

Pagan Imperialism

by
JULIUS EVOLA

TRADITION
2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Translator's Introduction	1
<i>The Ecumene and the Middle Ages</i>	2
<i>The Absolute Man and the Ghibellines</i>	3
<i>Racial Politics</i>	4
Pagan Imperialism	6
We Anti-Europeans	6
<i>European Decadence</i>	6
<i>The New Symbol</i>	7
<i>The Primordial Nordic-Solar Tradition</i>	10
<i>We Pagan Imperialists</i>	15
The Conditions for the Empire.....	18
<i>The Decline of the Imperial Idea</i>	18
<i>The Protestant Deviation and our Counter-Reformation</i>	22
<i>Will to Hierarchy</i>	26
The Democratic Error.....	30
<i>True Liberalism</i>	30
<i>Hierarchy Based on Power. The Conquest of the State</i>	32
<i>The Impossibility of Democratic Self-Government</i>	37
<i>Anti-Hegelianism</i>	40
<i>Anti-Historicism</i>	44

<i>The Individual and Humanity</i>	48
<i>The Irrationality of Equality</i>	51
<i>From Clan to Empire. Our Doctrine of Race</i>	53
The Roots of European Evil	59
<i>The Regression of the Castes. Gold and Labour</i>	59
<i>Science Versus Wisdom</i>	65
<i>Those who know and those who believe</i>	70
<i>Mechanical Force and Individual Power</i>	72
<i>Activism and the Humanised World</i>	76
Our European Symbol	84
<i>Nietzsche, Misunderstood</i>	84
<i>The True Paneuropa</i>	88
<i>The Myth of the Two Eagles</i>	93
<i>Ghibelline Restoration</i>	100
<i>Conclusion</i>	107
Appendix	109
Introduction	109
<i>The Order of Nations</i>	109
<i>The Spirit of Roman of Civilisation</i>	110
<i>Race and the Myth of the Origins of Rome</i>	111
<i>The Mysticism of Race in Ancient Rome</i>	111

Future Order of Nations.....	113
The Spirit of Roman Civilisation	119
Race and the Myth of the Origins of Rome.....	125
The Mysticism of Race in Ancient Rome	130

Translator's Introduction

"Admittedly *Pagan Imperialism* combined a radical impulse, expressed in violent terms, with youthful excess, a lack of political sensibility and a utopian awareness of present conditions." ~ Julius Evola. "We are the generation without ties and without depth. Our depth is the abyss. We are the generation without happiness, without a home, and without valedictions... Thus we are the generation without God, because we are the generation without ties, without a past, without identity." ~ Wolfgang Borchert.

Although Borchert wrote those lines shortly after the end of World War II, its roots go back much further. Already in 1918, Oswald Spengler was publishing the two volumes of *The Decline of the West*. It is in that atmosphere that the *raison d'être* of Julius Evola's *Pagan Imperialism* must be understood. It is the work of a young man looking into the abyss, searching for ties, a past, and an identity. Looking back, the older Evola recognised the limitations of the work. He described it thus:

"Admittedly *Pagan Imperialism* combined a radical impulse, expressed in violent terms, with youthful excess, a lack of political sensibility and a utopian unawareness of present conditions." (The Cinnabar Path).

Prior to the publication of *Pagan Imperialism*, Evola was actually more interested in philosophical and spiritual topics. Since philosophical idealism was dominant in Italy at that time - Giovanni Gentile and Benedetto Croce were world class thinkers - Evola learned German in order to study the great German idealist philosophers of the 18th and 19th centuries. He also engaged Oriental philosophy, particularly the *Tao Te Ching* of Lao Tze as well as Tantra Yoga as expounded by the British writer John Woodroffe.

Although Evola is perhaps best known today for allegedly extreme political views, they actually formed a small part of his interests. He certainly was no political activist, declining to commit to any political party or movement. Yet, his books on Buddhism, Tantra Yoga, Hermetism, Taoism, Sexuality, and so on, will have lasting importance, more so than his political or social commentary. While Benito Mussolini was trying to find some accommodation with the Catholic Church, Evola, on the other hand, was seeking the identity of Italy in the paganism of the ancient Roman Empire. That was the motivation for this book. In retrospect, the

title is misleading, and Evola later suggested a more precise title would have been "Roman Traditionalism" rather than "Pagan Imperialism."

The book was originally published in two editions. In 1928, the Italian edition was published. It had minimal impact on the Fascist movement, so Evola remained a rather marginal figure. Since that edition was quite specific to the situation in Italy at the time, with references to long-forgotten journalists, it has limited interest today.

However, a second, greatly revised, edition was prepared for publication in Germany in 1933 under the title *Heidnischer Imperialismus*. That edition did achieve a small success in Germany, where Evola was mistakenly seen as the leader of a significant current within Fascism. His views were aligned with the "Conservative Revolution" motivated by Moeller van den Bruck. Since Evola participated in the translation into German, I have resolved any ambiguities in the Italian text by referring to that edition.

The German edition was published before the National Socialists came into power, so it cannot be read as a proto-Nazi text. Quite the contrary, since Evola was opposed to the biological determinism of the National Socialists. Nevertheless, the book was better received in Germany than it was in Italy.

Some notions had to be softened up for a German audience. For example, Evola's harsh criticism of Protestantism would have been out of place. Then, he had to merge the ideal of a return to Romanity with the Nordic-Germanic tradition. Thus, he emphasised the "two" eagles: the Roman and the German. There are three main themes that would resonate with a German audience: Ghibellism, Nietzsche, and hierarchy. Ghibellism was the idea that the State is supreme, and the Church is subservient to it. Unlike Roman Catholicism, which regards the Church as supreme, Lutheranism held the opposite. Nietzsche's critique of the West was quite influential at the time. And the ideal of hierarchy found a home in the Prussian mentality.

The Ecumene and the Middle Ages

The Roman Empire represented the Ecumene, or the civilised World. It did not include all of Europe, but it included areas now known as Turkey, the Middle East, and North Africa. Hence, Roman traditionalism was not co-extensive with Europe. However, Evola was interested in uniting the Nordic and Roman traditions. For that, he had to turn to the Middle Ages, which he called the last of the great

Aryan civilisations, following the Vedic, Persian and Roman civilisations. Then he could speak of a European identity, or at least as far as it included Northern and Western Europe.

Evola then distinguished Catholicism from Christianity proper, since, he claimed, the former still retained essentially Roman elements. In an interview in 1967, Evola said:

“Speaking of Christianity, I often used the expression ‘the religion that came to prevail in the West.’ In fact the greatest miracle of Christianity was succeeding in asserting itself among the European peoples, even taking into account the decadence into which numerous traditions of these peoples had plunged. Nevertheless, we must not forget the cases in which the Christianisation of the West was only superficial. Besides, if Christianity has, without any doubt, altered certain European values, there are also situations where these values were revived by Christianity, by rectifying and modifying itself. Otherwise, Catholicism would be inconceivable in its various ‘Roman’ aspects. In the same way a part of Medieval civilisation would be inconceivable, without phenomena such as the appearance of the great Knightly orders, Thomism, a certain mysticism of a high level (e.g., Meister Eckhart) the spirit of the Crusades, etc.”

Although that time is considered the “Age of Faith”, those “Roman” elements have been abandoned, or certainly de-emphasised, in our day. The Crusades are an embarrassment, knightly orders are defanged, Thomism is no longer dominant, and the German mystics are objects of study rather than personages to follow. The “et cetera” would include, for example, Dante and the Feudal system. It also includes the Guild system as an alternative to both communism and capitalism.

The Absolute Man and the Ghibellines

Of course, the ultimate “et cetera” is the Holy Roman Emperor. The Emperor and the Pope were often at odds over political dominance. The Ghibellines supported the former and the Guelphs the latter, so they were frequently at war with each other. Although Rene Guenon and Ananda Coomaraswamy claimed that spiritual authority should have priority over political power, Evola asserted the opposite. This was in conformity with the ideal of the ancient Roman Emperor, who was considered a god. All the nations of the Empire were hierarchically organised with the Emperor at the peak.

For Evola, following the ancient pagans, the Emperor became, or was on the way to becoming, the Absolute man. Unlike Christianity in which God became man, the Absolute man becomes a god. This is done by transcending the human state, being beyond "good and evil". As such, he sets the law. The nobility and his subjects recognise this, so they freely obey him.

In *The Institutes of Biblical Law*, Rousas Rushdoony describes the ancient pagan god-king:

"Much more is known of the concept of divine kingship, the king as god and the god a king, as the divine-human link between heaven and earth. The god-king represented man on a higher scale, man ascended, and the worship of such a god ... was the assertion of the continuity of heaven and earth. It was the belief that all being was one being, and the god therefore was an ascended man on that scale of being. The power manifested in the political order was thus a manifestation of apprehension and seizure of divine power. It represented the triumph of a man and of his people. Moloch worship was thus a political religion ... Moloch worship was thus state worship. The state was the true and ultimate order, and religion was a department of the estate. The state claimed total jurisdiction over man; it was therefore entitled to total sacrifice.

Racial Politics

Evola's position is not racial, as it is understood today. Although race is part of man's being, it does not define him. Evola writes:

"We must not forget that to speak of blood in the case of a man is not the same thing as to speak of it in the case of an animal. If, by blood, one means the biological heredity of a race, then in the animal, race is everything, while, in man, it is only a part. The error of certain race fanatics who think that the reintegration of a race in its ethnic unity signifies *ipso facto* the rebirth of a people, lives exactly here: they regard man as if he could be regarded as horses, cats, or dogs of a 'pure breed'. The preservation or the restoration of the purity of race in the narrowest sense, can be everything in an animal, but not in man - in the man of superior type: even for man, it can constitute a condition which may be necessary under certain aspects, is not sufficient in any case, since the racial factor is not the only one which defines man."

Evola was not concerned with the idea of a "white race" in Europe. At that time, the Nordic race, the Mediterranean race, Slavic race, and so on, were considered to be separate races. Moreover, a "race" was ultimately considered to be a spiritual quality, and only the highest representatives could be said to "have race". The masses, on the other hand, did not have race, and hence were pretty much indistinguishable from each other.

Hence, Evola's categories need to be reinterpreted in psychological or spiritual terms. For example, he claims to be "anti-Europe, anti-Semitic, anti-Christianity". Although only the middle term is offensive, the three terms do not in fact refer to specific historical peoples. In Evola's scheme they are code words, or mythical categories, for certain negative trends he claims to be part of European history. The Introduction of the Italian edition states that those trends actually refer respectively to "bourgeois and cosmopolitan Europe", "secularising revolutionism", and "communism and socialism". Here we see that Evola is referring to the degeneration of Europe, Judaism and Christianity. Obvious his goal was the spiritual regeneration of Europe, and his views on Medieval Christendom were described above. Similarly, in regards to Judaism, he saw the idea of the return of the "Messiah" as an equivalent to the return to a "Golden Age".

"As for Judaism, it is not the ancient Hebraic, messianic idea, but to degeneration and materialisation that is the true focal point of the subversive forces turned to the final destruction of our civilisation and to a Satanic dominion over all the forces of the earth. In its original sacred form, prior to the period of the prophets (that indicated the first mystical and democratic fall of Israel's ancient tradition), the idea of the messiah had many traits in common with familiar conceptions and ideals of essentially Aryan civilisations, from which, moreover the Hebrews more than once borrowed many elements." ~ Julius Evola, *Transformazione del Regnum*

Pagan Imperialism

We Anti-Europeans

European Decadence

The current "civilisation" of the West is expecting a substantial upheaval, without which it is doomed to collapse sooner or later.

It has realised the most complete perversion of every rational order of things.

There is no longer breath, nor liberty, nor light in the realm of matter, of gold, of the machine, of number.

The West has lost the meaning of command and obedience.

It has lost the meaning of Action and of Contemplation.

It has lost the meaning of hierarchy, of spiritual power, of man-gods.

It no longer knows nature. This is no longer, for Western man, a living bod made up of symbols, gods, and ritual acts - a splendid *cosmos*, in which man moves about freely, like "a kingdom within a kingdom": he has instead deteriorated into an opaque and fatal exteriority, the mystery of which profane sciences try to ignore with petty laws and petty hypotheses.

The West no longer knows Wisdom: it no longer knows the majestic silence of those who have mastered themselves, the bright calm of the Seers, the superb "solar" reality of those in whom the idea has become blood, life, and power. Wisdom has been supplanted by the rhetoric of "philosophy" and "culture", the realm of professors, journalists, and sportsmen - the scheme, the program, the manifesto. It has been supplanted by sentimental, religious, humanitarian contamination and the race of windbags who flounder and madly rush while exalting "becoming" and "practice", because silence and contemplation frighten them.

The West no longer knows the State: the valour-State, the *Imperium*, as synthesis of spirituality and royalty, as a way to the "super world", as known by the great ancient civilisations - from China to Egypt, from Persia to Rome and to the Holy

Roman Empire of the German nation - has been submerged in the bourgeois misery of a *trust* of slaves and wheeler dealers.

What might war be, war willed in itself, as a value superior both to winning and losing, as that sacred path to spiritual realisation - for whom the celestial home of Odin, Valhalla, is the privilege of the heroes fallen on the battlefield; for whom in Islam, "holy war", *jihad*, is a synonym of the "way of God"; for whom in Aryan India, the warrior appears side by side with ascetics and, in classic antiquity, *mors triumphalis* is conceived as victory over death - these formidable European "activists" no longer know what such a war is. They no longer know warriors but only soldiers, for them a squabble is enough to terrorise and force them back to the rhetoric of humanism, pacifism, and sentimentalism.

Europe has lost its simplicity, it has lost its centrality, it has lost its life. The democratic evil and the Semitic poison corrode it in all its roots - right down to its laws, sciences, and speculative thought. As for leaders - those persons who excel, not through violence, nor through greed for profit, nor through their ability as exploiters of slaves, but instead through unwavering and transcendent qualities of life - there are none. Europe is a big anodyne body, possessed and shattered by an anxiety which no one dares to express, which has gold or blood, machines and factories for flesh, newspapers for brains - a shapeless body which tosses restlessly, driven by obscure and unpredictable forces which implacably crush anyone who tries to oppose it or even just to avoid its mechanism.

The highly extolled "civilisation" of the West has been able to do all this. This is the vaunted result of the superstition of "Progress" - beyond Roman imperality, Doric Greece, and all other exemplary forms of the great Aryan primordial civilisations.

And the noose tightens everyday around those who are still capable of great disgust and great rebellion.

The New Symbol

Are liberation and renewal still possible in this world in its twilight?

Is there still enough strength in Europe to be able to take on the awareness and the will for such a task?

We are not deceived: only after having understood the magnitude of the task, will we be able to act. The menacing reality of a destructive spiritual process must

be recognised. Its roots date back almost to the ground of prehistory, whose culminating phases coincide with those which contemporary men exalt as values essential to civilisation, and whose influences now manifest themselves in all fields of thought and action.

This is not a matter of compromises or adaptations. The power of a new Middle Ages is needed. A change, interior as well as exterior, of barbaric purity is required. Philosophy, "culture", everyday politics: no more of all that. It is not a matter of shifting to the other side of this bed of agony. It is a matter of finally waking up, and standing on one's feet.

Here and there, men still exist, mindful of ancient nobility, who now, as individuals, notice the intolerable discomfort and feel driven to react, sometimes in one cultural domain, sometimes in another. Before it is too late, the way to the peaks must be brought back into the consciousness of these scattered men, beyond all the limits and private interests which currently wear away their strength.. Unrelenting action must ensure that their purest strength manages to disclose itself, as something invisible, ready to shatter the foul crust of rhetoric, sentimentalism, moralism, and hypocritical religiosity with which the West has covered and humanised everything.. Whoever penetrates the temple - even if he is a barbarian - has the unquestionable duty to drive out as corrupters all those who in 'civilised' Europe created a monopoly of 'Spirit', Good and Evil, Science, and the Divine, and capitalise on it, declaring themselves their advocates, while, in truth, they only know matter and what the words, the fear, and the superstition of men have superimposed over matter.

To all this, let it be said: 'Enough!', so that some men may return to long-lasting paths, long-lasting risks, long-lasting gazes, and long-lasting silence; so that the wind of the open sea may blow again - the wind of the nordic primordial tradition - and arouse the sleepers of the West. Anti-philosophy, anti-humanitarianism, anti-literature, anti-'religion', this is the premise. 'Enough!' must be said to aestheticisms and idealisms; 'enough!' to the thirst of the soul which creates for itself a Semitic God to adore and implore; enough of the "need" which ties beggar-men in common bonds, to give them, in the name of mutual dependence, that substantial character which each of them lacks.

We must pass above and beyond all this, with some pure forces. Then, a task will be put before them, which transcends "politics", which transcends social prejudice, and which disregards the sensational gesture and superficial wide

appeal, and which is such that vigorous physical strength over persons and things can no longer be useful for anything.

In silence, through hard discipline, self-mastery, and self-overcoming, with tenacious and brisk individual effort, we must create an elite in whom "solar" Wisdom is revived: that *virtus* which cannot be spoken, which rises from the depths of feelings and the soul and is not proved with arguments and books but with creative acts.

We must reawaken to a renewed, spiritualised, and austere sense of the world, not as a philosophic concept, but as something which vibrates in our very blood: to the sensation of the world as a spower, to the sensation of the world as rhythm, to the sensation of the world as a sacrificial act. This sensation will create strong, hard, and energetic characters, beings made of strength and then only of strength, open to that sense of freedom and nobility, to that cosmic breath which the "dead" in Europe have babbled a lot about, yet have not even felt its puff.

Against secular, democratic, and material science, always relative and conditioned, slave to phenomena and incomprehensible laws, deaf to the deepest reality of man, we must reawaken - in this elite - the sacred, inner, secret, and creative science, the science of self-realisation and "self-dignification", the science which leads to the hidden forces which govern our organism and are united with the invisible roots of fate and things themselves, and which creates mastery over these forces; so that, not as a myth, but as the most positive of realities, some men are reborn as beings who no longer belong to "life", but to "more-than-life", and are capable of transcendent action.

There will be Leaders, a race of Leaders. Invisible Leaders who do not speak and do not show themselves, but whose action does not experience resistance and who can do everything. Then, a centre will exist again in the West - in the West without a centre.

It is absolutely an error to think that we can achieve renewal if a hierarchy is not reestablished, that is to say, if we do not place above the lower forms - tied to earth and matter, to man and humanity - a higher law, a higher right, a higher order, which can find confirmation only in the living reality of the Leaders.

It is absolutely an error to believe that the State can be anything other than a *civitas diaboli* if it does not rise up again as *Imperium*, and it is also a mistake to try to build the *Imperium* on the basis of economic, military, industrial, or even "ideal"

or nationalistic factors. The *Imperium*, according to the primordial conception rooted in Tradition, is something transcendent, and it can only be attained by those who have the power to transcend the petty lives of petty men with their appetites, their sentimentalists, their narrow national prides, their "values", "non-values", and gods.

The Ancients understood this, when, at the peak of their hierarchy, they venerated beings whose royal nature was united with the sacral, in whom temporal power was permeated with the spiritual authority of natures "no longer human", bearers of a secret and invincible force of "victory" and "fortune"; when they experienced a kind of "holy war" lived in every war, something universal, something devastating, that oriented and ordered everything - with the purity and fate of the great forces of nature.

Will those who still can or desire to put up resistance understand this? Will they understand that no other alternative exists? That there is no other spirit that - even in other forms and shapes - should be reawakened? That this is the condition for which any "revolution" whatsoever can be not only a trivial contingent event in a single nation, but can become a universal concept, a first ray of light in the thick fog of the "dark age" of the Western *kali-yuga*? The beginning of the true restoration, of the sole possible recovery?

The Primordial Nordic-Solar Tradition

We alluded to a primordial Nordic tradition. It is not a myth, it is our truth. Indeed, in the most remote prehistory where the positivist superstition postulated right up until recently cave-dwelling ape-men, there existed a primordial, unified, and powerful civilization, an echo of which still resounds in everything that the past has to offer us as an eternal symbol.

The Iranians speak of the *Airyanem Vaejah*, located in the farthest North, and see in it the first creation of "god of light", the origin of their lineage and also the seat of "glory" - *hvareno* - that mystical force characteristic of the Aryan race, and especially of their divine kings; they see in it - symbolically - the "place" where the warrior religion of Zarathustra would have been revealed for the first time.

Correspondingly, the tradition of the Indo-aryans knows the *Shveta-dvipa*, the "Island of Glory", also located in the far North where Narayana, the one who "is the light" and "who stands above the waters", that is, above the causality of events, has his residence. It speaks also of the *Uttarakuru*, a Nordic primordial

race; what is meant by Nordic is the solar path of the gods - *deva-yana* - and the term *uttara* connotes the concept of all that is sublime, lofty, and superior - of what in the figurative sense can be called *arya*, Aryan - according to the concept of "Nordic".

Again, the Achaean-Dorian stocks are heirs of the legendary Nordic Hyperboreans: the most characteristic god and hero of this race - the solar Apollo, the annihilator of the serpent Python - came from there; Hercules - the ally of the Olympian god against the giants, the annihilator of the Amazons and of elemental beings, the "fair conqueror", of whom many Greek and Roman kings later considered themselves so to speak, as his avatars - would have carried the olive tree from here with whose branches the victors were crowned (Pindar).

But in Hellas, this Nordic theme is, moreover, mixed up with that of Thule, the mysterious Nordic land, which sometimes becomes the "Island of the Heroes" and the "Country of the Immortals", where the blond Rhadamanthus reigns, the "Island of the Sun" - *Thule ultima a sole nomens habens* - whose memory remained so alive that, convinced that he had recognised it in Britain, Constantius Chlorus marched there with his legions, not so much for military glory as to reach the land "which is nearest to the sky and more sacred than every other region", in the sense of anticipating in this way his apotheosis as Caesar.

Often, in the Nordic-Germanic traditions, Asgard, the home of the Aesir and departed heroes, is superimposed over another divine residence of the same kind; and the Nordic kings, who were considered to be demigods and Aesir - *semideos id est ansis* - and brought their peoples victory with their mystical power of "fate", transferred the origin of their dynasty to that "divine" land.

In the Gaelic traditions, there is Avalon, from which originated the pure divine race of the *Tuatha de Danann*, the heroic conquerors of prehistoric Ireland, among whom the hero Ogma corresponds precisely to the Dorian Hercules - Avalon, which on the other hand, blends into *Tir na mBeo*, the "Land of the Living", the kingdom of Boadag, the "Victorious".

Even the Aztecs have their land of origin in the North - in Aztlán, which is also called the "White Land" or "Land of Light", which they left under the leadership of a god-warrior, Huitzilopochtli; hence, the Toltec also claim, as a seat of origin, Tlalocan, Tollan, or Tula, that like the Greek Thule, is also the "Land of the Sun" and blends into the "paradise" of the kings and heroes fallen on the battlefield.

These are only some of the harmonious references, traceable in the most diverse traditions as the memory of a primordial Nordic civilisation and fatherland in which, in a more precise way, a transcendent superhuman spirituality is united with the heroic, royal, and triumphal element: towards form victorious over chaos; towards super-humanity triumphant over all that is human and telluric; towards "solarity" as principal symbol of a transcendent virility, as ideal of a dignity which, in the order of spiritual forces, correspond to the sovereign, the hero, the ruler, on the material plane. And, while the traces of tradition go back to a road from the North to the South, from the West to the East, which the races preserving this spirit have travelled, the largest formations of Aryan peoples, in more recent times, testify, through the quality of their purest values and religions, to their most characteristic deities and institutions, typical of this force and this civilisation, as well as to the struggle against inferior southern races, which are tied to the earth and to the spirit of the earth, to the "demonic" and irrational part of their being, to the promiscuous, the collective, the totemic, the chaotic, or the "titanic".

On the other hand, however - and the preceding references already show it - history became metahistory: while the "Land of the Living", the "Fortress of the Heroes", the "Island of the Sun", contained on one hand the secret of the origin, on the other hand, revealed the secret of the road towards rebirth, towards immortality, and towards superhuman power: the road which can lead in large measure to the traditional royal dignity. The historical factors thus became spiritual factors, the royal tradition became Tradition in the transcendent sense, and therefore something which, above time, is constantly present. Symbols, signs, and sagas tell us in hidden ways of a unique Tradition, in order to show us a unique orthodoxy", where the correspondent pinnacles were always reached, where "solar" spirituality always towered over inferior forces.

Thus, in subsequent times already bound to the destiny of the darkening of the "divine" - Ragnarok - among the peoples dispersed in their strengths and their leaders, the "Nordic" racial element, detaching itself from the "spiritual" realm to which it originally belonged, became a category, a general type of civilisation and of conduct opposite the superhuman, which can be found even where no memory remains of an ethnic correlation in the strict sense; a type which therefore can reunite their diverse civilisations when they reveal their spiritual formative force, in the same way as, within that primordial tradition, it influenced the lower elements and the multiplicity of matter.

This is why pagan Romanity must be considered as the last great creative act of the Nordic spirit, the last universal attempt, successful to a considerable extent

over an entire cycle, to resurrect the forces of the world in the forms of a heroic, solar, and virile civilisation: a civilisation which was closed to mystical escapism; which was true to the aristocratic-Aryan type of the *patres*, the lords of the lance and patriotism; which was mysteriously confirmed by the Nordic insignia of the Wolf, the Eagle, and the Axe; which was alive above all in the Olympian-warrior cult of a Zeus and a Hercules, of an Apollo and a Mars in the feeling of owing its greatness and its *aeternitas* to the divine; in action as rite and rite as action, in the crystal-clear and yet potent experience of the supernatural, which was acknowledged in the Empire itself and culminated in the symbol of Caesar as *numen*.

The fall of pagan Rome is the fall of the greatest traditional and solar bastion, and it is not difficult to recognise in the forces which mainly contributed to this fall, the same forces which paved the way for all the subsequent derivations and successive degenerations which have led to the current state of Europe.

In its frenetic crushing of every hierarchy, its exaltation of the weak, of the underprivileged, of those without birth and without tradition, its resentment against all that is strength, conceit, wisdom, and aristocracy, and its intransigent and proselytising fanaticism, the Semitic wave, dark and barbaric, enemy of itself and the world, was, in effect, poison for the greatness of Rome, a galvanising substance for all the other Asiatic-Southern factors of decadence which then penetrated into the structures of Rome, and the greatest cause of the decline of the West.

In the Semitisation of the Greco-Roman and then the Nordic world, attributable to a large extent to Christianity, we have in fact the revolt of the lower strata of those races, by whose domination the Nordic-Aryans had obtained their splendid civilisations. The spirit of Israel, which had already created the collective sense of "sin" and "expiation", and which emerged mainly in the so-called "prophets" after the defeat and enslavement of the "chosen people", buying the residues of the aristocratic spirit of the Pharisees, re-evoked the lower forces of Aegean-Pelagian tellurism which the Achaean stocks had subdued. These can be equated to the castes of the sudra, the so-called "dark" caste - *krsihna* - and the demonic caste - *surya* - above which the hierarchies of the three higher castes of the reborn - *dvija* - up to the Brahmins and the king, understood as "a great deity under human form", had stood in India, as form over chaos. Lastly, the forces which myth hands down to us under the Nordic *Rinthursi* and the military formation of Gog and Magog, whose path Alexander the Great barred with a symbolic iron wall.

These forces worked spiritually, through primitive Christianity, to destroy the European spirit. At first, they concealed themselves within the lunar spirituality which took shape in the Catholic church, that is to say, a spirituality whose type is no longer the sacred king, the solar initiate, or the 'hero', but the saint or the priest who bows before God, whose ideal is no longer the warlike, sacral hierarchy, and "glory" but fraternal community and caritas. Later, in the Reformation and in humanism, there reappears the original, anti-traditional, primitive, anarchist, dissolute nature of these forces. Then, through political revolutions, liberalism, and the emergence of collectivism, one cause produces another, and one fall follows another. In all the forms of modern society - and also in science, in law, in the illusory power of technology and the machine - the same spirit, paradoxical as it may seem, appears; the same levelling will, the will of the greatest number, the hatred for hierarchy, quality and difference prevails; the collective and impersonal bondage born of mutual insufficiency, typical of the organisation of a race of slaves in revolt, grows stronger.

There is more. Semitic-Christian mysticism combined Orphic-dionysian pathos (which, previously for Dorian-Nordic Greece, constituted a deformation of the ancient Olympian cult) with the popular mysticism of Isis, born out of the decline of the solar Egyptian tradition. In the same way, the identical element of "passion" and excitement produced, by means of messianism and millennialism, the promiscuity of the imperial plebs - in contrast to the calm superiority of the Caesars, the simple greatness of the Homeric heroes, the purified spirituality and the autarchic ideal of the pagan "philosopher" and initiate. Here is also the root of every modern deviation, in the romantic, irrational sense which craves a bad infinitude. After its secularisation, this mysticism leads us to the myths of "activism", of "Faustianism", of the contemporary superstition of progress, the Semitic mysticism of the instincts, and of the "*elan vital*", the evaluation of the "event" and of "life"; in short, up to the divinisation of the barbaric, sub-personal, collective element of man, which today seems more unleashed than ever - so as to drive individuals and peoples in a direction that they themselves did not will.

Before the fall, the other force raised itself up once more against the Judeo-Christian tide, almost to present a decisive alternative for the further course of the Western history of the spirit. It was the tradition of the Aryans of Iran, arose in the form of the warrior cult of mithra, the avatar of the ancient Aryan god of the luminous heaven, the "Lord of the Sun", the "Killer of the Bull", the hero with the torch and the axe, the symbol of men reborn "through power" which a syncretic myth, no less significant for this, assimilates the Hyperborean god of the golden age. But stronger forces impeded even this "solar" possibility.

Then the last great reaction: the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation. With the so-called "barbarians", some races were introduced which were in reality closely related to the Achaeans, paleo-Iranians, paleo-Romans, and Nordic-Aryans in general, who maintained themselves, so to speak, in a state of prehistoric purity. And if their emergence, in regard to the material aspect of the already Asianised and Semiticised Empire, seemed destructive, it still amounted, from a higher point of view, to a revitalising flow of heroic spirit, a galvanising contact with a force spiritually akin to that to which pagan *Romanitas* had originally owed its solar greatness. This is how the ancient Roman symbol rises again in the world, directly defended by the forces of the North.

The imperial, feudal, and universal civilisation of the Middle Ages, despite its purely nominal profession of Christian faith, must be evaluated above all from this point of view. A Nordic-Roman spirituality is expressed through it. Its militia was the knights of chivalry; its supra-political centre was the Imperial Ghibelline ideal; its rite was the Crusades - much truer as the return to the pagan idea of the "*mors triumphalis*" than in its outward religious impulse. Its secret soul, opposed to Christianity and faithful to an older and higher tradition, was what kept it alive, hidden in legends, myths, and warrior and chivalrous Orders, from the Templars to the Knights of the Girail and the Fedeli d'Amore.

After the fall of this medieval civilisation, after the destruction of this radiant European Spring in its first flowering, after the unleashing of those forces which led to secularisation, particularism, and a disintegrating humanitarianism, the paths to the final downfall were opened. The force of Tradition passed from the visible to the invisible, and became an inheritance which was handed down in a secret chain from the few to the few. Even today some have a presentiment of it, in somewhat confused efforts, still tied to the human and to the material. They are those who, through an obscure instinct, as a mark of reaction, evoke the symbols of the Swastika, the Eagle, and the Axe. They are often unknown men, or men who blaze like tragic meteors - such as Nietzsche, crushed under the weight of a truth too strong for them, which now awaits others who will be able to reassume it and impose it anew so that it rises up hard and cold against their enemies, in the great revolt, the great struggle: whether the West confirms itself in its decline or rises up in a new dawn depends on it.

We Pagan Imperialists

The circle is closing and what an ancient myth - Iranian before becoming Jewish - describes in the apocalyptic term of "universal judgement", now imposes this

upon us: the separation of the "chosen people" from those who, at the "end of the world" - that is, of our world, of our civilisation - will perish.

We call for a decisive, unconditional, integral return to the Nordic pagans' tradition. We are finished with every compromise, with every weakness, and with every indulgence toward everything that, derived from its Semitic-Christian root, has infected our blood and our mind.

Without the return to such a tradition there is no liberation, there is no true restoration, and the conversion to the true values of spirit, power, hierarchy, and Empire is not possible. This is a truth which allows no doubt. Anti-Europe, anti-Semitism, anti-Christianity - this is our rallying cry. The most foolish and absurd fable make paganism a synonym for materialism and corruption, and instead portrays an exotic and anti-Aryan religion created in our decline as the purest and most exclusive resynthesis of all that is spiritual, almost as though the entire history of civilisation had already been predestined. And how this superstition is still firmly and deeply rooted in our contemporary "cultured" outlook!

No! The living and immanent spirit, the spirit in act as extra-human wisdom and power, the glory of Kings and Victors, was not known to the Semitic contamination. Our paganism, our tradition in the middle of the great sea of peoples who brought it from North to South, from West to East, did know it. And whoever today rises up against the European sickness, and against the European religion, is not a denier, but an affirmer - the only one who knows what an affirmation is.

We, therefore, today, bear witness to the Nordic pagan tradition and call for the restoration of its value in a Pagan Imperialism. The person of the speaker and of others who may be joined to him in the spiritual reality - solitary, impassive and uncompromisingly aristocratic in this world of merchants, the caged, and deviants - vanishes the face of this every reality, which, through them, calls to the unbroken and unvanquished of Europe, to those who still offer resistance, to those who still possess the future.

Will we manage to feel that this is not a matter of words, utopias, or romantic abstraction, but that it is the most positive and most powerful of realities, that it is waiting to be resurrected by beings capable of everything, by means of a work in respect to which everything that for the masses the word "reaction" means becoming nothing? That a thousand forces are pressing in obscurity, in anticipation only of those who might provide for their liberation.

To exchange our tradition with any of the new pseudo, or special traditions or with any of the new Western forms of faith, all of which are inevitably contaminated by the Semitic spirit, would be the most absurd of errors.

The primordial forces of our race place us today, at this decisive phase for the history of the West, for the last time confronting the dilemma: loyalty of treason. Our restoration is an empty word if it is not, first of all, a "solar" restoration, a restoration of pagan spirituality. It would be a palpable contradiction to wish to invoke the defence of the Nordic or Roman Tradition and not to remember those forces which primarily contributed to the decline of these traditions; to evoke the ideal of the Empire and not to notice these that Semitic-Christian image of the world, stripped of its mask, signifies the negation of the spiritual base for the Empire.

Beyond every contingent goal, every empirical interest, every passion, and every personal or partisan tie - who, among those who are ready for the revolt on German and Roman soil, will dare to take up again the torch of the Nordic pagan tradition.

