

EURASIANISM



BRUNO CARIOU

BERSERKER

BOOKS



Yockey and Russia

Summary

While it is generally considered that there is an unbridgeable ideological divide between fascism and the ideological USSR, not all fascists, indeed not all neo-Nazis, adopted the classic anti-Soviet position. Some fascists have argued that Stalin's elimination of Trotsky was the first sign that the USSR was changing direction from what they saw as "Jewish Bolshevism" to a type of collectivist Russian imperialism that had adapted the symbols and the language of the Soviet Union. Communism's rhetoric to its own objectives, which were national rather than international. They pointed to Stalin's dissolution of the Comintern, the purging of a large number of veterans Bolsheviks and the substitution of the call for "socialism in one country" for the incitement to international proletarian revolution. Foreign Communist parties became instruments of Soviet foreign policy and espionage rather than organs for fomenting revolution.

An eccentric and very active figure in the immediate post-war period until his death in 1960, Francis Parker Yockey, convinced that the United States was the main enemy of European culture, concluded that the USSR could be used by those who wished to see occupied Europe 'liberated' (sic) from foreign influences. This point of view, unorthodox in 'right-wing' circles, won him a number of votes.

the support of a surprisingly large number of hitherto anti-communist veterans, including neo-Nazis and neo-fascists such as Major General Otto Remer. These German veterans who had fought the USSR, saw no reason why Germany should now slavishly align itself with the anti-Soviet stance of the United States during the Cold War. This essay examines the development of a pro-Soviet outlook among one of the most active and philosophical representatives of this faction, Yockey. This attitude is once again attracting the interest of certain extreme right-wing groups, notably the Western admirers of the Russian academic Alexander Dugin.

Russia is the bearer of meaning for our times. Russia's actions are crucial for the future of civilisation in the face of the globalisation trends favoured by the United States and capitalism. international financial system. Russia experienced a brief interregnum of subordination to liberal democracy and oligarchy, first under Gorbachev and then under Yeltsin. Putin's rise to power has been something of a partial coup, at least against the plutocracy and globalism.

The American-born philosopher Francis Parker Yockey, a specialist in Western Density, was one of the first thinkers to assess Russia's situation from the point of view of realpolitik, at a time when the American right was serving the interests of globalisation and cosmopolitanism by aligning itself with the American establishment to beat the war drums against the USSR with the advent of the cold war.

In this essay, Yockey's attitudes are examined in relation to Russia and placed in the context of the present and the near future.

Yockey's formative influences: "Communism is Jewish".

Yockey's formative years were spent in Depression-era Chicago, where he moved in 1938 to continue his studies [1]. At that time, many Americans were turning to the new experiments being conducted by the USSR, Fascist Italy and National Socialist Germany, to find answers to their difficult situation. The ideological war being waged between Marxism and Fascism translated into a material war in Spain. In Europe and elsewhere, Catholics saw the Church's social doctrine as a response to the materialistic dogmas of Marxism and capitalism [2]. The result was often what we might generically call "fascism", but which can be more accurately described as "corporatism" [3].

The most influential of these movements in the United States was the National Union for Social Justice, founded by the popular "radio priest", Father Charles Coughlin, who had emerged from the obscurity of his parish in Royal Oak, Michigan, in 1926 to present a radio programme in which he called on his millions of American listeners [4] to do away with the representatives of finance capitalism and the Bolsheviks. His enterprise gave rise to a mass movement [5].

Yockey emerged from this milieu as an activist and political thinker. Born in 1917, we know that, as early as 1934, he had discovered Spengler's *The Decline of the West* [6], which was to exert a major influence on him.

Yockey was linked to Pelley's Silver Shirt Legion. Yockey was linked to Pelley's Silver Shirt Legion, more particularly, it seems, as a lecturer [7]. Yockey's first political writing appears to have been *The Tragedy of Youth*, published in 1939 in Father Coughlin's widely read newspaper *Social Justice* [8].

It was during this period of social unrest that many in the United States and around the world came to believe that the Bolshevik experiment in Russia was a Jewish movement [9]. The slogan "Communism is Jewish" became an article of faith in many of the anti-communist movements, including Coughlin's and Pelley's, that sprang up at the time,

As his links with Pelley's and Coughlin's movements show, Yockey, right from his As a teenager, he was attracted to the 'right' and to anti-Jewish circles. As we know, he was seduced by the fascism and national socialism. Discharged during the Second World War, his stature as a brilliant lawyer enabled him to obtain a position in the Public Prosecutor's Office at the War Crimes Tribunal, where he was able to infiltrate and make contact with the last representatives of National Socialism in post-war Germany [10].

In 1947, Yockey withdrew to the Irish coast, where he wrote his magnum opus *Imperium*, a work that was to become one of his most important works. Spenglerian [11], in which he called on Western civilisation as a cultural organism [12] to fulfil its cyclical destiny by creating an empire [13].

At that time, Yockey's attitude towards Russia remained in the "anti-Semitic" mould Orthodox insofar as it continued to regard Russia as being under Jewish control. In this conspiratorial scenario, the USA and the USSR were generally seen as two countries run by Jews and colluding to dominate the world at the instigation of a small Jewish coterie pulling the strings. This attitude persisted among "anti-Semites" until the collapse of the USSR.

[14]. However, even at that time, Yockey discerned an underlying dichotomy in the Bolshevism, which he considered to be a foreign product imported by cosmopolitan Jews and under which the substratum of the real Russia with its own soul and its own historical mission continued to exist.

The struggle for the Russian soul: two factions in Bolshevism

Yockey drew on Russian history to explain the dichotomy between Jewish Bolshevism and One sought to 'westernise' Russia, imposing imported thoughts and forms on the Slav masses, who were made up of men with deep-rooted 'strong instincts'. It should be borne in mind here that, for Yockey, "Westernised" forms and thoughts were not the same as "Westernised" forms and thoughts. The 'Western' forces imposed on Russia are those that are specific to the last cycle of decadence or Winter of the West in the Spenglerian sense [15]; the morphology of Yockey's history is fundamentally that of the 'West'.

Spenglerian. In his view, the revolutionary and secular Jews were the agents who imposed 'Western' ideas and forms on Russia, insofar as these represented the 'Western' forms that were to be adopted by the Russians.

materialist and economic theories inherent in the last stage of Western civilisation, the free trade school and the Marxist school [16] being mirror images of each other [17].

Yockey described Moscow as the "Third Rome", the new Byzantium, disdainful of the West, then in full decline. This view has great significance for the present and the near future.

In Imperium, Yockey says of Russia:

"Russia, the real Russia, the spiritual Russia, is primitive and religious. It hates Western culture, civilisation, nations, the arts, forms of state, ideas, religions, cities and technology. This hatred is natural and organic, because this population is outside the Western organism and everything Western is therefore hostile to and deadly for the Russian soul.

"The real Russia is the one that Petrinism tried to break. It is the Russia of Ilya Muromets, of Minin, of Ivan the Terrible, of Pojarski, of Theophilus of Pskov, of Avakkum, of Boris Godunov, of Arakcheev, Dostoyevsky, the Skoptzes and Vassili Chouiski. This is the Russia of Moscow, 'the third Rome', the mystical heir to Rome and Byzantium. There cannot be a fourth," wrote the monk Theophilus. This Russia identifies with humanity and despises the rotten West" [18].

Yockey identifies this "westernisation" specifically with the rationalist philosophy imported by the Jewish element of "cultural distortion" [19] :

"Because Russia is primitive, its spiritual centre of gravity lies in instinct, and this is why, even during the egalitarian-rationalist 19th century, Russia was a land of pogroms. The Russian felt totally alienated from the Culture-State-Nation-Church-Race of the Jew, and the Tsarist regime confined the Jews to a zone of residence reserved for them.

"The Russia of the upper classes, the Westernised stratum, which played with Western materialist philosophy, spoke German and French, travelled to European spas and took an interest in the politics of European cabinets, was the object of the fierce hatred of the pure Russians, the Nihilists, who embodied the implicit idea of the complete destruction of the West and the Russification of the world. What

this great destructive idea was expressed in the religious form of the affirmation of the sole Whether in the truth of Eastern Orthodox Christianity or, later, in the political form of Slavophilism and Panslavism, or again in the present form of Marxism-Bolshevism, its inner imperative remains the destruction of all that is Western, which it feels is suffocating the Russian soul." [20]

As early as 1948-49, Yockey argued that "Bolshevism" could be put at the service of a Panslav imperialism which was to manifest itself with the rise of Stalin, after the overthrow of the "Bolshevik" faction. led by Trotsky. Yockey examined these questions in detail in 1952, on the occasion of the Prague Trials, to which we shall return later. Yockey clearly describes the two factions in There were two factions at work within Bolshevism at the time, both of which had the destruction of the West as their goal:

"So there are two Russias: the Bolshevik regime and, underneath it, the real Russia. Bolshevism, with its worship of Western technology and its stupid foreign theory of class struggle, does not express the soul of the real Russia. That soul burst forth in the insurrection of the Streltsy against Peter the Great and of Pugachev against Catherine the Great. In his rebellion, Pugachev and his peasants massacred all the officers, officials and nobles who fell into their hands. Everything that had any connection with the West was burnt or destroyed. Whole tribes joined the movement of mass. It continued for three years, from 1772 to 1775, and the Moscow court itself was at risk for a time. At his arraignment after his capture, Pugachev explained that it was God's will that he should punish Russia. This spirit is always there, because it is organic and cannot be destroyed; it is the will of God.

must express itself. This is the spirit of Asian Bolshevism, which is currently harnessed to the Bolshevism of the Moscow regime, with its obsession with economics and technology [21] [emphasis added].

At the time he wrote Imperium, Yockey still saw the Russians, from Hitler's point of view, as destructive Mongol hordes ready to sweep across the borders of the West. His strategy was for the West to exploit the division between Russian and Jewish factions within the Moscow regime.

"Russia is divided internally; the current regime does not represent the true Asian soul, On the contrary, it is a technological caricature of Petrinism, and this relationship, by its very nature, means that one day this regime may meet the same fate as the Romanovs. This split can be used against Russia, just as Russia is trying to foment internal revolutions at home. its political enemies. Such a tactic was successfully used by the West against the Romanov regime in 1917. By virtue of its physical location on the border with the West, Russia will and must

will always remain the enemy of the West, as long as these populations are organised into a political unit" [22].

Whatever Yockey's attitude at the time towards Russians as a 'race' or, more precisely, according to his terminology, as Culture-People-Nation-State [23], the Prague Trials led him to change his position with regard to Russia, insofar as he came to consider the Russian occupation of Europe as a bulwark against the American occupation, which he saw as more destructive - physically, culturally and economically - than the former. He would thus become a supporter of the Soviet occupation of Europe at the height of the Cold War era, while defending the neutralist lines of many Third World leaders. Anti-Americanism rather than anti-Sovietism was to become his main preoccupation.

Europe: between Moscow and Washington

In 1949, Yockey, having failed to persuade Mosley to accept his ideas, or even his offer to acknowledge authorship of Imperium [24], founded the European Front of Liberation with a few other ex-Mosleyites. Despite its ideological and intellectual orientation, the Front organised public meetings [25] and tried to make Yockey's ideology accessible to a wider public than might be expected. Yockey wrote the EFL's manifesto, The Proclamation of London, a convincing synthesis of Imperium. In the latter, Yockey says of Russia:

"Europe knows who the enemy within is and what he is responsible for. It knows that he is Europe's worst enemy, because he passes himself off as a European, but Europe has external enemies towards whom it must also adopt a definitive stance.

"The external enemies are the Bolshevik regime in Moscow, the Judeo-American Bolshevik regime in Washington and the Culture-Nation-State-Race of the Jew, which has now created a new home. of intrigue in Tel Aviv, which is a second New York" [26].

Thus, in 1949, Yockey saw Europe as facing the hostility of the two superpowers, as had Germany during the Second World War. The "two external enemies" saw

...Europe, [as] a backward population waiting to be re-educated by the American world clown and the sadistic Jew; Europe, [as] a laboratory in which Moscow was engaged in gigantic social experiments and New York and Tel Aviv were engaged in experiments...".
Europe, [as] a black mass of show trials, retrograde persecutions, betrayal, terror, despair and suicide". [27]

According to Yockey, Russia had brought Asians to "the sacred soil of Europe"; America, Blacks; and the Jews reigned over it all [28].

It was still a time when Germany was occupied by American forces in the West and Soviet forces in the East, but the alliance between the USA and the USSR would not last, which is fundamental to understanding Yockey's new orientation towards Russia. Point 5 of the The EFL's programmatic declaration, drawn up in 1949, focused on "Purifying the soul of Europe from the ethical syphilis of Hollywood and the Marxist Bolshevism of Moscow".

Europe's only hope was to embody a spiritual Idea, distinct from the superficial and ephemeral materialism of the occupying powers:

"But these conditions are only external and material. The soul of Europe cannot be occupied, governed or dominated by strangers to culture [Culture-aliens]. Only a materialist could think that possession of the visible attributes of power guarantees the eternal continuity of power" [29].

However, even in the post-war period, Russia, unlike the United States, seems to have been a very secondary concern for Yockey compared to the 'liberation' and 'destiny' of Europe. While he saw Russia's influence primarily as an influence on material existence, he saw the United States as a virus eating away at the very soul of Europe through pervasive cultural distortion.

In 1949, Yockey declared:

"Thus, the Liberation Front is now announcing to Europe its two major tasks: (1) the complete expulsion of everything foreign to the soul and soil of Europe, the cleansing of the European soul

the dross of nineteenth-century materialism and rationalism, with its cult of money, liberal democracy, social degeneration, parliamentarianism, class warfare, feminism, vertical nationalism, financial capitalism, narrow-minded statism, chauvinism, the Bolshevism of Moscow and Washington, the ethical syphilis of Hollywood and the spiritual leprosy of New York; (2) the construction of the Imperium of Europe and the actualisation of the European will, of divine origin, of unlimited political imperialism. " [30]

In a commentary on point 5 of the ELF programme, published anonymously in Frontfighter in 1952, it was stated that the "virus of Jewish Bolshevism" was "more comprehensible and therefore less dangerous" than the "ethical syphilis of Hollywood" [31].

Russia could be defeated militarily by a united Europe, but Europe would have to defeat America on much deeper levels - spiritual and cultural. In 1949, Yockey also believed that the occupation of Europe by the two rival superpowers would sooner or later lead to a confrontation to which Europeans should remain aloof. He did not

did not believe that Russia could invade Europe and hold it militarily for very long, and therefore considered the idea that Europe could only live in security under the American military umbrella to be chimerical. He also reminded the Europeans that while they were fighting Bolshevism in the last war, Washington was supplying arms to the Russian army:

"The Liberation Front will not allow Europe to be distracted by the current situation, in which the two crude Bolshevisms of Washington and Moscow are preparing a third Bolshevism. world war. In these preparations, the cultural backwardness (Culture-Retarders), the internal enemies, the liberal-communist-democrats are once again at their post: with one voice, the Churchills, the Spaaks, the Mensonges, the de Gaulles, croak that Washington is going to save Europe from Moscow or that Moscow is going to wrest Europe from Washington. There is nothing to back up this propaganda" [32].

Yockey's statements were to have an influence on many war veterans and German nationalists at the start of the Cold War.

The Prague trials

In 1952, something happened in Czechoslovakia that made him change his tactics completely. He explained in his essay *The Prague Treason Trial* [33] that the importance of the trials lay in the fact that they marked the reaffirmation of Russian Bolshevism in relation to Jewish Bolshevism.

"On Friday 27 November, the world was shaken by an event which, although insignificant in itself, will have gigantic repercussions on future events. It will have these repercussions because it will necessarily provoke a political reorientation in the minds of the European elite.

"This event was the conclusion of the treason trials of the Jews of Prague and their death sentence" [34].

The circumstances of the Prague trials are as follows: at the end of 1951, Rudolf Slánský, General Secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, was arrested for "anti-state activities". A year later, he and thirteen co-defendants were tried as "Trotskyist-titoist-Zionist traitors". It is interesting to note that the terms "Trotskyist" and "Zionist" were used together. They were accused of espionage and economic sabotage on behalf of Yugoslavia, Israel and the West. Eleven of the fourteen defendants were sentenced to death, the other three to life imprisonment. Slánský and the other eleven were hanged on 3 December 1952. Of the fourteen defendants, eleven were Jews and were hanged.

They were identified as such in the indictment. Numerous other Jews were accused of involvement in the conspiracy, including US Supreme Court Justice Frankfurter, described as a "Jewish nationalist" and the Yugoslav Moshé Pijade as a "Jewish Titoist ideologue". The plot against the Czechoslovak state was hatched at a secret meeting in Washington in 1947 between President Truman, Secretary Acheson, former Treasury Secretary Morgenthau and the Israelis Ben Gurion and Moshe Sharett. In the indictment, Slánský was described as "by his very nature a Zionist" who, in exchange for American support for Israel, had agreed to place "Zionists in important sectors of the government, the economy and the Party apparatus". The plan included the assassination of President Gottwald by a "Freemason" doctor [35].

In such a context, it is easy to understand how Yockey could have seen the trials through the prism of the USSR and Zionism, just as it is difficult to understand how "anti-Semites" could have seen the trials through the prism of the USSR and Zionism.

It is also interesting to note that, in 1968, the Zionists were once again accused of being the brains behind the insurrection that had just taken place against the Czechoslovak state [36].

Yockey argues that, in the immediate post-war period, the two allies, the USA and the USSR, acted in concert and that their relations with Israel from 1948 onwards were a perfect illustration of their collusion:

"During 1945 and 1946, the coalition between the Jews, Washington and Moscow functioned perfectly and without friction. When the 'state' of Israel was created as a result of armed Jewish aggression, the whole world, dominated by Moscow and Washington, sang hymns of praise. Washington de facto recognised the new 'state' within hours of its proclamation. Moscow surpassed Washington in pro-Judaism by granting Israel de jure recognition. Washington and Moscow compete in ingenuity to please the sham state of Israel and help it in every moral and material way possible. Russian diplomats have boasted that Haifa finally has a warm-water port" [37].

I believe that those who see Moscow's pro-Israeli attitude in the early years of Israel's foundation as an indication that the USSR was under the sway of a Jewish regime are mistaken.

Stalin, as soon as he had eliminated Trotsky and the Russian Trotskyists, ensured that the USSR set itself apart from the other countries.

objectives of the American regime and eventually oppose it. Yockey at least suggests that Moscow's support for Israel was pragmatic, as it allowed the Soviets to gain a foothold in the region through Israel; and one might even add that the German-Soviet pact had been dictated just as much by pragmatism [38]. As we shall see below, Yockey realised that Stalin had stood in the way of the world government proposed by the Washington regime in the aftermath of the Second World War.

As Yockey notes, the alliance between the USSR and Israel did not last long. Many conspiracy historians have argued that the break-up of this alliance was a subterfuge to draw the Arabs into the Soviet orbit as part of a conspiracy between the USA, the USSR, Israel and the

to dominate the world. According to this conspiracy theory, the world was divided into two power blocs led respectively by the USA and the USSR, and the Cold War was a "war on terror".

a strategy designed to frighten all other countries into joining one or other of these two blocs, which would eventually merge into a world government. This view, which is based on a superficial interpretation of facts such as the US transfers of technology and money to the USSR, the possible motives for which are beyond the scope of this article, is untenable. Historically, the salient fact is that such world government could easily have been achieved directly after the Second World War through the United Nations, had the USSR not opposed it.

"And now, a few years later, Israel is recalling its 'ambassadors' from Russia's vassal states and intensifying its anti-Russian policy from its American citadel. The fickle Jews of Israel and America cry out that Stalin is following in Hitler's footsteps. The entire American press is seething with fury at the anti-Semitism in Russia. Anti-Semitism, warns the New York Times, is the one thing America will not tolerate in the world.

"Why this upheaval?" [40]

Few on the "right" seem to realise that it was Stalin who rejected the idea of continuing the wartime alliance with the United States and helping to create a world government, which the oligarchs hoped to create in the aftermath of this war, just as they had hoped to create it via the League of Nations in the aftermath of the First World War. Yockey writes that the first major break in US-Soviet relations, which we might consider to be the start of the Cold War,

"... began in early 1947 with Russia's refusal to cede part of its sovereignty to the so-called 'United Nations' as part of the 'control' of the atomic weapons industry. Jewish statesmen, whose metaphysics is materialistic, firmly believe in the 'absolute' military power of the weapons. They considered that the success of their policy therefore depended on their total control of these weapons. They already had this control in America by means of the Atomic Energy Commission, specially created and set up to be beyond the reach of Congress and responsible for only before the President, who is, according to the practical rules of American domestic politics, an appointee of the Culture-State-Nation-People-Race of the Jew. They sought to obtain to the same degree as the control of atomic weapons in Russia and used the 'United Nations' mechanism to issue an ultimatum to the Russian leaders on this issue. [41]

"This was at the end of 1946, when the cult of the atom was in full swing and the minds of almost all the poor statesmen who now run the world's political affairs were fantastically dominated by a single explosive bomb... So the Judeo-American ultimatum of late 1946 was rejected and, at the beginning of 1947, preparations for the Third World War began.

"This Russian refusal thwarted the Jewish leaders' plans to transfer sovereignty to Russia. Russian and American members of the 'United Nations', an instrument of Jewish Culture-State-Nation-People-Race. It was hardly to be expected that America, docile and politically unaware as it was,

gave up its sovereignty while the only other world power unconditionally refused to give up its own, so the whole policy had to be scrapped" [42].

While right-wing conspiracists quote the eminent American historian Dr Carroll Quigley, they ignore what he wrote about the post-war USSR [43]. However, Quigley has much to teach us about relations between the USA and the USSR at the time. The question of the internationalisation of atomic energy, mentioned by Yockey, was presented by Quigley, a supporter of world government, as "the most important example of the Soviets' refusal to cooperate and their insistence on falling back into isolation...". [44].

The project to internationalise atomic energy was called the "Baruch Plan", after Bernard Baruch, a Zionist plutocrat and perennial adviser to American presidents, who headed a citizens' committee in conjunction with a State Department committee [45].

In his memoirs, Gromyko, who was a member of the UN Atomic Energy Commission at the time, said of Plan Baruch :

"The real intention was to be disguised by the creation of an international body responsible for monitor the use of atomic energy. However, Washington did not even try to hide the fact that it intended to take over this body, to keep in its own hands everything to do with the production and storage of fissile materials and, under the guise of international inspection, to interfere in the affairs of sovereign nations" [46].

Bertrand Russell, the famous pacifist who believed that the best way to establish world peace was to bomb the USSR before it became too powerful [47], remarked on the Baruch Plan:

"The American government... tried... to follow up some of the ideas that atomic scientists had suggested. In 1946, it presented to the world what is now known as the 'Baruch Plan'. Unfortunately, certain aspects of the Baruch Plan were deemed unacceptable by Russia, as was to be expected. It was Stalin's Russia, proud of its victory over the Germans, suspicious, not without reason, of the Western powers and aware that, at the United Nations, it could almost always be outvoted" [48].

Gromyko also recounts how the USSR torpedoed the UN's plan for world government. His testimony refutes another of the main right-wing conspiracy theories, namely that the UN was jointly created by the USA and the USSR, or at least that it was part of a "communist plot". The US wanted power in the UN to be vested in the General Assembly and decisions to be taken by majority vote. Such a system parliamentary vote would have allowed the United States to bribe member states to obtain the required number of votes, whatever the issue. On the other hand, the USSR insisted that the Security Council should have the final say and that every member of the Council should have the right of veto, which effectively meant that the UN could not function as the United States had intended. Gromyko writes on this subject: "The American position in fact made it possible to transform the UN into an instrument for imposing the will of one group on another, above all the Soviet Union, the only socialist member of the Council" [49].

This led to the Cold War. Yockey continues: "The Jewish leaders then tried to persuade Stalin's regime, through encirclement and the threat of the "Cold War", that it was futile to resist..." [50].

Because of its rejection of the atomic weapons ultimatum, Russia was now encountering opposition to its policy everywhere, in Austria, Germany, Korea and Finland. The same American publicists who had become so adept at explaining Russia's need for 'security' as it successively took over several countries, suddenly turned the accusation of 'aggressor' against it..."[51].

The Prague trials thus took on a different meaning, which Yockey explains as follows:

"The trials in Bohemia are neither the beginning nor the end of a historical process; they are simply an undeniable turning point. From now on, everyone must necessarily reorientate their policies in line with the undeniable evolution of the world situation. Burying our heads in the sand is suicide. The rhetoric of 'defence against Bolshevism' is a thing of the past, as is the expression absurd notion of 'defending Europe', at a time when every inch of European soil is dominated by Europe's mortal enemies, those who seek its political-cultural-historical extinction at any price" [52].

As Yockey perceptively discerned, the symbolic gesture that had been made to the internationalist power structure in Prague changed the world situation not only for the United States, but also for "those who believe in the destiny of Europe". This is why, whether they are thinkers or activists, they must now see the USSR not as a threat to Europe, but as an ally in the liberation of Europe.

"The same barbaric despotism known as the Russian Empire, presided over by the fat peasant Stalin - Jugashvili, who by his cunning rules over a khanate larger than all those founded by the mighty Genghis, is today the only obstacle to the domination of the whole earth by the instrument known as the United Nations. This vast Russian empire was created by the Judeo-American hatred of Europe-Germany. During the Second World War, in order to prevent Stalin and his Panslav nationalist-religious entourage from concluding peace with Europe-Germany, the Jewish-American leadership delivered to Russia unheard-of quantities of military equipment and lavished it with promises, gifts and political advantages like never before." [53]

Yockey convincingly explains the importance of the Prague trials:

"It is now possible to indicate the developments that were made inevitable by the clear break marked by the Prague trials.

"First and most importantly for those of us who believe in the Liberation of Europe and the Imperium of Europe: this is the beginning of the end of American hegemony over Europe...[54]

"It is obvious that the events that were extraordinary enough to force Stalin to reorientate his entire world policy and become openly anti-Jewish will have the same effect on the elite European [55] ...

"America cannot go back on the Prague trials any more than Russia can. There is no turning back now. They constitute a declaration of war by Russia against American Jewish leaders, whether or not the Russian press continues to wrap its denunciation of 'anti-Semitism' in vague explanations. In politics, what counts above all is not what you say, but what you do. The fact is that Russian leaders are killing Jews for betraying Russia, for collaboration with the Jewish entity. This cannot be denied, nor can it be changed. The European elite will be forced to acknowledge this fact and will govern accordingly. Russia has publicly designated before the world

its powerful enemy and thus put an end to any controversy over who is the real beneficiary of American hegemony in Europe [56].

"From now on, the European elite will be able to assert itself more and more in affairs and it will force the American Jewish leaders to hand back, step by step, custody of Europe's destiny to Europe, to its best forces, to its natural leaders. If the American Jewish leaders refuse, the new Europe's leaders will threaten them with the Russian bogeyman. By playing Russia off against the American Jewish rulers in this way, Europe can achieve its liberation, perhaps even before the Third Reich. world war. [57]

"For us in Europe, trials are welcome; they clarify things. The opponents have now defined themselves...

"It was stupid enough to ask Europe to fight for America. Is there a single European - a single one - who would respond to this call for war? Today, however, it is clearly, and unashamedly, the reason for this. to be part of the coalition against Russia, because Russia has designated its main enemy, its only enemy, and the panslavic, boorish and devious leaders of the Kremlin are not inclined to be frivolous when it comes to foreign policy.

"We repeat our message to Europe: no European should ever fight except for a sovereign Europe; no European should ever fight an enemy of Europe in the name of another enemy" [58].

Europe's enemy

From then on, Yockey's strategy was to present the Soviet occupation of Eastern Europe in terms of as a bulwark against the American military occupation of Western Europe, and in particular against the subjugation of the heartland of Europe, Germany. Yockey's message that Europe should maintain a neutralist stance during the Cold War and repudiate anti-Soviet rhetoric disguised as anti-communism and even patriotism, found an echo among veterans anti-Bolsheviks of the last war. As Yockey declared in The Prague Treason Trial, these veterans who had waged a bloody war against the USSR during the Second World War

were not prepared to fight the Russians on America's orders in order to keep Europe under American hegemony. He was right.

Yockey's main contacts in Europe were Major General Otto Remer and members of his Socialist Reich Party (SRP), founded in 1949 [59]. Yockey's main American collaborator was H. Keith Thomson, who had re-registered with the US State Department. as the American representative of the Reich Socialist Party [60].

In 1948, Yockey had written a number of chapters for Imperium. He did not include them "for personal reasons" [61]. However, in 1953, the manuscript was published in German and in Germany under the title *Der Feind Europas* [62]. His intention was apparently to publish *Der Feind* for the instruction of the leaders of the SRP [63], who had adopted a position of neutralist towards Russia. However, copies of the book were seized and destroyed by the German authorities [64].

The Enemy of Europe is a concise restatement of the main ideas of *Imperium*. However, Yockey revised the final chapters to bring them into line with his views on developments in the Soviet bloc at the time of the Prague trials [65]. While Yockey maintained his rather Hitlerian bias towards the Russians, whom he saw as lacking any sense of a higher mission or destiny, as culturally "external barbarians", politically he advocated a reorientation of the European liberators towards a pragmatic attitude towards the USSR.

Yockey repeated that the Russian occupation of Europe would be less harmful than the American occupation. He believed that superior Western culture would withstand American military occupation and that the

Russians would eventually succumb to a symbiotic relationship, allowing the standard-bearers of European culture to infiltrate the Soviet bloc at all levels, including the Kremlin itself.

Russia's occupation of Europe would not lead to Russification, but to the Europeanisation of Russia and a peaceful "new Europe-Russia symbiosis" [66].

For Yockey, the Russian occupation was also preferable to the American because it would lead to the elimination of the "traitor within", the class of politicians embodied by Churchill who, while part of the Western cultural heritage, acted against European interests on the orders of the Washington regime. Without the "traitor within", the narrow-minded statism that divided Europe would give way to European integration under the auspices of Russia [67].

As part of this realignment, Yockey recommended clandestine resistance to the occupation and, at the same time, a pro-Soviet campaign. Naturally, he ended up attracting the attention of various intelligence and police services.

Yockey appears to have adopted a pro-Russian orientation from the outset of his activities in Europe. A 1953 FBI report on him [68] indicates that, according to informants, as early as 1949, at the inaugural meeting of the EFL held privately in the London flat of Baroness von Pflugl, Yockey was "a very important figure in the European Union",

"Yockey immediately launched an attack on the Union Movement, which he described as an instrument of American policy. In German, which he spoke fluently, he began to make the following points praising German policy in Germany, with particular reference to the so-called army of Seydlitz and Paulus. Yockey asked for help in organising a West German secret group of partisans who would be prepared to collaborate with the Soviet military authorities to carry out actions against the Western occupying powers" [69].

The report goes on to say that Yockey spoke of Germany's orientation towards the East. He also spoke of his aim to create a newspaper with a wide circulation that would specialise in anti-establishment campaigns. American [70].

One of Yockey's main British collaborators, Guy Chesham, a former member of Mosley's Union Movement, defined a policy of infiltrating nationalist organisations with the aim of steering them towards a "violently anti-American" policy and distracting them "from any anti-Bolshevist conception". Chesham proposed setting up a force in England that would "act directly against American military bases" as well as an anti-American popular front, which could obtain funds from the Soviet embassy [71].

Yockey's last book, *The World in Flames* [72], published in 1961, the year of his death, reaffirmed his position on Russian and American attitudes towards Europe. In it, Yockey predicted a Third World War and observed that "the Russians are combative, because of the barbarous nature of their soldiers"; American soldiers "are worth absolutely nothing" [73]. For him, Russian policy was "stupid" in comparison with American or specifically "Zionist" policy, which he considered "malicious" [74].

