as spiritually superior to the secular, anti-traditional, decadent West, while they do not seem to have the slightest remorse for living as parasites of the productive work of Western societies. It is so obvious that we are dealing with an overcompensation mechanism of a collective inferiority complex that it becomes embarrassing for the author. Russia's underdevelopment is interpreted as proof that it has managed to avoid being contaminated by the “evils” of Western modernity. The communist revolution was in its essence a revolt of the Russian Eurasian ethnos against the pro-Western elites of Russia. Bolshevism was a re-Asianization of Russia. Instead of taking the modern West as a norm, which can only lead to devaluing the history of Russia and other non-Western countries by making them appear marginal and underdeveloped, Dugin wants to reverse the relationship , by elevating Eurasia to the dignity of a “sacred center” and marginalizing the West as its “secular periphery”. Dugin attributes to Russia a central messianic role analogous to the messianic role that German conservative revolutionaries attributed to Germany as the sacred center, or axis, of Europe. Eurasia is not only the place of the great geopolitical decisions of our time, it is also a sacred center in the sense of crossroads, crucial point, intersection and mediator between East and West, l 'Europe and Asia. A similar role is attributed to Iran, Hungary and Turkey, Eurasian mediators between the East and Europe. Eurasists claim to be close to the left-wing group of the Turkish Workers' Party and it is for purely geopolitical reasons that they consider Turkey to be part of Europe. The massive occupation of German territory by Turkish immigrants, they claim, will be a positive factor in favoring the integration of Turkey and Germany into a common Eurasian empire (9). Here, as always for Eurasists, geographic and geopolitical considerations outweigh racial factors, to the point of denying the latter altogether. These are the consequences of the fact that Dugin identifies the ethnos, not with race or history, but with a space. Here, for some reason, Dugin is suddenly no longer a supporter of social constructivism. Geopolitical determinism replaces racial or historical materialist determinism. Geopolitical factors are considered to be more decisive than racial and economic factors. Racial nationalism is dismissed as "utopian" or "reactionary". The question of race is not considered to be of paramount , decisive importance - which is crucial for Eurasists - what determines the distinction between friend and foe - is the struggle against the West.

The priority Eurasism gives to soil over blood makes this ideology irrelevant to European nationalists today - for whom immigration is the decisive existential issue. The massive occupation of European soil by immigrants from Africa and the Middle East does not and never will make them Europeans. It is not only because they do not have a deep connection with European soil and European traditions, but also because they are racially foreign. Blacks and Arabs in Europe can be "westernized", but that only means "globalized", ie Americanized. Homo americanus is the normative “human” type of the postmodern era.

Dugin tries to interpret the profane and linear Marxist vision of history from the point of view of cyclical, mythical time and sees in the communist political revolution a cyclical cosmic revolution, a return to a golden age of utopia. Just as he tries to interpret historical time as mythical time, he tries to interpret geopolitical space as sacred geography. He asks us to see the West as the absolutely negative pole and the East as the absolutely positive pole. In the Manichean narrative, the boring Eurasian propaganda tale, the East is Heaven (Eden) and the West is Hell. “Sacred geography, as for the symbolism of space, traditionally considers the East as the 'land of the Spirit', the land of paradise, the land of plenitude, of abundance, the sacred 'native land' in its most complete and perfect form. […] The West has an opposite symbolic meaning. It is the “land of death”, the “lifeless world” […]. The West is "the empire of exile", "the abyss of the damned", to use the expression of Muslim mystics (10). The West is “the anti-East”, the land of […] decomposition, degradation, the passage from the manifested to the unmanifested, from life to death, plenitude when needed, etc. Further, "Along the East-West axis stretched peoples and civilizations possessing hierarchical traits - closer to the East were those who were closer to the Sacral, to Tradition, to spiritual wealth. Closer to the West, those who had a more decadent, more degraded and dying spirit ”.

