Spengler, Evola, and Yockey: Subversive Teachings

October 3, 2015 renegade

When it comes to political, spiritual, and philosophical consciousness and metaphysical meanderings of the mind within the intellectual realm of jew-wise racialists, many of us find ourselves repeatedly encountering the unscientific, silly, and subversive beliefs and teachings of Oswald Spengler, Julius Evola, and Francis Parker Yockey.

Undoubtedly, there are many great insights on many important subjects to be found among the writings of these three individuals. However, I deem both the racial and jewish questions fundamental in our quest for racial health, purity, and preservation. They are what I call the “two primary pillars”, and the answers to these two questions are key. Comprehending and dealing adequately with the racial and jewish problems are prerequisites if one wishes to legitimately claim that their political and spiritual interests lie in recognizing, separating, celebrating, elevating, and preserving the White-European race.

If the aforementioned men, who are perceived as being part of the racialist (meta)political movement by many, did not even themselves claim to hold these interests at heart and instead struggled only for “Western Civilization” or “Higher Culture” or “Tradition” or “Transcendence”, then why do they receive such significant ideological, lip-service support and seeming solidarity from so many self-identified jew-wise racialists? Is it ignorance, perhaps? Throughout their works these thinkers demonstrate such clear metaphysical insights into modernity and their analyses of history and the alienation people suffer post-industrialization and urbanization are so clear, focused, and profound, surely these men’s take on race and jews must be so, also, right?

The simple fact of the matter is this: Spengler, Evola, and Yockey all provided inadequate (as well as inaccurate) proclamations pertaining to these most pertinent provinces. My interest in writing and putting together this post is not to convince anyone who is not already to be a jew-wise racialist of a single thing (therefore I will not be attempting to prove the validity of such a position nor the veracity of any of its claims), but rather merely to elucidate many of the subversive stances put forth by these three heretofore mentioned persons in relation to the two primary pillars, i.e. our valid, natural, and healthy racial concerns and the question of how we might successfully combat our most dangerous and despicable foe: the eternal jew.

[My intention is not to write an article, but rather to compile a compendium of critcism on these sirs.]

Oswald Spengler

Oswald Arnold Gottfried Spengler was born on the 29th of May in the year 1880. He was 1/8th jewish:

 On 26 May 1799, Friedrich Wilhelm Grantzow, a tailor’s apprentice in Berlin, married a Jewish woman named Bräunchen Moses (whose parents, Abraham and Reile Moses, were both deceased by that time). Shortly before the wedding, Bräunchen Moses (ca. 1769–1849) was baptized as Johanna Elisabeth Anspachin (the surname was chosen after her birthplace—Anspach).[4] The couple gave birth to eight children (three before and five after the wedding),[5] one of whom was Gustav Adolf Grantzow (1811–83)—a solo dancer and ballet master in Berlin, who married Katharina Kirchner (1813–73), a nervously beautiful solo dancer from a Munich Catholic family;[6] one of their daughters was Oswald Spengler’s mother Pauline Grantzow.[7] –Wikipedia

May 1925, Alfred Rosenberg critiques the work of Oswald Spengler:

 Spengler regards the rise and fall of cultures as an occurrence similar to the life and death of a plant, but forgets in the adducement of this richly superficial comparison that of plants as such do not die out if they are not destroyed, crippled, mixed with inimical types. The ‘race’ of the fir tree persists although the single fir dies. The ‘race’ of the linden tree is still the same as many thousands of years ago. And the races of men as such could remain just as eternally young, if hostile blood is not mixed with them, if unassimilable spiritual opposites do not clash and mix with them, without being able to be blended.

 Thus Spengler’s treatment of history remains stuck in a somewhat exalted environmental theory; his doctrine of the cultural group [Kulturkreislehre] lacks the essential thing: the organic-racial prerequisites, and, bound with them, the embodiment of the spiritual forces that created this cultural group.

 It is significant above all that Spengler vigorously combats the folkish idea, dismisses anti-Semitism, and yet, despite all these protests … succumbs, and truly in such a scope that he makes almost all folkish political positions into his own, without however admitting this, even with a single word.

 It is wrong, he says, to wish to build realpolitik upon racial feeling [Rassegefühl] and not to wish to treat existing financial powers as powers. Politics are not made from long skulls but from what is retained in them.

 On the question of race, Spengler is just as ambiguous. For, no sooner has he refused with marked derision to acknowledge racial instincts as determining factors, than he speaks of ‘Germanic world-feeling,’ refers to a quantity of ‘magnificent men of race’ among us, speaks of a right that is ‘born from blood,’ and declares that the ‘Nordic life-feeling’ of the Goths, Franks, and Saxons has created the type of the present nations. Justice was supposedly born from ‘Germanic fundamental feeling,’ fed from a spring that does not derive purely from purposeful contemplations. Indeed, Spengler gets carried away to the point of exclaiming that the so-called ‘youngest Germany’ has awakened as the best heir [Erbe] from the years of the rise of the Reich.

 In addition, he has also contradicted himself here, explicitly even, when he designates British politics as an effluence of the Norman essence, and at the same time praises the English instinct that put the Jew Disraeli-Beaconsfield in charge. That this man himself admitted that he was conducting Jewish racial politics in combination with English power, Spengler seems to be unaware. The connection of high finance with the London stock exchange has been tightly bound since this time. –Oswald Spenger (1925), by Alfred Rosenberg

Now we have the erudite Dr. Revilo P. Oliver and his perspective on Spengler:

 In no published work did Spengler show the slightest awareness of the terrible power of the international race or anticipate the now unconcealed Jewish domination under which the West is being driven to the precipice over which nations and races disappear from history. Some of his admirers today point out that he did not overlook the power of the great predators of international finance, some of whom are Aryans who have assimilated Jewish attitudes toward their own race…

 The cardinal flaw in the historical theories of Spengler and Yockey is an almost perverse equivocation about the biological reality of race. Both strive to make race more or less independent of genetics, although they do not go so far as does Alexander Raven, who would reduce civilization to a ‘super-organic’ idea. In The Enemy of Europe (p. 43), Yockey insists that ‘the idea of vertical [= linear, i.e., hereditary] race is dead…. The race one feels in oneself is everything, the anatomico-geographic group whence one comes means nothing,’ and he even deplores the racial policy of the National Socialist r‚gime as ‘an enormous tragedy.’ (25) It is true that Yockey, following Spengler, had the strange notion that the physical characteristics of race, such as the cephalic index, were determined by the landscape and soil, not be genes, in proof whereof ‘long-headed Jews from Sicily, and short-headed ones from Germany, produced offspring with the same average head measurement, the specifically American one.’ (26) Spengler was taken in by some of the propaganda for an American ‘melting pot’ and especially by the hoax contrived by Franz Boas, a twisted little Jew, who popped into the United States, was, for undisclosed reasons, made Professor of Anthropology in Columbia University, and founded a school of fiction-writing called ‘social anthropology,’ (27) It is also true that Spengler and Yockey, unlike Raven, do not categorically deny that race in the accepted meaning of that word does determine the outlook of a people and hence the quality of their civilization, but they create some confusion by using ‘race’ and ‘thoroughbred’ to designate a high degree of excellence in individuals who, it seems, are largely the product of the soil of the region in which they reside. They simply ignore the vast amount of scientific evidence that the potentiality of every individual is unalterably determined by his heredity, although obviously his development will be affected by nutrition and other environmental factors and, of course, by sheer accident, which may terminate his life at any stage.

