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Vladimir Putin’s lecture in the New York Times may mark the end of the dogma of American evil, the so-called “American Exceptionalism.”

This is the belief, fed to Americans by the Jews, that the United States is “exceptional” and thus not subject to the constraints, natural or through international law, placed on other human societies. This belief, very similar to the Hebrew self-conception of a race of Chosen People, is at the root of both neo-Marxist internationalism and Judaeo-Christian Zionism, the dominant belief system of the United States. The belief in American Exceptionalism has also led, domestically, to America’s multi-cultural, interracial suicide, and the transformation of America into an enemy of the White race.

Now exceptionalism has consumed itself, and is in the process of handing the world over to a multi-polar order under Vladimir Putin’s direction.

“We had to learn from the suicide of America, England, Holland, and France, if we are to survive as a nation,” Putin told his Parliament on February 4, 2013. The suicide Putin referred to was the mass introduction of non-Whites into those countries’ citizenry, the dismantling of the ethno-cultural organism which is the root of any true nation. America was persuaded by the Jews to commit racial suicide, and the result has been the bankrupting of the country with welfare and the cost of maintaining a large, non-productive, non-White population. This is the first prong of the fork in the heart of American Exceptionalism.

While America was dying, Putin enacted exactly opposing policies in Russia. Putin’s first few years in office were spent purging Russia of its Jewish oligarchs and nationalizing their corporations, all state corporations stolen under Yeltsin from the Russian people. Putin took the mass media from the Jews and stopped multi-culturalist propaganda in Russia. Putin cares about the Russian people, and directs the Russian economy for their benefit. Putin has reduced taxes, encouraged entrepreneurs, and built Russian gold reserves to stabilize the Russian currency. Putin’s reign has brought unprecedented economic expansion—four times the economic growth America has seen under Obama. Russia today is much like America in the 1950s—ordered, clean, beautiful, and happy. There are no Jews, no blacks, and none of the cultural poison Jews manufacture with blacks.

This economic growth and social stability has allowed Putin to avoid the second prong of the fork of American Exceptionalism—unlimited imperialist warfare. The old Soviet Union demanded international Communist revolution, Just as America has killed itself with multi-culturalism, the Jews demand America kill others when those others defend their nations and traditions. The process began with Karl Marx’s support of Abraham Lincoln, continued with the anti-German wars of 1914 and 1939, and continues with the endless war against Islam. In this, Trotskyite Communism reveals itself in both Zionism and Judaeo-Christianity.

What America is learning is that there is no exception to the laws of God and nature. As Dante taught, all men enter hell by free will. The Jews, in their hubris, have exploited and bankrupted America, just as was done to Soviet Russia and Britain. Now, America is seeing what defiance of natural law brings—collapse and failure. Russia’s president is a true nationalist, a geo-political genius who represents his people, and he is putting the reins on Obama, a vapid trophy negro whom America elected just to show it can. Well, we can all commit evil, but we pay for it.

Now, with Putin’s broadside, America sees leadership. Against it the negroes, Jews, shiksas and shabbos goyim of Obama have posited a bizarre dance, a comedy of weakness, corruption and absurdity. Americans believed Exceptionalism meant they could endlessly appoint half-wits, spend and borrow false money, integrate with alien races, and flaunt their immorality and tyranny over the world’s peoples. Now, Putin has come to put an end to the party, to constrain America within its proper bounds, and to free the world from its “exceptionalism.”
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Karl Marx, the Jewish founder of Communism, told the world that history was scientific, that its course could be objectively studied, and that it would end at a point where the world ceased to change. Despite building on 5000+ years of thought about time and its nature, he presented his apocalyptic view of a world ending in world communism as original thought. It was not, and neither was his inept reduction of Aryan notions of the process of change to mere duality contained within the opposition of the two lower castes – the merchant and the worker. The effort to understand the mechanism by which society changes is ancient, and is known as the study of metahistory – the study of “historical change”.

Fundamental to metahistory are notions of divinity, archetype, and myth. In understanding how human society changes, it is as important, if not more important, to understand how the events of history are perceived as it is to understand what the events of history are. History and the real events humans experienced are almost instantly mythologized and interpreted in the context of the stories and archetypes – idealized notions of things – prevalent in society. The effort to steer the course of human events is, in its most essential part, an effort to utilize or control the governing myths of society. The forces that direct these changes are generally hidden, or occult, and their conflict is often equally hidden, giving rise to the notion of the occult, or hidden, war.

