

Uppsala University
Faculty of Theology

Master's Thesis
History of Religions, D2
AT 2010

Ride the Currency: “Evolianism” in Contemporary Sweden



Passport photo, circa 1940

“What I am about to say does *not* concern the ordinary man of our day. On the contrary, I have in mind the man who finds himself involved in today’s world, even at its most problematic and paroxysmal points; yet he does not belong inwardly to such a world, nor will he give in to it. He feels himself, in essence, as belonging to a different race from that of the overwhelming majority of his contemporaries.”

Julius Evola, in *Ride the Tiger: A Survival Manual for the Aristocrats of the Soul*, 2003, p. 2

Author: Björn Boman

Supervisor: Kristian Pettersson

Abstract

In recent years it has been possible to distinguish instances of “Evolianism” among some Swedish far right-wing Traditionalists. Two bloggers from the blog portal Motpol, Oskorei and SolGuru, designate themselves through their interest in the Italian esoteric writer and Traditionalist Julius Evola, and both of them have written reviews of the very same autobiographical book of Evola, *The Path of Cinnabar*.

The main aim of this master’s thesis has been to make a discursive reading and intertextual analysis of their blog material, as well as to compare the two bloggers with other more prolific Evolians – Alain de Benoist and Guillaume Faye of the French *Nouvelle Droite*. It has also been to examine other instances of “Evolianism” on a transnational level, in particular the Left-Hand Path movement Dragon Rouge.

Overall Evola can be regarded as a major influence and true-teller for Oskorei and SolGuru, although they disagree with him on various points. Oskorei and SolGuru are in certain senses also very influenced by de Benoist and Faye. Oskorei expresses the same positive outlook on modern technology as Faye, while SolGuru has a slightly more skeptical attitude in regard to this, more like de Benoist and Evola. In regard to Dragon Rouge he is rather one of many influences and it is problematic to point out which of his writings that are particularly important for their beliefs.

Keywords: Julius Evola, Oskorei, SolGuru, Dragon Rouge, Traditionalism, *The Path of Cinnabar*, Motpol, Swedish far-right wing, Alain de Benoist, Guillaume Faye, *Nouvelle Droite*, archeofuturism, polemics, discourse analysis, intertextuality, influence

Contents

1.	Introduction.....	5
1.1.	Purpose and research question.....	8
1.2.	Demarcation of this thesis.....	8
1.3.	Scholar definitions.....	8
1.4.	Organization of this thesis.....	9
2.	Previous research.....	10
2.1.	Julius Evola and Traditionalism.....	10
2.2.	Motpol and the Swedish far right-wing.....	13
2.3.	Alain de Benoist, Guillaume Faye and the <i>Nouvelle Droite</i>	13
3.	Theoretical-methodological approach, terminology and primary material.....	14
3.1.	Discourse theory and method.....	14
3.2.	Intertextuality, Influence and the Re-birth of the Author.....	15
3.3.	Genre analysis.....	16
3.4.	Primary sources – selections, translations and clarifications.....	17
4.	Formative background and description.....	18
4.1.	Evola’s life and authorship.....	18
4.2.	The New French Right.....	20
4.3.	Motpol.....	21
5.	A transnational “Evolianism”	22
6.	Oskorei: “Life stance” – worldview, anthropology and morals.....	28
7.	SolGuru: “Life Stance” – worldview, anthropology and morals.....	38
8.	The Path of Cinnabar.....	42
8.1.	SolGuru’s Review.....	43
8.2.	Oskorei’s Review.....	47
9.	Which Currency? Oskorei and SolGuru’s relationship to de Benoist and Faye and political main tenets.....	49

10.	Conclusive discussion.....	58
	References.....	61
	Printed sources.....	61
	Internet sources.....	65
	Appendix 1: Oskorei quotes.....	68
	Appendix 2: SolGuru quotes.....	71

1. Introduction

It is interesting that when Göran Dahl warned his readers – those he had in mind were most likely primarily undergraduate students – about the fascism and racism of Julius Evola¹ and Alain de Benoist² in *Myter om det nordiska* (myths about the Nordic) (Raudvere et al 2001), he did not showcase any examples of how those two controversial figures had influenced any movement or person in the nationalist domain in Sweden. I do not know if he was aware that the philosophy of the Swedish-based Left-Hand Path movement Dragon Rouge is partly influenced by Evola's texts³, but besides from that single instance, which comes from outside of the nationalist orbit, one has to wait about five years until it is possible to distinguish any distinctive examples of "Evolianism". I use this term in a "neutral" manner in order to describe movements or persons that have written about Evola and presented him more or less positively.

The Swedish poet, author, Islamist and neo-Platonist (Omar 2010) Mohamed Omar could be mentioned in this regard. There is nothing that indicates that Evola's thoughts are particularly important within Omar's Islamic beliefs, but he has been mentioned in some of his blog posts and has never been depicted in a negative way; rather the other way around.⁴ Another example is the Traditionalist blog Café Expose, which includes the same Evola-related excerpt from an interview with the Traditionalist and Sufi master Seyyed Hossein Nasr that Omar has posted on his blog. This particular blog post does also include various comments about Evola and his relationship to Perennialism.⁵ One comment also mentions that the blogger Spöknippet has posted excerpts from one of Evola's book, *Men Among the Ruins* (2003), on his blog; this is however the only post that deals with the person in question.⁶

The author Bo Cavefors has written a rather nuanced essay about Evola that was published on the *Tidningen Kulturen* website⁷, and Martin Häggkvist has written an article, "Modernitet

¹I will describe him and his authorship in a more thorough manner at another place, but for the moment it is worth to mention that he was, among other things, an Italian esotericist who lived between 1898-1974.

²Alain de Benoist (1943-) is a French philosopher and scholar, who has been one of the most salient persons in the *Nouvelle Droite* (New Right).

³Dragon Rouge: General Information: <http://www.dragonrouge.net/english/general.htm>.

⁴Mohamed Omar: Julius Evola category: <http://alazerius.wordpress.com/category/julius-evola/>.

⁵A religious school of thought which has its roots in the 16th century but was more fully developed by French author René Guenon during the early 20th century. The doctrine is also often called Traditionalism. Basically there is an Ur-revelation and the "World religions" have the same divine essence albeit their utter forms are different. The esoteric traits and aspects of religions are often emphasized.

⁶Spöknippet: Evola Excerpts: <http://spoknippet.blogspot.com/2006/01/excerpts-evola-men-among-ruins.html>. Spöknippet was a newspaper that was distributed by the Swedish Fascist party SFKO.