We make a plea, we must make it. We wish to neither to hope nor to despair. Nor could that which is be changed by that which is not.

They are the values we hold. That circumstances and men might show themselves, so they may or may not be able to give form and content to a given period in the contingency of temporal and transitory things - this is something that indeed must interest us not as much as those whose truth stops at this contingency.

The Conditions for the Empire

The Decline of the Imperial Idea

Just as a living body maintains itself only insofar as there is a soul to dominate it, so every social organisation not rooted in a spiritual reality is precarious and insubstantial, incapable of keeping its strength and identity under the vicissitudes of the various forces; it is not properly an organism, but rather a composite, an aggregate.

The true cause of the decline of the political idea in the contemporary West resides in the fact that the spiritual values which at one time suffused the social order have gradually vanished, and no one as yet has been able to replace them with anything. The problem has been reduced to the level of economic, industrial, military, administrative, or, at most, sentimental factors, without taking into account that all this is just mere matter, necessary as long as you want, but never sufficient, and as little capable of producing a strong, rational, self-supporting order as the simple meeting of mechanical forces could produce a living being.

Inorganicity, exteriority - these are the dominant characteristics of contemporary social "organisations". That the higher should be determined by the lower; that law and order, instead of being justified in an aristocracy, a difference of quality, a spiritual hierarchy, ought to be based on the contingent bond of the balancing of interests and the avidity of an anonymous multitude already stripped of any higher sensibility whatsoever - such is the fundamental error standing at the base of these organisations.

The root of this degeneration goes back to distant times, precisely to those periods in which the processes of decline of the Nordic-solar tradition first appeared. It is linked to the separation of the two powers, the division of the regal and the sacred principles, the dualism through which, on the one hand, a material virility took shape - the secular State and its sovereign, with purely temporal and, we would almost prefer to say, Luciferian, values - and on the other hand a lunar, anti-Nordic and anti-aristocratic spirituality, a spirituality of the "priestly" and "religious" type, which nevertheless claims the right of sovereignty.

The formation of a priestly caste, as a distinct ruling caste, necessarily led to the desecration, secularisation, and materialisation of the political idea: all the rest is only the consequence of this. The first anti-traditional revolution was the one in

which the priest replaced the "divine King", and "religion" took the place of the elites, who were the bearers of the solar, victorious, and aristocratic spirituality.

Phenomena of this type can already be observed at the threshold of prehistory, in the pre-Christian and non-Christian world: but they almost always butted against reactions, which limited their influence and prevented the possibility of further falls. Even in India, where the caste of the *Brahmans* often became the priestly caste, in spite of all the echo of a spirituality proper to a superior caste, that of the *Kshatriya*, endured, and Buddha - like Zarathustra - was an ascetic of royal blood.

It is only in the West, with the rise of the Semitic religion and the Semitic spirit, that the disruption appears to have become decisive, and irremediable from diverse points of view.

Primitive Christianity, with the transcendentalism of its values leading everyone in the expectation of that "Kingdom" which "is not of this world", with the characteristic Semitic will of submission to God and humiliation of the creature, smashed the "solar" synthesis of spirituality and politics, of royalty and divinity, which the ancient world knew.

Taken in itself, in its deep contempt for all worldly concerns, the Galilean doctrine could only render impossible, not just the State, but society itself. But to the failure of the animating spring of this doctrine - the coming of the "Kingdom", in which all values would be exchanged and the humble exalted - the spirit and the intransigence of the primitive doctrine manifested; new forces arose in order to leave a space in the world for what "is not of this world". A normalisation was reached. A compromise was reached. The Semitic element succeeded in conquering the universal symbol of Romanity. The Catholic Church, a hybrid formation, in which Romanisation, that is to say paganisation, of some aspects of the original doctrine did not prevent the "lunar", priestly, and feminine idea of spirituality from taking a central position at the same time: the atmosphere of those who "believe" and "love", who are mere sons and servants of "God", and who transmit the right of sovereignty to their fraternal community (the Mother Church), conceived of, so to speak, gynecocratically.

Let us establish this point without doubt. Christianity is one thing; Catholicism, another. Christianity as such, that is, in its primitive Semitic and revolutionary aspect, is the mystical analogue of the French Revolution of yesterday, and of communism and socialism today. Christianity, as the Catholic Church instead, partially takes on some forms of pagan-Roman organisation: something utterly

contradictory because these forms lend themselves to a content, to a system of values and belief, which is the contradiction of the "solar" spirit of Roman paganism; they stand in opposition to this spirit.

In this intrinsic contradiction lies the cause of the failure of the hegemonic claim of the Church, of its inability to really take on the heritage of what had been destroyed by the Asian-Semitic revolt: Roman imperialism and universality.

The Catholic Church, in fact, is not sufficiently pagan to completely abolish this dualism: thus it distinguishes and separates the spiritual domain from the political, the care of "souls" from the care of the people. Then it strives, in vain, to rejoin the two parts. It finds itself in a predicament without an exit.

The attitude of the Guelphs, who refused to acknowledge the possibility of an autonomous secular State against the Church, and demanded the complete subordination of the Eagle to the Cross, was consistent. However, if that had occurred, what would have remained to the Church which could have allowed it to still call itself Christian - to claim the heritage of the one who taught renunciation, the vanity of worldly concerns, and the natural equality of men as slaves to a God whose kingdom is not of this earth? How could it have been possible to maintain dominion and hierarchy, if not by adopting in reality the pagan value of achievement, immanence, and distinction? This is what happened to the Church in its golden age, the Middle Ages, when, for a moment, galvanised by the partial Romanisation of the Nordic-Germanic spirit, it gave the impression of really wanting to embrace all the peoples of the West in an acumenical unity. But this was a *Fata Morgana*, something without enduring reality - basically, only a presentation of the problem in the form of a solution, a *de facto* solution to the contradiction, but not *de jure*.

But then the disagreement remains irremediable, in that an Empire which is truly an Empire cannot tolerate a Church above it as a distinct organisation. An Empire whose dominion is purely material can certainly let a Church co-exist with it, and even into it in matters which concern the care for spiritual things, in which, by hypothesis, it is not interested. However, such an Empire, as we said above, is for us only a semblance of Empire. An Empire is such only when an immanent spirituality permeates it; but it is obvious that a real Empire of this sort cannot recognise any organisation which claims a prerogative regarding the things of the spirit. It will deauthorise and supplant every Church, putting itself in its place purely and simply as true and sole Church: in one way or another, consciously or

unconsciously, there will be a return to the pagan and Aryan conception, to the solar synthesis of royalty and priesthood, to the "*Sacrum Imperium*".

If we consider more attentively, in the Imperial idea which asserted itself in the Middle Ages against the Church, above all thanks to the Hohenstaufen, we can notice precisely this: there is no temporal power in rebellion against spiritual authority, but rather a struggle between two authorities of the same spiritual nature, each one claims a supernatural origin and destiny and a universal and supra-political law. On one hand, in the Empire, even if not without extenuations and compromises, the pagan idea of the divine King returns, the sacred ruler, *lex animata in terris*, living centre for the relations of a transformative warlike *fides*, a personification of the virile and heroic pole of the spirit. On the other hand, what subsists in the Church is the principle of spiritual castration and "priestly" truth, the lunar pole of the spirit, which seek heedlessly, by any means, to support and bless the slaves and merchants in their revolt against the Empire (the Communes) and to hinder its restoration, in order to be able to preserve its supremacy.

In the struggle between these two great ideas we have, as we said, the last spiritual lightning of the West. Then a phase of loosening and progressive secession followed/ If, finally, the modern State made itself autonomous from the Church, this happened only because it declined from the spiritual and universal principle of the *Imperium* to the pluralistic and plebeian principle of the "nation"; because it forgot what royalty signified in the traditional sense; because it did not know that the political problem is inseparable from the religious problem, and it took no interest in every question which transcended material interests and the claims of the respective races and nations; abandoning the field to all the encroachments of humanism and so-called "freedom of thought", it was reduced to a mere temporal power. Thus, we arrive at the present horizons, within which we see, on one hand, an essentially secular and anti-aristocratic State, exhausting itself in economic, military, and administrative problems, in fact, refusing any authority in affairs of the spirit, and on the other hand a lunar religion, ripped apart by schism, that took no interest in politics, and was reduced, in the form of the Catholic Church, to a sort of great international association of believers, capable only of a insipid paternalism as expressed in the form of an ostentatious and useless concern for the salvation of the people - each of whom goes by his own path, no longer following any religious impulse - or for the salvation of "souls" - which have all lost the inner, living, concrete, virile sense of spiritual reality.

This state of affairs can no longer endure - or, at least, those who want to speak seriously of reciting, those who do not want to fall back on anything which the

ironic saying, "*Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose*", is valid, must no longer permit this renunciation, this affliction.

There is only one way out of the crisis of the Western world, through a restoration of the absolute synthesis of the two powers, political and sacred, royal and spiritual, on the basis of an Aryan-pagan vision of the world and of the enucleation of higher forms of benefit, life, and individuality - as the beginning of a new universality.

Let no one rebuke us for anachronism. The same spirit can also be evoked in other forms. That the secular decline of the political idea may be overcome, that the State Might regain a supernatural significance and represent the peak of the victory over chaos - this is the central point.

We are sick to the marrow of abstract "religiosity" and political realism. This paralysing antithesis must be broken, in the name of our recovery and tradition.

The Protestant Deviation and our Counter-Reformation

We have already alluded to the fact that the messianic-Galilean doctrine, according to its original character, did not aim at all to establish a new form of social life, or even of religion. It had a purely anarchic, anti-social, defeatist character, subversive of every rational order of things. A single concern obsessively pervaded it: the salvation of the soul of the individual in the face of the supposedly imminent coming of the "Kingdom of God".

But when the prospect of this "Kingdom" receded and finally disappeared, the forces focussed on this hope fell onto themselves, and from its individualistic aspect the Semitic religion passed to its socialistic aspect. The *ecclesia*, the community of the faithful, understood as an impersonal and mystic *medium* formed out of mutual need - the need to love, the need to serve, the need to communicate, the need for mutual acknowledgment, and the mutual dependence of lives each insufficient in itself - replaced in each soul the reality of the missing "Kingdom of God".

It is necessary to distinguish clearly the *ecclesia*, of which we are now speaking, from what would then become the Catholic ecclesiastic organisation. This organisation arose from a gradual Romanisation of the *ecclesia* in the primitive sense, whose spirit, to a certain extent, it betrayed, and whose Semitic part was choked off by means of a hierarchical principle of authority and a symbolic ritual

corpus. What is important here, however, is to understand its primordial reality the *ecclesia* of the first Christian communities, which came to the surface when the direct influence of Jesus ceases and the sense of imminence of the "Kingdom" faded. In those times we find the seed of that force which would lead to the type of modern Euro-American society.

In the Empire the principle was: hierarchy, investiture from above. In the Christian *ecclesia* it was: equality, brotherliness. In the Empire there were personalised relations of dependence: there were personalised relations of dependence: there were masters and there were slaves. In its most complete forms, there was a system of castes. In the *ecclesia*, these relations became depersonalised: there was a bond of equal beings, without leaders, without distinction of class or tradition, held together only by mutual dependence and by the identical need of the soul. In other words, sociality arose, the form of pure social living, of staying together in something collective, in an egalitarian solidarity. And as we said, the spirit proved to be the annihilator of the spirit.

And we now come down to the Reformation. The Reformation is the great fall of Nordic humanity: it is the degeneration, the overturning into the negative and the Semitic, of that force which had animated the struggle for the Empire against the Roman yoke. In the ideal of the Hohenstaufen we find, as a matter of fact, those principles of freedom, independence, and individuality which are characteristic of the original ethos of the Germanic stocks. Except that these values, reconciled with the hierarchical ideal, fought a spiritual battle during the Middle Ages; they raised the claim of a higher hierarchy, more solar, more virile, and more perfect than anything the Church was able to offer as compromise. In the Reformation we have precisely the opposite: here, these same Nordic forces freed themselves from bondage to Rome, only to buy at the same time those residues of hierarchical authority, Romanity, and universality which the Church still offered; through it, what occurred was a resuscitation of those very forces which had formed the first Christian community and the life of the *ecclesia*. In the Reformation we have the return of primitive Christianity, precisely in its slower, "socialistic" aspect, in contrast to the Roman aspect characteristic of the Church. Protestant intransigence put an end to the Catholic compromise, though not on behalf of the way back to the Empire, but rather towards the anti-Empire.

In spite of everything, the Germanic peoples still preserved, within the heredity of their blood, too many Nordic factors for the upheaval to be fatal for them. Among the Germanic peoples, more than in any others, despite the schism, an imperial and almost feudal regime was able to maintain itself, as well as a living sensibility

for the virile and Nordic values of honour, loyalty, and hierarchy - right up until recent times, until the outbreak of the world war (World War I).

Things take a totally different form among the Anglo-Saxon peoples, especially after religious revolt became a political revolt' after Humanism and the Enlightenment yielded their fruits; after the principle of authority fell, first in the spiritual domain, then in the social domain, and finally in the moral domain, and the substance of ferment and rot from the Jacobin revolution encroached on the world.

In such a context we see in fact how the Reformation - originally a religious revolution - brought about a profound change of the political idea itself. Releasing consciences from Roman authority, it socialised and immanentized the Church; it actualised, in a more or less secularised political reality, the primitive *ecclesia*.

Across the Reformation, the hierarchy form above was replaced by the free association of believers, emancipated from the bonds of authority, each one having become anarchically judge of himself and at the same time the equal of everyone else. It was, in other words, the beginning of the European "socialistic" decline: in opposition to the imperial ideal, the Protestant religion opened the way to a form of organisation dependent, not on leaders, but on the aggregate of separate individuals; an organisation coming from below and exhausting itself in impersonal relationships; a purely collective, self-governing and self-justifying reality.

This process has rapidly absorbed the Anglo-Saxon peoples and even today tends to a "catholicity" or universality, antithetical both to Roman and medieval imperial catholicity and to that which, in the narrower sense, was characteristic of the Church itself. Just as within each individual nation, it removed the difference between individual in a pure social bond by pooling them, so it also tended to remove the differences and the privileges of each individual nation by replacing them all at the same rank in the anonymous universalism of the ideal of a "League of Nations". At the same time, religiosity became more and more humanised, tending more and more to identify itself with sociality. The most recent orientations, towards "religion of work", and the increasing preponderance of personal self-interest and rigid moralism over any other ideal and metaphysical interest in the Protestant countries prove it.

In conclusion: the Reformation favours a consistent position, it separates the Christian aspect (in its moderate form of the idea of a mere associative life) from its Christian-pagan nucleus shown in Catholic countries, and realises a distinct type of State: the democratic state, the anti-Empire, the self-government of the mass, sovereign over itself, along with the simultaneous levelling of individuals in an anarchic, acephalous solidarity, with the appearance of governing servants of servants as mere "representatives", dependent upon the responsibility to the masses - rather than being responsible to themselves, as superior leaders, to remain the principle of absolute authority.

Naturally, not everything is included here. By underground means, the secularised reconstitution of the *ecclesia* again evokes the Semitic element, and the Protestant countries are those in which capitalism and plutocracy have developed in their most important forms; in which, behind the scenes of democratic "freedom", the all-powerful Jew reappears, master of forces and men of a world desecrated by stateless finance. While together, they announce the latest fall, the birth of the pure collective, in correspondence to the proletarian myth of the "Third International" and the prophetic mission of the Soviets.

We are thus confronted with a decisive "either-or".

It is vain to fight effects without knowing the remote and secret causes from which they derive. It is vain to think about a political reaction of any efficacy if not rooted in a corresponding spiritual revolution.

The Church is something halfway. The Church for us is too little. We need much more. We need a true counter-Reformation. And this counter-Reformation will consist in the return to the original Aryan *ethos*, to the pure forces of Nordic-Roman tradition, the Imperial symbol of the Eagle.

This is the first restoration. It will be a question of time, but our nations have to make a decision: either they will become in fact victims of the converging forces of Protestantism and Judaism, organising themselves definitively on the republican and democratic type of Anglo-Saxon society, choosing a religion immanent to sociality where the spiritual becomes a means to temporal fulfilments, culminating in the service of the Ahrimanic mysticism of the faceless "collective man" - or they have to react, and commit themselves to recovery and restoration, that is, for a revolution in the other direction, thus bringing up to completion the ideal of the other State.

As the Protestant revolution surpassed the Catholic compromise, and brought the West back into the forms and to the values of democratic society, we, against the Reformation, must surpass the same compromise, but in order to affirm the other possible alternative: that which was announced in the struggle of the Empire for the Holy Roman Empire. On the basis of an integral Nordic-Roman restoration, we must create a State which is new and ancient at the same time, sustained by the values of hierarchy, of organisation from above, of aristocracy, of domination, and of wisdom - that is, by those imperial values which the Church in its best period possessed to some extent on loan, and which, after the setback of the Church itself - in the course of a bimillennial experiment - must be asserted plainly, clear of any disguise or mitigation, by men who are not ashamed of their primordial nobility, who, in their faithfulness to the original powers of the noble *arya*, their uranic-solar spirituality, and to their heroic symbols, against the whole of socialised and Semiticised Europe in decline, might finally dare, as we do, to declare themselves pagan imperialism.

Will to Hierarchy

Hereinafter, when speaking of the roots of the European evil, we will have the means to recollect the principles by which the necessary counter-Reformation can pragmatically be achieved.

Now we want to briefly dwell on a special point: the meaning of the principle of hierarchy, presupposed for the new idea of the State. Here, proclamations and party programs don't matter; what matters is what is done, not what is said; only the decisive impulse matters, strong enough to sweep away habits which are innate in contemporary men by which they are still dominated, even though their mouths and minds assert the opposite.

Today people speak a great deal about hierarchy - but at the same time they continue to make concessions to a bourgeois and anti-aristocratic outlook which stands in precise contradiction of this concept. Naturally, first of all, we should get rid of all residues of the democratic and "representative" system, and of all that partakes in any way in the "socialistic" and collectivist spirit. Every relation should be toughened, revitalised, and virilised, through a warrior attitude, loyalty, rectitude, and a manly zeal for service. That *fides*, which was one of the most ancient deities of pagan Rome, and about which Livy said that the difference between Romans and the barbarians lay in its possession; that *fides*, which was found in the Indian *bhakti*, and in the devotion which the Iranian warriors dedicated not only their actions, but their very thoughts and wills, to their deified

chiefs - such *fides* is also found as the spiritual cement in the individual feudal political units, and in the connection of these to the *unum quod non est pars*, at the superpolitical and sacred centre of the medieval Empire.

We still need today, and especially today, such a *fides*.

The pride of subordinates in service to their superiors must be reawakened. Service must be reawakened as freedom and as overcoming, almost as a transfiguring offering, which does not humiliate, but elevates everywhere, in the affairs of war as well as peace, in the particular as in the general.

A structure must emerge on the spiritual base, which runs perpendicular from the higher to the lower, in which the least would be so many rays of a single centre and, in their turn, centres of unity of lower orders, gathered like soldiers around their officers.

Such a system naturally implies the necessity of the creation of elites - elites in fact and not only in name, among whom authority is not based upon position, but position upon authority - and the latter, in its turn, upon actual superiority. Every hierarchy which is based on premises other than these is nothing but the appearance of hierarchy, in fact the opposite of a hierarchy: violent and artificial creation which hides in itself a principle of injustice and therefore anarchy.

On the other hand, we must maintain that hierarchy must not in any way exhaust itself on the plane of what is called "politics" today. Rather, politics - as that economic, industrial, and administrative part of the State which establishes an equilibrium in the material sense - should subordinate itself to the values of superior character in order to serve as means to the end. The idea of a qualitative differentiation requires the elaboration of a number of supra-political levels, which actually correspond to various forms of life and interests, and precisely for this reason they are suitable to confer on the leaders that true and indisputable authority that could not be put into effect with anything conditioned by the temporal and the contingent.

Naturally, this ideal implies not only the affirmation of the concept and right of the nobility, but also of the monarchy. In this respect there is only an empty space in Europe, whether we speak of republican States, or of States which are nominally still monarchic, or of states built by dictators (who, from the traditional point of view, are nothing but tribunes of the people). Where monarchy still subsists, it has become a survival, a symbol rendered mute, a function which has lost its true

sense and is cut off from reality. It is better than nothing - but from those who, not only in name but also in spirit, are of royal blood, it would be to ask for the courage to no longer tolerate compromises and uncertain accommodations; it would be to demand to disdain royal dignities when they now correspond to nothing, or almost nothing - or to return resolutely, as centre and head of the State, to crush the "legal" usurpations of recent times, and to make themselves again, in an absolute and transcendent sense, leaders of the people.

Wherever monarchy, in hands that were no longer able to hold a sword and a sceptre, was beaten down by the intrigues of the mob of Jews and merchants, it must be restored. Wherever, by force of inertia, it still exists, it must be renewed, strengthened, and made dynamic, as an organic, central, and absolute function embodying simultaneously the power of the force and the light of the spirit in a single being who is truly the actualisation of an entire peoples, and at the same time the point which transcends everything that is conditioned by land and blood. Only then will we have the right to speak of Empire. If monarchy will be reawakened to a glorious, sacred, metaphysical reality, the peak, nevertheless, of the militarily ordered political hierarchy - the monarchy will take up the place and function which it once had, before its usurpation by parts of the priestly caste.

Naturally, before reaching the true traditional ideal along this route, the path is long. Moreover, we expressed rather clearly that one should not think that this identification of the two powers is limited to a rhetorical prosopoeia, or to a superstitious divinisation of some being simply because he happens to occupy the highest level in a purely material organisation - as happened, in past decadent periods, in various cases of theocracy. We insist instead on asserting a real synthesis, where spirituality is not a word, but the real positive reality of self-transformation, which, when achieved, puts as least as much distance between some beings and the mass of other men, as that which this mass presumes exists between itself and animals. We do not want to use the term "superman", as discredited and rhetoricised as it is in the present day; and, on the other hand, we can hope to be understood only by the very few, and misunderstood most, when we referred to the sense of the right of initiation, which, in many ancient States - when dynasties "of already divine blood" were not present - confirmed the investiture of political power. At any rate, we must insist that this distance of the leaders is irreducible to anything "moral", "ideal", "religious", or to any other human or non-human value, but consists, so to speak, of a different quality of being, achieved by a substantial transformation of consciousness.

We therefore assert that this real and concrete superiority will give a meaning to the term "spirituality", and will have to be posited as the centre from which the dignity, the quality, and the actual function of royalty will proceed. It will, in its turn, be evidenced in the *Imperium* - according to the Aryan-pagan tradition, for which the Kings were Kings by virtue of a "fire" attracted from the heavens - *hvaerno* - which invested them, made them immortal, and provided them with victory.

In this way, the centre of transcendent stability would be present, "sovereignty", the principle of every other hierarchy, the core of every loyalty, of every honour in service, and of every heroic action, the most magnificent force of equilibrium from above.

The Democratic Error

True Liberalism

The organic idea must be the principal and sound foundation of the new State.

In the previous chapter we mentioned how the concrete concept of the *organism* is opposed to that of the *compound*, which is the form of an assemblage of atomistically free elements, held together only by an impersonal, abstract bond, that is not located in any higher principle, nor based on a real and substantial difference of the elements themselves. And we added that the opposition between the imperial ideal and the liberal-democratic ideal is just like the one which exists between organisation and composition.

Our imperialism requires universality and unity; but not something abstract, characteristic of an impersonal law or of an unreal "collective will" and an internationalist and pacifist breakdown, even if that which is concretised in the reality of a superior individual and in which the sense of the transcendent is equivalent to the principle of differentiation and organisation.

Our imperialism transcends nationalism, of course: but, while democratic supranationalism is a wakening and subordination of national affirmation, promiscuously associated with many other national assertions, the imperial and Roman super-nationality is that of a national affirmation which, by means of a group of rulers, is reaffirmed beyond itself in a synthesis superior both to it and to the other nations, which it takes back under itself.

Strange as it may seem, at the basis of our imperialism, there are values which appear moreover as assumptions for the liberal forms of democracy. The values of freedom and independence stand in fact at the centre of the best Aryan traditions. A nobleman, according to the primordial Germanic tradition and alter in the organisation of the same medieval civilisations, was equivalent to a free man. The first Roman constitution is based on the idea of the *patres*, priests, leaders, and supreme judges of their peoples, who are free as so many worlds within one world. Frederick II will say: "I am king insofar as I am free." - Identical in word, radical opposition in spirit.

The difference lies in the fact that, in liberalism, these values are asserted by a race of slaves, which dares not think and will them to their foundation, for and in individuals, but instead shifts them, illegitimately and egalitarianistically, onto

“society” and “humanity”, where they lose their primeval meaning and are transformed into errors.

To hear it said - according to the first of its “immortal principles” - this race had established the age of freedom. In reality, there is nothing of it. They do not know what freedom means. If they did, they would moreover know that to desire freedom, is the same as desiring the Empire.

Let us observe more precisely. Freedom does not tolerate compromises: either it is asserted or not. But if it is asserted, it is necessary to assert it all the way, without fear - that is, it is necessary to assert it as unconditioned freedom.

That includes completely whoever asserted that the free man can call himself a single individual. Several free beings can only limit and deny each other - unless one supposes that, in the depths of each of them, there is a law that regulates their actions according to a sort of pre-established harmony.

Now, since a law does not cease to be a law merely because it is an interior law, and moreover, since this law is, by hypothesis, something which will transcend the conscious power of each individual, in this case, also, there is only the appearance of true freedom.

We are therefore faced with this alternative: either to fail in the demand, altering its value, that is, denying freedom in order to make the many, individual, atomistic freedoms remained tamed, mechanised, in mutual self-limitation (liberal democratism); that is, to stay intransigently firm to create the ideal of a being who - through an inner superiority ceasing to represent one force among many others in that dynamic system which is social reality - realises himself in that which, as determiner of the law of this same reality, is free from the law; who, therefore, will be law and authority only for the others. This means that as much reality as freedom has, so has the Empire.

This Empire must be conceived using the analogy of a body which has become a unity under the dominating synthesis of a soul. The unity to which such a body converges - unlike one without a soul - is a higher principle, which has its beginning and end within itself; which does not live for the needs of the body, but instead, the body serving as its tool; and which is not produced by the body, but vice versa, in the sense that the soul is the ultimate aim, the deep organising principle of the body itself, without which the latter would disintegrate (Aristotle).

Analogously, we will say that the Leader, that bearer of the value of freedom, will not be the mere representative of the masses (the democratic thesis), the impersonal symbol of a mythical self-organisation, of which these masses are already capable, but just the opposite: the masses would receive order and form only thanks to this superior force qualitatively distinct from the others they tend to express with difficulty. And this force, far from living through them, would subordinate the interests of the masses to those wider horizons which it alone can determine; without recognising the right of anyone to give sanction to his law, which is not law because it is just, but which is just because it is law, and his law (in striking contrast to the democratic principles of popular sanction and of dedication of the governors to abstract "principles" or to what is supposed to be their common interest). Otherwise the top leader would not be a free being, but rather the foremost of the servants, not a spirit, but the voice of the body.

Unfortunately, today, no one knows any longer what freedom is, no one dares to think it to its foundations. Unfortunately, today, almost no one knows anymore how to command, or how to obey. The risk of absolute responsibility and absolute dedication, have both totally disappeared, in the face of the mediocrity of the mechanised collectivity.

And people dare to sing the praises of an age of freedom and liberalism, boasting of the abolition of slavery, without understanding that, instead, freedom can only exist when there are masters opposed to slaves, when there are proud leaders and masses that boldly and generously put their lives and their destinies in their hands; without understanding that only a race of slaves could have willed the abolition of slavery, a race of slaves which remained such even when the chains had been smashed and the hierarchies broken down - insofar as their need for servitude and dependence created new and much more terrible tyrants: on one hand, the Semitic judge-God of providence and grace, and on the other, gold and "public opinion" - tools of the Jewish conspiracy, the fetish of socialised, impersonal law, and the moralistic intolerance of the Protestant nations; the omnipotent man of the masses of Bolshevism.

Hierarchy Based on Power. The Conquest of the State

The fundamental concept of the pagan and "solar" view of the world is that spirit is power and power is spirit, in conformance with an insoluble synthesis. Therefore, returning to our first considerations, we will state without hesitation that the measure of freedom is power.

As the soul - in which, according to the analogy used previously, the various parts and functions have their purposes, but the soul has its purpose in itself - considers the conditions and limitations coming from the body as imperfections, and it must not tolerate them but try to overcome them with perfect mastery in an organism wholly malleable to the spirit, so the Ruler will behave with respect to the various conditions typical of the masses, or the superior race with respect to the other races, which it must organise into a universal unity.

The freedoms of the Ruler will therefore extend as far as he has the power to carry out what he wills; "responsibility" - under any regard - making sense only when action is unsuccessful or a higher power is present. Failing such a power, he will lose, moreover, the right which will pass to the one who knows how to reassert his own law over and against any other. So that hierarchy will not be something given, but rather a task: it will not arise through its conformity to the abstraction of a transcendent law of good and evil, of justice and injustice, of humanity, nationality, or tradition in the more narrow and empirical sense but, instead, will be a precise putting-onself-in-relationship, balancing, subordinating, or being subordinated to specified forces, to convey who is more or less worthy of a certain level of the hierarchy. We insist therefore on the fact that, without power, the Imperium - and with it the summit of the free being - has no foundation; and, when if it even exists, it would exist in a contingent and precarious manner, based not on its own strength, but on someone else's weakness and cowardice.

But these assertions must be followed immediately by an explanation of precisely what we mean by power, without which, there would certainly arise ambiguities that, in this context, would not have any *raison d'être*.

First of all, we want to emphasise that, to us, power does not at all mean purely physical force, and that dominium and Imperium are not at all identified with violence and the abuse which can be exerted by means of it. It is all the more necessary to make this clear, since many make this confusion artfully, in order to be able subsequently to drag out the most forbidden *ad hominem* rhetoric against the "human beast", the "*homo hominis lupus*", "inhuman rulers", "tyrants", and so on. Violence is too little. Power is not violence, insofar as it expresses a mere "standing-against" (and, therefore, on the same plane) and not a "standing-above". Presupposing, and deriving its sense and justification from a resistance - that is, presupposing that another will can resist it - it blames an extrinsic, polemical, contingent, and thus, not truly hierarchic and dominating relationship. A free body is not moved by violence, nor shook by a *bon mot*; he who is truly able does not know violence. He has no need of it, insofar as he has no antithesis

and he imposes his authority directly, invisibly, and irresistibility in virtue of his inner, individual superiority with respect to those he commands.

All this, from an absolute point of view. However, we do not mean to deny every utility to violence, but only to say that it is still not truly power; it may be necessary in the face of lifeless rigidities which cannot be overcome except by being broken; it may again be necessary in the action of a first direct organisational mark in the chaos of various overwhelming material forces; nevertheless, it remains a rudimental and provisional phase.

We can be convinced this is so, also by considering also that, supported by an unleashed and sufficiently lively forces, one can come to the head of many, if not everyone; but nevertheless, it is certainly necessary that we know first how to unleash, and then to direct, these forces, something which cannot be achieved by purely physical force, but rather by the force of persuasion or suggestion.

This brings us, therefore, to a more subtle plane, where action and control are exerted by means of ideas. Ideas - be mindful - are understood not as abstract notions, but rather as power-ideas, as myths in the Sorelian sense that is, principles applied to the task of awakening energies, movements, and social currents through various moral or emotional suggestions, plus those of belief, tradition, etc., which they are capable of exerting on the masses. But here two basic points must be borne firmly in mind. In the first place, the Ruler must remain master of the various ideas or myths; he must not, by believing them, then fall under their suggestion, becoming an obsessive, a slave of the spirits which he evoked; he must not accord to them any absolute value whatsoever, but instead must regard them coldly as means, as fascinating tools with which - in conformance to a precise science of crowd psychology - he will exert those influences which he wants, awakening and directing the blind forces of the associated communities.

The second point is connected to the first one, and consists in embracing the absolutely positive aspect of our attitude, which goes beyond both the ideology of pure force and the idealism of "values", "immortal principles", and so on. That purely physical force is not sufficient in itself, that will always be the tool of ideas - this is simply an act to ascertain. From a positive point of view, one cannot and must not give another value beyond what results precisely from that ascertained fact, that suggestive value of principle, measured by its practical consequences. The idea, in other words, has value insofar as it works, and as long as it works: not because it is "good", "just", "true", etc., all that is only fog with respect to its reality of power-idea. To control the "suggestive potentials" with which the various ideas

are loaded, to examine them, evaluate them, apportion them, exploit them, discard them, or stop them - this is a superior, invisible, and frightful art of control which, when rendered conscious, as will be said, can convey "magic" in the highest sense.

Therefore, we can label as truly naive all those currents which maintain that only action (in the limited sense mentioned above) is worthwhile, and that every conflict, or use of ideas is a waste of time. We cannot agree with this, not because of an "idealism" from which we are quite far removed, but because this is an attitude which shows itself abstract and incomplete from the point of view of action itself. An impassable Ruler and promoter of power-ideas will overpower at the first attack those who exalt pure action, tearing them apart and turning precisely the same force against them on which they base themselves.

Nevertheless, this stage, also, is again transitional and must be transcended. It does not lead beyond the level of a tribune of the people. It remains within an order for which even psychoanalytic theories of the collective unconscious or of the "primal horde" could have value. It entails a compromise. The various "myths" and power-ideas should not serve as support or condition of the Ruler, since he alone should be the condition. Now such ideas - especially those of "nation" and "fatherland", which culminated in the area with which we are concerned - necessarily contain something transcendent and impersonal, from which there is a margin of contingency, which limits their instrumental value as explained above. Because to the one who bases his own rule only in the name of a certain group of ideas, can always happened to find himself confronting others who invoke the same ideas and who - demonstrating situations, moreover, that correspond to them more than those given by the ruling group - can undermine it precisely by attracting itself the forces on which the former based himself.

Thus a further realisation necessarily is called for, a turn to make what counts not so much the idea in itself, but rather the one who asserts it. It will no longer be the idea which gives value and power to the individual, but rather the individual who will give value, power, and justification to the idea. This is what Voltaire meant, if we remember court, when he said, referring to a French king, that, if certain acts acquire value, this happened essentially because it was he who accomplished them.

So now, one big final step remains to be accomplished: to get rid of the superstition of the "fatherland" and the "nation", understood in a democratic and impersonal sense. The Ruler shifting the centre gradually from the attract to

the concrete, will abolish in the end the very idea of the fatherland, and will cease to support himself on it; he will immanentise it, and will leave only himself, as the sufficient centre for every responsibility and every value, so that finally he will be able to say: "I am the nation, the State".