Mythologizing of history is almost the only means by which preliterate, or proto-linguistic, societies understand the past. In the proto-linguistic society, where language is non-permanent and word usage changes generationally, not only are the stories a reflection of the ideals and principles the teller wishes to convey, but also the language itself is a reflection of personal whim. In the preliterate society, where history is oral but the language is changing much more slowly, the objective of the storyteller is still the driving force behind the structure of the story. Thus, we see schools of oral poetry develop, often involving extensive memorization, under the guidance of a usually religious body. In a fully literate society objective factors become more important, but, again, the ability to mass communicate those factors and the objectives of those mass communicating those factors is key.

The tribal chief who tells a story to justify war against another tribe; the religious leader telling a story to justify a taboo; the modern “historian” telling a story t justify a social policy; the modern reporter broadcasting their selected version of the news – all of these are metahistorical forces. When we look behind them to the clan elders who want their neighbor’s cattle; to the Temple structure who wants control of the fields their devotees work; to the University the historian depends on for his living; or to the billionaires who own the shares of the media company – we see the occult forces who are shaping historical change.

These forces, though, are not arbitrary. They are rooted in the historical changes that preceded them and are, in many ways, limited by both the past and the objective reality they must interpret. Of the two, reality is the easiest aspect to ignore, as any particular person can only experience a tiny portion directly. Consensus among the taletellers, or the preserve of a “larger megaphone”, can negate actual events. More important are the notions of how things are and should be which are brought into the experience and shape its interpretation.

For instance, most of the late mythical period of the German, Nordic, and English peoples occurred within historical time. Much of what we know of these peoples through the Sixth Century is from Roman writers; from the Sixth through the Twelfth we have a variety of sources. Yet historical events of these periods – from the Hun-Gothic wars to the Anglo-Saxon invasion of England, were largely understood in that time through lenses of Nordic, Classical and Hebrew mythology. Thus the Church fathers could say that the religious practices Christianity imitated were actually anticipations and preparations of the Christian faith. Theodoric the Great, born a few years after Attila the Hun’s death, could be placed at Attila’s court to live out the myths of Nordic gods. And the Anglo-Saxon conquest of Roman Britain could be understood as a replay of a migration saga at least 700 years its antecedent.

Even in a literate society, actual observation of historical change could be recorded and believed to have occurred in manners that suited the ideological needs of the persons recording them and the institutions and persons directing them, whose own ideology was derived from the ideologies that preceded them.

A good modern example is the “Holocaust” and the modern understanding of the Second World War. The Second World War was essentially lost by Britain when the Soviet Union entered it, and Germany was primarily defeated by the Soviet Union, not the United States – whose greatest role was to roll back an inevitably defeated Germany and limit Soviet Communism’s takeover of Europe.

During this war, the battle between Germany and the Soviet Union was essentially genocidal. The Soviet Union was a largely Jewish power and Germany had a deep hatred for the Jewish system of communism. The Germans exterminated the Communist bureaucracy – which was largely Jewish – and the Jewish commanders of the Soviet Army exterminated German civilians. The mass slaughter of the ethnic Russian soldiery by its own side and its German opponents contributed to the deaths.

During the war, the Soviets manufactured the idea of a general slaughter of Jewry in Germany. World Jewry, tapping into mythical archetypes of slaughter and persecution deep-seated in the Jewish people, latched on to the idea – both to manipulate and control their people, manipulate and control the victorious populations, and to profit personally. The actual effects of the war – Soviet-led genocide, a world-wide shift towards communism, the dissolution of the British Empire – were ignored or justified by the need to fight “fascism” and the equally artificial construct of “racism”, both covers for the advance of internationalist forces.