⁷Tidningen Kulturen: Bo Cavefors About Evola: <http://tidningenkulturen.se/ess-mainmenu-57/litteratur-mainmenu-95/1007-julius-evola-frdadaismen-till-traditionen>.

och undergång: Om traditionell tidsuppfattning och Kali Yuga”, in the culture-related journal *Subaltern* (2004: number 1), which partly deals with some of Evola’s philosophical traits but in a more critical manner. The Stockholm-based folk metal band Sigrblot (old Swedish for sacrificial feast of victory) has written at least two songs – “Kali Yuga intifada” and “Exiles of the Golden Age” – that seem to have perennial or even Evola-influenced lyrical concepts.⁸

If one is looking for more distinctive instances of where Evola’s thoughts are being presented positively, it is even more fruitful to put focus upon the Swedish blog portal Motpol. The portal includes about twenty more or less active blogs⁹, and most of them – albeit being different in many senses – share the semblance that their authors are critical against “mass immigration”, treat subjects related to Swedish and European culture and politics, and belong to what in broad political terms can be called a far right-wing. Some also label themselves as Traditionalists or Perennialists, and two bloggers in particular are seemingly influenced by Evola: Oskorei and SolGuru.

The former label himself as “Identitarian¹⁰ Indo-European Traditionalist”, and then adds that he is also an “Indo-European Pagan and right radical.”¹¹ Oskorei, an anonymous writer, has written extensively about politics, culture, popular culture, history, religion and philosophy since 2005, and some of the material that were initially posted on his former independent blog¹² have been transferred to the Motpol portal. Oskorei is influenced by the French right-wing philosophers Alain de Benoist and Guillaume Faye in a rather high degree – although some of the blog posts that treats these phenomena also criticize certain components of their ideas¹³ – and he sometimes refers to the importance of meta politics, which is the idea that ideologies can be shaped outside of the normal political domain, such as in culture and popular culture. (Bar-On 2007: 86) This concept is unquestionably one of the conditions of the blog portal in question.¹⁴ Oskorei is unhesitatingly the blogger who has written most

⁸Metal Archives: Sigrblot: <http://www.metal-archives.com/release.php?id=207457>.

⁹Motpol Blogs: <http://motpol.nu/bloggar.php>.

¹⁰According to Metapedia, Identitarianism is the name of the non-dogmatic movement in which a person’s or group of people’s identity, culture, tradition and ethnicity is the center of their life stance: <http://sv.metapedia.org/wiki/Portal:Identitarianism>. Needless to say, this is an attempt to grasp the emic definition of the concept in question.

¹¹Oskorei: Self-description: http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?page_id=2.

¹²Oskorei: Former Blog: <http://www.oskorei.webblogg.se>.

¹³Oskorei: The New Right and Postmodernism: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=400>.

¹⁴It is no coincidence that there is a more radical variant of Wikipedia that is called Metapedia: <http://www.metapedia.org/>.

extensively about Evola and at least seven blog posts deal almost solely with Evola's authorship.¹⁵

SolGuru – who labels himself as both Traditionalist and Identitarian¹⁶ and has written mostly about everyday politics, philosophy and culture since June 2008 – have made five posts that treat Evola from different aspects and extents: one mentions that a martial artist have labeled himself Traditionalist¹⁷, another includes a quote of Evola from his script “Youth, Beats and Right-Wing Anarchists”¹⁸, a third post includes a reference and tip to Evola's book *Meditations on the peaks: Mountain Climbing as a Metaphor for the Spiritual Quest* (1998)¹⁹, while the three other, although from different angles, treat his ideas and authorship in more depth.²⁰ SolGuru has also written about de Benoist and his former collaborator Guillaume Faye.²¹

The last-mentioned post is a review of Evola's autobiography *The Path of Cinnabar* (2009)²² and in fact Oskorei too has written a review of the very same book, and at a certain place of the text he also refers to SolGuru's review which was obviously written before his own.²³ It would perhaps be an overstatement to call these two reviews *movement texts* (Hammer 2001:

¹⁵Oskorei: Interview with a Socialist: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=2844>, Oskorei: Organic and Totalitarian state: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=174>, Oskorei: Ride the Tiger 2008 – fragments: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=748>, Oskorei: Julius Evola and the Atlantis – Excerpts: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=1200>, Oskorei: Julius Evola and the Counter-Initiation: http://oskorei.webblogg.se/030406151328_julius_evola_och_motinvigningen.html, Oskorei: Julius Evola about the Crusades: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=482>, Julius Evola About America: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=431>, Oskorei: Julius Evola as a Green Anarchist?: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=436>, while several other posts treats Evola partially, includes quotations, or refers to some of his thoughts in comparison to other phenomenon or writers, Oskorei: Kerouac – On the Road, Oskorei: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=2641>, Fear and Loathing in Las Vegas: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=2650>, Oskorei: Wall Street 2 – Money Never Sleeps: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=3948>, Oskorei: Evola on War as a Path to God: http://oskorei.webblogg.se/101205105810_evola_on_war_as_the_path_to_god.html.

¹⁶Identitarianism is related to and influenced by the French philosopher Alain de Benoist and the think tank GRECE (*Groupement de Recherche et d'Etude pour la Civilisation Européenne* – Research and Study Group on European Civilization), but also to the French nationalist party Bloc identitaire and in broader terms, what the French media called the *La Nouvelle Droite*.

¹⁷SolGuru: Traditional "Fighter": <http://solguru.motpol.nu/?p=114>.

¹⁸SolGuru: Active Youth: <http://solguru.motpol.nu/?p=39>.

¹⁹SolGuru: King of the Forest: <http://solguru.motpol.nu/?p=998>.

²⁰SolGuru: Guillaume Faye criticizes Traditionalism: <http://solguru.motpol.nu/?p=1014>, A Handbook for Traditional Living: <http://solguru.motpol.nu/?p=1074>, and Julius Evola: The Path of Cinnabar: <http://solguru.motpol.nu/?p=118>.

²¹Guillaume Faye (1949-) is a French scholar and journalist and one of the main theorists within the *Nouvelle Droite*. He leaved the movement in 1987 and has since then partly distanced himself from and criticized de Benoist et consortes, but returned to right-wing politics during the late 90s. The work which perhaps has got the most attention, *L'archeofuturism* (1998), was distributed by the partly Swedish-based web shop Arktos during September 2010 (<http://www.arktos.com/guillaume-faye-archeofuturism.html>). Arktos seems to have certain connections with Motpol since they are selling t-shirts with a Motpol logotype on it (<http://www.arktos.com/lifestyle/fashion.html>).

²²The book was originally published in Italian in 1963 as *Il Cammino del Cinnabro*.

²³Oskorei: The Cinnabar Path: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=1747>.