 (25. One hears that Yockey’s opinion may have been determined by awareness of his mixed Irish and Spanish ancestry, but such speculations are nugatory. A novelist can know all the inner thoughts and motivations of his characters, but when we deal with living persons, the motives of their actions are usually obvious, but an attempt to ascertain by psychological analysis the source of rationally expressed opinions will usually end in a quagmire of subtle hypotheses. If it can be shown that Yockey was in fact embarrassed by his ancestry, it will be necessary to determine the percentage of influence to be assigned to that sentiment and also to (a) the authority of Spengler, (b) the political doctrine of Moeller, whom I shall mention in the next note, or any one of a score of writers connected with the National Socialist movement, (c) one or more of a hundred other books touching on this subject that Yockey may have read, (d) what he was taught in his youth and took for granted, (e) lectures that he may have heard at some time, (f) conversations with one or more respected friends, (g) veneration for writers of genius, such as Spengler and Montaigne, whose ancestry was to some extent tainted, (h) affection for respected friends of comparable ancestry, (i) consideration of the practical political problem I shall mention in the next note, (j) fear lest a scientific ethnology, recognizing a multiplicity of sub-races, would produce a hopeless multiplicity of subdivisions of the population, comparable to the jungle of sub-castes in India, as was, for example, predicted by Dr. Guido Landra when he attacked the basic National Socialist conception of race in his lectures in the University of Berlin in 1939, where, under Hitler, he enjoyed a freedom of speech that is denied to American biologists, even at Yale and Harvard, which were once respectable universities, (k) a publicist’s desire to minimize potential obstacles to the European unity he wanted to promote, and (l) other possible influences that do not occur to my mind at the moment of writing.)

 (26. Imperium, p. 275; the information comes from The Decline of the West, Vol. II, p. 119. Spengler’s belief that such spurious (and inherently preposterous) data had been empirically verified was probably crucial in his thought, but there were many other influences, particularly the doctrine that a man may belong ‘spiritually’ to a race or sub-race to which he does not belong biologically–a belief held by many of his contemporaries, notable Moeller, whose Das Dritte Reich (Hamburg, 1923) was a major source of National Socialism; see also H.-J. Schwierskott, Arthur Moeller van den Bruck und der revolution„re Nationalismus in der Weimarer Republic (Gottingen, 1962). The urge to minimize or conceal biological and even cultural differences is related to the practical problem that has confronted every ruler and statesman since Sumerian times: the need to create a state (which is necessarily territorial) by inducing some cohesive unity among the more or less diverse peoples who are residing in that territory at the time and whom it is not expedient to expel. This was an acute problem throughout Europe, including Germany, where the proverbial differences in temperament between the typical Prussian and the typical Bavarian could seem as great as a difference between major races to a population that had, for the most part, little contact with non-Aryan races except the chameleon-like Jews with their racial ability to simulate the manners of other races when it is profitable to do so.)

 (27. A typical example is a ‘study’ concocted by one of Boas’s creations, Dr. Ruth Benedict, whose Patterns of Culture (1934) purported to contain an ‘anthropological investigation’ of the Zu¤i Indians, who were a model of the perfect society, uncompetitive, deeply religious, peace-loving, totally egalitarian, sexually adjusted, etc. — all this put out as an object-lesson for the vile white Americans, whose vices deprived them of such bliss. Gullible Americans put their common sense in cold storage when they saw that the preposterous tale was told by a Ph.D. from Columbia and labeled ‘scientific.’ Virtually every significant statement in the book was found to be false by responsible investigators who actually observed the Zu¤i (Esther Goldfrank, FLorence Hawley Ellis, J.M. Roberts, William Smith, Li An-che, Philipp Farb, et al.), although they politely pretended to believe that Mrs. Benedict, Ph.D., did ‘inadequate field work,’ i.e., that she would have told the truth, had she not been incompetent, feckless, and irresponsible. I need not say that Patterns of Culture was cunningly adjusted to the opinions and superstitions prevalent in the 1930s and designed to benumb the minds of its readers.)

 This attempt to minimize the biological nature of men is paradoxical in writers who not only recognize that the greater part of human conduct is determined by instincts and tropisms that are largely subconscious, but so restrict the function of reason as to make it virtually without effect on the course of history. We are told–and the proposition is illustrated by examples drawn from the history of our race–that great men, who determine events rather that chatter or write about them, have a ‘tact’ or instinct that enables them to make correct decisions with so little reliance on their rational powers that they may not know why they took the action that made them victorious or successful in a given undertaking. Their strength comes, not from superior powers of cognition and cogitation, but from a faith in their own destiny. The psychological problem cannot be analyzed here, (28) but if we accept the claim that even the greatest men are basically irrational, we thereby attribute to heredity an absolute power over human conduct, of which it becomes the sole determinant, since it is beyond question that in all mammals, including men, instincts are innate and genetically transmitted. The logical conclusion to be drawn from Spengler’s psychology, therefore, is that biological race is supremely important. Granting that ‘the race one feels in oneself’ is what counts, what one feels (as distinct from what one may simulate) is genetically determined.

 There is one great difference between Spengler’s concept of race and Yockey’s. Although Spengler recognizes the Jews as a Magian people imbued with a Magian world-outlook and so instinctively different from us (and therefore at the limit incomprehensible to us), and although he knows that this alien body, this international nation, is today, as it was for centuries before the Christian Era, lodged in all the nations of the world that it can profitably exploit, he regards the natural antagonism between Jews and their hosts as basically not determined by biological race, but rather by the phase of civilization, the Jews representing a Magian culture that is much older than ours and now petrified. (Hence, of course, Toynbee’s description of the Jews as a ‘fossil people,’ despite the absurdity of applying such a phrase to a species that is so active and powerful and, quite possibly, has a vitality much greater than our own.) Spengler asked his readers to believe that the Jews are a dwindling and disintegrating people, a negligible force in world politics and the struggle for power. I have always thought the Jews’ aspersions of Spengler’s memory a good example of their habitual ingratitude toward their most effective apologists. –Dr. Revilo P. Oliver, The Enemy of Our Enemies: A Critique of Francis Parker Yockey’s The Enemy of Europe\*

Here is more criticism from Dr. Oliver surrounding Spengler and the issue of biological race:

 For all practical purposes, Spengler ignores hereditary and racial differences. He even uses the word ‘race’ to represent a qualitative difference between members of what we should call the same race, and he denies that that difference is to any significant extent caused by heredity. He regards biological races as plastic and mutable, even in their physical characteristics, under the influence of geographical factors (including the soil, which is said to affect the physical organism through food) and of what Spengler terms ‘a mysterious cosmic force’ that has nothing to do with biology. The only real unity is cultural, that is, the fundamental ideas and beliefs shared by the peoples who form a civilization. Thus Spengler, who makes those ideas subject to quasi-biological growth and decay, oddly rejects as insignificant the findings of biological science concerning living organisms.