This level, however, can only be maintained by one in whom - in accordance with the expression just used - superiority is not based upon power, but power upon superiority. To need "power" is impotence, and the one who understands this will perhaps mean it in the sense that the path of a certain renunciation (a virile renunciation, based entirely upon an "Ability-to-do-without", a "being-sufficient") can be a condition for the path to the supreme power, and will also understand the hidden logic through which striking and extrasensory powers, stronger than any power of men and things, spring unexpectedly and naturally from the ascetics, saints, and dynasts (according to traditions that most people regard as myths, but which we cannot by any means deem as such).

As every need, every desire, and every passion expresses deficiency of being, saying no to all that, integrates, increases, exalts being and pushes it to a higher, central, solar life.

Thus any trace whatsoever of Titanism which could remain in the assumption of power by a single person, completely centralised and deliberated from every conditioning, vanishes. Here the individual and the super-individual, in fact based on each other, and particularistic tendencies could as little be isolated and deasserted the one against the other as a small stream could at the moment of its flowing into the sea. Here the ruler is not so much a specific mortal being, but rather a universal element, a cosmic force. Thus it becomes comprehensible how, in certain Eastern traditions, kings, at the time of their coronation, abandoned their old human names. One will understand, behind the mythological symbols, the extent to which the ancient Nordic countries could consider their rulers as incarnations of the blood of Odin, Freyr, and Tyr, the Egyptians and the Iranians, almost earthly images of solar divinities, their incarnations: the Greeks and the Romans, as revelations of constant "heroic" influences borne out of figures such as Heracles and Apollo. "To reside constantly in the great dwelling of the world; to sit constantly in the upright seat of the world; to move forward constantly on the great road of the world, and, when this has been achieved, to make people participants in the goods which are possessed." "Through the vastness and depth of one's own *virtus*, to make themselves similar to the earth; through their loftiness and brilliance, to make themselves like heaven, through their extension and

duration to make oneself similar to space and eternity: to form a third power between heaven and earth" - thus speaks Tradition.

The true Ruler, the imperial nature, is exactly the one who arranges this higher quantity of being, which immediately signifies a different quality of being: *virtus*, by which the others - without, in a certain sense, his willing it - are inflamed, attracted, overwhelmed. He imposes himself, to speak, by his simple presence: like an extensive and dreadful gaze which the others cannot resist; like that calmest greatness which magically stops both armed arms and the onrush of wild unleashed beasts, and directly arouses respect and the drive to obey, to sacrifice oneself, to seek in his greater life the sense of one's own truest life. In him, a whole race, a whole tradition, a whole history burn, as in their deed: they cease to be abstractions, they cease to be bloodless idealities, they make themselves reality, individual, concreteness, life- absolute life, because an end in itself and pure freedom - spirit, light.

So there is, at the top, the one who can really say: "I alone am the way, the truth, and the elife", and who gives to a multitude of beings, to the entire system of the lower determinations of life, a unity, a meaning, a justification which they did not have before. For the interior never lives his own free life so perfectly as when he knows that he has his centre and his end in something higher; the part, that when he knows that he is a member of an organism which has its own *raison d'être* not in itself, but in a soul (in a soul that is a reality and no less an ideal or abstract law).

These would be in outline the principal stages of the conquest of the State and the way of power. The naivety of brute force, the rhetoric of ideality and of "immortal principles", and the relativity and the ambiguity of the dynamic play of power-ideas, the myth of the fatherland and of the nation, the support of the same power - are the various limits which, as the rising sun disperses the fog and the ghosts of the night - must be smashed by the powerful reality of the superior and surly more-than-human individual, who finally becomes one with the powers of the "supraworld".

The Impossibility of Democratic Self-Government

Let us return to liberalism.

We pointed out the compromise that controls it in its pretension to assert the "immortal principle" of freedom from the individual to society, alongside "freedom" another "immortal principle" is asserted, that of equality. How can

anyone fail to notice that if there is equality there cannot be freedom? That the levelling of possibilities, the identity of duties and rights, and the despotism of one law based exclusively on quantity, make freedom impossible? We repeat: there is true freedom only in hierarchy, difference, and the irreducibility of individual possibilities, on the basis of an ideal of articulation, and therefore of inequality, whose most perfect model is the ancient system of castes - but, apart from this, there is true freedom only when the meaning of loyalty, heroism, and sacrifice can sweep away the petty values of material, economic, and political life.

But let us go beyond this into an analysis of the nature of the superficiality and absurdity characteristic of the anti-imperial standpoint.

Democracy, it is said, is the self-government of the people. The sovereign will is that of the majority, which they express freely through the vote, in the symbol of representatives, who must yield to the common interest.

However, no matter how much they insist upon "self-government", a distinction will always arise between the governors and the governed, insofar as a civic organisation is not yet constituted if the will of the majority is not concretised in individual personalities to whom the government is entrusted. These persons obviously will not be chosen at random: they will be those in whom the people believe they recognise greater capacities, and therefore, for better or worse, superiority over everyone else, so that they will not be considered as simple spokesmen, but one will suppose a principle of autonomy and legislative initiative in them.

Thus an anti-democratic factor appears in the bosom of democratism, which it vainly seeks to suppress by the principles of election and popular sanction. We say "vainly", because the superiority of superior men is expressed, among other things, in the fact that they are capable of discerning what truly is of value, and of arranging the various values hierarchically, that is, as subordinating or superordinating them in relation to each other. Now, the stated democratic principles completely overturn the thing, insofar as they restore the judgement (in respect to election as well as sanction) of the highest value to the mass to decide, that is to say, to the body of those who, by hypothesis, are the least capable of judging, and whose judgement is restricted by necessity to the lower values of the most immediate life. Therefore, in the democratic regime, one can remain certain that those who are able to point out the best futures (even if chimerical), for the purpose of practical utility, will have a disastrous preeminence over the others. In such an error - similar to that of someone who, after having conceded that the

blind should be guided by those who see, demands that the blind decide who can see and who cannot - there is found the main cause of the modern degradation of political reality into a purely empirical, utilitarian, and material reality.

It is true that there still remains one possible objection: that the material welfare controllable by the people could be a propitiatory partner in the development of a higher order. But this thesis is doubtful. The fact is that higher values and regenerating forces have arisen from moments of social crisis, whereas the "geese of Capua", the periods of economic prosperity have led to stagnation and torpor in the life of the spirit. This is a reflection of what happens in the life of individuals, in which certain values arise from the ground of suffering, renunciation, and injustice, and in which a certain degree of tension, of "living dangerously" from every point of view, is the best leaven to awaken the meaning of the relevance of spirit. But, without wanting to insist on this, we limit ourselves to asking: by what criteria should the masses be expected to recognise those who must direct them because they are capable of also caring much about superior values, although based on material values.

The truth is that democratisation depends upon an optimistic but totally gratuitous presupposition. It does not at all take into account the absolutely irrational character of the psychology of the masses. As we have already indicated above, in our discussion of "power ideas", the mass is influenced not by reason, but by enthusiasm, emotion, and suggestion. Like a little girl, it follows anyone who best knows how to fascinate it, by scaring it, or alluring it, using means which are void of logic. Like a woman, it is inconsistent, and passes from one thing to the next, without such a transition explicable by a rational law or progressive process. Particularly, that idea of "progress", referring not to the simple realisation that things become better or worse from the material point of view, but referring instead to the transition from a material standard to a higher standard, is a Western superstition which has arisen from the Jacobin ideology, against which we can never react energetically enough. Instead, to the extent it is possible to speak of self-government of the masses, and to the extent that the right of election and sanction can be left to the general public, then all that may or may not be true; instead, the "people" can be considered as a single intelligence, as a single great being, living a single, actual, conscious and rational life. But this is a pure optimistic myth, which no social or historical consideration confirms, and which was invented only by a race of servants, impatient with true leaders, who sought a mask for their anarchic pretension to be able to do everything by themselves and for their rebellious will.

Thus this optimism, presupposed by democratism, is also, and eminently, presupposed by anarchist doctrines. And, brought to a rationalised and theologised form, it reappears again at the basis of historical currents and the theory of the "Absolute State".

Anti-Hegelianism

In our description of the modern world, we often use the term "the many" in preference to more fashionable terms such as "people" or "humanity", which were handed down from the French Revolution. The reason for this is that these terms in themselves already reflect the democratic and collectivist mindset. We cannot and will not endorse in any way that tenacious residue of the scholastic mentality by which the so-called "universals" are reified or substantialised.

Let us explain it this way. We are still waiting for someone to make us understand what "Man" might be, over and above individual men. In reality we know of men, but of "Man" in general we know nothing or, to put it better, we know that it is nothing, in as much as we know that it is a simple concept obtained by omitting the specific marks of concrete individuals, which disperse in an empty uniformity through the abstraction characteristic of a classificatory pragmatism. "Man", as such, is something, that has existence, if at all, in our mind, but which corresponds to nothing in reality.

Analogously, we hold that the "nation", the "people", "humanity", etc., are simple metaphors, rather than real beings, and that their "unity", on one hand, is simply verbal, and on the other, not that of an organism constituted by an immanent rationality, but that of a system of many individual forces bumping into and balancing each other, and therefore essentially dynamic and unstable. Let us bear this well in mind when we use the term "the many", adding to its already mentioned character of the irrationality of the "mass", that of its multiple nature.

From such a point of view, even the democratic base-concept of the so-called "will of the people" is shown to be insubstantial, and needs to be substituted with that of the momentary equilibrium of many wills, those of many more or less related individuals, like the jet of a waterfall which, from a distance, may seem motionless and unitary, but, at close range, is seen to come from an indefinite number of different elements in incessant motion. Therefore any democratism is, after all, only disguised liberalism and atomism.

We could never insist too much on these considerations, concluding in their reality of the entity "people", the entity "nation", etc., and the illogicality of the pluriform reality to which these are concretely reduced - before a force from above appears and the power of loyalty is restored. In this, it is decisive that, if they reveal that in which the democratic doctrine of organisation from below they can be justified as self-government of the "people" or the "nation", they reveal moreover a more outworn pretence, about which a lot of conceptions which are said to be, and are believed to be, undemocratic, are anything but free. We refer to the neo-Hegelian¹ concept of the "Absolute State", or Superstate, which asserts that what is real is the State, not the individuals which - whoever they are, starting with the leaders - must vanish behind the State.

Few obsessive phenomena appear to us of such an aberrant character as this one, whose abstractionism is certainly much worse than democratic abstractionism. We have already seen that, in democracy, the "people" is basically a mask, which, through the more concrete notion of "common interest", reveals to us, especially in its liberalistic forms, the acknowledged reality of the individuals upon which the centre is displaced, also in an egalitarian and anti-hierarchical manner. In the doctrine of the "Absolute State", this reality disappears, devoured by a mere idea; no centre, either above or below, remains, insofar, as the leaders themselves are the obsessed of the obsessed, instruments of this impersonality to which everything must be subordinated.

We expressed ourselves quite clearly with respect to the pragmatic value which certain power-ideas or "myths" can have, and we could even grant, with due reservations, that the "Absolute State" is one of these. It is necessary however that the thing not become a bad bargain (*marche des dupes*). Every true imperialism

¹ We say "neo-Hegelian" because we intend to combat above all certain political deductions of recent times, of which only in part is justified their claim to the complete doctrine of Hegel. In what Hegel has written ("Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences, 539): "As a living spirit, the state only is as an organised whole, differentiated into particular agencies, which, proceeding from the one notion (though not known as notion) of the reasonable will, continually produce it as their result.", and added (542): "In the perfect form of the state, in which each and every element of the notion has reached free existence, this subjectivity is not a so-called 'moral person', or a decree issuing from a majority (forms in which the unity of the decreeing will has not an actual existence), but an actual individual - the will of a decreeing individual, - monarchy." - since Hegel expressed this thought, our critic could not turn totally against him. Here it is above all about some recent Italian interpretations of Hegelian thought in the statolatry sense, in which the idea of an absolute State is associated with tendencies of depersonalised centralisation, of an absolute "socialisation" of every activity, of an intolerance in the face of every traditional concept of caste and aristocracy: so much that, in the field of fascism, some have reached the point of holding possible a conciliation of this conception of the State not only Marxism, but with Sovietism.

must be intensely positive, however it must recognise a sole reality: that of the individual. The empire will exist for an individual, a superior individual, that individual capable of saying: "I am the State" - the individual will not exist for the State. There will be a hierarchy because there are leaders, not leaders because there is a hierarchy. The deep tracks, the organising rule, left by a group of conquerors, will give meaning to so-called "national unity", the so-called "nation", and not the myth of this to the deep life of those who have no need of it. The State, the nation - and "tradition", also - are abstractions (at most, tasks), which find their reality only in certain individuals, who impose themselves, create paths where there were no paths, and restore unity to what was only multiplicity, chaos, confusion, the rule of sub-personal forces.

Lacking this reality, this higher level of strength, life, and light (whose transmission through elites or dynasties, across generations, beyond the limits of time, constitutes precisely that which can be said to be Tradition in an eminent and positive sense) with a purpose that survives through inertia, with the empty form of an imperial or national organisation without anything which could still justify it, with the centre of a monarchy whose throne is empty - this obsessive survival, which then had become autonomous and reacts against that of which it is nothing but a shadow, with this claim that there is no individual to rule it and that it remains the supreme reality: with this degeneration coincides the genesis of the idea of "Absolute State", of "Nation", and of the whole analogous rhetoric of recent times.

This superstition, the political heresy deriving from Hegel, has led it onto the summits of a philosophical system. We must decisively rid ourselves of it and its every reflex, in order to return to the Nordic-Aryan vision of free and living beings, who do not know of the voice of the levelled multitudes, who knockdown and mock these clay idols of modern ideologies, and organise themselves freely, on the only possible basis of irreducible differences, which are defined in the natural and dynamic relationship of their intensity. Men, leaders of men, and men, servants of men, as pure forces, not men turned into shadows by shadows.

Against the collectivist, centralising, and homogenising concept of State and nation, we insist therefore on the pluralistic, individualistic, and realistic concept as a base for a restoration, in a hierarchical, virile, and entire anti-democratic sense.

Do not forget that the "nation" is a modern invention - a French invention. The Birth of the idea of the "nation" coincides with the fall of our feudal, aristocratic,

and imperial ideal. For the primordial Germanic races, the "nation" coincides with the whole of a race commanded by free masters, linked by blood, joined formation in a single front, ready to submit themselves with pride to the discipline of a warrior Order, where immediately with their retinue they became "vassals" of the *dux* or *hereigo* - yet always preserving their independence and their feeling of themselves as differentiated principles, not radiations of the collective. The same thing could be said, more or less, of the ancient aristocratic constitution of Rome. The same, *mutatis mutandis*, of the Aryans of India: they did not have the "nation", they knew only their caste, and, in them, the caste expressed itself spiritually as supreme and inviolable principle of order and hierarchy. The same of the Aryans of Ira: the divine fire - *hvareno* or *farr* - carried by their race, converges in three fires, which correspond to the articulation of the three higher castes - the masters of the sacrifice, the warriors, and the heads of families, but without any collective and "public" bond.

The principle characteristic of the formations of the Nordic-Aryan peoples is this sense of individualisation, of anti-collectivism, which then coincides with civilisation, with "form" - opposite to the sense of promiscuity characteristic of the Southern communities and races and of the lower form of society.

When the kings in the West made themselves hostile to feudal aristocracy, when they aimed systematically at centralisation in the sense of the "nation" - and really France started this process in a decisive way - they began to dig their own graves. The "public authorities", instituted by the kings with absolute levelling, eliminating the privileges and differentiated laws proper to each caste, established that from which, undermining royalty, would consequently have had to take form and exercise its tyranny typical of the "people", the mass. Every absolutistic State is an anti-aristocratic State. Every centralisation paves the way to demagoguery, and therefore to the fall from the personal to the collective.

Individuality, differentiation, articulation - an Order established solely by individuals and by clear, pure, and virile relationships between individuals - this is our ideal.

Nationalism: return to totemism.

Superstate as incarnation of the "absolute spirit": mask of the Leviathan idea - anteroom to the Soviets.

Anti-Historicism

Let us consider the democratic diversion in relation to its historicist dishuises. For our critique, we shall examine the ideology of an Italian, Giuseppe Mazzini: that is, only as a point of connection. The same considerations could certainly be extended to other conceptions which have the same spirit, and which today are not at all rare. But Mazzini's ideology is especially interesting for its attempt to mix different themes, not excluding the Roman idea itself.

The democratic will to this tendency has devised a "philosophy of history" which our previous arguments already suffice to undermine. It only "reifies" but even theologises the "people": the people-entity becomes a mystical body in which same divinity, pulled down from the heavens and in due course socialised, would live and reveal itself as in its interpreter - according to a progressive law of development which is the evolution of humanity itself through great cycles, each of which reflects an idea or "revelation" of the divine mind.

This is a wretched modern mythology, which no serious person can possibly believe any longer, and whose Semitic-Protestant character is immediately obvious. We repeat that the people-entity, if not a mere abstraction, is an inferior, irrational, and "demonic" entity, which in itself, without the dominating action of superior beings, could not have any relation with the divine. We regard the idea that the divine should reveal itself, to anyone equally in confusion or in the element of the masses, and not in those who are themselves almost divine natures, as a perversion. We refer here to the Doran-Olympian idea of the superiority of the "gods" over all that is becoming; we consider the anti-aristocratic myths of *parvenus*, such as the idea of "progress" or the "evolution of humanity" as superstitious origination from below; we regard as a fantasy of weak souls the idea of a providential or rational plan of history, the idea that everything that happens must be regarded as rational and justified, and superimposes itself over the realization of a transcendent goal, which the private opinion of some philosopher or other takes place of. As free beings, we see freedom in history, and we dispute, in particular, the legitimacy of the idea of a "philosophy of history", because it only expresses a disguised form of determinism, and an inability to see and value the living, individual, unique reality of historical facts. As aristocratic spirits, we oppose the modern myth of evolution and development with the traditional ideal of permanence and the traditional myth of involution, the decline which was unitarily given as the "direction of history", through doctrines such as that of the "four ages", from Hesiod to the Persians, from the Chaldeans to the Indians, from the Egyptians to the Nordic conceptions of the Ragnarok.

What, in any case, does the Mazzinian philosophy of history demand? One thing only: to show that what must be, because it incorporates the "goal" of historical progress itself, and that the "third Rome" should take on as its prophetic mission, is the anti-empire, that is, the ideal of single-humanity-reality, realised through the brotherhood of equal peoples, through the impersonal associationism in an anti-monarchical federation, enemy of every hierarchy from above, deluding itself that it expresses the superstition of a "will of God" in the mythical "will of the people". If this ideology is stripped of all its mystical aspects and we focus on it coldly penetrating down to the hidden and unacknowledged impulses which give them life, we will find the same sophism of democracy and anarchy, with the same optimistic illusions about the rationality of the masses and of history; we will find the same distinct, unequivocal expression of that which, as the ideal of the *ecclesia*, arose from the Semitic-Plebeian revolt against the ideal of Rome; and, therefore, we will find, essentially, the spirit of the Reformation, the same esprit from which modern organisation is derived: anti-imperial, anti-aristocratic, anti-religious - because it reduces religion to mere sociality - and anti-qualitative, characteristic of Anglo-Saxon and American society.

The Mazzinian ideal is in reality identical to that essentially democratic and Lutheran product, foretold by the so-called "League of Nations". In fact, as an international confederation, presided over, not by power and the individual, the shining reality of a single superior being - the emperor of the Dantesque universal-Ghibelline conception, which "upon considering the different conditions in the world, should have, in order to direct the different and necessary offices, the universal and indisputable office of complete command" (*Convivio*, IV, 4) - although by a people, or rather by the people, by "humanity". Since the "chosen people" (chosen people! - another Jewish superstition: we do not know "chosen peoples", but only peoples which are superior, or which, through struggle, make themselves superior) would uniquely have, according to Mazzini, the mission to reject itself and to impose this new gospel: that all peoples are free and are brothers. The nationalistic Mazzinian velleity, to preserve a function and a particular mission for every people, vanishes before the assertion that this mission must then be resolved without residue in the general interest of humanity. If so, a sort of universal confederation, to be constituted on the base of a system of anti-monarchical and anti-catholic revolutions, is the centre of Mazzini's entire politico-religious gospel. We see how this gospel, basically, is a precursor of the various modern anti-aristocratic, pacifistic, and democratic tendencies up to the so-called "Paneuropa".

Nor do the Mazzinians hesitate to secretly understand in true Rome, in Rome as Rome, as something surpassed by "progress". Their blind, evolutionistic apriorism makes them subject to the rather deplorable superstition which reduces Roman paganism to the concept of purely juridical and material reality and makes the values of the spirit as prerogatives of Christianity. The "mission" of pagan Rome, according to them, would have been exhausted in the creation of a juridical unity and a material Empire based on force; the second Rome, the Catholic Rome, would have established a spiritual Empire instead; and the synthesis would be the third Rome, which is supposed to affirm social unity, establishing the pallid fraternalism and federalism which we mentioned above. Roman law would have contributed the factor "freedom", and would have prepared on the material plane an equality which then was realised in the spiritual field in Christianity: a new era would be prophesied in which the two terms, freedom and equality, would be joined in a synthesis derived from the concept of a related humanity.

As uncompromising defenders of the values of the pagan tradition, we reject all these historicist sophisms. No, whether or not anyone accepts it, Rome was simultaneously a material and spiritual reality, a complete and shining ideal, which rebels against any attempt to deform it in the game of some arbitrary progressivistic dialectic. It was the Augustan power, arisen "to rule the nations, to establish the laws of peace, to spare the vanquished, and to subdue the proud" (Virgil, Aeneid, VI, 852-854), and, at one time, it was something sacred, a cultural formation in which there was no gesture of life, public or private, in war or in peace, which was not accompanied by rite or symbol - a cultural formation of mysterious origin, that had its own demigods and divine kings, the Aryan cult of fire and victory, the culmination in a "*pax augusta et profunda*", in which a universal reflection of the "*aeternitas*" was, almost physically, realised which was acknowledged with dismay in the same imperial function.

No, the new Asian faith was not the "continuation" of Rome, it deformed Rome - it did not often hesitate to identify the city of Caesar with the beast of the Jewish Apocalypse and the whore of Babylon. Rome did not know "equality", as conceived by the modern mob. The *aequitas* of Roman law is an aristocratic concept: it answers only to the classic idea of justice, which was undermined by the Christian concepts of mercy, forgiveness, repentance, grace, compassion, and love. Only the levelling down of every terrestrial value to an identical non-value, in the equality of all beings in regard to "God", in regard to the "original sin" of the Jewish faith and in regard to the arbitrariness of grace, produced in the West an egalitarian principle which was totally unknown to the higher forms of pagan civilisation; a heresy for them, who even on the material plane were held

up by an hierarchical organisation, by military relations, by relations of domination and servitude, and by the pre-eminence of the elites.

Romanity did not need any Semitic contribution in order to be able to recognise its universal ideal and to realise it. Whatever greatness there still is, in subsequent times, belongs to it. As we already said, the grandeur of Rome, having risen from the forces of the Nordic Aryans, created the last, great, universal period in the West, the feudal-imperial civilisation of the middle Ages. What would perhaps otherwise have remained the legacy of an obscure Palestinian sect was able, through us, as Church, to participate for a moment in a universal value.

But our universality is not the mazzinian universality: the latter is only an internationalism, only the unfolding of that levelling, fraternising, socialistic, and democratic tendency which has nothing Roman, whose freedom is not our freedom, whose last word is not organism but aggregate, not universality but collectivity.

And the two terms of the Mazzinian pseudo-synthesis, Romanity and sociality, represent two irreconcilable concepts. Between them there is a choice, but there is no compromise or composition.

Let the mob, too, seek its justification in the "direction of history", that, with all its chains broken, has overflowed all the embankments, and now, in a world that no longer knows either emperors or shepherd,s it exhibits its excuses, poisoning every well, soiling all the crossroads of science, politics, religion, and culture with its absence of spirituality. It asks only that the rhythm of history, of evolution, be accelerated, that it become pandemic, that the glorious aim of its "progress" - the "sun of the future" - draws nearer, because it eventually reaches the final fall, beneath which it will be miserably buried.

We belong to a different world, which remains immobile in accordance with the stability of circumstances. We possess truth, not rhetoric.

We possess a tradition; Rome for us remain that immutable, realised, and super-historic symbol, which said to the Galileans: "As long as Rome exists, we need not fear the convulsions of the final age - but if Rome falls, humanity will be near its end".

The Individual and Humanity

Another form of justification, more evolutionistic than historicist, which democratism can adopt, can be inferred from the claims of Duke G. Colonna di Cesarò. This form has the advantage of being able to be considered in itself, not just on the basis of a hypothetical verification *ad usum delphini* ("for the use of the Dauphin"), but as a possible conception of the world in general. It is certainly more coherent, and precisely for this reason it is so much simpler to notice how furiously the application tends to be overturned by that which animates the values of the hierarchical ideal.

According to this point of view, it is claimed that there is asociality which, far from representing the point of arrival of an ideal development, is instead its point of departure. Such a stage is comparable in some primitive peoples, where it seems that individuals do not have a true consciousness of themselves as autonomous beings, but live as parts of an indistinct collective being, which is their tribe or their people.

Di Cesarò sees progress in passing beyond this primitive "social" stage: beyond humanity, it is necessary that men reassert themselves as distinct, self-conscious centres. Then, in a third period, men are called to the restoration of the universal bond of humanity, which will then no longer be a given, almost a nature in which individuals are instantly connected to each other, but instead will be something which men themselves will create: spontaneously, by a free act. Democratism would correspond to this third phase, insofar as it would aim precisely at the ideal of a sociality on the basis of a collection of equal autonomous, and free beings.

The principal point of criticism of such a view is this: to determine the precise difference between that sociality, which would be the point of arrival, and the other, which would only be the point of departure of a similar development.

Di Cesarò joins the concept of a law of progressive individuation to the view just expounded, but this present things in a much different light. Such a law means that the lower levels of reality differentiate themselves from the higher, through the fact that in the former, the individual can be separated into parts that conserve the same quality (the parts of a mineral, for example - and something similar happens in certain species of plants and in the parthenogenesis of lower animals), while, in the latter, this is no longer possible, since the individual is a higher organic unity, which cannot be divided without its destruction, and without its parts entirely losing their specific and living significance the quality that they had within it. Nature would show us an impetus of progressive individuation that

goes from physical mineral systems to the supreme individuation, given by the unbreakable simplicity characteristic of human self-consciousness.

According to di Cesarò, however, a further phase of this process is conceivable, in which the law of progressive individuation tends to go beyond the human individual into a wider form of association, which would be the social individual, the social and spiritual unity of humanity. A unity that would hence be differentiated from that other point of departure typical of primitive sociality, by being the culmination of a process of individuation.

In all this, there is enough to overturn the democratic position. What does individual being, in fact, consist of? It has already been said: the state of the simple, aggregate of separable parts (the crudest form of mineral individuation) ends, and a higher principle arises which reasserts itself over them; it subordinates them to itself and makes them obey a determined law. And the more perfect the subordination and the dominance of this higher principle, the higher is the individuation. And then: just as we see that the unity of chemical compounds is control over various elements and purely physical forces (lower level), and vegetal unity is control over various unities and chemical laws by a higher law which transcends them, and so on - in the same way, admitting the development, which we mentioned above, beyond the single individual, in the unity of the "social individual" we will have to intend control over single individuals - not the democratic unity of the representation of the many, but rather the imperial unity of the ruler of the many, the *Imperium*, which corresponds to the superiority which shines irrefutably in the life of the soul, master of itself and of the body.

Even admitting the law of progressive individuation, we thus find that, if there must be a difference between the point of departure and the point of arrival of the process, if this process is to be something more than a huge *circulus vitiosus*, the difference can consist only in this: that, in the beginning, every "I" in itself was nothing, and identical to all the others, as a sort of *medium* within which the collective life of the community circulated; but, in the end, after greater and greater distances are created between "I" and "I", differentiating higher levels from lower levels of self-consciousness and human power, and creating thereby a hierarchy, those who can no longer be called humanity, but Lords of humanity, will arise.

This is the only way to understand the law coherently, or, better said, the will to progressive individuation with respect to a possible development beyond the form typical of normal human consciousness; and let us add that the idea of the

"Lord of humanity" is by no means one invented by us: it corresponds precisely to the primordial Aryan concept of the *cakravarti* (Lord of the World), which, in the symbolic terms of sagas and myths, was constantly connected with the real or legendary figures of great rulers, from Alexander the Great to King Arthur and Emperor Frederick II.

From a one-sided point of view, this may perhaps have a certain coloration of abnormality, almost as in the idea of one part of the body assuming the right to subordinate all the remaining parts to itself. But this coloration completely vanishes once one distrusts in continuing to refer the one who, as ruler of men, would no longer be a man, but a being of higher level, as a "man" - even if, on the exterior, he maintains, more or less, a common human appearance - through the fact that the hierarchy, whose members are at this point consciousnesses, is immaterial and cannot be distinguished by any physically visible feature. As such, the ruler would no longer be compared, for instance, to a hand which wants to make itself master over the whole body, but should rather be compared to the organic unity of the body which, in a higher, incorporeal synthesis, includes the hand and everything else.

Just as we can conceive that the unifying and organising function of nature to which a mineral compound corresponds, transforms itself and passes (in the ideal, not the historical, sense) into its higher potential, in which the elements and mineral laws become the means subordinated to the vegetal individual, and so on - analogously, we can think of a transition from the power which rules that bundle of beings and elements that constitutes the personality of a common man, to a higher power, in which the elements which must be dominated according to the same relation are the laws and the wills of the individual consciousness of men or of races.

With that, keep in mind that we do not want to abolish "man", that is, that consciousness of freedom, individuality, and autonomy of individuals gained against the primitive, indistinct, mediumistic sociality. A true King never desires shadows, puppets, and automatons as subjects, but rather he desires individuals, warriors, living and strong beings; and in fact, his pride would be to feel himself to be a King of kings.

On the other hand, we have already stated, if we are intransigent affirmers of the necessity of hierarchy, we maintain that this hierarchy must be built dynamically and freely, through natural relationships of individual intensity. Primitive aristocracies formed like this - even where a supernatural principle did to impose

them directly - not by election and recognition from below, but by the direct self-assertion of individuals capable of a degree of resistance, of responsibility, of a heroic, generous, full, and dangerous life, which the others were not capable of. It is the "trial by fire": which terrorises and breaks some, makes those who resist it Leaders, to whom the masses naturally and freely subject themselves and obey - until others, even stronger, appear whose right and dignity the former leaders will be the first to recognise, without resentment or envy, but loyally, militarily. In no other conception than this is the value of the individual better preserved. Instead, it is in the democratic solution that it tends to vanish through the advent of an impersonal reality which equalises all individuals under the same law, which is not identified in anyone and is not justified in anyone, and serves as reciprocal support, as reciprocal defence, and as reciprocal slavery, of beings each of whom is insufficient in himself.

The Irrationality of Equality

Turning back to what was said at the beginning of this chapter: behind the "people" that democrats speak about, we accordingly find the "many" - which are understood in an egalitarian way (and here lies the difference), insofar as recognition of their leaders is claimed to be made not by quality, but by quantity (the greater number, the majority of the electoral system). But quantity can be a criterion only on the presupposition of the equality of all individuals, which equalises the value of each of their votes.

Now the "immortal principle" of equality can be the most questionable. The inequality of men is something too obvious to need to waste words on it: it is sufficient just to open one's eyes. But our opponents, who will grant this, will make it a matter of principle, and will say: men may very well be unequal, but they are so *de facto*, and not *de jure*; they are unequal, but they should not be. Inequality is unjust, and not to take into account, but instead to seek to go beyond it, is precisely the merit and the superiority of the democratic ideal.

Nevertheless, these are only words: the fact remains that the concept of the "many" is logically contradictory with the concept of the "equal many".

In the first place, there is the Leibnizian principle of the identity of indiscernibles, which is expressed as follows: a being which was absolutely identical to another would be one and the same thing as it. Kant sought to refute this by reference to space in which there can be equal yet distinct things: but, even prescindingly from the inconsistency of transferring to the spiritual ground and observation characteristic only of the physical world, the modern notion of space refutes the

objection, since, for it, any point entails the ascription of a different value used in Minkowski's four-dimensional continuum function. In the concept of "many", their fundamental diversity is therefore implicit: an equal "many", absolutely equal, would not be many, but one. To expect the equality of the many is a contradiction in terms.

In the second place, there is the principle of sufficient reason, which is expressed as follows: for everything there must be some reason for it to be one thing and not something else. Now a being absolutely equal to another would lack "sufficient reason": it would be a duplication completely deprived of significance.

From both of these points, then, the idea that the "many" not only are unequal, but must be so, and that inequality is true *de facto* only because it is true *de jure*, that it is real only because it is necessary, turns out to be rationally founded.

But to posit inequality means transcending quantity, it means passing into quality; and so it is that the possibility, and the necessity, of hierarchy is justified; it is that the criterion of the "majority" is proved absurd, and that every law and every morality, which starts from egalitarian presuppositions, is unnatural and extreme. We repeat that it is the superior which must justify the inferior, and not vice versa. Just as the nature of error is not to know itself as error, whereas the nature of truth is to posit itself as consciousness of truth, while knowing at the same time error as error - so the nature of what is superior is to be posit itself directly as superior to the inferior, which is made inferior completely by the self-posting of the superior. Superiority must not be submitted to any sanction or recognition, but it must be based only on the direct awareness of superiority of those who are superior and prove themselves as superiors by every test.

For this reason, the so-called criterion of the "useful" cannot offer any support. In fact we would have to begin by asking what is useful, in relation to what, and to whom. For example, a margin for violence exists even in the democratic regime - violence proper to the constituted authority, which requires a tax authority, civil and criminal laws, etc. This violence is not called such because it is considered convenient to be useful to the greatest number. But who defines and justifies it as useful, and thus determine the famous boundaries between "legality" and "illegality"? We have already shown that, in a rational order of things, it cannot be the mass, because of the inability and inferiority of its power of discrimination. However, if one does not intend to shift the centre of equality, the whole thing will turn into the worst of tyrannies: that exercised by the numerous upon the qualitatively superior few, who are overwhelmed inexorably by the mechanism,

established by law, of the determinisms of lower life and organised "society", just as is happening in the modern West.