Russia today and tomorrow

As much as Yockey got the details wrong, his perception of what Spengler called "the broad outlines of history" was correct. Yockey's main theories on realpolitik are therefore important today and in the near future as a method of historical and political analysis.

Yockey correctly saw that the USSR had changed direction since Trotsky's ouster. He correctly identified two "Bolshevisms" in the sense in which he understood the term, namely an attack on the Western cultural organism: the 'Bolshevism' of Moscow and the 'Bolshevism' of Washington and New York. He saw the militaristic 'Bolshevism' of the 'Russian barbarians' as less dangerous to the Western cultural organism in the long term than the 'cultural Bolshevism' of America.

This 'cultural Bolshevism' does exist in the true sense of the word in the United States, and can be identified more specifically today than in Yockey's day. As he clearly saw, Trotskyism-Bolshevism remained an important tactic of US foreign policy during the Cold War, with the aim of subverting the Soviet bloc. The Stalinists were right to describe Trotskyism as a tool of "international capital".

The specific organ for the propagation of "cultural Bolshevism" in the United States was the Congress for Cultural Freedom, founded mainly to (1) destabilise the Soviet Union and (2) rally non-Stalinist and anti-Stalinist leftists, including communists, to the American policy of "Cultural Freedom".

Such was the hatred Trotskyists felt for the USSR after their idol's second exile that they were prepared to sell out to any anti-Russian party. Founded in 1949, the Congress for Cultural Freedom grew out of Americans for Cultural Freedom, which was founded in the 1930s by Professor Sidney Hook, a leading American Trotskyite who continued to describe himself as a "Menshevik". It also included the Fabian pedagogue John Dewey. Other prominent members of the movement included Menshevik Sol Levitas, co-editor with Hook of *The New Leader* and a former collaborator of Trotsky and Bukharin; and the European correspondent of *The New Leader*, Melvin Lasky, another seasoned American Trotskyist, who became a leading figure in Congress and in the magazines *Partisan Review* and *Encounter* [75].

It was from these Trotskyist circles linked to the CIA that what are now known as the neo-conservatives were born during the Cold War, a movement that is neither "new" nor "conservative"[76].

Thus, as Yockey understood, the policy of the Washington regime is that of Trotskyite Bolshevism. This is as true today as it was in Yockey's day. At a time when Russia, once again a superpower, is once again confronted with the global hegemony of the United States after the brief Yeltsin's liberal-democratic-oligarchic parenthesis, the Washington regime is continuing to export the This is a "permanent world revolution" through a totally Trotskyist policy, even if it is carried out under the guise of "conservatism".

In the upper echelons of American foreign policy, this strategy finds expression in a neo-Trotskyist "world revolution". For example, Major Ralph Peters wrote an article entitled "Constant Conflict", which bears a striking resemblance to Trotsky's "permanent revolution". Peters, an adviser to the US administration on future war tactics, declares that "cultural and economic struggles will be more sustained and will end up being more decisive.... We are creating a new American century, in which Americans will become even richer, more culturally dangerous and increasingly powerful". He describes democracy as the "liberal version of imperialism", "Hollywood is going where Harvard has never gone". The traditional elites are shrinking and are replaced by "figures such as Bill Gates, Steven Spielberg, Madonna... Contemporary American culture is the most powerful in history and the most destructive of competing cultures... The addicts of our cultural empire - men and women everywhere - want more. And they pay for the privilege of being disillusioned... American culture is criticised for its impermanence, its 'disposable' products. But therein lies its strength. American culture, for example, is not based on any traditional ideals, so it never comes to an end, but is constantly evolving. Our military power has a cultural foundation.... American culture is contagious, an epidemic of pleasure... Hollywood prepares the battlefield and the hamburgers precede the bullets. The flag follows the trade. What could be more threatening to traditional cultures [77]?

Peters frankly presents as a tactical strategy precisely what Yockey called in the late 1940s the 'ethical syphilis' of Hollywood and the 'spiritual leprosy' of New York.

Similarly, a leading neo-conservative ideologue and political analyst, Michael Ledeen, writes that America is "the only truly revolutionary country in the world, and we have been for over 200 years. Creative destruction is our middle name". Ledeen asserts that the United States "led a global democratic revolution that toppled tyrants from Moscow to Johannesburg... We destroyed the Soviet empire, then gave up our great triumph in the third world war of the twentieth century" [78].

The Western Imperium that Yockey predicted would be the ultimate destiny of Western civilisation did not emerge as Yockey had envisaged, but through the tactics described by Ledeen and Peters, and it is the empire of the dollar.

It is remarkable that, in Ledeen's eyes, the Cold War was in fact the "Third War" of the twentieth century". Yockey wrote about the approach of a third world war between Russia and America. Yet this war took a form that was not that of real war. he had predicted. In retrospect, it seems that the Yockeyians of the time underestimated the power of "cultural distortion". Just look at George's global network Soros and all his subversive ventures, from 'colour revolutions' in the former Soviet bloc and elsewhere to feminism and the liberalisation of marijuana. Soros is now considered by Yockey to be the epitome of a 'culture distorter'.

Yockey was right, however, to regard the tenacious religious and peasant soul (which he described as "barbaric" and "primitive") of the Russian as virile and ultimately capable of repelling this global spiritual and cultural contagion. Russia has yet to fulfil a historic mission that could liberate the Western cultural organism and create this new "symbiosis between Russia and the West". Europe' (and those more distant 'cultural colonies') that Yockey predicted, provided that the The "West" recognises that the Russian People-Culture-Nation-State is in no way inferior to it.

Kerry R. Bolton, "Francis Parker Yockey: Stalin's Fascist Advocate", *International Journal of Russian Studies*, vol. 3/2, July 2010, pp. 9-35, translated from English by B. K. (*)

Bibliography

Ivor Benson, *This Worldwide Conspiracy*, Victoria, The New Times Ltd, 1972.

K. R. Bolton, *Origins & Varieties of Fascism*, Renaissance Press, 1997.

K. R., Bolton, *Varange: The Life & Thoughts of Francis Parker Yockey*, Paraparamu, 1998.

K. R. Bolton, *America, Russia and the New World Order, Origins of the Cold War & How Stalin Stymied a World State*, Paraparamu, Renaissance Press, 2002.

K. R. Bolton, *Israel Reconsidered: Should Conservatives Support Zionism*, Paraparaumu, Renaissance Press, 2002.

K. R. Bolton, *America's Revolutionary Mission Against the West*, Renaissance Press, Paraparaumu, 2004.

K. R., Bolton, *Trotskyism, Tool of Big Business*, Paraparaumu, Spectrum Press, 2004.

K. R., Bolton, *Was Stalin Jewish?* Paraparaumu Beach, Renaissance Press, 2008.

A. K. Chesterton, *The New Unhappy Lords*, Hampshire, Candour Publishing, 1975.

Winston Churchill, *Zionism versus Bolshevism: A Struggle for the Soul of the Jewish People*, Illustrated Sunday Herald, 8 February 1920.

R. W. Clark, *The Life of Bertrand Russell*, London, Jonathan Cape, 1975.

K. Coogan, *Dreamer of the Day, Francis Parker Yockey and the Postwar Fascist International*, New York, Automedia, 1999.

Louis McFadden, Washington, *The Congressional Record*, House pages, 1934.

Dennis Fahey (Father), *The Rulers of Russia and the Russian Farmers*, Tipperary, Maria Regina series, n°. 7. Thurles: Co. 1948.

FBI Memorandum, 100-25647, Passport and Visa Matters, 24 November 1953.

A. Gannon, *Frontfighter #10*, London, February-March 1951.

A. Gromyko, *Memories*, Hutchison, London, 1989.

M. Ledeen, *Creative Destruction*, National Review, 20 September 2001.

P. Lendvai, *Anti-Semitism in Eastern Europe*, London, MacDonald, 1972.

R. Peters, *Constant Conflict, Parameters*, US Army War College Quarterly, Summer 1997.

Leo XIII, *Rerum Novarum: Rights and Duties of Capital and Labour*, 1891.

Pius XI, *Quadragesimo Anno*, 1930.

C. Quigley, *Tragedy & Hope: The History of the World In Our Time*, New York, The MacMillan Co, 1962.

B. Russell, *Has Man a Future?* 1961, Penguin Books.

Frances Stonor Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War*, New York, The New York Press, 1999

W. Cleon Skousen, *The Naked Capitalist*, Utah, self-published, 1971.

Oswald Spengler, *The Hour of Decision (1934)*, New York, Alfred A Knopf, 1962.

Oswald Spengler, *The Decline of the West* (1918), London, George Allen & Unwin 1971.

F. P. Yockey, *Tragedy of Youth*, (in *Yockey: Four Essays*, New Jersey, Nordland Press, 1971), *Social Justice*, April 21, 1939.

F. P. Yockey, *Proclamation of London of the European Liberation Front*, London, Westropa Press, 1949.

F. P. Yockey, *Prague Treason Trial*, What is behind the hanging of eleven Jews in Prague (in *Yockey: Four Essays*, New Jersey, Nordland Press, 1971) 1952.

F. P. Yockey and H Keith Thompson, *The World In Flames*, An Estimate of the World Situation, (in *Yockey: Four Essays*, New Jersey, Nordland Press, 1971), 1961.

F. P. Yockey, *Imperium*, (1948), Noontide Press, 1969.

F. P. Yockey, *Yockey: Four Essays*, New Jersey, Nordland Press, 1971.

F. P. Yockey and Revilo P. Oliver, *The Enemy of Europe* (Yockey), *The Enemy of My Enemies* Revilo P Oliver, West Virginia, Liberty Bell Publications, 1981.

Notes

[1] Coogan, 1999, p. 92.

[2] Papal encyclicals in particular: Leo XIII, 1891; Pius XI, 1930.

[3] For example, General O'Duffy's Irish Blue Shirts, Father Coughlin's National Union for Social Justice in the United States and Dollfuss's regime in Austria, among many others, are all examples of this. were directly inspired by Catholic social doctrine.

[4] In 1930, Coughlin made his first attack on the representatives of "finance capitalism" on his CBS programme, which was watched by 40 million people. Bolton, USA: Coughlin & Social Justice, Renaissance Press, 1997, p. 110-2.

[5] Coughlin launched a weekly newspaper in 1936; it had 900,000 subscribers. Bolton, 1997, p. 111.

[6] Coogan, 1999, p. 55.

[7] *Ibid*, p. 92.

[8] Yockey, 1939.

[9] Even high-level diplomatic and military intelligence agencies reported the involvement of Jews in Bolshevism, an involvement to which most influential circles in the European Union did not subscribe.

the Catholic Church believed. For example, the eminent Catholic theologian Father Dennis Fahey, *The Rulers of Russia and the Russian Farmers*, 1948.

[10] For biographical details, see Coogan, *op. cit.* and Bolton, 1998.

[11] Spengler, 1971. The masterpiece of this conservative German philosopher-historian - the is *The Decline of the West*, in which he sets out a morphology of history based on the idea of the organic and cyclical growth and decline of cultures.

[12] Yockey, *Imperium*, *Cultural Vitalism: (a) Culture Health; (b) Culture Pathology*, 1969, pp. 245-416.

[13] Yockey, *Imperium*, 1969, p. 612-9.

[14] For example, an excellent writer and journalist, Ivor Benson, a former information adviser to the Rhodesian government under Ian Smith, argued that the discord between Zionism and the USSR was little more than a family feud, a continuation of the family discord, referred to by Chaim Weizmann et al. Benson, 1972, pp. 92-9, between Zionism and the Bolshevism, which vied for the allegiance of Eastern Jews. Interestingly, the title of his book, *This Worldwide Conspiracy*, is a paraphrase of Winston Churchill's article *Zionism versus Bolshevism*, 1920. It is also worth noting that Benson seems to have included *Imperium* in the list of recommended reading that he included in his books, although he does not seem to have adopted Yockey's views on Russia. Another fine writer, A K Chesterton (1975, p. 246), was that "since 1917, the polarity between the United States and the Soviet Union has been fictitious...". The point of view of Chesterton, a staunch British imperialist, is understandable, given that the British and European colonial interests were being attacked and undermined by both the USA and the USSR, who were seeking to fill the vacuum.

[15] Spengler, 1971. Spengler used the seasons to describe the cycles of cultural birth (spring), cultural flowering (summer), cultural and civilisational maturity (autumn), and civilisational decline and death (winter). In the last cycle of a civilisation, where the money ethic dominates, a Caesarian figure emerges as a reaction to restore the earlier sense of grandeur. Spengler saw this future "Caesarism" as the "destiny" of the West (see in particular the last pages of Spengler, *op. cit.*, 1971, pp. 506-7). Although his relations with the Hitlerites were far from friendly, he saw in Italian fascism the nascent Caesarism he had predicted (see Spengler, *The Hour of Decision*, 1962, p. 230).

[16] Yockey, *op. cit.* *The Twentieth Century Historical Outlook*, 1969, pp. 3-110.

[17] Spengler, 1962, p. 492: "There is no proletarian or even communist movement which, without the idealists among its leaders being in some way aware of it, does not act in the interests of In the direction the money wants and for the duration the money wants.

[18] Yockey, *Russia*, 1969, p. 579-80.

[19] In Imperium, Yockey sets out his morphological theories of cultural distortion and parasitism, according to which elements foreign to a culture have a pathological effect on that culture.

[20] Yockey, 1969, p. 579-80.

[21] Ibid, p. 582.

[22] Ibid, p. 586.

[23] For Yockey's 'racial' concepts, see Imperium, Cultural Vitalism, (A) Cultural Health, 245-354. Yockey, contrary to the ideologists of National Socialist racism [see, for a refutation of this received idea, <https://elementsdeducationraciale.wordpress.com/2015/12/02/apercu-sur-le-racism-national-socialism/> and the expanded version of this study in Julius Evola, Synthesis of the Doctrine of Race, Cariou Publishing, 2021, Appendix 1: On National-Socialist Racism, pp. 243-70,) saw biological racism as a nineteenth-century materialist idea allied to Darwinism. Yockey's conception of 'race' is a synthesis of the spiritual and the cultural, shaped by landscape and historical circumstances. It is similar to Spengler's Decline, op. cit.

[24] Coogan, op. cit. pp. 169-72. The ELF made scathing attacks on Mosley himself in an article in the ELF newsletter entitled "'Fuhrer' in Search of a Following!!!" (Gannon A., Frontfighter #10, February-March 1951).

[25] The Frontfighter issue of 7 November 1950 refers (p. 3) to meetings in the market places of the main towns in the North of England and the North Midlands since April. The editor, Thomas Davies, as director of propaganda, said the meetings had been very successful and, with the onset of winter, had been held indoors.

[26] Yockey, III. The Mission of the Liberation Front, 1949, p. 28.

[27] Ibid.

[28] Ibid.

[29] Ibid.

[30] Ibid, p. 29.

[31] What the Front is fighting for, item 5, Frontfighter, n° 23, April 1952.

[32] Yockey, 1949, p. 30 [Yockey adds: "The fact is that only American intervention in the Second World War prevented Europe from completely destroying Bolshevik Russia as a political unit. The current Russian Empire is therefore a creation of America. Never in the 500 years of Russian history has Russia been able to make its way unaided into Europe. It only invaded Prussia against the great Frederick with the help of France, Austria and Sweden. It invaded France in 1814 and 1815 only with the help of England, Austria and Prussia. It only

invaded Europe in 1945 only with America's help. Russia is only a threat to a divided Europe; a united Europe can destroy Russia's power when it decides to do so. It is a gross lie to say that Europe cannot defend itself against Russia. Do we believe that Europe

Can Europe forget the knowledge it has just bought with the blood of millions of its sons? Do we think that Europe can forget that the Judeo-American regime and it alone brought the Red Armies to the heart of Europe? Can Europe forget that the enemy within, with its liberal-communist democracy, led Europe into this abyss? Europe remembers and knows that democracy

Liberalism is the creature of the abyss, the spirit of negation seeking an ever deeper abyss.

This creature has destroyed a world empire and now it is asking for Europe's trust to lead a new crusade". N.D.T]. [There seems to be an "intruder" in this list. Paul- Henri Spaak (1899 - 1972) was a Belgian politician who is regarded as one of the Founding Fathers of Europe, but, unless we are mistaken, no politician at the time was called Lie. So Yockey personified the lie. He left us this strikingly true portrait of de Gaulle: "De Gaulle is not a great man, but if he is able to obtain the independence of France, he will find himself...".

immediately the spiritual leader of the whole of Europe, small as he is. De Gaulle is a moron, but people will follow even a moron if he embodies their deepest, most natural and instinctive feelings. De Gaulle's driving force is immeasurable vanity. Even Churchill, the embodiment of the idea of Vanity itself, was content to be a leading Zionist executive with a large office. But De Gaulle wants more: he wants to be the equal of the masters who created him and inflated him like a balloon. Thanks to the spiritual force on which he accidentally landed - the desire universal European neutrality - it may even succeed. An idiot could save Europe. History has seen such strange things', *The Tragedy of Youth, Social Justice*, 21 August 1939; reprinted in *Four Essays, Union*, NJ, Atlantis Archives, 1972, 1-2. N.D.T]

[33] Yockey, Prague Treason Trial, originally published as What is behind the hanging of eleven Jews in Prague? According to 'DTK' in the preface to Yockey: *Four Essays*, Yockey's supporters in the US circulated the manuscript as a mimeographed 'press release' dated 20 December 1952. EDITOR'S NOTE]

[34] Ibid, p. 1.

[35] Lendvai, 1972, p. 243-5.

[36] Ibid, pp. 260-97.

[37] Yockey, 1952, p. 1.

[38] On the context of early relations between the USSR and Israel and the pro-Soviet orientation of the Zionist leadership, see Bolton, *Israel Reconsidered*, 2002.

[39] See note 14 above.

[40] Yockey, 1952, p. 1.

[41] Ibid, p. 1-2.

[42] Ibid, p. 2.

[43] See, for example, W Cleon Skousen's review of Quigley's book, 1971.

[44] Quigley, 1962, p. 893.

[45] Ibid, p. 895.

[46] Gromyko, 1989.

[47] Clark, 1975.

[48] Russell B., 1961.

[49] Ibid. On the context in which the Baruch Plan was drawn up and the American proposal for a world government under the aegis of the UN, see Bolton, *America, Russia and the New World Order*, 2002.

[50] Yockey, 1952, p. 1.

[51] Ibid, p. 2.

[52] Ibid, p. 3.

[53] Ibid, p. 5.

[54] Ibid, p. 6.

[55] Ibid. One of the common assertions of the 'anti-Semites' of the 1930s was that Stalin was a Jew and that he worked for the domination of the Jews as much as his fallen rival Trotsky, albeit by different methods. For example, Congressman McFadden told Congress in 1934 that Stalin was a Georgian Jew. According to the most common interpretation, Stalin's name, Djougachvili, means "son of a Jew", because in Georgian, "Dzu" or "Ju" means "Jew". Stalin's great-grandson, Jacob Djougachvili, wrote to me in 2008 about this name: "'Jews' is Georgian for 'Ebraeli', so the theory that it means 'son of a Jew' is simply wrong. [see <https://elementsdeducationraciale.wordpress.com/2014/10/30/staline-et-la-question-juive/>, note 3]

[56] Ibid, p. 6-7.

[57] Ibid. p. 7-8.

[58] Ibid, p. 8-9.

[59] T. Francis, Appendix I, A note on Yockey's Career, *The Enemy of Europe (Yockey), The Enemy of My Enemies Yockey*, 1981.

[60] Ibid, p. 135.

[61] Yockey, Introductory Note, *The Enemy of Europe*, *ibid*, p. 1.

[62] Coogan, 1999, p. 399-400.

[63] T. Francis, *op. cit.* p. 135.

[64] *Ibid*. A few copies were sent to the United States and an English edition was published in 1981 by Liberty Bell Publications.

[65] Yockey, Introductory Note, *op. cit.* p. 2.

[66] Yockey, *op. cit.* p. 83.

[67] *Ibid*, p. 84.

[68] FBI memorandum, 1953.

[69] *Ibid*, p. 6.

[70] *Ibid*, p. 7.

[71] *Ibid*, pp. 7-8.

[72] Yockey, Thomson, *The World In Flames, An Estimate of the World Situation*. According to the introduction to *Yockey: Four Essays*, in which *The World in Flames* was published, very few copies were distributed in February 1961. H. Keith Thompson, with whom Yockey had written it, told us that he himself had written in particular the passages praising the neutralist regimes of the Third World. I was in communication with Thompson in the years before his death. In one of the In his first letters to me, he lamented the state of the world since the demise of the USSR.

[73] Yockey, Thomson, 3, IV, 1961.

This cultural distortion, confronted by a tough, Spartan people, was brought about by the proxy war that the two countries fought in Vietnam.

[74] *Ibid*, VII, 1961, p. 6.

[75] Saunders, 1999. This article examines the links between the anti-Russian left and the United States, including the CIA, during the Cold War. See, on Trotskyist connections with international finance and the US. Bolton, 2004.

[76] Bolton, *ibid*, *Trotskyism, Origins of Neo-Cons*, 2004, p. 13-7. [four arguments are formulated in support of the thesis of the Trotskyist origins of American neo-conservatism: "The first is that the the genesis or 'roots' of neoconservatism are to be found in the American Trotskyist movement and, more specifically, that the first generation of neoconservatives were former Trotskyists. In this version, particular attention is paid to Irving Kristol, who is pilloried as the fifth column of Trotskyist influence within conservatism. The second is that members of the second generation of neoconservatives, i.e. the current generation,

were once followers of the heretical Trotskyite Max Shachtman. Through them, the neoconservatism would have retained some of the main principles, albeit in a modified form, of 'Shachtmanism'. Thirdly, neoconservatism is said to have retained the 'methods' and the 'principles' of 'Shachtmanism'.

The last argument, which is perhaps the best known, is that Trotskyism has 'characteristics' of Trotskyism, particularly those of the early neo-conservatives, and is therefore a form of 'inverted' Trotskyism. The final argument, perhaps the best known, is that the neoconservatives adhere to Leon Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution and have put this theory into practice through their role in the Bush administration" (William F. King, 'Neconservatives and 'Trotskyism'', *American Communist History*, vol. 3, n° 2, 2004, p. 250, which intends to refute the thesis that American neo-conservatism has its roots in Trotskyism and reminds us that this accusation was made against the "neo-cons" by the paleo-conservatives. conservatives in the early 1990s. Here is his conclusion: "Only four of the first neoconservatives were Trotskyists. The small minority of neoconservatives involved in the movement passed through it briefly and marginally in their late teens. No substantial influence from this period remains, apart from an opposition to Marxism and Trotskyism and indeed to socialism in all its forms.

2. None of the second-generation neoconservatives have ever been 'Shachtmanites'. A small number of today's neo-conservatives were leaders, along with Max Shachtman, of the right wing of the Socialist Party in the late 1960s. However, none of the future neoconservatives ever adhered to the quasi-trotskyism that characterised historic 'Shachtmanism' before 1958.

3. The assertion that neoconservatism is an 'inverted Trotskyism' is based on the following assumptions: excessively abstract methodology. By focusing on elements of Trotskyism that are not central or definitive, it empties the term of its meaning. Such an approach is ultimately false and misleading, as it implies that there is a link between neo-conservatism and Trotskyism that cannot be demonstrated by historical evidence.

4. The accusation that the neoconservatives adhere to and implement the theory of the Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution is based either on a misreading or on a pure and simple ignorance of Trotsky's theory. In attempting to establish a link between permanent revolution and the neo-conservative theory of democratic globalism, the accusation distorts both theories.

Whichever version of the statement one focuses on, it is clear that there is no substantial link between neoconservatism and American Trotskyism' (pp. 265-6); [see, for a opposing argument, Kerry R. Bolton, America's 'World Revolution': Neo-Trotskyist Foundations of U.S. Foreign Policy, May 3, 2010, <https://www.foreignpolicyjournal.com/2010/05/03/americas-world-revolution-neo-trotskyist-foundations-of-u-s-foreign-policy>. EDITOR'S NOTE]

[77] Peters, 1997. Peters was at the time assigned to the office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence.

[78] Ledeen, 2001. Ledeen is a resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute and has held a number of senior positions at the Institute. many high-level government and academic posts. The Peters and Ledeen essays

as well as commentary and analysis were reprinted in Bolton, *America's Revolutionary Mission Against the West*, 2004.

(*) Kerry Bolton is a New Zealand author and political activist. He was a member of the New Zealand Democratic Nationalist Party from 1976 to 1991, belonged to the New Zealand National Front (NZNF) in the 1980s ("Nazis, Zap And Trim Out", *The New Zealand Herald*. 20 June 1983. p. 2) and the Temple of Set, founded the Order of the New Zealand National Front (NZNF Left Hand Path (OLHP) in 1990 following disagreements with other members (Gavin Baddeley, Paul Woods [eds] *Lucifer Rising: A Book of Sin, Devil Worship and Rock 'n' Roll*. Plexus Publishing, 2000, p. 221), a study group founded on the ideas of Nietzsche, Jung and Spengler and renamed two years later *Ordo Sinistra Vivendi* (Jeffrey Kaplan and

Leonard Weinberg, *The emergence of a Euro-American radical right*. New Jersey, Rutgers University Press. 1998, p. 143), before founding the Black Order in 1994, which, according to Goodrick-Clarke (*Black Sun:*

Aryan Cults, Esoteric Nazism, and the Politics of Identity. New York: New York University Press, 2003, p. 227), "claimed to be a worldwide network of national lodges in Britain, France, Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States.

Italy, Finland, Sweden, Germany, the United States and Australia, dedicated to promoting National Socialism, Fascism, Satanism, Paganism and other aspects of the European Darkside.

Its quarterly newsletter, *The Flaming Sword*, which has been succeeded by the fanzine *The Nexus*, has published interviews with James Mason, Charles Manson, George Eric Hawthorne, Varg Vikernes, the Austrian musician Kadmon, David Myatt and Miguel Serrano, articles on Thulianism, the "Theological" and the "Theological", among others.

Wewelsburg, studies on Julius Evola, Savitri Devi and Ezra Pound, tributes to former SS leaders, as well as 'a reprint of the Order of the Nine Angels' Mass of Heresy [and] contributions by David Myatt on galactic empire, eonic strategy and the cosmological magic of National Socialism' (Goodrick-Clarke, op. cit., pp. 227-8).

227), "[t]he Black Order is conceived not merely as a study group or a publishing house, but as a militant front aimed at mobilising music and political groups to accomplish the 'Wyrld of our Civilisation and the Post-Western Aeon'". "In keeping with Bolton's growing interest in Francis Parker Yockey as a 'Third Way' theorist, [The Nexus] recognised communist revolutionaries Mao-Tse-Tung and Che Guevara as allies against the 'Third Way'.

globalist capitalism of "American plutocratic global hegemony". In his search for allies on the left and the right in his fight against the "New World Order", Bolton thus marks his

affinity with the new 'national socialist' or red-brown alliances of post-communist Russia and groups such as Bouchet's *Nouvelle Résistance* and Troy's *National Revolutionary Faction*

Southgate in England. Bolton also celebrates Stalin as a strong nationalist leader [...] [he] claims that Stalin destroyed the old Bolshevik revolutionary elites by labelling them 'Zionists' and 'agents of international capitalism'. In his search for rebels to the "new order

Bolton praises developing nations such as India and Malaysia for rejecting free trade policies in exchange for loans from the International Monetary Fund.

The Western intervention in Kosovo is condemned as an attempt by the 'new world order' to subjugate a sovereign nation seeking to maintain its ethnic homogeneity against globalisation and multiracialism" (ibid., p. 230). In 1996, shortly after publishing *Dietrich Eckart:*

Hitler's Occult Mentor (Renaissance Press, 1995) and Lovecraft's Fascism: The Political Views of H. P. Lovecraft (Renaissance Press, 1995), Bolton founded The Thelemic Society, an attempt to merge the teachings of the occultist Aleister Crowley with the philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche in a right-wing political line. "It is now vital for Thelemites to declare our holy war against the remnants of the Old Aeon; to pave the way for the New Aeon, That of Force and Fire, of the Child Crowned and Conqueror", it says in the group's manifesto (*ibid.*, p. 228).

At the same time Aleister Crowley and the Conservative Revolution (1996) and The Warrior Mage (1996). In 1997 he co-founded the New Zealand Fascist Union (Mattias Gardell, *Gods of the Blood: The Pagan Revival and White Separatism*, Durham and London, Duke University Press, 2003, p. 294). In 2004, he was secretary of the New Zealand National Front (Tony Wall, "A picture of white supremacy", *Sunday Star - Times*, Wellington, New Zealand, 9 May 2004, p. A.11) and spokesman for New Right ("Hate posters in New Zealand". *Papua - New Guinea Post - Courier*. Port Moresby. 15 December 2005. p. 9). Since 2021, he has been a regular participant in the online activities and meetings of Action Zealandia ("Action Zealandia, NZ's largest neo-Nazi group, on the hunt for new recruits". *NZ Herald*, 8 August 2021). In recent years he has been published in various journals (*The Foreign Policy Journal*, *International Journal of Social Economics*, *Geopolitika*, *India Quarterly*, *Irish Journal of Gothic and Horror Studies*, etc.) and on their websites. Together with the Greek historian Dimitris Michalopoulos, he is co-editor of the journal *Ab Aeterno*, which was founded in 2010 and counts Tomoslav Sunic and Alexander Dugin among its contributors. In addition to those mentioned above, his main books are, by category: *Origins & Varieties of Fascism: A Pictorial History* (Renaissance Press, 1997), *Thinkers of the Right: Fascism, Nationalism & Elitism Amongst the Literati* (Luton Publications, 2002), *Portraits & Principles of World Fascism* (Renaissance Press, 2003), *Nazism?: An Answer to the Smear-Mongers* (Renaissance Press, 2005), *Revolution from Above* (Arktos Media, 2011) ; *Perón and Perónism* (Black House Publishing, 2014), *Zionism, Islam and the West* (Black House Publishing, 2015) ; *Rudolf Steiner & the Mystique of Blood & Soil* (Renaissance Press, 1999), *Otto Strasser's 'New Europe'* (Renaissance Press, 2011), *Stalin: The Enduring Legacy* (Black House Publishing, 2012), *Yockey: A Fascist Odyssey* (Arktos Media, 2018) ; *Religion, Mysticism and the Myth of the "Occult Reich"* (*Inconvenient History*, 2015), *The Occult and Subversive Movements: Tradition & Counter-Tradition in the Struggle for World Power* (Black House Publishing, 2017) ; *The Holocaust Myth: A Sceptical Enquiry* (Spectrum, 2000), ; *The Kosher Connection: Drugs, Israel, Gangsters & Zionism* (Renaissance Press, 2002), *Mel Gibson & the Pharisees* (Renaissance Press, 2003), *The Banking Swindle* (Black House Publishing, 2013), *Opposing the Money Lenders: The Struggle to Abolish Interest Slavery* (Black House Publishing, 2016) ; *Geopolitics of the Indo-Pacific* (Black House Publishing, 2013) , *The Psychotic Left: From Jacobin France to the Occupy Movement* (Black House Publishing, 2013) ; *The Decline and Fall of Civilisations* (Black House Publishing, 2017) ; *The Perversion of Normality: From the Marquis de Sade to Cyborgs* (Arktos Media Ltd, 2021) ; *Yockey and Russia: Francis Parker Yockey: The USSR's American Rightist Advocate* (Renaissance Press, 2009; Francis Parker Yockey and Russia, *Ars Magna*, 2010), of which the present article - to be followed shortly by a translation of Bolton's introduction to his forthcoming edition of *The Enemy of Europe* - is a first draft, and *Russia and the Fight Against Globalisation* (Black House Publishing, 2018).