 Now there is a great deal that we do not know about genetics, both individual and racial, and these uncertainties permit widely differing estimates of the relative importance of biologically determined factors and cultural concepts in the development of a civilization. Our only point here is that it is highly improbable that biological factors have no influence at all on the origin and course of civilizations. And to the extent that they do have an influence, Spengler’s theory is defective and probably misleading. –Revilo P. Oliver, Spengler: Criticism and Tribute

Keith Stimely via The Occidental Quarterly buttresses the claim that Spengler didn’t believe in biological race:

 Beyond a matter-of-fact recognition of the ‘colored peril’ and the superiority of white civilization, Spengler repeated his own ‘non-materialist’ concept of race (which he had already expressed in Decline): Certain men — of whatever ancestry — have ‘race’ (a kind of will-to-power), and these are the makers of history. –Keith Stimely, Spengler: An Introduction to His Life and Ideas

Jeffrey Woodruff, also writing for TOQ, reiterates the aforementioned:

 …he persistently denied the role of race in culture-building and even foolishly cited work by socialist anthropologist Franz Boas to bolster the unscientific assertion that the physical environment can affect the shape of men’s skulls. –Jeffrey Woodruff, The New Relevance of Oswald Spengler

Greg Johnson’s piece on The Occidental Observer states:

 Where Spengler departs from sound biology is his belief that landscape can shape a population independent of genetic change, and that different races, when placed in the same landscape, will converge in their traits without genetic blending. Spengler even refers to Franz Boas’s false and probably fraudulent claims that in America, the offspring of different European racial stocks had convergent biological traits that were products of environment alone. –Greg Johnson, Is Racial Purism Decadent?

Dr. Johnson quoting from pp. 219-220 of Spengler’s Hour of Decision:

 In speaking of race, it is not intended in the sense in which it is the fashion among anti-Semites in Europe and America to use it today: Darwinistically, materially. Race purity is a grotesque word in view of the fact that for centuries all stocks and species have been mixed, and that warlike—that is, healthy—generations with a future before them have from time immemorial always welcomed a stranger into the family if he had ‘race,’ to whatever race it was he belonged. Those who talk too much about race no longer have it in them. What is needed is not a pure race, but a strong one, which has a nation within it.

Continuing from further on down in Johnson’s writing:

 Thus the healthy man ‘of race’ is not concerned with racial purity—defined as the preservation of a certain set of gene frequencies, whether his own or his ancestors’. He is pleased with the good traits he has received, and he would like to pass them on. But, as Spengler says, he is more concerned with strong sons than pure ones, and he would not hesitate to breed with an outsider if he thought this would improve his progeny.

 For Spengler, a concern with racial purity is a sign of racial decadence, of a lack of racial vitality. The racial purist looks to the past, not the future, because he does not have the vitality in him necessary to create a future. He is defined by the past and feels that he does not have the power or the right to change it, only to repeat it (or talk about repeating it, and urge others to repeat it).

 As Spengler writes, “Those who talk too much about race no longer have it in them.” This means that the people who talk the most about reproduction do it the least. And, Spengler might add, that is a good thing. Let the sapless branches rattle in the wind all they want, as long as they spare us their shriveled fruit.

 White Nationalism: A Degenerate Movement?

 Racial purists often claim that their intellectual opposition to miscegenation is merely a healthy ‘instinct.’ They also claim that there is something biologically sick about the instincts of miscegenators.

 Spengler thinks that the exact opposite is true. He would predict that those who intellectually oppose miscegenation and advocate racial purity and preservation would be, on average, less virile, less fecund, and less mentally and physically healthy than the average person, including the average miscegenator.

 Based on ten years of experience in the American White nationalist movement, I have to say that Spengler’s prediction is absolutely correct. White nationalism in America is an overwhelmingly degenerate movement, and I do not exempt myself from this judgment.

The two pillars of jew-wise racialism are a proper, adequate understanding and undertaking in response to the existential realities related to the topics of race of jewry:

 …Spengler disagreed with their biological ideology and anti-Semitism. […] …Spengler had always been an outspoken critic of the pseudo-scientific racial theories professed by the Nazis and many others in his time, and was not inclined to change his views upon Hitler’s rise to power. […]

 In his private papers, Spengler denounced Nazi anti-Semitism in even stronger terms, writing ‘and how much envy of the capability of other people in view of one’s lack of it lies hidden in anti-Semitism!’ and that “when one would rather destroy business and scholarship than see Jews in them, one is an ideologue, i.e., a danger for the nation. Idiotic.”[19] –Wikipedia

If you ask me, Spengler sounds like a jerk. Oh yeah, and he was an 1/8th jewish.

Leo Yankevich’s poem Epilogue, from his collection of works Tikkun Olam:

 […] In you remains the power to save the West.

 Put down your childless Spengler, who spawned two books at best.

 Better to heed the deeds of a forsaken prisoner like Hess. […]

Julius Evola

The SS in a report on Evola (who was allowed for a time to give lectures on university campuses and whose literary works indubitably would have been known among certain intellectual and political circles throughout Third Reich era Germany):

 The ultimate and secret motivation for Evola’s theories and plans must be sought in a revolt of the old aristocracy against today’s world, which is totally alienated from the upper class. This confirms the initial German impression: that we are dealing with a ‘reactionary Roman’. The whole impression is one of an old fashioned aristocratic feudalism. Thus even his scholarship displays a trait of dilettantism and literary affectation.

 In conclusion, there exist no grounds for National Socialism to place itself at the disposal of Baron Evola. His political plans for a Romano-Germanic Imperium are of a utopian character and moreover very apt to cause ideological confusions. Since Evola is also only tolerated and barely supported by Fascism, it is tactically not necessary to accommodate his tendencies from our side. It is therefore recommended to:

 Not support Evola’s current efforts for the establishment of a secret supra-national order and the founding of a magazine directed toward this goal.

 Curb his public activities in Germany after this lecture series, without taking any special measures.

 Prevent his further penetration into leading offices of the party and the state.

 Observe his propaganda activity in neighboring countries.

 In a short letter (AR/83) dated August 8, 1938, it then says laconically:

 The Reichsfuhrer-SS has acknowledged the report regarding the lectures of Baron Evola and is in full agreement with the thoughts and recommendations stated in the last paragraph thereof.

And what were some of Evola’s ideas? As with the preceding excerpt, the proceeding text is taken from Dr. H.T. Hansen’s (who knew Evola personally) introductory essay to the American edition of Men Among the Ruins:

 …he had polemicized against Alfred Rosenberg, the ‘Ideologue of National Socialism,’ whom he also met in person. Here the November 1930 essay ‘I1 `Mito’ del nuovo nazionalismo tedesco’ (The ‘Mythos’ of the New German Nationalism) in Vita Nova must be mentioned. Evola’s dislike was based mostly on the fact that Rosenberg valued modernity so much. Another article against Rosenberg was ‘Paradossi dei tempi: paganesimo razzista = Illuminismo liberale’ (A Current Paradox: Racist Paganism = Liberal Enlightenment) in Lo Stato, VI, 7 (July 1935), pp. 530-532. Evola also polemicized against Walther Darre, who was already NSDAP Reichsleiter at this time, in Lo Stato (‘I1 Nazismo sulla via di Mosca’ [Nazism on the Same Path as Moscow], March 1935, pp. 186- 195). Later in Cammino (p. 147), Evola stated about Rosenberg that ‘he lacked any understanding for the transcendental dimensions of the sacral.’

