

A Call to Young Europeans

By Guillaume Faye

<http://www.counter-currents.com/2010/08/call-to-young-europeans/>

Translated by Greg Johnson, with thanks to Michael O'Meara

Translations from this English translation: [Czech](#), [Portuguese](#)

To avoid repeating myself, I must first point out the statement that I made at the beginning of the manifesto *Why We Fight*. Now let us summarize, following this statement, some suggestions referred to in this manifesto. Because of our historically unprecedented situation, I recommend a strategy inspired by certain revolutionary leaders whose names need not be mentioned.

1. First off, it is important to unify, on a European scale, all the identitarian forces of resistance around a doctrine and a basic revolutionary program.

Ignoring the secondary ideological or emotional quarrels which are often merely the expressions of petty nationalisms and family or sectarian disputes, we should follow Lenin's counsel to "settle our quarrels after the revolution." For pity's sake, it is necessary to cease the oh-so-delicious internal disputes (the rumors, excommunications, and paranoias) and to reserve our blows for the real enemy. We concentrate on the essential, on what brings us together, because we are confronted with an absolute emergency (the *Erntsfall*, theorized by Carl Schmitt). Look at the Moslems: they cease fighting one another as soon as it is a question of carrying out the *Jihad* against the infidel.

2. For us the common and main enemy (the one who invades concretely, physically) is the alien colonization and settlement under the banner of Islam; obviously, one can share certain common values with the enemy, but one should not fall into the trap of feeling any sympathy for him. The enemy, moreover, profits from collaborationists — from those good European ethnomasochists who are the most dangerous to us. As for the common adversary (which seeks to weaken and dominate us), it is the United States, the objective ally of the former.

3. Our movement — which is one of radical (and not "extremist") thought — has a true monopoly on revolutionary dissidence, since we are the only ones who seek a total inversion of the dominant values and civilizational forms (Nietzsche's *Umwertung* [transvaluation]).

4. The three pillars of an ideology and project of European unity are (1) awakening an ethnic consciousness that makes defending our common biological heritage, our race, the top priority; (2) the regeneration of ancestral values, the forgetting of which is the main cause of today's tragedies; and (3) the creative assertion of an all-inclusive and revolutionary European political doctrine.

5. As indicated in the excellent title of your magazine [*Réfléchir & Agir*], reflection is fundamental, but by the same token it is also necessary to act. But how to act? What is to be done? This is always the key question. We must form a European network of resistance,

solidarity, and action around a common ideological program. This should not exclude, but include politics. It is too late now to win power by the ballot box and parliamentary democracy. It is necessary to make the following bet. It is risky like any bet, but it is our only chance in this twilight age: in the next ten to fifteen years there is likely to be a major crisis (“chaos”) which will take the form of an ethnic conflict of great magnitude, probably based on economic impoverishment; this could change the mentality of the masses, who are today force-fed like geese by our neo-totalitarian mass media.

It is a matter, then, of anticipating the “post-chaos,” of preparing for the coming storm by constituting a European network — horizontal, web-like, informal, polymorphic — of revolutionary minorities, a network of solidarity, a European international of resistance and propaganda. “The Network” should not take any name or institutional form. It is what I call the strategy of the cobra. It must stretch, in a clandestine but unshakeable manner, from Portugal to Russia, connecting cadres or elected officials of political parties, associations and circles of all natures, individuals, publishers, businessmen, financiers, net surfers, media people, etc. With three objectives: general agitprop, formation and recruitment, and the acquisition of media. In a word, it must prepare us for the inevitable confrontation. It is a matter of being ready and powerful for that day when the hurricane comes, the hurricane which is our only chance, our only lever to move the world. We also have to stop thinking that “the system is invincible.” It is strong only because of our current weakness and disorganization. Finally, it is necessary to forsake this psychopathic cult of defeat, of the “last stand.” The only people who win are those tragic optimists who think of themselves as the “first stand.”

When such a network exists, it will be time to pass to the next, properly political, stage, which is impossible to plan for today. Let us begin, then, by building our network with patience, determination, and professionalism. And let us cull from our ranks the incompetents, mediocrities, hotheads, and kooks. For such a network, united around a clear and common doctrine, must above all constitute a rigorous elite. From Resistance to Reconquest, from Reconquest to Revolution.

From *Réfléchir & Agir*, no. 9 (Summer 2001).

Cosmopolis: The West as Nowhere

By Guillaume Faye

<http://www.counter-currents.com/2010/07/cosmopolis/>

From Guillaume Faye, **L'Occident comme déclin [The West as Decline]** (Agir pour l'Europe, 1985).

Translated by Greg Johnson

The old tradition is mistaken: the West is no longer European, and Europe is no longer the West. In its course toward the West, the sun of our civilization has dimmed. Starting from Greece, settling in Italy, then in Western Europe, then in England, and finally, having crossed the seas, installing itself in America, the center of the “West” has been slowly disfigured.

Indeed, today, according to Raymond Abellio, *California* has been established as the epicenter and essence of the West.[1] Pacified at the edge of the Pacific, it is the symbol of the happiness where our civilization dies; land of the end of history, land of Hollywood's simulacrum, it is the asymptotic approach to madness, to commercial society, to the society of the spectacle, and to cosmopolitanism.

The West as a planetary movement which is always-already underway will thus continue its course towards the West by establishing its center where it has already been prepared, in the Far East, in the archipelagos of the Pacific Ocean, from Japan to the East Indies. It is the absolute reverse of the movement across the seas departing from Europe in the 16th century . . .

The West thus becomes “something” global. It appears in the form of a vague whole composed of networks of decisions, dispersed territorial zones, cultural and human blocs distributed in all countries. If the United States still dominates it, the West will increasingly take on the countenance of a “qualification”—and no longer as a membership—which crosses national boundaries.

The West, or Western civilization, indicates those places where the “Western system” prevails. These places are less and less describable in political, geographical, and ethnic terms. If the epicenter remains localized in the United States, the foreseeable future leads us to forecast a dispersion of the West, of its transformation into a polycentric ensemble of quite Western nations (Germany), fairly Western nations (the Ivory Coast), partially Western nations (Czechoslovakia), and not very Western nations (Afghanistan). But few places will be able to “escape the West.”

In parallel, if the center is everywhere and that “everywhere” is at bottom nowhere, the West has to lose any specific virtue; to be Western is to be nothing rather than something. In this process, Europeans—and Europeans alone—lose the very possibility of designating themselves validly as anything but Western. The Indian, for example, can remain “Indian” *and* Western, but the German or the Dutchman has to be *nothing but* Western, i.e., at bottom, nothing.

Neglecting borders, states, religions, the West covers much more than a geopolitical reality or a

diplomatic solidarity with the “free world.” It goes far beyond this framework. It is, in its essence, the global establishment of a form of *society*, that of the “Americanosphere.”

Not all people feel that they are founding members of the club called Western civilization. France, Italy, Spain, or Greece will never be as integrated into Western capitalist society as, for example, New Zealand which belongs culturally to the source from which capitalism drew its impulse, namely the Anglo-Saxon hegemony founded by England and continued by the United States.

The smallest deviation of identification from the primary source of ideas and the current seat of power inexorably causes national anxiety and dissatisfaction. Thus the whole planet experiences an *identity crisis* in relation to a global cultural standard that few participate in completely. The schizophrenic shame that results from this is, perhaps, from a psycho-political point of view, a powerful engine of Westernization.

Organized in concentric membership circles, the West has its center, its club house, in the so-called developed countries where English is the native tongue or at least the second language, as in Northern Europe, where the mentality has been shaped by Protestantism.

The “second circle” of club membership includes, for example, France, a moral member because of its democratic universalism and the memory of Lafayette; Israel, an honorary member; Germany and Italy, associate members due to military reverses, etc. As for Japan, it has made itself a member, and American industrialists are surely beginning to regret it.

In the countries known as the “Third World,” a Westernized class, often cut off from its culture, serves as the model of emulation for the population, whose identity crisis *vis-à-vis* the cultural standard of its “elites” makes their deculturation that much easier. Many Southern countries are thus internally divided by a cultural and economic abyss separating those who have hastily Westernized to the point of parody from the disadvantaged bearers of the wreckage of the traditional culture.

Delirious Americanism and traditional culture in decay—which appears in this regard as backwards and inferior—are violently opposed through the logic of ethnocide. Town planning, daily manners, arts, family and social structures are the places where the Western standards of “evolution” and “development” collide with traditional cultures that, as in Africa, end up thinking of themselves as backwards.

One can wonder if “Western civilization,” in particular its American aspect, is not also constructed on a rejection of Europe, although European culture is in part the starting point of Occidentalism.

Consider, for example, Greece, which with some justice is presented as one of the fundamental matrices of European civilization: Occidentalism of the Anglo-Saxon variety violently conflicts with the original Greek culture as if it were a cancer. Thus Greek culture, by an incredible reversal, appears—and not only, alas, in the eyes of tourists—“Oriental” to Westerners, whereas in Europe it remains an almost unique example of authenticity and ancestral rootedness, and for the historians and the sociologists its linguistic, musical, religious, economic, and family forms are deeply European. In Greece, and to a lesser degree in all the other European countries, the Western standard makes the people “foreign to itself,” foreign to its own culture, which becomes

an object of ethnology or is classified and neutralized as “folklore.”

The essential difference between traditional cultural standards and the Western standard is that the former are defined in relation to the cultural standards of other ethnic groups, according to a logic of differentiation (relative standards), whereas the latter claims to be *the* standard, having universal value and indeed regarding all other cultures as atypical—“backwards”—or morally abnormal, as “savages” who need to be civilized., i.e., domesticated.

This “domestication” described, *inter alia*, as a *mass global culture*, is well analyzed in the artistic field by Theodor Adorno. In this mass global culture, anthropologist Arnold Gehlen saw signs of the appearance of a “neo-primitive” era.

In this respect three types of “standardized” cultures seem to coexist: (1) global mass culture, which imposes in music, cinema, furniture, clothing, food, etc., ever more uniform styles, and which is presented in the form of a *distractive* culture; (2) an abstruse and elitist culture, both abstract and universalist, whose function is social and discriminatory (to substitute for ethno-cultural divisions a vertical separation between two cultural spheres on the scale of the entire West); and finally (3) a “museum” culture that codifies the “ancient,” rationalizes collective memory, with the aim of transforming the cultural past unique to each population into a standardized folkloric stock described as the “inheritance of humanity,” etc.

The *image of the Westerner* (a socio-mental system common to all who are Westernized) has reigned since the 1950s. It is generally organized around a simplified American culture and sanctions the domination of the Anglo-American language even in the arts and sciences.

In this regard, the ideology of “communication” plays a central role. For example, Gaston Dommergues, a specialist on the United States, showed that the American doctrines of transparency of information, world freedom of communications, established in particular on the construction of television networks, planetary data communication, and data processing, are not free of hegemonic inclinations.

The universalization of a language, especially when it passes through the computer, means the generalization of an international mode of thinking, acting, and feeling “American style.” Even if “liberty” reigns as the supreme value, with this enterprise, one must wonder if this planetary standardization of culture, supported by communications technology, really encourages dialogue between men and peoples. Can one communicate through a code that is in itself deculturized?

The most striking example of planetary cultural standardization appears to be the international youth culture of the generations since World War II. This culture, presented as an anti-bourgeois ideology of “liberation” and protest, has in reality functioned in scores of countries to create *the first Westernized middle class in history*. The generation born just after the war first bought in. Today, a large part of Western youth—including those in non-industrialized countries—share the same music, manners, and “practical culture.” One can say, according to the expression of Robert Jaulin, that the West is no longer a place, a zone, but a form of life that “crosses” all boundaries, that is interiorized in each ego.

As much as the West is a cultural and geopolitical reality, it is also a coherent and structured *ideology* whose totalitarian aim is all the more present as it is generally not immediately apparent to those lovers of freedom who claim to be our intellectuals.

[1] Raymond Abellio, *La structure absolue* [*The Absolute Structure*] (Paris : Gallimard, 1965).

From Dusk to Dawn

By Guillaume Faye

<http://www.counter-currents.com/2010/07/from-dusk-to-dawn/>

Editor's Note:

This is the first unabridged publication of the following translation with introduction by Michael O'Meara.

Translator's Note:

The following talk was given in Moscow on May 17, 2005 and recently posted, in French, on the Russian site *Athenaeum*.

For at least three reasons, I think it deserves the widest possible circulation in White Nationalist circles. The first is one which more and more English speaking nationalists are beginning to realize: Guillaume Faye is today the most interesting, if not pertinent spokesman for the genetic-cultural heritage associated with the White Resistance. Everything he says or writes on the subject of who we are, what we are fighting for, and where the main battle fronts will lie are worth thinking about. In France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Spain, Portugal, Italy, and now Russia, his ideas have touched the leading debates (even, in some cases, descending to *ad hominem* issues, which seem the least important of our concerns).

The second reason this article deserves attention is the metapolitical one. Faye is a veteran of the first major effort to practice a "Gramscianism of the Right" — that is, to wage a cultural war against the ethnocidal principles of the dominant liberal culture. Not unrelatedly, he stands out among anti-liberal nationalists, creative force that he is, in having developed a language and a discourse that reaches beyond the narrow confines of our movement, while serving as a radical alternative to the anti-White language and discourse of the existing System.