But the "useful" is itself something far less absolute than many would like to believe, in relation to the same mass. Because of the irrational character of the psychology of the masses, what the majority does has very seldom been this "useful" pure and simple, and even less often the autonomous will of the many; instead, infinitely more often, it has been the power, the attractive force of particular persons, whose power the greatest number of followers was only a consequence and an echo. Powerful individuals have known how to drag the crowds where they wanted, throwing into the sea all the mediocre, bourgeois, precisely calculated standards of "utility", suitability, and general welfare. History show this to us everywhere: fired by enthusiasm for a man, a symbol, or an idea, millions of beings have overwhelmed the barriers of prudent normality, and sacrificed, immolated, or destroyed themselves.

Democratism knows that and for this reason, slowly, subtly, widening throughout the whole of Europe, it seeks to extinguish the race of the leaders, guiding spirits, enchanter, and to create a levelling such that everything can be reduced to the autonomy characteristic of the parts of an economic mechanism left to itself. And the game is succeeding terrifyingly in recent times. Bolshevised Russia and democratic and mechanised America are opposed as two symbols, as two poles of the same danger.

But this will to degeneration, this darkness, on which Western "civilisation" is being shipwrecked, finds us against it. We, once again following Nietzsche, raise the alarm and issue the call. May our nations oppose a "do not pass beyond this point!" to the Bolshevik-American tide. But not with words, threats, and empty proclamations, but silently, isolating themselves and creating an aristocracy, an elite that firmly maintains, in the living reality of superior individuals, the values of our tradition.

After this, all the rest will come as a natural consequence.

From Clan to Empire. Our Doctrine of Race

We mentioned, while considering the ideas of Duke di Cesarò, the "social" form characteristic of primitive communities. In passing, we also touched upon a relation - which may appear paradoxical to many - between totemism and nationalism. It is necessary to clarify this point, by posing the problem of the

relation between the concept of clan and the concept of Empire, between the concept of race and the concept of civilisation in the higher sense.

Against certain abstract and rationalistic forms of universalism, to recognise the right of blood, to require truths and values which again become that vibrant expression of our very life, and which, therefore, are joined with blood and race, instead of being weak generalities "valid for everyone": this is certainly a justified request. But, under this aspect, racial theory is a general introduction, which needs to be further identified.

We must not forget that to speak of blood in the case of a man is not the same thing as to speak of it in the case of an animal. If, by blood, one means the biological heredity of a race, then in the animal, race is everything, while, in man, it is only a part. The error of certain race fanatics who think that the reintegration of a race in its ethnic unity signifies *ipso facto* the rebirth of a people, lies exactly here: they regard man as if he could be regarded as horses, cats, or dogs, of a "pure breed". The preservation or the restoration of the purity of race, in the narrowest sense, can be everything in an animal, but not in man - in the man of superior type: even for man, it can constitute a condition which may be necessary under certain aspects, is not sufficient in any case, since the racial factor is not the only one which defines man.

To reach a higher level and to refute the accusation of biological materialism, it is still not sufficient to attribute to every race a mystical soul, its characteristic "spirit". In fact, we already find this, and in a more meaningful way, in the primitive forms of totemic society. As was pointed out, in these forms of society, the totem is the mystical soul of the group, the clan, or the race: the individual members do not feel themselves, in their blood and in their life, as anything other than incarnations of this collective spiritual force, and possessing in themselves almost no trace of personality.

If the totemic force remains at this diffuse and faceless level, so to speak, and if, consequently, there are neither leaders nor subjects, and the individual members of the group are nothing more than "placed together" (*com-posti*) - then we find ourselves at the lowest level of human society, at the level which borders on the subhuman, that is, the animal kingdom: something confirmed by the fact that the totems - the mystical souls of the clan - are often regarded at the same time as the "spirits" of particular animal species. In addition, it is interesting that, even as the totems represent masculine figures, the composition of these societies reflects above all the telluric-matriarchal type, characteristic of the non-Aryan, and,

particularly the southern races. The communistic principle plays a decisive role here. This type corresponds spiritually to the "father's path" - *pitr-yana* - which the Indian traditions speak about, also called the earth path or mother's path, according to which individuals are dissolved entirely after death into the original stocks, into the forces of the race and forefathers blood, with which true existence alone rests. But, opposed to this path, there is the solar path or path of the gods - *deva-yana* - also, called the Nordic path (while the first path, the path of the totem, is called the path of the South); a path which we can also call Olympic, travelled by those who make themselves immortal, who become gods, who "go out in order not to return".

This contrast constitutes the key to our problem. A civilisation, in the true and higher sense with reference both to individuals and peoples - arises only where the totemic level is surpassed, and where the race element, also understood mystically, is not the last resort; where, beyond blood, a force of higher, meta-biological, spiritual, and "solar" type manifests itself, which does not lead outside of life, but determines life, transforming it, refining it, giving it a form which it initially did not have, freeing it entirely from every mixture with animal life, and opening the various paths for the realisation of the various personality types. When this occurs, the ethnic tradition is not destroyed: it remains exclusively a base that possess a spiritual tradition as inseparable verification - and here, in the order of the relationship between the biological factor and the spiritual factor, it is the latter which should be used as support for the former, and not vice versa.

This is valid, we said, as much in reference to individuals as to peoples. As far as the first point is concerned, sociology shows us, already in the primitive forms of society, the frequent self-enucleation of groups characterised by initiation, which obey a law of their own and enjoy a higher authority; and the most noticeable characteristic of these groups is their purely virile nature, the principle of the exclusion of women. But even among the great traditional peoples, the situation is not different: from China to Greece, from Rome to the primordial Nordic groups, then up to the Aztecs and the Incas, nobility was not characterised by the simple fact of having ancestors, but by the fact that the ancestors of the nobility were divine, unlike those of the plebeians, and to which it can remain faithful, also through the integrity of blood (in the caste system, the principle of heredity was valid not only for the higher castes, but even for the lower ones). The nobles originated from "demigods", that is to say, from beings who had actually followed a transcendent form of life, forming the origin of a tradition in the higher sense, transmitting to their lineage a blood made divine, and, along with it, rites, that is, determinate operations, whose secret every noble family preserved, which

allowed their descendants to continue the spiritual conquest from where it had previously reached, and to lead it gradually from the virtual to the actual.

Thus, from the traditional point of view, not-having-ancestors distinguishes the plebeian from the patrician less than not-having-rites. In Aryan hierarchies, a single characteristic differentiated the higher castes from the lower: rebirth. The *arya*, as opposed to the *shudra* (the one who serves), was the *dvija*, the born again. The assertion of the Manavadharmashastra (II, 172), that the *brahman* himself, if he left out initiation, would no longer be differentiated from the one who serves, the *shudra*, is indicative. Analogously, what characterised the three higher castes of the Oranians was that each of them corresponded to a determinate celestial "fire". The Nordic nobles were noble because, in their blood, they carried the blood of the Asen, of the "celestial" forces in continuous struggle with the elemental beings. The nobility of the great medieval orders of chivalry - among which the most significant were the Templars - was also tied to initiation. One of the weakest points in Nietzsche's conception is precisely this biological naturalism, which, in most cases, diminishes and secularises his aristocratic idea, carrying it to the level of the "blond beast".

This would be the essential issue. Moving from castes to races, we must consequently say that the true difference between race and race is not something naturalistic and ideologically conditioned, but precisely something much deeper, which exists among the races preserving in the depth of their blood and the heritage and the presence of a principle which transcends blood, inoculated by the action of the dominant and "solar" elites; and the other races, which have nothing of this, and in which something promiscuous and tied for the forces of the earth, of animality, and of biologic-collective heredity, prevails. Among these races, totemism dominates, and there is neither true difference nor true personality; worship is resolved in an ecstatic-pantheistic nostalgia or, at most, in a "religiosity" in the lunar and communist sense.

For us, there is no other difference between the noble races of the North and the races of the South: and more than a difference between race and super-race. However scandalous this may appear to the profane and plebeian mentality of today, we decisively hold firm to the divine character - in the literal meaning of the word - which some races can have in comparison to others in which lead the heredity of a suprabiological and, we can say, suprahuman factor is not transmitted with the blood.

Thus, it seems to us, the doctrine of Comte de Gobineau has a glimmer of truth, but not more. The decadence of the qualities and factors which constitute the greatness of a race is not - as she held - the effect of mixing this race with others, nor the effect of its ethnical, biological, and demographical decay; instead, the truth is that a race decays when its spirit decays, when that inner tension, to which it owed its original form and its spiritual type, fails. Then a race mutates, or is corrupted, because it is damaged in its most hidden root; then it loses that invisible, indomitable, and transforming virtue, at which contact, other races, far from contaminating it, take on little by little the form of its civilisation, and are pulled by it as if by a vaster current.

This is the reason why the return to race cannot entail for us just a return to blood - particularly in these crepuscular items, in which almost irreparable mixings have occurred. It must entail a return to the spirit of race, not in the totemic sense, but in the aristocratic sense, that is to say, in connection with the original seed of our "form", of our civilisation.

So, if we affirm the return to race and the return to tradition, the idea of the Leader lies at the centre of this idea. In their solar individuality, the Leaders represent for us the concrete and active expression of spirit as race and of race as spirit; they are reanimations of the same formative primordial idea, sleeping in the depths of blood as the foundations of "form", victorious over chaos and animality, and carried, consciously or not, in potency or in act, by all the non-degenerate members of a group. The Leaders establish that inner tension; they reawaken the "divine" elements of a transformed blood. Hence the magic of an authority that has nothing violent and tyrannical about it, but rather something regal; the magic of an action "through presence", of an indomitable "action-without-action" - according to the expression of the Far East (*wei wu wei*). Here is the path toward rebirth. The numerous forces of a lineage, which are fatally under way towards deterioration and disintegration when they are deprived of this inner support and abandoned to the ensemble of material, ethnic, and even political conditions in the narrow sense, then find again a steady and living point of unity, and participate in a higher reality: in the same way as an animal body if the power of a soul is infused into it.

Every defence of race and blood that leaves this higher aspect out of consideration, and, through the symbols of the "nation", the "people", or the "collective", evokes in any way the mixture, the pure law of blood and soil, signifies nothing but a return to totemism and an inclination to fall back into the social forms characteristic of an inferior humanity. Basically, the yearning of the

socialist, democratic, and communist ideologies leads toward no no other condition - the phenomenon of the Soviets illustrates exactly the effect of this ideology, which, following a Jew (Marx), reviving the old, barbaric, Slavic collectivism and bringing it to a new, rationalised, form, created an ominous breeding ground of contagion for the wastes of a traditional Europe.

Far from being a direction towards the future, all this is - from an ideal point of view - nothing but a direction towards the past, towards what was surpassed at the time of the formation of every true traditional civilisation and every Empire. Through the "socialist" and democratic-nationalist ideal may still be surrounded with a halo, the fact still remains that - *mutatis mutandis* - it finds its perfect reflection in the social forms of a lower, anti-Aryan, and anti-Nordic type; and if the currents which aim at these ideals require the subordination of the individual, and of every higher spiritual possibility, to the law of blood and soil, they basically teach a "morality" which is not different from what an animal breed, if it became conscious, could claim for itself.

Opposed to our truth - let us repeat it one more time - similar tendencies express the direction of involution and abdication over against achievement. It is that which is awakened in moments of exhaustion and weakness, moments in which the *chaos* hidden in the *cosmos* increases; it is a phenomenon that appears when an epoch is no longer able to produce superior beings in whom the entire tension and tradition of a superior race is located, concentrated, and liberated in transcendent and solar forms.

The aristocratic idea of a tradition of Leaders - not the democratic or "nationalist" idea, which depends upon the mere community of blood, soil, and birth - must be the foundation and axis of every doctrine of race rightly understood - of our restoration.

The Roots of European Evil

We said that the modern world has now reached a point where it is useless to delude ourselves about the efficacy of any reaction not originating from a deep spiritual change. We can only free ourselves from the evil which corrodes us by a total negation, by a spiritual impulse which truly makes us into new beings, reopening for us the possibility of grasping a new world, of breathing a new freedom: even if everything in which the West vainly prides itself should also collapse.

In the awareness that our world is a world of ruins, we must push ourselves again toward those values which allow us to recognise unequivocally the cause of such a ruin.

The first root of European decadence is "socialism", the anti-hierarchy.

The fundamental forms which have developed from this root are:

- The regression of the castes.
- The development of sciences and positive philosophy.
- Technology and the illusion of mechanical power.
- The new romantic and activist myth.

These are the four principal roots of European decline, which we shall now consider one by one and then oppose them with our hierarchical values.

In this way we will exhibit the fundamental features of another vision of the world and of life, which must have value for us as a secret force and as the soul of our battle.

The Regression of the Castes. Gold and Labour

We already alluded to the fact that if we could formulate a law in a very general way which gives us the "direction of history" for modern times, we could not speak of progress, but, if anything, of involution.

In this respect, there is a process which imposes itself upon everyone's consideration in the most objective and evident way: the process of the regression of the castes. As the "direction of history" since the prehistoric era, we see precisely the progressive decline from one to the other of the four great castes

- the "solar" (royal-sacred) caste, the warrior nobility, the bourgeoisie (merchants), and the serfs - in which, in traditional civilisations, and particularly in Aryan Indian, the qualitative differentiation of human possibilities found its reflection.

In the first place, we witness, in fact, the twilight of the age of royal divinity. The leaders, who are "divine" beings, who completely unite in themselves the two powers, the royal and the pontifical authorities, belong to a remote, almost mythical, past. This first fall occurred through a progressive deterioration of the Nordic-Aryan force, the creator of civilisation. In the German ideal of the Holy Roman Empire we recently recognised the last echo of this tradition, of this "solar" level.

Once this peak passed, authority passes to the next lower level: the caste of warriors. It is about monarchs who are now simply military leaders, lords of temporal justice, absolute political sovereigns. The formula of "divine right" subsists at times, but as a mere memory lacking content. Behind the institutions that only formally preserved the traits of the ancient aristocratic-sacred constitution, there were often only sovereigns of this type left in antiquity. After the fall of the universal medieval unity, this phenomenon is manifested in a definitive and decisive way.

The second fall: aristocracy declines, chivalry is extinguished, the great European monarchies are "nationalised" and fall into decline. Through revolutions and "constitutions", when they are not simply supplanted by regimes of a different type (republic, federation), they are transformed into the aforementioned empty survival, subject to the "will" of the "nation". In parliamentary, republican, or national democracies, the establishing of capitalist oligarchies conveys the fatal passage of authority and power from the second to the modern equivalent of the third caste: from the warrior to the merchant. In place of the virile principles of loyalty and honour, the doctrine of the "social contract" now takes over. The social bond is now utilitarian and economic: it is a contract based upon the convenience and the interest of individuals. In such a way, the bond necessarily passes from the personal to the impersonal. Gold acts as an intermediary, and those who take possession of it and know how to multiply it (capitalism, industrialism) also virtually reach the taking of power. Aristocracy gives way to plutocracy, the warrior to the banker, the Jew, and the industrialist. The trade in money and interest, previously confined to the ghetto, becomes glory and pinnacle of the latest age. The hidden force of socialism, of anti-hierarchy, begins to reveal its power visibly at this point.

The crisis of bourgeois society, the proletarian revolt against capitalism, the manifesto of the "Third International", and the correlative slow rise and organisation of groups and of the masses in purely collective and mechanised forms - in the context of a new "civilisation of labour" - indicate to us the third fall, through which authority passes to the last of the traditional castes, that of the slave labourer and mass-man, with the consequent reduction of every horizon and value to the level of matter and number.

If super-human spirituality and "glory" characterise the "solar" period; heroism, loyalty, and honour, that of the warriors; and gold, that of traders and Jews; so the coming of the slaves must correspond exactly to the exaltation of the principle of the slaves: labour is raised up to a religion. And the slave's hatred comes to proclaim sadistically: "Whoever doesn't work, doesn't eat", and its idiocy, glorifying itself, forms sacred incense from the emissions of human sweat: "Work ennobles man", "Work is greatness", "Work is an ethical duty". Thus, the sepulchral stone covers the cadaver of Man, and the cycle of involution seems to be conclusively completed.

No other ideal offers the future to the priests of "Progress". For the moment, the struggle continues between the Jew, omnipotent master of gold, and the revolt of the slave; and that "civilisation", which our contemporaries are so proud of, hangs over a monstrous mechanism moved by the brute and impersonal forces of gold, capital and the machine.

The bonds of dependence, far from loosening, have tightened again. But alongside force there is no longer authority, alongside obedience, no longer recognition, alongside rank, no longer superiority. The master is no longer such because he is master, but because he is the one who has more money, because he is the one who, even though he does not see at all beyond the small horizon of ordinary human life, dominates the material conditions of life; by means of which it is even possible for him to subdue or to oppress those whose breadth of thought is immeasurably more powerful than his own: the possibility of the most despicable fraud and the most awful slavery. The power and the tie of dependence depersonalised and mechanised, have become capital and machine. Thus, it is no paradox: only today can we speak seriously of true slavery, if we can speak of it only in the Western economic and mechanical organisation, along the direction of brutalisation, of which "free America" gives us the best example.

Perhaps, after a short cycle of generations, duly and scientifically educated to the standards of "social service", the sense of individuality will be completely removed, and, with it, the last remnants of awareness necessary to realise, at least, that they are slaves. Perhaps, what will remain will be that state of renewed innocence, which will differ from the mythical Eden by the fact that "Labour" will reign in it as universal and sole purpose of existence, which Kirilov speaks about in Dostoyevsky's *The Possessed*: this is the ideal of the Soviets.

A dependency without leaders, an organisation indifferent toward every qualitative requirement - this "social" ideal, impersonal, brute force, made of mere quantitateness and money, creates it.

We said: without more leaders. Let us not be deceived by this indeed. Let us repeat that the race of Masters, if it has not already disappeared, is close to doing so; and everyone proceeds in a crescendo of levelling, rushing toward a life that is more material and faceless. The so-called "upper" or "ruling" classes of today are such only ironically: the great leaders of the world financial organisation - such as the technicians, industrialists, functionaries, and so on - represent nothing more than those freedmen to whom the masters once delegated control of the slaves and administration of their goods. The same yoke subjects them to the immense, blind, automatised mob of workers and employees, and above it, neither slaves, nor freedman supervising slaves, having any respite - and, above them: no one - this is the terrible truth of "civilised men"!

And inwardly how much narrower, more dependent, and poorer is the day of the masters of gold and machine, without break, feverish, saturated with responsibilities, than the day of a humble artisan, so likewise is the day of the "upper" classes, for whom gold serves only to multiply morbidly their thirst for "distraction", luxury, sensual pleasure, and further profits.

There is no trace of Masters in all this, and in their absence there is no meaning in this pseudo-organisation. If one asks the millions of prisoners, among their machines and offices, for a reason, a justification, beyond the ephemeral thrill with which they seek to ape the "refinement" of the "upper classes", they will have no answer. But if one goes up and asks the "leaders of the economy", the investors, the masters of steel, coal, oil, gold, and peoples (have we not seen that the political problem today tends to be reduced to the economic one?) - again, no answer. This means for life have controlled life; rather, they have reduced it to their means. And thus the great darkness of burst into the light of the pompous illusions of Western pride, a darkness which expresses itself in a very new and

monstrous myth: that of work for work, of work as end-in-itself, as intrinsic value and universal duty.

The masses of men on earth are devoid of light, reduced to pure quantity - only to quantity - made equal in the material identity of a parts dependent on an unstoppable mechanism left to itself, which can no longer do anything - this is the perspective that lies at the base of the economic-industrial direction which matches the entire West.

Those who feel that this is the death of life, and the coming of the brute law of matter, the triumph of a fate so much more frightening since it is no longer personal, also feel that there is only one remedy: to break the Semitic yoke of gold, to go beyond the fetish of sociality and the law of interdependence, to restore aristocratic values, values of quality, of difference, and of heroism, to restore that sense of metaphysical reality which everyone today opposes, and which we, furthermore, affirm against everyone.

And so, if understood as a revolt against economic tyranny, against the state of affairs in which the quantity of gold, and not the individual, rules; in which the concern for the material conditions of existence corrodes the whole of existence; if understood as the pursuit of economic equilibrium, on the basis of which diverse forms of life, no longer reducible to the material plane, are able to free themselves and to develop - if understood exactly in this way, but only in this way, we could recognise a necessary function and a future even in some extremist currents.

The major cause of the lack of a qualitative differentiation in modern life consists precisely precisely in the fact that it no longer leaves room for a type of activity that is not valued in terms of practical utility and sociality. The economic bias creates a levelling; imposing itself upon all alike, since differences based on gold and the mechanical-economic hierarchy are not differences. They return in a single level, a single quality; beyond this level, taken in the totality of all its possible differentiations, it would be necessary that other levels exist, yet do not exist today: independent of the first and to which the first should be subordinated, and not the other way around, as is the condition of things in contemporary society.

This is why, when the hypertrophy of such evil in monstrous banking-industrial trusts arrogates to itself the right to "imperialism", we, unable to cry, can only laugh. And to calmly counter with the idea that a radical revolution against gold and capital is the inescapable premise of the true *Imperium*. Passing through to the aspiration that spreads at the base of all revolutionary ideologies as symptom of

revolt against modern slavery, we nevertheless transcend it, ascertaining that it is itself pervaded by the same evil: it likewise sees only economic and social problems, it does not demand liberation from the economic yoke in the name of differentiated, meta-economic, and metaphysical values - not because forces, free from economic concerns, can work in the depths - but rather only for an egalitarian and an even "more socialistic" arrangement, considered better, of the same economic problem determined by the purely material and utilitarian needs of the masses. Whence, in such tendencies, arises a mistrust, an intolerance and an almost concealed resentment, let us not say for what is spiritual, but even for what is "intellectual", deemed a "luxury": beyond economic equilibrium, they do not have an eye for non-economic differences - neither seeing them nor desiring them: with the same spirit of plebeian and egalitarian intolerance of slaves in rebellion that was already revealed in the fall of ancient Romanity.

In conclusion, it is necessary to fight the main root of the European evil with two weapons. We need not insist upon and stop at the first: it consists in creating an elite, in bringing out, conscientiously and tenaciously, new differences, interests, and new qualities from the undifferentiated substance of the individuals of today, so that an aristocracy, a race of masters, of rulers, may return. This, first and foremost.

In the second place, what is necessary is a movement, a revolt from the depths, which frees us from the machine, from extrinsic, inorganic, automatic, violent dependence; which breaks the Jewish, capitalist, economic yoke; which mocks the duty of labour imposed as universal law and end-in-itself; which, in short, frees us, and opens a passageway for air and light - for hierarchy cannot be restored by violence, the control of needs, or the interplay of passions, interests and ambitions, but only by the free and spontaneous recognition which springs from the sense of values and of transcendent forces, from faithfulness toward one's own way of being, whatever it might be, from consciousness of nature, dignity and quality. An organic, direct, real, hierarchy: freer and stronger than any other.

How not to recognise, then, that the reality of the past is also a prophetic myth for a better future? The return to the system of castes is the return to a system of truth, justice, and "form" in the higher sense.

In the caste there is the ideal of a community of activity, profession, blood, heredity, laws, and rights, which correspond more precisely to pre-established, typical modes of being, to organic manifestations of nature's suitably refined; in it, there is, as a presupposition, the will to be what one is, the will to realise one's

own nature and destiny as quality, silencing the individualistic and opportunistic velleities which are the cause of every disorder and disorganisation; in it, there is the overcoming of quantitative uniformity, of centralisation, and of standardisation; in it there is the basis for a social hierarchy which immediately reflects a hierarchy of modes of being, of values, and of qualities, and which rises up from the material to the spiritual ordered by levels, from the formless to the deformed, from the collective to the universal and the supra-individual.

In the most perfect way, ancient India shows us this ideal, which, however, is found in different forms in other civilisations as well, up to our Nordic-Roman Middle Ages.

Our point of reference cannot be anything else.

As substratum, the healthy activity of the lowest class (*shudra*), no longer anarchised by demagogic ideologies, led by experts in trading, commerce, and economic-industrial organisation, simplified through simplified needs (*Vaishya*); beyond the *Vaishya*, the *Kshatriya*, the warrior nobility who recognise the value and purpose of war, and in whose heroism, pride, and victory, the higher vindication of a whole people can burn; beyond the *Kshatriya*, the *Brahmana*, the solar race of spirit and Wisdom, of those who "see" (*rishi*), who "can", and who testify by their life that we are on top of this dark earth, but our vital roots are lost at the top in the brightness of the "heavens". At the apex of everything, as myth and limit, the ideal of the *Chakravartin*, "the King of the World", the invisible emperor, whose strength is hidden, powerful, and unconditioned.

Science Versus Wisdom

As power, depersonalised and socialised, has become gold, capital, so likewise has wisdom, depersonalised and socialised, become "concept", "Rationality". And this is the second root of the European evil.

Philosophy as well as Western positive science are, in their essence, fundamentally socialistic, democratic, and anti-hierarchical. They propose as "true" only what can be universally recognised, which anyone can assent to, whatever life he allows himself to live, provided only that he has a certain education. And so, as in the criterion of the "majority" of political democratism, they presuppose equality, and, under the criterion of quantity, they dominate everything in this field that could be equality, the irreducibility of quality, or the prerogative of quality.

And it is useless to promulgate individualistic, or even relativistic, doctrines, since in the manner of promulgating them, which is the conceptual manner of secular philosophy, it shows that one has adhered to the democratic, impersonal, and collectivist presuppositions which lie at the base of that very philosophy. The way is totally different - it would be necessary to begin by disputing, in the first place, those very presuppositions, if we do not want to fall again into the foolishness of an imperialism which, instead of imposing itself through that hierarchy from above, which was mentioned, appeals to popular recognition for its own justification. And here one will begin to realise the enemy we have to fight with, and how frighteningly the "culture" itself, not only the "society" of our contemporaries, in a democratism in action - and one begins to see what renunciation they must demand of themselves in order to regain health.

Just as gold is a reality which has become indifferent to the quality of the individuals who own it, so is the "knowledge" of contemporary men. Let us put it better: following a will to equality, an anti-hierarchical intolerance, and, therefore, a socialistic prejudice, the knowledge of Europeans had necessarily to come to something on which the effect of individual differences and of the condition - through knowledge - of an active individual differentiation, is reduced to a minimum; thus, it referred either to physical experience, more or less equal for all men insofar as they are animals (positive science), or to the world of abstraction and of verbal conventions (philosophy and rationalism).

The need for the socialisation of knowledge has led fatally to its abstraction, and therefore created an insuperable hiatus between knowledge itself and life, between knowledge and being, as well as what can be the quality of phenomena and "metaphysical reality". Thus, in the West, thought, when it is not reduced to a tool for the more or less conventional transcription of the most exterior, fully quantitative, and uniform aspect of material things, is the creator only of unreality, "reified" words, and empty logical schematics, or becomes an intellectual sport, all the more ridiculous for the good faith in which it is practiced.

From this comes the whole unreality of the modern spirit: split off from life, man today is almost a shadow that bustles among schemes and programs and intellectual superstructures, powerless to dominate reality and life itself, while making himself more and more dependent upon a science which piles abstractions onto abstractions, slave as it is to phenomenal law ascertained but not understood by it, and exhausting himself in mechanical and exteriority, without any possibilities for the inner being of man.

We certainly cannot get to the heart of this question here, due to the limits of the present exposition. It should not be thought, however, that it is unrelated to the problem of the Empire: for us the problem of Empire is the problem *par excellence*, with respect to which more specialised problems cannot be separated and made into domains of their own. Particularism, the common indifference of the various forms of human activity - here politics, there science, here practice, there religion, and so on - is, as we have already stated, itself as an aspect of European decline, and an unequivocal symptom of Europe's inorganicity.

The foundation of the imperial hierarchy must be based on knowledge: "The wise should govern", Plato already said - and this is a central, absolute, definitive point in every rational order of things. But nothing would be more ridiculous than to associate this knowledge with some technical competence, positive science, or philosophising speculation: instead, it coincides with what, from the outset, we have called Wisdom, a traditional expression used by both the classical West and the East. Wisdom is as much aristocratic, individual, real, substantial, organic, and qualitative, as the knowledge of the "civilised" is democratic, social, universalistic, abstract, levelling, and quantitative. Here again, there are two worlds, two eyes, two different visions, opposed against each other without any abatement.

To know, according to Wisdom, does not mean "to think", but to be the thing known: to live it, to realise it inwardly. One does not really know a thing unless one can actively transform one's consciousness into it. Therefore, only what ensues from direct individual experience will count as knowledge. And, this is just the opposite of the modern mentality, for which, whatever appears immediately to the individual is called "phenomenon", or "subjective", and so it posits some other thing behind it as "true reality", which is simply imagined or presumed (the "thing in itself" of the philosophers, the "Absolute" of vulgar religion, "matter", "ether", or "energy" of science). Wisdom is an absolute positivism which regards only what can be grasped by direct experience as real, and everything else as unreal, abstract, and illusory.

It will be objected that, from this point of view, all knowledge would be reduced to the finite and contingent things presented by the physical senses - and, indeed, this is the way things are, and how they must remain, for the great mass of men, who can only truly claim to know this finiteness and contingency, which remains such even after all the scientific pseudo-explanations. However, beyond this, we maintain the possibility of forms of experience different from the sensory forms of the common man, not "given", not "normal", which can be reached by means

of certain active processes of inner transformation. The peculiarity of such transcendent experiences (of which the "supraworld", the "field of beings", the seven heavens, the spheres of fire, and so on, were only different representations of humanity linked to Tradition) is to be direct, concrete, and individual, as much as sensory experience itself, and yet to see reality, beyond the contingent, spatio-temporal aspect characteristic of everything that is sensory. Aspects that science also tries to transcend, on condition of even transcending everything which is truly knowledge - vision, individual and living evidence - in favour of mere probabilities, incomprehensible "uniformities", and abstract explanatory principles.

This would be the sense in which we speak of "metaphysical" reality. It must be borne in mind, however, that we speak of experience, and only of experience; from the traditional point of view, there is not a finite reality and an absolute reality, but a finite manner and an absolute manner of experiencing reality, a finite manner and an absolute manner of experiencing reality, a finite eye and an absolute eye; the whole so-called "problem of knowledge" is enclosed within the interiority of every being, and does not depend on "culture", but on his capacity for freeing himself from the human, i.e., from the sensory, the rational, and the emotional, and of identifying himself with one or another form of "metaphysical" experience", along with a hierarchy which, at its limit, culminates in a state of perfect identity, spiritual vision, full suprasensual and suprarational accomplishment of the thing in the I and of the I in the thing, which realises a state of power and, simultaneously, a state of absolute obviousness with respect to the thing itself, in which no longer asks oneself anything, and one discovers that it is just a successor to reason as it is to speak.

This, in broad outline, is the meaning of the Wisdom which constitutes the foundation of "metaphysical" teaching and of spiritual science, whose rite of initiation originally produced the transformation of consciousness necessary for "knowledge" and metaphysical "vision", and whose tradition has maintained itself in the West, in clandestine form, even after the Semiticisation and decline of its ancient civilisation.

The point to be borne in mind is that sacred and sapiential science, since, unlike secular science, is not a "knowing", but a being, and cannot be taught by books or universities or transmitted by words: to gain it, it is necessary to be transformed, to transcend common life for a superior life. It measures exactly the quality and reality of individual life, of which it becomes an inviolable privilege and an organic part, rather than being a concept, or a notion, which can be put into one's head

like something into a sack, without at the same time having to be transformed or to budge in the slightest in regard to what one is.

Hence the natural aristocracy of Wisdom; hence its resolute non-popularisation, non-communicability. Another taboo of European is precisely communicability: they think, more or less, that intelligible being and speakable being are the same thing. They do not realise that, although this may make sense with respect to intellectual abstractions and conventions at the basis of experiences - those characteristic of the physical senses - presumed to be roughly the same for everybody, nevertheless, where this uniformity ceases, where a qualitative differentiation is reasserted, discursive communicability can no longer be a criterion.

Since it is based precisely on the evidence of actual experiences beyond the experience of common men, Wisdom leaves open just one road: to try and bring oneself to the same level, by means of a free and creative act, as the one who sets out the teaching, so as by knowing from experience what the other knows, or say with one word, what otherwise will remain only words. To the socialisation, depersonalisation, and conceptualisation of knowledge, to the democratic inclination to "popularise", to weaken the superior for the purposes of the inferior, so that the majority can participate in knowledge without a change of mind or ceasing to be inferior - we oppose, without compromise, the opposite aristocratic attitude. There must exist hierarchies in knowledge itself; there must exist many truths separated from each other by deep, immense, impassable gulfs, corresponding exactly to the many qualities of life and power, to the many distinct individualities: there must exist an aristocracy of knowledge, and "universality", understood in a communicative, democratic, and uniform manner must cease to be a criterion. We must not descend to them; they are obliged to raise themselves to us, by dignifying themselves, by ascending for real - according to their possibilities, along the hierarchy of beings - if they want to partake of higher and metaphysical forms, which are the points of reference to themselves and to the lower and physical forms.

From this, freedom also ensues, the open field, the breath that gives Wisdom. In socialised knowledge there is always instead a hidden "you must", a hidden, intolerant, moralistic constraint: "scientific" or "philosophical" truth demands to be recognised by everyone as "the truth"; in the face of it, one is not allowed to take a different stand. The expression of a collective despotism, it aims to reign despotically over all, making all equal with respect to it - and it is precisely on the basis of this will that it has organised, built its arms, its ordeals, its method, its

violence. In Wisdom, on the contrary, the individual is dissolved, restored, returned to himself: he has his truth, which expresses his life exactly and profoundly, which is a special way of experiencing and expressing reality, which does not contradict or exclude other, different ways, which are equally possible in the differentiation on which the hierarchy of Wisdom is based.

This discussion will suffice as far as the second root of the European evil and its corrective are concerned; already, in this brief outline, the principle that "the wise must govern" is justified. In the order of Wisdom, the hierarchy of knowledge is coextensive with the hierarchy of strength and superiority of individuals. Knowledge is being, and being ability and power, so that it attracts spontaneously to itself the dignity of *Imperium*. The true foundation of the primordial concept, rooted in the Tradition of "divine royalty", was nothing other than this.

Opposed to this, let us repeat, there is the whole of Europe, with its age-old inheritance and organisation: there is, as we said, the reign of professors, "intellectuals", glasses without eyes, the "cultured", academic, university world, which, in claiming for itself the privilege of knowledge and spirit, testifies only to the extent which they have been able to push the decline and abstraction of modern man.

Those who know and those who believe

But there is an even greater usurpation: that which religion - in the narrowest and newest sense of the term - accomplishes by securing for itself control and expertise in matters of the "sacred" and of the "divine".

The sacred and the divine are matters of faith. This is the truth which has been imposed on Europe of late. Our truth is otherwise: it is better to know to know that we don't know rather than to believe.