 The absence of any transcendent background was, of course, one of Evola’s main objections against National Socialism. ‘One can organize a state in the name of the spirit or in the name of matter,’ he wrote in 1937 (‘Sulle premesse di un’antibolscevismo positivo’ [On the Prerequisites for a Positive Anti-bolshevism], in Lo Stato. This and a few other quotes we have culled from Alessandro Campis’s interesting contribution ‘Organicismo, Idea Imperiale e Dottrina della Razza’ in Trasgressioni, I/1, Florence, 1986). This lack of reference to transcendence also leads to the other points criticized by Evola, such as National Socialism’s great attachment to nature (the Volk as guiding principle); the Führer principle that answers only to the people and has no legitimation from above, and the resulting demagoguery; as well as populism and purely biological racism.”

Pfft, what a bunch of fluff. Just like the following where Evola is further quoted directly:

 Due to a regrettable incompetence and pressure from immediate interests, Nordic thought, paganism, primordial symbols, and so on, today all too often see new life in the distorted form of personal affectations and slogans… .

 As they are frequently understood today, Nordic thought, Aryanism, the imperial idea, and the concept of a super-race are burdened with an interpretation entirely foreign to the great free breath of the corresponding primordial traditions. According to the Aryan primordial conception, the Reich is a metaphysical solar reality. The Nordic heritage is not semi-naturalistic, only conceivable on a blood-and-soil basis, but rather constitutes a cultural category, an original transcendent form of the spirit, of which the Nordic type, the Aryan race, and the general Indo-Germanic moral being are only outward manifestations. The concept of race itself, according to its higher traditional significance, cannot have anything in common with the rational idols of modern biology and profane science. Above all, race is a basic attitude, a spiritual power, something primal and creative, whose outer, tangible forms are only a last echo…

 The truly original Nordic essence melts with the Hyperborean; and here we see a primordial culture that is solar and sacral, that possesses the power and irresistibility of the universal, and that encompasses paganism and spirit, Olympian sovereign superiority and will-conditioned originality, in a grand synthesis of the mundane and the supra-mundane. Once one has reached this realization, then one can truly say that Tradition in its higher sense is synonymous with the Hyperborean, or primordial Nordic, tradition, and that the Nordic element has been present wherever a people has had a tradition, and vice versa. That is not all. In this way we can even approach the mystery of prehistory and sense a fateful correspondence between physical circumstances and higher, metaphysical meanings. If the tradition in question indeed had the polar region as its original seat, it must therefore have been geographically polar and so has always embodied the spiritual significance of a pole as an unshakable axis for any ordered movement, as a center point for any normal hierarchy and every true tradition-based Reich… .

 Now, can one present such streams of thought in certain circles without being accused of an alien universalism, of Roman notions that are anti-Germanic, or even of having Jewish ideas? And yet all this belongs to the highest Aryan inheritance; this is the true level to which the motifs and symbols that the new Germany has called forth must be elevated if it really wants to stand at the forefront of the resistance and attack against the dark powers of world revolution. We must really return to the origins, and the Nordic essence must be freed from any interpretations that are infected by modern, profane intellectual prejudices and by the superstitious religion of life, becoming, and being bound to nature. We must once again find out how to imbue the Nordic-Aryan symbols and their logical consequence, the Reich, with a spiritual power and a universal gravity, something truly Olympian and transcendental. And this is indeed possible. This must be our task. The new Germany has talented and qualified powers for this and it remains only to give them the right points of orientation, true principles instead of myths and slogans… .

 We repeat: race is secondary, spirit and tradition the primary factor, because, in a metaphysical sense, race dwells in the spirit before being expressed in the blood. If it is true that without racial purity, spirit and tradition are deprived of their most precious means of expression, then it also true that pure race deprived of spirit is condemned to be a biological mechanism and, in the end, doomed to extinction. The proof of this lies in spiritual decay, the ethical stupefaction, and the slow death of many tribes that did not commit any of the sins against the blood that have been discovered by materialistic racial science. . . . It follows that without the rejuvenation of the higher spiritual power latent in the Nordic symbol, all measures for the biological protection of the race will have a limited and relative effectiveness, as opposed to our superior task of a Western reconstruction of the Nordic-Aryan spirit… .

 Leader and followers, organic structure, overcoming of individualism and collectivism through a virile spiritual concept of community—these foundations for an inner rebuilding of the Folk should now be valid above and beyond the individual nations, and should lead the way to an organic conception, to which independence contributes as well as unified higher leadership, ethnic diversity, as well as spiritual, supranational community. That is what Western rebirth fueled by the Aryan spirit means… .

 It follows that our front should also take account of all the surviving conservative and traditionalist forces in Europe and even strive toward a new active conservatism on a Nordic foundation, which will have this dual purpose: to rid the world in revolutionary fashion of a culture of decadence and the new materialist and collectivist barbarism and to call forth to new life the primal creative power of the ancient Aryans, in close connection with the values of personality, hierarchy, spiritual virility, and the Reich as both worldly and metaphysical reality. The first condition for this is the desecularization of the world and of man, of realization and of action. If this prerequisite is not fulfilled, then all roads toward the understanding of primordial Nordicism remain blocked. The first assumption is that there is a higher world beyond this one. Therefore, we have to abandon any mysticism of this world, any adoration of nature and of life, any pantheism. At the same time we must strongly oppose the curious interpretation of Aryanism invented by the dilettante Chamberlain that relates to a purely rational praise and glorification of profane science and technology for the surmounting of a supposedly un-Aryan supersensible worldview. It is indeed high time that we were done with such foolery… .

Well, as anyone can see, this is clearly not the kind of thinking a jew-wise racialist movement is in need of. H.T. Hansen points out:

 When it was realized (especially by the Ahnenerbe) that Evola wanted to spread totally different ideas and that his racism was far removed from the NS version, both interest and support for him waned. In spite of this, as he notes in his autobiography, Evola was long able to say things for which a German would have landed in prison.

 Another document from Himmler’s personal staff should be mentioned here (archived in the aforementioned file under no. II 2113), because it shows that Himmler personally received and collected information about Evola. It reports that Himmler again ordered a thorough examination of Evola’s Heidnischer Imperialismus, in which the German translation should even be compared to the original Italian text in order to eliminate errors in translation. At the same time, the opinion of the chief of the Sicherheitshauptamt (main security office) is given:

 Evola possesses no understanding of the German folkish (volkisch) past, whereby it must be noted that he is a foreigner and probably does not know Germany’s historical conditions enough to really grasp the origins of our folkish history. His results remain a spiritual and speculative impossibility… .