The third reason is that this talk is a succinct and eloquent synthesis of the ideas — the vision — Faye has developed in the seven books (and countless articles) he's produced in the eight years since the appearance of his path-breaking *L'Archéofuturisme* (1998). However provisionally sketched, these ideas aim at helping us through what promises to be the worst storm of our collective existence. At the same time, these ideas speak to something more primordial.

As an earlier student of our historical destiny writes: "All that is great stands in the storm" (Plato). What is coming will undoubtedly determine if we have any greatness left in us. The Whitemen of the West, the men of the Evening Lands (*Abendländer*), having gone under before, have also a long history of recognizing that it is only in resolutely confronting the dangers bearing down on them that they stand a chance of weathering them and, in doing so, of rediscovering what is still great within themselves.

Faye, I believe, is one of the seers calling us to return to ourselves and to the greatness inherent in who we are. — Michael O'Meara

Not since the fall of the Roman Empire has Europe experienced such a dramatic situation. It faces a danger unparalleled in its history and doesn't even know it — or rather refuses to see it.

It's been invaded, occupied, and colonized by peoples from the South and by Islam. It's dominated by the United States, which wages a merciless economic war on it. It's collapsing demographically, as its population ages and it ceases to reproduce itself. It's been emasculated by decadent, nihilist ideologies cloaked in a facile optimism, and it's been subjected to an unprecedented regression of culture and education, to primitivism and materialism. Europe is the sick man of the world. And its political classes, along with its intellectual elites, are actively collaborating in this race suicide. The argument I'm making is not, though, just about immigration, but also about a colonization and an invasion that is transforming Europe's biological and ethno-cultural stock; it's about not giving way to despair; about seeing that the struggle is only just beginning; and knowing that the closely related peoples of Europe have no alternative but to unite in their common defense.

The Destruction of Europe's Ethno-Biological Stock

The demographics of the non-White invasion of France and Europe is terrifying. In a recent work, "France africaine" (African France), a well known demographer predicts that if present trends continue, more than 40 percent of the French population will be Black or Arab by 2040. Twenty-five percent of school children in France and Belgium today and more than 30 percent of infants are already of non-European origin. Of France's present population of 61 million, more than 10 million are non-European and have a far higher birth rate than Whites. Every year 100,000 non-Europeans are naturalized as French citizens and another 300,000, most illegal, cross our undefended borders. The situation is not much different throughout the rest of Europe and signals the virtual end of our civilization, though the political classes have apparently yet to notice it.

Worldwide, including the United States, the White race is in steep numerical decline. It's often said that our technological superiority will compensate for this disparity, but I don't think so: The only meaningful forms of wealth and power are in human beings. For a civilization is based primarily on what the Romans called "*germen*," that is, on the ethno-biological stock, the roots, that nourish a civilization and culture.

The non-European invasion of Europe that began in the 1960s was largely self-engendered, provoked: By left and right-wing politicians contaminated with Marxist and Trotskyist ideas; by an employer class greedy for cheap labor; by Jewish intellectuals demanding a multiracial society; by the ideology of human rights that had sprung from the secularization of certain Christian principles.

In France and in Europe, the collaborators abetting the invasion have established a system of preferences for the invaders that native Whites are obliged to pay for. Illegal immigrants are thus not only rarely repatriated when caught, they continue to receive the lavish social welfare benefits handed out to them by the anti-White forces in control of the state. At the same time, "anti-racists" have introduced a host of discriminatory laws that protect immigrants from normal

social restraints, even though they are largely responsible for the on-going explosion of criminality (more than a thousand percent in the last 50 years).

The invasion is taking place as much in the maternity wards as it is along our porous borders. Combined with the demographic decline of the White population, immigration has become an economic disaster for Western Europe. It's estimated to cost \$180 billion per year (if the growing insecurity, as well as the innumerable forms of social assistance benefiting immigrants, including illegals, is figured in). This, in turn, creates new lures for the invaders: It is simply far more interesting to be unemployed in Europe than to work in the Third World. While the educated and creative segments of our population are beginning to flee, mainly to the United States, they are being replaced by Africa's refuse, which has to be fed and supported by us and hasn't anything in the way of skills or intelligence to offer.

All these facts suggest that the 21st-century European economy will be a depressed, Third-World one.

Islam's Third Major Offensive

In addition to this mass, non-White invasion, Islam is again on the offensive. With single-minded persistence, its totalitarian and aggressive religion/ideology seeks the conquest of Europe. We've already suffered three great assaults by Islam, which today stretches from Gibraltar to Indonesia. The first of these offensives was halted at Portiers in 732 by Charles Martel; the second in 1683, during the Ottoman siege of Vienna; the third [in the form of the present invasion and colonization] is now underway [and virtually unopposed]. Islam has a long memory and its objective is to establish on our continent what [the leader of Iran's Islamic Revolution, the ayatollah] Khomeiny called the "universal Caliphate."

The invasion of Europe has begun and the figures [testifying to its extent] are alarming. The continent, including Russia, is now occupied by 55 million Muslims, a number that increases at a 6 percent annual rate. In France, there are at least 6 million. Like those in Belgium and Britain, these French Muslims are starting to demand a share of political power. The government, for its part, simply refuses to take seriously their objective of transforming France into an Islamic Republic by the year 2020, when the demographic weight of the Arab/Muslim population will have become determinant. Meanwhile, it is financing the construction of Mosques throughout the country in the hope of buying social peace; there are already more than 2,000 in France, nearly double the number in Morocco. Islam is at present the second largest religion in France, behind Catholicism, but the largest in the numbers of practitioners. [The republic's president] Jacques Chirac has even declared that "France is now an Islamic power." Everywhere in the West there prevails the unfounded belief that there's a difference between Islam and "Islamism," and that a Western, secularized, that is, moderate, Islam is possible. There's no such thing. Every Muslim is potentially a jihadist. For Islam is a theocracy that confuses the spiritual with the temporal, faith with law, and seeks to impose its Shari'a [Islamic law] on a Europe whose civilizational precepts are absolutely incompatible with it.

The Advent of Race War

The criminality and delinquency in Western Europe caused by mass immigration and the collapse of civic values have reached insupportable levels. In France in 2004, more than a

100,000 cars were torched and 80 policemen killed. Nearly every week race riots erupt in the *banlieues* [the "suburbs" housing the immigrants masses]. In the public schools, violence is endemic and educational levels have almost collapsed. Among youth under 20, nearly 20 percent are illiterate. While racist assaults on Whites are steadily rising, they are routinely ignored in the name of the anti-racist vulgate, which holds that only Whites can be racists. At the same time, an arsenal of repressive legislation, worthy of Soviet communism, has imposed "laws" whose purely ideological and subjective intent make no pretence to fairness, let alone objectivity. All criticism of immigration or Islam is prohibited. I myself have been tried several times and levied with an enormous fine for having written **La colonisation de l'Europe** [The Colonization of Europe].

A race war is foreseeable now in several European countries, a subterranean war that will be far more destructive than "terrorism." The White population is being displaced, a sort of genocide is being carried out against it with the complicity or the abstention of the ruling class, the media, and the politicians, for the ideology these collaborating elites uphold is infused with a pathological hatred of their own people and a morbid passion for miscegenation.

The state's utopian plan for "republican integration" has nevertheless failed because it thought peaceful coexistence between foreigners and natives, non-Whites and Whites, was possible in a single territory. Our rulers haven't read Aristotle, who taught that no city can possibly be democratic and orderly if it isn't ethnically homogenous. . . . European societies today are devolving into an unmanageable ethnic chaos.

I'm a native of Southwest France, of the area along the Atlantic coast, and speak not a word of Russian, but I feel infinitely closer to a Russian than to a French-speaking Arab or African, even if they happen to be "French" citizens.

The Moral Crisis and Archaefuturism

The present situation can be explained, almost clinically, as a sort of "mental AIDS." Our present afflictions come from the virus of nihilism, which Nietzsche foresaw, and which has weakened all our natural defenses. Thus infected, Europeans have succumbed to a feverish self-extinction. They have voluntarily opened the city gates.

The primary symptom of this disease is "xenophilia:" a systematic preference for the Other rather than for the Same. A second symptom is "ethnomasochism," a hatred of one's own civilization and origins. A third is emasculation [*dévirilisation*], or what might be called the cult of weakness and a preference for male homosexuality. Historically proven values associated with the use of force and a people's survival — values associated with honor, loyalty, family, fertility, patriotism, the will to survive, etc. — are treated today as ridiculous shortcomings. This sort of decadence owes a good deal to the secularization of Christian charity and its egalitarian offshoot, human rights.

Europeans may take inspiration from certain values still upheld in Russia: For example, the consciousness of belonging to a superior civilization and of maintaining a "right to distance" from other peoples. We need to break with all forms of "ethnopluralism," which is simply another kind of egalitarianism, and reclaim the right to "ethnocentrism," the right to live in our own lands without the Other. We also have to reclaim the principle: "To each his own." Besides,

only Westerners believe race-mixing is a virtue or envisage the future as a melting pot. They alone believe in cosmopolitanism. But the 21st century will be dominated by a resurgence of ethno-religious blocs, especially in the South and the East. Francis Fukuyama's "end of history" will never happen. Instead, we're going to experience an acceleration of history with the "clash of civilizations." Europeans also need to break with the "presentism" in which they are sunk and learn to see themselves again (as do Muslims, Chinese, and Indians) as a "long-living people," bearers of a future. The mental revolution needed to bring about this change in European attitudes is, though, only possible through a gigantic crisis, a violent shock, which is already on its way and which I will say a few words about below.

The New American Imperialism

Europeans also have to come to terms with what I called in my last book "the new American imperialism," an imperialism more heavy-handed than that of the Cold War era, but one that is also more blundering. Since the collapse of the Soviet Union, American administrations seem to have lost all sense of measure, becoming even more hubristic, as they embark on a fantastic quest for world domination, dressed up in the simulacra of a new Roman empire. Much of this, of course, is explainable in terms of neoconservative ideology, linked with Zionism, but it's also driven by a messianic, almost pathological, sense of having a "divine mission."

What are the goals of this new American imperialism? To encircle and neutralize Russia, preventing any meaningful alliance between her and Europe (the Pentagon's worse nightmare); to deflect Europe's challenge to its hegemony by making Islam and Muslim Turkey a part of it; to subjugate the Eastern and Central European parts of the former Soviet empire; to wage a relentless economic war on the European Union and do so in such a way that the latter doesn't dream of resisting. Everywhere, the crusading spirit of this new American imperialism endeavors to impose "democracy," especially on Russia's periphery. "Democracy" has come to mean "pro-American regime."

But we shouldn't complain of these American ambitions, which accord with the country's geopolitical and thalassocratic desire for domination. In history, everyone is responsible only for oneself.

That's why I oppose the "obsessional and hysterical anti-Americanism" so prevalent in France, for it is counter-productive, self-victimizing, and irresponsible.

A people or nation must learn to distinguish between its "principal adversary" and its "principal enemy." The first tries to dominate and undermine, the second to kill. We shouldn't forget Carl Schmitt's formula: "It's not only you who chooses your enemy, it's more often your enemy who chooses you." America, specifically its ruling class, is Europe's and Russia's "principal adversary" at the level of geopolitics, economics, and culture. Europe's "principal enemy" is the peoples of the South, increasingly assembled under the banner of Islam, whose invasion of the continent is already well underway, facilitated by a political class and an intelligentsia who have opened the gates (to Washington's delight) and who seek a miscegenated, non-European Europe.

Like Atlanticists, the hysterical anti-Americans overestimate the United States, without understanding that it is only as strong as we are weak. The Americans' catastrophic and counter-productive occupation of little Iraq, to which they have brought nothing but chaos,

makes this all indisputably evident. In the 21st century, the US will cease to be the premier world power. That will be China — or, if we have the will, what I call “Euro-Siberia” — a federated alliance between the peoples of the European peninsular and Russia.

The Convergence of Catastrophes

I’ve postulated the hypothesis that the present global system, founded on a belief in miracles, a belief in the myth of indefinite progress, is on the verge of collapse. For the first time in history, humanity as a whole is threatened by a cataclysmic crisis that is likely to occur sometime between 2010 and 2020 — a crisis provoked by the on-going degradation of the ecosystem and climatic disruptions, by the exhaustion of fossil fuel sources and food-producing capacity, by the increased fragility of an international economic order based on speculation and massive indebtedness, by the return of epidemics, by the rise of nationalism, terrorism, and nuclear proliferation, by the growing aggressiveness of Islam’s world offense, and by the dramatic aging of the West’s population.

We need to prepare for these converging catastrophes, which will mark the transition from one era to another, as their cataclysmic effects sweep away liberal modernity and bring about a New Middle Age. With such a convergence, there will also come an opportunity for rebirth, for every major historical regeneration emerges from chaos. This is especially the case with a civilization like our own, whose very nature is “metamorphic.”