Or, one can look at archetypes as they are made in the emergence of the religion of Islam. The Koran, was largely revealed to Muhammed to settle petty disputes between his adherents. The actual practice of Islam is largely derivative of Arab paganism – the worship of the Qaaba, the belief certain statues in Mecca are divine “anticipations” of Islam, et cetera. On a foundation of Roman and Persian scholarship, Arab paganism, strong feelings in the conflict around the Trinity (root of the Islamic idea that god is one) and the tribal desert cultures of Mecca and Medinah came a religion which presented new social archetypes – first in support of a global Caliphate, then in support of the factions it produced. An understanding of Islam involves an understanding of those peoples who embraced it who demanded a Mahdi, and those who didn’t, and the material factors that led to the ascendancy of the one party or the other. The archetypes and mythology are the products of metahistory; the individuals handing gold over to the sons of Ali and Omar are the occult forces.

This analysis applies to all history at all times. Who were the Roman initiates who created the Bible and why did they choose that portrayal of Christ? What was the real reason the Greeks attacked Troy, and how did prior invasions color their account of it? Who led the American Revolution and why did they build the peculiar monuments they did? All of human history is the battle of men and women who adhere to ideas with antecedents and who create ideas from those antecedents to manipulate and control the actions of other humans. Success is not a factor in testing the validity of these notions. Metahistory is the study of these influences, which are “occult” when they are not readily presented for public viewing.

Nothing here implicates the depth to which people believe these archetypes or myths. No one doubts the majority of Jews seriously believe their recent ancestors were exterminated on an ethnic basis. Similarly, Evangelical Christians today certainly believe the literal truth of the Bible. Neither does the study of metahistory implicate actual historical truth – history is at its finest when it conforms to the ideal. Even those who create myths deliberately for practical reasons often do so in adherence to an underlying view of right and wrong that justifies their deeds.

What metahistory does do, though, is admit that all historical influences are not objective. Mere economic and environmental and biological circumstance does not dictate change, and one cannot predict from economic and environmental and biological variables the precise nature social changes can take. Black African Nubians, for instance, were able to run Egypt, which had governed them for 2000 years. A Negro communist has achieved the presidency of the United States. Aryan Germany was defeated by an alliance of Jewish communism and Anglo-American capitalism. All these changes emerged during periods of economic weakness – though Germany’s defeat came at a period of great economic strength. All of these changes can be explained in the context of myth and archetype – none can be predicted from pure economics or other objective data.

Such is metahistory – the study of the stories people tell themselves and the storytellers who shape them – of myth and the occult forces that shape [it]. In it we find gods, and men who merely wish to be gods. What we do not find is make-believe, mere fairy tales, or worse, conspiracy theories.

The purpose of much of my work is not to rewrite standard history, but to examine that history to trace the development of the metahistorical and occult within it.
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Within a few days, we’re told, the United States will launch an unprovoked attack on Syria. The accusation is that the government of Basher al-Assad used chemical weapons against Al Qaeda rebels. These weapons were likely set off by rebel groups backed by Saudi Arabia and the Zionists in Palestine. America’s information is also coming from the new Saudi-Zionist alliance. And the media is largely ignoring the central fact – that launching missiles in an unprovoked attack legitimately permits a coalition of nations, including nuclear armed Russia and China, just cause to attack America’s homeland.

The attack may have begun before anyone can read this. It hasn’t begun before today because Obama has been too busy celebrating Trayvon Martin Luther King day and America’s long history of black communist agitation. Glenn Beck disagrees on attacking Syria, but he’s standing with Obama on that. So are the Judeo-Christian Zionists and the neo-cons at the Wall Street Journal. All of these factions viciously attack each other, but, when it comes to values — internatioanlism, anti-racialism, “democratic” revolution and Zionism — they all march together.

One thing that won’t delay the attack is Congress. Only Congress has the power to make war — and, that power is enshrined in big rubber stamps, one given to the President of the Senate; one to the Speaker of the House. 91% of the American public opposes war – 85% if chemical attacks have occurred. Truly, this is a war being made by a handful of Jews and Negroes.

Not that Obama is being overly aggressive. Obama clearly knows this is a fraud. The Zionists and the Saudis broke off from the US-led coalition in the Middle East a few months ago. Last week they installed Egyptian General Al-Sisi in Egypt. Al-Sisi is one quarter Jewish; his grandfather was a member of Haganah. The Saudis gave Al-Sisi $2 billion in cash, to compensate for any cut off American aid, and Al-Sisi killed over 1000 Muslim Brotherhood members in a coup. American neo-conservatives were involved. Obama tried to join in, with his ally George Soros’ man El-Baradei but was quickly sidelined. The Jews – in America and Palestine – and Prince Bandar bin Sultan, the Saudi Minister of Intelligence, realized Obama is a paper tiger. So, they pushed their luck.