The Enemy of Europe (Introduction)

We publish below, as a complement to <https://elementsdeducationraciale.wordpress.com/2022/03/20/yockey-et-la-russie/>, the introduction to Kerry Bolton's new edition of *The Enemy of Europe* (Centennial Edition Publishing, 2022), for its ability to put Yockey's thesis into context by recounting little-known or virtually forgotten episodes in the political vicissitudes of post-war Germany. We will then attempt to review and evaluate Yockey's thesis, as presented and defended by Bolton in the two essays we have published by him. This critical study is in three parts, the first of which is published below.

The Second World War ended with Europe under the domination of two non-European powers: the United States and Soviet Russia. Most of the extreme right in the post-war period saw America as the lesser of two evils and sided with Washington in the Cold War, which had just broken out. In *The Enemy of Europe*, Francis Parker Yockey rejects this consensus and argues that Europe's identity and destiny are far more threatened by American domination than by Russian domination.

L'Ennemi de l'Europe (1948) was conceived as the third volume of *Imperium*. In 1952, he revised his writings on Russia in the light of the Prague trials, which he analysed in the essay he published that year, "What is Behind the Hanging of the Eleven Jews in Prague? [1] For Yockey, it was clear that with the Prague trials, in which eleven of the fourteen defendants were Jews, the Soviet bloc had attacked Jewish interests [2].

Yockey argued that the USA was more Jewish-dominated and more implacably hostile to Europe than the USSR. It was therefore futile for Europeans to hope that the war and woof regime in the United States would work. tion in Washington be overturned. According to Yockey, it was even unthinkable that a "nationalist revolt" in the United States. From 1951 at least, Yockey sought to convince the "European elite" that only America was Europe's enemy. He said: "Let's not attack ghosts, let's attack the real enemy of Europe: America" [3].

Yockey's views were very poorly understood by the Right, which could only see Russia as a n existential enemy. Even Sir Oswald Mosley failed to understand the new situation. He saw the United States as a lesser evil, necessary to protect Western Europe from the ultimate horror of a Soviet invasion. Otto Strasser, on the other hand, took a different view.

The view taken by Strasser was similar to that taken by Yockey, but it is not known whether he was influenced by the latter's thinking. If Europe does not interfere", wrote Strasser, "Europe can and will face up to any interference".
threat from Russia - or from ailleurs" [4].

Yockey published *The Enemy of Europe* in Germany in 1953. Simultaneously, he published an ordered translation, *Der Feind Europas*, in two hundred copies, which he intended to distribute to the leaders of the Reich Socialist Party (RSP) and other leading German nationalists.

The Reich Socialist Party (PSR) was founded in 1949. The party won two seats in the Bundestag after two MPs left their party to join its ranks. Major General Otto Remer, the party's deputy leader, was its most energetic supporter. He was soon banished from Schleswig-Holstein and North Rhine-Westphalia, the strongholds of the PSR. The American occupation authorities noted the PSR's opposition to Western influence and its support for a united Germany within a united Europe.
United Europe. In 1950, members of the PSR were excused from public office because the US State Department feared that the party would democratically seize power. PSR meetings were violently broken up by the police and the pro-PSR newspaper *Reichszeitung* was banned.

Remer emphasised his denunciation of the American occupation and Western influence, while refraining from condemning the USSR and the Soviet-occupied German Democratic Republic (GDR). The US State Department took note and commented: "The party is suspected of being prepared to make an important compromise with Russia in order to unify Germany [5]".

When the United States opted for a policy of integrating Germany into the European Union system, it did so with the support of the European Union.

Remer launched a campaign under the slogan "Ohne mich!" ("Don't count on me!"), which immediately provoked a reaction from war veterans who were unhappy with the difficult situation they were experiencing in the Western zone. Remer's campaign was supported in all layers of society are demanding, much to the consternation of the government and the media who published sensationalist articles on a "Nazi-communist alliance" [6].

Remer went beyond his "neutralist" position and decided that, in the event of war, the Allemands would not be able to take part in the war.
should not cover the retreat of the American army, if the Russians pushed it back. He stated that he would "show the Russians the way to the Rhine", and that the members of the PSR, "stationed as traffic wardens would spread their arms so that the Russians could find their way through Germany as quickly as possible" [7]. On 23 October 1952, the PSR was banned after winning sixteen seats in the Lower Saxony state parliament and eight seats in the Bremen parliament.

In the United States, where [New York business executive and friend of Yockey] H. Keith Thompson, with Yockey's help, [8] campaigned for Remer and the legal rights of the PSR, the FBI was interested in rumours about the German nationalist Frederick Weiss's dealings with Soviet agents and right-wingers in Germany. Weiss told the FBI that Yockey had left the United States for Germany in January 1953 and that he believed Yockey had travelled to Germany to have *The Enemy of Europe* translated into German [9]. To his In turn, the German secret service, K-16, seized and destroyed all copies of *The Enemy of Europe*. No copies of the original English edition have survived, and only a few copies of the requested edition were distributed. The current English edition is a translation of the German edition.

Yockey considered that the Asiatic horde of the eastern steppes had not been able to occupy half of Europe. Russia's world mission was destructive. In fact, his vision of Russia in *Imperium* reflects an atavistic anti-Slavism and is even reminiscent of the calls for the conquest of a *Lebensraum* in the East that had been voiced since the end of the nineteenth century. He also felt that the United States, as the bearer of the pathology of Culture, had rotted the organism of Culture spiritually, morally and culturally. Russian hegemony was only superficial and could be overthrown or subverted. American hegemony, on the other hand, was a cancer and had to be destroyed. Yockey's view of Russia was pragmatic and in keeping with the tradition of *Realpolitik* of the allemand elite of previous centuries. As a Spenglerian, Yockey was well aware of the prediction that the German philosopher had made in 1922 - the year of the Treaty of Rapallo - that Russia would soon eliminate Marxism as an import and return to its old ways. and that, from then on, Germany, because of its commercial, military and political interests, would be in a position to conciliate an alliance with Russia against Versailles and the Entente powers [10].

American-Jewish Bolshevism versus Russian Bolshevism

Like Spengler, Yockey saw the Russian as a 'barbarian', but not in a pejorative sense. He meant a "young" race that retained the vigour of adolescence. "The barbarian is rough and hard... he is neither egalitarian nor intellectualised. He is the opposite of the decadent. He is ruthless and does not shrink from the destruction of what others hold in high esteem", writes Yockey in *Der Feind*. Yockey asserted that Bolshevism, imported from the West to Russia largely by Jews, had been modified on the Russian steppes. On the other hand, Americans were at the same time culturally primitive because of their indifference to Europe, and "overcivilised" because of their concern for the environment. "Peace, comfort and security". This apparent paradox shows that Yockey's thinking was deeply influenced by German historicism. Even in the academic world

For the English-speaking world, for whom history is like a worm crawling along a path called 'progress', German historicism establishes a dichotomy between Kultur and Zivilisation, which respectively reflect the inner (spiritual and moral) and outer (materialistic and technical) qualities of a Volk.

Nevertheless, both the American and Russian Bolshevik ideologies were obsessed with technology and production. Spengler had written extensively on the similarities of communism and capitalism in *Le Déclin de l'Occident*, *Le Socialisme prussien*, *L'Heure de la décision* and others.

Heidegger alluded to this in 1935: "Russia and America, from a metaphysical point of view, are both identical: they are seized by the same miserable frenzy for unbridled technology, and they are both in love with each other.

l'organisation sans limite apparent de l'homme moyen [11]. Aldous Huxley also understood this, and his *The Worst of All Worlds* describes a synthesis of capitalism, Freudism and communism.

However, for Europe, writes Yockey in *Der Feind*, "the following distinction is important: American-Jewish Bolshevism is the instinctive destruction of the West by primitive, anti-cultural ideas... by the imposition of cultural distortion and cultural backwardness. Bolshevism

Russia seeks to destroy the West in the spirit of pan-Slavic rebellion, that is to say, to Russify all humanity". These are two antithetical messianic perspectives, but they have not yet been realised in history.

Yockey wrote in *Der Feind*: "Thus, American-Jewish Bolshevism constitutes a veritable spiritual threat to Europe. In all its aspects, American-Jewish Bolshevism strikes at a weak point in the European organism.

The "Élément Michel" [*Der Deutsche Michel*] is a personification of

The "enemy within" - the "Allemand" - forms a large part of the ruling class in post-war Europe, a reflection of the "America within", driven by the "purely American idea".

comfort, security and conformism". If this tranquillity is disturbed, bayonets can impose themselves again.

In Europe, there was an "inner America" which attracted the decadent elements of the West, but there was no "inner Russia". The Communist parties had quickly ceased to serve Russia's interests, and Moscow would have shown "political stupidity" if it had continued to use Marxism.

as a means of exporting its influence, because Marxism had lost its value. When Russia turned against the Jews after the Second World War, the fate of every Communist party in Europe was decided.

The West was scelled," writes Yockey. In 1943, Stalin had dissolved the Comintern, which he considered a nest of traitors. Similarly, the graves of the leaders of the German Communist Party were dug in Russia, not in Hitler's Germany. The theoreticians who were critical of Hitler and who lived in Germany

found refuge not in the USSR, but thanks to the State Department and the Rockefeller Foundation,

in the United States, where they took control of the academic world. These Judeo-Marxist destroyers were rejected in their entirety by the USSR, and the Soviet press condemned Herbert Marcuse at a time when he was being presented as a great intellectual in the United States, where he inspired the riots that the New World was witnessing.

The Left unleashed from Chicago to Prague (while the conservative Right cried "Soviet conspiracy").").

The Prague trials definitively clarified Soviet relations with the Jews for the world to see, but the process had been underway since the Trotskyists began to be purged in 1928. Moreover, the significance of the USSR's rejection of the post-war American plans for the United Nations and the so-called 'internationalisation' of atomic energy within the framework of the 'Baruch plan' was not lost on Yockey, while it was not grasped - and continues not to be grasped - by the right-wingers, most of whom are English-speaking, unable as they were - and still are - to make sense of the situation.

- their ideological quagmire. As a result, Yockey was attacked by Anglo-Nazis such as Arnold Leese.

The United States, for its part, recruited Mensheviks, Trotskyists and liberals to attack European culture with jazz and abstract expressionism in what is now known as the "Jazz Age". cultural cold war". They were supposed to embody the benefits of American democracy, but the USSR condemned them as "rootless cosmopolitanism" and "internationalism". This is how Yockey came to call it "American Bolshevism" and to consider it more dangerous for the Western culture-organism than "Russian Bolshevism". Today, the proponents of "American millennium" are proud of America's worldwide "revolutionary mission", which consists of destroying all vestiges of tradition through the irresistible attraction of decadence.

When Sedova Trotsky, having broken with the Fourth International, declared his allegiance to the United States of America, he became a member of the Soviet Union.

She said that her late husband would have done the same, and showed her that he was a good man. fundamentally Bolshevik character of the United States. Other Mensheviks, such as the esteemed Dr. Sidney Hook, joined the American camp against the USSR and redefined American conservatism to such an extent that when Dr Christopher Lasch, having disavowed the Left in the early 1970s, looked for a true 'conservatism' in the United States, he found none. In the 1950s, Yockey had already grasped that 'American conservatism' was a farce and a swindle.

According to Yockey, the impact of a Russian occupation of Europe (which was not Slavic) would be similar to that of the 'barbarian' invasions of other civilisations, such as the Norse invasion of Egypt, the Kassite conquest of Babylon, the Aryan conquest of the Indus and the Germanic invasions of Rome. The conquest did not destroy these cultures; on the contrary, the barbarians were absorbed by the Roman Empire.

by the culture-organism or were expelled from it. Yockey also pointed out that the barbarian sometimes becomes the guardian of the cultural values of those he has defeated, especially when the latter are too weakened to preserve their own traditions, as happened during the long "dynastic cycles" in China [12]. The barbarian brings pure vigour and the prospect of cultural renewal rather than destruction, distortion, backwardness or parasitism.

The other possibility for a civilisation under threat from a barbarian invasion is that the external enemy will force it to unite around its traditional ethos, thereby reinvigorating it.

Yockey mentions these two possibilities in the event of the Russians invading Europe, while he considers that the United States does not so much represent a military occupation as an invasion of the culture-organism by madness. Yockey refers, for example, to the "ethical syphilis of Hollywood".

The Europe-Russia symbiosis

Yockey argued that Russia had only occupied a tenth of Europe (not the whole of Europe) after the Second World War, and that this occupation had only been possible because of the machinations of the "Soviet Union".

Washington regime", machinations motivated by its pathological hatred of Europe. At the time, the New York-Washington regime was still dreaming of associating the USSR with a world state through the United Nations and the Baruch Plan.

In the event of a Russian occupation of Europe, Yockey saw two possibilities: either Russian interminable uprisings until Russia gives up and leaves, or the establishment of a regime This would ultimately lead to the emergence of a new symbiosis: Europe-Russia. This would ultimately lead to the emergence of a new symbiosis: Europe-Russia. Its definitive form would be that of a European Imperium. It would respond to historical necessity rather than to the concept of a Western Lebensraum.

This is the most clear-cut presentation of the slavophobe Yockey's views on Russia.

Yockey also decided that, in the event of a Russian occupation of Europe, the first victims would be the local Communist parties, because those who were attracted to them could not be trusted.

parties. Stalin had already recognised this when he dissociated the Comintern and eliminated those foreign communists who had been naive enough to seek refuge in the USSR. They were theorists of Marxism, whereas Russia's true religion was not Marxism, but Russia. It has since been argued that Russian Bolshevism owed more to Aleksander Herzen than to Marx, and it could also be argued that it owed more to Marx than to Herzen.

the anti-Russian character of Marx's own attitude, which influenced the development of Russian Bolshevism by distancing it from what was regarded as a German-Jewish current riven by socialism. Bolshevism was Russian messianism in another form [13].

According to Yockey, instead of destroying Europe, the Russian occupation would eliminate "the enemy within", "the enemy within".

l'élément Michel" and "libérer ainsi en Europe toutes les forces créatrices de la tyrannie du passé".

Narrow-minded statism would disappear with the traitors, who were kept in power by American bayonets: "The barbarian, whether he likes it or not, will complete the spiritual unification of Europe by

removing the only intra-European obstacle to this unity. There is only one step from the spiritual to the political. If Russia were to try to incorporate Europe into its empire, it could only do so by making the European Union a part of it.

Europe "major concessions", in particular autonomy as a unit. If it were to use brute force, it would provoke a reaction from all European countries analogue to the uprisings. against the Roman occupation.

Yockey's agreement with geopolitical thought requires

Yockey was writing for a political party, to encourage them to keep fighting at a time when Europe was in ruins and many of the surviving political, humanitarian and cultural leaders were being dispossessed and persecuted. The message was this: Don't fight for

Europe's enemy, the American-Jewish symbiosis, even if this meant co-operating with a Russian occupation. This message was taken on board by many elements of the right-wing demand and explains

the interest shown in Yockey by the American authorities. Many Allemands shared this opinion.

Yockey distributed *Der Feind* to the Allemands at the very moment when the prospect of a rapprochement between Germany and Russia made American leaders extremely paranoid. Yockey's point of view in *Der Feind* was part of the German tradition of Realpolitik and alliance with Russia: the alliance between Peter the Great and Frederick the Great in 1762; Bismarck's Rückversicherungspolitik (reinsurance policy); [14] the Treaty of Rapallo; the German-Soviet pact, which had been greeted with genuine enthusiasm in the allemand military and diplomatic milieus.

After Napoleon's defeat in 1812, General Johann David Ludwig von Yorck, commander of the Prussian corps in Napoleon's army, negotiated a separate peace with the Russians in defiance of the wishes of the King of Prussia and the Treaty of Paris, which committed Prussia to supporting France against Russia. This was the Tauroggen Neutrality Pact, which made a lasting impression on the Prussian army officers. It turns out that one of the many aliases used by Yockey to mislead military intelligence and the FBI during his travels from one country to another was (Franz) Ludwig Yorck.

Even the dominant circles in Germany at the time wanted a united Europe, independent of the United States, with a cooperative attitude towards the USSR, which it was hoped would make major concessions. One of the leading German newspapers said:

To break out of its current isolation, it [the USSR] could, just as the Treaty of Rapallo did thirty years ago, turn Germany into a defensive buffer between East and West. From a political and economic point of view, Germany could once again emerge as a world power by concluding long-term agreements with German industry and by resuming trade with Germany. In this way Russia could regain its place in the world market [15].

If we Germans had the feeling that the other powers, openly or tacitly, were trying to hinder [...] the reunification of Germany, the (Western) treaties would quickly prove to have had a disastrous effect. The fact that we are bound to the NATO pact does not prevent Europe, as soon as it is strong enough and the international situation has changed, from one day becoming independent of all the parties. [16]

For its part, the newspaper Christ und Welt, reporting on Chancellor Adenauer's Christian Democratic Union, said:

Continental Europe would break the Atlantic Pact if the Soviets agreed to withdraw their forces behind the Pripjat Marsh and allow not only the eastern part of Germany, but the whole of Eastern Europe, to join the European Union. A Western Europe, standing on its own feet and equipped with powerful forces of its own, would begin by developing its empire. colonial in Africa. Such a Europe, whatever its ties with America, could afford to pursue an independent policy, because it would have at its disposal the strength of a third power [17].

Father E. J. Reichenberger[18] wrote in 1952 that the reunification of Germany "cannot be achieved without the consent of the Russians". Moscow's primary objective

was not to spread communism in Germany, but to make Germany an ally. There was no reason why Germany should not align itself politically with Russia, especially after the Western democracies had agreed to ally themselves with Russia. For Germany, the political question is therefore: with which side can Germany hope to do the best business in the world?
term?

He reminded the German-American inventors that the United States and the USA had "seized foreign assets, stolen foreign patents and eliminated foreign competition on the world market". His vision of the world was much the same as that of Yockey and other libérateurs
Communism and Western democracy are variations of the same materialism, which is said to be transcended by the demand for Weltanschauung [19].

The demand for neutrality in any conflict with Russia was the norm among the Allies of all classes at a time when the United States was trying to rekindle the warrior spirit among the Allies, in case they were used as cannon fodder. Just after the outbreak of war in Korea, the New York Herald Tribune reported from Germany:

The general impression abroad was that the German people would jump at the chance to get back into uniform and lead new Blitzkriege. All political and trade union leaders
with whom our correspondent spoke in the principales villes of West Germany have shown that those who have this impression are sadly mistaken [20].

The Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung also published an article advocating a policy similar to that recommended by Yockey and his comrades:

We do not need to draw the attention of the experienced men in the Kremlin to the fact that a strong and unified Western Europe can defend its independence from all sides. Why should the Kremlin not be interested in such independence?... If the world, which is now divided into two parts, could be reorganised into a number of powerful independent groups, this could prevent an appalling global conflagration. A Russian policy
could, for example, agree to the reunification of Germany in exchange for

Europe's independence, which would then be able to defend itself against all parties. In such a case, the reunification of Germany would become a guarantee of peace. The treaties currently signed will not be an obstacle to reunification, if the Russians remain interested in a further solution. [21].

It is remarkable that, in the calls for reunification from various quarters, Germany was seen as an integral part of a united Europe. The United States called for - even demanded - European unification, provided that a united Europe opposed the USSR. On the contrary, even in the minds of liberal Allemands, a united Germany within a united Europe could only guarantee peace if it adopted a neutral, or even cooperative, attitude towards the USSR.

Russia's conciliation policy

Why were the Germans so optimistic about the possibility of a Russian-US agreement? allemand? On 10 March 1952, Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko handed the "Staline Note" to the German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer and the occupying powers. occidentales. James Cartnal puts it into context:

On 10 March 1952, the Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister, Andrei Gromyko, sent a diplomatic note to the delegates of the three Western occupying powers in Germany. included a draft peace treaty. The provisions outlined were radical. According to the Soviet note, Germany would be reunited, thus putting an end to its aberrant division and enabling it to become an independent, democratic and peaceful state. In addition, all democratic parties and organisations in Germany would enjoy full public freedoms, including the right of assembly, speech and publication. The Soviet note also provided for the granting of civil and political rights to all German citizens, including all former German citizens. members of the Wehrmacht and all former Nazis, with the exception of those serving sentences for crimes against humanity. The draft Soviet peace treaty called for the withdrawal of all armed forces of the occupying powers, demanded the liquidation of all foreign bases of operations in Germany and prevented a reunified Germany from joining any coalition or alliance. military action against any power that participated with its armed forces in the Second World War. against Germany. The territories of Germany were defined, according to the Soviet diplomatic note, by the borders laid down in the provisions of the Potsdam Conference. In addition, the The draft Soviet peace treaty allowed Germany to create the national armed forces (land, sea and air) it needed to defend the country, and authorised the formation of a national armed forces.

allemanded armaments industry, limited by the provisions of the final version of the peace treaty.

The Soviets hoped to discuss the terms of peace with a united allied state at a summit conference between four great powers. The conference envisaged by the Kremlin never took place. The Russian initiative only led to an exchange of diplomatic correspondence between the Soviet Union and the three Western occupying powers, which continued throughout the summer of 1952. This "bataille des notes", as British Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden called it, revealed that the Soviets and the West had very different points of view on the need to organise free elections throughout Germany before any discussion on the reunification of Germany.

The "battle of the notes" left unanswered important questions which had been raised in the Soviet note of March 1952; the Soviets did not propose any specific limits to the remilitarisation of Germany and did not give any definition of what constituted a state.

democratic, peaceful and independent. By the end of the summer of 1952, Soviet attempts to resolve the demand question had failed; Germany would remain divided and each side would remain more firmly rooted in its respective bloc for the next three and a half decades [22].

Debates ensued as to whether Staline could be trusted. In the absence of a "threat The Soviet Union, nothing could justify the subjugation of Europe to the Washington-New York regime, except a new change of policy and the revival of the legend of the Soviet Union. Prussian threat". Staline was prepared to meet most of Adenauer's demands, but Adenauer preferred Germany's subordination to the United States to a free and united Germany and Europe. As for the reaction to the "Staline Note", Gromyko pointed out that

The reaction of the Western powers was not enthusiastic. In Bonn, Adenauer and his entourage were completely abandoned by common sense, and the Soviet proposals became an object of controversy. propaganda and the question of German reunification disappeared into the shuffle.

No other post-war government made such a gross political miscalculation. Adenauer undoubtedly lost a historic opportunity. Moreover, the Federal Republic was part of the Western anti-Soviet military bloc, while the USSR and Germany were still technically in a state of war. This did not end until 25 January 1955 by an order of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

Adenauer's policy was a long succession of lost opportunities. In 1957, he rejected East Germany's proposal for a German confederation... [23].

Could Staline really be trusted in this respect? Probably yes.

The USSR, after spilling human blood and indulging in all manner of brutality in the part of Europe it occupied, put an end to its barbaric ravages, while the Morgenthau plan was de facto implemented, the United States still hoping that it would be possible to integrate the USSR as an associate in a new post-war order.

A significant example of the difference in attitude between the USSR and the United States towards Europe is the intervention of the USSR in favour of the Norwegian novelist Knut Hamsun, who had always been considered to be a Europeanist.

in the Soviet Union. During the war, Hamsun supported Hitler and the collaborationist Prime Minister Vidkun Quisling. One writer recounted:

At the end of 1945, the Soviet foreign minister, Molotov, informed his Norwegian colleague Trygve Lie that he "would be sorry to see Norway condemn this great writer to the gallows".

Molotov had made this declaration with Staline's agreement. It was after this intervention that the Norwegian government abandoned the plan to try Hamsun, contenting itself with imposing a heavy fine on him which practically put him out of business. The question remains open: would Norway have Hamsun to the death penalty? The Norwegian collaborators all received heavy sentences. The strong influence that the Soviet Union could exert in Scandinavia in the immediate post-war period was no less feared [24].

It is particularly symbolic that the USSR offered Rudolf Hess membership if he recognised the GDR. In 1952, the year of the "Staline Note", Lothar Bolz, Vice-Minister-President of the GDR, Karl Hamann, and Otto Grotewohl, Minister of Trade and Procurement, were invited to the GDR's headquarters, met Hess to find out whether he was prepared to play a leading role in a reunited and neutral Germany. The German historian Werner Maser claims that Otto Grotewohl told him about the meeting afterwards, on the understanding that it would not be mentioned until after Grotewohl's death [25]. Hess was

Hess came out of Spandau to meet the leaders of the GDR at a time when the prison was under the judicial authority of the USSR. Maser recounts that Staline wanted to "temper justice with mercy in the allemande affair and give Hess an important role in reconstruction and in efforts to promote the GDR".

reunification of Germany" [26]. If Hess were to declare that the policy of the GDR was the same as the "socialism" to which he had always adhered, he would immediately be expelled from Spandau and would play a role in the reunification of Germany.

role in leading a reunited Germany. Hess rejected the offer, while "supporting... the efforts of the GDR and the Soviet Union to preserve German patriotism and listening carefully to what his interlocutors had to say about the programmes of the political parties mentioned...". II

Nevertheless, he considered that accepting such an offer would have been a betrayal of Hitler's memory. Grotewohl found it difficult to understand why Hess had rejected the offer to help rebuild Germany as a free man [27].

When the author states that Hess listened "attentively to what his interlocutors had to say about the programmes of the political parties mentioned", he is referring to the creation of a nationalist party that was to form part of the GDR government.

At a meeting between Staline and the leaders of the Socialist Unity Party (Sozialistische Einheitspartei Deutschlands, or SED) held on 31 January 1947 in the Soviet zone, Staline asked how many Germans in all the occupation zones were "fascist elements" and how many were "fascists".

"Grotewohl replied that it was difficult to answer this question. Grotewohl replied that it was difficult to answer this question, but that he could provide Staline with lists of former members of the National Socialist Party "occupying leading positions in the Western zones". Staline had not asked this question with the ulterior motive of purging Germany of "fascists", but because he felt that he could provide Staline with lists of former members of the National Socialist Party "occupying positions of leadership in the Western zones".

envisaged reuniting former members of the National Socialist Party in a party that would promote nationalism and socialism in a Soviet Germany. He was also interested in the vote which could be that of the "fascist elements" in the event of a plebiscite on the demand for unification. For Grotewohl, they were "all reactionaries". Staline's point of view was different. Would it be possible to organise "fascists" under another name in the Soviet zone? He pointed out to the SED leaders that their policy of "exterminating fascists" was no different from that of the Americans and said: "Perhaps I should make this choice [of organising a nationalist party] so as not to push all the former Nazis into the enemy camp" [28].

Grotewohl dogmatically objected that if the "fascists" were united in a party that would be theirs Such an initiative would not be "understood by the working masses" of the Western zones. Stalin replied that by showing the "Nazis" in the Western zones that their Soviet comrades were not being wiped out, he would give them the positive impression that "not all of them will be wiped out"; he also said that he wanted to recruit "patriotic elements", particularly from among the "figures". "party" to create a "fascist party". There would be nothing reactionary about the creation of such a party, since many "Nazis" had "come from the people" [29].

Ulbricht found Staline's idea plausible because, by emphasising the socialist aspect of national-socialism, it could appeal in particular to young idealists. Staline explained that he had no intention of integrating "fascist" elements into the SED, but that he wanted to encourage them to join. form their own party in alliance with the SED. In the Soviet-occupied zone, former "Nazis" voted for conservative parties, fearing that the establishment of a Soviet state would lead to their liquidation. Staline wanted to demonstrate to them that their situation in a Germany would be different. Nor did he share the opinion of the Communist leaders allemands that the "fascist elements" were all bourgeois. He declared that "we must help those who have not sold out" to the Western occupation and that "we must not forget that the elements who have remained loyal to Nazism are to be found not only in the bourgeois strata, but also among the working class and petty bourgeoisie". The new party, which would be part of a "national front" coalition led by the SED, would be called the "National Democrats" [30]. To the other objections that were raised, Staline replied that the "fascist elements" were no longer concerned with acquiring a "living space" in the East.

In February 1948, the Soviet Military Administration (Sowjetische Militäradministration in Deutschland, or SMAD) announced the end of denazification. In March 1948, proceedings against the Germans for alleged "war crimes" were officially terminated. The Nationaldemokratische Partei Deutschlands (NDPD) was created in the same month. The GDR, which was created in 1949, was established by elections in the Soviet occupation zone after the USSR and the Western occupiers failed to agree on the conditions for elections in a reunified Germany.

After the NDPD was founded, Staline declared that the party had "erased the dividing line between non-Nazis and former Nazis". On 22 March, a newspaper was launched to pave the way: the National-Zeitung, which announced that "while in other regions there is still an atmosphere of denazification, the eyes of the people are once again shining on the eastern part of the country". Simple party comrades should no longer be afraid and look around fearfully as if they were pariahs". The party was founded three days later under the chairmanship of Lothar Bolz. He held this post until 1972. A member of the German Communist Party in the pre-war period, Bolz was one of the few German Communist leaders to survive Staline's uncertain hospitality towards Communist refugees [31]. During much of this period, Bolz held various positions in the GDR government, notably as Foreign Minister (1968-1978). The Vice-President of the NDPD was Heinrich Hohmann, who had joined the National Socialist Party in 1933 and was also a co-founder of the League of German Officers, the original nucleus of the NDPD. The NDPD's programme was resolutely nationalist, as was that of the Reich Socialist Party, which was about to be outlawed in the Federal Republic:

America has violated the Treaty of Potsdam and has plunged us, the Germans, into the greatest national distress in our history... But the American war can and must not happen!

Germany must live! That is why we, the National Democrats, demand: Americans for America. Germany to the Germans! The Federal Republic of Germany is a child of national treason... That is why we, the national democrats, make this demand: Germany must live!

demand: Unity allemande over the government of national treason in Bonn, as the basis for peace, independence and prosperity for our entire homeland allemande [32].

The party had up to 230,000 members in 1953 and in the 1980s still had 110,000.

In 1948, 52 of its members were elected to the GDR parliament, the Volkskammer. To support its campaigns, it called on former NSDAP members and army veterans. In 1952, the that it was signed by 119 former officers of the Wehrmacht, the SS, the Hitler Youth, the League of Young German Women (BDM) and the German Labour Front [33].

The origins of the NDPD go back even further, to the National Committee for a Free Germany, formed by German officers captured by the Soviets during the Second World War. On their return to the Soviet zone after the war, these officers took over the leadership of the NDPD and held senior positions in the GDR for many years. For example, Colonel Wilhelm Adam, co-founder of the NDPD, was a veteran of both World Wars. He had supported a nationalist policy since joining the German Youth Order in 1920. He joined the NSDAP in 1923 and took part in the Munich Putsch. He had also been a member of the Conservative Party of Germany.

people allemand (DVP) between 1926 and 1929. In 1933, he joined the Stahlhelm and the Sturmabteilung. Captured in 1943 in Stalingrad, Adam joined the Comité national pour une Allemagne libre (National Committee for a Free Germany) and, on his return to Germany, he became a member of the Comité national pour une Allemagne libre (National Committee for a Free Germany).

He returned to the Soviet zone in 1948 and became a member of the Saxon state government. In 1952, he became a member of the Kasernierte Volkspolizei (KVP), which later became the People's Army of the GDR. He was awarded the Labour Banner in 1968 and the title of Divisional General in 1977. Many other people with similar pasts were honoured by the GDR.