“… Sacred geography affirms with one voice the law of“ qualitative space ”, in which the East represents“ the ontological more ”symbolic, and the West“ the ontological less ”. According to Chinese tradition, the East is Yang, the male, shining, solar principle, and the West is Yin, the female, dark, lunar principle. "The geopolitical East itself represents the exact opposition to the geopolitical West." "Instead of" democracy "and" human rights ", the East gravitates around totalitarianism, socialism and authoritarianism, that is to say around various types of social regimes, whose only common feature is that the center of these systems is not here the "individual", "the man with his" rights "and his particular" individual values ​​", but something supra-individual, of supra -human - be it “society”, “nation”, “people”, “idea”, “weltanschauung”, “religion”, “cult of the leader”, etc. The East pitted Western liberal democracy against the most varied types of non-liberal, non-individualistic societies - from authoritarian monarchy to theocracy or socialism. Moreover, from a purely typological, geopolitical point of view, the political specificity of this or that regime was secondary in comparison with the qualitative division between the “Western” order (= “individualist-mercantile”) and the “ oriental ”(=“ supra-individualist-based on strength ”). Representative forms of such an anti-Western civilization were the USSR, Communist China, Japan until 1945 or Khomeini's Iran ”.

Here Dugin departs completely from traditionalism by confusing raw material force with true authority and interpreting communist forms of totalitarianism and collectivism, as well as the non-stratified, non-hierarchical collectivism of primitive societies, as "supra-individual". And transcendent. Evola who never advocated totalitarianism viewed both as the opposite of the supra-individual and the transcendent - as infra-individual and undifferentiated.

Ernst Jünger, in his National-Bolshevik period, not only rejected bourgeois individualism, but also its reverse, mass collectivism. He believed that bourgeois individualism and the formlessness of the masses would be overcome by the emergence of a new “type” of man, whom he called “the Worker”, who would be able to control the forces mobilized by modern technology. But Dugin quite simply adopts, by overthrowing it, the liberal Popperian reduction of fascism and communism to the sole term of "totalitarianism": he reduces radically heterogeneous movements to the same movement, quite simply because they all reject liberalism. In this sense, he interprets fascism not so much from the point of view of the left as from the point of view of liberalism.

The ethnos is therefore not what traditionalists like Evola call a traditional society. Furthermore, given that the ethnos is in its essence anhistoric and has no relation to the other, Dugin did not sufficiently specify how it could be a political and historical subject. It is also difficult to know how Dugin proposes to combine the Heideggerian concept of Dasein as historicity with the antihistorical position of traditionalism. However, he proposed another possible political and historical subject: civilization. This will be the theme of the third part of this essay.

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

<http://democratia-mortui.blogspot.co.uk/2014/06/race-ethnos-and-fourth-political-theory.html> , translated from English by BK

(1) <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=D6pnd2Kq0k0> ; <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7qeko11nV40> ; <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nQb33bGoPI4> ;

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=g4mCgDstONQ> .

(2) Kosmos ( "order") is a Greek word which meant, not the universe considered as an ordered set, but a part of the universe considered as an ordered set; not the whole of the parts of the terrestrial globe, the whole of men, the society of men living on earth, but the whole of a City-State, all of the men living in a City-State (see, for example, B. Deforge, Eschyle: Poète cosmique, p. 36). It is the philosophers who falsified the concept of Kosmos as an ordered City- State by extending it to the whole world, giving it a global dimension and who, in doing so, paved the way for the concept of globalization. The traditionalists, who know everything, should know it. (NDE.)

(3) This question should be explored further for reasons which are anything but linguistic or philosophical. (NDE.)

Let us first recall, without subjecting them to a criticism, which has no place here, that Heidegger's reflections on legein are situated within the framework of a meditation on the notion of the unity of being and of thought among the pre-Socratics (“Thinking and being,” Parmenides declares, “are the same thing”) and on what caused this unity to be broken.