Eurosiberia

The Europe of the future must no longer be envisaged in the mushy, ungovernable forms of the present European Union, which is a powerless Medusa, unable to control its borders, dominated by the mania of free-trade, and subject to American domination. We need to imagine a federal, imperial *Grande Europe*, ethnically homogeneous (that is, European), based on a single autonomous area, and inseparably linked to Russia. I call this enormous continental bloc “Euro-Siberia.” Having no need to be aggressive toward its neighbors because it would be unattackable, such a bloc would become the premier world power (in a world partitioned into large blocs), self-centered, and opposed to all the dangerous dogmas now associated with globalism. It would have the capacity to practice the “autarky of great spaces,” whose principles have already been worked out by the Nobe; Prize-winning economist, Maurice Allais. The destiny of the European peninsula cannot be separated from continental Russia, for both ethno-cultural and geopolitical reasons. It’s absolutely imperative for America’s mercantile thalassocracy to prevent the birth of a Euro-Siberian federation.

This is not the place to speak of the Israeli state. Only a word: For essentially demographic reasons, I believe the Zionist utopia conceived by Hertzl and Buber and realized since 1948 will not survive any longer than Soviet communism did; indeed, its end is already in sight. I’m presently writing a book on *The New Jewish Question*, which I hope will be translated into Russian.

Conclusion

Fatalism is never appropriate. History is always open-ended and presents innumerable unexpected caprices and turns. Let’s not forget the formula of William of Orange: “Where there’s a will, there’s a way.” The period we are presently living through is a one of resistance

and of preparation for the even more threatening events to come, such as might follow the juncture of a race war and a massive economic downturn. We need to start thinking in post-chaos terms and organize accordingly. In closing, let me leave you with a favorite watchword of mine: “From Resistance to Reconquest, From Reconquest to Renaissance.”

Interview with Guillaume Faye

<http://www.counter-currents.com/2010/10/interview-with-guillaume-faye/>

http://cdn.counter-currents.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/10/paris_riots_day_9.jpg**Question:** We will begin by quoting you. In the review *Études et recherches*, fifteen years ago, you wrote that one can arrive at the point where “a world civilization desirous to stabilize history opposes its conservative will to the forces which it had itself released.” According to you, are we there? The Occident, longtime passive witness of the ethnic invasion, America longtime imprudent accomplice of the Islamists — do they still have the moral strength “to stop the course of history” when the clash of civilizations has passed from the stage of the “cold war” to that of the “hot war”?

Guillaume Faye: One epoch terminates, another commences. One cannot foresee what will occur: what we know is that we are at a crossroads; we live the end of an age of European civilization. This civilization has known three great epochs: the ancient, the medieval, then the modern which commenced about the 1850s. Currently we live at the end of this last epoch because Europe is invaded by the very ones it had conquered when it is in full demographic decline. On the moral, mental, psychological level, all European values have reached their conclusion, diluted in humanism and total egalitarianism. The Hegelian “enough” thesis that I defend is that this situation is provoking a world catastrophe which can in the end regenerate us. One does not regenerate oneself cold: one can metamorphose oneself only hot. The central question that one can pose in a dialectical manner is to know if this ethnic, ecological, ethical, etc., catastrophe that European civilization caused by its own decline will be the occasion of a regeneration or a disappearance.

Currently we are colonized, and this invasion is coupled with an incredible masochism on the part of Europeans themselves. Thus, only a terrifying crisis – that I welcome, in this respect -- can change collective mentalities, awake Europeans. In my new book, *Avant-Guerre [Before the War]*, I develop my thesis of “the Colonization of Europe,” while going beyond, by transcending the European context. Because for me, now that we have come right to the clash of civilizations, we go towards the third world war!

Question: The shock of September 2001 seemed to awaken the capacity of analysis of certain media. Then, quite quickly, Bush specified that he did not make war on Islam, and the big media — *Le Monde* or *Télérama* in France, *Repubblica* in Italy — devoted all their energy to make Islam known to us, this religion of tolerance and culture, so near and so remote. Has censorship already returned?

Guillaume Faye: This awakening was a shuddering, a flapping of wings. When Bush and Blair say that they do not make war on Islam, it is risible. Maybe we do not make war on Islam, but Islam makes war on us! It is not you who designate the enemy; it is the enemy who designates you! They knew very well that they declared the war on Islam, which besides is designated in Arabic by the same word as “Islamism”: *islamiya*. There was thus a small awakening, but it is not very important. The war which Islam makes on us did not begin on September 11, 2001, but in the '60s. What is positive, it's that the Islamists went too far, too fast: it's the Arab mentality

which wants that. They passed too quickly from the time of peace to the time of war, whereas they were underway to invade consciousness. If they had been less impatient, nobody would have seen anything. No doubt, so that the eyes really open, there a giant attack will be necessary: but I do not believe that this will take place immediately; it is not in their interest to realize too much of it in the immediate future.

It is possible that there will be a period of calm. We are faced with a terrorism which does not depend on a true terrorist organization, but deploys itself according to the logic of a transnational war, in networks, and which goes beyond the sole capacities of a group like Al-Qaeda: Islam is multinational; the war is not territorialized, nor reducible to the misdeeds of a single organization! The end of bin Laden will not solve anything at all because this last, simple sponsor of the jihad in spite of his posture of Prophet, had only applauded some acts that he undoubtedly had followed and financed, but certainly not organized directly himself!

Question: Which strategy do you recommend for citizens who would like to prepare for the future conflicts? Some have said that you want to found your own political party.

Guillaume Faye: It's idiotic! That would limit my audience. That goes completely against my current analysis, because I recommend creating and working through a network. It is certainly necessary that there be parties to make agitprop. But the important thing is the network, on a European scale, without a guru or bigwig! To found one more petty sect is completely counterproductive. My "party" is my secretariat and the many friends with whom I collaborate in all Europe. I do not want a label!

Question: In the review *Réfléchir et Agir*, you recommended a "withdrawal" from associative action, following the example of that which the extreme-Left made. Could you develop this point?

Guillaume Faye: It is not a "withdrawal," but a general-purpose strategy. One needs parties, publishers, associations, trade unions. It is necessary that our ideas be present in civil society. But all the forms of action are necessary: we should not oppose metapolitics to politics. All action, political, cultural, should be connected by the same vision of the world. It is not a strategy of withdrawal, but of spreading out, comparable that of the Trotskyists — who are today at the head of the State and of the Catholic Church! — from the '60s. The French national Right is undermined by the culture of defeat, petty bosses, gossip: the different groups of Muslims and Leftists can detest one other, but they have each and all the same enemies against whom they unite. Whereas for many people of our ideas, the enemy is at first his own political friend, for simple reasons of jealousy!

I am stunned to see that associative action has so little been used. There is no association which defends Europeans! Well, there is AGRIF, but they do few things, and they belong too openly to the National Front, which undermines their credibility: S.O.S Racism knew to more or less camouflage its connection to the Socialist Party!

At least, the Left moves: look at Act against Unemployment, ATTAC or Right to Housing, which represent 5,000 people in France! People in our circles are for order, but they are disorganized and inactive, whereas the Trotskyists, in spite of their ideology, are organized people. It is necessary to move! I am struck by the poverty of the associative activity in our

camp. I repeat it, there is anti-European racism and no association really stirs itself to get it talked about!

Question: What do you think of this pro-Islamist drift that one observes in the French national Right, a drift often aroused by an anti-Americanism fed on ill-digested antisemitism?

Guillaume Faye: This drift is recognized. They confound the enemy and the adversary: the adversary is that which weakens us, that is to say the United States, the enemy is that which invades us concretely: Islam and the Third World. The funniest thing is that it is I, among others, who, in the '70s, convinced this circle that one did not have to be deeply pro-American. All the obsessional anti-Americans of today were then pro-Americans! Giorgio Locchi and I, notably with my book *Le Système à tuer les peuples* [*The System Against the Peoples*], made Alain de Benoist topple over into anti-Americanism, who was an Americanophile before; to realize it, it is enough to re-read the numbers from before 1975 of the review *Nouvelle École*! Some suffer from an obsessional antisemitism, coupled with a kind of Stockholm Syndrome which makes them love the true enemy. The Muslims will not hold any liking of them for it: the French "identitarians" who perhaps admired the actions attributed to bin Laden will have their throats cut like the others! Islam is a religion of force which leads certain nationalist militants to prostrate in front of the conquering religion with the fascination of a colonized people. But even if they convert, which is already the case for some, they are always, as Occidentals, only second-class Muslims. Pro-Islamism in the nationalist Right is common enough. Plus these people are "nazis" in the most primary sense of the word, anti-Americans in the most idiotic sense of the term, and plus they are pro-Muslims, without knowing either America or Islam besides. They are fascinated by the neo-romantic illusions which they have of Islam. In circles which claim to be radical, there is an infantile reaction: these people are perhaps extremists, but not radical, because the radicals are those who go to the root of things. It is easy to tag "US go home" or "Long live bin Laden" in the subway; they risk less than if they were going to write "Islam out" in the projects.

Question: As a journalist, which judgment do you give to the sociology of the current media? Does the "politically correct" find its roots in the Third-Worldism of the '50s and '60s, in communist engagement, or rather in May '68 and the years which followed?

Guillaume Faye: It is a sequence; but I believe that it is the post-'68 period which weighed the most. Those who hold the media are people 50 years old, of my generation, who grew up in a neo-Marxist atmosphere. But one needs to know that there reigns among journalists a true Stalinist single thought: Marxism has ceded in this respect its place to Third-Worldism, then to immigrationism. To succeed socially, it is necessary to have a position which goes in the direction of the anti-[White] racist, immigrationist, and egalitarian software-ideology (as at the time of the USSR, where it was necessary to be pro-Soviet). Knowing that even people disapproving of it participate in this vulgar affair.

Everyone sees the truth in the street, everyone except the current elites, who play ostrich. Some great journalists, totally [in spite] of my ideas, signed the petitions for the "undocumented;" they explained to me that if they had refused, their career was screwed. It does not suffice not to speak of it: one must claim to be anti-[White] racist, as it was necessary to be Stalinophile in the '50s. *Charlie-Hebdo* attacked Gérard Depardieu because he refused to sign! That did him no harm, because he is at the top. But a young actor would have seen his career cut short. One must know

that many do not speak by conviction, but from fear: they want to be on the side of the whip hand. One must proclaim oneself anti-[white] racist, for immigration, etc. as in the nineteenth century one must go to Mass every Sunday! That means *Charlie-Hebdo*, directed by “old schmucks,” is the classic example of the “Stalinist rag and informer,” a “media of thought-police and collaborators,” the “freezing point of journalism.” For Europeans to have a true awakening from the conformism and ethno-masochistic blindness of our self-styled “opinion leaders,” we have need of a terrible crisis, which alone can give us the energy to defend ourselves.

From the [Guillaume Faye Archive](#), interviewer and translator not credited.

Mars & Hephaestus: The Return of History

By Guillaume Faye

<http://www.counter-currents.com/2010/06/mars-and-hephaestus/>

Translated by Greg Johnson

Russian translation of this translation [here](#)

Allow me an “archeofuturist” parable based on the eternal symbol of the tree, which I will compare to that of the rocket. But before that, let us contemplate the grim face of the coming century.

The twenty-first century will be a century of iron and storms. It will not resemble those harmonious futures predicted up to the 1970s. It will not be the global village prophesied by Marshall McLuhan in 1966, or Bill Gates’ planetary network, or Francis Fukuyama’s end of history: a liberal global civilization directed by a universal state. It will be a century of competing peoples and ethnic identities. And paradoxically, the victorious peoples will be those that remain faithful to, or return to, ancestral values and realities—which are biological, cultural, ethical, social, and spiritual—and that at the same time will master technoscience. The twenty-first century will be the one in which European civilization, Promethean and tragic but eminently fragile, will undergo a metamorphosis or enter its irremediable twilight. It will be a decisive century.

In the West, the nineteenth and twentieth centuries were a time of belief in emancipation from the laws of life, belief that it was possible to continue on indefinitely after having gone to the moon. The twenty-first century will probably set the record straight and we will “return to reality,” probably through suffering.

The nineteenth and twentieth centuries saw the apogee of the bourgeois spirit, that mental small pox, that monstrous and deformed simulacrum of the idea of an elite. The twenty-first century, a time of storms, will see the joint renewal of the concepts of a people and an aristocracy. The bourgeois dream will crumble from the putrefaction of its fundamental principles and petty promises: happiness does not come from materialism and consumerism, triumphant transnational capitalism, and individualism. Nor from safety, peace, or social justice.

Let us cultivate the pessimistic optimism of Nietzsche. As Drieu La Rochelle wrote: “There is no more order to conserve; it is necessary to create a new one.” Will the beginning of the twenty-first century be difficult? Are all the indicators in the red? So much the better. They predicted the end of history after the collapse of the USSR? We wish to speed its return: thunderous, bellicose, and archaic. Islam resumes its wars of conquest. American imperialism is unleashed. China and India wish to become superpowers. And so forth. The twenty-first century will be placed under the double sign of Mars, the god of war, and of Hephaestus, the god who forges swords, the master of technology and the chthonic fires.

Towards the Fourth Age of European Civilization

European civilization—one should not hesitate to call it higher civilization, despite the mealy-mouthed ethnomasochist xenophiles—will survive the twenty-first century only through an agonizing reappraisal of some of its principles. It will be able if it remains anchored in its eternal metamorphic personality: to change while remaining itself, to cultivate rootedness and transcendence, fidelity to its identity and grand historical ambitions.