The civil war in Syria was a four-way conflict. Iran, Iraq, Hezbollah and Syria are the Shiite side. The rebels were divided three ways. The Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood was supporting the Syrian Muslim Brotherhood. Egypt is now gone, as is the Muslim Brotherhood stronghold of Homs. Qatar and Turkey were backing the Free Syrian Army — the liberal former Syrian Army commanders whom the US has failed to supply with weapons. And, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, the United Arab Emirates and Kuwait back al-Qaeda, via the al-Nusra Front and others.

The US was allied with all three rebel factions. However, the Saudis and Zionists decided Obama was withdrawing US military power from the Mid East- so, while remaining nominal “allies”, they both decided to pursue a foreign policy of their own. After all – what is Obama going to do about it?

Months ago, al-Nusra seized chemical weapons when it overran a Syrian ammunition depot. This week, al-Nusra used these weapons. As Syria’s army, bolstered by its new National Defense Force, the elite of the Syrian Shabiha militia, retook neighborhoods to the east and southwest of Damascus, the Saudis and Zionists green-lighted the detonation of captured Syrian rockets.

There are two things you can believe here. One, you can believe the version above. Or, you can believe that Syria launched this completely unnecessary, strategically disadvantageous attack knowing it would invite American intervention. The latter belief – what the Zionists are telling us – would have to mean the Syrians want America to attack. If true, America should be doubly cautious – because this means Assad knows something the US doesn’t.

Why does the US believe Syria launched this attack? The bottom line is the Mossad. The Zionists have given the US an intelligence report they are claiming came from a source inside the Syrian Republican Guard’s 4th Armored Division, a chemically armed tank division currently leading the offensive around Damascus. The source says chemical artillery was deployed in the area, two to three weeks ago.

So, the Zionists orchestrated the attack – and the Zionists are providing the evidence that Syria did it. Syria must feel like a Defendant in the federal court system. The Jew cries out in pain as he slaps you – once again.

But, OBama is in a pickle – when I’m sure he’d rather be munching a watermelon. The Jews talked Obama into “red-lining” the use of chemical weapons. The Jews set the weapons off around Aleppo when their militias were run out of there in April. That didn’t work. This time, they ramped up the casualties and called Obama a pussy. Obama had two choices — the hard choice of calling the Jews’ bluff; or the “easy” choice of blowing off a few dozen missiles. Obama is doing the easy thing.

Right now, the US has four missile destroyers in the Mediterranean with about 100 Tomahawk cruise missiles. At $1.5 million apiece, that’s a $150 million barrage. As wars go, that’s cheap. The missiles also have a range of 1500 miles – which is important. The Zionists are claiming these destroyers are “off the coast” of Syria. Don’t be fooled. Those ships are no closer than the west coast of Cyprus. The US tried to deploy an aircraft carrier “off the coast” of Syria last year. It retreated when the Syrians deployed Russian Yakhont missiles, which can sink ships from Palestine to Egypt to Cyprus’ west coast. The US destroyers are hiding somewhere near Italy – as close to the coast of Syria as the murder of a two-year-old is to an abortion.

Frankly, my prayer is that the Syrians or the Russians or someone sinks those four destroyers before they get off a shot – but, that won’t happen. No US warship will come within range. But, what if the Syrians decide to start sinking US shipping to Egypt and the Zionists? They could close the Suez with their missiles – though that stretches the 200-mile range. Has anyone thought of this?

Obama “leaked” fifty locations he plans to attack in Syria this morning – probably, as the Wall Street Journal argued, so Assad could move his equipment and absorb the attack without feeling a need to retaliate. Obama wants a theatric strike — just enough that he won’t be mocked. Assad is supposed to play a role – take his “punishment,” teach the American people a moral lesson about Obama’s power, and move on.

But, what if Assad retaliates? Say Assad sets off a hundred Boston Marathon-style pressure cooker bombs in the US. 300 killed and wounded each — 30,000 casualties, a disproportionate response, as the US bombing will be much worse. Is this acceptable to Americans? Trade a $25 pressure cooker bomb one for one with a $1.5 million cruise missile. Good idea? Let America feel an immediate consequence for its actions — not a delayed response like 9-11. Then, see how Obama stomachs it.