Conclusion

This was the environment in which Yockey operated, and why the American authorities took such an interest in his activities. He and his American mentor, Frederick Weiss, who published "assessments" of the world situation in a Spengnerian spirit, adopted a line which was in line with that of many of those who sought German and European liberation and unity, recognition of the United States as der Feind and agreement with Russia to oblige in concessions. This point of view had been propagated since 1948 in Argentina by the Der Weg organisation,

who represented what H. Keith Thompson told us was "the higher authority", sensationalistically referred to as "Die Spinne" and "Odessa" by the world's news media. But beyond that, The idea had taken root among people from all walks of life. Der Feind thus gave historical-philosophical depth to popular sentiments.

Otto Remer never denied that Germany and Europe had to turn to Russia. After continuous legal harassment and exile in Spain, he returned to Germany.

West Germany. In 1983, he founded the German Freedom Movement (Die deutschen Freiheitsbewegung, or DDF), dedicated to understanding between Russia and Germany. Its manifesto, *Le Manifeste Bismarck-Allemand*, was subtitled "Alliance germano-russe Rapallo 1983", in a ligne neutraliste du PSR de Remer trois décennies plus tôt. The manifesto, which takes up Yockey's ideas on the "cultural distortion regime" of Washington and New York, states that "the way of life We will not take part in a NATO war against Russia".

Like Yockey's other writings, *Der Feind* has not changed its method of analysis. The world situation worsened with the collapse of the Soviet Empire. The Spartan way of life that had been imposed in the Soviet Empire means that, today, the people of this region are the only ones who can afford to survive. Hence the frenzy with which "the enemy of Europe" is trying to contaminate these regions - some states, like Hungary, are consciously resisting this "syphilis". The "enemy of Europe" is now the global enemy (as Yockey predicted in his last essay, "Le monde en flammes" [34]), whose weapon is the "enemy of Europe".

As the American strategist Ralph Peters was delighted to see, the main challenge remains what Yockey called the "cultural distortion", backed by military force. Although certain conditions have changed and the political fronts are different, the major political issues remain: the existential conflict, the war on terror and the war against terrorism.

between the United States and Russia; the role of Israel; the role of Europe and the West in this conflict; and the relationship between the West and the United States, which is presented as the 'leader of the West' when in fact it is responsible for the distortion of culture, parasitism and backwardness.

Kerry Bolton (ed.), *The Enemy of Europe*, Centennial Edition Publishing, 2022, Introduction, translated from English by B. K..

Let's start with Yockey's thesis: Europe has two enemies, one internal: the United States and its rivals at the head of the European countries; the other external: Russia.

Its internal enemy is more dangerous to it than its external enemy because, while the latter threatens its existence in its material aspects, the former attacks the very spirit of Europe; it seeks, by stirring up the fear of a Russian invasion of Europe, to unify it politically and economically and to unify it culturally and mentally, in order to enslave it in every respect.

Its external enemy is all the less dangerous for it because it has purged itself of its own internal enemy, namely Bolshevism, which, on the other hand, the United States is now carrying; "cultural distortion" is basically synonymous with Bolshevisation and, ultimately, enjuvenation, since, to paraphrase Yockey, "Bolshevism is Jewish" (the paraphrase is justified by the fact that he applies the term "Bolshevism" to both the communist regime in Moscow and the Jewish regime in France). Washington capitalism). The only way for the European culture-bearing stratum to free Europe from the Bolshevik stranglehold of the United States is to make it a place of peace. The United States is therefore in a position of trust with Russia, debolchised as it is. The unmistakable sign of this disenchantment was the "anti-Semitic" turn taken by Staline on the occasion of the Prague Trials.

Has Russia really been debriefed? Has it freed itself from the clutches of the "distorter of culture", the "bearer of the culture of decadence", "instinctively attached to all the forms, theories, doctrines and practices of decadence in all areas of life", namely the Jew?

The answer to this question will determine whether or not Bolton's related thesis that Russia and the United States are intrinsically enemies and not, as it were, two sides of the same coin is valid.

In 1887, Édouard Drumont wrote in *La France juive* that "les Karl Marx, les Lassalle, les all the leaders of the Cosmopolitan Revolt are Jews". In 1935, Léon de Poncins was spoilt for choice when he wrote "*Les Juifs dans le bolchevisme russe*" (1).

From the day after the October 1917 revolution, anti-Semitic leaflets began to appear in Russia in reaction to the sudden worsening of the shortage and the consequent vertiginous rise in prices. Gorky received one published by the Central Committee of the Union of Christian Socialists in Moscow and Petrograd. The leaflet, addressed to "workers, soldates and peasants", bore the slogan "Antisemites of all stripes".

countries, of all peoples and parties, unite". He opposed the "Aryan race" to the Jews and urged all "Aryan" Russians to "purify themselves of all this Jewish vermin, which has so competently taken over our whole country, from the highest peaks to the depths of the people". "Many A resident of Rovny, in the government of Volhynia, wrote: 'Bread used to cost us 5 roubles, and now it costs 15 roubles, and it's all the fault of the Yugins who have invaded all the offices'. The Bolsheviks try to organise a planned distribution of the very inadequate food supply They nationalised trade from top to bottom. Private trade is forbidden. Anyone who engaged in it was treated as a victim. The Jewish merchant was therefore considered a trafficker and a starver. The young Ukrainian communist Klounny explained the virulent anti-Semitism of the peasantry as follows

Ukrainian in a letter to the Central Committee: 'In the majority of cases, the village knows the Jew. He was a merchant, who expressed this in all sorts of ways, particularly in the bread trade. While the villager fed the Jew with his produce, the Jew did nothing for himself.

The bourgeoisie (the nobility) and the petty-bourgeoisie (milliners, sewers, etc.) and the Ukrainian village almost never saw the Jewish proletariat. The peasant, however, did not see trade as a means to an end. considered all Jews to be non-workers. It is this view which explains the irritation of the peasantry against the 'Yugin commissars' and the popular phrase in the Ukraine:

Before, the Yips were watching us and now they want to settle on our backs" (2). 27 April

1918, the Moscow Provincial Commissariat, after hearing the report of the commission it had set up a few weeks earlier to study preventive measures against pogroms, decided that to organise systematic propaganda against anti-Semitism. On 21 April 1918, the Bolsheviks

organised a big meeting against pogroms at the Circus Moderne in Petrograd. In July, Lenin drafted and co-signed a decree entitled "On the eradication of anti-Semitism" (3), which ends with the prescription to "outlaw those who participate in or call for pogroms". On the Bolshevik

and former Menshevik Yuri Larin, "to outlaw active anti-Semites was to shoot them" (4). But, noted a special report by the US Congress in 1954, "this decree, promoted as a directive during the civil war, was not included in the official collection of government laws and ordinances.

And, in 1922, the first systematic penal code enacted by the government

Soviet law did not contain a specific paragraph against anti-Semitism. The question was covered, in a general form, by a provision prohibiting 'agitation and propaganda arousing anti-Semitism'.

The penalty was a minimum of one year's imprisonment and, in wartime, if the offence was committed in particularly dangerous circumstances, death. A law

The Special Crimes Against the State Act, enacted in 1927, increased the minimum sentence to two years. But a Supreme Court decision in 1930 ruled that this paragraph was not applicable to 'attacks' against individual members of national minorities following personal conflicts with these people'. The law was strict, but rarely applied".

In March 1919, Lenin gave a "speech on the pogroms and persecution of the Jews", from which the following extract is taken (5): "The propagation of hatred towards the Jews is called anti-Semitism. In the last days of the accursed Tsarist monarchy, attempts were made to turn ignorant workers and peasants against the Jews. The Tsarist police, in alliance with landowners and capitalists, organised pogroms against the Jews.

against the Jews. The hatred of the poor workers, the landowners and the capitalists was directed against the Jews. And in other countries too we often see the capitalists fomenting hatred against the Jews in order to blind the workers, to divert their attention from the real enemy of the workers, the capitalist. Hatred of Jews persists only in countries where the enslavement of landowners and capitalists has created abysmal ignorance among workers and peasants. Only the most ignorant and oppressed people can believe the lies and fabrications which about the Jews. It's a hangover from the old feudal times, when priests burned heretics at the stake, peasants lived in slavery and the people lived in the streets. was crushed and unable to express itself. This ancient and feudal ignorance is disappearing; people's eyes are opening.

"It is not the Jews who are the enemies of the workers. The enemies of workers are the Jews. capitalists of all countries. Among the Jews there are workers, labourers, indeed most of them. They are our brothers who, like us, are oppressed by capitalism. comrades in the fight for socialism. Among the Jews, there are kulaks, exploiters and capitalists, as there are among Russians and people of all nations. The capitalists endeavour to sow and foment hatred between workers of different denominations, races and religions. different nations and races. Those who do not work are kept in power by the power and force of capitalism. The rich Jews, like the rich Russians and the rich of all countries, to oppress, crush, veil and disunite workers.

"Shame on the accursed tsarism that tortured and persecuted the Jews. Shame on those who foment hatred towards the Jews, who foment hatred towards other nations (6)".

In 1924, Gorky recounted what Lenin had said to him about the pamphlet he had published in 1919 "On the Jews" (7), in which he wrote: "The Jews, with the greatest energy, have served and served others. serve the great cause of the Europeanisation of our half-Asian country": "It must be said that in the course of our conversations, Lenin repeatedly stressed the general importance of the Jews for the Europeanisation of our half-Asian country. the importance of putting an end, as soon as possible, for the good of the revolution, to all these evils which are afflicting the Jewish working masses in a world governed by capitalism and religious institutions (8)". "The response of Lenin reflected his general attitude to ethnic questions, which was that Communists of every ethnic group had to combat the prejudices and nationalist and religious ideologies of their own ethnic origin" (9). The Jews were no exception.

As early as 1903, Lenin had criticised the idea of a Jewish nation as "a Zionist idea which is absolutely false and reactionary in its essence"; "the Jewish nation-culture," he added, "is the watchword of the rabbis and the bourgeois, the watchword of our enemies" (10). Stalin took up Lenin's arguments. Neither Lenin, Trotsky nor, at first, Stalin, was anti-Zionism, to use the title of a book by Leon Poliakov, anti-Semitism. Lenin and Stalin were in favour of assimilating the Jews into the Russian people. Stalin defined the nation in a pamphlet ("The Marxism and the National Question"), which Lenin had asked him to write in 1913, as "a human, stable, historically constituted community, born on the basis of a community of values, a community of values, a community of values, a community of values, a community of values, a community of values, a community of values, a community of values, a community of values, a community of values, a community of values".

langue, de territoire, de vie économique et de formation psychique qui se traduit dans une communauté de culture ", les Juifs pouvaient et devaient naturellement faire partie de la nation russe. Anti-Zionism was thus instituted as a dogma of Communism and staunchly defended by both Stalin and Trotsky, for whom Zionism was a reactionary utopia (11).

Trotsky, who made no secret of the fact that he had been born and bred in the Jewish religion, nor of the fact that his origins were "of no importance to him", to the point of declaring that he had "ceased to be a Jew for the sake of being a Jew".

l'essentiel!" the day he became a Marxist and therefore an internationalist (12), never ceased to attack in general those of his congeners who, like the Bundists, glorified their Jewishness and in particular the Zionists. His denial of his own Jewishness led him, logically, to a detestation of all nationalism, which he shared with Lenin and Stalin. "The Bund exerted a political influence between the revolutions of February and October 1917. Its leader, Mark Liber, was an active member of the coalition of socialists that dominated the soviets until the Bolsheviks came to power. The Jews were Fédor Dan and Yui Martov were Menshevik leaders, while Abram Gots was one of the leading Socialist-Revolutionaries.

For a while, it seemed as if the Jewish question had ceased to be a problem in France.

They were "worried about the number of Jews in the leadership of the revolutionary movement. They thought that this might

possibly turn against Jews in general once the old popular traditions of anti-Semitism had been reaffirmed" (13). They sent a denial to Trotsky in Petrograd

to persuade him to break with the Bolsheviks. Trotsky sent them packing, while revealing nothing of his own concern about the matter. The anti-Soviet commander Alexei Kaledin galvanised his troops by telling them that the Bolshevik leaders were not Russians but "the Bolsheviks".

Jews. And Lenin and Trotsky were at the top of his list of men to be shot. They embodied the order communist. An anonymous letter to the Soviet authorities asked: 'Have you become and can't you see who's in charge of Russia now? Trotsky, Sverdlov, Zinoviev and the others...

They are all pure-blooded Jews who have given themselves Russian family names to deceive the Russian people. Trotsky is called Bronstein, Zinoviev is actually Liberman, and so on. And it is you who prefer the Yid Bronstein (Trotsky) to the orthodox Tsar'" (14). In an article published in *Izvestiya* in October 1919, after nebulously stating that "[a]ntisemitism is not only hatred of Jews, but also cowardice towards them" (15), he was not afraid to justify the over-representation of "anti-Semites".

Jews in politics by the fact that they were mainly city dwellers and that it was in the cities that the revolutionary movement had originated and developed.

So 70-80% of the Russian population was Jewish?

He said no more about the Jewish question until he entered into an "open" conflict with Staline in 1923. He then learned that some party members were drawing attention to his Jewish origin and that anti-Semitic remarks were regularly made at party meetings. Someone is reported to have said: "The Yiddish are making trouble in the Politburo" (16). Staline turned a blind eye to manifestations of anti-Semitism in the Party, which "helped him to defeat his rival" (17).

On 12 January 1931, Staline gave the following answer to a question from the Jewish Press Agency in Paris United States on the Soviet attitude to anti-Semitism: "National and racial chauvinism is a vestige of the misanthropic customs characteristic of the cannibalistic period.

Anti-Semitism, the extreme form of racial chauvinism, is the most dangerous vestige of cannibalism. Anti-Semitism serves the employers; it is the lightning rod which deflects the blows dealt by the workers to capitalism. Anti-Semitism is dangerous for workers because it is a false road which leads them away from the right path and into the jungle. Consequently, as consistent internationalists, Communists can only be the sworn, irreconcilable enemies of antisemitism. In the USSR, anti-Semitism is punished with the utmost severity by the law as a phenomenon deeply hostile to the Soviet system". "Under Soviet law, anti-Semitism is punished with the utmost severity. active anti-Semites are subject to the death penalty (18)", he conceded, knowing full well that the laws in question were, as mentioned above, rarely applied. In 1931, it had been seven years since Lenin had, shortly before his death, advised the Party to be wary of him, and he had been succeeded by Stalin, who had been allied to Zinoviev and Kamenev. He now had a free hand. to deal with Lenin's and Trotsky's supporters.

In December 1934, Kirov, the Party leader in Leningrad, was shot dead. The murder provided Stalin with the pretext for purging the Party. From 1936 to 1938, there were three trials, known as the "Bloc of the and Trotskyists". At the end of the first trial, in August 1936, Kamenev and Zinoviev, accused of belonging to the "Trotskyist-Zinovievist Terrorist Centre", were sentenced to long prison terms for having "attempted to seize power at any cost" and, incidentally, for "complicity in murder"; at the end of the second trial, Sokolnikov was found guilty of having formed, with 16 other "Trotskyists", a "Trotskyist-Zinovievist Terrorist Centre". old bolcheviks", a "reserve Trotskyist anti-Soviet Centre [...] in case the activity of the Trotskyist-Zinovievist Centre was discovered by the organs of Soviet power"; it was founded in February

1937; Radek was one of the four defendants who escaped the death penalty. The third trial opened on 2 March 1938; the four main defendants were Bukharin, Rakovsky, Yagoda and Rykov (19). Number of the defendants, including those just mentioned, were Jews, although they were not named as such in the indictments. The congressional report quoted above states that "[t]he violent campaign against the 'traitors' was not officially presented in an anti-Jewish guise. But the campaign of anti-Semitic whispers was not discouraged either. At the same time, circulars the Communist Party ordered many branches of the civil service not to recruit people of Jewish origin or to demote or dismiss those already in post. A numerus clausus was surreptitiously introduced in the military and civil service academies. diplomatic. Each new 'election' led to a further drop in the percentage of men of Jewish origin elected to the various soviets. This process found its most obvious expression in When, in May 1939, Foreign Minister Maxim M. Litvinov was dismissed from his post and handed over by Vyacheslav M. Molotov. A man of Jewish origin was not the most suitable person to negotiate the Stalin-Hitler Pact.

It was at this time that the following first appeared in the USSR of what Gennady Kostyuchenko, in "Prisonniers du pharaon rouge: les répressions politiques contre les Juifs en URSS dans la dernière décennie du règne de Staline" (Arles, Solin-Actes Sud, 1997), for which he consulted around a hundred documents, hitherto unpublished, from the archives, party organs, national security services and other structures of leadership and repression in the U. S. S. R., calls a "State anti-Semitism". R.S.S., Gennady Kostyuchenko (20) calls it "state anti-Semitism". He had four axes: the liquidation of Jewish institutions and organisations (21), the persecution of the elite Jewish intellectuelle, purges from certain state institutions, and reprisals against certain Jewish activists. "Stalin regularly took advantage of the anti-Semitic moods in society and the party to defeat his opponents in the struggle for power. Once transferred to the bureaucratic arena, this approach acquired the status of a systematic state policy. Its aim was the progressive eradication of 'Jewish influence' (more precisely, the influence of Jews) on the socio-political and cultural life of society; and its preferred means were assimilation imposed from above and administrative and repressive measures, which became heavier and heavier with time" (22).

Barely restrained during the war (23), "State anti-Semitism" reached its apogee in the following years 1950. In October or November 1948, General Antonov, the Jewish Chief of Staff of the Red Army, was replaced by General Shtemenko, a Gentile. The publication of the Yiddish newspaper Einigkeit, les performances of the Moscow Yiddish Theatre and a number of other Jewish institutional activities were suspended. The Jews of the USSR ceased to be recognised as a national minority, all this at a time when relations between the USSR and Israel were at an all-time high. The six leading Yiddish writers in the Soviet Union were arrested and disappeared without a trace. The culte that had formed around the memory of Simon Mikhoels, the famous actor and Jewish community leader who died at the beginning of the year, was suddenly hushed up and his name was no longer officially mentioned.

until he appeared in the indictment of the famous trial of the white wives, seventeen people in charge of the main medical institutions in Moscow, most of whom were Jews (24). In agreement with the majority of specialists, G. V. Kostyrčenko explains this development by a "lack of understanding".

a set of internal and external political factors: increased political chauvinism

Soviet leaders; the exacerbation of Soviet-American tension and the hardening of the Cold War; the psychological degradation of the old Soviet leader; his judgement of the Soviet sionisme, sur l'État d'Israël comme 'avant-garde de l'impérialisme des États-Unis' et sur les Juifs soviétiques comme potentielle 'cinquième colonne'" (25).

According to Maurizio Lattanzioni (26), these developments "should not, however, be attributed to Staline's 'anti-Semitism', i.e. to a visceral aversion he might have harboured against Stalin's aim was not to cut all the bridges between the Soviet Union and the 'Western' plutocracy. Nor did Stalin wish to cut all the bridges linking the Soviet Union to the 'Western' plutocracy. Staline's motives were different: he wanted, more simply, to challenge a political and ideological trend which had developed an interpretation of Marxian thought different from his own and which had deduced from this interpretation models for the management of Soviet power opposed to those advocated by Staline himself. This ideological quarrel led to a confrontation between two rival factions in the CPSU. Stalin [...] understood that Marxism could only survive if it was realised 'in one country'. Only the emergence of a kind of 'national-communism' rooted in the deepest historical currents of pan-Slavism, within the framework of an authoritarian, bureaucratic and centralising conception of power and the State, could permit the advent of socialism in a single country, that is, in this case, the Soviet Union". Trotsky himself never ceased to insist that "Stalin, in his battle with the opposition, was merely expressing the country's anti-Semitic tendencies" (27). Most experts on the subject (28) still seem to agree that, although many victims of the Great Purge were Jews, they were not targeted as Jews, unlike the Jews who lived in Hitler's Germany.

"Stalinist anti-Semitism takes up two themes from Nazi anti-Semitism: the 'pollution' of the more or less massive presence of Jews in the various spheres of social life, and the sea serpent of the worldwide Jewish plot to dominate the world. But these two themes remain hidden, like shameful stains, in secret internal circulations and in fabricated confessions, even more secret, to which former policymakers in disgrace lend themselves, ready to repeat whatever their colleagues in power tell them. There is more than one nuance here. Hitler's anti-Semitism is a the organic development of nazism; stalinian anti-semitism is contradictory with the origins of the soviet system, born of a social revolution (i.e. the iliquidation of private ownership of the means of production and the institulon of collective ownership) and poltical revolution (the overthrow of the old class) and its social foundations. The former asserts itself, the latter buries itself, or even falls silent. camouflages and disguises himself, as if ashamed to show himself; he acts in the shadows" (29). In Russia, he

There was no equivalent at the Nuremberg trials, partly for the reason just given, partly for legal reasons. As for national-socialism, it always acts in the open.

Stalin's anti-Jewish policy was continued after his death by the two men who had had the greatest influence on him: Malenkov and Beria (30). On 4 March 1953, *Komsomol'skaja pravda* published an article entitled "Greater revolutionary vigour", which denounced "the terrorist groups of doctors/saboteurs - agents of the Jewish organisation and of a nationalist-Bourgeois orientation", at the behest of foreign secret services" (31), but only a month after Stalin's death, the radio broadcast the announcement by the Ministry of the Interior that all the doctors accused of having taken part in the conspiracy of the Sunday brides were to be arrested and reinstated in their posts. State of die a second time.

In his memoirs, Khrushchev points out that Stalin often made "anti-Semitic" remarks "And," he recalls, "we got used to it. We listened to them, but we didn't take them to heart and we did nothing about it" (32). He did, however, follow in his predecessor's footsteps, albeit, if we may say so, in his slippers (33). "He learned from Stalin how to subtly use 'popular anti-Semitism' to implement his policies (34). Incidentally, the death penalty for economic offences such as embezzlement, theft, corruption and thefts was also used.

This made the USSR the country with the most draconian legislation for this type of crime in peacetime. "Of the hundred or so people executed for economic crimes in 1961-62, the vast majority were Jewish, and their trials were the most severe. had strong anti-Semitic overtones. The obvious implication was that shortages of consumer goods and their poor quality were not the fault of the country's leaders or the Soviet economic system, but of a handful of Jewish black marketeers and corrupt petty officials" (35).

In July 1965, for the first time since 1918, a senior Soviet official, Aleksei N. Kosygin, said in a speech given in Riga and published the day after in *Pravda* (36) that antisemitism, like nationalism and racism, was alien to the communist worldview (37). A year earlier, Brezhnev had become First Secretary of the Party and therefore the main leader of the Soviet Union; he would vigorously condemn anti-Semitism fourteen years later, on 23 February 1981, in a general policy speech to the 26th Congress of the Communist Party (38). In the meantime, the official message was that "there has never been and still is no anti-Semitism in the USSR" (39).

According to Kostyuchenko, Israel's overwhelming victory in the Six-Day War in June 1967 marked a resurgence of state anti-Semitism in the USSR and the Eastern Bloc countries (except Romania), all of which supported the Arab cause. It would be more appropriate to speak of anti-Zionism. The proof of this is that, on 4 October 1967, following vehement protests abroad, the Ideological Commission of the Central Committee of the Party disavowed *Judaizm bez prikras* (Judaism Without Embellishment, 1963), a book which had been published by the Soviet Union.

Trofim Kichko, a member of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences who had had close ties with the National Socialist regime during the war. On the same day, Kichko published an article in the Ukrainian newspaper *Komsomolskoye znamya* about "a group of Zionist bankers"; on the 20th, he published an article in the Ukrainian newspaper *Komsomolskoye znamya* about "a group of Zionist bankers".

On 1 January 1968, *Pravda Ukrainy*, the official press organ of the Ukrainian Republic, reported that Kichko had been awarded a certificate of merit by the Presidium of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet for "services rendered to atheist propaganda". Shortly afterwards, Kichko published *Judaizm i Zionism* (Kiev, 1968), one of whose central theses was that Judaism - practised by a large proportion of Russia's three million Jews - bore a great deal of responsibility for the "crimes" of the "aggressors".

There was a direct link between the morality of Judaism and the actions of Israeli Zionists. The actions of Israeli extremists during their latest aggression against Arab countries are not in accordance with the Torah" (40). In the meantime, numerous Soviet publications had dealt with the

Jewish conspiracy; for example, *Komsomolskaya pravda* of 4 October 1967 wrote

Zionism is an invisible but enormous and powerful empire of financiers and industrialists, an empire that does not appear on any map of the world, but which exists and acts everywhere in the world" (41). In August

1968, just a few days before the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, the main bodies

The Soviets dedicated long articles to the mysterious "saboteurs" who threatened to undermine the Socialist Republic. Judaism was condemned on the grounds that it prescribed "racial exclusivism" and justified "crimes against Gentiles". The Kremlin's views on the question were summarised in a book published in 1969 (75,000 copies sold), *Beware of Zionism!* by Yuri Ivanov, a specialist on Zionism on the Central Party Committee. "In 173 pages, it brought together the various strands of the anti-Zionist theme woven over the previous three years. Zionism was presented as the giant international 'affair' of world Jewry. Thanks to 'the largest amount of capital' available to it the Affaire maintains a vast 'international intelligence centre' and a 'well-organised service'.

disinformation and propaganda'. The aim of all the various 'bureaus' of the Affaire, allegedly under a 'single leadership', is 'profit and enrichment' and, ultimately, the 'preservation' of its powers. *livre* described in detail the influence of international Zionism on the and its cunning efforts to subvert both the socialist states and the new national states. It also dealt extensively with the so-called ramified network of Zionist propaganda organs, supported by the mainstream media, which it claimed was behind the creation of a Zionist propaganda network" (42).

By the time the Red Army had crossed the border into Czechoslovakia, the official Soviet organs were portraying that country as the embodiment of "counter-revolution", in which the Zionists played an important role (43). In the months that followed, they continued to denounce, with a vehemence, the Zionist forces which, according to the Kremlin, were at the origin of this "counter-attack".

revolution". These were not just anti-Zionist demonstrations. When, the day after the Soviet tanks entered Prague, Brezhnev convened the Political Bureau of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, Piotr Chelost, General Secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party, called Kriegel, a member of the Czechoslovak Political Bureau, a "Galic Jew" (44), "under the approving or indifferent gaze of the other Soviet leaders" (45). "If Tsarist anti-Semitism [had] been shamelessly displayed, Stalinist anti-Semitism, even under [...] Brezhnev, tried to disguise itself. The mask crumbled, but the Kremlin bureaucrats tried never to let it fall" (46). The bureaucrat Alexandrov, in a report to the secretariat of the Central Committee, denounced the over-representation of Jews in Russian cinema, "just capable of thriving like parasites" (47). It was not just a question of words: for example, on 28 October 1973, the police prevented a group of Lithuanian Jews from going to the cinema to lay wreaths of flowers at the place where the national-socialists and the Lithuanian nationalists had shot Jews in 1941 near Kaunas. In 1974, "the Stern affair illustrated both the government's anti-Semitic policy and the resistance it encountered among the population" (48).

But why, in 1981, did Brezhnev, as mentioned above, unofficially condemn anti-Semitism and, to begin with, just as unofficially acknowledge its very existence in Russia?

?

"Two distinct, albeit complementary, hypotheses can be put forward. The first is linked to external considerations, the second, much more crucially, to internal factors. The need to restore the Soviet Union's image, seriously tarnished by the public revelations of the Kremlin's virulent anti-Semitic propaganda campaign, must have been clear to Soviet decision-makers. The Council of Europe in Strasbourg had officially documented this campaign, as had an Austrian parliamentary enquiry. At the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, held in Madrid in November and December 1980, several delegates, including the President of the Council of Europe and the President of the European Commission, made a statement.

Belge René Panis, repeated the accusations of anti-Semitism levelled against the Soviet Union. In fact, the Belge's communication was one of the few, during the Madrid meeting, to enrage the Soviet Union. Soviet delegates: they vigorously denied the existence of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union, which provoked laughter from the other participants. The leaders of the Kremlin may well have been convinced that if the USSR's relations with the West, which had deteriorated following Moscow's adventure in Afghanistan, were to improve, it would be necessary for them to stop taking anti-Semitic positions.

extreme. Significantly, Brezhnev strongly advocated détente on several occasions in his speech, noting in particular that 'the vital interests of the peoples of Europe' required following the 'path... laid out at Helsinki'. The Madrid process, he said, must continue.

continue 'without interruption'. Public recognition and denial of Soviet anti-Semitism

by Brezhnev could probably contribute to this process. It is certain that the Kremlin has a great need to improve its image" (49).

The second hypothesis is much more crucial: "Exactly two years before the In Brezhnev's speech to the party congress on 23 February 1979, a six-page typed article full of anti-Semitic invectives was posted in every letterbox in Moscow and distributed in Leningrad. What was striking about the article was that it openly called Brezhnev and seven of his associates in the Politburo 'Zionists of the Kremlin' (50)".

"Impossible in the USSR" because it is "prohibited by law and constitutes a crime"; this was Gorbachev's answer to the question put to him by a journalist from L'Humanité in February 1986. after his appointment as head of the Party, to find out whether anti-Semitism existed in the USSR, Article 123 of the Constitution of the Soviet Union (1936) states that the equal rights of citizens of the USSR, regardless of nationality or race, in all areas of economic, public, cultural, social and political life are an immutable right. Any direct or indirect restriction of rights, or conversely, the establishment of direct or indirect privileges for citizens based on race, nationality or ethnic origin, is an immutable right. and the nation to which they belong, as well as any propaganda of exclusivism or of racial or national hatred and disdain, are punishable by law"; moreover, under article 74 of the Penal Code Russian penal code, reproduced in each Soviet republic (51), incitement to hatred or hostility between members of the "national community" was a crime punishable by several years' imprisonment (52). At a meeting of the Central Party Committee in January 1987 and in his book Perestroika, published the same year, Gorbachev dismissed antisemitism and Zionism as examples of unacceptable forms of national chauvinism (53), in line with the Declaration of the International Conference on Zionism and Antisemitism held in Paris in 1949. United Nations headquarters in April 1986 (54).

1 February 1988 marked a spectacular turning point: Pravda, "breaking with past official statements" by the Soviet press organs (55), categorically condemned anti-Semitism; the newspaper accused the Russian nationalist organisation Pamyat of anti-Semitism and ridiculed the thesis it was adopting of a Judeo-Masonic plot to dominate the world. He "stigmatised not only the open antisemitism of extreme right-wing groups, such as the Pamyat, who blame Jews for all the country's past and present problems, but also that of Russian nationalists who use antisemitism in their efforts to revive Russian culture" (56). He was preparing the ground for the Kremlin.

On 2 October 1991, the Washington Post reported the news, little picked up by the other media, that at a meeting with American Jewish leaders that very day in Moscow, Gorbachev had acknowledged that anti-Semitism was a problem in the Soviet Union, but that he did not consider it to be a "deep-rooted disease" in society; as for the American Jewish leaders in question, they acknowledged that progress had been made in terms of "emigration and the granting of freedoms". synagogues, Hebrew schools and other Jewish institutions".

make a public statement condemning anti-Semitism, which Russian and American Jewish leaders had been calling for for a long time, because, as the odd justification goes, "he didn't think it would serve anyone's interests to point the finger at anyone in particular" (57). Their patience would be rewarded. A few weeks later, the Russian President's loyal adviser, Aleksandr Yakovlev, who had been asked to represent him at the ceremony to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the Babi Yar massacre, issued a statement in which he said: "We are not going to do anything about it, Gorbachev made a statement in which Babi Yar was presented as "a call to the politicians of our time to be vigorous, to remember everywhere and at all times that they have been given the power to serve the people, that immoral politics should never have a place in the world.