The First Age of European civilization includes antiquity and the medieval period: a time of gestation and growth. The Second Age goes from the Age of Discovery to the First World War: it is the Assumption. European civilization conquers the world. But like Rome or Alexander's Empire, it was devoured by its own prodigal children, the West and America, and by the very peoples it (superficially) colonized. The Third Age of European Civilization commences, in a tragic acceleration of the historical process, with the Treaty of Versailles and end of the civil war of 1914-18: the catastrophic twentieth century. Four generations were enough to undo the labor of more than forty. History resembles the trigonometrical asymptotes of the "theory of catastrophe": it is at the peak of its splendor that the rose withers; it is after a time of sunshine and calm that the cyclone bursts. The Tarpeian Rock is close to the Capitol!

Europe fell victim to its own tragic Prometheanism, its own opening to the world. Victim of the excess of any imperial expansion: universalism, oblivious of all ethnic solidarity, thus also the victim of petty nationalism.

The Fourth Age of European civilization begins today. It will be the Age of rebirth or perdition. The twenty-first century will be for this civilization, the heir of the fraternal Indo-European peoples, the fateful century, the century of life or death. But destiny is not simply fate. Contrary to the religions of the desert, the European people know at the bottom of their hearts that destiny and divinities are not all-powerful in relation to the human will. Like Achilles, like Ulysses, the original European man does not prostrate himself or kneel before the gods, but stands upright. There is no inevitability in history.

The Parable of the Tree

A Tree has roots, a trunk, and leaves. That is to say, the principle, the body, and the soul.

1) The roots represent the "principle," the biological footing of a people and its territory, its motherland. They do not belong to us; one passes them on. They belong to the people, to the ancestral soul, and come from the people, what the Greeks called *ethnos* and the Germans *Volk*. They come from the ancestors; they are intended for new generations. (This is why any interbreeding is an undue appropriation of a good that is to be passed on and thus a betrayal.) If the principle disappears, nothing is possible any longer. If one cuts the tree trunk, it might well grow back. Even wounded, the Tree can continue to grow, provided that it recovers fidelity with its own roots, with its own ancestral foundation, the soil that nourishes its sap. But if the roots are torn up or the soil polluted, the tree is finished. This is why territorial colonization and racial amalgamation are infinitely more serious and deadly than cultural or political enslavement, from which a people can recover.

The roots, the Dionysian principle, grow and penetrate the soil in new ramifications: demographic vitality and territorial protection of the Tree against weeds. The roots, the "principle," are never fixed. They deepen their essence, as Heidegger saw. The roots are at the

same time “tradition” (what is handed down) and “*arche*” (life source, eternal renewal). The roots are thus manifestation of the deepest memory of the ancestral and of eternal Dionysian youthfulness. The latter refers back to the fundamental concept of deepening.

2) The trunk is its “*soma*,” the body, the cultural and psychic expression of the people, always innovating but nourished by sap from the roots. It is not solidified, not gelled. It grows in concentric layers and it rises towards the sky. Today, those who want to neutralize and abolish European culture try to “preserve” it in the form of monuments of the past, as in formaldehyde, for “neutral” scholars, or to just abolish the historical memory of the young generations. They do the work of lumberjacks. The trunk, on the earth that bears it, is, age after age, growth and metamorphosis. The Tree of old European culture is both uprooted and removed. A ten year old oak does not resemble a thousand year old oak. But it is the same oak. The trunk, which stands up to the lightning, obeys the Jupiterian principle.

3) The foliage is most fragile and most beautiful. It dies, withers, and reappears like the sun. It grows in all directions. The foliage represents *psyche*, i.e., civilization, the production and the profusion of new forms of creation. It is the *raison d'être* of the Tree, its assumption. In addition, which law does the growth of leaves obey? Photosynthesis. That is to say, “the utilization of the force of light.” The sun nourishes the leaves which, in exchange, produce vital oxygen. The efflorescent foliage thus follows the Apollonian principle. But watch out: if it grows inordinately and anarchically (like European civilization, which wanted to become the global Occident and extend to the whole planet), it will be caught by the storm, like a badly carded sail, and it will pull down and uproot the Tree that carries it. The foliage must be pruned, disciplined. If European civilization wishes to survive, it should not extend itself to the whole Earth, nor practice the strategy of open arms . . . as foliage that is too intrepid overextends itself, or allows itself to be smothered by vines. It will have to concentrate on its vital space, i.e., Eurosiberia. Hence the importance of the imperative of ethnocentrism, a term that is politically incorrect, but that is to be preferred to the “ethnopluralist” and in fact multiethnic model that dupes or schemers put forth to confuse the spirit of resistance of the rebellious elite of the youth.

One can compare the tripartite metaphor of the Tree with that of that extraordinary European invention the Rocket. The burning engines correspond to the roots, with chthonic fire. The cylindrical body is like the tree’s trunk. And the capsule, from which satellites or vessels powered by solar panels are deployed, brings to mind foliage.

Is it really an accident that the five great space rocket series built by Europeans—including expatriates in the USA—were respectively called Apollo, Atlas, Mercury, Thor, and Ariadne? The Tree is the people. Like the rocket, it rises towards the sky, but it starts from a land, a fertile soil where no other parasitic root can be allowed. On a spatial basis, one ensures a perfect protection, a total clearing of the launching site. In the same way, the good gardener knows that if the tree is to grow tall and strong, he must clear its base of the weeds that drain its roots, free its trunk of the grip of parasitic plants, and also prune the sagging and prolix branches.

From Dusk to Dawn

This century will be that of the metamorphic rebirth of Europe, like the Phoenix, or of its disappearance as a historical civilization and its transformation into a cosmopolitan and sterile Luna Park, while the other peoples will preserve their identities and develop their power. Europe

is threatened by two related viruses: that of forgetting oneself, of interior desiccation and of excessive “opening to the other.” In the twenty-first century, Europe, to survive, will have to both regroup, i.e., return to its memory, and pursue its Faustian and Promethean aspirations. Such is the requirement of the *coincidentia oppositorum*, the convergence of opposites, or the double need for memory and will for power, contemplation and innovative creation, rootedness and transcendence. Heidegger and Nietzsche . . .

The beginning of twenty-first century will be the despairing midnight of the world of which Hölderlin spoke. But it is always darkest before the dawn. One knows that the sun will return, *sol invictus*. After the twilight of the gods: the dawn of the gods. Our enemies always believed in the Great Evening, and their flags bear the stars of the night. Our flags, on the contrary, are emblazoned with the star of the Great Morning, with branching rays; with the wheel, the flower of the sun at Midday.

Great civilizations can pass from the darkness of decline to rebirth: Islam and China prove it. The United States is not a civilization, but a society, the global materialization of bourgeois society, a comet, with a power as insolent as it is transitory. It does not have roots. It is not our true competitor on the stage of history, merely a parasite.

The time of conquest is over. Now is the time of reconquest, inner and outer: the reappropriation of our memory and our space: and what a space! Fourteen time zones on which the sun never sets. From Brest to the Bering Straits, it is truly the Empire of the Sun, the very space of the birth and expansion of the Indo-European people. To the south-east are our Indian cousins. To the east is the great Chinese civilization, which could decide to be our enemy or our ally. To the west, on the other side of the ocean: America whose desire will always be to prevent continental union. But will it always be able to stop it?

And then, to the south: the main threat, resurging from the depths of the ages, the one with which we cannot compromise.

Loggers try to cut down the Tree, among them many traitors and collaborators. Let us defend our land, preserve our people. The countdown has begun. We have time, but only a little.

And then, even if they cut the trunk or the storm knocks it down, the roots will remain, always fertile. Only one ember is enough to reignite a fire.

Obviously, they may cut down the Tree and dismember its corpse, in a twilight song, and anaesthetized Europeans may not feel the pain. But the earth is fertile, and only one seed is enough to begin the growth again. In the twenty-first century, let us prepare our children for war. Let us educate our youth, be it only a minority, as a new aristocracy.

Today we need more than morality. We need hypermorality, i.e., the Nietzschean ethics of difficult times. When one defends one’s people, i.e., one’s own children, one defends the essential. Then one follows the rule of Agamemnon and Leonidas but also of Charles Martel: what prevails is the law of the sword, whose bronze or steel reflects the glare of the sun. The tree, the rocket, the sword: three vertical symbols thrust from the ground towards the light, from the Earth to the Sun, animated by sap, fire, and blood.

People - *Why We Fight*

By Guillaume Faye

<http://www.counter-currents.com/2011/05/why-we-fightpeople/>

Guillaume Faye

[*Why We Fight: Manifesto of the European Resistance*](#)

Translated by Michael O'Meara

Arktos Media, 2011

People

An ethnic ensemble — biological, historical, cultural — with a territory, its fatherland, in which it is rooted.

‘The people’ — the very term is suspect to the cosmopolitan Left, which sees it as bordering on the politically incorrect — is not any statistical ‘population’; it’s an **organic community embracing a transcendent body made up of ancestors, the living, and their heirs**. Though marked with a certain spirituality, a people is diachronically rooted in the past and projects itself into the future — it’s submerged in biological and genetic matter, but at the same time it’s a historical, and spiritual, reality.

It’s belonging to a specific people that distinguishes a man and makes him human. Though modern Western egalitarian doctrines reduce peoples to indifferent socioeconomic aggregates, peoples actually constitute the organic bases of the human race; similarly, such doctrines conceive of the ideal man as an individual ‘emancipated’ from his organic attachments — like an undifferentiated cell in a human magma.

It’s necessary to recall, especially for certain Christians, that **a people’s attachment is incompatible with Christianity’s present cosmopolitanism**. The claim, for example, that ‘I am closer to an African Catholic than I am to a non-Christian European’ is a universalistic claim that relegates a people’s nation to something of secondary significance. This is, indeed, the great drama of European Christianity, marked as it is by Pauline universalism. A Catholic attached to his people and conscious of the biological and cultural dangers threatening them might instead say, ‘I respect all the Christians of the world, but *hic et nunc* I fight for my people above all, whatever their religion’.

The Jesuit spirit might resolve the contradiction in reference to the *Old Testament’s* Hebraic tradition: ‘Babel — the mélange of disparate peoples — is a punishment from God, Who wants His peoples to be separate and diverse — humanity is one in Heaven, but multiple on Earth’.

Arab Islam has no difficulty reconciling the notion of people (the ‘Arab nation’) with that of its universalism. The Jews, on their side, have similarly reconciled a ferocious defence of their ethnicity — their singularity — with their religion, however theoretically monotheistic and universalist it may be. At no moment have Judaism and Islam, unlike the Christian Churches today, engaged in doubting, guiltstroking diatribes against ‘xenophobia’ and ethnocentrism.

They are not masochistic . . .

* * *

Like every anthropological notion, ‘people’ lacks mathematical rigour. A people doesn’t define itself as a homogeneous biocultural totality, but as a relationship. It’s the product of an organic alchemy that brings various ‘sub-peoples’ together. The Bretons, Catalans, Scots, etc., can be seen thus as the sub-peoples of a larger people — the Europeans.

* * *

We ought to highlight the ambiguity that touches the notion of the people. The universalist ideology of the French Revolution confused the idea of the people with that of an ‘ensemble of inhabitants who jurisdictionally possess nationality’, whatever their origin. **Given the facts of mass immigration and naturalisation, the notion of the French people has been greatly diluted** (as have the British or German peoples, for the same reason). This is why (without broaching the unresolvable issue of what constitutes a ‘regional people’ or a ‘national people’), it’s advisable to dialectically transcend semantic problems — and **affirm the historic legitimacy of a single, European people**, historically bound, whose different national families resemble one another in having, for thousands of years, the same ethnocultural and historical origins. Despite national, linguistic, or tribal differences, haven’t African Blacks, even in Europe, been called on by Nelson Mandela or the Senegalese Mamadou Diop to ‘think like one people’? From Nasser to al-Qadhafi, by way of Arafat, haven’t Arabs been urged to see themselves as an Arab people? Why don’t Europeans have the same right to see themselves as a people?

As for ‘regional peoples’, it’s necessary to oppose Left-wing regionalists, self-professed anti-Jacobins and anti-globalists, who unhesitatingly accept the concept of French or American *jus soli* — who confuse citizens and residents, and who recognise as Bretons, Alsatians, Corsicans, etc., *anyone* (even of non-European origin) who lives in these regions and chooses to accept such an identity.

* * *

In belonging to a people, its members are emotionally inclined to define themselves as such, which implies political affiliation. For this reason, we say that **a people exists at that point where biological, territorial, cultural, and political imperatives come together**. But in no case does mere cultural or linguistic attachment suffice in making a people, if they have no common biological roots. Alien immigrants from people X who are installed on the territory of people Y — even if they adopt cultural elements of their host people — are not a part of Y. As De Gaulle thought, there might be minor exceptions for small numbers of compatible (White) minorities, capable of being assimilated, but this could never be the case for, say, French West Indians.

Similarly, **in defining the notion of a people, territorial or geopolitical considerations must also be taken into account**. A people is not a diaspora: the Jews felt obliged to reconquer Palestine as their ‘promised land’ because, as Theodor Herzl argued, ‘without a promised land, the Jews are just a religious diaspora, a culture, a union, but not a people’.