But, there are two much more serious consequences – all resulting from the broader consequences of Obama’s actions.

Once Obama starts to fight, he will be pressured to win. $150 million won’t do it. Say Syria doesn’t lay down like a shocked dog and take it, and Obama now has to fight a war. If the war stays limited to Syria, the cost will be $18 billion a year for an air campaign. An invasion – which the US is not prepared for – may cost $400 billion. Obama — and America — are broke. A true, protracted war will break America like World War II broke the British Empire. It’s coming anyway – in a sense, it might as well start now – but, does Obama understand this?

Then, there is the big issue – what if Russia decides to respond militarily? What if China intervenes? What if, on a much smaller scale, Iran deploys troops – not just advisors – to the region, using the US attack as an excuse?

Nuclear death from Russian and Chinese ICBMs raining down on the US would be a relief. Finally, the democratic tyranny would be over. The blacks and Jews are concentrated in major urban areas; they’d be gone. White people may even be free again.

How else could Russia intervene? If US forces mass in Turkey, Russia could invade. That would be an exhausting war – but, Russia would win, and retake Georgia and the Caucasus in the interim.

Or, Russia could just escalate its arms sales to Syria and Iran, and provide support for a joint Iranian intervention in Syria and, possibly, Iraq. Syria could fight a war with Turkey as Russia’s proxy. Or, Syria could blockade the Zionists in Palestine by sea and air – no airlifts of US armaments like in 1967 and 1973 – while renewing war on the Golan Heights. The Zionist military is substandard; it is heavily dependent on US resupply; and its only hope would be its new friends in Saudi Arabia and Jordan.

Or — what if Russia and China arm and support a general war – Iran, Iraq and Syria against Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Jordan and the Zionists?

None of this might be immediate – but, even if a US attack doesn’t prompt a direct Russian counterattack, it invites and justifies further Russian intervention. This intervention pushes all parties closer to a general conflict. And, with NATO in Turkey, Iran close to nuclear weapons, and the Zionists holding no real card but nuclear weapons – nothing good can happen.

The Zionists are starting this war because, in their arrogance, they can’t imagine they’ll lose. When asked about potential Syrian counterattacks on US ships – the Jews credulously announced that Syria “wouldn’t dare” — because it would invite the same ineffective attacks they’ve invited now. Well, the US isn’t what it was 10 years ago. Immigration, free trade, economic collapse and political discussion have hollowed the US out. Russia and China are waiting to push the US over the edge into a regional power – not a superpower. Conflict in Syria is a way to do that.
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Alexander Dugin, with the help of Arktos’ John Morgan, has recently published an essay, On White Nationalism and Other Potential Allies in the Global Revolution. The essay is almost entirely on point, and is mostly an excellent and impressive statement of Traditional principles. However, Dugin errs when it comes to discussing race and the Jewish question, and displays a misunderstanding of both the Traditionalist worldview and the realities of race. As an inhabitant of nearly all-white Russia, his lack of experience with the negro and lack of understanding of the Jewish role in America politics likely contributed to those errors.

Dugin is an advocate of what he calls Eurasianism. Eurasianism seeks a multi-polar international order based on the organic ethno-cultural unities among the European and Asian peoples, in opposition to the multiculturalist, one-world internationalism of the American and British systems—what Dugin calls Atlanticism. There are variants within Eurasianism, and in the West, Eurasianism has tended to attract the idiosyncratic types who glory in creating variants just to show they are in opposition to everyone. For our purposes, though, we shall typify Eurasianism with its best expression.

Practically, Eurasianism promotes the nationalism of Russia, China, Iran and India, and a host of other states, against American imperialism and the American push for a one world democratic order. However, while attacking the idea of an ultra-liberal New World Order. Eurasianism often embraces the ideologies of that order, particularly anti-racism and opposition to anti-Semitism, as well as Holocaust affirmation and opposition to Adolf Hitler. This contradiction often reflects the fear of the Jews and of the laws they have caused to be passed in many states as it does real conviction, but the embrace of these international list doctrines also creates fatal internal contradictions in the Eurasianist worldview.