In the contemporary mentality, there is a central point at which the attitudes of materialistic science and religion meet: in an identical renunciation, in an identical pessimism, in an identical agnosticism about the spiritual, declared and methodical in one case, veiled in the other.

The premise of materialistic science is basically that science - in the sense of real, positive and empirical knowledge - can only subsist in what is physical; and that in the non-physical there can be no science, so that the scientific method

neglects it and abandons it, by lack of authority, to belief, to the dull and arbitrary abstractions of philosophy, or to the "exigencies" of sentiment and morality.

In addition, religion, insofar as it is focused exclusively on faith and does not admit an esoteric initiatory teaching beyond the profane religion imposed on the masses, or a gnosis beyond pious superstition, ends up with the same renunciation. In fact, one believes only when one does not know and thinks one cannot know. Hence, there is again the same agnosticism of the "positivists" with respect to whatever is not material and gross reality.

We, on the contrary, - basing ourselves on a tradition much more ancient and real than the one which can be claimed by the "faith" of Western man, on a tradition which is not proved by doctrines, but by deeds and acts of power and clairvoyance - affirm instead the possibility and the concrete reality of what we have called "Wisdom". We thus assert the possibility of a positive, direct, methodical, empirical knowledge in the "metaphysical" field, just as science strives to gain in the physical field, and, just like science, it remains above any moral or philosophical belief of men.

Therefore, in the name of this Wisdom and of those who can attest to this Wisdom, we assert that all those who, within the scope of religious superstitions, by mere aspirations of the "soul", by dogmas, traditions in the narrowest and most sectarian sense, hallucinations, and acts of blind faith, making themselves custodians of the sacred and of the divine, must be divested of authority and ousted. Those who know and who, insofar as they know and are able - just as those god-men known and venerated by all great ancient traditions - must replace those who "believe" - the blind leading the blind.

And it appears, therefore, that dwelling on that which is anti-Europe and anti-democracy in the cognitive field - on what is Wisdom, in the order of this very work - represents nothing but a superfluous deviation: regardless, the identification, which we can claim, of the two powers - the sacred and the temporal - in a unique intensely personalised hierarchy, could neither be justified nor understood, and instead the most sinister misunderstandings become possible.

But, inclusive of what has been examined, our declaration that we intransigent imperialists do not know what to do with a religious hierarchy (as opposed to the Gnostic and initiatory one), is confirmed and justified. In truth, it would add nothing to a material organisation to which perhaps it would be added: it would only add an empty outline of empty forms, the fantasies of faith and sentiment,

the degradation into contradictory dogmas and into symbols and rites which are not it's own and whose meaning it has lost. In sum, it would not produce the higher, solar, reality, testifying to it in potency, that we as pagans mean by spirit, but instead an absolute unreality, an anti-Aryan and anti-Roman rhetoric which is expressed in the same ethical field, favouring everything feminine, "romantic", and escapist that is lurking in the Western soul.

It is necessarily a surpassing of both religious unrealism and materialised realism by a transcendent, virile, Olympian positivism.

Mechanical Force and Individual Power

The third of the European illusions is mechanical power which comes from the technical applications of profane science: in which, in a unanimous voice, they instead believe they see the legitimate pride, the triumph of Western civilisation.

Regarding the democratism which abides in the idea of the "universality" of Western science, if the general spirit of the new Semitic doctrine is reflected in its socialist and egalitarian requirements, we should recognise also some antecedents in the Socratic method and in some aspects of later Greek intellectualism. Nevertheless, sharing in this kind of idea with Nietzsche, we may consider this an anticipation of and a prelude to the Judeo-Christian spirit, insofar as it is precisely in that Judeo-Christian spirit that we see the universalistic and egalitarian application manifest itself in the most overwhelming, concrete and unequivocal manner. Greek culture reflects more an aristocratic concept of knowledge and the principal motifs of its speculation were drawn from the Wisdom traditions. The doctrine according to which actual knowledge is conditioned by a real process of "purification" and self-transformation, directed by an active individual initiative or by the traditional power of a "rite", and such knowledge is not a purely mental fact and even less - passing to another aspect - a matter of faith and of sentiment, remains a fundamental theme of the classical world, up until Neoplatonism. Instead, in the passive attitude of the followers of the new doctrine, in their intolerance towards every method and autonomous discipline of the individual as a path to a "gnosis", to an actual spiritual experience - a concealed intolerance, still present in the various beliefs on "revelation", "grace", and the sinful aspect which any direct and precise initiative relying on the sole forces of man assumes - in all this there are enough themes of renunciation which, joined with the democratic and egalitarian *pathos*, can sufficiently account for the efficiency of Christianity itself regarding the social, popularised, inorganic, impersonal, character of modern knowledge.

But, beyond pernicious universalism, in modern science particularly, there is another fundamental point which comes from Christianity - we mean its dualistic presupposition. In modern science, nature, in fact, is thought as something "different" - as inanimate, external, completely separated from man; it is assumed - or it is thought to be assumed - to be a reality in itself, wholly independent of those who know it and, even more, of the spiritual world of those who know it.

Now, what is revealed through and through is the theme characteristic of the unrealistic religious attitude in sharp contrast with the pagan-Aryan image of the world. The theme of the opposition of spirit to reality; the dualistic theme: the subjectivity of spirit against the objectivity of nature; the theme of the loss of the sense of what spiritual objectivity means. Reaching this point, natural reality was made extraneous, mute, inanimate, external, material - and it is precisely as such that it constituted the object a new science, of Western profane science.

Far from exhausting itself in naturalism - as today only the ignorance or the tendentious falsification of some people are able to present it - beyond knowing the ideals of manly overcoming and of absolute liberation, in the pagan conception, the world was a living body, suffused with secret, divine, and demonic forces, with meanings and with symbols, as illustrated by that saying of Olympiodorus: "the sensible expression of the invisible". Man lived in an organic and essential connection with the forces of the world and of the supraworld, so that it could be said, with the hermetic expression, to be "a whole within the whole, composed of all the powers": the sense which is revealed by the Aryan-aristocratic doctrine of the Atman is no different. And that conception was the basis on which, as a whole in its perfect way, the *corpus* of the sacred traditional sciences developed.

Christianity smashed this synthesis, creating a tragic gulf. Thus, on the one hand, spirit became "what is beyond", the unreal, the subjective - hence the primary root of European abstractionism; on the other hand, nature became matter, outward appearance closed in itself, enigmatic phenomenon - hence the attitude which was to give rise to modern science.² And just as interior, direct,

² Do not accuse us of one-sidedness or bias by indicating the various dualisms known also by the ancient pagan and oriental world. These dualisms have a different character from the Christian. Even Plato knew the "other" - but this "other" was considered as a non-being, as something unintelligible and illusory, not as a reality in itself - and the Greek spirit knew the idea of matter only with late Stoicism. Oriental *maya* indicates a sense of the presence of the spirit in things more than dualism, to make one feel the sensible aspect of these as a veil of deceptive appearance. The Iranian doctrine knew two cosmic forces in battle, but that precisely for this reason they were on the same plane and approached a synthesis given by the final

integral knowledge given by Wisdom was replaced by external, intellectual, discursive-scientific, profane knowledge, so the organic and essential connection of man with the deep forces of nature, which constituted the base of traditional rite, of the power of sacrifice, and of magic, was replaced by an extrinsic, indirect, brute relation; the relation peculiar to technology and machine. Thus, in that way, the Semitic revolution contains the seeds of the mechanisation of life.

In the machine we find reflected the impersonal and egalitarian side of the science which produces it. In the same way that gold is dependency reduced to the impersonal; in the same way modern culture has as ideal a universalistic knowledge, good for all, inorganic and transmittable as one thing - we find ourselves on a level with the world of the machine facing an equally impersonal, inorganic power, based on automatisms which produce the same effects with an absolute indifference with respect to the one who acts. The whole immortality of such a power, which belongs to all and to no one, which is not value, which is not justice, which, by means of force, can make one powerful, without first making one superior, becomes clear. Just as, however, it is clear that it is possible only because not a shadow of true action is found in that order either: no effect, in the world of technology and the machine, is directly dependent upon the "I" as its cause, but, between the one and the other, there is, as condition of efficacy, a system of determinisms and of laws which are known but not understood and which, by a pure act of faith, are deemed to be constant and uniform. For what the individual is and for direct individual power, scientific technology says nothing, or rather: in the midst of his knowledge of phenomena and of his innumerable diabolical machines, the individual today is extremely wretched and powerless, more and more conditioned rather than conditioning, moving more and more on a path on which the necessity of will is reduced to a minimum, the sense of oneself, the indomitable fire of the individual entity is gradually dying in weariness, in desolation, in degeneration.

With the "laws" discovered by his science, which for us are mere statistical-mathematical abstractions, he will also be able to succeed in destroying or in

predominance of one over the other. Pure nature, disanimated, purely material and opposed to the I, arose only when the spirit was exiled in absolute "afterworld", and that is only from the Judeo-Christian mentality.

creating a world - but that does not mean that his real relation with the various events would be changed in any way: fire will continue to burn him; organic change to trouble his conscience; time, passion, and death to dominate him with their law. In general: he will be absolutely the same being as before, in the same situation as before relative to that level in the hierarchy of beings, which man with all that is human represents.

To surpass that level - to integrate oneself - to accomplish the action, feeling it, leading it to work not below but above natural determinisms, not among phenomena but among causes of phenomena, directly, with the irresistibility and the right proper to what is superior - this, instead, is the path to true power, which is identified with the path of Wisdom itself: for where knowing entails being, certainty also entails power.

But that task demands first of all the overcoming of dualism, the restoration of the pagan vision of nature, of that living conception, a sapiential imagery, which all great ancient civilisations had.

When man, starting as a phantom, becomes once again a "being who is" and restores contact and conformity with the deep forces of nature, rite, symbol and magic itself will no longer be "fantasies", as the superstition of those who today would have it. Knowing nothing about it, they speak of it as a superstition surpassed by their science. And that power which is justice, which is the sanction of dignity, natural attribute of an integrated life into which he belongs as something living, individual, inalienable, will be known.

We repeat what we said at the beginning: Europe has created a world which in all its parts constitutes an irremediable and complete antithesis to what the traditional world was. There are no possible compromises and reconciliations, the two conceptions are opposed to each other, separated by an abyss over which any bridge is illusory. Moreover, semitic civilisation is proceeding with a dizzying velocity toward its logical consequences, and its ultimate conclusion, without intending to be prophets, will not be a long time coming. Those who foresee this conclusion and manage to feel all its absurdity and all its tragedy must therefore ask of themselves the courage to say no to everything.

It is all one world. These considerations about science and machine show quite clearly how far renunciation must go and yet how necessary and unavoidable it is. This renunciation, however, is not a leap into the void. The same considerations show how a different system of values, possibilities, and knowledge, just as

complete and total, is possible - a completely different man and world; which can be recalled out of the shadows and revived as soon as that wave of fever and madness starts to recede from the West.

Activism and the Humanised World

The so-called activist, evolutionistic, "Faustian" conception of life is closely connected with the coming of the machine in the West. The romantic exaltation of everything which is stress, quest, tragedy; religion, or, better said, drawing on Guenon's expression, the superstition of life understood as an irrepressible tension, as a concern that never finds satisfaction and, in a perpetual thirst and in a perpetual disgust, moves without pause from form to form, from sensation to sensation, from invention to invention; the obsession with "doing" and with "gaining", with what is new, with setting the "record", with the unusual - all this constitutes the fourth aspect of the European evil: an aspect which characterises unquestionably the physiognomy of Western civilisation and which, these days, has really reached a feverish crisis.

We already indicated how the root for his perversion also can be traced back to the Semitic lineage. The spirit of messianism is its spirit, its original matter. The hallucination of another world and of a messianic solution which flees from the present is the need for escape of the failures, of the pariahs, of the accursed, of those who are powerless to assume and to will the reality which is their; it is the inadequacy of the persons who suffer, whose being is desire, passion, and despair. Gradually, persistently hatched within the Semitic race and rendered still bolder and more necessary all the more of the political fortune of the "chosen people" stumbled, this obscure reality developed from the dregs of the Empire and was the myth for the great revolt of the slaves, for the frenzied wave which pagan Rome was overwhelmed.

And then, going beyond the Catholic order, pushing it aside, there was the spread of the millennial madness; and when the promise and the wait proved to be deceptive, and the goal receded to infinity, while need and desperation persisted and increased, what remained was a becoming without end, a pure tension, a gravitation to emptiness.

The flight from this world and the never-ending withdrawing of the other - this anxiety towards the world which is the secret of modern life, and which shouts desperately that it is of value to escape the consciousness of oneself - is likewise the deeper secret of Christianity after the failure of its eschatology; it is the

immanent curse which it carries within itself and which spread to the peoples who converted to it, betraying the Olympian, classical, and Aryan ideal.

Combining the first theme which we saw rising from the messianic figure - the theme of the *ecclesia* which has become the law of social interdependence - with that second theme which has the same origin - combining those two themes we find ourselves facing the very law which dominates the whole culture and society of today: on the lower plane, the industrialist fever, means which become ends, mechanisation, the system of economic and materialist determinisms for which science beats the rhythm - linked with social climbing, with the race for success of men who do not live, but are lived - and, ultimately, the newest, already mentioned, myths of "infinite progress" on the basis of "social service" and of work having become an end-in-itself and universal duty; on the higher plane, the whole of the "Faustian", evolutionistic, Bergsonian doctrines which we mentioned above, and the basis of socialised truth, of the "becoming of knowledge", of universalism, and of the impersonalism of the philosophies.

In the last analysis, all this confirms and testifies to one thing, the same thing: the decadence in the West of value and of individuality - of that value which it chatters about with so much impudence. Only lives which are not self-sufficient and which lose interest in themselves seek, in fact, for the "other": they need society, a system of mutual supports, a collective law; and they aim - since they are not being, they are quest, dissatisfaction, dependence upon the future - they are becoming. They are terrified by man's natural environment: by silence, by solitude, by idle time, by the eternal - and they act, they toss restlessly, they turn here and there unceasingly, dealing with everything except themselves. They act to feel themselves, to prove that they exist: demanding form action and all that they do its own confirmation; actually, they do not act, but are obsessed by action.

This is the meaning of the activism of the moderns. It is not action, but the fever of action. It is the mad race of those who have been pushed away from the axis of the wheel and whose race is all the more insane the greater their distance from the centre. That race, that "velocity", just as the tyranny of social law in the economic, industrial, cultural, and scientific domain, is entirely lethal, in the whole order of things which they have created, once the individual wandered from himself; once, with the sense of centrality, of stability, and of inner sufficiency, he also lost the sense of what really constitutes the value of individuality. The twilight of the West follows unquestionably from the twilight of the individual as such.

We said at the beginning that people today no longer know what action is. This is the truth. Those who would skim through some traditional Indian doctrines, with which, in addition, correspondences could be found also in our classical West, would certainly be surprised at the affirmation that everything which is movement, activity, becoming, and change is characteristic of the passive and feminine principle (*shakti*), whereas immobility is to be referred to the positive, masculine, solar principle (*shiva*). And in the same way, they would not quite realise the meaning of the other affirmation, contained in a relatively more well-known text - the Bhagavad-Gita; (IV, 18) - according to which the wise man distinguishes non-action from action and action from non-action.

What is expressed in this is neither quietism nor contemplative *nirvana* in any way: what is expressed, on the contrary, is the consciousness of what activity really is. The concept is rigorously identical to the one which Aristotle expressed in speaking of "unmoved movers". The one who is the cause of and in control of movement is not moved himself. He arouses, controls, and directs movement: he causes the act, but does not act, that is to say, he is not led by, not involved in action; he is not action, but rather an impassable, very calm superiority, whom action comes from and depends upon. This is why his potent and invisible control can be called, with Lao Tzu, an "action-without-action" (*wēi-wu-wēi*). His opposite, the one who acts is acted on: the one who is seized by action, the one who is drunk with action, with "will", with "force" in elan, in passion, in enthusiasm, is already an instrument; he does not act but is subject to action; thus he appears - to these doctrines - as a feminine principle and a negation with respect to the higher, transcendent, motionless, and Olympian mode of the Masters of motion.

Well, what is exalted today in the West is precisely this negative, decentered, lower, action: a drunken spontaneity which is unable to control itself and to create a centre for itself, whose law is outside itself and whose secret workings is a will to dissipate and to keep up a whirl of activity. Thus, they call positive and masculine, and exalt, what is completely negative and feminine. In their blindness, contemporary men of the West do not see anything else and imagine that inner action, the secret force which does not create machines, banks, and companies, but men and gods, is not action, but renunciation, abstraction, a waste of time.

"Power", thus, is reduced to a synonym for violence; will is identified more and more only with the single type of what is animal-like and muscular, of that which the one assumes an antithesis, a resistance (within or outside himself) against which he strains and wears himself out. Tension, struggle, effort, aspiration - *nisus*, *struggle* - these are the watchwords of this activism.

But all this is not action.

Action is something elementary. It is something, simple, terrible, irresistible. There is no room in it for passion or for its antithesis, nor for "effort", and even less for "humanity" and "feeling". It starts from absolute centres without hatred, without craving, and without pity; from a calmness which terrifies and immobilises; from a level of "creative indifference" superior to every opposition.

It is command. It is the fearsome power of the Caesars. It is the concealed and silent action of the Emperors of the Far East, inevitable like the forces of nature, whose "purity" it shares. It is what can still be felt breaking out of the magic immobility of some Egyptian portraits, of the fascinating slowness of certain ritual gestures. It is the naked, new Machiavellianism, in all its hardness and its inhumanity. It is what bursts out when - as in the high feudal Middle Ages - man becomes alone again, man next to man or man against man, cloaked in his strength or in his weakness, without escape, without law. It is what shines when - in heroism, in sacrifice, or in great sacrilege - a force stronger than good and evil, mercy, fear, and happiness arises in man, a force before which the eye no longer stares either at itself or at others and in which arises the primordial power of circumstances and persons.

What is called in physics dissipation of energy by friction - this is what, instead, Europeans call "heroism", in which, like children, they pride themselves. The torment of torn up souls, the pathos of naive weaklings powerless to control themselves, to impose upon themselves silence and absolute will, all this is exalted in the West in the name of the "tragic sense of life" since unbalance and dualism, "guilty conscience", the sense of "sin", of man as enemy of himself and angry against himself, has grown in the soul.

And complication arose from complication: action disappeared behind pleasure of feeling and of torment. Resistance, that is powerlessness, became a condition for the sense of self, hence the need for effort, the romantic exaltation of violence, the running in circles, the yearning, the superstition that the value is not in arriving, but in the running; not mastery and control, but painful, struggling, conquest; not precise, bare, fulfilled, realisation, but "unending task". Christianity, denying classical harmony, the sense of autarchy and of absolute limit, the sense of Olympian superiority, of Dorian simplicity, of active, positive, hard, immanent force has prepared the ground for a world of the obsessed and the shackled.

Everyone in the West knows of chains, blood, and darkness, but nothing of freedom. The shout of freedom, which is heard ringing out everywhere, is only a shout of prisoners, a howling of chained wild animals, a voice which comes from below. Modern "voluntarism" is not will, but a desperate rhetoric which is substituted for will, a mental effusion to convince oneself of a will which one does not have. Identical obsessive signs, symptoms of worry, assertions which only testify to the lack of and the need for what they assert, are all modern exhalations of "power" and of "individuality": the desperate aspects of European decadence under a hard law of "seriousness" and "duty".

For everything in the West is, in a sinister way, serious, tragic, unfree. Everything betrays a sense of deep coercion which, in some, manifests as rigourism, prohibitionism, imperativism, moralist or rationalist intolerance, in others as romantic impulse and human pathos. Crystalline clarity, agile simplicity, detached in a spiritual joy of free play, irony, and aristocratic superiority, all this exists and is conceived of only as a myth. In any thing there reigns instead a new sense of identification, of collapse, of greedy interest. It is the world of michelangelesque prisons which still echoes in humanity, embellished with "heroism" and "universality", with a Beethoven and a Wagner. And, how much seriousness and romantic passion there is in the Nietzschean exaltation of the "gay science", in the very laugh of Zarathustra! The curse of the crucified god has spread everywhere, has wrapped the whole of Europe, a block of metal and blood, in its deep pain.

This "human" sense of life, so typical of the modern West, confirms its plebeian and lower aspect. That which some were ashamed of - "man" - others took pride in. The ancient world elevated the individual to God, made every effort to unbind him from passion, to adapt him to transcendence, with the free air of the heights in contemplation as well as in action; it knew traditions of non-human heroes and of men of divine blood. The Semiticised world not only deprived the "creature" of the divine, but finally reduced God to a human figure. Bringing back to life the demonism of a Pelasgian substratum, it substituted the pure Olympian regions, vertiginous in their radiant perfection, with the terrorist viewpoints of its apocalypses, of hells, of predestination, of perdition. God was no longer the aristocratic god of the Romans, the god of the patricians, to whom one prays standing, in the light of the fire, head up high and which is carried at the head of the victorious legions; it was no longer Donar-Thor, the exterminator of Thrym and Hymir, the "strongest of the strong", the "irresistible", the master of the "refuge against terror", whose fearsome weapon, the hammer Mjolnir, in a representation corresponding to the Vajra of Shiva - the same lightning force which hallowed the

divine kings of the Aryans; it was no longer Odin-Wotan, the one who brings victory, the Eagle, the host of the heroes who, in death on the battlefield, celebrated the highest cult of sacrifice and were transformed into the phalanx of immortals - but become, to say it with Rougier, the patron of the wretched and of the desperate, the holocaust, the comforter of the afflicted who is implored with tears of ecstasy in the annihilation of oneself. Therefore, the spirit was materialised, the soul softened. Only what is passion, feeling, effort, was then experienced. Not only the supramundane sense for Olympian spirituality, but also for virile Nordic-Roman dignity disappeared little by little and, in a general degeneration, a contorted world of tragedy, of suffering and of seriousness followed: the "human" world instead of the epic and Dorian world.

"Humanism": in all this - a dirty fog exhaled from the earth, which has prevented the vision of the heavens - some take pride as being the "value" of the West. It spreads effectively in each of its forms, it is at the root of old and new romanticisms, of all sentimentalisms, of all modern enthusiasms of action and will.

And we shout: it is necessary to purify oneself from it! The task is just as hard as the eradication of the other described elements which canonise European decadence.

What is "human" must be overcome, absolutely, without mercy. But, to come to this, it is necessary that individuals attain the feeling of inner liberation. Let it be known that this cannot be the object of thirst, it cannot be the object of a greedy quest by the shackled who, as such, have no right to it. Either it is, as a simple matter which is neither solemnly proclaimed nor theorised about, which is barely noticed, as a natural, elementary, and inalienable presence of the elect - or it is not. The more it is sought and desired, the more it is elusive, because necessity is fatal to it.

It is necessary to regain consciousness: as the one who, realising that he is running, gasping for breath in the scorching heat, would say to himself: "So? What if I walked more slowly?" - and, walking more slowly: "So? What if I stopped walking?" - and, ceasing to walk: "So? What if I lie down on the ground, here, in the shade?" - and, lying on the ground, he would feel an infinite rest and recall with amazement his race, his old haste; likewise, the soul of the Moderns, which does not know rest, silence, nor a breathing space, must be gradually appeased. It is necessary to bring men back to themselves and to force them to find in themselves their purpose and their value. They should learn again to feel alone, without help and without law, until they awaken to the act of absolute command

and of absolute obedience. So that, looking coldly around, they realise that there is nowhere to go, that there is nothing to ask for, nothing to hope for, nothing to fear. They should breathe again, released from the weight, and acknowledge the misery and the weakness of both love and hate. They should stand up as simple, pure, and yet no longer human things.

In the superiority of aristocrats, in the high estate of souls in control themselves, they mock the turbid avidity with which slaves rush at the banquet of life. They retreat into an active indifference capable of everything in accordance with a renewed innocence. The power of putting their own life on the line and to stare, smiling, into the abysses, of giving without passion, of acting while placing on the same level both victory and defeat, success and failure - it should spring from that superiority which disposes of oneself like a thing and in which the experience of a principle than every death and every corruption truly awakens. The sense of rigidity, of effort, of the brute "you must!" no longer exists except as the memory of an absurd mania. Acknowledging the illusion of all "evolutions", of all "providential plans", of all "historicism", acknowledging the illusion of all the "goals" and the "reasons" as leashes necessary only for those who, still children, don't know how to walk on their own, men will cease to be moved, but will move. If their "I" becomes their centre, men and no longer ghosts, action in its primitive, elementary, absolute sense will spring up again from them.

And, here, then, if the poisonous fog of the "human" world is dispelled, besides intellectualism, besides psychology, besides the passion and the superstition of men, nature in its free and essential state will reappear. Everything around will become free again, everything will breathe, at last. The great disease of romantic man, faith, will now be overcome through experience. To man, thus reintegrated, new eyes, new ears, new wings, will really and spontaneously open. The supernatural will cease to be the pallid escape of pallid souls. It will be reality and will become one and the same thing with the natural. In the pure, calm, powerful, and incorporeal light of a revived Dorian simplicity, spirit and form, interiority and exteriority, reality and supra-reality, will become one and the same thing in the balance of both members, of which none is higher, none is slower than the other. It will thus be an epoch of transcendent realism: in the forces of those who believe they are men and do not know they are sleeping gods, the forces of the elements will awaken, up to the thrills of absolute illumination and of absolute resurrection.

And then the other great human constraint, that of the faceless social amalgam, will also be overcome. If the law which has made them parts of machines, stones linked together in the impersonal cement of collective despotism and

humanitarian ideologies is swept aside, individuals will each be the beginning and end in themselves; each closed in himself like worlds, rocks, peaks, clad only in their strength and in their weakness. To everyone a place - a combat post - a quality, a life, a dignity, a distinct force, matchless, irreducible. Their moral will be: you must assert yourself over the need to "communicate" and to "understand each other", over the ignominy of the pathos of fraternity, over the sensual delight of loving and feeling loved, of feeling equal and close - assert yourself over that subtle force of corruption which dissolves and weakens the sense of aristocracy. Incommunicability will be desired, in the name of an absolute and virile respect: valleys and peaks, stronger forces and weaker forces, one beside the other or one against the other, loyally acknowledged, in the discipline of the spirit inwardly on fire but externally stiff and hard as steel, containing the immensity of the infinite to a magnificent extent: militarily, as in a warlike enterprise, a son the battlefield. Precise relationships, order, *cosmos*, hierarchy. Rigorously specific groups which organise, without intermediaries and without attenuations, through actions in which some will luminously rise, others will irremediably fall. Above, solar and haughty beings, a race of Masters with a "long, distant, fearsome look", which does not take, but give slight and power superabundantly, and, in a resolute conduct of life, aspires to a more and more extraordinary intensity, yet always balanced in its supernatural calm.

Then the romanticist myth, that of "man" and of the "human", will vanish and we will approach the threshold of great liberation. In a world of limpidity, the words of Nietzsche, the precursor, will then be able to ring out in a transcendent sense: "How beautiful, how pure, these free forces, no longer stained by spirit!"

Our European Symbol

Nietzsche, Misunderstood

Once again, we end up facing two ideal worlds, whose opposition we do not want to mitigate, but rather to exacerbate.

A break and a total change are needed, if there is to be a solution.

Considering the situation we have reached, the effectiveness of grafts should no longer be hoped for. Nothing, on the basis of the values of our contemporary world, could save this cadaver which plays every day with resurrections and exchanges the thrills of agony for the thrills of awakening.

It is the substance itself which must be destroyed and renewed, radically - otherwise, everything that can be given as salvation will be contaminated; it will not save but will itself be subject to the identical evil.

In all fields - as we have seen - currently prevailing conceptions are the absolute opposite of the spiritual premises on the basis of which a restoration in the traditional sense can be reached. Thus, we must not hesitate to demand that everything which in modern man is part of what he had led to the current corruption be destroyed. But, at the same time, we must bear this in mind: we demand destruction only insofar as we know of higher, more glorious, more living forms. We do not want negation, but restoration. There is a complete, total, positive system of values, developed in correspondence with all the other forms which have occurred in the profane "civilisation" of today, as a secure base to surpass all the negations characteristic of European decadence without fear of ending up with nothing.

The ideal of a return to castes and qualitative hierarchy must be supposed to the demon of the collective, to the anonymity of omnipotent finance, and to the tyranny of the socialised and Semiticised West.

The aristocratic ideal of Wisdom must be opposed to positive science and to the debasements which - through it - have opened up the floodgates of work and of culture to the mob.

The super-real and solar ideal of initiation must be opposed to the sanctimonious abstractionism and formalisms of an anti-Aryan faith.

The aristocratic ideal of metaphysical action, the unconditioned power which rite and sacred traditional science, can offer to the lenses of a reintegrated humanity, against the Luciferian illusion of technical-mechanical power, fruit of a total renunciation, instrument of new needs and of new slavery.

The liberated and domineering Nordic-classical vision and the ideal of a metaphysical experience, as the basis of a new action and new contemplation, to the romantic, evolutionistic and Faustian vision of life.

The rhythm accelerates, the circle of Western "civilisation" threatens to close. There are three possible attitudes towards this.

Either withdraw, putting up barriers, leaving those deviators and betrayers to themselves; breaking the bridges - before the "sons of Muspell" think of it - to prevent their contagions from reaching our most hidden corners.

Or wait for the solution, accelerating the rhythm of "progress", waiting for the end, or, if this is not enough, going too far as to provoke it, so that the ground is clear for the instant rise of the new tree.

Or we unite, meanwhile, in the call to consciousness and to revolt, we oppose patiently, tenaciously, mercilessly, with a destructive force on one hand, with a creative force on the other, the tide which threatens to overwhelm the still sane parts of Europe.

But the basis for this - let us repeat - the premise of any other action is an inner renewal. Before any other type of bravery it is necessary to have the spiritual, which no longer allows us to tolerate any rapprochement and any compromise and which, manifesting the most complete indifference towards those who accused us of being anachronistic dreamers, utopians cut off from reality, fixes us firmly, impassive, in traditional truth.

And those who are still not capable on their own can find a precursor even in these dark times, someone misunderstood, who waits in the shadows: Friedrich Nietzsche. The Nietzschean experience is still not exhausted, since it has not even started. What is exhausted is the aesthetic-literary caricature of Nietzsche, conditioned over time, and theological-naturalistic reduction of some parts of his theories. But the value carried heroically by Nietzsche after much nameless suffering, in spite of the fact that his whole being revolted and yielded, until, without any complaint, after having given everything, it collapsed - this value

which is beyond his "philosophy", beyond his humanity, beyond himself, identical to a cosmic meaning, reflection of an economic force - the *hvareno* and the terrible fire of solar initiations - this value is still waiting to be understood and assume by contemporaries. There is already in it the call for arms, the appeal for loathing, for awakening - and for the great struggle: the one in which - as we have said - the destiny of the West will be settled: either to fall into twilight or enter a new dawn.

Freeing the doctrine of Nietzsche from its naturalistic part, we see that the "overman" and the "will-to-power" are not true except as supra-biological qualities and, we should say, supernatural qualities, then this doctrine, for many, can be a path by which the great ocean can be reached - the world of the solar universality of great Nordic-Aryan traditions, from whose summit the sense of all the misery, of all the irrelevance, and of all the insignificance of this world of the shackled and maniacs imposes itself.

It is on this basis that temporary practical action must be understood, which should be based on the highest points of contact accessible, even if only to a tiny elite at the moment; whereas, for the others, who do not understand, they would only be the cause of confusion, which would force them to relinquish the ideals of immediate, practical, and realisable value along with those higher ideals.

Pagan Nordic values are transcendent values which get their true sense only within that full, anti-modern and anti-European conception, which we have already described in essential outline. But these could also constitute ethical principles, likely, in the meantime, to form a base for a new education and for a new style of life, free from hypocrisy, from the baseness and from the hallucinations of the most recent generations.

The pagan experience is not at all an impossible and anachronistic experience from any point of view whatsoever. Do we not feel almost every day how "paganism" in the modern world is noticed and deplored by the representatives of European religions? Thus paganism is largely, and is truly, an imaginary paganism: we are dealing with an evil at whose root those who have followed us up to this point can recognise without difficulty the forces and the conditions which originally altered the ancient, pre-Christian world.

Under other aspects, instead, this paganism is a true paganism. It is a matter of discovering the aspects through which it can be used as a means to an end, by transforming itself into something positive; without being in any way a synonym

for materialism and corruption, as is assumed unfortunately by most people when they speak of paganism; and by becoming the expression of the preparation of a higher and truly spiritual state, such as to allow us to remain faithful to the forces of the nordic-Aryan race - where these forces, even if still oppressed, are not defeated.

The positive aspect of modern paganism exists wherever there is a realism that signifies the overcoming of romanticism; wherever, in the new generations, a non-theoretical but practically experienced elimination of the various bogeymen of thought, of feeling, of art, and of morality has taken place; wherever something original and barbaric arises, but united with the simplified, clear, and controlled forces of the most exceptional modernity; wherever a new objectivity, a new seriousness, a new isolation have really occurred, which, however, do not exclude the possibility of a union in action and for action; wherever objects, more than men, works, more than private "personalities" and the "tragedies" of their authors - whether individuals, races, or collectives - arouse interest once again; wherever the impulse to come out of one's own "soul" in the vast world, restored to its character of eternity and to its indifference towards the human, gains in value; not as an escape, but as a return to normality, to naturalness, to centrality.

All this can contain principles for a temporary catharsis. The effort must aim at not letting the way of those "overcomings" flow out - as they do in most cases - to the plane of matter and of a mere "living" - to end up in the most horrible degeneration of human possibilities.

It would thus be necessary that the themes of a new realism, of a new Nordic-pagan classicism, of a new freedom in what is essential, in anti-sentimentalism, in the "Dorian" and the objective - which, here and there, appear in various tendencies of the most recent generation, not seldom accompanied by the virile themes of a new Nietzscheanism - that these themes manage to transform, to reach a true level of spirituality (to find, therefore, ways which lead to something which is beyond both matter and "spirit" as understood by modern culture) and - through forward-looking elites - with a style of clear vision, of control, and of supra-individual perfection, to end up in the extra-human.

If, on this basis, an ethic which we can still call Nordic-pagan cleanses our still sane races and fills them fully with a new style of life, the ground will be ready for the comprehension and the gradual fulfilment of that which has an even higher value, and which we have spoken about, to acknowledge that there is no void ahead or beyond, but the void is only now.

The True Paneuropa

Some practical considerations on the state of contemporary Europe can be connected to this.

It is a fact that, even in just the political and economic domain, definite negative forces which had previously manifested only sporadically and appeared in a disorganised condition, are organised today, they become powers in the true sense of the word and, in their hegemonic claim, in their destructive character, with respect to everything that can be considered as European tradition even in the narrow sense, they appear to us as a precise threat in the face of which a political and social alternative is forced.