What is open to criticism here from a methodological point of view is Heidegger's etymological research. In fact, to find the original meaning of a word, it is necessary to study it in its earliest attested state. However, the conclusion to which it happens that the primary meaning of legein is "to collect", "to collect", "to assemble", that of "to say", "to speak" while being derived, starts from an examination of this word in the The work of the Presocratics, notably that of Heraclitus, which does not constitute the oldest Greek literature. As this one happens to be the work of Homer , it is obviously here that the research must be started.

In Homer, the term logos and terms of the same family are sometimes closely related to the idea of ​​action and in this case they have a strongly positive connotation, while anything that prevents the Greeks from acting, whether it is speech or reflection, is reprehensible. The action alone allows the hero to escape a dramatic situation with no way out; speech is useless.

However, other passages, more numerous, but which, it should be noted, have a less direct connection with heroism, indicate that the word can be as effective as the action. Speech is a τέχνη (tekhn ê), which can seduce. The power of seduction that it exercises can be positive or negative. Deceptive speech can have a beneficial psychological effect, insofar as it alleviates physical suffering. The seductive word is negative only when it is not sufficiently effective. Deception is not inherently negative; it is because it is not sufficiently convincing. When a word immediately leads to action, it is considered to be true and, if not, to be misleading. Speech, in Homer, is therefore neither true nor false in itself. Speech does not make it possible to distinguish between appearance and reality, exteriority and interiority of an individual. In fact, only Δίκη (dik ê) is able to distinguish the true from the false in the words of the men. If so, the divine restores the truth.

In Hesiod, the logoi mainly concern Pandora, both a symbol of the human condition and an eternal feminine. Moreover, he is attributed "misleading, caressing words". Pandora's deceptive logoi are negative because she represents injustice. The logoi are not necessarily misleading, however: the king, to establish justice in a world given over to hubris, must use words. The ideal king dispenses justice in “straight sentences”. On the other hand, deceptive words are not necessarily to be condemned. They can be useful. The word is out.

From the rigorous analysis of the value and the concomitant meanings of legein and its differents in Greek mythological literature, two conclusions can be drawn. The first is that a striking resemblance to the sophistry: "The effective word of mythology uses practical means in order to achieve certain useful ends, and transforms an unfavorable power relation into an advantageous relation, that is to say that she overturns certain facts by the force of her cunning and persuasive technique; this gentle, charming, deceptive and seductive word is something useful, positive because it is active. His skill is strangely reminiscent of that of sophistication. Indeed, the sophist seeks to produce effects of charm and seduction through the technical use he makes of language. He is a cunning being who does not hesitate to deceive to achieve his ends, sometimes selfish. The logos of mythology in agreement with that of sophistry takes no account of the truth, it aims at persuasion. Plato will say that in rhetoric one does not care the least about alêtheia [the truth], but rather one cares about what is likely to convince. Rhetoric does not seek to understand reality but exerts its power over others, it does not consider the signified content of language but aims at the effects of language. In addition to this the resemblance appears in associating and confusing deception and truth. Mythology will be able to tell deceptions similar to truths. The sophist, is he not the one who manages to pose as being what is not, as being true what is a lie? It therefore seems that the sophistry will come to thematize a certain pragmatic use of the language which functioned since Homer. So Homer is not yet able to distinguish the true from the deceiver, and does not value either of the two terms of the opposition. It is only with sophistry that we will see the generalization and valuation of the skilful logos over the logos of truth. »(See M. Fattal, Logos, thought and truth in Greek philosophy, p. 51-72)

The second conclusion is that the decision of the philosophers, starting with Parmenides, to identify the logos with the truth was completely arbitrary. It was not long before Democritus took it upon himself to reduce true speech to virtuous speech, linked to a moral imperative, so true is it that in every seeker of infinity there is more or less a utilitarian dreamer slumbering.