 His [Evola’s] words about the ‘superstition of the Fatherland’ clearly display that these traditionalist values of his are only theoretical and are not rooted in profound historical views and realizations. The following passage of Evola’s shows his basic lack of understanding of National Socialism and Germanic values (p. 98): ‘If it is true that the swastika, the Aryan pagan symbol of the sun and of the flame burning by its own volition, certainly belongs to those symbols that more than any others might lead the way to a real Germanic rebirth, it nevertheless must be realized that the name of the political party that has taken it as its emblem and that is today revolutionizing Germany in the spirit of Fascism is anything but a fitting choice. Indeed, aside from the association with the working class, both ‘Nationalism’ and ‘Socialism’ are elements that have a hard time fitting in with the noble Teutonic tradition, and it should be clear that what Germany urgently needs is a counterrevolution against democratic socialism. The resurrected Harzburg front already showed the right path: an anti-Marxist and anti-democratic movement of revolt that called upon the front of conservative and traditionalist elements as such. One will have to be careful that the ‘socialist’ element, even if it is a ‘National Socialism,’ does not get the upper hand and let everything become a mass phenomenon grouped around the momentary prestige of a Fuhrer: [emphasis original]

More from H.T. Hansen:

 Even Guido Landra, the extremely important director of the Racial Studies Department in the Ministry for National Culture, coeditor of the official periodical La Difesa della Razza (The Defense of the Race), and coauthor of the official 1938 Manifesto Razzista, attacks Evola vehemently. In his article ‘Razzismo biologico e scientismo’ (Biological Racism and Scientism), in La Difesa della Razza, VI, no. 1, November 1942, pp. 9-11, aptly subtitled ‘For Science and Against the Melancholic Apostles of a Nebulous Spiritualism,’ we read: “Those poor racists of the first hour who are guilty merely of having initiated the race campaign in Italy and of having remained loyal to the original as well as the official line, are now being accused of nothing less than Jacobinism and Bolshevism. The accusation—and this is painful to report—originates from a publication that can really be proud of a noble anti-Jewish tradition; and the accuser is the author Evola, who, while claiming to expatiate upon Professor Canella, attacks all those who remain loyal to the notion of biological racism. . . . If the expressions ‘biological’ and ‘scientific’ have a negative connotation for the spiritualists, we answer that for us it is a great honor to be called biological and scientific racists.” In Vita Italiana (XXXI, no. 359, February 1943, p. 151 ff.) Landra adds: “And this is the weakest point in Evola’s teachings: that an Aryan can possess the soul of a Jew and vice versa. And that a Jew could therefore be discriminated against even though he possesses the soul of an Aryan is for us theoretically untenable. In practice, the assumption of such a principle would have terrifying consequences for racism, and ones that would exclusively benefit the Jews.”

 Landra, probably the highest official racial theoretician, makes his sharpest attack in his own publication La Difesa della Razza (VI, 1, November 5, ‘1942, p. 20), singling out the following for criticism: “The essays about the problem of race, `Due razze’ [Two Races] by Giulio Evola and `I nostri nemici’ [Our Foes] by Guido Cavalluci, that have appeared in a well-known monthly Diorama [Evola’s aforementioned Diorama Filosofico] and in which every realistic foundation of racism is doubted, even going so far as labeling anti-Semitism as a mere polemical view . . . [and] that article `The Misunderstanding of Scientific Racism’ by Evola, which is the most exemplary document and monument of the present campaign that has been unleashed against racism in Italy …”

 Attacks of this sort and the resulting sanctions from high places were also responsible for the demise of a project that surely was very dear to Evola. He was to have been the editor of a bilingual German-Italian periodical on race. The project had been worked out together with Mussolini, who moreover had already pledged his full support. Even the title of the magazine had been deter-mined: Sangue e Spirito—Blot and Geist (Blood and Spirit). The intention was to unify the approaches to the race problem in Germany and Italy, whereby both sides hoped to present their own views to each another. The steady efforts by the Church and orthodox Fascists to influence Mussolini finally succeeded in swaying him toward the ‘biological’ racist position, which also corresponded to the NS ideology. In the end, Mussolini withdrew his approval of the magazine. Since the German Foreign Affairs Office had also noticed that Evola did not intend to champion the racism dear to the Germans, it also withdrew its support. In addition, the dramatically increasing wartime confusion made this and other similar plans seem less important. Thus the project was doomed to certain failure.

 Now we turn to another question that logically follows from Evola’s racial thought: his anti-Semitism.

Dr. Hansen on Evola and the jews:

 His writings never spoke out against orthodox religious Judaism [This is untrue; see Evola’s: “The Authenticity of the Protocols proven by the Hebrew Tradition”. –Blut]. On the contrary; as an example, he writes in his Tre aspetti del problema Ebraico (Three Aspects of the Jewish Problem), Rome, 1936, p. 23: “There are elements and symbols in the Old Testament that possess metaphysical and therefore universal value.” [< Subversive perennial philosophy.] Or in Revolt Against the Modern World (p. 281): “In contrast to orthodox Judaism, early Christianity can at most claim a mystical character on the same line as the prophets. . . . And whenever a true esotericism was subsequently created in the West, it was essentially found outside of Christianity with the help of non Christian currents, like the Hebraic Kabbalah….” Evola even names operative Kabbalah as one of the few paths that can still be followed successfully in the West today.

 In light of all of Evola’s well-known anti-Jewish remarks, how could he ever have been called a ‘Jew lover’? [Earlier in the text: “In the above-mentioned polemic, Grimaldi characterized Evola as a ‘Jew lover.’ “] We have already shown a few reasons. Since Evola set supreme importance on the spiritual attitude, a Jew could of course also espouse ‘Aryan’ thought (see ‘Scienza, razza e scientismo’ [Science, Race, and Scientism], in Vita Italiana, XXX, no. 357, December 1942, pp. 556–563; there, he writes verbatim: “For example, can an ‘Aryan’ have a Jewish soul or inner race and vice versa? Yes, it is possible. . . .”). And Evola had surely noticed that especially in Germany some Jews felt more ‘Aryan’ than many Germans, and this was not only in intellectual circles. In exactly this sense one must assume that Evola did not at all regard the Jews Weininger and Michelstaedter, to whom he owed so much, as ‘Jews,’ independently of their heritage. That an opinion like this was a danger to mass propaganda could not go unnoticed by the political observers of the day.

Don Miguel Serrano discusses Julius Evola in his book, Adolf Hitler: The Ultimate Avatar:

 I can not fail to consider that, in this attitude of eminent Latin writers, since no German National Socialist is to be found among the Integral Traditionalists, beneath the appearance of wishing to show broad criticism, magnanimity, objectivity and ‘Olympic’ detachment, to use their words, one only finds the desire to somehow ingratiate the all-powerful Jew, to be pleasing to him at the same time that they declare him their enemy. Evola dares to write “in Hitler there was an element of unhealthy fanaticism in his opposition without concessions to the Jew.” Despite my admiration for the Italian writer, I must distance myself from this position. Hitler, as always, had reason.

 In my interview with Julius Evola, in his apartment on the Via Corso Vittorio Emmanuele, he told me Mussolini had asked him to write a new racial theory in order to counter that of Rosenberg. It would be the ‘Fascist racism,’ different from ‘Nazi racism.’ (As if there could be more than one racialism). And thus that entire brilliant Evolian concept of the ‘race of the body,’ the ‘race of the soul’ and the ‘race of the spirit’ was born that he labelled with the antipathetic term of ‘traditional.’ Something churned within me when I heard this word, as if before the presence of an intellectual social climbing, a literary vulgarity. This concept has been taken by Evola from Guenon, attributing it to Aryan Hinduism that mentions other bodies distinct from the physical that could be components of man, because if they only exist potentially they are virtual, being developed through the practice of yoga. They are bodies that are astral, mental, spiritual, etc. Being German, Clauss, the creator of psycho-anthropology, never called his theory ‘traditional’ or ‘traditionalist.’ He was married to a Semite, which explains his attitude towards biological racism that he tried to outflank with his psychic racism, his ‘race of the soul.’ The ‘traditionalist’ Rene Guenon also ended his days 71 converting to Semitic Mohammedanism. The brave and clear Claudio Mutti does something similar. Nevertheless he could still return to the Hyperborean Wotanism of his Lombard ancestors. Because he, thank the Gods, is still alive.