There’s a good deal of talk today, on the Left and the Right, about people being

‘deterritorialised’. In reality, there’s nothing of the kind. Every healthy people, even if they possess an important diaspora (Chinese, Arabs, Indians, etc.), maintains close relations with its fatherland.

* * *

Modernist gurus have long claimed that the future belongs not to peoples, but to humanity conceived as a single people. Again, there’ll be nothing of the kind. **Despite globalisation and in reaction to it, the Twenty-first century will more than ever be a century of distinct peoples.** Only Europeans, submerged in the illusions of their decadence, imagine that blood-based peoples will disappear, to be replaced by a miscegenated ‘world citizen’. In reality what is at risk of disappearing are Europeans. Tomorrow will be no twilight of peoples.

On the other hand, the twilight of several peoples is already possible. One often forgets that Amerindians or Egyptians have disappeared — hollowed out internally and overrun. For history is a cemetery of peoples — of weak peoples — exhausted and resigned.

* * *

A caution is necessary here: Right and Left-wing theoreticians of ‘ethnopluralism’, opposed to humanity’s homogenisation, speak of [‘the cause of peoples’](#), as if every people must be conserved. In reality, the *system that destroys peoples* — the title of one of my books that was misunderstood by certain intellectuals — only threatens unfit peoples, i.e., present-day Europeans. It also threatens those *residu* peoples, whose fate is of interest only to museum-keepers. It seems perfectly stupid and utopian to believe that every people can be conserved in history’s formaldehyde. What a pacifistic egalitarian vision.

The main threat to the identity and existence of great peoples occurs, in contrast, through the conjunction of deculturation and the colonising invasion of alien peoples — which we’re presently experiencing. The Western globalist ‘system’ will never threaten strong peoples. Are Arabs, Chinese, or Indians threatened? On the contrary. It reinforces their identity and their desire to conquer, by provoking their reaction to it.

The people in danger — largely because of its own failings — is our people, for reasons as much biological as cultural and strategic. That’s why **it’s necessary to replace the egalitarian ideology of ‘the cause of peoples’ with the ‘cause of our people’.**

* * *

There are three possible positions: first, peoples don’t exist, or no longer exist — it’s an obsolete category — only humanity counts (the thesis of universalistic egalitarianism); second, all peoples ought to exist and be conserved (the utopian — also egalitarian — ethnopluralist position — completely inapplicable to our age); and third, **only strong, wilful peoples can subsist for long historical periods — periods of selection in which only the most apt survive (the voluntarist, realist, inegalitarian thesis).** We obviously support the third position.

What’s essential is **reappropriating the term ‘people’ and progressively extending it to the entire Eurosiberian Continent.** The present understanding of ‘European’ by the reigning ideology at Brussels is inspired by French Jacobin ideology. This ideology makes no reference to

an ethno-historical Great European people, only to a mass of disparate residents inhabiting European territory. This tendency needs to be radically replaced. We propose that European peoples become **historical subjects** again and cease being **historical objects**. In the tragic century that's coming, it's especially crucial that Europeans become conscious of the common dangers they face and that, henceforth, they form a selfconscious **community of destiny**. This is well and truly a matter of forging a 'new alliance' that — through resurrection, metamorphosis, and historical transfiguration — will lead to a refounding of a Great European people and, in the midst of decline, succeed — not without pain, of course — in giving birth again to the phoenix.

Available from [Arktos Media](#)

The Lesson of Carl Schmitt

By Guillaume Faye and Robert Steuckers

Part 1

We met Carl Schmitt in the village of Plettenberg, the place of his birth and retirement. For four remarkable hours we conversed with the man who remains unquestionably the greatest political and legal thinker of our time. “We have been put out to pasture,” said Schmitt. “We are like domestic animals who enjoy the benefits of the closed field we are allotted. Space is conquered. The borders are fixed. There is nothing more to discover. It is the reign of the *status quo* . . .”

Schmitt always warned against this frozen order, which extends over the Earth and ruins political sovereignties. Already in 1928, in [*The Concept of the Political*](#),^[1] he detects in the universalist ideologies, those “of Rights, or Humanity, or Order, or Peace,” the project of transforming the planet into a kind of depoliticized economic aggregate which he compares to a “bus with its passengers” or a “building with its tenants.” And in this premonition of a world of the death of nations and cultures, the culprit is not Marxism but the liberal and commercial democracies. Thus Schmitt offers one of the most acute and perspicacious criticisms of liberalism, far more profound and original than the “anti-democrats” of the old reactionary right.

He also continues the “realist” manner of analyzing of politics and the state, in the tradition of Bodin, Hobbes, and Machiavelli. Equally removed from liberalism and modern totalitarian theories (Bolshevism and fascisms), the depth and the modernity of his views make him the most important contemporary political and constitutional legal theorist. This is why we can follow him, while of course trying to go beyond some of his analyses, as his French disciple Julien Freund, at the height of his powers, has already done.^[2]

The intellectual journey of the Rhenish political theorist began with reflections on law and practical politics to which he devoted two works, in 1912 and 1914,^[3] at the end of its academic studies in Strasbourg. After the war, having become a law professor at the universities of Berlin and Bonn, his thoughts were focused on political science. Schmitt, against the liberal philosophies of the Right, refused to separate it from politics.

His first work of political theory, [*Political Romanticism*](#) (1919),^[4] is devoted to a critique of political romanticism which he opposes to realism. To Schmitt, the millennialist ideals of the revolutionary Communists and the *völkisch* reveries of the reactionaries seemed equally unsuitable to the government of the people. His second great theoretical work, [*Die Diktatur \[Dictatorship\]*](#) (1921),^[5] constitutes, as Julien Freund writes, “one of the most complete and most relevant studies of this concept, whose history is analyzed from the Roman epoch up to Machiavelli and Marx.”^[6]

Schmitt distinguishes “dictatorship” from oppressive “tyranny.” Dictatorship appears as a method of government intended to face emergencies. In the Roman tradition, the dictator’s function was to confront exceptional conditions. But Machiavelli introduces a different practice; he helps to envision “the modern State,” founded on rationalism, technology, and the powerful

role of a complex executive: this executive no longer relies upon the sole sovereign.

Schmitt shows that with the French jurist Jean Bodin, dictatorship takes to the form of a “practice of the commissars” which arose in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The “commissars” are omnipotent delegates of the central power. Royal absolutism, established on its subordinates, like the Rousseauist model of the social contract which delegates absolute power to the holders of the “general will” set up by the French revolution, constitutes the foundation of contemporary forms of dictatorship.

From this point of view, modern dictatorship is not connected with any particular political ideology. Contrary to the analyses of today’s constitutionalists, especially Maurice Duverger, “democracy” is no more free of dictatorship than is any other form of state power. Democrats are simply deceiving themselves to think that they are immune to recourse to dictatorship and that they reconcile real executive power with pragmatism and the transactions of the parliamentary systems.

In a fundamental study on parliamentarism, [*The Crisis of Parliamentary Democracy*](#) (1923),^[7] Schmitt ponders the identification of democracy and parliamentarism. To him, democracy seems to be an ideological and abstract principle that masks specific modalities of power, a position close to those of Vilfredo Pareto and Gaetano Mosca. The exercise of power in “democracy” is subject to a rationalist conception of the state which justified, for example, the idea of the separation of powers, the supposedly harmonious dialogue between parties, and ideological pluralism. It is also the rationality of history that founds the dictatorship of the proletariat. Against the democratic and parliamentarian currents, Schmitt places the “irrationalist” currents, particularly Georges Sorel and his theory of violence, as well as all non-Marxist critiques of bourgeois society, for example Max Weber.

This liberal bourgeois ideology deceives everyone by viewing all political activity according to the categories of ethics and economics. This illusion, moreover, is shared by liberal or Marxist socialist ideologies: the function of public power is no longer anything but economic and social. Spiritual, historical, and military values are no longer legitimate. Only the economy is moral, which makes it possible to validate commercial individualism and at the same time invoke humane ideals: the Bible and business. This moralization of politics not only destroys all true morals but transforms political unity into neutralized “society” where the sovereign function is no longer able to defend the people for whom it is responsible.

By contrast, Schmitt’s approach consists in analyzing the political phenomenon independently of all moral presuppositions. Like Machiavelli and Hobbes, with whom he is often compared, Schmitt renounces appeals to the finer feelings and the soteriology of final ends. His philosophy is as opposed to the ideology of the Enlightenment (Locke, Hume, Montesquieu, Rousseau, etc.) and the various Marxian socialisms as it is to Christian political humanism. For him, these ideologies are utopian in their wariness of power and tend to empty out the political by identifying it with evil, even if it is allowed temporarily—as in the case of Marxism.

But the essence of Schmitt’s critique relates to liberalism and humanism, which he accuses of deception and hypocrisy. These theories view the activity of public power as purely routine administration dedicated to realizing individual happiness and social harmony. They are premised on the ultimate disappearance of politics as such and the end of history. They wish to

make collective life purely prosaic but manage only to create social jungles dominated by economic exploitation and incapable of mastering unforeseen circumstances.

Governments subject to this type of liberalism are always frustrated in their dreams of transforming politics into peaceful administration: other states, motivated by hostile intentions, or internal sources of political subversion, always emerge at unforeseen moments. When a state, through idealism or misunderstood moralism, no longer places its sovereign political will above all else, preferring instead economic rationality or the defense of abstracted ideals, it also gives up its independence and its survival.

Part 1 of 3.

Notes

[1] Carl Schmitt, *The Concept of the Political*, trans. George Schwab, expanded edition (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007)—trans.

[2] Cf. Julien Freund, *L'Essence du politique* (Paris: Sirey, 1965), and *La Fin de la Renaissance* (Paris: PUF, 1980).

[3] Carl Schmitt, *Gesetz und Urteil. Eine Untersuchung zum Problem der Rechtspraxis* [*Law and Judgment: An Investigation into the Problem of Legal Practice*] [1912] (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1968) and *Der Wert des Staates und die Bedeutung des Einzelnen* [*The Value of the State and the Meaning of the Individual*] (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1914)—trans.

[4] Carl Schmitt, *Political Romanticism*, trans. Guy Oakes (Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press, 1985).—trans.

[5] Carl Schmitt, *Die Diktatur: Von den Anfängen des modernen Souveränitätsgedankens bis zum proletarischen Klassenkampf* [*The Dictator: From the Origins of Modern Theories of Sovereignty to Proletarian Class Struggle*] (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1921)—trans.

[6] In his Preface to the French edition of *The Concept of the Political*: Carl Schmitt, *La notion de politique* (Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1972).

[7] Carl Schmitt, *The Crisis of Parliamentary Democracy*, trans. Ellen Kennedy (Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1986). See also Carl Schmitt, *Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Theory of Sovereignty* [1922], trans. George Schwab (Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1986)—trans.

Part 2

Schmitt does not believe in the disappearance of the political. Any type of activity can take on a political dimension. The political is a fundamental concept of collective anthropology. As such, political activity can be described as substantial, essential, enduring through time. The state, on the other hand, enjoys only conditional authority, i.e., a contingent form of sovereignty. Thus the state can disappear or be depoliticized by being deprived of the political, but the political—as substantial—does not disappear.

The state cannot survive unless it maintains a political monopoly, i.e., the sole power to define

the values and ideals for which the citizens will agree to give their lives or to legally kill their neighbors—the power to declare war. Otherwise partisans will assume political activity and try to constitute a new legitimacy. This risk particularly threatens the bureaucratic states of modern liberal social democracies in which civil war is prevented only by the enervating influence of consumer society.

These ideas are expressed in [*The Concept of the Political*](#), Schmitt's most fundamental work, first published in 1928, revised in 1932, and clarified in 1963 by its corollary [*Theory of the Partisan*](#).^[1] Political activity is defined there as the product of a polarization around a relation of hostility. One of the fundamental criteria of a political act is its ability to mobilize a population by designating its enemy, which can apply to a party as well as a state. To omit such a designation, particularly through idealism, is to renounce the political. Thus the task of a serious state is to prevent partisans from seizing the power to designate enemies within the community, and even the state itself.

Under no circumstances can politics be based on the administration of things or renounce its polemical dimension. All sovereignty, like all authority, is forced to designate an enemy in order to succeed in its projects; here Schmitt's ideas meet the research of ethologists on innate human behavior, particularly Konrad Lorenz.

Because of his “classical” and Machiavellian conception of the political, Schmitt endured persecution and threats under the Nazis, for whom the political was on the contrary the designation of the “comrade” (*Volksgenosse*).

The Schmittian definition of the political enables us to understand that contemporary political debate is depoliticized and connected with electoral sideshows. What is really political is the value for which one is ready to sacrifice one's life; it can quite well be one's language or culture. Schmitt writes in this connection that “a system of social organization directed only towards the progress of civilization” does not have “a program, ideal, standard, or finality that can confer the right to dispose of the physical life of others.” Liberal society, founded on mass consumption, cannot require that one die or kill for it. It rests on an apolitical form of domination: “It is precisely when it remains apolitical,” Schmitt writes, “that a domination of men resting on an economic basis, by avoiding any political appearance and responsibility, proves to be a terrible imposture.”