The Nazis preyed on the basest of feelings, jealousy, national intoxication and hatred. They used anti-Semitism to infect people's minds with racism... The Stalinist bureaucracy, which publicly dissociated itself from anti-Semitism, in fact used it as a means of isolating the country from the outside world and strengthening its dictatorial position" (58). Already clearly affected by various problems, including those of memory, the windmill was not short of ranting about the "venomous germs of the Holocaust". anti-Semitism" and to "draw from the history of the persecution of the Jews a warning against the persecution of the Jews".

the current resurgence of 'nationalist excesses' in this country and elsewhere in Europe" (59). The media slogan that anti-Semitism is on the rise again has been familiar to Western Europeans for a good ten years; it was preached to Russians by Pravda as early as 1988.

Yeltsin, in a televised interview after his election victory in May 1990, decried anti-Semitism and decided that Russian organisations promoting fascism would be banned (60). On 24 February 1999, the members of the Subcommittee on European Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate, at its first session (61), entitled "Antisemitism in Russia", met with a number of representatives of the Russian Federation and the United States.

welcomed the fact that "Yeltsin attended the inauguration ceremonies of the Holocaust Synagogue in the Victory Park in Moscow in early September [1998]. He was the first Russian head of state to attend a Jewish event in this century".

denounced anti-Semitism on several occasions and formed a special commission to combat the rise of anti-Semitism in the country", while deploring that "this is not enough for the moment. [He and the people who support him must continue to take concrete action against those who violate Russian law. We call on the Russian government to

They further deplored the fact that "the Communist deputies in the Duma rejected the motion to ban the use of the Nazi symbol used by fascist groups". On 23 March of the same year, the Resolution

The Senate's concurrent motion n° 19 "Concerning anti-Semitic statements made by members of the Duma of the Russian Federation" was aimed in particular at "the Chairman of the Duma's Security Committee and member of the Communist Party, Viktor Ilyukhin", who in December 1998 had "accused President Yeltsin's 'Jewish entourage' of being responsible for an alleged 'genocide against the Russian people'" (62). There is nothing to show that Yeltsin gave in to American blackmail. "Although he relied to some extent on Jewish advisers (63), Yeltsin never actively defended Jews against the United States.

Russian extremists and several leading politicians [...] have openly used anti-Semitic rhetoric in their political campaigns" (64).

If we can imagine the table we have just drawn up of the attitudes and policies of twentieth-century Russian presidents towards the Jews as a case in point, Gorbachev would appear to be a man of great courage. Like a real UFO, Putin, whose advanced Jewishness (65) is not taken into account in Bolton's analyses (66), is like an extraterrestrial.

Notes to the Introduction

[1] Originally published anonymously in the National Renaissance Bulletin, bulletin du National Renaissance Party led by James H. Madole, who was at the time closely associated with Yockey's mentor, the American First World War veteran Frederick Weiss.

[2] The defendants were accused of being part of a Jewish cabal set up by, among others, the judge of the Ia Felix Frankfurter, the Yugoslav Moshe Pijade, described as "the Jewish ideologue of Titoism", and the Israelis David Ben Gurion and Moshe Sharett. They are said to have been part of a The indictment against Czechoslovakia was drawn up in Washington in 1947 by President Harry S. Truman, Secretary of State Dean Acheson and former Treasury Secretary Henry Morgenthau, Jr. Communist Party Secretary Rudolf Slánský was described in the indictment as being "by nature even a Zionist" (Paul Lendvai, *Anti-Semitism in Eastern Europe*, London, Macdonald & Co., 1972, p. 243-5).

[3] Yockey, *The Death of England*, Part 2, *Frontfighter*, n° 13, June 1951, p. 3.

[4] Otto Strasser, *The Role of Europe*, in *Mosley: Policy & Debate*, Euphorion Books, 1954.

[5] Martin Lee, *The Beast Reawakens*, London, Little, Brown & Company, 1997, p. 58.

[6] Edmond Taylor, *Germany: Where Fascism & Communism Meet*, *The Reporter*, New York, 13 April 1954.

[7] US State Department report, 22 June 1951; quoted by Martin Lee, *op. cit.* p. 65.

[8] Thompson registered with the US Department of Justice as an American agent of the PSR in 1952. When the party was banned, Thompson, with the help of Yockey, formed the Committee for International Justice and the Committee for the Freedom of Major General Remer, to help Remer and others prosecuted in Germany, and also helped the families of veterans.

[9] Edward A. Brandt, FBI file n° 105-23413-26, 22 October 1954.

[10] Oswald Spengler, *The Two Faces of Russia & Germany's Eastern Problems (1922)*, in *Spengler: Prussian Socialism & Other Essays*, London, Black House Publishing, 2018.

[11] Quoted in Javier Cardoza-Kon, *Heidegger's Politics of Enframing: Technology and Responsibility*, New York, Bloomsbury Academic, 2020, p. 22.

[12] Bolton, *The Decline & Fall of Civilisations*, London, Black House Publishing, 2017, pp. 260-9; Amoury de Riencourt, *The Soul of China*, Honeyglan Publishing, 1989.

[13] See Mikhail Agursky, *The Third Rome: National Bolshevism in the USSR*, London, Westview Press, 1987.

[14] He decreed that each would remain neutral if one of them was attacked by another power.

[15] *What Can Russia Win if She Plays Her Trump Card*, *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 15 March 1952.

[16] *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 5 June 1952.

[17] *Christ und Welt*, 27 December 1951.

[18] Before the Second World War, Father E. J. Reichenberger had been the leader of the Catholic Church in Czechoslovakia and an opponent of social nationalism and Germany's annexation of the Sudetenland. After the war, he became the leader of the Sudeten German emigrants and the main spokesman for the Sudeten Germans.

allemand deportees from Eastern Europe and a fierce critic of allemitic policies against Germany, in particular the concept of "collective culpability". Despite his opposition to Nazism, the fact that he had been honoured by the Vatican as a member of the Pontifical Secret Chamber and that he had received from numerous awards such as the Austrian Badge of Honour, he was denigrated for defending Germany after the war.

[19] E. J. Reichenberger, *Nord-America*, 17 April 1952.

[20] Joseph Newman, *New York Herald Tribune*, 27 August 1950.

[21] *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 30 May 1952.

[22] James Cartnal, *Dispelling a Myth: The Soviet Note of March 1952*.

[23] Andrei Gromyko, *Memories*, London, Hutchison, 1989, p. 196.

[24] Anonymous, *Knut Hamsun: Saved by Stalin?*, *Counter-Currents*, 6 July 2010.

[25] The event is described by Wolf Rüdiger Hess in *My Father Rudolf Hess*, London, W. H. Allen, 1986. Note 6 in the 'Special Treatment' chapter states that Maser wrote a typed note on his meeting with Grotewohl when he was working at the Institute for Research into Imperialism at the Humboldt University in East Berlin, which was directed by the pre-war "national-bolchevik" Ernst Niekisch, who was present at the meeting between Maser and Grotewohl.

[26] Wolf Rüdiger Hess, op. cit., p. 251.

[27] Ibid, p. 252-3.

[28] Historical and Documentary Department, Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, The USSR and the German Question: 1941-1949 (Documents from the Archives of the Foreign Policy of the Russian Federation, M. "Relations internationales" , 2003), pp. 244-53.

[29] Ibid.

[30] Ibid.

[31] Staline liquida la totalité du Comité central du Parti communiste allemand qui avait réfugié en USSR pour échapper à Hitler.

[32] NDP programme, June 1951.

[33] NDPD appeal for unity, fourth party congress, 1952.

[34] Reprinted in Kerry Bolton & John Morgan (eds.), The World in Flames: The Shorter Writings of Francis Parker Yockey, Centennial Edition Publishing, 2020.

Study notes

(1) Léon de Poncins, Revue Internationale des Sociétés Secrètes, 1 May 1935; see also Leonard Schapiro, The Rôle of the Jews in the Russian Revolutionary Movement, in The Slavonic and East European Review, vol. 40, n° 94, December, 1961 [p. 148-67]; Enzo Traverso, The Jewish Question: History of a Marxist Debate, translated by B. Gibbons, Brill, Leiden/Boston, 2018, chap. 6: Intermezzo. The Jews and the Russian Revolution (1917-37).

(2) See Jean-Jacques Marie, L'antisémitisme en Russie, de Catherine II à Poutine, Tallandier, 2014.

(3) Decree of the Council of People's Commissars of the RSFSR "On the eradication of anti-Semitism": "According to information which has reached the Council of People's Commissars, pogroms are being perpetrated in many towns, particularly in the area near the front, following which, in some places, attacks are being made on the Jewish population. The bourgeois counter-revolution took up the Tsar's weapons [...] The counter-revolutionaries are now once again engaged in the hunt for the Jews, using hunger and fatigue, as well as the obscurantism of the most backward masses and the residues of the anti-Jewish hatred inculcated by the autocracy [...] Any attack on a nation whatsoever is unacceptable and humiliating. The Council of People's Commissars declares that anti-Semitism and anti-Jewish pogroms are the death of the workers' and peasants' revolt and the death of the nation. calls on the working people of socialist Russia to fight this mal by all means. National hatred is weakening our revolutionary ranks, disuniting the united front of workers, without

distinction of nationality, and extends its hand only to our enemies. The Council of People's Commissars calls on all the deputies of the soviets to take energetic measures to eradicate anti-Semitism. Those who take part in or call for pogroms must be expelled.

"The Chairman of the People's Commissars (Ulyanov) Lenin; The Head of the Administrative Department of the Council of People's Commissars, V. L. Bontch-Brouievitch; The Secretary of the Council, N. Gorbunov" (Lidia Milakova [ed.], "N 155 Decree of the Council of People's Commissars of the RSFSR on l'éradication de l'antisémitisme (Le 27 juillet 1918)", translated from the Russian by Nicolas Werth, Patrice Bensimon, Claire Le Foll and Ekaterina Pichugina, Calmann Lévy, Paris, 2006, p. 541.

(4) Quoted in Jean-Jacques Marie, *op. cit.*

(5) <http://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1919/mar/x10.htm>; Lidia Miliakova (ed.), *op. cit.* p. 541.

(6) Interestingly, "neither the fourth Stalinist nor the fifth Khrushchevian editions of Lenin's Works reproduce this text. They did, however, reproduce the Appel La Patrie. socialiste en danger dont l'auteur est, d'ailleurs, Trotsky et non Lénine!" (Jean-Jacques Marie, *op. cit.*).

(7) The complete works of "On the Jews" were never republished in the USSR" (Jean-Jacques Marie, *op. cit.*).

(8) Quoted in Tamás Krausz, *Reconstructing Lenin: An Intellectual Biography*, Monthly Review Press, 2015.

(9) *Ibid.*

(10) Quoted in Collectif, *Communisme et complotisme : Contre les délires complotistes anti-communistes. Pour une approche réelle des faits*, La soluce, 2017, p. 138.

(11) See Robert Paris, *Léon Trotsky sur la question juive et le sionisme*, 26 September 2020, <http://www.matierevolution.fr/spip.php?article5990>.

(12) "The same was true of Trotsky's friends in Europe," from Kautsky and Luxemburg to Victor and Friedrich Adler of the Austrian Social Democratic Party (Robert Service, *Trotsky: A Biography*, Belknap Press, 2010).

(13) *Ibid.*

(14) *Ibid.*

(15) Quoted in *ibid.*

(16) Quoted in *ibid.*

(17) *Ibid.*

(18) <http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/stalin/works/1931/01/12.htm>.

(19) Myriam Anissimov, Vassili Grossman: un écrivain de combat, Paris, Éditions du Seuil, 2012.

(20) Gennadii V. Kostyrčchenko, *Tajnaja politika Stalina: vlast'i antisemitizm*, Moscow, 2001.

(21) One of the first Jewish institutions to be targeted by the Soviet authorities was the Jewish Committee. created in 1942 as part of Russian efforts to obtain American military aid, it was dissolved in 1948; its dissolution had been preceded by the assassination of its leader and the arrest of its members, who were tried the same year and, in many cases, sentenced to death (Božena Szaynok, *The Anti-Jewish Policy of USSR in the Last Decade of Stalin's Rule and its Impact on the East European Countries with Special Reference to Poland*, *Russian History*, vol. 29, n° 2/4, *The Soviet Global Impact: 1945-1991, Summer-Autumn-Winter 2002* [pp. 301-15],, p. 305).

(22) Samson Madievski, Gennadij V. Kostyrčchenko, *Tajnaja politika Stalina*, in *Cahiers du monde russe* [Online], vol. 43, n° 4, 2002.

(23) "A Soviet diplomatic official in Canada who later defected, Igor Gouzenko, recounted that he had been told in 1939 that a 'confidential' decree of the Central Party Committee sent to all directors of educational institutions established admission quotas for Jews. Gouzenko also stated that, in the summer of 1945, he had been informed by the head of the secret division of the Soviet intelligence services that the Central Committee had sent 'confidential' instructions to the directors of all factories to exclude Jews from jobs in the factory. responsibility" (William Korey, *The Origins and Development of Soviet Anti-Semitism: An Analysis*, in *Slavic Review*, vol. 31, n° 1, March 1972 [pp. 111-35], p. 117). In fact, selon Hitler, Staline had told Ribbentrop that he would have volontiers driven out all les Jews who held leadership positions in the USSR, (William Korey, *Russian Antisemitism, Pamyat, and the Demonology of Zionism*, *The Hebrew University of Jerusalem*, 1995, p. 8). "On August 17, 1942, in the midst of the Battle of Stalingrad, the Central Committee of the Communist Party published a report entitled 'On the Battle of Stalingrad'. la sélection et la promotion des cadres dans le domaine de l'art', which denounced 'l'effroyable distorsion de la politique ethnique', which resulted in 'un trop grand nombre de non-Russes (principalment of the Jews)" in many Russian artistic institutions, led by the Bolchoï. This began with music, before spreading in all directions, particularly in the 'Fight against the Jews'. cosmopolitanism'. Administrators and enthusiasts began to count the percentage of 'impure (Jews)' among executives. The quota system was reinstated, but its very existence remained a secret, unlike during the Tsarist era" (Gennady Gorelik, *The World of Andrei Sakharov: A Russian Physicist's Path to Freedom*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2005, p. 118).

(24) See Laurent Rucker, *Staline, Israël et les Juifs*, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 2001.

(25) Samson Madievski, op. cit.

(26) Maurizio Lattanzioni, Staline et la question juive, in Revue d'Histoire Non Conformiste, n° 3, June 1994; see elementsdeducationraciale.wordpress.com/2014/10/30/staline-et-la-question-juive. (27) <http://www.marxists.org/archive/trotsky/1937/02/therm.htm>.

(28) Mikhail Baitailsky, Russkii evrei vchera i segodnia, unpublished. Quoted in Roy Medvedev, Let History Judge: The Origins and Consequences of Stalinism. translated by George Shriver, Columbia University Press. New York, 1989 [1972] ; Jeffrey Veidlinger, The Moscow State Yiddish Theater: Jewish Culture on the Soviet Stage, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, IN, 2000 ; David Priestland, The Red Flag: A History of Communism. Grove Press. New York, 2009; Edvard Radzinsky, Joseph Staline, Le Cherche-Midi, 2011 [1997].

(29) Jean-Jacques Marie, op. cit.

(30) William Korey, op. cit, p. 224. See Commentary Bk, Was Malenkov Behind the Anti-Semitic Plot?The Doctors' Frame-up and Its Reversal, <http://www.commentary.org/articles/commentary-bk/was-malenkov-behind-the-anti-semitic-plotthe-doctors-frame-up-and-its-reversal>.

(31) Benjamin Pinkus, The Soviet Government and the Jews 1948-1967: A Documented Study, Jonathan Frankel (ed.), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1984, p. 90.

(32) Quoted in Sergei Khrushchev (ed.), Memoirs of Nikita Khrushchev, vol. 2, translated by George Shriver, The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2004.

(33) Benjamin Pinkus, op. cit. p. 91 et seq.

(34) Shimon Redlich, Khrushchev and the Jews, in Jewish Social Studies Jewish Social Studies, vol. 34, n° 4, October 1972 [p. 343-53], p. 353.

(35) Maurice Friedberg, Antisemitism as a Policy Tool in the Soviet Bloc, in J. Jacobson (ed.), Soviet Communism and the Socialist Vision, New Brunswick, Transaction Books, 1972, p. 124, 125.

(36) William Korey, op. cit. p. 75.

(37) Benjamin Pinkus, op. cit. p. 99.

(38) William Korey, op. cit. p. 75.

(39) Quoted in *ibid*.

(40) Quoted in Maurice Friedberg, op. cit. p. 137.

(41) Quoted in William Korey, op. cit. p. 138.

(42) *Ibid*, p. 20, for an account, repositories.lib.utexas.edu/bitstream/handle/2152/25452/Selling+Anti-Semitism+in+Moscow.pdf?sequence=59.

(43) Ibid, p. 131.

(44) Quoted in Jean-Jacques Marie, op. cit.

(45) Ibid.

(46) Ibid.

(47) Quoted in ibid.

(48) Ibid. See Alan M. Dershowitz, Guilty or Crazy as Charged, 20 November 1977, <https://www.nytimes.com/1977/11/20/archives/guilty-or-crazy-as-charged-guilty.html>.

(49) William Korey, op. cit. p. 77.

(50) Ibid.

(51) This article clearly inspired the UN drafters of the Decision adopted by the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination in application of Article 14.

of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination [2011]) (<http://docstore.ohchr.org/SelfServices/FilesHandler.ashx?enc=6QkG1d%2FPPrICaQhKb7yhsiNV6Z8nZXqCvGgfOQo8ok8yFgbhFrYQ%2Fgbs8ufS6GQOVcP17fIN9xr%2FIFxddmLpQkrzQ8LoURo36k0cJoLDq0EhJ%2FU9GBL3l%2FurXK%2B2ZjpvLr6jCaX06saKUgNTsp1TuQ%3D%3D>), immediately reproduced in the penal code of various "western" republics.

(52) From 1918 to 1921, "convictions and sentences for incitement to anti-Semitism were not unusual", but then "no one was accused of incitement to anti-Semitism, let alone convicted and sentenced for such crimes" (William Korey, op. cit., p. 328).

(53) William Korey, op. cit. p. 177.

(54) Yoram Dinstein, Anti-Semitism, Anti-Zionism and the United Nations, in Israel Yearbook on Human Rights, vol. 17, 1987, p. 15-23.

(55) See <http://www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-1990-07-23-mn-412-story.html>.

(56) See Michael Parks, Anti-Semitic Tide Perilous, Pravda Says: Soviet Union: Party paper warns that rapidly growing prejudice undermines political and economic reforms, 23 juillet 1990, <http://www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-1990-07-23-mn-412-story.html>. One of the group's directors, Constantin V. Smirnov-Ostashvili, aged 55, was the first person in Russia to be convicted of anti-Semitic insults. He committed suicide in prison. He did not commit suicide before hanging himself, and officials at the Tver penitentiary, about 60 miles north-west of Moscow, told the Tass news agency that his death was 'a mystery'" (id., Russian Nationalist Imprisoned for Anti-Semitism Kills Himself, 30 avril 1991, <https://www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-1991-04-30-mn-988-story.html>).

(57) Fred Hiatt, Gorbachev, U.S. Jews

Meet, 3 October 1991,

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/politics/1991/10/03/gorbachev-us-jews-meet/36e703e0-65b3-4aae-8bd2-da9867207eab>.

(58) Quoted in Peter Golden, O Powerful Western Star! American Jews, Russian Jews, and the Final Battle of the Cold War, Gefen Publishing House, 2012, p. 414;

<https://www.nytimes.com/1991/10/07/world/gorbachev-condemns-anti-semitism-past-and-present.html>.

(59) Ibid.

(60) Encyclopaedia Judaica: Year book, Encyclopaedia Judaica, 1990, p. 49.

(61) <http://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CHRG-106shrg55215/html/CHRG-106shrg55215.htm>.

(62) <http://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CRECB-1999-pt4/html/CRECB-1999-pt4-Pg4814-2.htm>. See also, on the campaign of the neostalinian nationalist Viktor Ilyukhin against Yeltsin and then Putin, Nadia

Russ, Russia is in a State of Ferment Again, New York, NY, NeoPopRealismPress, 2019.

(63) Susan Sarah Cohen (ed.), Antisemitism. An Annotated Bibliography, vol. 15, K. G. Saur, Munich, 1999, p. 430 refers instead to "the prominence of Jews in Yeltsin's government".

(64) Virginie Coulloudon, Broken Promises: Antisemitism under Yeltsin, Davis Centre for Russian Studies, Harvard University, February 1999. Quoted in Zvi Gitelman, Jewish Identities in Postcommunist Russia and Ukraine: An Uncertain Ethnicity, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012, p. 204, who notes that, in Russia, more than three hundred anti-Semitic advertisements were listed in 1999, compared with around forty in 1991.

(65) See <https://elementsdeducationraciale.wordpress.com/2015/11/21/vladimir-shlmv-poutine>.

(66) In November 2017, Putin's Russia went so far as to present to the UN a project entitled "The Russian Federation and the United Nations".

Combating the glorification of Nazism, neo-Nazism and other practices that contribute to alimenter les formes contemporaines de racisme, de discrimination raciale, de xénophobie et de l'intolérance qui y est associée", which was adopted by 125 votes in favour, 2 votes against (United States and Ukraine) and 51 abstentions. The opposition of the United States and Ukraine to the adoption of this draft,

wrongly interpreted in some circles as proof of the fascist nature of the governments of these two countries, is shown in detail on the relevant page of the UN website. Russia

Putin, who is regularly accused of fascism by other types of circles, had not shot himself in the foot.

Indeed, as a specialist in populist movements in post-Soviet Eurasia, Europe and the United States explains, "[...] Russia is by no means the only country in which a marginal element of society is inspired by the arguments of the extreme right, with or without references to historical fascism per se. Not only are these groups not allowed by law to participate in the game, but they are also not allowed to take part in it.

But their sociological basis remains difficult to grasp. In the United States, for example, these groups can draw on deep-rooted traditions of slavery and segregation and on voters with a similar worldview, but this is not the case in Russia. The Russian authorities have in turn repressed, marginalised or adopted a policy of laissez-faire towards the initiatives of the [Russian] radical right, or even co-opted them, depending on the context. This interaction is in fact much more complex, because the Russian state is made up of a multitude of actors and 'spaces'. We can discern a dozen high-level political figures who, in one way or another, play the role of eminence grise by trying to promote, support and protect the figures of the radical right and to bring them closer to the State authorities. Two groups - the sections of the Church under the personal direction of Bishop Tikhon and several groups of high ranking members of the military, either in the They also seem to be supported by the Ministry of Defence and the security services. However, they represent only a small part of Russia's political elite. [...] The fascist 'tree [Russian] should not hide the Russian ideological forest, should not hide the existence of other ideologies, which celebrate the uniqueness of Russia in a more traditional way, emphasising national history and culture, orthodoxy or a certain form of Soviet nostalgia. The Classical fascism, i.e. historical European fascism or white supremacism, is still despised by Russian public opinion and widely repressed by Russian state bodies. What I call 'parafascism', i.e. Russified doctrines such as [that of the reactionary, monarchist and ultra-nationalist group] Black Hundreds, Eurasianism, Bolshevik nationalism, mystical stalinism, which may have certain conceptual characteristics in common with fascism - belief in a meta-ideology and an ecstatic elite, an appeal to mass indoctrination and state violence, a utopia of national regeneration through war - have some room to manoeuvre. They gives them the right to exist as the radical ends of a broader spectrum of accepted doctrines considered to be part of the classical forms of Russian nationalism or conservatism. Russian: the 'Black Hundreds' are the radical end of the continuum of rehabilitation of tsarism, Eurasianism the radical end of the continuum of belief in Russia as the pivot of Eurasia, mystical stalinism and national-bolchevism at the radical end of the continuum of nostalgia for Soviet greatness. These doctrines, which can exist thanks to some powerful patrons, are nevertheless outside the mainstream of what the presidential administration and the Russian government promote at the level of everyday government. Russia's main ideational current is based on a much more conventional and consensual approach, which combines nostalgia with the desire to make a difference. At the same time, we have seen the emergence of a new world order that would challenge the hypocrisy and moral decadence [...] of the West. At the same time, The official line continues to refer to Europe as a civilised cradle embodying a superior culture and quality of life (Engström, 2020) and to state that, in the 21st century, it is 'normal' for each country to accept modernity/modernisation/mondialisation. Cultivating doctrinal plurality, flou and implicitness, this current thinks of ideologies in a market logic: the Contradictory ideational products are developed for each micro-civic audience in order to obtain the greatest possible consensus around the regime. If there is a dominant ideological trend to be identified, it is ideiberalism" (Marlene Laruelle, *Is Russia Fascist?: Unraveling Propaganda East and West*, Cornell University Press, 2021) Putin's Rtssie gave the example, when, in May 2014, the Duma voted in first reading a law against the "rehabilitation of Nazism, thus reinforcing" the sanctions.

against the 'denial of the facts' established by the Nuremberg Tribunal, the 'apology of the crimes' established by the Nuremberg Tribunal, and the 'denial of the facts' established by the Nuremberg Tribunal.

tribunal, 'as well as the dissemination of false information about the activities of the Soviet Union during the Second World War' [...]" (The Duma passes a law against the "rehabilitation of Nazism", 4 avril 2014, <https://www.lapresse.ca/international/europe/201404/04/01-4754521-la-douma-vote-une-loi-contre-la-rehabilitation-du-nazisme.php>). The crime "is punishable by a fine of up to 300,000 roubles (8,400 dollars) or three years' imprisonment. If a state official commits the offence, he or she is liable to a prison sentence of up to five years, a fine of up to 500,000 roubles or three years' imprisonment.

roubles (14,000 dollars) and a ban on holding government office for three years. The public desecration of symbols of Russian military history or the dissemination of disrespectful information on public holidays dedicated to the defence of the country are punishable by a fine of up to 300,000 roubles or one year's community service" (<https://www.ponarseurasia.org/the-implications-of-russia-s-law-against-the-rehabilitation-of-nazism/>).

Race, Ethnos and The Fourth Political Theory (1)

Each side has spies on the other sides, especially in wartime, and in wartime men on both sides tend, as a matter of expediency, to stroke the authorities in the right direction, to adhere sentimentally to the ideology and propaganda of the regime, as long as everything is going well, only to turn round when things start to go wrong, or at least, since not everyone can renounce the ideas they do not hold, to make eyes at the enemy side.

and, to use a typically biblical expression, sell him his birthright for a plate of lentils, as soon as the wind changes, when victory changes sides. Their country invaded, occupied, legitimately or not, for its own good or not, opportunists immediately collaborate with the invader, whoever the invader may be, whether he occupies the territory of others legitimately or not. for the good of others or not. Their country invaded, their country occupied by frogs, opportunists would do the same.

allegiance to the frogs. Their country invaded, their country occupied by hoovers, the opportunists would pledge allegiance to the hoovers. As soon as his country was, rightly or wrongly, liberated and occupied by the opposing camp, the opportunist joined the opposing camp, waiting to pursue his cause with impunity.

career under the occupier, a career which, if the occupier judges that, of all the viziers at his disposal, he is the most qualified to take the measures necessary for the definitive enslavement of the country.

country, can lead him to the limelight of the Republic. Inevitably, his past catches up with him, preferably in the paneled twilight of his life. In most cases, the past in question is

fascist past; it is extremely rare for an opportunist to be caught out by a communist past, but it is extremely common for an opportunist journalist to pinpoint an opportunist politician for his fascist past and that the opportunist journalist argues from this past to conclude that the opportunist politician has never ceased to be a fascist and, generalising, that fascism, under the guise of "fascism", has never ceased to be a fascist.

democracy, is still in power. In 1995, for example, *Libération* revealed that Bernhard de Lippe-Biesterfeld, Prince Consort of the Netherlands from 1950 to 1980, had been a member of the NSDAP from 1933 to 1936.

The Bilderberg Club, one of the flagships of globalism, was a member of the Steering Committee from 1954 to 1975, and every budding Sherlock Holmes on the planet has deduced that the Bilderberg Club can only be a den of "Fascists" and "Nazis" (a number of films on the subject have already been released by Hollywood studios). The NSDAP was not infiltrated by agents of stateless high finance, none of those who made the

Resistance fighters in the Third Reich were not among the 4 million people who joined the NSDAP in 1936, and the administration and diplomacy under National Socialism were not riddled with traitors and allied spies (*). Nazism" is still alive and well; the Fascists are in power

The nationalist and racist policies of the governments that have led European countries since the end of the Second World War are proof of this.

never been so protected, national values so exalted, not to mention racial laws and anti-immigration laws, each as drastic as the last.

The *reductio ad hitlerum* is one of the main characteristics of all the media-savvy forms of "conspiracy theory", whose senile tenors should not all be thought of as schizophrenics - even though only a true schizophrenic is capable of making an audience aware of their schizophrenia.

schizophrenic, if they are not already schizophrenic and, if so, aggravate their schizophrenia. The "Conspiracy theory" is one of the preferred media for globalist propaganda. In power, the globalist pseudo-elites advertise globalism, just as nationalists in power would advertise nationalism. There's nothing very natural about that. This which is less so, is to present oneself as an opponent of globalism, while at the same time propagandising, in one form or another, for the values, or at least some of the values, of globalism. This is the case of all the current anti-globalization media or mediatized that extremists have. The incoherence of their positions is explained by the fact that they are either former Marxists or religious. The incoherence of their positions is explained by the fact that they are either former Marxists or religious. What the media refer to as the "far right" has not existed since the end of the Second World War, after which, in any case, all organised political groups, from parties to small groups, were more or less infiltrated by the victors (**). At the same time, Marxists have entered the world of Right-wing intellectuals to such an extent that they have replaced the Right-wing thinkers worthy of the name who were part of it, and it is their hybrid thinking that they are now trying to pass off as Right-wing principles, often with success, their public falling on the whole, through lack of critical and discriminating power, and no doubt also through lack of 'race', under the spell of their 'dialectic', of which a minimum of. However, discernment is all that's needed to spot suave sophisms, crude confusions, shaky paradoxes and machinelike subtleties; everything and its opposite can be said in the same text, or even in the same sentence.

We present below what is to our knowledge the first substantial and detailed critical analysis of the thought of one of these 'old' Marxists (**).

Alexander Dugin designated liberalism as the enemy of the "fourth political theory", or rather, since the enemy can only be an actual group of people and not an idea or ideology, he designated as enemies all those who are in favour of the world hegemony of the "fourth political theory". liberalism (i.e. the hegemony of the "West"). "If you are in favour of global liberal hegemony, you are the enemy" is one of its slogans.

What does Dugin mean by 'liberalism'? By 'liberalism' he does not mean the ideology of what Americans call 'liberals'. The term 'liberal' does not have the same meaning in Europe as it does in the United States. Liberals" in the United States are on the left: they vote for the Democratic Party and are in favour of the government. in favour of a welfare state and a regulated economy. In Europe, they would be considered social democrats. Ideologically, they are egalitarian and tend to criticise capitalism. savage. They oppose "racism", "sexism" and "homophobia" from an egalitarian point of view. They see prison sentences as a method of therapy and socialisation rather than a form of punishment. They believe in "social justice" rather than punitive justice. They believe that human beings are fundamentally good and can be saved through "social work". They

believe in social conditioning rather than personal responsibility. They believe that human beings can be saved in this world. They tend to favour a strict separation of church and state, while advocating an egalitarian worldview that is essentially a secularised form of Christianity.