 If the theory of Evola and Clauss on the races of soul and spirit can be accepted as a comfortable element of exposition, in the end they are not necessary, only complicating things, serving only to speak of racism among hybrid and mestizo people without hurting their feelings, since a mulatto or an Indian among us could always think that even though his body is coloured, his soul might not be. There is the suspicion that Evola has just invented everything to speak about race to the Southern Italians and Mussolini. Yet, although their pride remains standing, reality does not change. […]

 In Vienna it was possible for me to read an internal communication among several SS centers in which they recommended Julius Evola not be given facilities to expound ‘his esotericism.’ I understand this was just since Evola would have generated confusion. In Italy herself he was not given better facilities. Those were times of struggle and they had to simplify. Yet the beautiful ‘race of the body’ of the Italy of today is a result of the racial selection that was then done in the last years of Fascism, carried out under the influence of Hitlerism. I wish that something like that had happened in Spain.

 We repeat, unfortunately Julius Evola did not understand the enormous favor Jung gave to Aryan man with his idea of the two Collective Unconsciousnesses, the most valuable tool given to Esoteric Hitlerism. He also did not understand Esoteric Hitlerism. Perhaps he was too close to the Avatar in space as well as in time. So great was the energy that emanated from his vortex that only adoration or rejection were possible, never indifference. Humility and voluntary detachment are necessary from the self to be able to be an unconditional partisan of the Fuhrer Prinzip, essential Aryan idea that only emerges from the greatest depths of the ‘blood memory.’ Evola ended taking refuge in the distance of ‘integral traditionalism’ and an aristocracy more of class than of race.

 The Jews, on the other hand, as was logical, instantly understood the danger implied by the Jungian idea. They could not rid themselves of Jung so they had him censured, in accord with their familiars and disciples, making the theory of the two Collective Unconsciousnesses disappear from his works, in such a way that they would henceforth be found no more. Due to the mention made in the book of professor McQuire, ‘Jung Speaking,’ where the interviews in which Jung refers to Hitler are reproduced, this work was not published by the publishers in London.

 Two thousand years of Judeo-Christian domination have made the term pagan pejorative. A writer as anti-Christian as Julius Evola fell into the same error of discrediting the term due to his incomprehension of Rosenberg and National Socialism. I have his essays ‘L’equivoco del Nuovo Paganesimo’ and ‘Paradosi dei temi: Paganesimo razzista, eguale iluminismo Liberale.’

 The criticisms Evola made of the gregarious State, common masses, Nazi, claiming to find a difference between Totalitarian State and Organic State, are unjust and a result of ignorance about what was happening there. Evola moved on the surface of Hitlerist events and was theorizing.

 Evola was mistaken when he thought Germany aimed at a type of crushing economic and social equality of everyone, a proletarianization. This arose later, after the war, when the accent was exclusively on the economic-judaic, like in Switzerland and the Scandinavian countries, in a superlative way. Like in the entire world, including Japan, India, China, Chile, Argentina, etc. In Hitler’s 458 Germany everything was about race, not economics, least of all usury. If everyone achieved blood purity, they would be equal, in a brotherhood of Aryans, like in pre-history, in Polar Hyperborean, like in the organization of the Mannerbunde and the Court of King Arthur. Equal and free, equality among nobles. An aristocratic nation, with a racial aristocracy.–Miguel Serrano, Adolf Hitler: The Last Avatar

Published on TOQ, Flemish political and cultural activist Robert Steuckers, when asked “Do you have a ‘spiritual angle’?”:

 By answering this question, I risk being too succinct. Among the group of friends who exchanged political and cultural ideas at the end of the Seventies, we concentrated of course on Evola’s Revolt Against the Modern World. Some of us rejected totally the spiritual bias, because it lead to sterile speculation: they preferred to read Popper, Lorenz, etc. I accepted many of their criticisms, and I still dislike the uttermost Evolian speculations, alleging a spiritual world of Tradition beyond all reality. The real world being disregarded as mere triviality. But this is of course a cult of Tradition mainly supported by young people ‘feeling ill in their own skin,’ as we say. The dream to live like beings in fairy tales is a form of refusing to accept reality.

Also from an article released through TOQ, Michael O’Meara comments on “Evola’s Anti-Semitism“:

 Evola’s anti-Semitism was largely an offshoot of his ‘Traditionalist’ opposition to liberal modernity and its assault on the Aryan spirit, just as his support for racial nationalism in the Thirties and Forties was based less on his belief in its various ideological manifestations than in its resistance to the materialist and Judaifying impulses of the Third Estate.

 Yet not long after 1945, once the forces of the Third Estate had crushed the last remnants of Traditional Europe, the Jews ceased to be a target of Evola’s traditionalist critique. At the very point, then, when the lunar forces became triumphant, Evola seemed to abandon his anti-Semitism.

 Why?

 Part of the reason had to do with the impossibility of mounting an effective political resistance to the Judeo-liberal order of the postwar period. For once Europe fell under the yoke of the extra-European powers and every vestige of its historic past fell into ruin, all that could be done in this new dark age was to make certain that those few men left standing were able to keep the dimming embers of the Aryan spirit from being entirely extinguished.

 As he wrote in 1948, “I see nothing but a world of ruins, where a kind of front line is possible only in the catacombs.” To sustain this underground resistance, it was henceforth necessary to adopt a stoic—an indifferent—attitude to the frenzied antics of what had become a totally Hebraicized world.

 But there was another reason for his waning interest in the Jewish Question.

 In his ‘spiritual autobiography,’ The Road of Cinnabar (1972), Evola writes that following the Second World War he thought it ‘absurd’ to continue stressing the white man’s superiority over the Jew “because the negative behavior [traditionally] attributed to Jews had now become that of the majority of Aryans.’ ” That is, in an age where the Jewish spirit of liberal modernity prevailed and most whites had succumbed to it, it was futile to exalt Aryan values, for whites, the Aryans’ alleged heirs, now behaved no differently than Jews.

 For this reason, I think his postwar stance was less an abandonment of his earlier anti-Semitic critique than a recognition that the subversive forces (of which the Jews were the most conspicuous embodiment) had become hegemonic and that those few white men who had not succumbed had no choice but to ‘ride the tiger’ until it dropped of exhaustion—the tiger being the perverted powers that had come to rule the world.

 Insofar as the twenty-first century announces a new order of battle, Evola’s apolitical stoicism can no longer be our position today.

Julius Evola: Race – Wikipedia

Now, instead of having you read all of that, I could have just showed you the man’s degenerate “art”:

Francis Parker Yockey

\*These particular excerpts from the first Dr. Revilo P. Oliver source above under the section for Spengler apply here to Yockey as well, as they were likewise in reference to him.