Liberal economism and “pluralism” mask the negligence of the state, the domination of the commercial castes, and the destruction of nations anchored in a culture and a history. Along with Sorel, Schmitt pleads for a form of power that does not renounce its full exercise, that displays its political authority by the normal means that belong to it: power, constraint, and, in exceptional cases, violence. By ignoring these principles the Weimar Republic allowed the rise of Hitler; the techno-economic totalitarianism of modern capitalism also rests on the ideological rejection of the idea of state power; this totalitarianism is impossible to avoid because it is proclaimed humane and is also based on the double idea of social pluralism and individualism, which put the nations at the mercy of technocratic domination.

The Schmittian critique of internal pluralism as conceived by Montequieu, Locke, Laski, Cole, and the whole Anglo-Saxon liberal school, aims at defending the political unity of nations, which is the sole guarantor of civic protection and liberties. Internal pluralism leads to latent or open

civil war, the fierce competition of economic interest groups and factions, and ultimately the reintroduction within society of the friend-enemy distinction which European states since Bodin and Hobbes had displaced outwards.

Such a system naturally appeals to the idea of “Humanity” to get rid of political unities. “Humanity is not a political concept,” writes Schmitt, who adds:

The idea of Humanity in doctrines based on liberal and individualistic doctrines of natural Right is an ideal social construction of universal nature, encompassing all men on earth. . . . which will not be realized until any genuine possibility of combat is eliminated, making any grouping in terms of friends and enemies impossible. This universal society will no longer know nations. . . . The concept of Humanity is an ideological instrument particularly useful for imperialistic expansion, and in its ethical and humane form, it is specifically a vehicle of economic imperialism. . . . Such a sublime name entails certain consequences for one who carries it. Indeed, to speak in the name of Humanity, to invoke it, to monopolize it, displays a shocking pretense: to deny the humanity of the enemy, to declare him outside the law and outside of Humanity, and thus ultimately to push war to the extremes of inhumanity.[2]

To define politics in terms of the category of the enemy, to refuse humanitarian egalitarianism, does not necessarily lead to contempt for man or racism. Quite the contrary. To recognize the polemical dimension of human relations and man as “a dynamic and dangerous being,” guarantees respect for any adversary conceived as the Other whose cause no less legitimate than one’s own.

This idea often recurs in Schmitt’s thought: modern ideologies that claim universal truth and consequently consider the enemy as absolute, as an “absolute non-value,” lead to genocide. They are, moreover, inspired by monotheism (and Schmitt is a Christian pacifist and convert). Schmitt claims with good reason that the conventional European conception that validated the existence of the enemy and admitted the legitimacy of war—not for the defense of a “just” cause but as eternally necessitated by human relations—caused fewer wars and induced respect for the enemy considered as adversary (as *hostis* and not *inimicus*).

Part 2 of 3

Notes

[1] Carl Schmitt, *Theory of the Partisan: Intermediate Commentary on the Concept of the Political*, trans. G. L. Ulmen (New York: Telos Press, 2007)—trans.

[2] Cf. *The Concept of the Political*, 53–54—trans.

Part 3

Schmitt’s followers, extending and refining his thought, have with Rüdiger Altmann coined the concept of the *Ernstfall* (emergency case), which constitutes another fundamental criterion of the political. Political sovereignty and the credibility of a new political authority is based on the capacity to face and solve emergency cases. The dominant political ideologies, thoroughly steeped in hedonism and the desire for security, want to ignore the emergency, the blow of fate,

the unforeseen. Politics worthy of the name—and this idea pulverizes the abstract ideological categories of “right” and “left”—is that which, secretly, answers the challenge of the emergency case, saves the community from unforeseen trials and tempests, and thereby authorizes the total mobilization of the people and an intensification of its values.

Liberal conceptions of politics see the *Ernstfall* merely as the exception and “legal normality” as the rule. This vision of things, inspired by Hegel’s teleological philosophy of history, corresponds to the domination of the bourgeoisie, who prefer safety to historical dynamism and the destiny of the people. On the contrary, according to Schmitt, the function of the sovereign is his capacity to decide the state of the exception, which by no means constitutes an anomaly but a permanent possibility. This aspect of Schmitt’s thought reflects his primarily French and Spanish inspirations (Bonald, Donoso Cortès, Bodin, Maistre, etc.) and makes it possible to locate him, along with Machiavelli, in the grand Latin tradition of political science.

In *Legality and Legitimacy* (1932),[1] Schmitt, as a disciple of Hobbes, suggests that legitimacy precedes the abstract concept of legality. A power is legitimate if it can protect the community in its care by force. Schmitt accuses the idealistic and “juridical” conception of legality for authorizing Hitler to come to power. Legalism leads to the renunciation of power, which Schmitt calls the “politics of non-politics” (*Politik des Unpolitischen*), politics that does not live up to its responsibilities, that does not formulate a choice concerning the collective destiny. “He who does not have the power to protect anyone,” Schmitt writes in *The Concept of the Political*, “also does not have the right to require obedience. And conversely, he who seeks and accepts power does not have the right to refuse obedience.”

This dialectic of power and obedience is denied by social dualism, which arbitrarily opposes society and the sovereign function and imagines, contrary to all experience, that exploitation and domination are the political effects of “power” whereas they much more often arise from economic dependency.

Thus Schmitt elaborates a critique of the dualistic State of the nineteenth century based on the conceptions of John Locke and Montesquieu aiming at a separation between the sphere of the State and the private sphere. In fact, modern technocracies, historically resulting from the institutions of parliamentary representation, experience interpenetrations and oppositions between the private and public, as shown by Jürgen Habermas. Such a situation destabilizes the individual and weakens the State.

According to Schmitt, it is this weakness of the democracies that allowed the establishment of one party regimes, as he explains in *Staat, Bewegung, Volk* [*State, Movement, People*].[2] This type of regime constitutes the institutional revolution of the twentieth century; in fact, it is today the most widespread regime in the world. Only Western Europe and North America preserved the pluralist structure of traditional democracy, but merely as a fiction, since the true power is economic and technical.

The one party state tries to reconstitute the political unity of the nation, according to a threefold structure: the state proper includes civil servants and the army; the people are not a statistical population but an entity that is politicized and strongly organized in intermediate institutions; the party puts this ensemble in motion (*Bewegung*) and constitutes a portal of communication between the state and the people.

Schmitt, who returns again and again to Nazism, Stalinism, theocracies, and humanitarian totalitarianisms, obviously does not endorse the one party state. He does not advocate any specific “regime.” In the old Latin realist tradition inherited from Rome, Schmitt wants an executive who is both powerful and legitimate, who does not “ideologize” the enemy and can, in actual cases make use of force, who can make the state the “self-organization of society.”

War thus becomes a subject of political theory. Schmitt is interested in geopolitics as a natural extension of politics. For him, true politics, great politics, is foreign policy, which culminates in diplomacy. In *The Nomos of the Earth* (1951),[3] he shows that the state follows the European conception of politics since the sixteenth century. But Europe has become decadent: the bureaucratic state has been depoliticized and no longer allows the preservation of the history of the European people; the *jus publicum europaeum* which decided inter-state relations is declining in favor of globalist and pacifist ideologies that are incapable of founding an effective international law. The ideology of human rights and the vaunted humanitarianism of international institutions are paradoxically preparing a world where force comes before law. Conversely, a realistic conception of the relations between states, which allows and normalizes conflict, which recognizes the legitimacy of will to power, tends to civilize the relationship between nations.

Schmitt is, along with Mao Tse-Tung, the greatest modern theorist of revolutionary war and of the enigmatic figure of the partisan who, in this era of the depoliticization of states, assumes the responsibility of the political, “illegally” designates his enemies, and indeed blurs the distinction between war and peace.[4]

Such “a false pacifism” is part of a world where political authorities and independent sovereignties are erased by a world civilization more alienating than any tyranny. Schmitt, who influenced the constitution of the Fifth French Republic—the French constitution that is most intelligent, most political, and the least inspired by the idealism of the Enlightenment—gives us this message: liberty, humanity, peace are only chimeras leading to invisible oppressions. The only liberties that count—whether of nations or individuals—are those guaranteed by the legitimate force of a political authority that creates law and order.

Carl Schmitt does not define the values that mobilize the political and legitimate the designation of the enemy. These values must not be defined by ideologies—always abstract and gateways to totalitarianism—but by mythologies. In this sense, the functioning of government, the purely political, is not enough. It is necessary to add the “religious” dimension of the first function, as it is defined in Indo-European tripartition. It seems to us that this is the way one must complete Schmitt’s political theory. Because if Schmitt builds a bridge between anthropology and politics, one still needs to build another between politics and history.

Part 3 of 3

Notes

[1] Carl Schmitt, *Legality and Legitimacy*, trans. Jeffrey Seitzer (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2004)—trans.

[2] *Staat, Bewegung, Volk: Die Dreigliederung der politischen Einheit* [*State, Movement, People: The Three Organs of Political Unity*] (Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt,

1934)—trans. It concerns a series of studies on one-party states, primarily Marxist, that appeared in 1932.

[3] Carl Schmitt, *The Nomos of the Earth in the International Law of Jus Publicum Europaeum*, trans. G. L. Ulmen (New York: Telos Press, 2006)—trans.

[4] Cf. “The Era of Neutralizations and Depoliticizations” [1929], trans. Matthias Konzett and John P. McCormick, in the expanded edition of *The Concept of the Political*—trans.

Ten Untimely Ideas

By Guillaume Faye

<http://www.counter-currents.com/2010/07/ten-untimely-ideas/>

Translator's Note:

The struggle white nationalists wage for the genetic, cultural, and territorial heritage of their people is no less a struggle for those ideas necessary to their survival.

Here, freely translated from Guillaume Faye's *Pourquoi nous combattons* (2001), are ten ideas I think relevant to this struggle.—Michael O'Meara

EUROPE is at war, but doesn't know it . . . It is occupied and colonized by peoples from the South and economically, strategically, and culturally subjugated by America's New World Order . . . It is the sick man of the world. [page 9]

ARCHEOFUTURISM: The spirit which realizes that the future arises from a resurgence of ancestral values and that notions of modernity and traditionalism need to be dialectically overcome [59] . . . To confront the future, especially today, dictates a recourse to an archaic mentality that is premodern, inegalitarian, and non-humanistic, to a mentality that restores ancestral values and those of social order . . . The future thus is neither the negation of tradition nor that of a people's historical memory, but rather its metamorphosis and ultimately its growth and regeneration. [From *Archéofuturisme* 11, 72]

IDENTITY: Characteristic of humanity is the diversity and singularity of its peoples and cultures. Every homogenization is synonymous with death and sclerosis . . . Ethnic identity and cultural identity form a block, but biological identity is primary, for without it culture and civilization are impossible to sustain . . . Identity is never frozen. It remains itself only in evolving, reconciling being and becoming. [146-48]

BIOPOLITICS: A political project responsive to its people's biological and demographic imperatives . . . Biopolitics is guided by the principle that a people's biological quality is essential to its survival and well-being. [63-64]

SELECTION: The collective process, based on competition, that minimizes or eliminates the weak and selects out the strong and capable. Selection entails both the natural evolution of a species and the historical development of a culture and civilization . . . Contemporary society prevents a just selection and instead imposes a savage, unjust one based on the law of the jungle. [212-13]

INTERREGNUM: The period between the end of one civilization and the possible birth of another. We are currently living through an interregnum, a tragic historical moment when everything is in flames and when everything, like a Phoenix, might rise reborn from its ashes. [153]

ETHNIC CIVIL WAR: Only the outbreak of such a war will resolve the problems created by

the current colonization, Africanization, and Islamization of Europe . . . Only with their backs to the wall is a people spurred to come up with solutions that in other times would be unthinkable. [130]

REVOLUTION: The violent reversal of a political situation that follows a profound crisis and is the work of an “active minority”. . . . A true revolution is a metamorphosis, that is, a radical reversal of all values. The sole revolutionary of the modern era is Nietzsche . . . and not Marx, who sought simply another form of bourgeois society . . . We have long passed the point of no return, where it is possible to arrest the prevailing decay with moderate political reforms. [210-11]

ARISTOCRACY: A true aristocracy embodies its people’s essence, which it serves with courage, disinterest, modesty, taste, simplicity, and stature . . . To recreate a new aristocracy is the eternal task of every revolutionary project . . . The creation of such an aristocracy is possible only through war, which is the most merciless of selective forces. [60-61]

WILL TO POWER: The tendency of all life to perpetuate itself, to ensure its survival, and to enhance its domination, its superiority, and its creative capacities . . . The will to power accepts that life is struggle, an eternal struggle for supremacy, the endless struggle to improve and perfect oneself, the absolute refusal of nihilism, the opposite of contemporary relativism . . . It is the force of life and of history. It is not simply the organic imperative for domination, but for survival and continuity . . . A people or a civilization that abandons its will to power inevitably perishes. [227]

The Cause of the Peoples?