Historically, Eurasianism draws from diverse philosophical tendencies. Most prominent is left-wing National Socialism—the wing of the National Socialist German Worker’s Party which, in the 1920s and 1930s, sought an alliance between the Reich and Soviet Russia as a check to American-British imperialism. Eurasianism also draws from an idealized, and mostly hypothesized, Stalinist national communism. This historically erroneous worldview posits that Stalin was a great ruler of the Russian people, whose “socialism in one country” was not Communist in the bad, Jewish sense, but a nationalist reaction to Trotskyite internationalism.

Lastly, Eurasianism draws from the Radical Traditionalist worldview of Rene Guenon and Julius Evola, without the nationalist Socialist interpretations of Savitri Devi. In doing so, Evola’s actual ties to National Socialism are generally ignored or misrepresented, and his writings are purged of anti-Semitic and racial statements—a falsifying revisionism similar to that applied to Stalin.

Yet, at its best, Eurasianism’s ideology of a multi-polar and nationalist Europe and Asia most likely describes the world system that will dominate the 21st Century. At its worst, historical figures—like Anglo-American agent Otto Strasser and his Black Hand movement—are tortured into new interpretations which support this Twenty-first and not Twentieth Century philosophy.

Dugin’s Views

Alexander Dugin is easily the most important Eurasianist thinker, though he publishes primarily in Russian and has not been easily accessible to English- language speakers. Dugin’s essay On White Nationalism was assembled by John Morgan, and is a concise exposition of Dugin’s philosophy. Dugin’s thesis is succinctly laid out in the second and third paragraphs which state:

“Those from either the Right or Left who refuse American hegemony, ultra-liberalism, strategic Atlanticism, the domination of oligarchic and Cosmopolitan financial elites, individualistic anthropology and the ideology of human rights, as well as typically Western racism in all spheres… and who are ready to cooperate with Eurasian forces in defending multi-polarity, socio-economic pluralism, and a dialogue among civilizations, we consider too be allies and friends.

“Those on the Right who support the United States, White racism against the Third World, who are anti-socialist and pro-liberal, and who are willing to collaborate with the Atlanticists; as well as those on the Left who attack Tradition, the organic values of religion and the family, and who promote other types of social deviations- both of these are in the camp of the foe.”

This is, essentially, the populist philosophy of my friend Willis Carto and the American Free Press, as well as the philosophy of modern National Socialism, with two exceptions: One, it contains an overly broad denunciation of so-called White racism” and Two, it fails to name or even admit the roles of Judaism and Zionism- and the Zionist Entity in Palestine- in creating and promulgating American hegemony, ultra-liberalism, financial elites, human rights, and the rest.

As Dugin continues, it becomes clear this error comes from a misunderstanding of Traditional philosophy and the realities of race:

“ I consider the White nationalists allies when they refuse modernity, the global oligarchy, and liberal-capitalism…when White nationalists reaffirm Tradition and the ancient culture of the European peoples, they are right. But, when they defend the United States, Atlanticism, liberal or modernity; or, when they consider the White race, the one which produced modernity in its essential features, as being the highest and other races as inferior, I disagree completely.”

And this is the root of Dugin’s hostility, the belief that the White race and not the Jews, has been the producer of modernity. This error leads to Dugin’s misapplication of Tradition to the modern world and his statement that:

“I do not believe in any hierarchy among peoples, because there is not and cannot be any common, universal measure by which to measure and compare the various forms of ethnic societies and their value systems.”And also that “The idea of the nation is a bourgeois concept concocted as a part of modernity in order to destroy traditional societies, which are empires.”From its humble beginning, Dugin’s error balloons, consuming an entire section of his worldview.

The Cultural Soul

In On White Nationalism, Dugin cites a criticism of his Fourth Political Theory—the successor to Gadafi’s Third Political Theory- made by Michael O’Meara, a proponent of Francis Parker Yockey’s Imperium. Yockey’s theories, though, derivative of Oswald Spengler’s, and it is in Spengler’s theory of the culture organism with a culture-soul that we find what Dugin’s theories lack.

Spengler states, in the Decline of the West, that individual human beings exist primarily as part of larger organic wholes. Social stratification- caste- is like the division of functions between organs in the body, and human beings are like cells within those organs, each properly dedicated to a specific task. Cumulatively, the culture-organism is transcendent and possessed of a higher living nature—a soul.