Under these conditions, a fundamental problem arises: is it possible that Europe, despite its economic and political wound, can assert its autonomy against non-European and anti-European powers, or that, in order to save its existence, it needs to organise itself as a unit?

This is the so-called Paneuropean problem which Count Coudenhove-Kalergi has recently raised, indicating that Russia, England, and Asia are the three main powers with respect to which that problem assumes a special importance.

Besides, it is incontestable that, in the general feeling of crisis and of discomfort which even finds expression on the material plane of Western society, the best minds today find themselves forced to recall the ideal of a higher ecumenical civilisation, in which a new and uniform principle should reorganise European races, scattered and weakened in their strengths and in their individuals.

The Paneuropean problem can thus be included in our considerations, and we can say that it truly has meaning and a deeper *raison d'être*, insofar as - *in primis et ante omnia* - it expresses a need for the defence of the Europe linked to Tradition. The practical advantages of a Paneuropean union can have for us only a secondary and conditional interest, since the main problem which threatens Europe is not so much a material danger but rather a spiritual one. Let us not be mistaken about the possibilities of a unity on the plane of matter and of "politics". This is by its nature on a plane of contingency, of relativity, of irrationalism, and of compromise: it cannot be thought that it is on that plane that a form endowed with true stability can have life, since a higher principle - as its soul - is not present there. It is only on the plane of the spirit that a true unity can take on life and overcome any spirit of schism and of particularism.

Considering things from this point of view, one can continue to see - with Coudenhove - in Russia, in England, and in Asia, the main centres of forces against which a European bloc becomes necessary: provided that, at the same time, one tries to discover the aspect of the spiritual danger which corresponds to each one of them.

As far as Russia is concerned, we are actually in the presence of the most threatening force for our future. We have seen how the process of spiritual regression - especially in its aspect of the fall of power from one ancient Aryan caste to the other - tend to the rise of a new collectivistic, proletarian, mechanised barbarism, the declared enemy of everything which is freedom, spirit, and personality, as is precisely shown to us by the Russia of the Soviets. In the murky, demonic consciousness of this, the Soviets actually take on the prophetic mission of bring to future humanity a universal culture - the proletarian culture with its myth of the mass man. And Coudenhove rightly notes that, if Europe yesterday could represent order against chaos in the face of the Russian revolution, today it is precisely the contrary which is true: today, we see the Soviets constituting itself like an iron bloc - political, ideological and economic at the same time - and if such a barbaric power persists in this direction of an absolute organisation of every energy, of a rationalisation and use of any natural and human resource (of which their "five-year plan" is the first manifestation and for which they have headed with respect to specific intentions of international political domination), then, for Europe, split up in its various national and international disagreements, in its economy, and above all in its ideals, there is a danger which is difficult to overestimate.

As for the second power, England, it must be considered in its tightest relation to America, in order to assess entirely the anti-Europeanism of a utilitarian, mercantilist, democratic-capitalist, essentially secular and Protestant, culture, which has reached precisely its ultimate conclusion in America: mammonism, excessive standardisation, tyranny of the trusts and of gold, the degrading religion of "sociality" and of work, the destruction of every metaphysical interest, and glorification of the "animal ideal". Thus, from that point of view, England, whose world-wide empire is now heading for decline, constitutes a lesser danger than America, which can be considered objectively as the Western analogue of the same danger which, on the Eastern frontier, the Russia of the Soviets represents for us. The difference between both cultures consists only in this: those matters which the Soviets try to carry out with a tragic and cruel tension and by means of a dictatorship and a system of terror, in America, instead, thrive with a semblance of democracy and freedom, insofar as they appear at the spontaneous result, necessarily reached through the interest in material and industrial production, of

the detachment from any traditional and aristocratic point of reference, of the chimera of a technico-material conquest of the world.

As for the third danger, the Asiatic danger does not exist for us in Europeanised Japan and even less in China and in India. The merit of Rene Guenon is to have highlighted that it is precisely the opposite which is true, that is to say that it is the West which has represented a danger for those peoples, or rather, the principle of their decline: the West had injected into their veins the virus of modernisation, causing the quick dissolution of everything traditional and transcendent which those great peoples maintained in their organisations. If, some day, Asia, organising itself like the West and participating in all the contaminations of modern spirit, comes to represent a political danger for Europe, only the latter will be responsible and guilty for it. We can speak of an Asiatic danger in a quite different sense: it is the danger which is constituted for the European soul, especially in the present state of affairs, by an ambiguous, pantheistic, confused, escapist spirituality, in flight from the world, which can be found in thousands of contemporary neo-mystical and theosophical currents and sects, almost always connected with the themes of humanitarianism, of pacifism, and of anti-hierarchy, surprisingly similar to the syncretic Asiatic culture of the Alexandrine period of decay. Naturally, all this has absolutely nothing to do with the traditional and especially Aryan East: it is a pathos which, ultimately, can lead us to the substratum of the inferior races, through whose rule and civilisation the great Eastern cultures were formed: a pathos which favours precisely the ferments of decomposition of the Semiticised West. Nevertheless and unfortunately, in many European currents the East is known and active in this sense, and it is in this sense that it represents a danger: the danger of falling into an anti-Western and non-virile spiritualism in order to fight Western materialism.

The triple hostility with respect to which the problem of a European unity can be put in its true terms must be integrated in that way. To fight, fair enough - but the main thing is: to fight in whose name? Let us suppose that Europe, in order to be able to oppose in the political and economical sense either Russia as a confederation of Soviet republics or the United States, should organise itself in a way which corresponds precisely to the anti-hierarchical, "socialist", secular ideals of these two powers. Then, we would see that the positive solution would coincide with the negative one; the opposition would amount to a hidden abdication, to a secret undoing, to a defecting to the enemy through the action which should have closed the door on it. Besides, it would be thoughtless to demand from the esum of two parts something which is not even present in one of them; to delude oneself that any form of European unity may be useful for

anything, if each peoples have not already headed, each of them for themselves, toward a reaction in the same direction, toward a spiritual integration which rejects everything tending in the Russian or American direction. Well this creates a unitary spirit that actually gives to those peoples the possibility of becoming organically and, so to speak, spontaneously, united in something higher than their individual existence.

The soul of those individual reactions and integrations, which, from the inside, could clear the round for the formation of a European bloc, material and spiritual at the same time, is found in the ideals which we uphold, in the values fully assumed by the Nordic-Aryan tradition, as the base of an aristocratic restoration.

Coudenhove-Kalergi thinks he recognises individualism, heroism, and socialism as elements of the "European soul" - and, therefore, as premises of a future Paneuropa: values which modern Europe would have drawn from the classical, or better, Nordic and Christian, tradition. But the union of those three values is a compromise: the introduction of "socialism" as a European value - as shown by all our previous considerations - would amount to a sort of Trojan horse, which, sooner or later, would expose the European bloc to those forces which characterise the danger which it is necessary to oppose and which it is necessary to combat. Coudenhove made that mistake because he sees the element of "individualism" form a purely pluralistic point of view; this is why he accepts, as a compensation for the division and the atomism to which pure individualism could lead, the right of "socialism", as unifying cement. In fact, there is instead an individualism which, in itself - through the values of fidelity, of service, and of honour - contains the seeds of an overcoming of the isolation and of the egotism of the individual and opens the way to the possibility of a clear and sound hierarchical organisation. Neither Romans, nor primordial Aryan-Roman peoples, needed to wait for Christian socialism to reach real and higher forms of organisation. Besides, there is Aryan socialism, as warlike ideal of an association of free masters, and there is the Semitic, ambiguous, totemic, and non-virile socialism, made up of mutual need and *pathos*, of which we would not know what to make of it, and which we consider a disgrace to the European soul.

If, in our conception, the aristocratic idea is the first foundation for a traditional restoration, we have simultaneously with it the principle that, even in the practical and political sense, could bring us to the overcoming of that which today is opposed in substance to European unity.

This substantial obstacle is nationalism. We see, as a matter of fact, how the fall of that universal unity which Europe already had in the Middle Ages occurred because of nationalism. Once the medieval hierarchic-aristocratic ideal had decayed; once the differentiation of castes and guilds had vanished, and since the work of national centralisation and of the creation of "civil authorities" took their place and the leaders passed from the higher functions, which linked them to a liturgy of power, to a direct and absolutist interference in the world of a politics directly linked to the economy and nation - understood as country and collectivity - then there was a materialisation and a regression which gave rise to a dissolving particularism: to that particularism which still endures in an exacerbated manner and which the various European nations support, one against that either-, a sso many schisms, as so many concepts which oppose each other, and behind which a series of hegemonies of a merely political, economical and territorial type is hidden.

Therefore, it is only by taking the road in the opposite direction - in a natural manner, without necessarily having to return to forms conditioned by time, but reassuming their spirit - that one can come to the fulfilment of the ideal of a European unity. To the extent that - like today - spirit is an instrument in the service of politics; and aristocracy can be changed to a plutocracy and to the leaders of a purely economic, administrative, or military organisation; that the State is precisely - and solely - the nation, and not a hierarchy of castes corresponding to a differentiation and a hierarchy of values - to the same extent, appetites, egoisms, competition, the plans of a greedy industry, and so on, although they are irrational and self-destructive, will be the stronger forces, against whose front any attempt at unification will fail.

Instead, it is necessary that a decentralisation and an economic demobilisation take place; that the State, as spiritual principle, as spiritual principle, frees itself from its material aspect; that it ascribes to that aspect a limited field, beyond which it rises according to the fully understood hierarchic ideal which, as such, could never end up as that which is conditioned by particularism and materialism, by ethnos and by geography. In the various States we will have then as many aristocracies which, by experiencing the same tradition of spirit and the same rituals of power, by adhering inwardly to the essentially supranational values of this tradition, would bring about an actual unity from above: this supranational unity which unities in spirit without blending the bodies.

In this way, we could arrive at a Paneuropa; we could determine coherently everything which is useful to resolve the European crisis and to form a bloc against

the dangers which, even materially, threaten to bury the remains of our civilisation. In some cases, European unity could stay in a state of experienced reality which does not need any external order. But, in other cases, it should be ready to show, even dynamically, its power, fathering in a sole and unstoppable impulse, and with a single will, various races and traditions for one and the same goal of defence and of conquest, and yet still proceeding from an impulse from above, which leaves behind it the blind determinisms of political passions, and which follow an ideality, something universal and transforming: roughly like the ideal of the Crusades, in which Europe, for the first and last time, achieved a universal, unifying action, beyond the limits of country and blood.

It is through the political form of such unity, that it would be consistent with European tradition, we can only indicate once again the ethos on which ancient Nordic-pagan constitutions were based. Thus, we think of those associations of free men who, in times of peace, were like a parliament of peers, of independent masters inside their own *mundium*; in times of war, instead, or in the moment of a common goal and so long as the common action lasted, ready for the call, they transformed themselves, along with their men, into vassals absolutely faithful to one leader.

The Myth of the Two Eagles

The immediately preceding considerations bring us to an even more practical problem: it consists in assessing the point from which the action for a new European unity could start.

Our conviction is that such a beginning could take place only with the union of the two Eagles: the German Eagle and the Roman Eagle. Lenin once said: "The Roman-Germanic world constitutes the greatest obstacle to the fulfilment of the new proletarian ideal". This admission is precious for us.

If there is the need to form a belt of insulation of the European countries which legitimately in themselves have a tradition as opposed to those which either do not have it, have repudiated it, or have lost it, and which, for the former, in one form or the other, represents a danger - then, only the union of Italy with Germanic countries can constitute, to our mind, the heart of the formation of such a bloc. The Roman-Germanic world represents the symbol and the source of everything which in the West can be called "civilisation" in the true, qualitative, traditional sense: in this sense a supposed to which the socialist, mechanistic, and plebeian turning point represents, as we know, the most shameful collapse. Italy, Germany,

and Austria form together the traditional pole of the West. From East to West anti-traditional peoples push: the Slavs have never had a tradition; nor does America; France, republican and decadent, negrified and Semiticised, the first breeding ground of the modern insurrection of the slaves, no longer has tradition; old aristocratic England is in the hands of democracy and, now, from every point of view, is close to its decline; the various satellites of the Mediterranean, the Balkans, and the North, to various degrees, are part of the same picture and do not have in any case any possibility of getting closer to something which has value as a universal symbol.

Therefore, we do not hesitate to affirm that, to the extent that the efforts of a revolt and of a restoration manifesting in the shadow of essentially pagan and Aryan signs - on the one hand, the Eagle and the Swastika, on the other hand, the Eagle and the Fasces - would manage to assume a greater importance among the German and the Italian peoples, these could not enclose themselves in so-called "sacred egoism".

However, in our opinion, the German nation and the Italian nation are especially called to a bond that is not dictated solely by political, economic, and military interests - as in the immoralism which today is the only thing that tightly binds or divides nations - to a supplementary, organic bond of the spirit and the intellect just like the body. And we do not hesitate to affirm the restoration - in different forms - of what had its uncertain anticipation in the "Triple Alliance" before the war, still represents the issue for a better future. It is linked to the possibility of giving Europe a first centre, a sound foundation for its defence in every sense.

Naturally, the premise is that, in both countries, this process of virile and "solar" reintegration of which we have already spoken takes place, and in relation to which everything that Germany and Italy already offer on the basis of their new political idea can be considered only as an explorative preparation.

In any case, Italy has already taken a huge step forward in eliminating the last residues which, even if at this point hackneyed, still persisted in this ideology of renewal which insisted in portraying Austria and the German countries in general as its "age-old-enemy" and the others, the Latin ones, as brothers. And if Italy evokes an imperial ideal, the ancient Roman ideal, not only in name but also in fact, of thinking that wars should be waged for romantic and "patriotic" ideologies, will simply turn out ridiculous. Certainly, there will come the day in which - beyond its superficial and illusory impulses - the world war itself will reveal a meaning which will no longer have anything to do with the hypocritical pretexts

of a humanitarian and anti-aristocratic ideology. Mussolini has already explained that "the world war was revolutionary, because - in the middle of the blood bath - it liquidated the century of democracy, of numbers, of majority, and of quantity". As a matter of fact, the world war only meant the resurrection and the coalition of plebeian nationalisms and of modern world-wide democracy against the peoples in which, basically, the last remains of the ancient imperial-feudal order had been kept, and which fought in the name of the feudal concept of right and honour rather than of the modern plebeian principle of land and of "nation".

Naturally, there is even a counterpart to this for the German peoples. If Italy has to pass from the national ideal, of which it has its own ancient tradition to a lesser extent and which therefore links it to the new French ideology, to the universal-imperial idea that it has by virtue of the Roman idea, then in Germany the barriers of this fanaticism and nationalism of race, by which, basically, it would fall into a materialistic and anti-traditional particularism, must then be broken. It is necessary that Germany also recalls its higher tradition, the supranational one of the Holy Roman Empire of the German nation - and then the way to that "Third Reich", forecast by many contemporary currents of German restoration, will not be able to avoid leading to the point where - as in the times of the universal medieval Europe - the Roman eagle unites once again with the Nordic eagle. If Germany has to defend the Nordic-Aryan tradition, it must then distinguish - as we have done - between the lower, biologically conditioned, and, therefore, contingent and particularistic, sense, and the higher, spiritual sense of that concept, which does not exclude the former, but integrates it and leads it essentially to the idea of a type, of a primordial formative force, which must be awakened as a creative force of the new unity and of the new civilisation of Europe. If it remains on the level on which the myth of blood and of race has the value of last resort, it is clear that the claim of a universal mission, characteristic of higher races, would meet obstacles a sa rule. From our point of view, it is precisely that the behaviour of some German nationalist circles which must be overcome, not in the sense of a renunciation, but for self-assertion in a higher idea, free from the conditioning of nature and contingency. A spiritual nationalism could never be an obstacle to a universal idea, since it establishes itself as its prerequisite.

If Moeller van den Bruck said that Germany, after having lost the war, must win the revolution, this expression for us must then be essentially understood in the sense that Germany must reject any reformist concept which would lead it in the direction of those political ideas embodied by our ancient military adversaries. It is precisely that which some deplore today, that is to say, in the fact that Germany

has still not been a "nation", in the sense of a social and anti-hierarchical union of all the castes, that we see the value and the positive, anti-modern side of these people. It must break up any "socialism", facing up resolutely to any extravagant tendencies of a certain youth. He who thinks that the German tradition stopped at the spirit of the Lutheran insurrection and the peasant wars (on the basis of which one has gone so far as to proclaim a "message of the east", according to which a "socialist" Germany should unite with Russia against Rome and against the remains of "feudalism"), instead of searching for the true foundations of it in the medieval world and in the Aryan-Germanic *ethos*, demonstrates to us a most indicative evidence of lack of consciousness. If we encounter the anti-Romanism of a Ghibelline emperor, in conflict with the yoke under which a Rome having passed on to a Semitic religion would have liked to put him, weighing him down too much to support those remains of imperality, hierarchy and authority which Rome conserved in spite of everything, it must be firmly maintained that to the same extent that Christianity represented the great fall of Roman-pagan humanity, the Reformation represented the great fall of Nordic-German humanity, and that we must revolt against it, not in the name of the Church, but in the name of Nordic tradition, in the name of the pagan spirit fully assumed. Once that conviction is reached, many artificial antitheses, which some, even at a higher spiritual and cultural level, through incomprehension, lack of spiritual courage, or a sectarian spirit, foment against Rome, will automatically be eliminated. Luther is just as far from the true aristocratic German essence as is the "socialism" of the Jew Karl Marx.

Moving on to a more empirical point of view: in Italy, a struggle has already manifested itself with "fascism", against the parliamentary cancer, and against democracy and socialism. A will to order and to hierarchy, to virility, and to authority, are pervading the new national reality. Acknowledging whatever positive there can be in all this, must not however prevent us from determining the many limits which, if they persist, will still keep Italy far from a true aristocratic-traditional restoration. The Fascist tendency to the centralisation of the State certainly has value as an antidote against democratic liberalism and anarchic-destructive individualism, but must in any case be restrained, if we want to avoid that despotism of the "authorities" which, as a necessary consequence, provokes levelling and decay into an impersonal mechanism. Thus, the corporatist idea of Fascism, even though it has the value of overcoming the Marxist deviation of class struggle in the name of a higher ideal of collaboration, must lead neither to an affirmation of politics through the economy, nor to a transformation in a syndicalist sense, nor to state control of the economy, as is wished by some Fascists who consider their movement as a fulfilment of the Muscovite revolution.

It is instead a matter of reviving and defending the qualitative and pluralistic system of the guilds and of medieval corporations with their relative autarchy, and especially, with their secret spirituality, their superiority with respect to mere money making and activist-productive agitation: naturally, to the extent that this is still possible in the world of today, devastated by the machine and chained to the elusive determinisms of an omnipotent international finance. The Fascist "revolution" preserved the monarchy - and this is already a lot - but it has not managed to bring monarchy back from a mere symbol to a living power. Monarchy, even in the context of Fascism, remains unfortunately a monarchy which "rules but does not govern". Besides, the so-called "hierarchies" of Fascism are almost always composed only of mere party leaders, often people who have risen up from below, without name of true spiritual tradition, furnished more by the skill of instigating the "tribunes of the people" or of "mercenary leaders" in the secular sense of the Renaissance rather than truly aristocratic figures.

Carried away in struggles and in the concerns for practical politics, Fascism seems to lose interest in creating a hierarchy in the higher sense, which depends on purely spiritual values and which has only scorn for all the contaminations proceeding from "culture" and modern intellectualism, so as to shift once again the centre onto something which is above the secular limitation as well as the religious one. The Fascist evocation of Roman symbols is still very far from being an evocation of the Roman-pagan idea, not just the military, but also the sacred, idea of the *Imperium*, which would make clear the whole compromising and purely opportunistic aspect of the union of an integral Fascism with any interpretation of the Judeo-Christian religion. Thus, the fact that the Fascist conception of the estate would seem to be essentially secular, "political", at most, "ethical", makes even us, pagan imperialists, consider as "better than nothing" the situation by virtue of which Fascism, notwithstanding the contradiction, pays to the Roman Church - as bearer of a universal otherworldly authority, if not another tribute, the acknowledgment of its primacy. To the same extent that these limits could be overcome, Italy, on the road of Fascism, could be among the first peoples which the provisional traditional and aristocratic restoration calls to higher destinies.

As far as Germany is concerned, considering the state of struggle in which it still finds itself today, it is above all a matter of bringing to light the ideals and the myths which could best orient the currents made impatient by the current situation. If the swastika, the Aryan pagan sign of the sun and of the flame, which burns thanks to its own power, belongs certainly to the symbols which, better than others, could lead to a true Germanic rebirth, nevertheless, we have to

acknowledge that the name of the political party which has recovered it as emblem, and which today is revolutionising Germany in a Fascist sense, is most unfortunate. As a matter of fact, leaving aside the reference to the workers' class, both "nationalism" and "socialism," are elements which match up poorly with the whole German tradition, and it would be clearly necessary to be convinced that what is needed instead by Germany is a counter-revolution against democratic socialism. The reconstituted Harzburg Front already indicated the right way: a movement of anti-Marxist and anti-democratic revolt that summoned itself in the face of the same conservative and traditional elements. It will be necessary to take care that the "socialist" moment - even if it is a "national socialism" - does not take the upper hand, leading the whole thing to the framework of a mass phenomenon, which gathers around the momentary prestige of a leader. Surely, many claims for "social justice" are justified, and the revolt against capitalist oligarchy is even a presupposition for the restoration of qualitative and aristocratic order; therefore, it should not be forgotten that, so long as it is only about this, one still remains - even if with an opposite sign - on the same plane as the one on which Marxism acted and beyond which it did not grant a right to anything. The imprint of a tradition of order, of discipline, and of aristocracy has still remained with the German people. They have to remain faithful to this tradition and to rebuild the metapolitical element in which it can find a higher justification. In Germany, that the democratic-republican regime is only an interregnum, a transitional stage, is a conviction that always takes hold in the best minds.

In specific and stormy circumstances, dictatorship can turn out to be a necessary phenomenon, but it could never hold as a true and sufficient solution. It can apply insofar as it could perhaps represent a way of rebuilding what essentially an outer force - the destiny of an era lost after an extraordinary tension - has destroyed. This is naturally a matter of principle and not of persons. It is a matter of the type of regime. As we said at the beginning, monarchy - which as empire, in its supremacy over every single autonomous state, gave us a small picture of what an integral transnational European function could be - is the sounder base for the lasting preservation of a tradition and for the formation of a strongly personalised virile hierarchy; a hierarchy which would rest upon Aryan-feudal principles of service and of loyalty, and not on any "law" or on any of the "social truths" which have been insinuated with the coming to power of the caste of the merchants, and, finally, the caste of the serfs.

Naturally, a further requirement for Germany is to rid itself of all the substances of decomposition which have manifested since the post-war years in the many

forms of a defeatist-pacifist, vague, coarse, vulgar-realistic literature. The antithesis which becomes established, on the one hand by means of a professional, battered, secular, and incompetent rationalism and on the other hand by the modern romanticism of life and the irrational, must be overcome by claiming the right to a new realism of a transcendent character in which the ideal of culture in a classical, supra-rational, Dorian-oriented sense, can take on a new form; we must impress on the spirit, the soul, and the body from above, in silence and dignity, its precise law; filled, as far as we are concerned, with revulsion for the world of the men of letters, of learned people, and of insignificant men, in the dance around the complexes of *eros* and of the engine of the economy.

Considering the reservations already brought out against a doctrine of race one-sidedly understood, anti-Semitism is a further preliminary point for a German recovery. But, proceeding down to the bottom in that direction, one will realise that Judaism, which Germany is already fighting, is only one side of a still greater enemy: that anti-Semitism leads necessarily to the alternative offered by the profession of Christian religion, or rather of fidelity towards our true tradition, by the will of a new fully Nordic-solar and, therefore, pagan spirituality as a higher integration of our weakened and scattered forces in the dark age of the West. A radical anti-Semitism is possible only to the extent that there is at the same time an anti-Christianism. Only on the basis of an Aryo-pagan spirituality can a universal antithesis to Semitism develop, as just as universal a phenomenon, whose modern economic and social forms are only specific particular aspects on the material plane.

To favour on that basis the union of the two Eagles - the Roman and the German - is the first problem to be resolved of the future Europe. It is a matter of seeing if there will be enough courage and intransigence and if there will arise men capable of maintaining themselves at the heights of this "myth", so that they can affirm it as a "must be!" of a future reality. And the consciousness that only our two peoples can defend ancient Europe should give us enough power to allow us to overcome everything that, on the radical or political plane, might constitute an obstacle to an agreement.

In anticipation of the political upheavals which should indicate to Europe the way to a higher destiny, in the meantime it is necessary to take inner action, which is essentially this: to arrive at the creation of a state of mind and a lifestyle which, little by little, approaches the traditional type. The connection points and the primordial forces can be found again more deeply which, behind-the-scenes, thanks to those "invisible leaders" of whom we spoke at the beginning, will be

able to slow down the fall and to counterbalance those powers - themselves extra-human - which have contributed to the decline of the West.

Ghibelline Restoration

To conclude this series of considerations we must go deeper into the problem - just pointed out - of the relationship between the ideal of the new European civilisation and Catholicism. From the purely doctrinal point of view, it is not advisable to affirm that, given we have said, we have already given an unequivocal answer to this problem. But here it is about descending to a more contingent level, bearing in mind the principles through which movements of a political character can be strengthened today.

It must be stressed that we intend to speak specifically of Catholicism and not of Christianity in general. Certainly, a Catholic would not be such if he did not uphold that Catholicism is Christianity and that the Church represents the legitimate and sole heir of Christ. This "orthodox" conviction of his, however, does not change the fact that Christianity, in connection with Judaism, has been the ground which, directly or indirectly, formed a whole very far from being reduced to pure Catholicism. We have already pointed out in what powers the Semitic-Christian factor can be found, leaving aside the current which, to a certain degree, has been Romanised by the city of the Eagle and the Fasces. We do not need to waste other words here on our attitude towards those powers. It is Catholicism, in the narrow sense that we must deal with now.

The fact is that Catholicism, with its great hierarchical apparatus, with its semblance of something stable, eternal, and universal, still exerts a seductive magic on any. This implies that, for some, the concept of tradition is based inevitably on Catholic tradition and someone, most recently, in Italy, has not hesitated to state officially that, if Rome is still the entry of a universal idea, it is such only in the Catholic Church. Besides, until just recently, many great traditional monarchies of Europe were Catholic and the legitimist idea was defended essentially on a Catholic basis. Many modern attempts at a return to the universal Middle Ages are based on the premise that Catholicism has been the main force of that period.

All this is true, and yet it only shows how the horizon of modern man has narrowed. The acknowledgement of Catholicism is possible inasmuch as the sense of a system of values of a very different dimension and of a very different purity has been lost. We just said it above: for the one who has nothing, Catholicism is at least something. Against the usurpations of a "secular" or "ethical" State, a State

which at least acknowledges the authority represented by the Church as a higher and universal authority, for us, is undoubtedly a value. In spite of this, it is a question of having courage and of seeking thoroughly the elements for which Catholicism would be approved; then, of observing with clear eyes if these elements are present in Catholicism in a form beyond which a higher one is unthinkable.

These elements - to limit ourselves to the principal ones - have already been mentioned: a law of order, an acknowledgement of the supernatural, a principle of universality.

As far as the first point is concerned, whoever finds in the Church a principle of order must naturally leave out of consideration a past in which it has certainly not always appeared under this aspect. But there is more. Even in the Bolshevik ideal there is a principle of order - consequently one should pinpoint which principle of order is being talked about, then examine to what degree a connection exists between the chosen principle and the fundamental premises of Catholic doctrine. As for the last question, the answer could not be doubtful: the embarrassment of the selection that demonstrates it on the basis of texts, encyclicals and syllabi would remain, that the Catholic ideal of order is essentially that of coordination, and surely not that of hierarchy, and that it is not interested in the specifically political form assumed by the individual States, provided that their subordination to the Church and to Catholic doctrines endures. Catholicism, basically, remains Christianity, as "socialism" of the peoples - under a sort of paternal supervision which favours their spiritual levelling - this is the ideal of order which is most congenial to it than any other. Is this the ideal which could attract the best forces of European restoration? Of those who do not forget about the heritage of their most noble Aryan past? Certainly not. Instead, to the extent that Catholicism, in spite of everything, would represent the hierarchical ideal, those forces could find support in the Church.

Besides, from that point of view the fact is that everything good and great that the Church has managed to achieve over the centuries would find its justification not so much in the doctrinal affirmations of early Christianity and of orthodox philosophy itself but rather in the Roman element, which it partially revitalised and made its own. But if this is true, an unconscious return to Catholicism could only be a way of going beyond Catholicism, appealing directly to the pre-Christian, Roman, vital, and creative tradition, where compromise ends and those imperial forces which, when assumed by Catholicism, were enough to cause a Protestant opposition, are found in their pure state. The judgement of Maurras on the Church as principle of order belongs to a rather similar ambit of ideas. Italian Fascists - if it

is not about the most vulgar political opportunism - could recognise the Church only according to the possibility of linking the Caesarean idea of Rome with Catholicism. And it would not be difficult to find other examples of that kind.

Let us get to an even more particular point: to Catholicism as base of the legitimist doctrine with respect to divine right. Even here, a distinction needs to be made. In the first place, it is a matter of recognising everything that in Catholicism has been in contradiction with this doctrine. Let us not forget that it was precisely the Church which, for the first time in the West, upheld the doctrine of natural right, that is to say, of the popular origin and profane nature of royalty, against the Ghibelline thesis of the "two suns" and of the principle of supernaturalism of the Empire. This, because the Church understood clearly that, in the context of a doctrine of divine right full understood - as was the case from the Hohenstaufens on - not much room would remain for its hegemonic aspirations. Therefore, if Catholicism has come to support the thesis of divine right, there is a further compromise in this. This doctrine, insofar as it creates a supernatural basis for the premise of legitimate power, is in fact only the reduction of a much more concrete, ancient and traditional doctrine, that of royal divinity, to which we have repeatedly referred. Would Catholicism perhaps wish to retract the admiration of Gelasius I that "after Christ no man can be at the same time king and priest", as was the case in our Aryan and pagan traditions? Would it perhaps know how to understand the divine right of the Ruler in a different way from the mere condition in which the Church "acknowledges" it as such only nominally, or even by a "consecration" which - already excluded for centuries from true and proper sacraments - could represent today nothing but an empty symbol and a mere ceremonial. Once again: Catholicism is too little. We repeat that the principle of divine right must be understood concretely and not in a formal and conventional manner: it must be understood in the sense that an actually deified being, as person - beyond any convention and any exterior acknowledgement from another authority - showing an extra-human nature, has the true and legitimate right to rule. Therefore, once again, what could lead us to Catholicism leads us beyond Catholicism and, to views like those which are typical of the great pre-Christian traditions, shows us a complete, definite and solid whole.

Let us now take into consideration the second point: the value of Catholicism in that it defends a metapolitical point of view and guides souls towards a supernatural order. Even here, it must first be said that, to be able to recognise this value in Catholicism, we must leave out of consideration everything that, as Christianity, is presented instead as a romantic, passionate, and sentimental reduction, and humanised in its behaviour towards the divine. In spite of this - after

materialism and secularism have insinuated themselves everywhere as a cancer in the modern world - a higher right must be recognised, in a totally general way, to a system which shifts the barycentre to something truly supernatural. Certainly, this is only a premise. Beyond the problem of the relationship with the supraworld, the problem remains of examining the nature of such a relationship. And it is here that - as is known - the greater and insurmountable obstacle is found, for us imperialists, for an acknowledgement of Catholicism. We said that two fundamental attitudes towards the supernatural are possible: the solar, virile, assertive one, corresponding to the ideal of traditional sacred royalty, and the lunar, feminine, religious, passive one, corresponding to the sacerdotal ideal. The priest, however powerful, is conscious of turning to God as Lord whom he serves and before whom he humbles himself. He has every power from God and he is only an intermediary of spirit. It is especially the Semites who have carried this behaviour to an extreme degree, in depicting in almost masochist colours the subjection of the creature and the pathos of their distance in principle from the Omnipotent. Instead, the traditional sacred king was himself of a divine nature and the "gods" were his peers; he was, like them, of a "celestial" stock, he had the same blood as they; he was thus a centre, an affirmative, free, and cosmic principle. Then, if our primordial tradition, that of our purest race, is a tradition of the "solar" type, we must not delude ourselves: the will of restoration corresponding to this tradition, sooner or later, will be in conflict with Catholicism - precisely as happened in the Ghibelline Middle Ages; unless Catholicism, on the basis of what we are going to say, agrees to recognise the true hierarchical place proper to a religious system.

A similar problem, rather, even independent from the one which has just been dealt with, arises as far as the last point is concerned: the value of Catholicism as principle of universality. We have already emphasised that, if anti-Catholicism were limited to the affirmation of particularistic, strictly racialist, nationalist-totemist idea, we would not hesitate, in spite of everything, to declare ourselves in favour of Catholicism. But instead, if, on an exceptional and provisional basis, one is satisfied with the acknowledgement of the higher value and of the higher right proper to what is universal, a further problem arises, insofar as there is universality and universality, as there is a solar form and a lunar form with respect to the supernatural. After everything which has been said up to this point, it is not necessary to lay stress on this conclusion, clear as it should be now for everyone: as against solar, imperial - and hierarchical - based universality, culminating in the ideal of royal divinity, there is lunar, ecclesial - and "socialist" - based universality, culminating in the priest as slave of God. Which of these two universalities, we Aryans, we heirs of the sacred Caesars and of the royal sons of Thor and Odin, will we ask for a new European civilisation? The most secret voice of our blood must

give the answer to this question and our spiritual courage must be able to affirm it against the habits of thought, prejudice, superstition, and false traditions which have insinuated themselves into the various European races.

What place and what function could the Church continue to have in the context of a universal imperial civilisation? We are attempting to answer this question in the most unequivocal manner. To be able to do so, it is necessary to go back over what has already been said on the relationship between Wisdom and faith.

The principle of inequality, on which the traditional spirit was based, establishes as an axiom that, according to the diversity of men and their natural possibilities, there are very different ways to enter into relationship with the divine. For the best - who will always be a minority - it is possible to develop a link directly to the divine, transforming themselves into it and possessing it as a living and real state of their own experience: this is the solar path, the initiatory ideal. For the others, for the masses, it is not possible to actualise this kind of transformation and realisation. In them, the bonds of human nature are stronger. Another path is open to them: to connect themselves by a vow to something which is offered to them in the form of a particular, real, and transcendent being - that is God in the theistic concept. In place of the knowledge of the divine, faith in the divine supplants it; in place of experience, dogma; in place of the technique of overcoming and of real participation, prayer, fear of God, and religiosity; in place of the sense of sufficiency and supra-personality, insufficiency, and dependence upon the Omnipotent.