37-42), but for a Traditionalist and Identitarian these might function as an attempt to authoritatively articulate their position within a specific discourse. In the cases of Oskorei and SolGuru it seems like the two self-descriptions, Identitarian and Traditionalist, almost fit together as two analytically intertwined units. What does it mean to use both of these labels together?

Some of the Motpol blogs have been examined in *Det vita fältet* (the white field) (Deland et al: 2010), but it lacks any analysis of the importance of figures such as Evola among some of the bloggers. Niklas Bernsand's draft version of a more extensive work called *Friend or foe?* is a thorough description of some particular traits of Motpol, but it does not however focus on Traditionalism or Evola to any extent.²⁴

My intent is therefore to analyze those two related reviews and other significant texts, in order to illustrate instances of "Evolianism" in contemporary Sweden. The French far right-wing, de Benoist and Faye to be more specific, will also be examined since they can be considered as Evolians and have directly or indirectly influenced Oskorei and SolGuru to certain degrees. It does also consist of some passages about the Dragon Rouge and their possible influences of Evola, as well as other examples of a transnational "Evolianism".

1.1. Purpose and Research Question

The purpose of this thesis is twofold:

- Examine instances of contemporary Swedish Traditionalism and "Evolianism" – Oskorei and SolGuru, and in lesser degree also Dragon Rouge.
- Illustrate some of the characteristic traits of Evola's thoughts in relation to some of his followers, i.e. Evolians – Alain de Benoist and Guillaume Faye – which are also quite significant influential ideologists for the two above mentioned bloggers.

Research question:

1. How do the subjects of study – Oskorei, SolGuru and Dragon Rouge – both explicitly and implicitly use Evola's writings?

1.2. Demarcation of this thesis

This is a study about "Evolianism" which means that it concerns both Evola and his followers that to more or lesser degree have absorbed some of his thoughts and ideas and presented them

²⁴Niklas Bernsand: *Friend or Foe?*: <http://www.anst.uu.se/matwe309/Bernsand.pdf>.

or him in a positive manner. Albeit the chapter about de Benoist and Faye certainly may seem as a sort of digression – at various places Evola is not even mentioned – one should keep in mind that what I refer to as “Evolianism” can take several shapes and even walk its own ideological path where some of the roots even seem pulled up.

With that said it still focuses on a very limited field of contemporary “Evolianism” in Sweden – primarily the two Motpol bloggers Oskorei and SolGuru, and secondarily the transnational Left-Hand Path movement Dragon Rouge.

1.3. Scholar definitions

I use the term *Traditionalism* in the same way as Traditionalist scholar Mark Sedgwick does:

The word ‘tradition’ derives from the Latin verb *tradere*, to hand over or to hand down, and in an etymological sense a tradition is “a statement, belief or practice transmitted (especially orally) from generation to generation. The Traditionalist movement with which this book deals takes ‘tradition’ primarily in this sense, as belief and practice transmitted from time immemorial—or rather belief and practice that *should* have been transmitted but was lost to the West during the last half of the second millennium a.d. According to the Traditionalists, the modern West is in crisis as a result of this loss of transmission of tradition, as was explained in 1927 in *The Crisis of the Modern World*. (2004: 21)

Like Sedgwick, I capitalize letter T in order to separate it from “traditionalism” in a broader sense. Note that this is a survey definition that I use in order to guide the reader with one main tenet of René Guénon’s philosophy and it is not of great importance for the analysis as such and it is not definite that the subjects of study agree with Sedgwick. Still it is highly likely that it is Traditionalism in this sense that they have in mind when they label themselves as Traditionalists. Sedgwick uses the term Perennialism, or *philosophia perennis*, as almost equivalent to Traditionalism, but problematizes the historical relationship between Guénon’s writings and the Renaissance theologian’s Augustinus Steuchus and Marsilio Ficino; the former was probably the first person to use the concept *philosophia perennis* in writing. (Ibid: chapter 2)

I define the term *transnational* the same way as Ulf Hannerz does: a way in which international relations between individuals, groups, movements, and business enterprises are created, and thus it does not have to involve the country as a whole unit like in foreign relations politics. As Hannerz notes, the irony of the concept is that the word *national* is still

included in it, but on the other hand, the nation state distinction can still be important in relation to a description of differences between two or several nations. (1996: 6)

I have borrowed the concept of *life stance* from the field of Systematic Theology and Studies in World Views, a research discipline of the Faculty of Theology at Uppsala University. According to Anders Jeffner a person's life stance is tripartite: 1) something that has significant importance for an overall conception of the humanity and the world, 2) something that creates a central evaluation system, and 3) something that expresses a basic attitude to life. (1988: 5-9)

1.4. Organization of this Thesis

Chapter 2 treats previous research. In chapter 3 I discuss my theoretic and methodological approach as well as the primary material. Chapter 4 consists of a descriptive background of Evola, the *Nouvelle Droite* and Motpol.

The analysis is divided in chapters 5-9: 5 treat Transnational "Evolianism" with the main focus on Dragon Rouge; 6 treats Oskorei solely; 7 examines SolGuru exclusively; 8 is a discursive reading of Oskorei and SolGuru's reviews of Evola's autobiography *The Path of Cinnabar*; 9 treats Oskorei and SolGuru's political main tenets through comparisons between them and Evola, de Benoist and Faye. The thesis ends with a conclusive discussion (10) and appendixes that consist of more extensive quotes in Swedish.

2. Previous research

I will limit myself to discuss academic research that is related primary to Julius Evola and Traditionalism, secondary to Motpol and the Swedish far right-wing, and tertiary to de Benoist and Faye. At some points these subjects go hand in hand.

2.1. Evola and Traditionalism

The lines between polemic and non-polemic scholars are blurry for sure, and overall we can speak of a vast difference between for instance Göran Dahl's quite careless and definitely simplified descriptions of Evola (Raudvere et al 2001: 134-159) or his comparison between

Evola and the Swedish sadist Hans Scheike (Dahl 2006: 40-41)²⁵, and Mattias Gardell's less pejorative descriptions such as "occult fascist" (2003: 300), or "The perennial philosophy of Evola, with its romanticized notions of the spiritual nobility and hermetic traditions of the pagan past...". (Ibid: 28) Thomas Sheehan is perhaps more distinct in his polemics in his article "Myth and Violence: The Fascism of Julius Evola and Alain de Benoist" (1981). One might also mention Sheehan's article "*Diventare dio: Julius Evola and the Metaphysics of Fascism*" in *Stanford Italian Review* 6 (1986), which emphasizes Evola's intellectual responsibility for Italian terrorist groups in Italy during the second half of the 20th century.