A third conclusion, which it is not possible to draw positively from the data at our disposal, for lack of being able to determine what is the original meaning of legein, would come from the hypothesis that it, at the origin, was indeed a verb of action. in the strictest sense, almost in the metaphysical sense, of the term and that the use made of it in Homer and a fortiori in Hesiod reflects a world where speech (the verb "to speak", from the Latin ecclesiastic parabolare ("telling stories") perfectly preserved the connotations of the Homeric logos) as discourse took precedence over action, a world which, therefore, was going to feminize, while action became agitation.

The evolution of the word "action" in a number of Indo-European languages ​​strikingly reflects not only the gradual substitution of action - as a concrete exercise, particularly of the higher forms of activity in the world. 'an individual - to the word as a "doing", but also the discredit into which the action has fallen. This is particularly the case for English, a language in which the same verb (to act, from Latin actus) means both "to act" and "to play a role" and in which, historically, the substantive act has come into play. 1510 in a theatrical sense. On the other hand, both “to act” and “to act” come, not from “agere”, but from the supine, or past participle, of agere: actus. The climax is that the term designating the person whose profession is to interpret a character in a play or on the screen is actor ("actor"), whose fundamentally passive character is no longer to be emphasized ("passive state under the influence of a feeling aroused by repetition, by conviction. ”L. Jouvet, Le Comédien désincarné). “The whole world,” says Jacques to the old duke in “Comme il vous plaira” (1599), is a theater, and men and women are only actors; they have their entrances and exits ”; “I hold this world, Gratiano monologue in The Merchant of Venice (1596), for what it is: a theater where everyone must play their part. ". No doubt they take their desire for realities; undoubtedly, more than four centuries later, all conditions are met for their desire to become reality. (NDE)

(4) The notion of linearity of time is one of the many conceptions of Jewish origin that the Eurasists and other scorners of the "West" have the chutzpah to qualify as "western": the linear conception of time and therefore the nation. of Progress. Even if, at the limit, one can concede that the cyclical time is not absent from Judaism (the Sabbath, the new moon, the annual festivals), to please some, while recalling that the Jewish festivals do not consist repeating a past event, but remembering it, the point is that linear time predominates, starting with the doctrine of Creation. “Let us think (also) of the book of Exodus, and of the impetus which led the Hebrew people to leave slavery in Egypt to begin their long quest for a new life, a better future. It is the taste of the new that is central in the Bible. Abraham was ordered to burn his tents and go to a new land. To refuse to go forward is to turn one's back on the notion of divine vocation. In the Gospels, Jesus advises not to mend a garment with old pieces ”(T. Verhelst, Roots for the Future, p. 317).

The linear conception of time will really impose itself with Christianity, especially with Augustine. While Roman historians still linked historical events to cycles, the Numidian Augustine (\*) - that generations of academics and theologies have struggled to pass off as an “African Roman” - qualifying cycles of "deceivers", maintains that human history progresses in a straight line and thus introduces the notion of indefinite progress. Now, who says linear conception of time also says quantitative conception of time and, one thing leading to another, mercantilist conception of time (see on this subject J.-F. Chanlat, L'Individu dans organization: les dimensions oubliées, p. . 218). Christian teaching, especially as formulated by Basil of Caesarea (330-379), whose racial origin is unknown, calls for change in society. It is not a question of saving oneself from the world, but of being present in the world, to transfigure it. The Catholic and Protestant tradition of liberation will highlight this progressive aspect of early Christianity.

Incidentally, as it would be doing too much credit to Judeo-Christianity to regard it as the first ideology of Semitic origin to have infected the view of the Roman world, it should be added that the very first notions of progress in the world he Greco-Latin antiquity can be found with the Syrian Posidonius of Apamea, whose "genius remained quite oriental in its ability to combine the exact sciences with a fervent mysticism" ( <http://www.aakkl.helsinki.fi/melammu/> database / gen\_html / a0000834.php ).