Spenglerian in essence, unscientific in substance, and subversive in their use of biological language to refer to hypothesized, non-biological phenomenon, below are excerpts from Yockey’s magnum opus, Imperium: The Philosophy of History and Politics:

 Race is, in the first instance — in its subjective sense — what a man feels. […]

 […] …Race is the faculty of being true to one’s self. It is the placing of a beyond-value on one’s own individual soul.

 In this subjective sense, Race is not the way one talks, looks, gestures, walks, it is not a matter of stock, color, anatomy, skeletal structure, or anything else objective. Men of Race are scattered through all populations everywhere, through all races, peoples, nations. In each unit they make up the warriors, the leaders of action, the creators in the sphere of politics and war.

 Thus in the subjective sense, there is also a hierarchy of race. Above the men of race, below— those without race.

We get this from Michael O’Meara’s TOQ article Race as Destiny:

 It is, in fact, a matter of record that Heidegger opposed what Julius Evola and Francis Parker Yockey, along with Leon Trotsky, called the ‘zoological materialism’ associated with ‘Nazi racism.’

 Like the Italian and American prophets of Europe’s imperium, Heidegger believed the philistine, positivist, even liberal modernist character of so-called ‘scientific racism’ was symptomatic of all the Conservative Revolution of the 1920s (of which National Socialism was an offshoot) had fought against.

Once more found on The Occidental Quarterly, Michael Bell tells us in his “Julius Evola’s Concept of Race: A Racism of Three Degrees“:

 In The Decline of the West, Oswald Spengler set forth the idea of the Apollinian, Faustian, and Magian ‘soul forms,’ which can be understood as spiritual racial types.5 In this [sic] highly influential Spenglerian tome Imperium, Francis Parker Yockey elaborated this notion, asserting that while there are genetically related individuals within any particular human group, race itself is spiritual: it is a deeply felt sense of identity connected with a drive to perpetuate not just genes, but a whole way of life. “Race impels toward self-preservation, continuance of the cycle of generations, increase of power.”6 Spiritual race is a drive toward a collective destiny.

 Evola’s precise definition of “race” is similar to Yockey’s: it is an inner essence that a person must “have”…

According to Sebastian Linderhof’s “Concealed Influence: Francis Parker Yockey’s Plagiarism of Carl Schmitt” in an issue of The Occidental Quarterly:

 YOCKEY’S APPROPRIATION OF SCHMITT

 In addition to plagiarism of various kinds, Yockey also lifted and in some cases adapted many ideas from Schmitt that, because of a proper lack of attribution, he misrepresented as his own. Nonetheless, he often made interesting use of Schmitt’s ideas and theories, frequently employing and applying them in ways never pursued by Schmitt himself. Here I would like to consider one particularly compelling example of Yockey’s use of an idea originally developed by Schmitt in the late 1920s. In the following passage, Yockey employs Schmitt’s European historical framework in order to understand the historical development of Western understandings of the Jewish question:

 “The ‘Jewish problem’ is not to be explained ethically, racially, nationally, religiously, socially—but only totally, culturally. From having seen at each phase only that aspect of the Jew which his own development permitted him to, Western man now sees the whole relationship, for his own Cultural unity is uppermost in Western man. In Gothic times, he saw the Jew as different only in religion, because the West was then in a religious phase. In the Enlightenment with its ideas of ‘humanity,’ the Jew was seen merely to be socially different. In the materialistic 19th century with its vertical racism, the Jew was regarded as merely racially different. In this century, with the West passing into a unit of Culture, nation, race, society, economics, State, the Jew appears clearly in his own total unity, a complete inner stranger to the soul of the West.53”

 Here Yockey develops a position on the history of understanding Jews and their relation to Europeans that is based on a view of the intellectual-historical development of the West Schmitt describes in his essay, ‘The Age of Neutralizations and Depoliticizations.’54

Ted Sallis, in his “Phoenix Rising: Yockey, Salter, and the Future of the West“, makes known that:

 One of the fundamental purposes of my activism is to advance an integration of two radically different worldviews: the culturalist outlook of Francis Parker Yockey and the biogenetic outlook of Frank Salter. I wish to argue that our ultimate interests are genetic, that the Salterian emphasis on genetic interests has priority over Yockeyian concerns with ‘High Culture’ and ‘Western Civilization.’ That said, these two worldviews need not be in competition. Indeed, they can and should be complementary.

 BIOLOGICAL RACE, CULTURAL ORGANICISM

 After reading Imperium, I was struck by two things: Yockey’s inspiring vision, and his absolute wrong-headedness on many issues of importance. I started to formulate my objections, and then, by chance, discovered that Dr. Revilo Oliver, in his essay ‘The Enemy of Our Enemies,’7 had already laid out similar criticisms—and had done so many years before I had ever heard the name Francis Parker Yockey. Thus, I give full credit to Dr. Oliver for the fundamentals of my own critique of Yockey; I am just summarizing and paraphrasing his relevant arguments, adding some of my own, and then fitting it all into the big picture. Of course, any critique of Yockey leads one to Spengler, upon whose work Yockey based his own.

 Yockey disparaged and diminished the importance of biological (‘vertical’) race.8 To him, race was mainly a spiritual thing (‘horizontal race’); it was what one ‘felt,’ how one acted, the ‘racial beat,’ rather than any objectively defined biological characteristics. In addition, Yockey’s attacks on Darwinism are embarrassing to read, and one can only cringe when Yockey states that carnivores eat meat only as a matter of choice and inner imperative; they can just as easily survive on plants. One could test this theory by feeding a zoo lion with grass and hay and observe the results. But since big cats are difficult to come by for zoos, I assume zookeepers would not wish to sentence their animals to slow starvation and certain death.

 Essentially, much of what Yockey said about race and biology is just plain wrong. Whether these ideas had any connection—as Yockey’s biographer Coogan suggests9—to possible Jewish ancestry in Yockey’s familial background and to Yockey’s knowledge of said ancestry, is open to question.

 Dr. Oliver observed that while dismissing the biological realities of race, Yockey also asserted the belief that a ‘High Culture’ is a biological organism. Thus, biology is ignored where it should be stressed, and stressed where it does not exist. This was, of course, Yockey’s attempt to justify his belief in Spengler’s view of High Cultures as having definite life stages and life spans. To simplify: ‘Spring’ is the birth and flowering of the ‘Culture.’ ‘Summer’ is its high point. ‘Autumn’ follows with cultural decline, the growth of ‘Civilization’ and its emphasis on materialism rather than faith, and the formation of Empire. Finally, comes the ‘Winter’ of civilization, when the cultural organism dies and a rebirth of High Culture is no more possible than the resurrection of a dead man. Yockey also emphasized the aforementioned transition from Culture to Civilization, which can be viewed as occurring in ‘late Summer’ or at the ‘Summer/Autumn’ transition. This transition is represented by Napoleon in modern Western history and by Alexander in the Classical world. More details of this worldview can be obtained from Imperium. The point to be stressed here is the belief in the rock-solid inevitability of every civilization’s death, with a fixed ‘life-span’ not much different from that of those other High Cultures that came before.

 Thus, essential to Yockeyan and Spenglerian ‘pessimism’ is the idea that the death of the culture/civilization is inevitable, and must be accepted stoically. No hope for the future? Too bad. Any objections to this view are considered ‘cowardice.’