Nicholas Goodrick-Clarke's book, *Black Sun*, includes an entire chapter about Evola, "Julius Evola and the Kali Yuga". At the beginning of the chapter Goodrick-Clarke stresses that "...Evola advanced a radical doctrine of anti-egalitarianism, anti-democracy, anti-liberalism and anti-Semitism", but as the analysis is broadened and nuanced, the anti-Semitism assertion is explained and overall it is one of the most thorough depictions of Evola's ideas from a critical scholar. (2002: chapter 3) The same can be said about Anthony James Gregor's chapter about Evola in *The Search for Neo-Fascism* (2006: chapter four). Gregor argues that Evola never was a Fascist nor was he influenced by the movement in question and the same goes for his connections to Nazi Germany; he even underscores that American black protest movements have showed more fascist traits than Evola ever did. (Ibid: 110-112)

Umberto Eco²⁶ is less precise in his critique of what he calls Ur-Fascism or Eternal Fascism – he describes it almost as if it was a perennial doctrine that could take many shapes – and he mentions Evola²⁷ as one of many people that have influenced new types of Fascism and related phenomena:

One has only to look at the syllabus of every fascist movement to find the major traditionalist thinkers. The Nazi gnosis was nourished by traditionalist, syncretistic, occult elements. The most influential theoretical source of the theories of the new Italian right, Julius Evola, merged the Holy Grail with *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, alchemy with the Holy Roman and Germanic Empire. The very fact that the Italian right, in order to show

²⁵Dahl's text is overall well-written and rather nuanced but this passage, that ends his chapter about Evola, is definitely out of context and lack references to Evola's book, *Eros and the Mysteries of Love* (1991), the work that his rather misguided exposition implicitly alludes to. Less serious are perhaps that he has misspelled Evola's *Rivolta contra il mondo moderno* and Guenon's *La crise du monde moderne*. (40-43) Lastly, Dahl's text about Evola and Guénon is overall the same as in *Myter om det nordiska* (Raudvere et al 2001).

²⁶One may note that Eco's article should be regarded as popular scientific.

²⁷In chapter 20 of Eco's famous novel *Foucault's Pendulum* (1989), Evola's and Guenon's ideas are briefly examined.

its open-mindedness, recently broadened its syllabus to include works by De Maistre, Guenon, and Gramsci, is a blatant proof of syncretism. (Eco 1995: 6)

Bruce Lincoln has briefly treated Evola (and de Benoist) in *Theorizing Myth: Narrative, Ideology and Scholarship* (1999), and in slightly more depth by Göran Dahl in *Radical Conservatism and the Future of Politics* (1999). Mark Sedgwick's *Against the Modern World* (2004) – the title is most certainly an allusion of Evola's principle work *Revolt Against the Modern World* and René Guénon's *Crisis of the Modern World* – does not include any specific polemics and overall it is a very balanced and thorough examination of the intellectual history of Traditionalism and René Guénon, as well as persons and movements that are connected to him (Evola, Ananda Coomaraswamy, Frithjof Schuon, Mircea Eliade etc.). Sedgwick has been accused of being both pro-Traditionalist due to his early private life encounters with Traditionalism, and therefore also having an undisclosed bias against it; he has rejected these two contradictory accusations in an autobiographical note.²⁸

It would be inapt to ignore Dr. H. T Hansen's meticulous illustration of Evola's life that can be found in the chapter "Introduction: Julius Evola's Political Endeavour's" in *Men Among the Ruins* (2002). He might perhaps be regarded as semi-biased and pro-Evola, but his depiction is still quite nuanced and thus he might also function as equipoise to Evola's polemics. Evola's relationship with Catholicism has been treated by Richard Drake in the article "Julius Evola, Radical Fascism, and the Lateran Accords" in *The Catholic Historical Review* (1988).

Evola is also briefly mentioned as one of many possible influences of the satanic movement Order of the Nine Angles in Jacob C. Senholts revised master thesis *The Sinister Tradition* (2009: 55)²⁹. It might also be said that Senholt is now working on a doctoral thesis that treats the European right. At a later time, it will contain some chapters about Motpol and related subjects.

²⁸Sedgwick's Autobiographical Note:

<http://teo.au.dk/en/aisu/fac/sedgwick/internet/about/autobiographicalnote/>.²⁹I must say that I have thought about the relatively obvious linkage between chapter 18 and 19 in Evola's *Ride the Tiger* (2003) and this ONA text that treats modern science "as it should be", based on empery, unlike speculative "laboratory theories". Perhaps even more striking are the similarities between the very same ONA-text and Guillaume Faye's rather Faustian archeofuturism: <http://users.skynet.be/theriomorph/dotab/pdf/ona/nexion.pdf>.

Finally, Kenneth Granholm's doctoral thesis, *Embracing the Dark*, relies on Evola's work on Tantrism, *The Yoga of Power* (1992), regarding this specific matter at various places. (2005: 36, 141) This indicates Evola's sometimes semi scholar style of writing. (See also Sedgwick 2006: 100) It is conspicuous, however, that Granholm has not emphasized the significance of Evola as an ideological influence in an explicit sense; he has stated that Evola among others has influenced the alternative spiritual milieu in his background chapter. (2005: 64)

2.2. Motpol and the Swedish far right-wing

I have briefly mentioned two works that treat Motpol to different extents and from different perspectives, although none of them examines the Traditional ideas that are articulated by for instance Oskorei and SolGuru. For a deeper understanding of the Traditionalist tenets and similar characteristic traits within the nationalistic domain of Sweden, it is perhaps more suitable to turn to some of the above-mentioned works, like for instance Goodrick-Clarke (2002) and Gardell (2003). Nevertheless, it would be unjust to disqualify *Myter om det nordiska* completely – although the authors generally make oversimplified depictions of for example the *Nouvelle Droite* (Raudvere et al 2001: 105-115) – since it puts focus upon Swedish nationalism and its relation to Paganism, unlike the above-mentioned books which examine similar phenomena but with very little focus on Swedish movements and individuals.

A vast number of books have been written regarding the Swedish far right-wing or rather right extremism, to use a common and widespread term, and many of them can be categorized as popular scientific. Besides *Det vita fältet* (2010), not many of these are of particular significance for this thesis, but one might mention for instance *Sverigedemokraterna: den nationella rörelsen* (Sverigedemokraterna: the National Movement). (Larsson & Ekman: 2001) In order to make an international outlook one might also point out Roger Eatwell's *Fascism and the Extreme Right* (2007) – although I would refer to it as scientific without any sort of pejorative or degrading prefix – chapter 13 in Goodrick-Clarke (2002), as well as Hans-Georg Betz' *Radical right-wing populism in Western Europe* (1994).