By Guillaume Faye

<http://www.counter-currents.com/2010/09/the-cause-of-the-peoples/>

Translated by Michael O'Meara

Editor's Note:

The idea of the “cause of the peoples” is associated primarily with Alain de Benoist. It is an attempt to fuse European ethnonationalism with a kind of liberal universalism by asserting that European ethnonationalists are not merely fighting for their own cause, but for the cause of all peoples to preserve their distinctness — that they are not merely defending their own rights to ethnic self-preservation, but also the equal rights of all other nations to the same. See also Michael O'Meara's "[Benoist's Pluriversum: An Ethnonationalist Critique](#)," TOQ vol. 5, no. 3 (Fall 2005) and Michael J. Polignano's "[The Ethics of Racial Preservation](#)" on Frank Salter's *On Genetic Interests*, TOQ vol. 7, no. 3 (Fall 2007).

The “cause des peuples” is an ambiguous slogan. It was initially conceived in a polytheistic spirit to defend ethnocultural heterogeneity. But it has since been reclaimed by egalitarian and human rights ideologies which, while extolling a utopian, rainbow-colored world order, seek to inculcate Europeans for having “victimized” the Third World.

Failure of a Strategy

When [GRECE-style] identitarians took up the “cause des peuples” in the early 1980s, it was in the name of ethnopluralism. This “cause,” however, was little more than a rhetorical ruse to justify the right of European peoples to retain their identity in face of a world system that sought to make everyone American. For in resisting the forces of deculturation, it was hoped that Europeans, like Third World peoples, would retain the right to their differences — and do so without having to suffer the accusation of racism. As such, the slogan assumed that every people, even White people, possessed such a right. But no sooner was this argument made than the cosmopolitan P.-A. Taguieff [a leading academic commentator on the far Right] began referring to it as a “differentialist racism.”

In retrospect, the New Right's strategy seems completely contrived, for “la cause des peuples,” “la droit à la différence,” and “ethnopluralism” have all since been turned against identitarians. Moreover, its irrelevant to Europe's present condition, threatened, as it is, by a massive non-European invasion and by a conquering Islam abetted by our ethnomaschoistic elites.

Reclaimed by the dominant ideology, turned against identitarians, and tangential to current concerns, the GRECE's ethnopluralist strategy is a metapolitical disaster. It also retains something of the old Marxist and Christian-Left prejudice about Europe's “exploitation” of the Third World. As [the French Africanist] Bernard Lugan shows in respect to Black Africa, this prejudice is based on little more than economic ignorance. The “cause des peuples” is

nevertheless associated with a Christian-like altruism that demonizes our civilization, accuses it of having destroyed all the others, and does so at the very moment when these others are busily preparing the destruction of our own civilization.

The “right to difference” . . . What right? Haven’t we had enough Kantian snivelling? There exists only a capacity to be different. In the selective process of History and Life, everyone has to make it on his own. There are no benevolent protectors. This right, moreover, is reserved for everyone but Europeans, who are summoned to discard their own biological and cultural identity.

This slogan poses another danger: it threatens to degenerate into a doctrine — an ethnic communitarianism — sanctioning the existence of non-European enclaves in our own lands. For in the Europe it envisages, communities of foreigners, particularly Muslim ones, will, for obvious demographic reasons, play an ever-greater role in our lives. This affront to our identity is accompanied by sophistic arguments that ridicule the “fantasy” of a *reconquista*. In this spirit, we are told that we will have to make do [with a multiracial Europe]. But I, for one, refuse to make do. Nor am I prepared to retreat before an alleged historical determinism.

Life Is Perpetual Struggle

The “cause des peuples” has now become part of the “human rights” vulgate. By contrast, the neo-Darwinian thesis of conflict and competition, which assumes that only the fittest survive, seems to our bleeding-heart communitarians a vestige of barbarism — even if this vestige corresponds with life’s organic laws. This thesis, though, in recognizing the forces of selection and competition, is alone able to guarantee the diversity of life’s varied forms.

The “cause des peuples” is collectivist, homogenizing, and egalitarian, while the “combat of peoples” is subjectivist and heterogeneous, conforming to life’s entropic properties. In this sense, only nationalism and clashing wills-to-power are capable of sustaining the life affirming principle of subjectivity. Given its egalitarian assumption that every people has a “right to live,” the “cause des peuples” prefers to ignore obvious historical realities for an objectivism that seeks to transform the world’s peoples into objects suitable for a museum display. As such, it implies the equivalence of all peoples and civilizations.

This sort of egalitarianism takes two basic forms: one is expressed in a homogenizing but *metissé* concept of what it means to be human (the ‘human race’), the other endeavors to preserve people and cultures in a way a curator might. Both forms refuse to accept that peoples and civilizations are qualitatively different. Hence, the absurd idea that one has to save endangered peoples and civilizations (at least if they are Third World) in the same way one might save an endangered seal. History’s turbulent selection process has, though, no room for preservation — only for competing subjectivities. In its tribunal, salvationist doctrines are simply inadmissible.

The “cause des peuples” also assumes an underlying solidarity between European and Third World peoples. Again, this is nothing but a dubious ideological construct, which Grécistes invented in the early Eighties to avoid the accusation of racism. I don’t have the space here to expose the myth of Third World “exploitation.” However, to explain its misfortunes in crude, neo-Marxist terms, as if it were due to the machinations of the IMF, the Trilaterals, the Bilderberg group, or some other Beelzebub, is hardly worthy of a response.

According to media or academic pundits, the “culture of the other” is now under siege in France — even though “Afromania” is all the rage. I, on the other hand, think it is not at all exaggerated to claim that America’s deculturating influences no longer threaten Europe, for its dangers have been surpassed by another.

Europe First!

I respect the destiny of the sometimes afflicted Inuits, Tibetans, Amazonians, Pygmies, Kanaks, Aborigines, Berbers, Saharians, Indians, Nubians, the inevitable Palestinians, and the little green men from outer space. But don’t expect crocodile tears from me. When the flooding threatens my own house, I can think only of my own predicament and haven’t time to help or plead for others. Besides, when have these others ever cared about us? In any case, the dangers threatening them are greatly exaggerated, especially in view of their demographic vigor, which, incidentally, is owed to Western medicine and material aid — for the same Western forces that have allegedly exploited them also seems to have made them prosper (or, at least, to reproduce in unprecedented numbers).

If our communitarians really want to defend the “cause des peuples,” they might start with Europeans, who are now under assault by the demographic, migratory, and cultural forces of an overpopulated Third World. In face of these threats, you won’t find us sniveling (like a priest) or fleeing (like an intellectual) to the “other’s” cause. “Ourselves alone” will suffice.

From *Terre et Peuple*, no. 18, Winter Solstice 2003.

Faye’s *Archaeofuturism* is available for purchase [here](#).

The Essence of Archaism

By Guillaume Faye

<http://www.counter-currents.com/2010/07/the-essence-of-archaism/>

From *L'Archéofuturisme* (Paris: L'Aencre, 1998)

http://cdn.counter-currents.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/07/frank_frazetta_atlantis1.jpg **Translator's Note:**

In *L'Archéofuturisme* Guillaume Faye envisages, sometime within the next two decades, a large-scale civilizational crisis, provoked by what which he calls a “convergence of catastrophes.” For the post-crisis world Faye proposes, in terms that at times recall the Italian Futurists of the early twentieth century, the construction of a European Empire founded on essential, archaic values and on a bold, aggressive exploitation of science and technology: hence the concept of “archeofuturism,” the re-emergence of archaic social configurations in a new context.

It is probable that only after the catastrophe which will bring down modernity, its world-wide saga and its global ideology, that an alternate vision of the world will necessarily impose itself. No one will have had the foresight and the courage to apply it before chaos erupted. It is thus our responsibility — we who live, as Giorgio Locchi put it, in the interregnum — to prepare, from this moment forward, a post-catastrophic conception of the world. It could be centered on archeofuturism. But we must give content to this concept.

It is necessary, first, to return the word “archaic” to its true meaning, which, in its Greek etymon *archê*, is positive and non-pejorative, signifying both “foundation” and “beginning” — that is, “founding impetus.” *Archê* also means “that which is creative and immutable” and refers to the central concept of “order.” To attend to the “archaic” does not imply a backward-looking nostalgia, for the past produced egalitarian modernity, which has run aground, and thus any historical regression would be absurd. It is modernity itself that now belongs to a bygone past. Is “archaism” a form of traditionalism? Yes and no. Traditionalism advocates the transmission of values and, correctly, combats the doctrines of the *tabula rasa*. But it all depends on which traditions are transmitted. Not every tradition is acceptable — for example, we reject those of universalist and egalitarian ideologies or those which are fixed, ossified, demotivating. It is surely preferable to distinguish from among various traditions (transmitted values) those which are positive and those which are detrimental.

The issues that disturb the contemporary world and threaten egalitarian modernity with catastrophe are already archaic: the religious challenge of Islam; geopolitical contests for scarce resources, agricultural land, oil, fisheries; the North-South conflict and colonizing immigration into the Northern hemisphere; global pollution and the physical clash of empirical reality against the ideology of development. All these issues plunge us back into age-old questions, consigning to oblivion the quasi-theological political debates of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, which were little more than idle talk about the sex of angels.

Moreover, as the philosopher Raymond Ruyer, detested by the left-bank intelligentsia, foretold in his two important works, *Les nuisances idéologiques* and *Les cents prochains siècles*, once the historical digression of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries has finally closed, with egalitarianism's hallucinations having descended into catastrophe, humanity will return to archaic values, that is, quite simply, to biological and human (anthropological) values: distinctive sexual roles; the transmission of ethnic and popular traditions; spirituality and sacerdotal organization; visible and supervisory social hierarchies; the worship of ancestors; initiatory rites and tests; the reconstruction of organic communities that extend from the individual family unit to the overarching national community of the people; the deindividualization of marriage to involve the community as much as the couple; the end of the confusion of eroticism and conjugality; the prestige of the warrior caste; social inequality, not implicit, which is unjust and frustrating, as in today's egalitarian utopias, but explicit and ideologically justifiable; a proportioned balance of duties and rights; a rigorous justice whose dictates are applied strictly to acts and not to individual men, which will encourage a sense of responsibility in the latter; a definition of the people and of any constituted social body as a diachronic community of shared destiny, not as a synchronic mass of individual atoms, etc.

In short, future centuries, in the great pendulum movement of history that Nietzsche called "the eternal recurrence of the same," will in some way revisit these archaic values. The problem for us, for Europeans, is not, through our cowardice, to allow Islam to impose them on us, a process which is surreptitiously occurring, but to reimpose them on ourselves, while drawing upon our historical memory.

http://cdn.counter-currents.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/07/PH_TROY-03.jpg Recently, an important French press baron — whom I cannot name, but known for his left-liberal sympathies — made to me, in essence, the following disillusioned remark: "Free-market economic values are gradually losing out to Islamic values, because they are exclusively based on individual economic profit, which is inhuman and ephemeral." Our task is to ensure that the inevitable return to reality is not imposed upon us by Islam.

Obviously, contemporary ideology, hegemonic today but not for much longer, regards these values as diabolical, much as a mad paranoiac might see the features of a demon in the psychiatrist trying to cure him. In reality, they are the values of justice. True to human nature from time immemorial, these archaic values reject the Enlightenment error of the emancipation of the individual, which has only ended in the isolation of this individual and in social barbarism. These archaic values are just, in the Ancient Greek sense of the term, because they take man for what he is, a *zoon politikon* ("a social and organic animal integrated into a communitarian city-state"), and not for what he is not, an isolated and asexual atom fitted out with universal but imprescriptible pseudo-rights.

In practical terms, archaism's anti-individualist values permit self-realization, active solidarity and social peace, unlike egalitarianism's pseudo-emancipating individualism, which ends in the law of the jungle.

The Geopolitics of Ethnopolitics: The New Concept of “Eurosiberia”

By Guillaume Faye

<http://www.counter-currents.com/2010/08/faye-on-eurosiberia/>

Translated by Greg Johnson

Presented at the International Conference on “The Future of the White World,” Moscow, June 8th–10th, 2006

This text is dedicated to my friend and relentless critic, master of creative ideas, Professor Anatoly Ivanov.

I am very happy to speak again before my dear Russian friends, during this conference whose goal is to reflect on the fundamental ethnic and historical solidarity that henceforth must link all peoples of European origins in the 21st century.

We are entering a world in which the very old historical and national rivalries between all our peoples must be dialectically surpassed and replaced by a global unity. For we will face common threats of immense magnitude against our identity and our survival. This necessity constitutes a historical metamorphosis.

My talk will define the nature of these grave threats; explain the central role which Russia could play in this new alliance of all peoples of European origin; clarify the new concept of Eurosiberia—the union of peninsular Europe and Russia—and of ethnopolitics, i.e., the radical modification of world geopolitics by the introduction of the ethnic dimension; then, based on a risky but perhaps relevant forecast, I will propose the idea of the Septentrion, which is perhaps a revolutionary extension of the ideas I have expressed. Finally, I will conclude with the major historical role Russia will have to play in this process.

The French Revolution and its consequence, the Soviet Revolution, are only minor historical episodes compared to what awaits us. These two “revolutions” pose only secondary problems. Today, we must face the crucial questions, which condition our survival as people of European origin. For millennia, we have not faced a “state of emergency” (the *Ernstfall* of the political theorist Carl Schmitt) so tragic.