 Now, part and parcel of the justification of this pessimistic view of history is the premise that Classical Culture and modern Western Culture are completely different, with no connection whatsoever—a view made possible by the convenient dismissal of the relevance of biological race. We may say that both cultures were made by European peoples on European soil, but to Yockey the ‘cultural souls’ of the populations are different; there is no connection whatsoever. The rationale is obvious: if a connection can be made between the Classical and modern Western civilizations, then the idea of a civilization’s permanent death does not hold; rebirth is possible and thus optimism is not so ‘cowardly’ after all. And, since both Spengler and Yockey absolutely insist on the ‘heroically stoic’ pessimistic view of history, any hint of optimism must be refuted or ignored.

 Dr. Oliver pondered whether the differences that exist between the Classical and modern Western civilizations are truly fundamental, or merely epiphenomenal and secondary. I believe the latter.

 Some years ago, there was a debate about Christianity and race in American Renaissance. In an essay which was replying to the original pro-Christianity piece, the author stated that Whites need a new transcendent idea to replace Christianity, to give Western man a focal point to rally around. He, unfortunately, had no suggestions as to what that could be. I say ‘unfortunately,’ because I believe he is correct. If we already are in the Winter of the West, we need to ponder whether the noticeable exhaustion of some of our civilization’s founding tenets, particularly spiritual belief, translates into a need to jettison the exhausted belief system. […]

 […]

 I wish to argue that Frank Salter’s account of ‘ethnic genetic interests’10 can supply the biological dimension that Yockey sorely lacks.

 TOWARD A SYNTHESIS

 Genetic interests are vitally important—the ultimate interests. But, Salter tells us that whatever prods people to defend their genetic interests is adaptive, even if the stimulus is a proximate interest (e.g., a desire for power as opposed to a conscious interest in having biological descendants; this assumes that following such a proximate interest does not lead to genetically maladaptive choices). Perhaps a biologically-sound and racially aware Yockeyism can do the trick? That is, a Yockeyism stripped of Spenglerian pessimism and inevitability, including the Eastern Europeans (whom Yockey eschewed), and geared to a new beginning, with Whites as a ‘young people,’ as I believe Faye terms it—rather than as a stoically doomed population.

 Can we fuse Yockey and Salter and somehow come away with something better than each alone? Salter tells us what our ultimate interests are and Yockey tells us, perhaps, how we can defend those interests from other civilizational blocs who wish to destroy our bloc, taking our genetic interests to destruction with everything else. Salterism is the foundation; a reformed Yockeyism can be the edifice towering above that sturdy foundation.

 Yockey’s major weakness is that he not only ignores the importance of biological race, but actually attacks the materialist basis of race itself. Stripped of a firm foundation of biology, Yockeyan culturalism could, in theory, degenerate into a nationalist version of ‘constitutional patriotism/citizenism,’ in which commitment to a ‘High Culture’ trumps biological preservationism, and genetic extinction is acceptable as long as ‘the High Culture’ remains. This in clearly unacceptable.

 We must always strive to include mention of ultimate interests whenever and wherever possible, insofar as is practical.

 One way of achieving this is to constantly stress the interrelationship and co-dependence of the ultimate and the proximate. Contra Yockey and his anti-biological and anti-racial materialist views on ‘High Cultures,’ we must forcefully argue that the proximate interests we so value (e.g., ‘the West’) are the extended phenotypes of specifically European genetic structures. Thus, an appeal to ‘defending the West,’ or ‘a rebirth of a new Western High Culture,’ or ‘men of the West, Awake!,’ should not be construed as an aracial acceptance of any people or peoples willing to ‘assimilate’ into the West — Europe as a proposition culture. Instead, such appeal should be viewed as a specific reference to the European-Western ‘biocultural organism’ — in which genes and culture are inseparable.

 We can also mention the reverse: that culture can influence gene frequencies via selective pressures. Therefore, not only is our culture the result of our genes, but our genes are the result of our culture. The two are intimately intertwined, a further refutation of Yockey’s anti-biological materialism, and an additional tool to be utilized in practically merging Salterian and Yockeyan thought.

 Needless to say, other proximate interests, such as European phenotypes and behavioral traits, can be even more directly tied into a defense of European genetics, given the close and very direct relationship between genes and proximate interests in those cases.

 We also need to explain how Salter’s fundamental insights in no way diminish the proper appreciation of proximate interests such as ‘The West,’ while, at the same time, pointing out that Yockey’s inspiring vision was incomplete in that it did not recognize the fundamental importance of biological race. And, it must be stressed that it is possible to use defense of one set of interests to strengthen the defense of the other: a defense of The West can, and should, lead to a defense of European genetic interests; a defense of those genetic interests should lead to promotion of our most valued proximate concerns. These issues should fit together in a fully integrated fashion. The whole will thus be greater than the sum of the parts.

 Yockey’s reference to the ‘European graveyard’ can now be taken quite literally, since it [sic] are the European peoples themselves, and their distinctive genetic information, who are dying, not only Western civilization. The graveyard is biological as well as cultural, and our defense of the West must include the idea of racial materialism, even if Yockey himself emphasized ‘spiritual’ and ‘horizontal’ race as opposed to biological, ‘vertical’ race. We are under no obligation to internalize and accept all of Yockey’s opinions on that particular matter, since we know better, and have the firm foundation of Salterian genetic interests to point us toward our ultimate interests.

Finally, the jew-cultural Marxist Wikipedia gives one last affirmation regarding Yockey’s and the concept of race:

 Like Spengler, he rejected the strict biological view of race, instead preferring a spiritual conception of race married with Karl Haushofer‘s idea of geopolitics…

 Other proponents of Universal Nazism, such as Rockwell’s ally Colin Jordan, disagreed with Yockey’s views on race, and saw Yockeyism as advocating a kind of ‘New Strasserism‘ which would undermine true Nazism.

 Oswald Spengler, Julius Evola, Martin Heidegger, etc.—all criticizers of NS racialism as bio-determinist—were wrong: pic.twitter.com/mKeShbPagl

 — BlutundBoden (@Blut\_und\_Boden) May 4, 2016

“Blood is greater than gold, a dirt clod is greater than a stock portfolio, honor is greater than the highest dividend, the folk stands taller than the sum of its business-transactions.” -Alfred Rosenberg

“Never forget that the holiest right in this world is the right to land which one wishes to cultivate oneself, and the holiest sacrifice is the blood which one pours forth for this land!” -Adolf Hitler

“Through the racial question alone, i.e. through the eternal laws of blood, of type, of nature, we can understand life and history. The results of the inquiries of natural science in the field of racial science disprove the fundamental concepts of the past. The Folkish Movement is the first political consequence of the more recent findings of science. National-Socialism deliberately places race at the center of political thought. Blood and Soil are the two most important foundations of life. ‘Blood’ and ‘Soil’ are however not material, but the highest ideals. As our Germanic forerunners already recognized, blood and soil are eternal and holy values. For eternal is the bloodline which manifests itself from the past through the present into the most distant future. And eternal too is the soil, hallowed by the blood poured forth in its defense. These highest core-values place a great obligation upon us: remember that you are a progenitor!

Only a people that observes the eternal laws of the preservation of the type, that believes in its own racial strength, has a future!” –Hansjoerg Maennel