2.3. Alain de Benoist, Guillaume Faye and the Nouvelle Droite

I have already mentioned *Myter om det nordiska*, which treats Evola and de Benoist in one of the chapters. Since the polemical stance is flagrant one has to approach this book rather carefully; still it can be valuable for a Swedish reader's audience. The same goes for *Radikalare än Hitler* (Dahl 2006: 178-182).

In this respect it is definitely worth to mention Michael Böhm's Alain de Benoist und die Nouvelle Droite (2008), which is perhaps the most thorough analysis of the *Nouvelle Droite* and de Benoist up to this date. Sheehan's "Myth and Violence: The Fascism of Julius Evola and Alain de Benoist" (1981) is also pertinent in this regard but indeed more polemic than Böhm's work and does only grasp at the surface of the *Nouvelle Droite*. Tamir Bar-on's *Where have all the Fascists gone?* (2007) is relevant since it treats the *Nouvelle Droite* in a single chapter, but also due to its focus upon the connections between de Benoist and Evola.

3. Theoretical-methodological approach, terminology and primary Material

The thesis mainly hinges on text studies but chapter 6, 7 and 8 – especially 8 – are more specifically linked to discourse analysis in a spirit similar to Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe. In this chapter I describe their theoretical framework in an overall manner and those specific concepts that I will use in my analysis. Note that chapter 5 takes a less methodologically fixed approach and is a more descriptive, whereas chapter 9 has a slightly more comparative approach. I will also briefly discuss the primary material as well as other theoretical and methodological aspects.

3.1. Discourse theory and methodology

I agree, tentatively, with Laclau and Mouffe that nothing is constituted outside of discourse – or in other words, it is impossible to divide the world into discursive practices and non-discursive practices: there is only the former. Albeit the material world exists independent from discourses, all meaning is still created discursively: "The linguistic and non-linguistic elements are not merely juxtaposed, but constitute a differential and structured system of positions – that is, a discourse." (2001: 108) When analyzing texts from a discourse theoretical point of view, I will limit myself to a rather small number of key concepts from Laclau and Mouffe's quite vast nomenclature, and focus will be set upon *nodal point*, *element* and *moment*.

I will use the above-mentioned key concepts in a manner similar to Laclau and Mouffe (Ibid: 109-114) but they will still need a more accurate definition. A *nodal point* is a privileged signifier that fixes the meaning of a signifying chain. (Ibid: 112) An *element* is an unfixed

concept that someone strives to articulate within a specific discourse; the fixed element is thus a *moment*. However, "the transition from the 'elements' to the 'moments' is never totally fulfilled", to use Laclau and Mouffe's own words (Ibid: 110). My aim is to pinpoint certain elements and grasp how the subjects of the study try to articulate them.

Critique against Laclau and Mouffe's discourse theory can be raised from many perspectives. The more caricature-like critique, like the assertion that the theory in question implicitly says that there exists no physical world external to thought, has already been treated above so I will not dwell on this matter. A perhaps more serious epistemological problem is that every person is caught in a discourse and therefore it is impossible to "uncover the truth as it is" from this theoretical viewpoint, which is something that the scholar who accepts their ontology must live with. (Ibid: 3)

Marianne Winther Jørgensen and Louise Phillips have noted that Laclau and Mouffe's theory put focus upon abstract quantities rather than colloquial language or linguistic practices in general. But they have also pointed out that it is still possible to adapt the analysis in order to pose a more concrete methodology. (2000: 57) Similarly, David Howarth has emphasized that it is important to adjust the concepts to the empirical material rather than the other way around. (2000: 156-157) I will therefore use these concepts perhaps not as rigidly and systematically as other scholars sometimes do in certain discourse analyses.

3.2. Intertextuality, Influence and the Re-birth of the Author

I will also bring in one key concept from Norman Fairclough: *manifest intertextuality*, which is when someone refers directly to another text. (Fairclough 1992a: 117) The term is relevant within my theoretical framework since at least two key texts are reviews of a specific book, but also because one of the subjects of study (Oskorei) explicitly refers to another text (SolGuru's review of *The Path of Cinnabar*). On a more general basis, intertextuality, whether it is manifest or not, is pertinent since I will argue that Evola's writings have influenced the studied subjects. Fairclough has described intertextuality as a rather broad term in regard to texts that accentuate a dialogical relationship to other texts, or has the voice of another author. (Fairclough 2003: 39-41)

The term *influence* has often been a more author-centered concept than the impersonal notion intertextuality. From the 1960's onwards, prolific philosophers in a vast field have instead

focused on the reader's role as an agent (reader's response, Feminism, gay studies, postcolonialism, Marxist criticism) rather than a passive consumer. (Orr 2003: 166) Indeed there has been a decline for the concept of influence while intertextuality has been even more consolidated (Clayton & Rothstein 1991: Introduction), but those who reject influence and only advocate intertextuality, like Roland Barthes or Julia Kristeva, miss the fact that influence is more complex than just "a study of sources". It has a twofold vertical element, and the reader thus has an amount of agency, like the author that has come to live again, has 30.

I will reintroduce the author as a writer situated in history into a discussion of (inter)textuality. Not only does the "signature" of the writer matter, but the (con)texts of writer's biographical and historical record will be restored to the interpretive process. Some of the methodologies of influence studies will, in other words, be adopted to an intertextual project. (Clayton & Rothstein 1991: 162)

This leads to a position in which intertextuality – as the term has been described by Fairclough above – and influence are two compatible but not *totally synonymous* concepts. Intertextuality is the explicit and implicit references to other writings, while influence is more related to the significance of Evola's signature, even person, in my analysis. I study Evolians after all and focus on both his writings and he as an influential person, although the former might obviously seem more pertinent than the latter. However, I will use these two concepts as equivalent, but the reader should pay attention to the fact that "Evola's voice" or "Evola's person" are perhaps not present in all textual linkages. This theoretical-methodological approach concerns all parts of the analysis (5-9).

3.3. Genre analysis

The intent is not to include *genre analysis* in any deeper sense. Still it would be inapt to ignore this aspect since at least two of the key texts can be considered as book reviews. In general – and this especially concerns Oskorei's writings – many texts are based, or partly based, on a certain book or an author.

Sometimes narratives and expository texts are called *macro-genres*, but the boundaries between them are fluid. One can, in turn, also differentiate several macro-genres on the one

³⁰See Roland Barthes *The Death of the Author* (1967) and Michael Foucault's *What is an Author?* (1969).

hand and explanatory narrative genres and on the other hand, public relations, academic and report genres. The former is independent of context, while the latter is relatively context-dependent. The latter may be called genre colonies and share common features, such as lexical-grammatical similarities and rhetorical conventions. A problem arises, however, when one is talking about for instance narratives or explications, since they might be used in a variety of genres and genre colonies (autobiographies, historical works, novels, fairy tales, etc.). Overall genre analysis is more concerned about use than theory – rhetorical contexts, communicative purposes and linguistic structure – rather than stylistic traits.