This notion of the organic unity of man is Aryan and Indo-European in origin, and is similar in its positing of human archetypes to Platonic idealism, in which individual beings are representations of idealized forms which emanate from the One creator. The Greek daemon, the Roman victory, the Egyptian ba, and the Nordic fylgja and valkyrie all reflect this view of transcendence- as they are the ideas with which the individual seeks unity.

The Radical Tradition of Guenon or Evola presupposes the existence of a collective culture-soul. Evola, in his Notes on the Third Reich, reiterates his observation from Revolt Against the Modern World on the importance of the idea of suum cuique- each thing in its place- to Tradition. The guiding principle of Tradition is Order- Order among man and between them- and the process of breaking men from this natural social order Evola calls individuation in his Men Among Ruins.

To support multi-polarity and Traditional counter-revolution, one must support organic social entities with an ethno-cultural basis. Modernity- what Dugin opposes—is the effort to organize men without regard to these essential unities. In America, this Traditional potential is only found in white racial nationalism. Once one accepts the organic ethno-cultural state as the building block of international order, one has to accept that these states will limit immigration and expel excessive alien elements which penetrate them.

The organism’s integrity requires ethnic and cultural unity, and alien elements, though they can be absorbed and digested in small quantities, cannot be integrated into the organism en masse. Like poisonous food, the organism can either vomit them or die.

Further, in the United States and other social-democratic nations, the purpose of the always Jewish-sponsored immigration policies is to destroy the unity of the White ethno-cultural organism and to cause it to die. The goal is to create multi-ethic, meaning non-ethic,” states in areas where Jewish parasitism is dominant, so as to create an undifferentiated mass which the Jews can exploit and enslave. The Jews are a disease of the social organism, and the immigrants are a secondary infection. Dugin criticizes the organic state for fighting a cultural infection- and he is wrong in doing so.

Dugin similarly contradicts himself when he speaks in support of empire- as a globalist, leveling empire is precisely what Dugin opposes. An empire is a super-national organism, and it either brings its component parts together into a single nation, or it dies. Dugin’s understanding of nationalism only in terms of the bourgeois nationalism of the French Revolution is too narrow. He knows well that this is not the nationalism of National Socialism or the better elements of White Nationalism. Dugin’s multi-polar world is an order established between independent organic states—and not a détente between global empires seeking to consume each other.

Such a multi-polar world does require, though, what Dugin says he does not believe in a hierarchy among peoples. Such a hierarchy exists within a Traditional empire, and would have to exist in a multi-polar world as well. Order, in fact, requires hierarchy; chaos is the principle driving men to words equality, individuation, and modernism. As Savitri Devi notes in her Lightning and the Sun, Pharaoh Akhenaton prayed to praise God for having created the peoples and divided them, assigning each its place. Respect for this division of the Earth’s peoples is what Dugin demands—and it requires racial hierarchy and a standard for judgment. Without some standard for judging peoples and cultures, who is to say that Judaeo-American hegemony is wrong?

In fact, the ability to use Tradition as the basis for a culture and civilization- and the cultural works and technics an organic unity produces- is the measure by which human civilizations are judged. The peoples of Europe and Asia—the M and N haplogroups—have this ability; the K and L haplogroups—the Jewish and Negro peoples—do not. Thus, European and Asian peoples are superior. Negroes are inferior, and the Jews are their own measure of evil. Among the Eurasian peoples, the Aryan strata- neither the whole white race nor a part from it- were the spark of all Traditional cultures, and thus, should stand at the pinnacle of the global order.

The Interests of White Americans

Dugin sums up the application of Eurasianism to White America in one sentence: “We need to save America from its own dictatorship, which is as bad for the American people as it is all other peoples.”

Many white Americans agree. And, in so far as Dugin means the whiteAmerican people by “the American people,” he is correct. But, America is not the white American people—it is a multi-cultural empire dominated by Zionists and Jews. And, the reason American dictatorship is bad for the American people is that it is foreign, both in race and culture, to the White American people.