So there is a "religious" system which has its place and its justification also in the traditional world, insofar as it pertained to the masses and was offered as a substitute to those for whom the path of aristocratic, super-religious, and initiatory fulfilment was precluded. The principle of hierarchy extended to the spiritual domain but, beyond popular and devotional religion, beyond the worship and faith for the masses, there prevailed without contradiction an initiatory doctrine, an esoterism, a tradition of Wisdom and of rite, which was originally the privilege of princes and nobility. This way, any tradition can accept in the full sense, and justify without scorn, those who know and those who do not know, provided that there is only one axis, provided that there is no way out, provided that those who do not know, or who only assume they know, acknowledge, revere, and praise those who are above them.

In this full conception, the system of the Catholic Church could represent only a system corresponding precisely, in an approximate manner, to that of the popular

religion of ancient civilisations. Conflict with Catholicism is thus irremediable only to the extent that it does not acknowledge its "place"; insofar as it claims to be the higher value, the religion *par excellence*, above which nothing could ever be found and outside of which there are only deviations and errors; in short, to the extent that it does not have or does not want to have any sense for a hierarchy of values which, objectively, are higher than everything which is "religion".

It is not necessary to notice that it is precisely this spirit of intolerance and of limitedness, which gave form to early Christianity and above all to Judaism, so as to assume the features of a true reversal of those values peculiar to traditional elites, in favour of those belonging to the lower cases: this is why pagan, aristocratic virtues, were called "splendid vices", the type of the sage and of the initiate becomes the "enemy of God", and the qualities of sufficiency, of calm and conscious force for self-realisation, is stigmatised as Luciferian pride. All this has already been emphasised by Nietzsche and there is no need to repeat it here. We have alluded, in general, to the phenomenon of usurpation - which already manifested itself in antiquity - of the castes of priests, which appropriated to themselves power and sacred functions, originally privileges of the kings.

But, coming back to the present, it must naturally be affirmed in the clearest terms that those values, vis-a-vis those to which the Church, with a return to normality and true hierarchy, would be forced to accept, are not at all present in reality. In the modern world, what is completely missing is the counterpart of an ideality which, even if taking root as the Church in a supernatural origin and purpose, still does not represent the religious pole, but the solar pole of spirit, and forms the soul of a universality, not of the socialist-lunar, but rather of the imperial type. And we think we made ourselves clear enough, so that no one can think that we could support an anti-Catholicism which represents the attempt of a temporal or national power to arrogate to itself a spiritual authority, even if of the merely religious type. In spite of everything, the fact remains that, in the case of the principle and of the myth, for our awakening the concept of a complete order must be developed unequivocally in which the Church - let us repeat - could be admitted, insofar as expression of the spirituality of those who can only "believe" - remains hierarchically dependent upon the Empire, understood as incarnation of the royal spirituality of those who "know" and "are". The Eagle above the Cross, the solar symbol of the law of the Fathers (Empire) above the lunar one of the law of the Mothers (the Mother Church). It is only in this way that one can speak of a full traditionalism and return to an order of justice and of normality.

The light of the same origin proves to us, in effect, the legitimacy of this idea. It is only when the Aryan primordial stocks of India split up and came into contact with the adulterating forces of the races originating from the South, of the *purohita*, which was originally the priest in relation of dependence upon the sacred king, united with the king - according to the precise formula of the ritual - as the wife to the husband and the earth to heaven, that the Brahman, in the sense of a dominating caste of priests, arose. In China, in ancient Rome, in ancient Hellas, the rite was essentially the privilege of the king, and the sacerdotal caste, when it did not identify with aristocracy, was subordinated to it. This same can be said of the primordial Nordic stocks: it seems that the Norwegian kings were the only ones to celebrate the rite, and, among the Germans, if there ever were any priests, they still did not have the supremacy and the dignity of divine kings and leaders. In Egypt, it is only at the end of the twentieth dynasty that the sacerdotal caste managed to seize power and to give birth to the dynasty of the great priests of Thebes, to the detriment of the authority of the solar kings. In the first three centuries of Christianity, the Catholic Church itself was only an official organ dependent on the Empire, and, in the Councils, the bishops remitted the sanction of their decisions to the prince, not only in disciplinary matters, but also in dogmatic matters. To the Merovingian and the Carolingian kings pontiffs paid the tribute of acknowledgment, as expressed in the formula: "Melchizedek noster, merito rex atque sacerdos, complevit laicus religionis opus" - "vos gens sancta estis atque regale estis sacerdotum"³; and, it is said that after Charlemagne had received the Roman crown, Leo III prostrated himself before him according to the ancient tradition: "Post laudes ab apostolico more antiquorum principum adoratus est"⁴ - the Liber Pontificalis says. These references, taken from among many others which could without doubt be added, show us the traditional orthodoxy of our Ghibelline concept: they show us what justice demands, or that, in a fully understood hierarchical ideal, the Cross - as sacerdotal symbol - has a function and a positive side, if it remains subordinated to the Eagle. To the extent that the Church cannot do it or does not want it, it immediately places itself in the context of the anti-traditional, destructive and paralysing forces; it lowers itself to the problematic Semitic-Christian factor, which, as one of the main causes of the decadence of our world, can only find in us anti-moderns implacable and inexorable enemies.

³ "Our Melchizedek, in merit both king and priest / a layman perfected the work of religion" from Venantius Fortunatus Carmina 2.10, "De ecclesia Parisiaca"

⁴ After the hymns of praise, he was worshipped by the pope in the way of the ancient princes.

Conclusion

So, we believe we have said enough because the main features of our imperial myth have been made clearly recognisable. Here it is only about a standpoint. The systematic and comprehensive development of the premises which can consolidate this standpoint in a form which is not, a sphere, that of a military campaign, is found in our other writings.

In the beginning we said that European civilisation must plan on a radical upheaval, without which it is doomed to collapse. The plebeian superstition, according to which Western man has believed in the chimera of development and to which he has devoted his material conquest of the world, has unfortunately vanished. To speak of decline and of the West is no longer, like yesterday - or like in the century of the Enlightenment and in the Jacobin custom of the goddess Reason - an absurd heresy. More or less everywhere, the ultimate results, to which the praised "civilisation" had to lead, are made visible. Confronted with this result, it seems that some men return to their past, so that new forces might arise for the reconquest.

And this is why an appeal, which this book intends to represent, is not lacking justification today. There are still men who do not belong to this modern world and whom nothing in this world could lead astray, exalt, or humiliate - but who nevertheless are ready to fight this world with all their strength, as soon as it is time to.

Everyone knows of the saga of the Ghibelline emperor who awaits his awakening in the "mountain" to fight the last battle with his loyal men. This will occur when the hordes of Gog and Magog have demolished the symbolic wall which barred their way, and they will fling themselves into the conquest of the world- the one who translates the meaning of this apocalyptic myth into reality cannot avoid thinking that the moment is no longer distant. The hordes of Gog and Magog are the demons of the collective and the emergence of the socialist mass-man, omnipotent all over the world, in spirit as in matter. Opposed to this, the imperial Ghibelline symbol represents the call to muster the still healthy forces.

We have not spoken much of "politics", of social or economic reforms, since the thought of reaching a revival in this way is simply ridiculous: it would be like applying remedy on the sick parts of the body when the blood is already infected or poisoned. What only matters is the establishment of an order of values so that by their realisation the dark destinies which, even on the material plane, weight

on Europe can be averted. To the one who tells us that this is not politics and reality, we calmly answer that he no longer knows what politics mean, what reality means.

The exaltation created by moments of danger, crisis, and alarm is composed of various, often irrational and contradictory, elements. Consequently, if one examines the various contemporary social and cultural, reactionary and reformist movements, one will find in them many impure factors, conditioned from below, passions belonging in one way or another to the same evil against which they would like to defend themselves. But, in a few movements, one can find something better, a will in which the possibility of a true revival secretly may awaken.

The path to this must be pointed out.

For the unbroken, the unvanquished, we propose the symbol rooted deep in Tradition and assert that it is only by a return to solar spirituality, to the living vision of the world, to the virile and pagan *ethos*, and to the imperial ideal, as sacred inheritance of our Nordic-Aryan blood, that the forces of the European revolt will be able to burn in that soul where they are still lacking, and only this can give them an absolute self-consciousness, only this can push them to fracture the circle of the "dark age" of the West.

Appendix

The essays in this appendix expand on Evola's understanding of Romanity, myth, and race.

Introduction

The Order of Nations

In the September, 1941 issue of *La Vita Italiana*, Julius Evola wrote a review of *Das Reich der Volker* by the German political theorist, Hans Keller. The first part of Evola's essay is a review of the book. In the second part, whose translation appears below as the *Future Order of Nations*, Evola provides his own conception of the role of the Volk. Clearly, Evola supports neither Keller's naturalism nor the role of the Volk as the vanguard or the base for political organisation.

In the Traditional perspective, the Volk is lunar or passive and therefore has to rely on a spiritual and political hierarchy for its full development. Thus Evola opposes any sort of nationalism on the basis of an ethnicity or a race. In rejecting that sort of neo-Nordicism, Evola leads us back to the ideal of Romanity.

In this analysis of the German legal scholar Hans Keller, we see recognisable themes. In particular, Keller comes surprisingly close to the contemporary ideal of Ethnopluralism. In Klemmer's scheme, each people is free to define itself, to realise itself, and live independently of each other in their own enclaves. Evola rejects this conception on several grounds.

The first and most obvious is Keller's naturalistic starting point. Evola points out that for every Aryan civilisation, the authority of their law was based on its relationship to the supernatural, and the lawgivers themselves were considered "divine". So Klemmer's view has nothing at all to do with the self-understanding of the European peoples of the past. Keller regards such claims as fantasies and projections of earthly leaders onto an imaginary plane. Any rightist movement must be related to a transcendental tradition; the pseudo-tradition of neo-paganism would not qualify for reasons that are made clear.

The second difficulty with Keller's thesis is the very problem of defining a "volk". Keller speaks of nations of destiny or becoming, without specifying their actual destiny or the goal of the becoming. As such, it is not very helpful. Furthermore, it implies that there will be nations in a lesser or greater state of becoming. Would the latter have to treat the former as minors and guide their development?

In common with similar idea held by some movements today, Keller blamed “inorganicity and leveling” on the preceding religious Regnum. Evola rejects this thesis. Keller’s ethno-pluralism is itself deracinated, since it lacks any content, or principles, that a supernatural conception of the Regnum would provide. Relations between the ethnocentric conclaves are *ad hoc*, relativistic, and contingent. In contrast, Evola envisions a supranational Imperium, in which the emperor power furnishes the structure to the other. This, he claims, is a real unity, opposed to the merely nominal unity defined by Keller.

The final objection is devastating. Keller sees a pacifistic union of separate peoples, each according to its nature. But Evola asks the question, “what if the nature of a people is to be a warrior race?” This, Evola claims, is an essential part of Indo-European civilisations. This will blow up the ideal of peaceful ethnocentric enclaves, since one (or more) of them will seek to establish an Empire over the others; this an essential feature and not a historically contingent event that may or may not occur.

In opposition to Keller, Evola declares the Tradition is Roman, it forms a union with preceding traditions, with the Hyperborean tradition as its ultimate beginning. The Volk is a modern invention, opposed to Tradition. Its roots are found in Rousseau and the French Revolution. The life and traditions of early Germanic tribes is poorly documented, relying mostly on some comments of Tacitus, and the Eddas, which were preserved much later by post-pagans.

Nevertheless, since the Germans were Aryans, we can surmise about them, based on what we know of other Aryan civilisations. The Roman tradition, particularly that of the Middle Ages, is much more fully documented. Hence, that is where we put our focus. The State organises the people and relates them to spiritual reality. However, this is not a superstructure whose purpose is only to aggrandize its leaders and oppress the masses, as some in the New Right believe.

This orientation to transcendent values is a feature not only of the Christian Middle Ages, but also the authentic pagan traditions. Some civilisations may expand, creating a supranational organisation. But this is not merely an administrative function, hegemony, or acting as the “world police”. Rather, it is to spread its vision of a spiritual transcendental reality. Blocks of nations will arise, united by common transcendental values.

The Spirit of Roman of Civilisation

With this article from the December 1940 issue of *La Vita Italiana*, Evola takes up the idea of Romanity and its continuity beyond the Roman Empire itself. While different from the mystical vision of Guido de Giorgio, based on Dante, it is equally spiritual. Following a conception of Spengler, the difference between culture and civilisation is noted. Along the way, the features of the Old Right are delineated.

That requires a *hierarchical order*, based on a *supreme, divine and transcendent power*.

Race and the Myth of the Origins of Rome

This essay by Julius Evola was originally published in the April 20, 1940 issue of the journal *La Difesa della Razza*.

To the modern mind this article can be understood as the “Noble Lie” about the birth of Rome. From the point of view of profane history, these myths are simply superstitions. Evola, on the other hand, drawing on Vico, Bachofen, Rene Guenon, *inter alia*, views such symbols, myths, and legends as witnesses to the inner spirit of a people, which cannot be grasped simply in the accumulation of historical facts. Logically, this technique leads him to move beyond the merely physical and zoological understanding of race to his theory of the races of the spirit.

In this first part, Evola brings to light two aspects of the myth. First is the idea that the founder was born from the union of a god with a mortal woman. The god confers spiritual qualities on the founder. In this case, Mars, as the god-father of Romulus and Remus, is the spirit of warrior virility, not just on the twins, but on the entire city.

The second aspect is being saved from the Tiber as infants. For Evola, this represents the hero, the seer, etc., men who above the flow of time. The defect in Evola's methodology is that he is left in the same position as the profane historian: the third person perspective. Although he sees more deeply, he is still an outsider and does not participate in the myth. So, yes, for him, too, it is a Noble Lie. For the Romans, Mars was a living being, not some abstract force, and the story of their miraculous rescue from the Tiber was considered history, not legend.

There is the symbolism of fig tree, which was also the tree associated with Buddha's awakening. The next symbol is the She-Wolf who sucks the twin babies. The wolf curiously has a dual symbolism: it can represent both the forces of light and the forces of darkness. This is often depicted as the battle between order, or Logos, with Chaos.

The spirit of Rome is exemplified by the manifestation “of a principle of light and of order, of an ethic and a vision of life that is witness to the Aryan spirit”. Here it is made clear that the Roman race is known through its spirit, not its genetics.

The Mysticism of Race in Ancient Rome

This essay by Julius Evola was originally published in the May 20, 1940 issue of the journal *La Difesa della Razza*.

By "race", Evola means both something less and something more than is meant by the world today. "Less" in the sense that a race refers to any group of people of a common stock or lineage. "More" in the sense that he includes the transcendent, spiritual, and mystical aspect of race, not just biological or physiological characteristics. In this essay, he describes the mystical element of race in ancient Rome. A lineage was founded by a spiritual father, not necessarily the common biological ancestor; this father determined the cult, laws, and customs of his lineage.

Note on translation: I have left the words lares, manes, penates, genius (NOT a clever person), gens and gente untranslated, following the model of *The Ancient City* by Fustel de Coulanges. The interested reader should consult that work for the proper definitions.

First of all, this essay confirms that the aristocratic interiority is centred on the higher mind, the mens, the ajna chakra, the seat of intellect and intuition, that commands the lower soul and the body. To be blunt, that describes the true "aristocrat of the soul".

The second is the idea of destiny and the spiritual impetus behind it. A people, a family, and so on, have certain spiritual qualities at their origin. The purpose of rites and worship was to keep those qualities present in order to project them into the future. The modern mind cuts off the past in order to create a future with no relationship to it. But human nature will not be denied. Instead of being guided by past heroes and sagas, able to distinguish good and evil, the deracinated contemporaries will latch onto any a spiritual influences at random. Devoid of true identity, they will create factitious identities.

Future Order of Nations

In primis et ante omnia we cannot adhere to the mythology of the *Volk*, of the "people nation", so dear to Keller, who makes them the base of his juridical edifice. Mussolini once spoke ironically of the "mysterious entity that calls itself the people". "People", be it only as "Volk", is a simple myth that always and inevitably sounds like demagoguery: of the type which is accompanied by intense polemical applications to disvalue and degrade the significance of everything that is the State, the formative political force from above. Keller stands on the most naive optimistic natural law: he believes that the people exist as a very precise entity, equipped with its own consciousness, its own will, determined by "eternal laws" superior to all political forms in which they are concretised, a depository of determinate values. We can only speak of similar things to some naive types for whom, today, the natural meaning of nationality (quite different from every "nationalism" and deprived of a "political" character) becomes something extremely tenuous in the face of becoming the "mass" of the people and the advent of a civilisation no longer based on truly traditional values. Hegel said, "the people is that part of the State that does not know what it wills". That is exact. Our fascist idea is that the people, the nation, exists only as the State, in the State, and in a certain measure, only through the work of the State.

But our State is not the end of Keller's artificial antitheses: it is not a juridical superstructure, a mere fact of "power", an external power without basis. Our State is ethical and spiritual. It has the value of an *entelechy*, i.e., of a formative force of the nation and of the "people", who otherwise would remain a diffuse and unformed reality, vegetating on a naturalistic plane of life, without any metaphysical, ethical, or truly heroic tension.

Our point of view is detached both from the idea of natural law and collectivising of the people, as well as the abstract, juridical, and rationalistic of the State. We are realists. We do not believe in the "people", instead we believe in a guiding, formative elite, and, wherever it happens, leaders of the people. Keller has in mind the State only as *caput mortuum* i.e., as that which became in some cases, when the political structure created by leaders and elites personifying living traditions depersonalised themselves, objectified themselves, created an excuse to justify themselves, giving to understand the existence of public autonomous powers and neutral juridical forms or norms to order to obtain in that way recognition to which the direct affirmation and the prominent prestige by the high stature of the Leaders and by superior princes was not enough.

To reach the same goal, i.e., to hold it without exhibiting it, along other directions, therefore, it is joined to the creation of a myth opposite in appearance to that of the neutral "State", but in reality answering to the same end: the myth of the "people". Keller lets himself avoid the admission that the idea of the *Volk* was

"discovered" in 1933. Even if the date is not for us so recent, having some precise antecedents especially in democratic nationalism and French Jacobinism (in fact even in France, as the antithesis to an excess of *statism*, determined by the centralising, absolutistic, and anti-aristocratic work followed by the king sup to Philip the Fair, left, for the first time, the mystique of the nation, of the people a source of every law, not putting up with any authority from above) - even, therefore, if the Volk was not even discovered in 1933, only it stands in fact that the mythology referring to it is new, it was unknown by preceding civilisations and there came to life for precise political and propagandistic reasons: the "people" and *Volk*, far from being notions having, today, a real content, are two idea-forces, two myths taken up by a power to affirm a given political system, determined by circumstance, to capture and organise the forces - in themselves directionless and apt to follow very different suggestions - of the true people and to strengthen therefore a given type of political authority. For the less important socialising tendentially, it wasn't as necessary to us in Italy to have recourse even to this myth: to us the spiritual idea of the State, and moreover, the direct authority that proceeds from a Duce and from a Monarch were sufficiently based to lead to the same result.

Keller says that all the differences between *statualistic* law and one based on the idea of Volk lies in the judgement on human nature: in the first case, as in every idea of Reich and Imperium of Roman Catholic origin, it is pessimistic and does not have faith in human nature, while in the second case it has. But what is this "human nature"? We are not pessimists, but realists. We believe in human nature, but not of everyone, less than ever in the collectivity as the mass, whose psychology we know well; instead, we believe in that of the minority who create the States, who animate the peoples, who lead the collectivities to the heights which they could never reach alone. Neither statism, therefore, nor natural law, but the aristocratic hierarchical ideal, without the charade that is necessary only to demagogues and weak natures. That is what we mean by Roman and Aryan realism.

Keller says: "only the State is important to the Romanesque people, even if they serve additively nationalistic motives."

We say that we can even renounce the additive motives; we value the Mussolinian idea, according to which the people is something weak and blind, before they came to constitute a reality and a unitary will, commentated by higher meanings with the birth of the State. But we are not statist, because we do not make an idol of the State, as Keller and certain German jurists make of the Volk: because behind the State, in our view, there is somebody, there are Leaders, Monarchs - if you want, there is a "super race", in which alone "nation", "people", "race", "tradition" cease to be abstractions. Every great "people" is always comprised of various influences, various racial elements, various traditions. It is the work of the elites to choose, to affirm a given element from among them all, to

subordinate every other to it, leading back in that way to a precise order which otherwise would have remained heterogeneous and arrested in the form of a confused potentiality.

Keller believes in immanent laws of the people, given by "nature", respected and followed in themselves, not originating from any power from above or however personified: in any case, having nothing to do with a "beyond". This is a "faith" like any other. In reality, it would be difficult to adduce a single legal system of ancient peoples, the Aryans included, for whom the authority of the laws was not related to a "divine" origin from above, and was not considered to have been introduced by legislators themselves "divine". But we already know Keller's point of view: instead of understanding the order proper to an earthly and temporal *Imperium* as the reflection of a transcendent order and, from another point of view, the secularisation of law and authority purely spiritual in origin, he tends to see in every idea of a spiritual *Regnum* a type of fantastic projection of the fantastic image of an earthly reign. This stands, more or less, at the intellectual level of Euhemerism.

On the other hand, Keller finds it particularly difficult to define the concept of *Volk*. In certain cases, it seems that he values the national socialist conception of it as the criterion and measure, corresponding to the formula *Volksgemeinschaft*. Where he says that the "community of nations", the hope for supranational order, will not be able to be realised until all the peoples have been realised according to the Nazi totalitarian social concept, expressed precisely by the formula mentioned. But on the other hand, he concedes:

"It is not important to see how the individual peoples conceive themselves, even if each one leaves the other free to form for themselves a given concept of their own essence and to live in conformity with it."

This is the conclusion of the analysis of the various ideas of the people, a conclusion that evidently leads to a full indifferentism and a pale norm of reciprocal tolerance on the international plane. The fact that Keller insufficiently acknowledges race to define the people; that he introduced the rather indeterminate concept of the "community of destiny" (this is a greatness that is defined depending on directions and many directions exist in the history of a great people); that, finally, he speaks of a "people in becoming", without being able to say exactly what will define the *terminus ad quem*, i.e., the definite form of such a becoming - all that goes to confirm the mythical and weak content of this conception of the *Volk*. The only coherent solution would be to assert dogmatically that nations as truly such do not exist before being "total nations" according to the national socialist formula of the *Volksgemeinschaft*.

Nevertheless, to try to assume a provision for the membership with full rights in the *orde nationum* this political form is not, evidently, to fall short of the principle of

respect of every "people", even to the point of judging them "as minors" and to putting them almost under guardianship, even under a foreign State, when it has not reached such a form?

There is more. Keller, as we saw, blames the organicity and the leveling that would be typical of every Roman or religious conception of the *Regnum*, or *Reich* if one prefers, of the nations. Such an accusation is even turned against his own conception. In the logic of this, in fact, we don't encounter any obstacle to end up in the utopian vision of an order that takes up all the peoples of the earth. And we don't encounter any obstacle through the fact that this order is rather more abstract and deprived of content of that of the now defunct League of Nations. In it, there would be a question of only taking care of of the laws of each people, of teaching them, of maintaining peace and the balance of power - in summary, a type of administrative function that does not presuppose any specific vision of the world, no higher point of reference. But, in its turn, the particularistic, relativistic, and collectivistic conception of the Volk, is the cause of that. If the authority of higher values is not recognised, it is evident that among the various "national" unities, only extrinsic relations, "gravitational" and "equilibriums" will be able to exist, which do not involve, at its foundation, anything essential. In every way for us, such an *ordo nationum* as universal order is absurd and undesirable: we conceive of the concrete, differentiated, supranational unity, decentred in a well-defined vision of the world and in well-defined values that give the tone and the internal unity to a given "imperial space". The superior civilisation of a dominating race must furnish the reference point to a succession of political ethnic minors, in order that these, rising up from simply national values, and integrating such values, they find in them the basis of understand and to feel united to each other: to actually unite, and not in the style of an indifferent tolerance of belonging to the same club.

Therefore, these supranational unities, that will put a stop to the period of particularistic, schismatic, anti-European, as well as differentiated nationalism, will be able to even be combative. We see that Keller acknowledges war, but without recognising in it any specific value, in the same way that he eventually acknowledges the State, in a transitional phase, as an instrument and pedagogue that may help tie "people" to realise themselves, finally, in a "total" form. The general intonation of his view remains pacifistic. Wherever he uses the word "power", *Macht*, Keller thinks only of oppression, tyranny, violence, distortion of the people. He barely remembers Moltke's phrase: "universal peace is only a dream, and not even a beautiful dream."

Nevertheless, since every people, according to him, should be respected according to their own inclinations, we can certainly think that there exist peoples of a warrior race and calling - we noted everything that was said, starting from Klemm and D'Eichthal, about the typological distinction of "active races" and "passive races", "conquering races" and "slave races", etc. Keller, it is true, on

the other hand, refers to research on savage tribes, where he would demonstrate natural inclinations to reciprocal respect and peace, for the purpose of challenging the idea that the natural state is the war of all against all. But much more documentation would be necessary to show such a thesis, against which, all the great Aryan history already remains: it is true, not a history of eternal war and for war itself, but history, nevertheless, which is consistent with virile and dominating natures, capable of realising superior values in battle - superior, often, to all that can come from a climate of peace of naturalistic harmony. Among the rights recognised by Keller for the people, he acknowledges the right to "their own development": it would therefore behoove us to ask why this development must be limited to the bourgeois domain of "culture and economy", with the exclusion of everything that refers to the "power" factor, where the natural inclination of such people was *exactly* that of the warrior and the heroic type. We think instead that the heroic and warrior elements are of particular importance even as the common basis of an "imperial space", i.e., of a concrete and well-articulated order between a given group of nations.

Finding it necessary, therefore, to draw a conclusion, only what refers to the polemic against an abstract juridical internationalistic normativism is acceptable in Keller's ideas, after all, up to this point that is what the idea of State has assumed in certain cases in the modern world, in full settlement and against depersonalised "neutral" forms, deprived of a substrate of quality and true strength. The points of positive reference invoked by Keller against what are nevertheless a problematic a sever, and hardly acceptable from the point of view of a tradition, that we without difficulty declare to be Roman, in order to immediately add that it in its Romanity forms a unity with the traditions characteristic of every great past civilisation, with that of ancient Aryanity at the head. In fact, as we said, this mythology of the *Volk*, of the people-nation as absolute source of every authority, is only a modern invention, that arose in Germany recently and that in Germany itself it now seems somewhat *passe*, through the same force of European events.

Keller's and other's efforts to relate it back to an ancient German tradition are artificial. We saw, as much, that Keller was constrained to condemn as non-German and "Romanizing" the very tradition of the Prussian state and to extend an analogy, he blamed the Medieval Empire. Perhaps he will be able to support himself on such a view of the primitive Germans. But such views interest us very little, because they cannot be authoritative: the "primitive" Germans are in fact only some isolated, dispersed and involute stocks of the great Aryan tree, and we have to judge and understand their traditions on the basis of that which, in a rather more complete, precise, and documented form, present to us the great Aryan civilisations of antiquity, including the Roman.

In such ancient traditions, there are so many "myths", but of a more elevated and real content than the modern myth of the "*Volk*", which, as we noted, was essentially given to traditional and dynastic Europe by French Jacobinism and has

a strongly collectivistic and anti-hierarchical flavour. According to our traditional point of view, the "nationalities" can exist only on a naturalistic plane, not yet political nor properly spiritual: in place of certain spontaneous forms of sensibility and of certain customs where, however, the primary element ends up being less the "nation" than the race. The centre and the indispensable condition of the nation as political and spiritual reality is instead the State. The State is not a mere fact of "power" or a type of abstract juridical superstructure, but an ethical and spiritual reality and a formative and discriminatory force. This force, in its turn, is connected both to an elite, to a race of leaders and to the prestige proper to them, both to transcendent, to a certain extent, values (which are not necessarily only those of the Christian religion: ancient Iran, ancient Rome, etc., teach it) that legitimate them, because there is true authority only as authority from above.

The formative power of such principles, after having unified and animated a "people", can be projected beyond its borders and, in different ways, does not exclude those of war, can give rise to higher unities, i.e., supranational, but nevertheless well defined, and ordered by a determinate law: they are the "imperial spaces". The "rank" that goes to assure to a given nation the supranational directive function cannot be measured in materialist, administrative, bourgeois pacifist terms, and as quasi-police for collective security and peace. On the contrary, it is adherence to already noted transcendental values and to the corresponding faculty of animating, transporting, making capable of energy and commitment, capable even of confronting tragedy misfortune, which is the design of such a superiority. The logic of the system doesn't lead to its extension to every nation of the world, but to its limitations and particular zones, as blocks of nations, blocks united by the same chain of an "Order", capable where it occurs, of the same heroic unanimity of a "crusade".

Leaving aside both universalistic and nationalistic myths, *the organisation of a block of the type like the European, Aryan, and Roman block is the only concrete tasks of our future and the only object if a serious consideration in regards to a new law and a new ordering of the people.*

The Spirit of Roman Civilisation

With the appearance of every new work on Roman Civilisation, we experience a certain sense of annoyance: in fact, for the most part, we take notice of books of this type only perfunctorily, they do not reveal any new idea, they repeat the clichés of earlier "positivist" interpretations, adding only the rhetorical hype of commemoration, thereby producing a pathetic effect, and whatever true meaning it has of our original tradition, it is not so much illuminated by similar writings, but rather trivialised and almost profaned.

We were therefore pleased to have been removed, at least once, from prejudices of that type in reading a very recent book of crystalline clarity written by Pietro De Francisci on the Spirit of Roman Civilisation. (*Spirito della civiltà romana*, 1940). Above all, beginning with its first chapters, we had to admit: finally there is an authoritative person who hits the mark and knows what must be considered essential in Romanity. And we also found ourselves totally consenting to the justification of the books, viz., that no constructive revolution is a creation from nothing, but has as conditions the return to elementary principles and factors, which for us can only be those of the original tradition of Rome. And De Francisci also very correctly criticises those who break our history into two parts: the history of Rome and her Empire on one side, the history of Italy on the other.

As for Corradini, so also for De Francisci, Italianity and Romanity are a single thing, or said better: they *must* be a single thing, on the basis of a decisive choice of their own callings and traditions: that is, we must exalt, consider a *sour own*, and glorify as "Italian" only what is of value to us in our history, as "Roman", and not have any leniency or mitigation for the rest. De Francisci correctly says that to bring youth to the awareness of the power and depth of the current of Romanity that spreads throughout all our medieval and modern history, eliminating wrong ideas and destroying old and new prejudices, mean not draw on precious nourishment for the ideal strength of our revolution.

Who does not see the abyss that separates similar positions from those which, nevertheless like De Francisci, had to have the direction of the fascist Istituto Nazionale di Cultura (National Institute of Culture) - we mean Gentile, who did not hesitate to assert what Romanity is for us, but only in the empty rhetoric of life and content, because for him the true Italian tradition is identified with a series of suspect thinkers and heretical rebels starting with the Renaissance, as if in fascist Italy itself no others should be seen and desired except those involved in the development of Italy of 1870? (when Italy was unified).

As the premise of his treatise, De Francisci, following up on an idea from Spengler, makes the appropriate morphological distinction between *culture* and *civilisation*. Culture, both as an intellectualistic phenomenon, as well as

refinement of the material conditions of the life of a people, has nothing to share with *civilisation*, reality. De Francisci writes this very profound passage:

“Civilisation is not only a manifestation of the prevalent intellectual activities but the complex and concrete expression of all the energies of the spirit: it is not only the ruler of man in his exterior nature, but is at the same time the dominion of man over his own human nature, the awareness of coordination with other men, of subordination to a certain hierarchical power, and of dependence by a supreme, divine and transcendent power.”

It is a unitary and organic construction which, by being such, even permeates the political field, i.e., it also presupposes a political organisation as the realiser and promoter of the fundamental values resting on the base of the organisation itself. And in this special point, we see the contrast between the idea of civilisation and the abstract conception of “culture”, as meant in its modern understanding, through which, culture would be a kingdom to itself, alienated from everything that is “political”, instead of being the highest animating and justifying force of the political, as always happened in all traditional civilisations and, at the forefront, let us admit it now, in the Roman civilisation.

Now, De Francisci studies the ancient Roman world exactly in respect to “civilisation” in this precise meaning. Rome was eminently “civilisation” and its greatness must speak to us in the sense of this unitary and anti-intellectualist deal. What was the specific face of such a civilisation? What are the fundamental, typical, and constant elements of its “style”? De Francisci considers four above all:

First of all, *clarity* and *simplicity*, founded on a precise and certain intuition of reality, and not only of visible reality, but also - it is the merit of our author to recognise it - invisible reality.

“While the Romans were realists, they never were materialists: thus few people like the Romans carried with themselves for centuries the conviction of the existence of a will and a transcendent power, to which laws must be adapted and human conduct conformed. But clarity and simplicity are the elements of grandeur.”

These are reflected - as the echo of something eternal and detached from the small events of individuals, from everything that is *pathos* and sensibility - in the monumental elements of the Roman world. Furthermore, the unity that together is organicity and solidity, founded on a balance of forces and factors, on a wise bond that surpasses and decomposes all varieties, distinctions, complications: unity as formative and organising power.

An order results from it, which, while "it was experienced as a transcendent system of principles determined by the very nature of things" (which is the ancient Aryan conception of *cosmos* or *rita*), is expressed in a rigorous, definite, and essential style: intolerance for everything that is disordered, uncertain, subjective, scattered. Precision and clarity predominate in the *ethos*, but not as only a human norm, but rather as the rigorous objectification of a supersensible reality.

In that regard, De Francisci rightly opposes those who prefer to portray the ancient Roman as dry, lacking sentiment and imagination. What, alone, remains alien from the Roman soul, was the sterile subjectivism that surrenders itself to the caprices of the arbitrary in which every moral energy is scattered and dissipated:

"But not for this reason is his interiority less rich, which consists above all in the adhesion of the spirit to the norms of a higher Order."

This is demonstrated in the three virtues of *pietas*, *fides* and *gravitas*. And, as we ourselves on other occasions have emphasised, the lack of imagination in the Romans is more a sign of superiority than inferiority: it is to be taken in the sense, as De Francisci says:

"The imagination of the Romans is not a gratuitous game of intellectual boldness, it is not the creation of a world of images detached from reality, but an instrument to seal this reality in well-defined forms to frame and organise its forces."