The genre in question does often include several so-called generic/rhetorical values, most often a combination of *descriptions*, *explanations* and *evaluations*. (Martin 2002: 280-282), and my aim is to point out the abovementioned values in order to describe and analyze the reviews more fruitfully. I will also loosely analyze parlance and give examples of metaphors, pejoratives, sarcasm, and other forms of stylistic traits at some points; this concerns primarily chapter 8.

3.4. Primary Sources – selections, translations and clarifications

There is almost inevitably a circular reasoning involved in the formulation process of research questions and demarcation. In other words: my quite extensive reading of Evola and Motpol (to lesser degree also Dragon Rouge, de Benoist and Faye) has shaped the research question and the demarcation of this thesis, and after that point I will limit myself to the primary sources (mostly Evola, Oskorei, SolGuru, de Benoist, Faye but also a few others) that are relevant for that question as well as the demarcation. Therefore, I have consciously ignored those sources which do not fit into my restricted research horizon, such as Evola's early philosophical works, and those that are related to for example the Holy Grail, the Mithraic mysteries and René Guénon, and the same goes for the other above-mentioned figures.

It must, however, be emphasized that I have not decided to exclude these pieces of work prior to the analysis: I have used every available source that is relevant. Analogically, I have primarily focused on Motpol blog posts which are more or less explicitly linked to Evola, de Benoist and Faye's ideas, and besides from the two reviews of Evola's *The Path of Cinnabar* the three interviews that Oskorei has carried through can be regarded as key texts. This is another truth that demands some modification and to be utterly sure to not miss anything of

significance I have read all blog posts of Oskorei and SolGuru until January 2011. At some point it is perhaps more relevant to put focus upon the texts which are not explicitly connected to Evola's philosophical tenets, and in some regards it can also be relevant to try to "uncover" aspects that are unspoken.

Since it is impossible to understand Oskorei and SolGuru's relationship to Evola without some clarifications and descriptions of the latter's writings I have felt the need to present my own interpretations of Evola at some points, which however do not differ much from those of Goodrick-Clarke (2002: chapter 3) or Sedgwick (2004: chapter 5). The reason for this is both pedagogical and because this analysis is unique in itself and demands to shed light on phenomena that have not been treated by the above-mentioned scholars (Oskorei, SolGuru, Dragon Rouge, de Benoist, Faye and their relationship to Evola). I have also used *The Path of Cinnabar* (2009) rather frequently in order to present Evola's clarifications regarding his earlier books since it is, at some points, relevant to present them from his own – the author's voice is thus present – perspective.

Since most of Evola's books are translated into English – at least those I have used in this thesis – and I obviously can read my mother tongue, Swedish (Motpol is almost exclusively written in Swedish) these matters have not caused any problem. In fact, it is probably more relevant to read the English translations since Swedish Evolians seldom read Italian or even French or German if the writings are available in English. It is not unproblematic to translate extensive Swedish quotes into English, and therefore the reader can look at the original quotes of Oskorei and SolGuru in the appendixes. In regard to de Benoist's work *Critiques, théoriques* (2002), I had to rely on my rather poor French with necessary help from several French-English dictionaries. The only book written by Faye that I have used, *Archeofuturism* (2010), is thankfully an English translation of *L'archofuturisme* (1998). Correspondingly to the above statement, I assert that it is more relevant to use the English translation since both SolGuru and Oskorei have written reviews of that issue.

Lastly, I have with very few exceptions not taken into account reader comments from the two blogs in question, albeit some of them might be relevant and interesting for my analysis. This is a pragmatic strategy and an attempt to demarcate the texts ad hoc rather than something that I advocate in general. Blog comments can indeed be pertinent.

4. Formative background and description

The aim of this chapter is to furnish the reader with overall descriptions of Evola, Motpol and the *Nouvelle Droite* in order to formulate a backdrop for the analysis (5-9).

4.1. Evola's life and authorship

Baron Giulio Cesare Andrea Evola (1898-1974), commonly known as Julius Evola, was born in a noble Sicilian family in Rome two years before the twentieth century. (Goodrick-Clarke 2002: 53) He showed early interest in books and started his “philosophical career” rather early. While reading Nietzsche he strengthened his aversion for Christianity and the bourgeoisie lifestyle, which made him drop out of his engineering studies before his doctoral dissertation: he could not bear the thought of being a doctor or professor. (Sedgwick 2004: 99) After struggling for Italy in WWI³¹, he took interest in more subversive activities such as mountain climbing³², Dadaism, occult magic and drugs, but these were transient phases of his life and instead he immersed his interest in ancient traditions and philosophy. (Ibid: chapter 5)

His “anti-intellectual” stance made him reject most of contemporary 1920th philosophy, as well as most of the older Humanist ideas in this field. In order to formulate his basic ontological and epistemological position he inverted René Descartes famous maxim *cogito ergo sum* (“I think and thus I am”): *I am and therefore I think*³³ was Evola's device in this regard, and from that *a priori* postulate he concluded that every man has an absolute I, or rather a transcendent self; at some places he called this the *Absolute immanence* or the *Absolute individual* (Ibid: 100).

Through the Italian theosophist³⁴ Arthur Reghini Evola learned even more about occultism and esoteric traditions, but more importantly he met the French Perennialist René Guénon (1886-1951) – perhaps the person who has influenced Evola's work to the greatest extent.

³¹Evola also struggled in WWII for a short time, but he did also had a rather peculiar interest around this time, much like his mountain climbing but even more risky: during one his walks while he lived in Vienna – in order to seek danger rather than avoid it as most people did during the air raids – at the 12th of March 1945, Evola got an almost lethal injury on his spinal cord. He was wheelchair bound from that day but continued to write for about another 15 years.

³²See Evola 1998 for more information about the fact that he saw mountain-climbing as a spiritual metaphor.

³³Evola was however not the first to have positioned himself ontologically in this manner. For instance José Ortega y Gasset's “Yo soy yo y mi circunstancia” (I am myself and my circumstance) posits almost the same thing.