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

Today, it is increasingly clear that both the egalitarian social-democratic left and the bourgeois liberal right have their roots and foundations in the ideology of human rights. Today, all the institutional parties on the left and right tend to favour multiculturalism, immigration, gay rights and the separation of church and state. On the whole, they are all in favour of gender equality and, in some cases, the liberalisation of drugs. The "right" justifies these policies on the grounds of individual rights, while the "left" justifies them on the grounds of egalitarianism. Furthermore, the middle-class leftist "revolutionaries" of the late 1960s and early 1970s often switched from the communist left to the liberal right, after realising that their adherence to the left was based on an ideological misunderstanding. They were essentially bourgeois libertarians who thought they were communists.

The difference between the 'left' and the 'right' in Europe today lies in the interpretation of one and the same fundamental anthropological and ideological heritage, that of the Enlightenment. It would be more accurate to speak of a 'liberal-egalitarian hegemony' rather than a 'liberal hegemony' at all. Liberalism and egalitarianism are based on the ideology of human rights, but emphasise different aspects of them. Right-wing liberals emphasise the individual aspect of rights

human rights. Left-wing egalitarians insist on the universal aspect of human rights. These two conceptions of humanity - universal man and individual man - are abstractions: defined only in a negative way, they both embody abstract freedom. Universal man and individual man are defined as not belonging to a group or category (ethnic or otherwise). Insofar as man is universal, "he" cannot be defined by, or limited to, membership of a particular ethnic group, a particular gender or another particular category. On the other hand, the individual as such cannot be included in a category or defined in terms of a particular group. as belonging to a collective (national ethnicity, gender, etc.), because that would violate his individuality. The individual is therefore every human being; it corresponds virtually to the whole of humanity. The individual is universal (as the representative of "humanity" as such) and all human beings are, as such, individuals (1). In other words, "universal man" can only be "individual man". Egalitarianism and individualism ultimately boil down to the same thing.

It would therefore be more accurate to speak of "liberal-egalitarian hegemony" than of "liberal hegemony" at all. This hegemony is both political and metapolitical. All the main political parties established in Europe today gravitate towards this liberal-egalitarian centre. Certain groups find themselves marginalised. Since the centre is the bourgeois, rational, humane individual, the exclusive heir of the Enlightenment, positing reason as the characteristic trait of humanity, those who deviate in one way or another from the centre are to varying degrees considered less than human, non-rational and unenlightened. The marginalised are deemed irrational, 'crazy' and 'extremist'. They are de-humanised, silenced and excluded from the political sphere. These groups include all those who do not part of liberal modernity, such as religious conservatives (mainly Christian and Muslim), who oppose gay rights and the separation of church and state. However, Christian religious conservatives are not completely marginalised - they are still present in the established political parties, even if their influence is increasingly weak. Another marginalised group are the communists, who oppose the concept of individual rights, free enterprise and private property. However, they too were not completely marginalised, particularly in universities and cultural institutions. When the need arises, they are allowed to join coalition governments. They also share a common base with institutional political parties through the egalitarian universalist aspects of their ideology, which has its roots in the Age of Enlightenment. Much more marginalised and demonised are the nationalists, who oppose, to varying degrees, universalism (insofar as they oppose immigration), free trade (insofar as they want to protect the economies of their countries of origin) and the rule of law. and individualism (insofar as they consider that national and ethnic identity In some cases, this takes precedence over individual identity). Finally, the most marginalised and 'untouchable' group of all is made up of racists and racial nationalists, who not only oppose universalism, but also egalitarianism. However heterogeneous these groups may be, they are often lumped together by the liberal centre.

Alain de Benoist, Dugin and Alain Soral want to create an "alliance of the periphery against the centre", i.e. more or less marginalised groups against the political establishment. In practice, this means means not so much an alliance between the radical left and the radical right as an alliance between religious conservatives (mainly Muslims and Orthodox) and former communists (2). A good example in Western Europe is Alain Soral and his *Egalité et Réconciliation*, which seeks to create an alliance between Muslim immigrants and French patriots. The name of Soral's movement already indicates that criticism of egalitarianism is not part of the agenda. Racism or racial nationalism either. Dugin, too, avoids any criticism of egalitarianism, downplaying the differences between the left and the right to focus entirely on attacking the "liberalism" (3). The notion of 'liberalism' - intentionally ambiguous in his work, the term sometimes refers to capitalist economic individualism, sometimes to the moral individualism of the militants of the rights of homosexuals and secularists - plays the role of a central pole of opposition that is supposed to artificially unify into a single (purely utopian) group groups that are otherwise profoundly heterogeneous.

When Dugin calls for a "crusade against the West", he is not opposing liberalism in the sense that it is a "crusade against the West". to the destruction of the white race. On the contrary, he often seems to identify liberalism with the destruction of the white race. His primary stated aim is to destroy liberalism, even if it means burying the white race with liberalism. As he says in *The Fourth Political Theory*, "liberalism (and post-liberalism) can (and must) be rejected. And if behind it lies of the inertia of modernity, the spirit of the Enlightenment and the logic of the Enlightenment. the political and economic history of the European world in recent centuries, it must be rejected along with modernity, the Enlightenment and the European world. Furthermore, only the recognition of liberalism understood as a destiny, as a fundamental influence, the very march of the history of Western Europe, will enable us to really say "no" to liberalism (4). He also defined the race that is the subject of the fourth political theory as a "non-white European" race (5). He predicted worldwide anti-white pogroms as punishment for the evils of the white race, pogroms which will not, however, be aimed at Russians, because they are not, he says [<http://www.arcto.ru/article/1289>], entirely white.

In other words, Dugin is not a white nationalist. Dugin has said that he sees race as a social construct (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7X-o_ndhSVA). This statement may seem ridiculous to us, but there is every reason to believe that it is quite sincere. It is consistent with his postmodern, relativistic theoretical orientation and with his earlier statements about the unrealistic and potentially dangerous nature of the idea of white racial solidarity:

"As far as the myth of "the solidarity of the white race" is concerned, it is a complete utopia which led not only to the Holocaust of the Jews, but also to the genocide of the Slavs. The remains of the Third

Reich are the foundation of this miserable, contradictory and totally false conception. The Anglo-Saxon world is a socio-political and cultural reality. The people of Central Europe are something different. The Eastern world of Orthodox and Slavic Christianity is a third reality. I'm certain that many non-white peoples of Eurasia are a thousand times closer to us than they are to us. and culture than the Americans". (6). In short, Dugin believes - as do many Jews - that any form of positive white racial identity will inevitably and fatally lead to "a new holocaust".

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

It may be that Dugin subscribes to the idea that, for the biological notion of race to be meaningful, i.e. for it to be possible to classify individuals as belonging to this or that race, there must be a racially pure person who could embody a standard of comparison, an ideal standard. Since, from a genetic point of view, such an individual probably does not exist, the concept of race is supposedly deprived of any scientific basis and is revealed to have only a social significance.

Because Dugin sees race as a construct, he can freely manipulate and extend the concept of 'racism' to include different forms of discrimination that the term does not normally cover: cultural, civilisational, technological, social, economic and even film and clothing. The concept of "racism" is broadened and diluted (it becomes

synonymous with discrimination on the basis of standards that are subjective or relative), to the extent that almost anyone can claim to be its victim. As he defines racism as "any attempt at a subjective assessment of the state of a theory", he can argue that, in addition to the national-Socialism and fascism, communism and liberalism are racist because they posit a certain political subject as normative (the proletariat or the enlightened bourgeois individual). There are undoubtedly racist elements in Marx's writings. He favoured colonialism as a means of modernising and industrialising non-European nations, which was a prerequisite for necessary for the final transition to communism. He was also convinced that certain races were doomed to disappear, because they were intrinsically incapable of surviving the inevitable historical evolution towards communism.

Dugin also turns anti-racism against modernity and progressivism. It is "racist" [for a white person], for example, to pass negative judgement on immigrants from Black Africa or the Middle East because they are incapable of adapting to technologically modern Western societies. advanced. In fact, traditional Arab and African conceptions of women, homosexuality, child-rearing - as well as their rejection of evolution and their religious views - are seen by Dugin as a sign of their spiritual superiority (7). He also sees the idea of Even the notion of progress is intrinsically racist, because it implies that modern society (Western society) is normative and superior to traditional non-Western societies. It is not, he says, because they are incapable of building civilisations that the latter should be regarded as superior. as societies frozen in archaic social forms. On the contrary, if they are incapable of doing so, it is because they are more spiritual and have preserved tradition better than the white race (8).

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

However, no matter how hard most "progressive" Westerners themselves try to rid themselves of racism, by a mechanism psychoanalysts call "the return of the repressed" it cleverly comes back through the back door, taking on new forms.

unconscious forms, so that, as Dugin rightly points out, political correctness itself is not an end in itself. It is even "turning into a totalitarian method of purely racist political exclusion". In addition to white 'racists', religious conservatives and nationalist conservatives are subjected - with impunity - to forms of social exclusion, aggression, open contempt, intimidation, physical and psychological violence that are clearly an expression of those patterns of behaviour that in all other contexts are denounced as 'racist'. These groups, which are often made up of the 'outsiders' of white society, the most socially and economically vulnerable groups, including the working class, the unemployed, rural dwellers and pensioners, are systematically scorned by the establishment, its journalists and its 'intellectuals', who regard them as culturally, morally, intellectually and even biologically deficient ('little whites', 'inbreds', and so on).

Dugin's mania for denouncing racism looks suspiciously like an intentional parody of contemporary political correctness, which sees discriminatory norms everywhere, and it is possible that, while accepting the postmodern deconstruction of the notion of race, he intends to turn it into a deconstruction of the term 'racism' itself, stretching its meaning to the point of absurdity, to the point of emptying it of meaning and turning it against itself. Rather than trying, as most conservatives do, to resist postmodern relativism by upholding certain norms absolute morality, the authority of Western tradition and objective standards of rationality universal, his strategy seems to be to overcome the last vestiges of modern ideological presuppositions by pushing them to their extreme postmodern conclusions.

However, in *The Fourth Political Theory*, Dugin condemns racism and especially German National Socialism, not only for epistemological reasons, but also for the following reasons moral. Dugin's condemnation of the consequences of racism is simply regarded as axiomatic and is not subjected to any philosophical criticism. It is not clear on what basis morally, this condemnation of Western racism is compatible with absolute cultural relativism, the rejection of any universal point of view that allows us to make normative judgements (including moral judgements) about other cultures. Are slavery and genocide morally reprehensible only when committed by modern Westerners, and not when committed by other groups? Dugin seems to think so, as the following statement he made on Facebook about the slavery and exploitation (for food!) of black Africans by other black Africans shows:

"There are African tribes on the Atlantic coast who raise human slaves to eat. I think this is perfectly reasonable and fully responsible. If we kill animals with our own hands, we watch them suffer and die, butcher and dismember them, touch their internal organs - or at least if we imagine these acts every time we eat, we are completely sane and we could possibly go further and adopt - in war - the same attitude towards men. In war, it is essential to take responsibility for the act of killing.

Eating animal food implies a very similar responsibility (9). But animal means sentient, which implies suffering. Let's do it responsibly - eating and fighting, in a word - the responsibility of murder. Or let us abstain. The choice is free.

We can assume that this is a sincere statement and not simply a banal desire to 'shock the bourgeois'. It is entirely consistent with Dugin's cultural relativism (the assertion of the need to suspend all normative judgements about other cultures, because there is no such thing as a 'norm').

But it is questionable how this kind of moral relativism is philosophically compatible with the fact that it claims to be Christian. Dugin criticizes

apparently bourgeois moral hypocrisy, i.e. the refusal to take responsibility for the murder and exploitation that are the conditions of bourgeois society. Dugin continues

"To kill or not to kill (to eat or not to eat): "Do what you want", but never lie (to come back to the subject of vegetarianism and cannibalism) What is good or bad depends on the set of values accepted in society... we live in one society, others live in others

societies. Every society kills, murders and commits acts of violence -... against human beings or animals But some societies recognise this and include death, murder and violence as part of their social fabric.

their sacred concepts. Other societies, which do the same or worse hypocritically, deny it,

call for non-violence, tolerance and the promotion of peace through war and murder. So I'm not judging violence per se, which depends on the culture - some cultures make it sacred, others don't -

but every human group commits the same acts - kills, tortures and eats. So all I've done is highlight the fact that the people who do it are consciously more civilised and cultured, more honest and spiritually developed, less infantile and more mature than those who commit the same act without realising it or denying its cannibalistic nature (10). Killing (and eating) is what the world - God - man - beast - is all about. This is the meaning of the priesthood. The priest is the primordial killer.

Life is painful. We have to accept it for what it is. We cause pain, we feel pain. It's a perfectly normal situation. Cannibalism is not "an exception

disgusting", nor "a horrible sign of moral depravity". In a way, it is natural. Indian tradition states that kshatriya eat vaishya (11). The Vedic hymns are full of metaphors (12) for eating (killing, devouring). I only wish to emphasise that we are responsible for what we eat, for what we kill and destroy. The African and Oceanic tribes give us an example that I find beautiful and pure". (13).

Since he accepts moral relativism, it is not clear how Dugin can simultaneously condemn the extermination and enslavement of Slaves or Jews by National Socialism, or, for that matter, the enslavement and genocide of other populations by European colonists - practices which, historically, are not peculiar to Western Europeans (cf., for example, the Old Testament). What universal moral standard does he refer to? The ideology of universal human rights?

Probably not. Christian morality, which he refuses to apply to West African cannibals and slave traders? It's hard to see how he can accuse racists of inconsistency, since not all combative proponents of racial supremacy do so.

mystery of their intentions. Finally, it is hard to see how Dugin can condemn National Socialism from a moral point of view without hypocrisy, while at the same time rehabilitating figures like Stalin and Pol Pot by describing them as "national communists".

Although Dugin considers 'racism' to be a typically Western 'disease', he does not consider it to be an 'illness'.

It is particularly difficult to find examples of this in traditional or archaic non-Western societies, especially if racism is defined as the attitude of "seeing one's own person as a victim of racism". ethnic group as normative". This is particularly true of tribal societies, where the name of the tribe often simply means "humanity" and where members of other tribes are considered to be more or less non-human or sub-human. For example:

"An instructive case is that of the Yanoama tribe in the Amazon basin, whose name means "humanity" and who consider everyone else to be inferior, sub-human (nabä). They go even further: the members of a Yanoama village habitually accentuate small differences in dialect that separate them from the inhabitants of the other villages and make fun of them because they consider them to be less completely Yanoama than they are, in other words, a bit like sub-Saharan Africans. men" (14).

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

"I don't accept that the dog in the manger should finally have the right to the manger, even if he's been lying there for a very long time. I don't accept that right. I do not accept, for example, that a great wrong has been done to the redskins of America or to the black population of Australia. I do not admit that a wrong has been done to these people merely because a stronger race, a race of a higher rank, has been allowed to dominate them.

superior, or in any case, a race more in tune with things, to put it this way, has come and taken their place (15)".

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

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

"German racism has been deliberately distorted. It was never directed against any other race. It was pro-German racism. It was concerned with making the Germanic race strong and healthy in every sense. Hitler had no use for millions of degenerates, if he could do without them. Today, alcoholism and drug addiction are spreading everywhere. Hitler cared about Germanic families, ensuring that they raised healthy children for the future. Hitler wanted to renew a healthy nation. German racism meant a rediscovery of the creative values of their own race, a discovery of their own culture. It was a search for the excellent; a remarkable idea. National Socialist racism was not against other races, it was for its own race. It was about defending and improving the race, and it wanted all other races to do the same. It was not against other races, even for their own race.

The claim that the concept of race has no biological basis, or that if it does it cannot help explain contemporary reality, is obviously false. But Dugin follows postmodern thinkers like Foucault and Althusser in arguing that, apart from race, all political subjects are constructions. Race is a product of society, not the other way round; society is a product of society. In his view, man exists as a subject only in the political sphere. "What man is does not come from himself as an individual, but from politics. It is politics that defines man. It is the political system that gives us our shape. What's more, the system

politics has intellectual and conceptual power and unlimited potential for transformation.

"In other words, the subject does not create itself, it is not a natural given like race or the individual. The subject is a construct that only exists in a political system.

It follows that, ultimately, there is no sovereign subject who creates or exercises control over the system. On the contrary: subjects exist only as functions, produced by political structures without subjects. As the political system changes, passing from one historical paradigm to another - from the The political notion of man is the concept of man as such, which is implanted in us by the State or the political system. "The political notion of man is the concept of man as such, which is implanted in us by the state or the political system. The politician is a means

We believe that we are causa sui, that we are self-generated, and it is only then that we find ourselves in the political sphere. [We believe that we are causa sui, that we are self-generated, and it is only then that we find ourselves in the political sphere. In fact, it is politics that constitutes us. [The anthropological structure of man changes when one political system replaces another. In other words In other words, the subject cannot bring about a change in the political paradigm on its own initiative - it is the new paradigm that will give rise to a new subject by means of a process of 'interpellation'.

". The study of anthropological evolution from the type of man belonging to traditional society to the type of man belonging to modern society leads to the relativisation not only of modern man, but of modern rationality as such. This relativisation of modernity is "postmodernity". The modern idea of progress towards a unified humanity on the basis of universal Reason is revealed to be an illusion, which means that traditional societies are placed at the end of the road. same level as modern society.

In a nutshell, the argument is as follows: the subject cannot break the system (lead a revolution or bring about a 'paradigm shift') and go beyond it, if it is itself a product of the system, existing only within the limits of that system. This is why class, race and the individual, which are all subjects constituted and defined within the framework of modernity, have failed to overcome the crisis and impasses of modernity. In short, the subject should be founded on a kind of Archimedean point outside the political system, in order to have the necessary leverage for radical political action. It would have to be a 'radical subject' and, for Dugin, the 'radical subject' can only be chaos. Chaos is freedom that has not yet been enclosed within the limits of the bourgeois humanist conception of the individual. The disintegration of the liberal individual is not the negation of freedom, but the revelation of the essence of freedom as sovereign anarchic chaos.

The political subject acts in the realm of politics. Ideologically, however, it must be founded in a domain prior to and superior to politics. In other words, the object of politics must be to go beyond the sphere of politics in order to be able to control, define and found it. For example, liberal ideology postulates the existence of the individual before the existence of the social order, in order to

to base the political order on the individual and his natural, universal rights. The National Socialists consider that race is a biological fact that precedes and is superior to politics, and that the State only makes sense insofar as it is an instrument for protecting and preserving race and for actualising and improving its potential. This means that, for the National Socialists, race transcends the political sphere, subordinating it to itself. The political consciousness to which they strive to awaken others is racial consciousness, in the same way that Marxists attempted to sensitise the proletariat to class consciousness (16). For Marxists, the means of production go beyond the political domain, of which they form the material basis and the driving force. A class constitutes itself as a political subject by taking control of the means of production.

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

For example, for nationalism, the real subjects of history are nations, seen as a kind of supra-person with a will and destiny of their own. History is the history of nations. Identity is essentially national, and the friend/enemy distinction (which is constitutive of politics, as Carl Schmitt has shown) depends on national borders. For racism, on the other hand

On the other hand, the real subjects of history are the different races, locked in a Darwinian struggle for life. The vision of history is determined by modern concepts of biological evolution and progress. Identity is primarily racial, and the friend/enemy distinction has a racial basis. For

In Marxism, the subjects of history are classes, once again seen as forms of collective subjectivity and, consequently, the whole of history has been interpreted as the history of class struggle. Identity is class identity and the friend/enemy distinction is determined by class.

The political subject is also a historical subject. This means that every modern political ideology corresponds to a 'grand narrative' - an overall interpretation - of history. History as a whole is seen as created by the action of a certain historical subject. It then becomes clear that political ideologies are secular substitutes for a theological interpretation of history, and that the historical subjects they posit are substitutes for divine Providence, the transcendent subject of history. As Carl Schmitt has shown, all the fundamental concepts of politics are secularised theological concepts.

The place of the political subject - the void left when God withdraws from the world and from history - is an area of contestation between the various modern political ideologies. Each has fought for occupy this vacant space with their own concept of the political subject. Each of them claimed to have mastered the destructive and creative forces unleashed by modernity and fully updated the

modernity. Communism saw itself as the final, inevitable and culminating stage of the modernity, to which industrial capitalism had merely paved the way. Liberalism saw the gradual liberation of the individual and the processes of secularisation, modernisation and globalisation as a historical necessity. Fascism saw itself as an avant-garde, a revolutionary movement, rejected bourgeois liberal democracy as an outmoded residue of the twentieth century and asserted that the organic state was the only adequate form for mobilising the masses in modern societies. Italian Fascism and German National Socialism have both modernised and revolutionised their respective countries, which contributed to their political success. Fascism, in its early days, was influenced by the avant-garde modernism of Futurism, which called for the nihilistic destruction of the past and unconditionally worshipped modern technology and "progress".

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

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

According to Dugin, in the crisis at the end of modernity, in addition to race and class, the nation-state ceases to be an authentic political subject, even if he acknowledges that the will to preserve sovereignty

In the current situation, the nation is a natural site of resistance to globalisation. The 'de-sovereignisation' of the nation corresponds, philosophically speaking, to its de-subjectivation. However, Dugin sees this 'de-sovereignisation'/desubjectivation as inevitable and even inherent in the very nature of the nation. He fully accepts the postmodern idea that the nation is an artificial, ideological and political construct, an 'imaginary community' created to unify fragmented modern societies. The nation is, in his view, merely a simulacrum, an artificial substitute for the lost totality of traditional society (he seems to see race itself as a modern simulacrum of the 'ethnos'). Historically, its emergence corresponds to the precise moment when traditional society enters a crisis. It is a compromise, a form of transition, a ruse (19). Moreover, he sees the nation as a device to facilitate the transition from traditional pre-modern society to modern civil and liberal society. Consequently, the

nation cannot constitute a lasting force of resistance to liberal globalisation. It sees the nation as a device of power adapted to the production of a certain normative, standardised type of political subject: the bourgeois individual (the citizen). In so doing, it destroys organic ethnic and regional communities (for example, by eliminating regional dialects in Italy and France and imposing a standardised national language) and liquidates the last remnants of the elite.

(the aristocracy). Thus, the concept of "ethno-nationalism" is, in his opinion, at the end of its usefulness.

There is an absolute contradiction in terms: the nation is intrinsically "ethnocidal". It

destroys ethnicity and replaces it with a 'demos'. Nationalism, according to Dugin, must be condemned not only because it has been the cause of so many wars, but because the nation itself is

It is intrinsically violent - violent in the sense that it is an arbitrary construct with no transcendent, sacred foundation. Its violence is the violence of modernity itself (admittedly, this is true of

The idea of a Eurasian empire dominated by Russia is not a new one, but it is one that has been accepted by many countries (perhaps most notably the nation of Israel, which is a thoroughly modern artificial construct, as is no doubt the idea that the Jews are a unified and homogeneous race or ethnic group).

To date, however, there is no evidence that the idea of a Eurasian empire dominated by Russia would be any less artificial, violent or 'ethnocidal'.

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

As for the fascist notion of the organic state, based on the Hegelian philosophy of the state, Dugin does not explain why he rejects the credible idea that it might be suitable for the political subject. In general, Dugin simply takes the defeat of the second and third political theories as axiomatic, without providing anything resembling weighty arguments. In his view, modernity has been fully actualised in liberal society and, therefore, ideological rivalries in modernity are over. This view probably applies more to communism than to

fascism. The death of communism was, as Dominique Venner wrote, a "disappearance without glory". Its collapse was due to its own bureaucratic inertia and its inability to manage the economic development. Fascism and National Socialism, on the other hand, were spectacularly successful political experiments and it is perhaps for this reason that they had to be destroyed militarily by their international competitors. Dugin clearly attributes the defeat of National Socialist Germany to its anti-Russian and anti-communist policies. As Dugin sees these two policies as linked to the infection of National Socialism by Atlanticism and biological racism

Anglo-Saxon, he considered that the defeat of the Third Way was the consequence of ideological errors and not simply a historical contingency. In his view, apart from the fact that National Socialist Nordicism was a vulgar, materialistic misinterpretation of the traditional doctrine of the North as the pole of tradition, National Socialism was anti-communist and anti-Slavic because it was anti-Communist and anti-Slavic because it was anti-Slavic.

Eastern, i.e. pro-Western (modern). Today, according to the Eurasists (who, in this respect, are

the heirs of National-Bolshevism), European nationalists are repeating the disastrous mistakes of the German National Socialists, when they once again oppose the 'Orient' in the form of Islamisation. Generally speaking, Eurasists try to play down the idea of a "clash of civilisations" or any assertion that there is a clear opposition between Islam and European civilisation. They accuse nationalists who see Islam as incompatible with European values of confusing "Europe" with the "West". Any interpretation of European history according to which the values of the Enlightenment are rooted in the European tradition itself - in the Classical Greece, for example (20) - is accused of trying to legitimise the "West" by inventing historical precedents and falsifying the true European tradition (21). Liberalism has triumphed because it can legitimately claim to be the most successful actualisation of the potential of modernity. Liberalism has succeeded in modernising the West to a far greater degree than the Communism did not succeed in modernising the countries of the Eastern bloc, with the result that the "West" and the United States in particular are now more or less synonymous with modernity. In the decades following the Second World War, capitalism, using economic means, modernised the countries of the Eastern bloc. Western European societies to a degree that fascism had never imagined, making the ideologies of the Third Way seem archaic and obsolete by comparison.

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

Why does Dugin give the Heideggerian concept of Dasein the central role in the fourth political theory? Heidegger developed his analysis of Dasein in an attempt to overcome the abstractions of the metaphysical concept of the subject. Consequently, his "analysis of Dasein" offers the possibility of going beyond modern political ideologies based on various interpretations of the subject. Dasein is beyond, or before, the subject-object division. Dasein is not the rational subject as the abstract foundation of the notion of universal man. Dasein is the historical, spatio-temporal structure of concrete existence. The subject is outside the world and connected to the world as a system of objects. Dasein has always existed in the world, it is involved in it, it struggles in it. The world, to use Heidegger's own expression, is a set of relations of meaning. Everything is refers to other things in an endless circular weave of relationships. Dasein's relation to these things is one of understanding and interpretation, not (essentially) objectification.

The subject is reason, i.e. it is defined by its relation to a cause and an ultimate foundation (Grund). Dasein is defined by its relation to finitude, death and the abyss (Ab-Grund). However, it is not clear how Dasein, which, according to Heidegger, is precisely not the subject, can be called the 'subject' of the fourth political theory. Dasein is not a subject that imposes
It is part of a cosmic process that transcends man and his actions. He is part of a cosmic process that transcends man and his actions. Man does not decide the history of Being.
Heidegger is not concerned with re-elaborating or modifying the concept of the subject, any more than he is concerned with reducing man to "God and tradition" as metaphysical foundations, but attempts to
to go beyond metaphysics itself, i.e. all thought that takes the Being of beings as its 'foundation' (Grund). This also means that Heidegger is far from the conceptions of 'traditionalism'.

Since Dugin invokes Heidegger and the analysis of Dasein, we can assume that his critique of liberalism and the West conceals an attempt to critique modernity as such (identified with the West). Heidegger's critique of modernity is linked to an attempt to go beyond the
philosophy of the subject. For Heidegger, modernity, when the humanitarian masks of the Enlightenment is technological nihilism, and this nihilism is the fatal consequence of metaphysics.
Western metaphysics. However, Western metaphysics is the foundation of Western civilisation as a whole (23).

Heidegger's critique is not simply political. He criticises Bolshevism, liberalism (which paved the way for Bolshevism) and other modern ideologies for failing to grasp not only their own essence, but the essence of modernity itself: technological nihilism.
The emancipation of the subject is not the goal of technological development. Quite the opposite - the emancipation of the subject is a means of emancipating technology. The last glimmers of transcendence have been extinguished in the world, so that technology can pursue, in complete freedom and on a planetary scale, the infinite circular self-reinforcement of its productive power, sucking everything into its vortex, with no other ultimate goal than power for its own sake. The West
becomes das Abendland (24), the side where the sun sets, the realm of the darkening of the divine, the withdrawal of the gods. Technology as Gestell is not mastered by man (the subject), but is
reveals itself to be the impersonal destiny of Being itself. Man as subject can never master technology, but as subject he is "subjected" by technology, insofar as the essence of technology as Gestell
constitutes man as subject. Technological development has no intrinsic immanent limit, and no frontier can be arbitrarily set as long as thought remains enclosed within the framework of the philosophy of the subject (humanism) and technological calculation (the ultimate deviation of Western logos) (25). But even as modern technology fully actualises its domination, the subject it gives rise to enters into crisis, begins to "

disappear". It is liquidated into a system of purely functional relationships devoid of a centre, fixed norms and solid foundations. The essence of the object is revealed as a kind of limit, which, was initially a necessary condition, but is now just an obstacle to be overcome. For Heidegger, this threshold, this ultimate crisis of nihilism - provoked by technology itself - opens up the possibility of thinking the essence of man and Being in a much deeper dimension, beyond the object. Instead of thinking of man as a subject, Heidegger tries to think of the historicity of Dasein. This is why the 'inner truth' of National Socialism meant for him the confrontation of between modern technology and 'historical man' (i.e. man, but not as a subject).

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

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

Man is not the unconditioned, self-generated subject of modern metaphysics. Human existence is conditioned and limited - men are, as Jünger wrote, "sons of the earth".

(26). Race is one of the many earthly conditions of human existence. A historical world is not a construction *ex nihilo*, arbitrary and unconditioned. There is, to use Heidegger's expression, a struggle between the world and the earth - the world, an articulated historical space of possibilities and decisions, and the conditions set by the non-objectified elemental forces of the earth, including blood. Blood takes on the meaning of destiny in a historical world (which does not mean that it is an arbitrary historical and social construct). For Heidegger, the limits set by the biological potentialities of human beings are not arbitrary historical creations - what is historical is the figure or constellation of particular relations that give them meaning.

We can also note that the statistical concept of race to which today's realist racists refer is very different from the national-socialist racial theories, which were based on the idea of racial purity (27) and which, in the form they take today (28), are not sufficient in themselves to give a comprehensive account of the specificity of our civilisation or culture, or of other civilisations or cultures. The differences between the mentality of Americans of European origin and the mentality of Europeans clearly underline this (29). Intuitively, however, we understand that race plays a role in the general character of civilisations and that genetic research will increasingly confirm this intuition in the future.

Dugin considers the Marxist concept of class to be useful and "very interesting" as a tool for ideological criticism of the mystifications of liberal bourgeois society. However, he considers the Marxist materialism as reductive and recognises that class is no longer a credible claim to political subjectivity (i.e. action), because the class structure of society has largely dissolved (probably as a result of the atomisation and gentrification of society as a whole - as well as technological developments). He also recognises that

Ethnic conflicts are often at the root of class struggle, not the other way round. One wonders why Dugin cannot, in the same spirit, recognise that the concept of race is also scientifically legitimate and heuristically useful, even if it means rejecting an over-reductive application of it. In my opinion, this has to do with the fact that he is an ideologue rather than a genuine thinker.

Eurasism is an ideology specially designed to meet the geopolitical ambitions of contemporary Russia. Russia is a multiracial and multicultural empire and, since the "Great Patriotic War" against Germany, Russian identity has been profoundly anti-fascist.

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

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

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

(**) The trial of the members of Nationalsozialistischer Untergrund was held in Munich in May 2013. The group was accused of racially motivated murders. It soon emerged that a number of the group's members had been murdered.

members were police informers and had incited others to commit racially motivated crimes (

[http://voiceofrussia.com/2013_05_07/Neo-Nazis-trial-in-Germany-Several-NSU-](http://voiceofrussia.com/2013_05_07/Neo-Nazis-trial-in-Germany-Several-NSU-members-were-informers-lawyer/)

[members-were-informers-lawyer/](http://voiceofrussia.com/2013_05_07/Neo-Nazis-trial-in-Germany-Several-NSU-members-were-informers-lawyer/)) Ten years earlier, one of the co-founders of the NPD

(Nationaldemokratische Partei Deutschlands) was forced to admit in court that he had been an

informer for the German secret services "from day one" (<http://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2002/01/npd-j30.html>).