The same thing must be pointed out regarding the accusation made against the Romans of having degraded thought in favour of action. But what thought is this about? No one denies the scarce sympathy of the Romans for theoretical constructions. But action itself, when it proves to be coherent, consistent, and efficacious - De Francisci notes - does that not itself bear witness to a thought, or rather, a higher power of thought? All the history of the Romans stands to demonstrate that they believed in such values and held firm to principles which, through their experience, were defined, made precise, affirmed, and even assumed an ever more universal importance and applicability.

In the order of the structural element, there is a specific element in the "civilisation" of Rome, i.e., a hierarchy, in which the pre-eminence is reserved to political values: everything is assumed and organised in the operation of the State. But we were pleased to see that De Francisci avoided a double false turn in which, in this regard, he finishes the greatest part of the modern interpretations of Romanity. In fact, in the first place, such a pre-eminence of the political element is not at all to be understood according to certain modern political pretensions to the primary of temporal power over any spiritual authority. The political and religious elements in ancient Rome were an indissoluble union. The starting point of the Roman was the awareness that divine and transcendent forces exist and act bind human and historical forces. So the highest principle of

Roman "politics", and consequently of every determination of will and action, was that of conforming individual and collective life to the *fas* (divine law),

"The revealed divine will, which is the supreme law against which it is not possible to rebel without committing a *nefas*, i.e., not just a reproachable act but producing dire consequences."

After all, De Francisci had already mentioned the religious base of the first Roman law in his earlier History of Roman Law. In the new book he recalls the profound significance relative to the fact of the inseparable connection of the *imperium* of the Roman political leaders, with the *auspicium* (divination), that is to say, with a discipline having as a presupposition the possibility of coming into relationship with the divine forces and of presenting the directions, along which they were able to confirm and empower human forces and actions. Even if De Francisci doesn't go beyond an examination deeper into the meaning of the rite in the ancient world, but in that there is quite enough to clearly distance it from those, in this regard, who see only "superstitions" and "obtuse fatalism" in order to appreciate, in the Roman *ius* (law), only its positive juridical cadaver.

The other prejudice, which is often fostered in relation to the totalitarianism of Roman political civilisation, relates to *libertas* (civil liberty). But, again, it is impossible to judge the ancient word with modern measures, which then are simply false and misleading. De Francisci clearly points out all the respect that ancient Rome attributed to *libertas*: but it is a concrete *libertas*, comprising in itself the concept of limits: it is freedom as the faculty and the legitimate right of movement, of acting, of disposing oneself, and even within a well-defined space, within a positive hierarchy, where each recognises his own: *suum cuique*. So the Roman would know an exemplary balance of *auctoritas* (responsibility) or *lex* (law) and *libertas* while disregarding the democratic concept of equality characteristic of Hellenic decadence, in the surpassing individualism with a determination of limits, with an obsession with hierarchy, with a coordination of activity. And this is another of the aspects, according to which Romanity remains, for centuries, the sign and symbol of a higher political and traditional ideal.

Since we nailed down the truly valuable and, for many, the illuminative, aspect of De Francisci's new work in these terms, let's allow ourselves to make some other points.

First of all, in regard to origins: it is true that, in this respect, one hears nothing said about them today. Nevertheless, whoever has eyes sufficiently trained can recognise and discern what there is of value in regards to race and spiritual forces of the world of the origins. On the Aryan problem in Italy, on the meaning of the crossing or make up of various symbols and costumes - for example the rites of burial or cremation, solar cults and telluric-maternal cults, etc. - the spiritual relations between Etruria and Rome and so on, little or nothing is found in De

Francisci's book. Now, if one does not succeed in having a, so to speak, *dramatic* vision of the ancient Italic world, as it concerns both race and spirit, one can in no way grasp the true meaning of Rome, her battles, her mission, her destiny.

In relation to that, what is equally missing in the work of De Francisci is any investigation of what we would call the "subterranean history" of Rome. In his book, attention remains concentrated on history in the common bi-dimensional meaning of the term, even if examined with undeniable acumen. The analysis of the most profound, spiritual aspect of certain social rifts and certain oppositions of worship in Rome is not made. What was, for example, the influence that acts, in ancient Rome, through the Sibylline Books? It is a problem, among many others, of the subterranean history of Roma, whose importance is anything but to be neglected.

De Francisci, as we said, saw clearly in the connection of the human will, and therefore of action, to a more than human significance, an element characteristic of Roman reality. And it was emphasised more particularly by others that the Roman perceived essentially the revelation of the divine not in space, as a vision, but in time and in history, like action. Now, can one recognise that, without also recognising that a history of Romanity will always be incomplete, if it does not become, to a certain degree, a *metaphysics of history*, i.e., if it does not strive to grasp a symbolic content in its objective way in the more important and decisive upheavals of Romanity? The danger of digression and pure interpretations, here, naturally, is great. Nevertheless, it is necessary to do something in this direction, if Roman history is to truly speak to us. Does De Francisci know the famous introduction to Bachofen's *Legend of Tanaquil*? In this old work, even in reference to Romanity, there are methodological ideas that still are particularly important today. (Such as the interpretation of legend as history and the use of imagination or intuition to grasp it. ~ tr)

Also, De Francisci treated various problems of the imperial period, such as the importation of "Asiatic" cults and their significance, in only an "historical" way, in the current meaning of the word. The racial moment on the level of the elements of civilisation and cult, were not developed. For example: what of the Asiatic cults and forms of the same imperial cult, referring back, in spite of the degeneration of their exterior expressions, to elements of a common archaic Aryan tradition, inasmuch as, for example, certain aspects of the Augustan religious reform, in fact, call back to life some ideas forgotten or obscured by the first Romanity?

Instead, the best is the analysis made by De Francisci of the various political and social factors and various attempts of the restoration of the late imperial period. He brings to light the true use of decadence: the universal Empire could only hold on provided that the expansive moment would have a corresponding moment of deconcentration and national-racial intensification. Although indispensable, a unique supreme point of reference - the imperial divine authority - could not be

sufficient: it would have been instead necessary to provide simultaneously for the spiritual and material defense of the Italic-Roman race as the matrix privileged by elements destined to govern and command in the world. In place of that, Rome accepted cosmopolitanism, the turmoil of levelling and disarticulation. The Empire presumed to embrace universally the human species without distinction of race, peoples, or traditions, on the only basis of the supreme central divine power, and close to a break up and a "positivation" of the ancient judicial idea, at this point turning into the natural law.

On such a basis we incline to believe that contrary to the opinions of most and, it can be said, to judge by some of his comments, of De Francisci himself, Christianity or, at least, a certain Christianity, assumed the inheritance of only the negative aspects of the Empire. In fact, only in terms of the "spirit", universalistically, it proposed to unify and gather the scattered peoples in the Empire, and if, beyond that, it created in the clergy a hierarchy and a central power, it was created without any racial presuppositions: the clergy was recruited from all the class and peoples and, because of celibacy, could not constitute a caste, it could not give rise to a regular tradition, also supported on blood, as instead happens in many ancient Aryan societies.

Only in the Middle Ages, by means of the Aryan-Germanic contribution, there came to a certain rectification of these negative aspects of the legacy of the last Romanity. The organic ideal arose. Catholicism itself came to show less the traits of a universalistic religion than those of the faith characteristic of the fighting block of the Aryan and European nations of "Christianity". And it is in these terms and in forms that, as we have had the occasion recently to note in this journal, today have a curious aspect of current affairs and even of "futurism", that the purest force of our origins is reaffirmed beyond the decline of the first Rome.

Race and the Myth of the Origins of Rome

In his *Life of Romulus* (1,8), Plutarch writes:

“Rome would not have risen to such power had it not had, in any way, a divine origin, such as to offer to the eyes of men something great and inexplicable.”

Cicero repeats the same thing (*Nat. Deor.* II, 3, 8) and then goes on to consider (*Har. Resp.*, IX, 19) the Roman civilisation as that which surpassed every other people or nation through sacred knowledge: *omnes gentes nationesque superavivimus*. For the ancient Romans, Sallust has the expression *religiosissimi mortales* (the most religious mortals).

On the other hand, in our day all of that is fantasy or superstition for many “serious” persons and “critical” minds. The “facts” are the only thing that count for them. The mythical traditions of the ancients have no value, or they have it only insofar as it is supposed that, here and there, they are confused reflections of real events, that is to say, tangibly historical. There is, in that, a fundamental misunderstanding that was already denounced to a certain degree by our Giambattista Vico, then by Schelling, still more recently by Bachofen and, finally, by the most recent school of the metaphysical interpretation of myth, and by those little known today (Guenon, W.R. Otto, Altheim, Kerényi, etc.). According to all these writers, the mystical traditions are neither arbitrary creations more or less on the poetic and fantastic plane, nor deformations and transpositions of historical elements. Especially in regard to origins, Bachofen correctly pointed out that symbols and legends,

“If only in a dramatised form, represent actually and truly the history of the beginnings of a nation, but not the history of events occurring materially on earth, but rather of spiritual processes that have given birth to a new people alongside other people although different in culture and civilisation: history, so to say, of its prenatal period.

Legend and history, are tightly connected; the former proceeds through interiorisation and is dispersed through images, while the latter proceeds through exteriorisation as facts and events. These images are the result of formative living forces, facts are organised by human thought. In legends one is transported by formative forces; in the other, there is premeditated organisation of facts. But the legend is the invisible part and root of history; it is not poetry, rather it is a reality much vaster than history itself. The threads of the destiny of a people that unravel visibly in the most various ways in their historical development, go back to the impulses, to the creative spheres, to which the heroes of its legends are connected.”

In a particular way, Bachofen revealed that even at the point in which evidence, by being recognised as a myth, came to be rejected by profane history, even when it is a positive witness to the spirit of a people.

In that way, a study of mystical traditions, using new criteria, can lead us to interesting conclusions from the point of view of a theory of race that is not defined by the material aspects of the issues, but also addresses the inner reality of race.

On the occasion of the current anniversary of the Birth of Rome, we want to illustrate this interpretative method, applying it precisely to the exegesis of the myth of our origins. The legends related to the birth of Rome concentrate such a quantity of sensitive elements based on general meanings of civilisations and mythologies of Aryan peoples, that a special work would be necessary to analyse them and clarify them adequately. Therefore, we will point out here only the most notable themes, among which are: the miraculous birth, the theme of being "saved by the waters", the "wolf", the "tree", the rival pair of twins.

The myth of the union of a god with a mortal woman, in the present case, of Mars with Rhea Silvia, from which union Romulus and Remus were born, recurs in almost all traditions in regard to the birth of "divine heroes". Zeus and Leto gave birth to Apollo, Zeus and Alcmene to Hercules, Heracles being the symbolic hero of the Doric-Achaean Aryan peoples, and Apollo having a connection with the land of the Hyperboreans and with the primordial Nordic-Aryan races. An analogous origin, in properly Germanic traditions, is attributed to the heroic peoples of the Volsungs, to which Siegfried belongs.

In the ancient royal Egyptian tradition - whose remote origin can with good reason also be considered to be Aryan and Atlantic-Occidental - every sovereign is thought to have been begotten by a god uniting with the queen: his tradition in which the hidden meaning of the myth comes to the fore, inasmuch as a miraculous birth without the help of a man, of a human father, was imagined. Since the queen had her consort, the idea that her son was conceived by a god, being awoken to life by her husband, could only indicate that he, not in his mortal part, but so to say, in that eternal and "divinatory" part, had to be thought of as a type of incarnation of a decisive supernatural element that came to confer a royal dignity on him.

In the case of Rome, therefore, Mars is such an element from above, that is, the divine representation of the principle of warrior virility. Such a force stands therefore at the origins of the Eternal City and at the basis of its secret origin, veiled by the legend: so that in some traditions from the era of the Roman Republic itself, it will be directly conceived as the "son" of Mars. And this "Mars" force is associated with those who may be the guardians of the sacred flame of life; symbolically, with a vestal (Rhea Silvia).

The twins Romulus and Remus are abandoned to the waters and are saved from the waters. Here again is a symbolic theme recurring in many traditions: Moses is saved from the waters, the Indo-Aryan hero Karna is left in a basket in the river and is saved from the waters, and so on. But the symbol contained in the most ancient Aryan tradition is especially important, i.e., the Vedic tradition, in which ascetics are depicted as "supreme natures who stand on the waters". Analogous explanations and, therefore, the hidden meaning of such a symbol, can be clarified as follows: the waters have traditionally always depicted the current of time, i.e., the basic element of mortal, unstable, contingent, passionate, fleeting life. The weak man is taken from the waters and carried from the waters. The seer or hero, the ascetic or the prophet is saved from the waters, or is capable of standing on the waters, or of not sinking in the waters. Hence, in the myth of the origins of Rome this symbol must again characterise the "divine" element of the founders of Rome, their, so to speak, supernatural dignity.

The twins find refuge near the fig tree (*Ficus Ruminalis*) and are suckled by a She-wolf. The word Ruminal contains the idea of feeding: the quality of Ruminus, related to Jupiter, alluded to the quality of "nourisher", of the "god who gives nourishment" in the ancient Latin language. But this is the most elementary aspect of the symbol. In general, in the most ancient traditions of the Aryan races, the tree is the symbol of universal life, it is the tree of the world or the cosmic tree. If it is in the form of a fig tree as it appears in the legend of Roman origins, precisely as a "*fico indico*" (Banyan tree) - the ashwattha tree - it is depicted as upside-down in the Indo-Aryan tradition to express that its roots are from above, in the "heavens". The idea of a mystical flood from the tree is an often recurring theme: the myth of Jason, Hercules, Odin, Gilgamesh, etc. Naturally, according to the races and their spirit, this then present diverse variations. We know from the Hebraic myth that to pick and eat from the tree in order to make oneself like god is considered as the principle of guilt, abuse of power, and a curse. Things are conceived in a very different way in the myths of the Aryan races and even in the paleo-Chaldean myth of Gilgamesh. Also, in the legends of the Ghibelline Middle Ages, the heroic theme prevails and the tree often appears as that of the universal empire, reaching it in the symbolic lands of the mysterious Prester John means insuring the same dignity that the ancient Ario-Iranian rulers associated with the title of "king of kings".

Returning to our main subject, in the myth of the twins at the origins of Rome, we therefore have the allusion to a supernatural food from the Tree - but also the She-Wolf. The symbol of the She-wolf, considered in its entirety and in all the stories that refer to it, has an ambiguous character. Lucian and Emperor Julian recall that, in the ancient world, on the basis of the phonetic resemblance between the two words, the idea of the wolf (*lypa*) and of light (*lyce*) are often associated: *lykos*, which in Greek means world, sounds like *lyke*, light. But there are also figurations of the wolf as a hellish animal, as a dark force. The Wolf thus appears to us in the double aspect, symbol of a ferocious and savage nature and also as the symbol

of aluminous nature. This duality is verifiable, not only in Hellenic-Mediterranean prehistory, but also in the Celtic and Nordic. In fact, on the one hand in the Nordic-Celtic and Delphic cults the "wolf" is connected to Apollo, i.e., to the Hyperborean, Nordic-Aryan god, simultaneously conceived as the solar god of the golden age and significantly associated by Virgil with Roman greatness. "Sons of the wolf", on this basis, was a designation for warrior and heroic peoples of Nordic-Germanic origins, designations that persisted even up to the epoch of the Goths and Nibelungs. Yet, on the other hand, in the Edda, the "age of the Wolf" signifies a dark age, marking the epoch of the outbreak of savage and elementary forces, almost of the power of chaos, against the forces of the "divine heroes", or Aesir.

Now we can certainly also relate this quality to the principle that, according to the legend of origins, "fed" the two twins insofar as we see it reflected in their very nature, that is, in the antagonistic duality of Romulus and Remus, as related to us in the myth. As others already noticed, so also the theme of a single principle from which an antithesis is differentiated, whether depicted by the antagonism of two brothers or twins or, in general, of a couple, is found again in many traditions, and not rarely in respect of particularly significant moments for the origins of a given civilisation, race, or religion. For example, we only recall that in the ancient Egyptian tradition Osiris and Set are two brothers of discord - sometimes conceived as wins - and one incarnates the luminous power of the sun, the other, a dark, "infernal", principle, whose generation is called the "sons of the impotent revolt". Does not something similar also show through perhaps in the Roman legend? Romulus is the one who marks the contour of the city as the meaning of a sacre drite and a principle of *limit* of order, of law - having received the right of putting his name to the city from the apparition of the solar number, of the *twelve* vultures. Remus is instead the one who violates such a limit and is killed for this reason. One could say that the primordial force of Roman origins thus are differentiated and destroys the "dark" powers that contain din themselves, affirms in its luminous aspect of order, Olympian denomination, purified warrior force.

There have been attempts to see in the contrast between Romulus and Remus the reflection of the contrast between opposed Aryan racial forces, or of the Aryan type, and non-Aryan or pre-Aryan types. Research of this kind is without doubt interesting: problematic in its conclusions, if it intends to remain exclusively on the plane of material facts, or archaeological and anthropological evidence. It has greater possibilities if it also penetrates the myth and legend in order to extract elements that integrate research in other domains. Naturally, in order to accomplish that, it also needs to resolve to outline general frameworks of various aspects of ancient Roman society, considering, for example, with various writers, somewhat probable that the social system of castes of ancient Rome had a racial substrate.

In this totality, it is interesting to examine the link between the two principles, whose symbolic figurations could well be Romulus and Remus, with the two hills Palatine and Aventine. The Palatine is, as we know, Romulus' hill and the Aventine is Remus'. Now, according to the ancient Italic tradition, on the Palatine, Hercules met the good king Evander (who significantly founded a temple of the goddess Victoria on the same Palatine hill) after having killed Cacus, son of the Pelasgian (pre-Aryan) god of the subterranean fire: and Hercules conquered and killed in Cacus' cave, *located in the Aventine*, and erected an altar to the Olympic god, to whom he was allied according to the Hellenic myth. Researchers like Piganiol, are of the opinion that this duel between Hercules and Cacus - with the corresponding opposition of the Palatine and Aventine hills - could be a mythic transcription of the battle waged by peoples of opposing races.

The mythic legend of the origins of Rome is therefore saturated with deep meaning. The triumph of Romulus and the death of Remus is the key to the origin hidden in Romanity - and the first episode of a dramatic, outer and inner, spiritual, social and racial battle, in part known, in part still enclosed in symbols or in events not yet penetrated with respect to their most essential aspect - almost, we will say: with respect to the "third dimension" Through this secular battle Rome rises gradually and asserts itself in the world as triumphal manifestations of a principle of light and of order, of an ethic and a vision of life that, in its original and uncorrupted forms, is witness to the Aryan spirit. And we know what it is, according to the most widespread tradition, the conclusion of the legend of origins: it is the apotheosis of Romulus, Romulus deified,

"He returned from the earth to heaven after his mortal part was destroyed by means of the dazzling fire."

So what has been treated is neither fantasy, nor poetry, nor rhetoric. Analogous explanations recur in the traditions of all peoples, according to a uniformity that should lead anyone to reflection. Also in regards to Romulus, the myth contains a faith and a spiritual certainty: it is the meaning of a reality that, freed from the person and symbol, was not once, but will always be, and will always be present, in its greatness beyond history, the race that knows how to recall the "mystery".

The Mysticism of Race in Ancient Rome

The literature on racial theory has not failed to emphasise everything that shows the importance attributed to lineage, people, origin, and ancestry in ancient Rome at that time, and has also conducted research to recover the Aryan or Nordic-Aryan element and type in Romanity and to follow its destiny. Because of the predominant interests in modern racial theory and in the very nature of its development, this research is therefore almost always focused on the basically exterior and subordinate elements: thus it remains on the level of ancient law and custom, on certain aristocratic traditions, on the direct or indirect evidence in respect to a given physical type and, somewhat less often, is conveyed within the purview of the most noted and widespread cults and myths. It is curious that, as far as we know, a series of sources is instead almost systematically neglected which, in regard to the higher aspects of the doctrine of race, present a special meaning and are richly documented. The reason for that is in the predominance of the prejudice - which we previously reported in this journal - precisely to consider the totality of whatever in Roman antiquity had a super-rational and properly traditional character as fantasies, imaginations, superstitions, and finally, as something unserious and negligible. In this way a great part of the ancient Roman world still waits to be explored and this exploration, if conducted possessing the right principles and suitable qualification, is destined to yield valuable results, not just in regards to a spiritual and religious consciousness of the forces of the race.

The lares, penates, manes, genii familiari, the archeget heroes and so on are notions well known to anyone who has had even elementary studies of ancient Roman history. But known to what degree? Also, like the equivalents of dead and mute things that are conserved in museums, like the verbal residues of a world that is felt as foreign and "dead", as much to leave us indifferent, at least, for whatever technical and academic reasons, they are not compelled to make special studies of sources and traditions, in place of mere culture, resulting in a worthy monograph. To integrate such sings, including pulling sufficient elements form them to make us understand the meaning and fundamental truths of ancient Roman and, in general, Ario-Mediterranean, humanity is a task that, with very rare exceptions, is not at all felt. However, by this we also understand the most precise and significant racial profession of the faith of ancient Rome, not a "philosophised" profession of faith restricted to any cultured circle, but alive and active in the most original, most widespread, most revered traditions.

The notions of lares, penates, genies, heroes, etc., are in good measure interdependent. In various ways, they all refer to the ancient Roman awareness of the mystical forces of blood and race, to the lineage, considered not only in its corporeal and biological aspects, but also in its "metaphysical" and invisible, but not "transcendent", aspects in the limited dualist meaning that has come to

prevail for such terms. The single, atomic, deracinated individual does not exist. When he presumes to be a being in itself, he is deceived in the most pathetic way, because he cannot even name the last of the organic processes that condition his life and finite consciousness. The individual is part of a group, a folk, a *gens*. He is part of an organic unity, whose most immediate vehicle is blood, and is extended both in space and time. This unity is not "naturalistic", it is not determined and called to life solely through natural, biological, and physiological processes. Such processes just constitute his exterior side, the necessary but not sufficient condition. There is a "life" of life, a mystical force of blood and folk. It subsists beyond the forces of the life of the individuals that are dissolved in it at death or that are given by it through new birth; it is therefore a *vitae mortisque locus* (a place of life and death) - a place that encompasses life and death and that for that very reason stands beyond both.

To maintain a living continuous, and deep contact with this profound force of the race is the most direct and essential form of *pietas*, religiosity, the basis and condition of every other, the principle canons of family laws are its consequences and applications, even in relation to the earth, that it itself - as the notion of the *genius loci* shows - maintains mysterious and "mystical" relations with the blood and the original strength of the people or *gens* that possesses it and lives there. Looking toward the origins, there is the sense of a "mystery" - there is the myth both of beings having come from above, and of men who transcended self-humanity, to loosen their life from their person and to thus constitute it as the superindividual force of a folk, of a lineage, of an ancestry that will see its origin in it. Ideally, there is a contact and a perfect match of the individual with this power, to be able to signify through it the apotheosis, i.e., the conquest of the privilege of immortality, and to confer on it the right of be considered even a "son" - in a higher sense - of the being of the lineage, if even a type of new manifestation of this being itself.

This is the essence of the mystical-racial creed of ancient Ario-Mediterranean and, particularly, Roman, humanity. The significance that it gives to the race a spirit, beyond that of the body, is an irrefutable fact and constitutes the base of the belief of the entities indicated and of the meticulous worship that was dedicated to them. We will put forward some evidence that will also be valid to highlight further aspects of the central ideas we succinctly exposed.

According to a noted work of Macrobius (Sat., III, 3) the lares for the Roman were "the gods that give us life: they nourish our body and govern our soul". Naturally that must not be understood in an ingeniously literal way, but in reference to the mystery of the ultimate forces of our organism. As we pointed out, not one of the most important processes that are at the base of our organic and psychophysical life depends directly on our power and is illuminated by our consciousness. Ancient man, while he was uninterested in the exterior, physical work of such processes, which are studied by modern positive science, instead

focuses all his attention on the forces that were presupposed by them and that precisely - in a higher and symbolic sense - "nourished" and "governed" our life. Macrobius' testimony, among many others, is the most explicit in indicating that the ancient cults of lares, manes, or penates were indeed related, above all, to such forces.

These moreover were brought back to a single origin in close relation with the idea of race.

"The most ancient documents of the cult of the *larges* mainly relate divinity to the individual and embodies it in the *lar familiaris* (the family spirit), the sole, but ideal, father, of a given race; this word, in reality, means not that he created materially the race at its origin as the forefather, but that he is the divine cause of its existence and duration." (Saglio, Dict. Des Antiquites grecques and romaines, III.)

The *lar familiaris* was also called *familiae pater*, father or root of the family or of the *gens*, under this aspect identified with the *genius generis*, the genius (spirit) of a given lineage. Now the word *genius* was still meant more distinctly as the hidden and "divine" force that generates - *genius nominator qui me genuit* - the creator of a given race is *generis nostri parens*, the word *genius* already in itself is related to the words *geno*, *gigno*, i.e., to the idea of generating, that lies at the base of the same word *gens*, *gente* (folk): here it is still a question for the real power that acts beyond physical generation, in the union of the sexes (*a gignendo genius appellatur*, Consorino, *de die nat.* 3), through which the nuptial bed has also the name of *lectus genialis* (bed of the folk) and every offense to the sacredness of aristocratic marriage and to the lineage was considered as a crime above all in the face of the *genius* of the liege.

The ancient writers relate *genius* not only to the *geno*, *genere* (to generate), but also to the word *gero*, so that, by being etymologically inexact it is not less significant in relations of the idea that they had of the entity in word. This reconciliation in fact brings to light the conviction that the force constituting the mystical origin of a given lineage and the matrix of every generation, remains as a "presence" in the group corresponding and by way of principle governs, directs, and sustains the life of the individuals (Hartung, *Die Religion der Romer*, I). Our language still has the word "*geniale*" (brilliant, inspired), but just to designate a rather different thing, also opposed to the most ancient conception. The "inspired" individual, as commonly meant, is more or less the one who invents, who has some "bright ideas", on the rebellious, disordered, individualistic basis. In the ancient conception, geniality could be conceived only as a special inspiration or inspiration that the individual enjoyed not in that way, but essentially in relation to his race and blood, to the *genius*, to the divine element of his *gens* and the tradition of the *gens*.

The "presence" of the *genio*, the lares or the penates in the group to which it corresponded, was made aware and symbolised by the *fire*, the sacred flame, that had to burn uninterruptedly in the centre of the patristic houses, in the temple placed in the *atrium*, the place where the *pater familias* celebrated the rites and in which the various members of the domestic or aristocratic group were gathered for meals, for example, which itself had a ritualistic significance in ancient Roman and Aryan life. For example, a portion of the food was reserved for the god of the domestic fire, in order to remember the unity of life that connected the individuals to him - a unity of life and also a unity of destiny. In certain aspects, in fact, the *genius*, beyond being the principle that determines the fundamental traits of the individuals arising under his sign, was also conceived as the directing principle of this most important and most decisive acts, like who helps and guides him, so to speak, from behind the scenes of his finite consciousness, becoming the ultimate cause of his destiny, both good and evil, that was intended for him. In that way, this being of the ancient Roman racial cult successively gave rise to the popular depictions, which however conserve very little of the original meaning: we can for example recall the undeniable relation of the genius with the popular Christian conception of the "guardian angels" or of the good and evil angels, these images that have become absolutely mythological and deprived of the essential and concrete relation with the blood and mystical forces of the race.

The intimate connection existing between the individual and the *lares*, the *genius*, and in general with the divinity symbolised by the sacred fire of a given bloodline, and the living character, assumed to be present and acting in such a divinity, explain the peculiarities of the ancient cult. This entity of the fire appeared as the natural intermediary between the human world and the supernatural order. Starting from the idea of the unity, fulfilled in the bloodline and in the race, of the individual with a fore that, as the *genius* or the *lares*, was more than physical, ancient man was convinced of the real possibility of the influence precisely in this way, on his own destiny. Special rites had to propitiate and ennoble in order to ensure that transcendent influence was of help to his strengths and actions through the mystery of blood and race to which he belonged. A specific character of the most ancient cults of the most ancient Aryan societies was its anti-universalism. Ancient man did not turn to a God in general, a God of all men and all races, but the god of a lineage, in fact, of his *gente* and his family. And vice versa: only the members of the group that corresponded to them could legitimately invoke the divinity of the domestic fire and to think that their rites were efficacious. It is easy to pronounce negative judgments and formulaic stereotypes, like that of "polytheism"; it is difficult to clarify what, in the ancient world, that was about because the meaning of the ancient religion became almost entirely lost, in the ensuing centuries. We limit ourselves to make two points.

First of all, there is a visible hierarchy that legitimises the ancient aristocratic-racial Aryan and Roman cult. In an army, one does not directly address the supreme leader, but rather the hierarchy on which he immediately depends, because of the effect that he, or the individuals closest to him, were able to settle the situation, without needing to go higher up. Likewise, admitting a universal God was not a reason to exclude every intermediary and to condemn any reference to the particular mystical forces that are closer to a folk or race and connected in a concrete unity of destiny of life. Celsus even brought up the hierarchical argument against the accusation of polytheism made by the Christians by observing, by analogy, that whoever pays tribute to obedience to an authority delegated to the government of a given province implicitly pays tribute to the central government, while whoever claims to address it solely and directly, beyond being impertinent, can, in reality, be acting in an anarchic way. And it is well known that Romanity, beyond particular aristocratic cults, also recognised more general cults, parallel to the universality to which the eternal city gradually elevated itself, and also indicates on the level of entities, like the *lares* or *genii* themselves, because there was also a national conception of the *lares*, for example, where they attributed a cult to the *lares militares*, or they spoke of the *lares publici*, or they referred to the mystical force of the imperial lineage, to the "demigods who founded the city and established the universal empire", or they introduced the idea of "genius or universal demons".

In the second place, ancient traditional man did not reduce the cult to a mere sentimental disposition for which the rite was only an empty ceremony. Those who considered the relationship between the human world and the divine as real and effective, thought that there existed precise conditions. One of these was race and blood. Even without wishing to enter the complex field of the metaphysical presuppositions of the cult, it appears evident that the force, to which the individual thought he owed his life, that he supposed "present" in his name body but to which he attributed superindividual and supernatural characteristics, was conceived as the most direct and positive path to return to what is highest in life. The race, as race of the spirit, was therefore a religious value, it contained a sacrament, it was hidden by "magic", and that for considerations, one must recognise it well, in its positive and realistic mode.

The oath on the *genius* in Roman antiquity was made while touching the centre of the forehead, and the cult of the *genius* itself did not lack a relation with that of the Fides, the personification of essentially Aryan and virile virtue, of fidelity and loyalty. The detail related to the gesture of the oath is, for every expert, rather interesting, because it related the *genius* and the entities similar to it back to *mens*, to the intellectual and virile principle of life, hierarchically superordinate both to the soul and to the purely corporeal forces: it cannot be by any chance that the place attributed by the Roman tradition to *mens* - the centre of the forehead - was that which in the Indo-Aryan tradition is certainly assigned the ajna chakra to the force of "transcendent virility" and to the so-called "centre of command".

With that in mind, the suspicion is unlikely, that in the Roman family cult, if not exactly of superstitious personifications, it was a type of "totemism", the totem being the dark entity of the blood of a tribe of barbarians, related to the forces of the animal kingdom. We see instead that the ancient Roman world gave to the gods of the race and family group precisely some supernatural traits, the mind (*mens* or the *nous*) conceived in Mediterranean antiquity precisely as the supernatural and "solar" principle of man.

Certainly, we must not generalise and think that it is about that in every case. The traditions encompassed in the ancient Roman world are more varied and complex than has been supposed up to now. Both ethnically and spiritually, diverse influences met in the most ancient period of Rome. Some are actually related to inferior forms of cult - inferior either by belonging to a non-Aryan ethnic substrate, or by representing a regressive and materialised form of somewhat more ancient cults, of Aryan and particularly Atlantico-Occidental origin. That is valid also for the cult created or mystical forces of blood, race, and family, that in some cases and phases has, let us admit, "crepuscular" traits, with special regard to their inferior chthonic aspect predominantly relate to that instead of celestial and super-terrestrial symbols. One can nevertheless not contest the idea that in the greater number of cases the highest tradition was present in Rome and that in its development Rome was able to "rectify" and purify to a not negligible measure the different traditions that it had included. So against the myths, which, in reference to the cult of the *lares*, at Acca Larentia, to the *re plebea* Servio Tullio, and to the Sabine element remaining at an inferior level, we have the "heroic" elements of the cult of the lares and penates and such elements assume ever more significance in the events at the time of the Empire. Some think that the very term "*lares*" comes from the Etruscan *lar*, a word that means leader or chief, that however was related to chiefs and leaders like Porsenna and Volumnio. A very widespread tradition among the ancients for which it suffices to recall Varro, identifies the *lares* with the "heroes", in the Greek sense of demigods, of men who have transcended nature and were made participants of the indestructibility of the Olympics so that it validates, in spite of its generalisation, Mommsen's idea through which every gens would have had as one of its heroes, the principle of the people that was venerated precisely in the person of the *lar familiaris*.

The supernatural and "regla" side of the ancient cult of the mystical forces of blood is emphasised with that. This is not everything. On the one hand, the funereal epigraphs attest to the Roman faith that the principle of immortality for his descendants was the lares themselves: many epigraphs do not indicate the negative "telluric" possibility of a type of dull and nocturnal post mortem survival in an underworld, but they affirm the higher idea that death is the principle of a superior existence. They put death exactly in relation, to which they were dedicated, with the *lares* or heroes of his people. On the other hand, as previously noted, Romanity would universalise the notion of the *lares*, extending it to the central dominating force of Romanity. We find therefore the inscriptions

dedicated to the *lar victor*, the *lar martis et pacis*, and finally to the *lares Augusti*. It is already in an environment in which it is not about more of the race as gens and nuclear family, but as folk and political community. Even outside the race so conceived a divine force, a mystical entity, is presented, connected to the destinies of war, victory, and triumphal peace - *lar victor*, *lar martis et pacis* - and connected finally to the "genius", to the generating principle of the leaders, the Caesars, to the *lar Augusti*.

With that we will now discuss a very different subject which is the Aryan conception of the fortune and destiny of the leaders, the city, and nations. For now, we believe we have brought sufficiently to light the meaning of the mythical figurations and cults typical of the ancient Roman peoples, where unequivocally the consciousness of blood and race resided and where religiosity was not a factor of evasion and universalism, but constituted the most solid cement of the unity of folk and bloodlines. The mystery of blood was a central idea of ancient Roman spirituality and to disregard it means to be condemned to a superficial and profane understanding of the most tangible, noted, and celebrated aspects of the law, custom, and ethics of ancient society.