³⁴Evola, like Guénon, was overall very negative in regard to modern spirituality and saw Theosophy as a modern form of “counter-initiation”, a false tradition, even though he actually admired a small number of spiritualists for their immense knowledge about ancient traditions. (see Evola 2003: chapter 29)

Through his studies of especially Vedic philosophy, Guénon concluded that the world's great religious traditions – Hinduism, Buddhism³⁵, Taoism, Confucianism, Zoroastrianism, Judaism, Christianity, Hermeticism, Islam etc., but also pantheistic and naturalistic religions – corresponded to the Vedanta: he believed that they were all of the same divine essence and thus also residues of an ancient Ur-Tradition. After that insight he was able to formulate his specific Perennial philosophy – or the Traditionalist School for that matter, which Evola too can be considered as a member of – and fully developed ideas that were only outspoken in a quite imprecise manner by late medieval thinkers such as Marsilio Ficino (Sedgwick 2004: 23-24). Evola disagreed with Guénon at various points, which to some extent was due to their different dispositions, or *personal equations*, to use Evola's own expression. Guénon regarded himself as *Brāhmaṇa*, a priest in the Indian Varna system, who preferred contemplation. Evola on the other hand regarded himself as a *Kshatriya*, a member of the warrior class, who preferred action, which he regarded as an uranic quality. Evola reversed Johann Jakob Bachofen's evolutionary thesis; he regarded the history of mankind as devolutionary. (Sedgwick 2004: chapter 5) He also stressed, contrary to Guénon, that there were two Traditions – one masculine, Hyperborean and Northern for the Aryan people (in a spiritual sense, which only partly had biological traits), and one feminine, Telluric and southern for the “primitive” races.³⁶ (Goodrick-Clarke 2002: 59-61)

Evola's rather ambivalent relationship to the Italian Fascist movement and the German SS before and during World War II made him rather famous, but it is as a writer that he is most well-known. He wrote a vast number of books, essays, articles and translations during his lifetime, dealing with a lot of different topics but his works were primarily related to the esoteric elements of doctrines such as Buddhism, Taoism, Hermeticism and Tantrism. He did also write more “philosophical” and “political” works, such as *Cavalcare la tigre* (1961) and *Gli oumini e le rovine* (1953). (Sedgwick 2004: chapter 5, 9)

4.2. The New French right

The *Nouvelle Droite* was formed during the mid-1960s along GRECE (Research and Study Group on European Civilization). The main theorist is unhesitatingly the scholar and

³⁵At first Guénon and his disciple, the Swiss Frithjof Schoun, denounced Buddhism but after realizing that it articulated the same essence as the Vedanta they changed their minds and thus they also revised some of their earlier released books where Buddhism had been denounced.

³⁶This is also one of the main reasons why some contemporary Perennialists have rejected Evola and does not regard him as a “true successor” of Guénon (see Renaud Fabbri's review of Sedgwick's book *Against the Modern World*: <http://www.religioperennis.org/documents/Fabbri/Perennialism.pdf>).

philosopher Alain de Benoist but it has included many other more or less salient thinkers such as Guillaume Faye, who left GRECE in 1987³⁷, and Pierre Vial. (Bar-on 2007: 51) The persons that were, and in some cases still are, active in the *Nouvelle Droite* used meta politics – an influence from the Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci, who believed that ideologies were shaped not just in political parties and regular political institutions but also in culture and popular culture – but was in general more influenced by prolific right-wing philosophers³⁸ such as Ernst Jünger, Carl Schmitt, Oswald Spengler, Martin Heidegger and Julius Evola. (Ibid: 94, 122) Other characteristic traits were, and still are, promotion of Paganism, anti-egalitarianism and a ferment critique against “mass immigration” especially from outside Europe. (Böhm 2008: 13, 174, 184-189)

4.3. Motpol

The only printed work that is available up to this point that examines Motpol is *Det vita fältet*, which includes two chapters that treat the blog portal in question; one deals with it exclusively. The two authors have relied on some anonymous sources due to the outspoken will of “protecting their identity”. One of the authors, Mathias Wåg, writes as a non-scholar (Deland et al 2010: 98) and one must therefore approach his chapter with some caution. Regarding the assertion that Oskorei was one of the originators of Motpol and that his name is Joakim Andersen (Ibid), it might be worth to mention that Oskorei has not rejected this information on his blog, although he has commented the release of the book.³⁹ It is therefore rather likely that it is correct. SolGuru’s real name is not revealed in *Det vita fältet*, but the Swedish anchor man and columnist, Robert Aschberg, mentioned his alias in a polemical and satirical chronicle that was published in the tabloid Aftonbladet during November 2010. There he claimed that SolGuru is the person behind the Umeå-based hip hop project Zyklon Boom⁴⁰, which clearly has Traditionalism-influenced lyrics at some points. The song “Tigerrytt (växa som person)” does undoubtedly alludes to Evola’s book *Cavalcare la tigre*.⁴¹ SolGuru has not rejected this information in his comment about the chronicle in question, which makes it rather likely.⁴²

³⁷According to Faye himself (2010: 23), he left the organization in 1986.

³⁸This is simplification for “pedagogic” reasons.

³⁹Oskorei: Freedom of Speech and Pipsqueak: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=2735>.

⁴⁰Robert Aschberg about SolGuru in Aftonbladet: <http://www.aftonbladet.se/nyheter/kolumnister/robertaschberg/article8182810.ab>.

⁴¹Zyklon Boom at YouTube: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jFTQQ5drTNI>.

⁴²SolGuru Comment Aschberg’s Chronicle: <http://solguru.motpol.nu/?p=1220#comments>.

The blog portal was created in 2006 and currently it has about twenty active blogs and about twenty non-active ones; about half of these have ceased to exist. Motpol has close ties to Nordiska förbundet (a nationalistic project which does also include the “alternative encyclopedia” Metapedia, the activist portal Motstand.nu, the newspaper Folkets Nyheter, the Internet community Nordisk.nu, and Nordiska festivalen, a yearly culture related festival). (Deland et al 2010: 110-111) The amount of readers differs very much from one blog to another, and most of the blogs are not even registered on ranking websites such as Bloggtoppen.se. Weblog Oskorei is likely the blog with most readers and has between 3-4000 unique visitors per week in average.⁴³ Another prolific writer is the Catholic traditionalist Jonas De Geer, which also is the former publisher of the conservative magazine *Salt* (Deland et al 2010: 106) and has been a spokesperson for several movements within the nationalistic orbit in Sweden.⁴⁴ He has participated in Swedish television at two occasions, during 2000 and 2001.⁴⁵

It is not easy to categorize neither the blog portal in question nor its writers under one single appellation, but the three words *kulturkamp*⁴⁶, *folkbildning*, *samhällsdebatt* (cultural struggle, education of people, social debate) do at least sum up the intention with the very existence of Motpol. Cultural struggle and meta politics are two closely intertwined concepts that are retrieved from Gramsci via the *Nouvelle Droite*. (Deland et al 2010: 127) Politically-economically it is likewise hard to find a cohesive marker, albeit many bloggers are critical of both liberalism and socialism. The same goes for religion since many are more or less outspoken Christians, Pagans and atheists. Only a few of the writers are outspoken Traditionalists and/or Identitarians, even though many seem to support Identitarianism in the sense that they are critical against “mass immigration”, especially from outside of Europe, and multiculturalism (Ibid: 131). These lowest common denominators can perhaps be nuanced after a closer reading; some bloggers are likely more critical against immigration than others.