(\*) There were at least three Numidian popes: Victor I, Miltiades and Gelasius, who, in a letter to Emperor Anastasius, is the first successor of Peter to clearly affirm the distinction and separation of the Church and of the Empire. (NDE)

(5) If the form of society that has developed in Western countries since the industrial revolution then caused harm in other parts of the world, whether these were industrialized or not, it first caused harm. to Westerners themselves. Until the end of the 19th century, the living conditions and working conditions of workers had nothing to envy to what they are today in the cities of the Asian continent or South America. (NDE.)

(6) In the absence of having succeeded in offering as a sacrifice the "accumulated wealth", a wealth which, given the state of the economy of the communist countries, could hardly be accumulated, except in their own pockets, the leaders Communists all over the world, particularly in the Soviet Union, while considerably impoverishing their country, have considerably enriched its soil, its atmosphere, its water, its air, in chemical and biological agents. 40% the proportion of the territory of Russia (12% of the land surface) would be seriously or moderately polluted and 75% the proportion of its surface water would have become unfit for consumption. “We can rightly say that there is not a part of this huge Soviet Union that has been spared. Even the most remote, the least populated, the most inhospitable regions have suffered serious damage. Whether they are areas with marked pollution or areas with multiple pollution, the three elements essential to human life, water, land and air have been affected ”. (The end of the USSR and the Russian identity crisis Véronique Jobert, p. 178) And continue to be so, despite the fact that, naturally, various and varied institutes for the protection of the environment have been established. founded since the 1990s. In the purest tradition of communism, a tradition that Dugin, in many ways, only continues, Kremlin ideologues never ceased to maintain that pollution only existed in the West, because of capitalism's thirst for profit, as scientists searched and found the sources of pollution, measured the various pollution rates with great precision, rigorously established the criteria and methods for the maximum permissible concentration of pollutants, and participated in the development of measures aimed at combating all forms of pollution, which today can be seen to be as effective as measures taken in other fields. (NDE)

(7) Dugin apparently does not remember with what zeal the USSR fueled the Communist revolution in China, Cuba and Vietnam, with what generosity it supported militarily and economically - via its satellites - the Communist uprisings in Yugoslavia, Albania , Korea and several countries in Latin America and Africa. (NDE)

(8) Dugin here does too much honor to the “West”, which would however have done well without this “rationality” which has nothing specifically “Western” and which would not be asked to send it back to the sender: "It is no coincidence that the communist sphere in Asia almost coincides with the Confucian cultural sphere in China, Korea and Vietnam and that most communist leaders have emphasized the continuity between Marxism and Asian cultural tradition. "(E. László, Individualism, Collectivism, and Political Power, p. 153) To A. Peyreffite who reported it in" When China will wake up ...: ... The world will tremble "and which could be highlighted in a work which could be entitled "When Europe will wake up again ... China will tremble", the Chinese Prime Minister of the time, Hua Guo Feng him, made this confidence, as explicit as a confidence can. to be in the mouth of a Chinese: "Achieving communism through dialectics." Communism existed in ancient China. The highest ideal of all our tradition asks us to renounce selfishness in order to merge into the community. The greatest joy of the Chinese is to be together. As for the dialectic, research will perhaps show that Marx borrowed it from China. Hegel seems to have drawn it from Asian thought. - But at the time of Confucius, Heraclitus and Empedocles were already saying that everything is happening. "(NDE)

(9) Since the Eurasists take all their white readers for idiots, who, for some of them, encourage them to do so, let us not be outdone: in order to further promote "the integration of Turkey and Germany in a common Eurasian empire ”, propose“ The massive occupation of (Turkish) territory by (d) es immigrants (Germans)… ”, each community of ethnic Germans having their temple built at the expense of the Turkish taxpayer . Family allowances, "social housing" and all the mess at the expense of the Turkish taxpayer.

(10) Christians used the same language long before the Muslim mystics; see <https://elementsdeducationraciale.wordpress.com/2014/07/11/race-ethnos-et-la-quatrieme-theorie-politique/> , note 24. (NDE)