(***) [http://www.theoccidentalobserver.net/2014/05/alexander-dugins-4-political-theory-is-for-the-](http://www.theoccidentalobserver.net/2014/05/alexander-dugins-4-political-theory-is-for-the-russian-empire-not-for-european-ethno-nationalists/)

[russian-empire-not-for-european-ethno-nationalists/](http://www.theoccidentalobserver.net/2014/05/alexander-dugins-4-political-theory-is-for-the-russian-empire-not-for-european-ethno-nationalists/) (translated into French at <https://www.jeune-nation.com/geopolitique/la-4e-theorie-politique-dalexandre-douguine-est-pour-lempire-russe-pas-pour-les-ethno-nationalistes-europeens-par-domitius-corbulon.html>), which we have just discovered, is fully in line

with it, right down to its conclusion. Incidentally, in the countries of the West where Dugin enjoys a certain success, it is not widely known that his father was a member of the KGB and that, at the end of the 1980s, he was a member of Pamyat, a group of nationalist agitators that some have suspected of having been, if not created, at least supported by the KGB.

(<http://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae6abb558.html>). As far as Eurasism is concerned, it is perhaps worth noting that Nikolai Sergeyevich Troubetzkoy (1890-1930), one of the instigators of Eurasism and also one of the leaders of the Decembrist insurrection in 1825, was, like his father and grandfather, a Freemason (see Fr. Dennis Stoks, *Russian Freemasonry*).

(1) The Stoics, and in particular the Phoenician Zeno of Citium, trained at the school of the sophists, said no different. Ed.

(2) Dugin may well swear that "Eurasianism is not universalism; it is a patriotism of the earth, of the Heartland (sic), of the Great Continent. Eurasianism is not just for Russia, but for all the Eurasian peoples who want to preserve their identity and their dignity", but this rhetoric is belied by the Eurasianist desire to form an alliance with anti-liberal factions of North African or sub-Saharan origin, unless, of course, North Africans and black Africans are part of the Eurasian peoples. In practice, this utopian alliance means globalism in reverse. Basically, liberalism and Eurasism both see all peoples as dependent on each other and as forming a single human community. The human community of liberalism is made up of the scum from above; the human community of Eurasism is made up of the scum from below. Ed.

(3) The 'left' and the 'right', after having been an illusion until the middle of the twentieth century, are now so little distinguished ideologically and politically, as the author of the article points out above, that Dugin cannot be proved wrong on this point. Ed.

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

(5) At the beginning of the 20th century, the essayist, historian and philosopher Coudenhove-Kalergi, one of the fathers of Europe, as there were the fathers of the Church, declared: "In the near future, man will be a half-breed", or more precisely a "Eurasian-negroid", "whose external appearance will be similar to that of Ancient Egypt [and which] will replace the diversity of peoples with the diversity of individuals". It is true that the individual in question was himself a half-breed: Austro-Japanese, to boot. Ed.

(6) See A. Dugin, "The Magical Disillusionment of a Nationalist Intellectual". Apart from the fact that J. Evola's judicious observations on the similarities between the United States and the USSR apparently did not catch Dugin's attention, many of his compatriots, when visiting the United States, noticed and emphasised the affinities between the American and the Russian. "No other nation Russian actor and theatre director Stanilavsky, is as deeply attached to [art] as America, and in this respect the Russian and American souls are close. (L. Senelick, Stanislavsky: A Life in Letters, p. 446) Dale E. Peterson, professor of English and Russian at Amherst University in Massachusetts, draws parallels between the African-American and Russian souls (see D. Pesman, Russia and Soul: An Exploration). Ed.

(7) The traditional views of the ancient Romans and Scandinavians on these issues were no less prescriptive than those of these races; the emancipation of women, the acceptance of homosexuality and the shift from character education to purely book-based education were the consequences of the Semitisation of their respective societies. Transvestite musicians entertained Mesopotamian rulers 3500 years before a transvestite won the European Broadcasting Union's 2014 competition, and the members of the pseudo-European pseudo-parliament. While it has been shown that effeminacy enjoyed a degree of public and institutional recognition in pre-Islamic society and in the early days of Arab Islamic society, transvestites, however Semitic Europe may be, did not - not even for the first time in history - enjoy any public recognition. still - this status ("Effeminates of Early Medina", Journal of the American oriental Society, vol. 111, n°4, October-December, 1991, pp. 671-693; "Gender Irregularity as Entertainment: Institutionalized Transvestism at the Caliphate Court in Medieval Baghdad", in S. Farmer, Gender and Difference in the Middle Ages, S. Farmer, C. Braun Pasternack eds., pp. 45-72). On the other hand, it has been established that the culture from which Islam emerged was familiar with the "cult of ephebes" and that homosexual practices were seen there as a status symbol - a sign of wealth and/or power, so that it is not surprising that homosexuality was seen as a symbol of social status. surprising that such practices were later widespread among the wealthy Muslims and the elite of the Islamic world (http://trace.tennessee.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1231&context=utk_chanhonoproj). To avoid not to mention those whose names are compounded with the suffix -philia. One of the most widespread myths in modern Africa is that homosexuality is not an indigenous cultural practice, but a problem caused by the white, or even Arab, presence on the continent. However, scholarly research has shown the

preponderance not only of homosexual behaviour in a large number of traditional African societies, but also the importance of models of identity formation and of indigenous cosmogonies, which refute the idea that this type of sexuality only developed through contact with foreign cultures (S. Gikandi, *Encyclopedia of African Literature*, p. 311). In moral terms as in other areas, white people have nothing to learn. Finally, Dugin, who is in favour of gay rights, lacks logical thinking when he sees in the so-called refusal of the homosexuality of blacks as a sign of their spiritual superiority over whites.

As for Dugin's and the Eurasists' very Christian assertion that the "West" is "Evil", this echoes the twentieth-century Slavophile diatribes against "The Rotten West", which, not uniquely, themselves have their origins in "the criticism of the German Romantics of the Enlightenment, of certain aspects of the French Revolution, and of the very beginnings of modern technical and materialist thought" (E. Benz, *The Eastern Orthodox Church: Its Thought and Life*, p. 190). (E. Benz, *The Eastern Orthodox Church: Its Thought and Life*, p. 190). In the same way, Islam today, not without a certain amount of cheek, blames the "West" for all its ills. Ed.

(8) As a good traditionalist, Dugin assumes that, *horrisco audiens*, the white and black races have the same tradition, which is naturally 'primordial'. Ed.

(9) "The very similar responsibility is connected with the act of eating animal food". Dugin wants probably said 'meat', but wrote 'animal food', a slip of the tongue that is all the more revealing in that it was committed by an individual who is not far from being an advocate of cannibalism. In any case, as far as the quotations from texts written by Dugin in English are concerned, we have decided to respect the syntax, if we may use that term here, the expression and the style of the author, insofar as and only insofar as this does not hinder the understanding of his formulations. Ed.

(10) "without noticing it or denying its cannibal nature". Here, Dugin does not seem to be following his own reasoning. Logically, he can only mean the following: "without noticing it or denying its cannibal nature".
acknowledging its cannibal nature. Ed.

(11) The reference is not given. Ed.

(12) Precisely, they are metaphors, *me-ta-phores*. That said, the Rig-Veda was influenced very early on by Tamil literature. Ed.

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

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

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

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

(17) "Any 'traditionalist' with intentions must normally claim to be 'anti-modern', but he or she can also claim to be 'anti-modern'.

be no less affected, without suspecting it, by modern ideas in some more or less attenuated form, and therefore more difficult to discern, but always corresponding in fact to one or other of the stages that these ideas went through in the course of their development" (R. Guénon). Ed.

(18) On the other hand, it should be pointed out that all societies in the past have also had their From Sparta to Rome, from China to Egypt, via the Christian Europe of the Middle Ages and the Middle Ages, we have all seen their "type", their "figure".

It was a Christian "Middle Ages", even if it was not the subject of a formulation: it was and, nolens volens, is the subject of a formulation: it was and, nolens volens, is the subject of a formulation.

The concept of the "new man" has a biblical origin. The concept of the "new man" has biblical origins.

(19) Nationalism is a doctrine based on the exaltation of the idea of the homeland or the nation, and a political movement of individuals who are conscious of constituting a national community by virtue of the cultural or linguistic factors that bind them together. Although everyone more or less accepts this minimal definition of nationalism, nationalism has taken on various forms, which are proving difficult to classify. In general, their classification is based on the distinction between the liberal-democratic nationalism that emerged in Europe in the first half of the nineteenth century and the nationalism of the second half of that century. The former conceived of the nation as the coexistence of the community with other nations on the basis of peace and equality (this point of view is typical, for example, of Mazzini), while the latter, linked to the reaction against parliamentary democracy and against democratic and liberal ideology, promoted a national identity and culture and implied a belief in the superiority of one nation over others. The first appears as a form of transition, accompanying the passage of political power from the aristocracy to the bourgeoisie; it is the degree immediately preceding international forms of proletarian economic collectivism and the dissolution of all nations into a single human community, even if, for the purposes of the globalist cause, nations, emptied of all sovereignty, continue to exist formally. The second, drawing on what remains of national consciousness, can, provided it is led by nationalists, put the brakes on globalism and enable a state worthy of the name to be reconstituted. Dugin is right to criticise and reject the former, although, coming from a national-bolshevist, this rejection and criticism are not inconsistent. He does not see, or pretends not to see, the second, which he knows from his reading of J. Evola. Ed.

(20) While the 'values of the Enlightenment' are certainly 'rooted... in ancient Greece', i.e. in ancient Greek philosophy, it's a bit of an understatement to say that the 'values of the Enlightenment' are 'rooted... in ancient Greece', i.e. in ancient Greek philosophy.

to identify so-called 'Greek' philosophy with values - let's not say European, since that term is anachronistic - but, in a typological sense, Aryan:

<https://elementsdeducationraciale.wordpress.com/2013/10/01/la-liberte-un-concept-desdaves-2/>;

<https://elementsdeducationraciale.wordpress.com/2014/07/01/la-liberte-un-concept-desclaves-3/>;
<https://elementsdeducationraciale.wordpress.com/2022/08/31/la-liberte-un-concept-desclaves-4/>.

Paradoxically, nationalists of this ilk defend Europe on the basis of values or concepts that they do not know to be of Semitic origin and, as a result, do not actually defend it, but help to undermine it even further. Ed.

(21) Paradoxically, Dugin, whether he realises it or not, is not wrong, insofar as what is referred to as the 'European tradition' may well not be as white as we tend to believe today (if we think carefully about the fact that the name 'Europe' is that of a Phoenician princess, that it was never used to designate our continent in antiquity, that it was brought back into fashion at the end of the eighth century by ecclesiastics imbued with Levantine culture), it was brought back into fashion at the end of the 8th century by the ecclesiastics of Charlemagne's very Christian entourage, who were steeped in Levantine culture, and it was only in the 16th century that it began to be used to refer to our continent.

used to designate the whole of our continent. As for the term "European", it is first recorded in its adjectival form (*europenses*) in the *History of Augustus* by Ammianus Marcellinus, where it is not used in the modern sense. It did not reappear in literature until the 8th century, when it was written by a Mozarabic author (i.e. a Spanish Christian who, during Arab domination, had retained the free exercise of his religion in exchange for allegiance), who used it to refer to the whole of Europe. to describe the troops of Charles Martel who defeated the Arab Muslim army at the battle of Tours and to which, because these troops represented Christianity, it seems to give a religious meaning: the *Europenses* would therefore be the Christians. Coudenhove-Kalergi does not beat about the bush: "Christianity, prepared ethically by the Jewish Essenes (John) and spiritually by the Jewish Alexandrians (Philo), was a regenerated Judaism. As a Christian, Europe is Jewish in spirit; as a moral, Europe is Jewish. "Almost all European ethics are rooted in Judaism. All the protagonists of morality, religious or otherwise, from Augustine to Rousseau, Kant and Tolstoy, were chosen Jews in the intellectual sense; Nietzsche is the only non-Jewish moralist, the only pagan moralist in Europe".

(22) It was already present in a number of ancient philosophical schools. Ed.

(23) Paradoxical as it may seem to those who allow the enemy's terminology to be imposed on them and go so far as to use it unconditionally, spontaneously, their "Western" is, at best, a "Western". is a purely geographical term and is in no way superimposed on the term "white", as the suggest the considerations developed in the previous two notes and those that follow. Ed.

(24) Like Kwame Anthony Appiah,, There is no such thing as a western civilisation, 9 November 2016, <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/nov/09/western-civilisation-appiah-reith-lecture>), we consider that there is no such thing as a western civilisation, but for radically different reasons from those he puts forward.

The term *occidens* seems to have been used for the first time in the *Tusculanes*, 24, where it means "setting sun" ("occidente sole"). In the *Acts of the Martyrs of the East and West*, published in 1748 by Estifan Awwad as-Simani (1771-1782), Archbishop of Apamea, based on Chaldaic manuscripts of the In the 3rd or 4th century AD, the term "East" covered Persia and the term "West" Palestine.

(Jean-François Godescard [abbé], *Vies des Pères, Martyrs, et autres principaux Saints*, nouv. éd., t. 1, translated freely from English, Paris, 1836, p. xix). The meaning of occidents became fixed with the division of the Roman Empire by Theodosius I in 395. *Partes occidentis* then referred to "the territories to the west of the Sirmium-Lake of Scodra line in Europe and the line that crossed the Gulf of Greater Syrte in North Africa, leaving the province of Lybia II or Upper Lybia to the empire of Arcadius and Tripolitania to the empire of Honorius.

province of Scythia". After the fall of Rome in 476, "the term 'West' refers to the provinces of the collapsed empire that were governed by barbarian kings as managers of the sole emperor, who resides in Constantinople" (Télémachos Loungēs, *Les ambassades byzantines en Occident: depuis la fondation des états barbares jusqu' aux Croisades (407-1096)*, T. C. Lounghis, 1980, p. 1 ;

However, as Voltaire perplexedly remarked [*Œuvres complètes de Voltaire, Essai sur les mœurs*, t. 2, Delangle Frères, 1828, p. 193], the word 'occident' was applied to the Greek or Eastern empire in certain accounts from the ninth century AD). *Tota occidentalis Europa*, according to Nithard (858), refers to the empire of

Charlemagne. In 1690, Furetière defined Occident as "the western part of the European continent; all the countries and peoples that inhabit it". It therefore had a relative meaning. In international politics, it was not until the 19th century that the term took on the absolute meaning of "a group of nations comprising the capitalist countries of Western Europe and the United States", i.e. the States members of N.A.T.O., which it has retained ever since. As for us, we retain its astronomical meaning of "region, part of the globe situated towards the west, in relation to a given place", by virtue of which an inhabitant of the United States is a Westerner in relation to an inhabitant of Europe, an inhabitant of China a Westerner in relation to an inhabitant of the United States, and so on.

If we understand "Western" in this way, it is also because of the negative meaning of *occidens*, from *occidere*, to fall, to fall, to be lost, annihilated... Like the first Christians, like the Eurasianists, believed that demons dwelt in the West, it is not surprising that he seized on this term for apologetic purposes. Lactantius writes: "[...] God ordained and divided the earth into two opposite parts, namely the east and the west, of which the east is said to be like God, who is the light and illuminator of all things, and who gives us birth in order to attain eternal life. But the west resembles the disruptive and malignant spirit, because it offends the light, induces and always brings about darkness, and causes men to die and perish through sin. (Lactantius, *Des divines institutions contre les gentils et idolâtres*, 1543, p. xl; Lactantius also says, speaking of the reign of the Antichrist: "Then a desolation..." (Lactantius, *Des divines institutions contre les gentils et idolâtres*, 1543, p. xl; Lactantius also says, speaking of the reign of the Antichrist: "Then a desolation..." (Lactantius, *Des divines institutions contre les gentils et idolâtres*, 1543, p. xl; Lactantius also says, speaking of the reign of the Antichrist: "Then a desolation...").

will spread over the whole earth. And the cause of this devastation will be that the Roman name (I hate to say it, but I will say it because it will be) will be taken from the earth; the Empire will return to Asia, the East will dominate again, and the West will be subjugated [Henri-François de Vence, *La Sainte Bible en latin et en françois*, t. 13, 1750, p. 144]; we have modernised the spelling). Similarly, "[...] the Lord God planted a garden in Eden on the east side" (Genesis, 2.8). On TO maps, medieval representations of the three continents known at the time: Asia, Africa and Europe, Asia occupies the whole of the upper part of the circle, while Europe and Africa share the lower part, one on the left and the other on the right (see

https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Carte_en_T#/media/Fichier:T_and_O_map_Guntherus_Ziner_1472.jpg;
<https://www.bl.uk/fr-fr/medieval-english-french-manuscripts/articles/mapping-the-world>). What better way to visually express Asia's domination of the world?

Hence the orientation of Christian buildings from the earliest centuries of the Church. From the 6th century onwards, their west towers were dedicated to Saint Michael, the leader of the faithful and the fighter of demons and devils, in order to protect the entrance. Until the end of the 7th century, the priest, looking towards the

in front of the altar and the entrance to the church, prays ad Dominum towards the east, like the faithful (Jean Fournée,

Le jugement dernier, published by the author, Paris, 1964; Jean Bouhier, Lettres, Paris, 1712, p. 117). Until the fifteenth century, all religious buildings were adapted to prayer towards the East. From the third century onwards, baptism was preceded by a formula of "renunciation of the devil", and it was turned towards the west, as Jérôme tells us.

(see Bergier [abbé], Encyclopédie méthodique, t. 3, Paris, 1790, p. 354) that it was recited by the person who

was preparing to receive this sacrament and it was also facing east that he made his profession of faith: "In the mysteries of baptism, we first renounce him who is in the West and who dies in us with sins; and turned to the East, we make a pact with the Sun of justice in him.

promising to serve him" (Jerome, quoted in A. Kempeneers [abbé], "De l'orientation symbolique des églises chrétiennes". In Annales de l'Académie Royale d'Archéologie de Belgique, vol. 25, 2nd series, t. 5,

p. 596; in Greek Orthodoxy, the catechumen must also raise his or her hands as if to

You entered the vestibule of the baptistery," says St Cyril of Jerusalem, "and standing against the West, which is the region of darkness, you were made to stretch out your hand and renounce Satan as if he had been present. Then you turned to the East, which is the symbolic land of light, and said: I believe in God the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit (quoted in *ibid*, p. 397). The idea that the Oriens that Occidens corresponded to Good and Occidens to Evil, and that Occidens had to be fought in the name of Oriens can be found in the Heliand (or Poem of the Life of Jesus) and the Altsächsische Genesis (see Jürgen Fischer, Oriens-Occidens-Europa: Begriff und Gedanke "Europa" in der Späten Antike und im frühen

Mittelalter, F. Steiner, 1957, p. 73), two epic poems written in Old Saxon for "pagans" who had not yet converted to Christianity. Frankish thought was imbued with the belief that the Frankish missionary church represented the oriens in the struggle against the "paganism" of the occidens (Gillian M. Bediako, *Primal Religion and the Bible: William Robertson Smith and His Heritage*, Sheffield Academic Press, 1997, p. 26).

(25) If technology, which generations of native Europeans, flattered by the school education they received, have prided themselves on having invented, and whose misdeeds have been skilfully used over the last few decades by the media to make them feel guilty, has indeed developed on our planet, then it's only natural that we should be able to make the most of it.

continent, this obviously does not mean that its premises were germinated in the brains of white men, any more than the exhumation of a wooden aeroplane dated 2300 BC in the temple of Abydos five years before one of the Wright brothers made the first controlled powered flight of an aeroplane means that he had

was designed by Egyptians, or that the discovery of a 2,000-year-old electric battery in the vicinity of Baghdad a few years ago implies that its designers were of Semitic race: races, ethnic groups and individuals have migrated over the centuries, there is nothing to say, until archaeological research establishes it, that the place X where an artefact Y was discovered at a time Z was

inhabited at the time it was conceived by individuals of the same race as that inhabiting it at the time of discovery; but: in the historical period, there is evidence that many of the inventions which have been attributed to whites over the last two centuries in the field of technology are in reality only applications of processes which had been developed by non-whites. Ed.

(26) More precisely, the "Worker" "is the son of the earth", the "child of Prometheus". Ever since Goethe, who had a black ancestor, we have all known that the "Western man", the white man, is Promethean by nature. We know less that Prometheus, as a Titan, takes us back to the first settlers of Greece, the Pelasges, whose rites, customs and beliefs show that they were not a people of Indo-European origin.

(27) The concept of racial purity is to National Socialism what health is to the sick: just as A. Hitler, as certain passages in *Mein Kampf* attest, was perfectly aware that the German people were far from racially pure, but did not intend to let them continue to become bastardised, so the sick, while aware of their condition, far from wishing their condition to worsen, would like to regain their health.

(28) The *Waffen SS* are certainly not responsible for the more or less fanciful interpretations of their principles by dilettantes after the war. Ed.

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

It's already a great deal to recognise that "Alexander Dugin's 4th Political Theory is for But that's not enough, because, like all proselytism, Eurasism is not to be taken or left: globalism in reverse, globalism for the underprivileged, it is to be fought, before it is eventually imposed by force. The second part of Giuliano Adriano Malvicini's essay is no less interesting than the first in this respect, not so much because it shows that Dugin has not read the authorities (M. Heidegger, J. Evola, etc.) whom he takes hostage in support of his theses, or has misunderstood them, but because he exposes the incompatibilities between the two. the radical differences between the clearly more Asian than European foundations of Eurasism and the additional dangers it represents for a Europe that is already in a state of advanced dissolution.

As liberalism, an ideology based on the rights of the individual, calls for "the emancipation of all forms of collective identity in general (and is therefore) entirely incompatible with ethnoscience and ethnocentrism, and is the expression of a systematic theoretical and technological ethnocide", the "ethnocentrism" and the positive affirmation of 'ethnic identity' are seen by Dugin as the

potential basis for resistance to liberalism. This is why he argues that 'ethnocentrism' can be seen as a positive element of National Socialism, as long as it is neutralised by emptying it of any racial or national connotations. Dugin's notion of 'ethnos' has nothing to do with race - he makes it clear that it is a purely cultural, linguistic and sociological concept, with no biological basis. As we shall see, Dugin's concept of 'ethnocentrism', which he claims to derive from the German sociologist Wilhelm Mühlman (who, however, was a racist and a convinced National Socialist), is not to be taken in its ordinary sense. As for the notion of "ethnos" itself, in *The Fourth Political Theory* he only scratches the surface, defining it as "a community of language, religious belief, daily life and the identity of resources and objectives". However, he develops it in much greater detail in a series of lectures on "ethno-sociology" (a synonym for cultural or social anthropology, or structural anthropology) (1).

The first part of Dugin's presentation gives a very brief overview of the different schools of thought. anthropology, which he considers to be a peripheral scientific discipline that has the potential to challenge and overturn Western cultural hegemony (i.e. Western 'racism'). Those familiar with the work of Kevin McDonald and his book *'The Culture of the Criticism'* will be struck by Dugin's very positive assessment of figures such as the American Jewish anthropologist Franz Boas, famous for his attempts to undermine the notion of race.

Dugin is particularly interested in the French school of structural anthropology, founded by the French-Jew Claude Lévi-Strauss, who was a student of the Russian-Jewish linguist Roman Jakobson. This chain is important for Dugin, as Jakobson was not only one of the founders of structural linguistics, but also a Eurasist. Structural anthropology is also an important link between the study of pre-modern forms of rationality and post-structural thought on the one hand, and between conservative 'holistic' thought and post-modern relativism on the other. The structural method - Dugin equates the concept of a culture as a system of synchronic relationships with the overall organic vision of society that characterises conservative thought. Dugin also claims that his concept of 'ethnos' is also based on the work of the Russian ethnologist Sergey Shirokogorov, who studied the archaic tribes of the Siberian tundra.

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

Dugin proposed 'ethnos' and 'civilisation' as possible subjects for the 'fourth theory'. political". For Dugin, the "ethnos" and not the individual is the social "atom" (the simplest form, the "political atom").

of social being). The 'ethnos' is only fully embodied in primitive hunter-gatherer societies and neolithic agrarian societies. Once again, the ethnos is not a racial group. The essence of 'ethnos', as Dugin defines the term, is not a biological fact, but a social, symbolic and linguistic structure. He is always careful to emphasise that ethnos is a cultural phenomenon and is not defined by blood ties or race. It is similar to the phenomenological concept of the pre-logical 'lifeworld' (Lebenswelt). The 'lifeworld' is prelogical in the sense that it is a community's shared horizon of understanding. The idea of 'lifeworld' allows Dugin to link the notion of 'ethnos' to the Heideggerian concept of Dasein as being-in-the-world. This point is important because Dasein is supposed to be the "subject" of the world. "fourth political theory". Ethnos is thus apparently a specific type of Dasein.

Although the notion of ethnos cannot be fully applied to archaic societies, it continues to exist as a residual stratum in modern societies, in the form of symbols and archetypes of the collective unconscious. In the modern era, the ethnic 'world of life' has disintegrated, and society is increasingly being transformed into an economic system governed by instrumental, technological rationality. Taken as an interpretative paradigm, the ethnos is conceived of as the 'normal' type of society, and modern society is seen as a deviation or distortion of this original norm. The methods of social anthropology, developed specifically for the study of primitive societies, can therefore be used as a tool for the study of modern society. Interpretation of modern societies - a point already made by some of the world's leading semioticians such as Roland Barthes and Jean Baudrillard. The non-individualistic, non-utilitarian gift economies of primitive societies, based on symbolic exchange and honour, are presented as the basis of an economic system that could be an alternative to the modern liberal capitalist economy.

It is impossible to understand the ethnos correctly using historical methods. One of the characteristics of primitive, archaic societies is that they are a-historical, or prehistorical. They have no written documents. They live in mythical time - in the sense of They live in the time of the eternal return of the same thing. The ethnos (of primitive society) is not a historical community, but a structure that reproduces itself indefinitely.

This means that it must be studied according to the methods of structuralism, which, after being developed in the field of linguistics, were later applied to the social sciences. Structuralists see primitive societies as systems of oppositions that must be studied globally and synchronically, like a language. They cannot be interpreted adequately from the point of view of causality, either as the result of evolution biological (Dugin rejects evolutionary interpretations of culture because he considers them

contaminated by the modern 'racist' doctrine of progress) or as the consequence of historical processes. The ethnos is simply a phenomenological given. Although it often seems to be a purely theoretical, artificial and utopian construct, Dugin asserts that it is empirically validated by ethnological studies of archaic societies.

Instead of being interpreted historically, the ethnos must be interpreted spatially (synchronically). The spatial structure of the ethnos, however, is first and foremost an expression of the specific landscape in which it inhabits. The landscape must not be understood from a merely material or naturalistic point of view. The landscape of the ethnos is a sacred landscape. It is not just the natural environment of a tribal group; it is also the symbolic mythical space in which the natural environment is embedded. The concept of "nature", even in its romantic anti-wilderness form, is a sacred landscape.

modernity already presupposes the separation and alienation of man from the cosmos as a primordial whole.

The world of innocent, primitive man, the ethnos, is a whole prior to oppositions and natural, the subject and the object, the symbolic and the real, language and things, thought and experience, the individual and society (and, in this sense, it has features in common with the postmodern world, in which the boundaries between the virtual and the real, the natural and the unnatural are blurred). technology).

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

The fundamental polarity of ethnos is not the polarity of subject and object, but the polarity of sacred and profane. The polarity of the sacred and the profane corresponds to the polarity of the exceptional and the normal. The profane is the normal, and the sacred is a crisis in the normal course of events - an exception that suspends the oppositions that structure social reality, transcends it and traces its limits. The sacred is both exceptional and fundamental, both dangerous and salvific ("Wo ist aber Gefahr, wächst / Das Rettende auch"). It is the outer limit of the world, but also the dark soul of things. The sacred marks the impassable limits of communal life - impassable insofar as anyone who crosses them ceases to be part of the community, or becomes a member of it. (for example, by undergoing initiation). The sacred is a paradigm common to nature and society, designating the primordial totality that transcends and includes them. The sacred is normative in the sense that it is a limit that unites and brings together all the distinct regions of the world and determines their "dimensions". The dimension of the sacred is part of the structure of being itself, and therefore cannot be separated.

never be entirely eliminated, even in the most secular of modern societies: it can only be displaced and distorted.

The space of the ethnos is structured by the relationship between a sacred centre (pole) and a profane margin. Here, Dugin draws on Mircea Eliade's work on the symbolism of the centre. According to Eliade, sacred space is founded and organised around a central point characterised by a 'hierophany': a revelation of the sacred. The centre is symbolically designated by the erection of an axis mundi, an axis that links the different dimensions (or regions) of the cosmos (2). Space is therefore not homogenous, but differentiated by a sacred vertical central axis (or core) and a profane horizontal periphery (or margin). The

Traditional cosmogonies often describe the cosmos as emanating from a central point. Again according to Eliade, the centre is the point at which a vertical movement between the different ontological planes or cosmic regions - between profane and sacred space, between heaven and earth, gods and goddesses - can take place.

mortals, the realm of the living and the dead - can happen. It is the pillar of the world, the sacred mountain - Yggdrasil, Olympus, Meru, Irminsul. Climbing a mountain, a cosmic tree or a pillar means moving from one ontological plane to another. Yggdrasil links the nine worlds to each other and enables us to move between them. The sacred centre is also the yogi's backbone, the sacrificial pole... a lingam, or a sacred tree. It is the Christian cross, a symbol of gathering. It is the altar on which

Christ's redemptive sacrificial death is re-enacted, and churches and temples are oriented around the centrality of the altar. The axis is the totem, the 'signifier-master' that gathers the tribe around it. A cornerstone or the central column of a building is another form of sacred centre. The axis combines the symbolism of transcendence and foundation. It is the column that

supports the "house of being". The centre enables man to remain in the world (the English word "The word 'house' is related to the Old Norse word heimr, 'world'), and is the pole that brings together, unifies and orders a cosmos. According to Eliade, its 'temporal' counterpart is the sun at its zenith - which, for

Nietzsche, was a symbol of the revelation of the unity of Being and Becoming in an eternal cosmic return.

While modern society revolves around the pole of the 'sacred' and inviolable individual, each ethnos is united around a sacred axis. The ethnos sees itself as living close to the sacred centre of the world. world. It is the proximity of this starting point, this source of power and this pole of attraction, that roots the ethnos in a landscape. It is not primarily defined by borders - by the exclusion of the 'other', the enemy - but by the centripetal attraction of a pole of transcendence.

Each civilisation, while encompassing several ethnoi, is also organised around a pillar, which is undoubtedly one of the poles of multipolarity. Dugin says that the symbol of Eurasism, eight arrows radiating from a central point, is a symbol of the ethno-centre. These radiating arrows are not just a symbol of Russian ambitions for imperialist expansion. They also symbolise the Eurasian origin of the tradition and its subsequent spread to the rest of the world. Dugin states

that "excavations in Eastern Siberia and Mongolia prove that this is exactly the place where the oldest centres of civilisation". Finally, he adds a postmodern touch by stating that the symbol of Eurasism is also a symbol of chaos invented by British science fiction and fantasy author Michael Moorcock in his 1970 novel *The Eternal Champion*. This is undoubtedly an allusion to his own concept of "chaotic logos" and perhaps also to "right-wing anarchism" and its conception of sovereignty.