Jews have been able to establish dictatorship in America because of America’s origins in rootlessness. Unlike say, the Boer in South Africa, American whites did not have a common ethic origin and unlike Europeans or Asians, Americans roots do not go back more than three to four hundred years. The Normans may have conquered the Anglo-Saxons who conquered the Romans in Britain, but each was assimilated, on their common racial basis, into a single ethno-cultural whole. Americans whites conquered and exterminated the Asiatic Indians, then built their nation on the principles of rootless Masonry. The American (as opposed to white) nationalist point of reference is the Constitution- not a culture- and, thus, it has been co-opted by the Jews into the modern Trotskyist and Zionist, form of neo-conservatism. What America lacks and needs is a healthy, Traditionalist white identity; what needs to be done is the dismantling of the unhealthy, Masonic, democratic, Judaeo-Christian and Zionist white identity the Jews have marketed to America. Thus, on the intellectual plane, there is the work Dugin is doing, deconstructing anti-socialist, pro-liberal, anti-Muslim and anti-nationalist ideologies. And, on the practical plane, there is the work of making America one of the multi-polar Traditional states Dugin advocates.

The latter goal requires a massive demographic shift, if America is to be brought into such an order whole. The attitudes necessary to effect such a shift, and to bring America into a new world community, are precisely the anti-immigrant and racist worldviews Dugin opposes. 38 million blacks, a similar number of legal and illegal mestizos. 18 million Asians and 6 million Jews live in the United States, along with 210 million whites.

Perhaps 20 million whites truly believe in the multiculturalist system. Thus, 120 million people need to leave America for it to be eligible to participate as a Traditional nation in a Traditional world order. Perhaps Dugin feels America’s non-whites are simply yearning to be free in their own nation states. But, 62 million of these problem peoples—the whole of the mestizo, Asian and Jewish populations—have nations they could go to, but chose to remain in the United States particularly because of its liberal internationalist world-view.

And the real problem in the United States is not the mestizo and Asian populations, which ultimately, are probably assailable or expellable over time. The problem in the United States is the 38 million Negroes, who are absolutely inassimilable, and who have nowhere to go, the 6 million Jews, who are willfully parasitical, and the 20 million or so whites who buy into the internationalist lies. These populations will have to be forcefully eliminated—or in the case of the whites-converted.

This problem, of an alien anti-Traditional population within American culture organism which almost as large as Russia will almost certainly be solved by violence, and, particularly, by the violent expulsion and extermination of this population from, at first, a portion of the country armed by whites. The question is when does desperation of circumstances drive enough whites to take up arms and fight? The proper position of Dugin’s movement in such circumstances is one of support for whites’ interests and white racism, because this racism is the response of a healthy organism to an invader, and is a necessary and inevitable stage in the breakup of the American Empire. When an ethno-cultural organism exists, it can then be brought into Tradition- but that organism is going to have to be birthed, violently, from a badly diseased and afflicted mother.

Conclusions

Alexander Dugin and his Eurasianism are admirable. Dugin’s concept of a future multi-polar order is prescient. But, Dugin’s denunciations of racism, anti-Semitism, and the like are rooted in errors—both in understanding Tradition, and, in understanding the nature of America and its global order.

One has to wonder how much the same motives which drove American Conservatives to abandon race and embrace neo or New Conservatism are driving Dugin’s Eurasianists to introduce anti-racism to the New Right. American Conservatives, of course, were mostly motivated by fear of the post- World War II Jewish power. And, when one sees those New-Rightists who refuse to defy the Jewish media stereotypes of Adolf Hitler and his National Socialism, and who even adopt them, one wonders what forces are really at work.

Eurasianism, though, could be transformational for America- if it can accept the reality of the American situation. America is breaking because of the impossibility of maintaining a multi-racial, inorganic state. The result will be war, and war is fueled by race and by hatred- when it is anything but a mercenary enterprise. Thus, Dugin and Eurasianists both have to accept, and shoulder courage, the violent racism which is coming- because such racism is the foundation for the movement the American Right must make away from Constitutionalism, Judaeo-Christianity, and democracy- towards a Traditional social form.

This may be different than the racism Dugin does oppose. Anti-Islamicism and racist dislike of the Third World are the result of Zionist and Jewish influence. It is the projection outward, in an unhealthy way, of healthy racial feelings which need to be directed inwards, at America’s real racial problems.

But, in the end, all anti-racism is essentially a leveling philosophy, part of the march towards chaos that is the guiding principle of the globalism Dugin and all White Nationalists oppose.