The Diagnosis

All peoples of European origin are in constant demographic retreat. For the first time in our long history, we are being invaded by massive and uncontrolled immigration from other continents, and we are not reproducing ourselves. This immigration, which is connected with a true replacement of our population, is also the third and most severe attempt of Islam to conquer the European continent. This reinforces the opinion I expressed in one of my books, *L'Archéofuturisme*, that the 21st century may well be that of the “shock of the past,” of a challenge rising again from depths of history and memory, far removed from the phantasms of

“modernity” in its communist or liberal versions. It is the return of the “eternal present” of which Nietzsche spoke, i.e., of the invariance of human history, of the clash of civilizations, imperfectly anticipated in the United States by Samuel Huntington and more pertinently explained in France by Professor Pierre Vial, a historian present at this conference.

I suggest that this clash of civilizations actually amounts to the confrontation of the white race with all the others. If nothing changes, in the middle of the 21st century, i.e., in a generation, peoples of European descent will be minorities in their own lands, on our continent and even in America. This tragic upheaval had been implicitly envisaged by Oswald Spengler in the 1920s (*The Decline of the West*) and by Pierre Chaunu and Jean Raspail in the 1970s (*The White Plague* and *The Camp of the Saints*). The diagnosis for our civilization and our ethnosphere is death, pure and simple, if no unforeseen doctor emerges to cure us.

The Causes

René Descartes, following Aristotle, distinguished the causes of any phenomenon into secondary (or superficial, immediate) causes and primary (or fundamental) causes. The cause of this triple phenomenon of demographic decline, migratory invasion, and the massive ascendancy of Islam must be sought in exogenous or primary and endogenous or secondary sources.

Among the first: an enormous rush towards the North of all the peoples of the South, fascinated by the (false) the Western Eldorado, and suffering from their own inability to govern themselves; after decolonization, they seek by immigration to return to the bosom of the “Whites.” But, at the same time, to take revenge. Political psychoanalysis can easily explain such schizophrenia, as does Hegel’s master-slave dialectic.

The endogenous and thus primary causes of this evil are internal spiritual pathologies of European peoples: ethnomasochism (hatred of oneself) and xenophilia (love of the foreign) which lead to cynical or naive collaboration with the enemy, mercantile materialism and unbridled individualism, egalitarianism, the inversion of values, the loss of memory of traditions as well as the future, emasculation and confusion of sexual roles, moral melancholy and morbidity dissimulated under a factitious and simulated optimism, loss of the aesthetic sense, etc.

Are the European peoples undergoing an irremediable ageing, a biological loss of substance and will to live, predicted by Oswald Spengler and Paul Valéry, where the beginning of the “Iron Age,” the Kali Yuga of Hindu tradition, is a prelude to death? It is a disturbing portent: in Europe, neo-totalitarian legislation represses all those who wish to resist and encourage all that is morbid and decadent. It is this “false freedom” that makes our youth spineless.

I agree with Professor Anatoly Ivanov and Louis Rougier, as well as with Nietzsche, that one of the causes of this pathology is the “viral” influence of secularized Christian morals, based on universal charity, egalitarian cosmopolitanism, a culture of repentance, shame of oneself and sin, as well as a delirious, unrealistic conception of “love.” This thesis deserves debate, but it is quite relevant.

The Remedy

However, one does not have to yield to absolute pessimism. The European people are metamorphic, i.e., in the long run, they can be regenerated. But rebirth will be able to take place

only through a “positive Utopia,” i.e., the imagination of another world that completely breaks with this one. The tragic events that prepare Europe and all humanity for what I call the “convergence of catastrophes” allow us to envision something new, unthinkable today, but conceivable tomorrow. When chaos carries out the tragic task of cleansing.

Allow me to summarize some of my positions here: it is necessary to envision an ethnocentric and autocentric Eurosiberia, i.e. an alliance of the whole of peninsular and Central Europe with Russia, from the tip of Brittany to the Bering Strait. The goal is the formation of a federated Empire that is ethnically homogeneous and economically independent, autarkical. In this spirit, Russia would be in the center of such an ensemble, which would be most powerful and most imposing on the planet. This idea is obviously opposed to that of “Eurasia,” which neglects the ethnic unity of greater Europe and regards the Russians as Asians, which they are not.

Eurosiberia must be founded on the principle of the “separation of peoples.” Each one in its place, and in good relations with its neighbors, if possible. The economic model, which breaks completely with today’s “globalization” and planetary free trade, follows the principle that each civilizational realm must be self-sufficient. It is the economic theory of the autarky of great spaces that I developed following the work of the German Historical School and of Maurice Allais, a “third way” that simultaneously rejects the old obsolete capitalist and Marxist paradigms. To each group of peoples its own economic, political, and ethnic model.

Concerning the United States, my thesis is simple and shocking to many Manicheans. We should be neither anti-American, nor pro-American, but for ourselves. It is quite obvious and natural that Washington will seek to prevent by any means the birth of a “Eurosiberia,” which would be its nightmare. To encircle and weaken Russia, to break the threatening Paris-Berlin-Moscow axis, to awkwardly toy with Islam which has turned against them: all is fair for the American leaders whose backs are against the wall and, moreover, desperate for oil. I can only approve of Vladimir Putin’s efforts to thwart these attempts to surround Russia and to restore, after a fashion, Russian power.

Yet I think obsessive anti-Americanism is a trap. One should not confuse the Washington regime with the ethnic and popular core of America. My position is inspired here by a certain Niccolò Machiavelli. Moreover, I know the United States well: it includes forces that are completely in favor of an alliance with a future Eurosiberia.

This formula has stirred controversy in France, but I stand by it: it is unproductive to regard America as an absolute enemy, because it is only a provisional adversary. On the other hand, I ask: What if, whether we like it or not, the principal enemy is the Third World under the banner of Islam?

Of course Eurosiberia will shock globalists and right-thinking people, like the petty nationalists, who are still in the 19th century. All these ideas obviously constitute a radical rupture with the current world (which is already passé) but seem to me in agreement with the earthquakes, the upheavals, the storms that appear already on the horizon, with the total historical metamorphosis that we will live through in less than one generation.

I would like to insist on two new concepts: first of all, that of ethnopolitics. “Geopolitics” took into account only geographical factors. But the new planet taking shape before us will be one of

blocs of nations and civilizations fighting one another for survival, and not a world of human harmony, a “world state” ruling a mongrelized humanity, an infantile extension of the American “melting pot,” with petty rivalries between states.

Later on, it will be necessary for Eurosiberia to consider allying itself with all white people of European origin in 21st century, whether they live on the American continent or elsewhere. This is the concept of Septentrion.

Perhaps this position is utopian? Perhaps it is visionary? Isn't this planetary solidarity of all the peoples of European origin, sometimes transnational, a new concept, worthy of discussion?

The Destiny and Responsibility of Russia

I insisted that this conference take place in Russia, because I think that the Russian soul and the Russian people are one of the major centers of European civilization. Those who claim that Russia is “Asian” mislead. Those who proclaim that Russia is “Western” mislead too. Russia is European, I would even say “supra-European.” Its strange destiny is to gather all the heritages. I think that it is in Russia that the European peoples will be able to gather and defend their identity. Without Russia, its people, its space, its resources, its genius, nothing is possible. I know very well that Russia is sick, but no sicker than the rest of us, the Europeans of the West. And it is only together that we will be healed.

Russia is located at the geopolitical and ethnopolitical center of a gigantic “Eurosiberian” space stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific and including the Russian Federation, Central Europe, and peninsular Western Europe. In terms of resources, this space has no rival in the world. It does not need anyone. It will have to aim at increasing its ethnic homogeneity, protecting its borders, finding its related cultural roots, its common historical memory, increasing its birthrate, ensuring its power, a tranquil, wise, just and invincible power, inspired by certain principles formulated by Plato in his *Republic*. I am reminded of the formula of the Belgian theorist Robert Steuckers, founder of *Euro-Synergies*, who characterized the Euro-Russian alliance—and thus Eurosiberia—as a “giant hedgehog,” who touches no one and is touched by no one.

This is why Russia must be more concerned with reinforcing its links to its European neighbors to the West than with the Middle East and the Asian Far East. Likewise, our task in Western Europe is to explain that the union with Russia is a top priority.

But how to define Eurosiberia? It is impossible to specify institutional contours today. Like any great historical project, it always begins with the mobilizing dream of some conscious minority. It will obviously be an immense Confederation, or a racially homogeneous Empire (unlike those that preceded it) on which the sun never sets. It requires a break with the narrow egoistic and suicidal logic of the “nation states” that have divided the European people, perhaps taking as a starting point the Breton European federalism, of which one of the theorists, Mr. Yann-Ber Tillenon, is present at this conference.

This Eurosiberian project is based on an inversion of values (*Umwertung*): the Anglo-Saxon world, the West, the United States will cease to control the ethnic, political, and economic destiny of whites, replaced by the Eurosiberian bloc, stretching “from the moors to the steppes, from the fjords to the maquis.” It is around Eurosiberia, around the European motherland, that the brother peoples will have to gather, including those of North America and elsewhere. Allow

me to quote my late friend, the great painter and poet Olivier Carré: “We turn towards the rising sun. We are the New World.”

How can these ideas be put into practice? I don't know. But I know what is essential: to communicate them, to make them known. “Revolutions in the heart” found “revolutions in reality.” One thing is sure: Russia, your dear Russia, our dear Russia is at the center of this historical destiny. We have a common and glorious history. We fought one another well. But it is time to set aside childish things. We must come together again, reunite around our common ancestral stock, because we have common enemies and we belong to fundamentally the same people. We are brothers on the same land.

Thank you.

The Islamic Conquest of Europe

By Guillaume Faye

<http://www.counter-currents.com/2010/07/the-islamic-conquest-of-europe/>

There are officially four million Muslims in France today. The real figure is almost certainly higher, probably between six and seven million believers. Islam is already France's second largest religion, with 1,430 official mosques. Its followers are young, whereas practicing Catholics are old. If demographic trends are taken into account (a steady, uncontrolled flow of immigrants and a higher birth rate) Islam will become the dominant religion in France as early as 2015, if nothing is done to prevent it. France currently has more Muslims than Albania and Bosnia combined. In the European Union, the number of Muslims is estimated at fifteen million. It is growing in all European countries.

To claim today that France could never become an Islamic republic or even a Muslim country is as risky as someone denying in the 1980s the possibility of German reunification or the demise of Communism in the USSR.

None of my remarks will be hateful toward Islam, though it does not always reciprocate. On the other hand, I do indeed consider Islam a grave threat and an enemy, since this conquering religion is engaged in a massive and deliberate settlement of Europe. You do not despise an enemy; you combat him. And in attempting to understand your enemy, you should not descend to the naivety of contemporary intellectuals, who reflexively declare Islam tolerant, without ever having studied it.

It is perfectly possible to share values in common with your enemy. His character as *enemy* arises, in this case, only because he has first imposed himself on you as an occupier. We can, in agreement with Islam, resist or deplore the West's materialism and its exaggerated, deranged individualism, but nevertheless regard the establishment of Islam in Europe as an act of war, according to the Koran's own rigorous teachings. Carl Schmitt's warning aptly applies to all Europeans who remain naive and tolerant toward Islam: "You don't decide who your enemy is; he decides. You can easily declare him your friend, but if he decides that he is your enemy, there is nothing you can do about it."

<http://cdn.counter-currents.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/07/muslim.jpg> Contrary to the opinion of Islamophiles, Islam is not simply a "universal faith" like Christianity; it is also a community of civilization (*umma*) which aims at expansion. The implicit project of Islam is quite simply the conquest of Europe, both religiously and ethnically, as the Koran stipulates. We are *already* at war. Westerners, unlike the Russians, have not yet grasped this fact.

For even if Islam conveys transcendent values and proposes an individual and a collective doctrine of life — imposing high, intangible standards on its believers, thus endowing their lives with meaning — it nevertheless corresponds to nothing in the European soul and temperament. Its massive introduction into Europe would disfigure a European culture already damaged by Americanization. An assertive dogmatism, an absence of the Faustian spirit, a fundamental

denial of humanism (understood as the autonomy of the human will) in favor of an absolute submission to God, an extreme rigidity of social obligations and prohibitions, a theocratic confusion of civil society, religion and the political State, an absolute monotheism, a profound ambivalence toward artistic freedom and scientific inquiry — all these traits are incompatible with traditional European patterns of thought, which are fundamentally polytheistic.

Those who believe that Islam can be Europeanized, can adapt to European culture, can accept the concept of secularism, make a dreadful error. Islam, essentially, does not understand compromise. Its essence is authoritarian and bellicose. It is the religion par excellence of a desert people. Put differently, with the colonizing introduction of Islam into Europe, two dangers arise: disfiguration or war.

Excerpted from chapter IV of Faye's *La colonisation de l'Europe: Discours vrai sur l'immigration et l'islam* (Paris: Aencr, 2000), 69-70. Trans. Irmin. Faye and his publisher were found guilty and fined, at the behest of the "anti-racist" organizations MRAP and LICRA, for "spreading racial hatred" — that is, for the thought crime of writing critically about Islam and Third World immigration.

http://library.flawlesslogic.com/faye_02.htm