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

Since every ethnos is a "logos" - in the sense of a structure of language, thought and social relations - it becomes the basis of a kind of cultural and linguistic relativism. The universal Reason of the Enlightenment is not the only reason. There are many different valid "rationalities" (although "reason", "rationality" and "logic" are already deviations from the "universal reason" of the Enlightenment). original meaning of "logos"). The "fourth political theory" rejects "hegemony epistemology" of the West. Dugin argues, for example, that sub-Saharan Africans should not be considered inferior because they do not measure up to the standards and criteria of the modern West. Western conceptions of Reason, Enlightenment and "emancipation" are not the universal goal that "humanity" is consciously or unconsciously striving to achieve, with ethnic and cultural differences seen as mere particularistic obstacles to be overcome along the way. The predominance of the Western form of rationality tends to exclude all other forms of rationality and to deny them legitimacy. Dugin, like other postmodernists, wants to relativise Western logos by considering it only as one of many possible logoi, with no legitimate claim to privileged status. The relationship between these logoi is non-hierarchical, anarchic and pluralist. Insofar as a subject is a kind of rationality, there are many different kinds of subjects - not just the Western, modern, enlightened view of humanity, defined by Western rationality. In other words, Dugin is reiterating the postmodern critiques of Western culture that anyone who has attended a Western university knows ad nauseam. The West's global political hegemony is

based on the hegemony of Western reason. Western rationality (technological rationality) has not only enabled Western man to subjugate his natural environment, it has enabled the West to subjugate the rest of the world. It has forced other peoples to adopt the Western model. or to remain colonial subjects of the West.

According to the ideology of the Enlightenment, reason is universal and is the characteristic of universal human nature, of man as a rational animal. Reason is what all human beings have in common, a common standard on the basis of which conflicts can be neutralised and ironed out, and the world can be made harmonious. This is the telos - the goal and end point - of history, to be achieved through progressive universal enlightenment. When this goal, this ideal end point, is achieved, conflict and therefore real politics will cease to exist. But some critics of the Enlightenment have argued that reason cannot neutralise either the struggle for power or the conflictual dimension of reality, and that reason is itself an instrument of power and domination. The only authentic freedom is an essentially political freedom, which contains within itself the possibility of a conflict - a conflict that cannot be neutralised by a common norm or a common foundation in universal reason.

The emphasis, then, is not on universal reason gradually overcoming the dark forces of the past. Each ethnos identifies with the world (the cosmos), or at least sees itself as the centre of the world, insofar as it believes it lives close to the 'sacred centre'. Each ethnos identifies with the world (the cosmos), or at least sees itself as the centre of the world, insofar as it believes it lives close to the 'sacred centre'. The ethnos is a society anchored in a mythical space-time, a sacred geography. The ethnos not only inhabits a space, but is itself a living space, in a sense that Haushofer does not give to the term Lebensraum. It is 'a living space'.

The sacred in itself is an abyss, a chaos. Outside the world of ethnos, there is only chaos. an abyss of nothingness, the residue of creation. It cannot be eliminated, it can only be kept at a distance and circumscribed by a boundary. Chaos cannot manifest itself directly. It can only reveal itself by concealing itself, by taking on a paradoxical form or figure: by presenting itself under the guise of a "nothing that is". It seizes or takes possession of an individual, who then becomes its vessel and personification (as in the case of shamanic possession or when the totemic figure represents the founder of the tribe). From then on, the anonymous forces of the outside world were socialised and could address the community, donning the personae ("masks") of demons, spirits or gods. Thanks to this personification, the sacred becomes a "subject" that can have symbolic exchanges with the community. The shaman or healer is the personification of the sacred. a central figure in tribal or 'ethnic' society, who acts as an intermediary between the ethnos and the afterlife - the sacred realm of the dead, the demons or the gods. The shaman is a figure of both liminality and power.

and 'conservator', a guardian who works to preserve cosmic order and fights the demons and evil spirits of the chaotic outside world. His job is to resolve the various crises that the ethnos and its members regularly go through. The shaman not only heals the individuals of the tribe, but above all heals the tribe itself and the cosmos, reuniting them and restoring the cosmic order founded on the sacred. He or she is capable of moving from one ontological plane to another by climbing the axis mundi, the sacred pillar, mountain or tree of the world.

Eliade believed that shamanism originated in Eurasia. In prehistoric times, it was used to transmit the elements of the primordial tradition to pre-Columbian America and other regions. Eliade sees the shaman as a kind of proto-sovereign, in the sense that he/she is able to bind and unbind through magic. He/she occupies a 'liminal' position - he/she resolves the crises in the normal order of the tribe and the cosmos, but he/she does so only insofar as he/she communicates with the dangerous and chaotic outside world. He/she has the following characteristics similar to those that, according to Carl Schmitt, define sovereignty - the power to suspend the normative order, not in order to destroy it, but to save it from dissolution and chaos.

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

The dynamic of ethnos is opposed to novelty. It sees any change as a crisis, an entropy, that weakens the stability of the cosmos. The ethnos is intrinsically conservative and antihistorical, in the sense that its sole aim is to maintain homeostasis, to work at maintaining its identity with itself. Its main concern is self-reproduction. Once again, it is not a question of biological conservation and racial self-reproduction. By reproducing itself, the ethnos ritually restores and maintains the order and balance of the cosmos and the flow of its circular economy. Its existence is centred on the cycle of the seasons, of sowing and harvesting, of birth and death. Ethnos time is therefore not linear (4) and irreversible (historical), but sequential, circular and reversible. To use Armin Mohler's terminology, we could also call the space-time of the ethnos a 'sphere' (Kugel). It is a plenitude, which has yet to experience the duality of time and eternity, of matter and spirit, of man and nature, of the individual and society, and so on. The individual is not seen as distinct from the ethnos, and the ethnos is identified with the world. This world transcends and outlives the individual. The individual's main concern is not self-preservation, but the preservation of the ethnos/world.

As ethnos time is the eternal return of the same, death is not an irreversible event. The souls of the ancestors return to their descendants. The individual as a mortal being, historically

unique, does not exist. Children are potentially destabilising elements, foreign elements that threaten the cohesion of the tribe and are assimilated through initiation. When they are initiated, as adults, they become reincarnations, or personifications, of their ancestors. (Before
At initiation, children are considered both dangerous and sacred by many primitive tribal groups). Individuality has no positive meaning for the ethnos. In this sense, ethnos is the opposite of modern society, in which the individual is defined in opposition to the community. Instead of the individual, it is the ethnos as a whole that is the normative unit, the "man". In other words, he can be seen as a kind of 'subject'.

At this point, however, it becomes difficult to see how any of this can have anything to do with Dasein, since Dasein is defined precisely by its historicity, finitude and mortal character. For Heidegger, human beings are, in their deepest and most fundamental essence, mortal. The mortal character of Dasein is not the consequence of modern Western man's loss of faith or nihilism. In a sense, the essence of man - Dasein - is finiteness and finitude. finitude is not simply a human characteristic, but part of the essence of being itself. Dasein as finitude belongs to the structure of being itself, so that the question of Dasein is a necessary step in approaching the question of being. Heidegger does not develop his concept of Dasein as a philosophical anthropology, but as part of his ontological project. Dugin speaks of Dasein, but separates the term from the question of being. In so doing, Dugin effectively empties the term of its meaning. Nowhere does he show that he really understands what Heidegger means by Dasein, or what is at stake in Being and Time.

The oblivion of being is not a human error - still less the error of Western humanity - but part of the essence of being itself. The essence of nihilism is not a human error or something created by human beings. Moreover, only complete nihilism, which coincides with the end of Western metaphysics and the global domination of modern technology, opens up the possibility of the question of being in the Heideggerian sense. Contrary to what traditionalists think, nihilism cannot be overcome by a return to metaphysics, since nihilism is itself the final actualisation of metaphysics. The essence of metaphysics is the movement of transcendence (Übersteigen). The history of metaphysics is the event of transcendence, of the transcendence of being by being. It is in this sense that Heidegger defines metaphysics as "the history of being". All metaphysical concepts are structured by the fundamental ontological difference between being and beingness, namely the transcendence of beings by being, through which beings are brought together, immobilised and held in breath by the withdrawal of being.

The historicity (Geschichtlichkeit) of Dasein is founded on the irreversible and irreplaceable event (Geschehnis) that makes Dasein itself. Dasein is not only mortal, but also "born".

"(gebürtig). Birth is the essence of historicity (Geschichtlichkeit). Birth is an "event" (Geschehnis) in the ontological sense, it is an absolute beginning, an absolute interruption, or break, with the past (even if, ontologically, it is of course a natural event, part of a continuous chain of causes and effects). Man has a history because man as Dasein is history itself.

Death, for Heidegger, is not simply a natural event, a consequence of the fact that our bodies are part of the natural world and are conditioned by its cycles of growth and decline. At

On the contrary, man's mortal nature separates him (as Dasein) from the natural realm. It has the power to violently tear Dasein away from the automatisms of inauthentic social relations, the affairs of everyday life and the impostures of false subjectivity. Heidegger calls this inauthentic, somnambulist existence *das Man*. *Das Man* is not responsible for his existence. He observes existence from the outside, as a kind of spectacle. Death is never "addressed" to *das Man*, but always concerns someone else. In a sense, the "object" - abstract humanity - is *das Man* - a floating ego detached from concrete, finite, historical existence. The traumatic truth of being-for-death, the crisis of existential anguish, isolates Dasein and liberates it at the same time, but not in the sense that the "subject" is free because it floats in an unconditioned transcendent realm, somewhere outside or beyond the objective world.

Finitude, for Heidegger, is not simply a naturally set limit to freedom, power and life. The limits that isolate and liberate Dasein are not simply negative or negative.

But they can also be positive and active - active in the sense of having the power to go beyond. The limit transcends or overcomes what it limits. The "transcendence" of Dasein is being-for-death, not the transcendence of a subject suspended above concrete existence. The individuality of authentic Dasein is not the basis of arbitrary irresponsible freedom, of hedonistic egoism. The finitude of Dasein only makes sense as historical responsibility. The authentic freedom of Dasein is not an unconditional liberation from time and history, but the very essence of historicity (Geschichtlichkeit) itself as an event (Geschehnis). Through historical existence, the finitude of Dasein becomes the source of a potential renewal and refoundation of the historical community into which it is born. Insofar as Dasein's limit is active, it is a decision, and Dasein is summoned to affirm it, to assume responsibility for it, and to anchor it in the being-as-all that it forms the project of becoming.

Heidegger would see the historicity of primitive, tribal Dasein as existing only as something undeveloped or preconscious. Only Western man has a profound experience of the fundamentally historical essence of Dasein as event (Geschehnis), which corresponds to being as an event (Ereignis). However, this experience has remained unthought of and has not been given a philosophical formulation, because thought has remained trapped in the categories of the

metaphysics, subjectivism and Christian humanism. However, Dugin attempts to relativise the Heideggerian notion of Dasein, arguing that it applies only to Western Europeans. In doing so, however, Dugin is more relativistic and postmodern than Heideggerian. By giving absolute ontological priority to language, he removes any foundation for the concept of Dasein. For Heidegger, man does not exist as Dasein because he has a language, but he has a language because he exists as Dasein. In other words, Dasein as event (Geschehnis) is ontologically prior to language and social life. It follows that the existential structure of Dasein cannot itself be determined by the structure of language and society. Heidegger's position is in a sense absolutely opposed to that of social constructivism, which is simply a form of subjectivism, which conceives of reality - including man himself - as a pure and simple creation of man. It goes without saying that Heidegger is also opposed to Marxism, which interprets the emancipation of humanity as the self-production of humanity.

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

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

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

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

Authentic communism, Dugin argues, is 'national communism' (represented by Stalin, f o r example) or agrarian communism (represented by Pol Pot). National communism" (or "national leftism", as Dugin also calls it) is interpreted as a revolt against the modern Western world, a revolt rooted in local ethnic traditions. National communism is a hybrid of the Western rationality of Marxism (8) and the mobilising force of non-Western ethnic myths. Dugin emphasises the "national-communist character of successful Marxist revolutions, which have recognised nationalist elements as a determining factor and a virtue and have largely contributed to the success and stability of these revolutions through the archaic national histories of the mobilisation of Marxism as an eschatological myth interpreted in a national way". "National communism", says Dugin, reigned in the USSR, communist China, North Korea, Vietnam, Albania, Cambodia and many other countries. communist movements in the Third World, from Mexico's Chiapas and Peru's Sendero luminoso to the Kurdistan Workers' Party and Islamic socialism". In national communism / leftism, Marxism functions as a universal philosophical framework that enables national movements - local by nature - to communicate with each other and "even to claim a universal and planetary scope; they are transformed, thanks to the socialist rationality reinvigorated by nationalism, into a messianic project". In his opinion, "national leftism could certainly have a global future, insofar as, among many segments of humanity

whatever the citizens of the modern, enlightened and rational West may say". Dugin is obviously embroidering on the old leftist, anti-colonialist theme that the Third World and non-whites are the last revolutionary subjects (Third World nationalism, unlike European nationalism, has been glorified by the Left).

as a revolt against Western imperialism). In reality, the mass immigration to the countries of the West of non-white populations attracted by the terrestrial "paradise" or "golden age" of material wealth, religious tolerance, modernity and generous welfare systems, has long made it clear that non-white peoples are not the subjects of national communist revolutions, but simply one of the instruments of the ethnocidal globalist anthropological revolution.

Dugin seems to equate the white West with the bourgeoisie and non-white peoples (or Russians, insofar as they are 'not completely white') with the revolutionary subject. He believes that the first successful communist revolution took place in Russia because the 'ethnos' there retained more of its primitive vitality than in the modern West (remember, Dugin considers Russians to be non-white). His concept of the 'ethnos' allows him to interpret Russia's backwardness as a positive trait rather than a source of shame, in the same way that the negative view of the West that is being traditionalist writings enables Muslims to see their societies as spiritually superior to the secular, anti-traditional, decadent West, while they don't seem to have the slightest remorse about living as parasites on the productive labour of Western societies. It is so obvious that we are dealing with a mechanism of overcompensation for a collective inferiority complex that it is embarrassing for the author. Russia's underdevelopment is interpreted as proof that it has managed to avoid being contaminated by the 'evils' of Western modernity. The Communist Revolution was in essence a revolt of the Russian Eurasian ethnos. against Russia's pro-Western elites. Bolshevism was a re-Asianisation of Russia. Instead of taking the modern West as the norm, which can only lead to the devaluation of the history of Russia and other non-Western countries by making them appear marginal and Dugin wants to reverse the relationship, elevating Eurasia to the dignity of a "sacred centre" and marginalising the West as its "profane periphery". Dugin attributes to Russia a central messianic role analogous to the messianic role that conservative German revolutionaries attributed to Germany as the sacred centre, or axis, of Europe. Eurasia is not only the locus of the great geopolitical decisions of our time, it is also a sacred centre in the sense of the "axis" of Europe. crossroads, crucial point, intersection and mediator between East and West, Europe and Asia. A similar role is attributed to Iran, Hungary and Turkey as Eurasian mediators between East and Europe. The Eurasists declare themselves to be close to the left-wing Turkish Workers' Party, and it is this group that has the greatest influence on Eurasian politics. for purely geopolitical reasons that they consider Turkey to be part of Europe. The massive occupation of German territory by Turkish immigrants, they claim, will be a positive factor in promoting the integration of Turkey and Germany into a common Eurasian empire (9). Here, As always for Eurasists, geographical and geopolitical considerations take precedence over racial factors, to the point of completely negating the latter. These are the consequences of the fact that

Dugin identifies ethnos, not with race or history, but with space. Here, for some reason, Dugin is suddenly no longer a proponent of social constructivism. Geopolitical determinism replaces materialist racial or historical determinism. Geopolitical factors are seen as more decisive than racial and economic factors. Racial nationalism is rejected as "utopian" or "reactionary". The question of race is not considered to be of paramount, decisive importance - which is decisive for Eurasists - and which determines the distinction between friend and foe - is the fight against the West.

The priority that Eurasism gives to land over blood makes this ideology of little relevance to today's European nationalists - for whom immigration is the decisive existential issue. The massive occupation of European soil by immigrants from Africa and the Middle East does not make them Europeans and never will. This is not only because they have no deep connection with European soil and traditions, but also because they are racially alien. Blacks and Arabs in Europe may be 'westernised', but that means only 'globalised', i.e. Americanised. Homo americanus is the normative 'human' type of the postmodern era.

Dugin attempts to interpret the secular, linear Marxist vision of history from the point of view of cyclical, mythical time, and sees the communist political revolution as a cyclical cosmic revolution, a return to a golden age of utopia. In the same way that he tries to interpret historical time as a mythical time, he tries to interpret geopolitical space as a sacred geography. He asks us to see the West as the absolutely negative pole and the East as the absolutely positive pole. In the Manichean narrative, the boring propaganda narrative of the Eurasists, the East is paradise (Eden) and the West is hell. "Sacred geography, as far as the symbolism of space is concerned, considers the East to be paradise and the West to be hell.

The East has traditionally been seen as the 'land of the Spirit', the land of paradise, the land of plenitude and abundance, the sacred 'native land' in its fullest and most perfect form. [...] The West has the opposite symbolic meaning. It is the "land of death", the "lifeless world" [...]. The West is "the empire of exile", "the abyss of the damned", to use the expression of Muslim mystics (10). The West is the "anti-East", the land of [...] decomposition, degradation, the passage from the manifest to the unmanifest, from life to death, from fullness to need, etc.". What's more, "Along the axis between East and West

Closer to the East were those who were closer to the Sacred, to Tradition, to spiritual wealth. Closer to the West were those with a more decadent, degraded and dying spirit".

"... sacred geography affirms with one voice the law of "qualitative space", in which the East represents the symbolic "ontological plus", and the West the "ontological minus". According to Chinese tradition, the East is Yang, the male, brilliant, solar principle, and the West is Yin, the female, dark, lunar principle". "The geopolitical East itself represents the exact opposition to the West.

geopolitics". "Instead of "democracy" and "human rights", the East gravitates towards totalitarianism, socialism and authoritarianism, in other words towards various types of social regime, the only common feature of which is that the centre of these systems is not the "individual", "the man with It is not a question of the individual or his particular 'rights' and 'values', but of something supra-individual, supra-human - be it 'society', 'nation', 'people', 'idea', 'weltanschauung', 'religion', 'cult of the leader', and so on. The East has contrasted Western liberal democracy with the most varied types of non-liberal, non-individualistic societies - from authoritarian monarchy to the theocracy or socialism. Moreover, from a purely typological, geopolitical point of view, the The political specificity of this or that regime was secondary in comparison with the qualitative division between the 'Western' order (= 'individualist-mercantile') and the 'Eastern' order (= 'supra-mercantile'). individualism based on strength"). Representative forms of such an anti-Western civilisation were the USSR, Communist China, Japan until 1945 and Khomeini's Iran".

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

Ernst Jünger, in his National-Bolshevik period, not only rejected bourgeois individualism, but also its opposite, mass collectivism. He believed that bourgeois individualism and the lack of The problems of the masses would be overcome by the emergence of a new "type" of man, whom he called "the Worker", who would be capable of mastering the forces mobilised by modern technology. But Dugin simply adopts, and inverts, the Popperian liberal reduction of fascism and He reduces radically heterogeneous movements to the same movement, simply because they all reject liberalism. In this sense, he interprets fascism not so much from the point of view of the left as from the point of view of liberalism.

The ethnos is therefore not what traditionalists like Evola call a traditional society. Moreover, since ethnos is in its essence anhistorical and has no relation to the other, Dugin has not sufficiently clarified how it could be a political and historical subject. It is also unclear how Dugin proposes to combine the Heideggerian concept of Dasein as historicity with the anti-historical position of traditionalism. He has, however, proposed another possible political and historical subject: civilisation. This will be the theme of the third part of this essay.

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

<https://democratia-mortui.blogspot.com/2014/06/race-ethnos-and-fourth-political-theory.html>, translated from the English by B. K.

(1) <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=D6pnd2Kq0k0>;
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7qeko11nV40>; <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nQb33bGoPl4> ;
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=g4mCgDstONQ>.

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

(3) This question needs to be explored in greater depth for reasons that are anything but linguistic or philosophical (NDE.)

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

What can be criticised here from a methodological point of view is etymological research by Heidegger. Indeed, in order to find the original meaning of a word, it is necessary to study it in its earliest attested state. Now, the conclusion he reaches that the original meaning of *legein* is "to gather", "to collect", "to assemble", the word "to say", "to speak" being derived from it, starts from an examination of this word in the works of the Presocratics, in particular in those of Heraclitus, which do not constitute the oldest Greek literature. As this is the work of Homer, it is obviously here that we must begin our search.

In Homer, the term *logos* and terms of the same family are sometimes closely linked to the idea of action and, in this case, they have a strongly positive connotation, while anything that prevents the Greeks from acting, be it speech or reflection, is condemned. Action is the only way for the hero to escape a dramatic situation with no way out; speech is useless.

However, other passages, which are more numerous but which, it should be noted, have a less direct link with heroism, indicate that speech can be as effective as action. Speech is a *τέχνη* (*tekhnê*), which can seduce. The seductive power it exerts can be positive or negative. The word *deception* can have a beneficial psychological effect, insofar as it soothes physical suffering. Seductive words are only negative when they are not sufficiently effective. The

Deception is not negative in itself; it is negative insofar as it is not sufficiently convincing. When a word immediately leads to action, it is considered to be true; when it does not, it is considered to be deceptive. For Homer, then, words are neither true nor false in themselves. misleading. Speech cannot distinguish between appearance and reality, an individual's exteriority and interiority. In fact, only Δίκη (dikê) is capable of discerning truth from falsehood in the words of men. Where necessary, the divine restores the truth.

In Hesiod, the logoi essentially concern Pandora, who is both a symbol of the human condition and an eternal feminine. In fact, she is said to have "deceptive, caressing words". Pandora's deceptive logoi are negative, because she represents injustice. But logoi are not necessarily deceptive: the king, to establish justice in a world given over to hubris, must use words. The ideal king dispenses justice in "upright sentences". On the other hand, misleading words are not to be condemned outright. They can be useful. The word is out.

Two conclusions can be drawn from a rigorous analysis of the value and concomitant meanings of legein and its various forms in Greek mythological literature. The first is that a striking resemblance with sophistry: "The effective speech of mythology uses means it transforms an unfavourable power relationship into an advantageous one, i.e. it overturns certain data by the force of its technique cunning and persuasive; this soft, charming, deceptive and seductive word is something useful, something positive because it is active. Its skill is strangely reminiscent of sophistry. Indeed, the sophist seeks to produce effects of charm and seduction through the technical use of language. He is a cunning being who does not hesitate to deceive in order to achieve his sometimes selfish ends. The logos of mythology, like that of sophistry, takes no account of the truth; its aim is persuasion. Plato would say that rhetoric is not in the least concerned with alêtheia [truth], but rather with what is likely to convince. Rhetoric does not seek to understand reality, but rather to exert its power over others. language but targets the effects of language. Moreover, the resemblance appears in the fact of associating and confusing deception and truth. Mythology is capable of telling deceptions that are similar to truths. As for the sophist, isn't he the one who succeeds in positing as being what is not, as What is a lie? It seems, then, that sophistry is going to thematise a certain pragmatic use of language that has been in operation since Homer. Homer was not yet in a position to distinguish truth from falsehood, and did not value either of the two terms of the opposition. It is only With sophistry we will see the generalisation and enhancement of the logos of skill over the logos of truth". (see M. Fattal, Logos, thought and truth in Greek philosophy, pp. 51-72)

The second conclusion is that the decision of the philosophers, beginning with Parmenides, to identify logos with truth was completely arbitrary. It was not long before Democritus began to It is so true that in every seeker of the infinite, a utilitarian dreamer more or less slumbers.

A third conclusion, which it is not possible to draw positively from the data we have the original meaning of legein, is derived from the hypothesis that

that it was originally a verb of action. in the strictest sense, almost in the sense of an action. metaphysical use of the term, and that the use made of it in Homer and a fortiori in Hesiod reflects a world in which speech (the verb 'to speak', from the ecclesiastical Latin *parabolare* ('to tell stories') has perfectly preserved the connotations of Homeric *logos*) as discourse took precedence over action, a world that was becoming more feminine as action became agitation.

The evolution of the word 'action' in a number of Indo-European languages reflects a number of factors. This is particularly the case for English, a language in which the same verb (to act, from the Latin *actus*) means both 'to act' and 'to play a role', and in which, historically, the noun 'to act' has been used to mean both 'to act' and 'to play a role'. This is particularly true of English, a language in which the same verb (to act, from the Latin *actus*) means both "to act" and "to play a role", and in which, historically, the noun *act* came into a theatrical sense in 1510. On the other hand, both "to act" and "to act" come not from "agere", but from the supin, or past participle, of *agere*: *actus*. What's more, the term used to designate a person whose profession is to play a character in a play or on the screen is actor, the fundamentally passive nature of which no longer needs to be emphasised ("a passive state under the influence of a feeling aroused by repetition, conviction, etc."). "L. Jouvett, *Le Comédien désincarné*). The whole world," says Jacques to the old duke in *Comme il vous plaira* (1599), "is a theatre, and men and women are only actors; they have their entrances and their exits"; "I hold this world," monologues Gratiano in *The Merchant of Venice*. (1596), for what it is: a theatre where everyone has to play their part". No doubt they took their desires for realities; no doubt, more than four centuries later, all the conditions are in place for their desire to become reality. (N.D. E.)

(4) The notion of the linearity of time is one of the many concepts of Jewish origin that the Eurasists and other critics of the "West" have the chutzpah to describe the linear conception of time, and therefore the nation of Progress, as "Western". Even if we can concede that cyclical time is not absent from Judaism (the Sabbath, the new moon, the annual festivals), to please some people, while remembering that Jewish festivals are not about repeating a past event, but about remembering it, the fact is that linear time predominates, starting with the doctrine of Creation. "Think (too) of the Book of Exodus, and the impetus that led the Hebrew people to leave slavery in Egypt to begin their long quest for a new life, a better future. It is the taste for the new that is central to the Bible. Abraham was told to burn down his tents and go to a new land. To refuse to move forward is to turn your back on the notion of a divine vocation. In the In the Gospels, Jesus advised against mending a garment with old pieces" (T. Verhelst, *Des racines pour l'avenir*, p. 317).

The linear concept of time really took hold with Christianity, especially with Augustine. While Roman historians still linked historical events to cycles, the Numidian Augustine (*) - whom generations of academics and theologians have laboured to pass off as an "African Roman" - described cycles as "deceptive" and argued that human history progresses in a straight line, thus introducing the notion of indefinite progress. However, a linear conception of time also implies a quantitative conception of time and, one thing leading to another, a mercantilist conception of time. time (on this subject, see J.-F. Chanlat, *L'Individu dans l'organisation: les dimensions oubliées*, p. 218).

Christian teaching, in particular as formulated by Basil of Caesarea (330-379), of whom the racial origin is unknown, invites us to change society. It's not a question of saving yourself from the world, but of saving yourself from the world. to be present in the world, to transfigure it. The Catholic and Protestant traditions of liberation will emphasise this progressive aspect of early Christianity.

Incidentally, as it would be doing Judeo-Christianity far too much honour to consider it as the first ideology of Semitic origin to have infected the Roman worldview, it would be a mistake to consider it as the first ideology of Semitic origin to have infected the Roman worldview.

It should be added that the very first notions of progress in Greco-Latin antiquity are to be found in the Syrian Posidonius of Apamea, whose "genius remained entirely oriental in its ability to combine exact sciences with a fervent mysticism".

(http://www.aakkl.helsinki.fi/melammu/database/gen_html/a0000834.php).

(*) There have been at least three Numidian popes: Victor I, Miltiades and Gelasius, who, in a letter to Emperor Anastasius was the first successor of Peter to clearly affirm the distinction and separation of Church and Empire (N.D.E.).

(5) If the form of society that has developed in Western countries since the Industrial Revolution has caused problems in other parts of the world, whether or not they have been industrialised, it has first and foremost caused problems in the West itself. Until the end of the 19th century, the living and working conditions of workers were nothing like they are today in the cities of Asia or South America (NDE).

(6) Having failed to offer as a sacrifice the "accumulated wealth", a wealth which, given the state of the economy of the Communist countries, could hardly be accumulated except in their own pockets, the Communist leaders of the whole world, particularly in the Soviet Union, while considerably impoverishing their country, considerably enriched its soil, its atmosphere, its water, its air, with chemical and biological agents. 40% of Russia's territory (12% of the world's land mass) is thought to be seriously or moderately polluted, and 75% of the country's land mass is thought to be polluted. its surface water would have become unfit for consumption. "It is fair to say that not a single part of the vast Soviet Union has been spared. Even the most remote, sparsely populated and inhospitable regions suffered severe damage. Whether in

The three elements essential to human life - water, earth and air - have been affected in areas of heavy pollution or areas of multiple pollution". (La fin de l'URSS et la crise d'identité russe Véronique Jobert, p. 178)

And continue to be so, despite the fact that, naturally, various and varied institutes for environmental protection have been set up since the 1990s. In the purest tradition of communism, a tradition that Dugin is in many ways merely continuing, the Kremlin's ideologues never ceased to maintain that pollution existed only in the West, in the North, in the South and in the South.

At the same time, scientists were seeking out and finding the sources of pollution, measuring the various levels of pollution with great precision, rigorously establishing the criteria and methods for maximum permissible concentrations of pollutants, and helping to draw up measures to combat all forms of pollution, including the pollution of the environment.

Today we can see that they were just as effective as the measures taken in other areas (Editor's note).

(7) Dugin apparently does not remember how zealously the USSR fuelled the Communist revolution in China, Cuba and Vietnam, or how generously it supported militarily and economically - via its satellites - the Communist uprisings in Yugoslavia, Albania, Korea and several countries in Latin America and Africa (Editor's note).

(8) Dugin gives too much credit to the 'West', which could have done without this 'rationality'. "It's not a specifically 'Western' idea, and we wouldn't be shy about sending it back to its sender. It is no coincidence that the Communist sphere in Asia almost coincides with the Confucian cultural sphere in China, Korea and Vietnam, and that most Communist leaders have put their faith in the Confucians.

He emphasised the continuity between Marxism and the Asian cultural tradition. (E. László, *Individualism, Collectivism, and Political Power*, p. 153) To A. Peyreffite, who reported it in "Quand la Chine s'éveillera... : ... Le monde tremblera" (When China awakes... : ... The world will tremble) and which could be used as the title of a book that could be entitled "Quand l'Europe s'éveillera de nouveau... La Chine tremblera" (When Europe awakes again... China will tremble), the Chinese Prime Minister of the time, Hua Guo Feng, confided in him, as explicitly as a confidence can be in the mouth of a Chinese: "Reaching communism through dialectics. Communism existed in ancient China. The highest ideal of our entire tradition demands that we renounce selfishness and merge into the community. The greatest joy of the Chinese is to be together. As for the dialectic, research will perhaps show that Marx borrowed it from China. Hegel seems to have taken it from Asian thought. - But at the time of Confucius, Heraclitus and Empedocles were already saying that everything flows. (N.D. E.)

(9) Since the Eurasists are taking all their white readers for idiots, and some of them are encouraging them to do so, let's not be outdone: in the interests of furthering "the integration of Turkey and Germany into a common Eurasian empire", let's propose "the mass occupation of (Turkish) territory by (German) immigrants...", with each community of ethnic Germans having its own temple built at the expense of the Turkish taxpayer. Family allowances, "social housing" and all the rest at the expense of the Turkish taxpayer.

BERSERKER

BOOKS