⁴³Oskorei at Bloggtoppen.se: <http://www.bloggtoppen.se/blogg/5208/>.

⁴⁴Jonas De Geer Holds a Speech during the Salem Manifestation: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=00Q_WI8D5ic&feature=related.

⁴⁵Jonas De Geer Debates against Carl Rudbeck in Centrum: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TYi1KROIQqA&feature=related>, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pU2JOnPfZCs&feature=related>. Jonas De Geer and Nationaldemokraterna debates against Expo in the television show Insider at TV3: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AL596JG3IT4&feature=related>.

⁴⁶A concept that is retrieved from the Italian socialist Antonio Gramsci.

5. A transnational “Evolianism”

This chapter covers instances of pro-Evola movements and persons that are scattered around the world and has to some extent connections to Evolians in Sweden. As Sedgwick points out, Traditionalism, whether it concerns those currents that were active during the 1920s or contemporary counterparts are not just connected to a specific country or movement – they can be found in several nationalistic domains around the world, as well as in Islam, among other orbits. Neither does the Traditionalist movement have any formal structure. (2004: 23) The following examples – needless to say these are just a few of a much more far-reaching bifurcation – are thus evidences of multi-faceted and transnational “Evolianism” in the contemporary world.⁴⁷

The German Traditionalist and Evolian, Martin Schwarz, can be mentioned as an instance – he has been interviewed by the Swede Mohamed Omar, who was briefly mentioned in the introduction.⁴⁸ Schwarz is editor of the newsletter *Kshatriya: Tradition und Metaphysik* and a Sufi Muslim, and it seems like Evola’s close connection to René Guénon and the former’s writings about Islam (see Evola 1995: chapter 17 and Evola 2007) makes him an important thinker for Schwarz.⁴⁹ Another example is the publishing company Integral Tradition which ceased to exist during May 2010⁵⁰; it has now been supplanted by Arktos Media⁵¹, which sells their former products as well as new ditto. Arktos – the website can be read in Swedish, Norwegian, Danish, English and Spanish – focuses on esoteric and historical literature, including many of Evola’s works, but it does also sell posters and t-shirts among other products. The main target group seems to be Identitarians, nationalists and Traditionalists. It is also relevant to mention Counter-Currents Publishing in this regard, which shares semblances with Arktos and might be another role model for the latter.

The American journal *Tyr* is also worth to point out in this respect, a journal that besides from paying interest to Evola, has a palpable anti-Christian approach. One of the head figures of *Tyr* is Michael Moynihan, who apart from being a musician and an author of the black metal

⁴⁷Here it is however important to make a distinction: not every person or movement who present Evola in a positive manner have to be a Traditionalist, and not every Traditionalist has to be an Evolian.

⁴⁸Omar: The Radical Tradition – an interview with Martin Schwarz:

<http://alazerius.wordpress.com/2010/06/27/den-radikala-traditionen-intervju-med-martin-a-schwarz/>.

⁴⁹<http://traditionundmetaphysik.wordpress.com/>.

⁵⁰Integral Tradition: <http://www.integraltradition.com/>.

⁵¹<http://www.arktos.com>.

book *Lords of Chaos* (1998), has also edited the English translation of *Men Among the Ruins* (2002).

What does it mean to be a radical traditionalist? It means to reject the modern, materialist reign of "quantity over quality," the absence of any meaningful spiritual values, environmental devastation, the mechanization and over-specialization of urban life, and the imperialism of corporate mono-culture, with its vulgar "values" of progress and efficiency. It means to yearn for the small, homogeneous tribal societies that flourished before Christianity – societies in which every aspect of life was integrated into a holistic system.⁵²

It is a common trait that these certain orbits in question – present-day Identitarian and Traditionalist movements and their adherents, who sometimes include Evolians – use the World Wide Web as an instrument to spread information and tout about phenomena that they are interested in (for instance, SolGuru hyperlinks to the perennial blog Café Exposé, Counter-Currents Publishing, and the American white nationalist journal *Occidental Quarterly*⁵³).⁵⁴ While the founders of Traditionalism and the first streams of adherents used regular mail correspondence in order to establish networks (Sedgwick 2004: 119), contemporary counterparts have a more powerful tool: the Internet. But it is not only on a “virtual” level that these phenomena exist, or ideally, should exist: the goal is always to make people at a later time put them into practice; to make people in the long-term actually be Identitarians, Traditionalists or Evolians after sowing ideological seeds in the readers, rather than to be opportunistic and militant.⁵⁵ At the moment – due to linguistic implications – it is often a one way communication since non-Scandinavians in general cannot read Swedish and it seems more likely that the Motpol bloggers read for instance *Tyr* rather than the other way around. During December 2010, however, Oskorei has started to publish brief interviews in English at his blog. He has for instance interviewed the Frenchman Philippe Vardon of the Identitarian party Bloc Identitaire.⁵⁶

⁵²*Tyr*: About the Journal: http://tyrjournal.tripod.com/about_the_journal.htm.

⁵³One of this journal's prolific writers, Michael O'Meara, has written the foreword the English version (2010) of Faye's *L'archeofuturism*.

⁵⁴SolGuru: <http://solguru.motpol.nu/>.

⁵⁵Oskorei: Briefly about Revolutionary Struggle: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=493>. This aspect would need a more profound analysis, but it would be very inapt to state that the abovementioned instances, including Motpol, promotes military struggle in general.

⁵⁵Oskorei: Briefly about Revolutionary Struggle: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=493>. This aspect would need a more profound analysis, but it would be very inapt to state that the abovementioned instances, including Motpol, promotes military struggle in general.

⁵⁶Oskorei: Interview with Philippe Vardon of Bloc Identitaire: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=4203>.

One exception is however the transnational, Swedish-based Left-Hand Path and dark magic movement Dragon Rouge, which has an overall text in English in which Evola is mentioned⁵⁷; almost all texts are available in English and there exist or have existed so-called lodges at different locations in Europe, even in Argentina. (Granholm 2005: 180-181) Granholm has pointed out several Perennialism traits within Dragon Rouge (see especially chapter 3), but these are hard to link to Evola in particular. So, which can the non-outspoken influences from Evola be without too much guesswork?

The philosophy of the dark side is represented by the left hand path and its ideology. The left hand path is founded around a philosophy which defines two main spiritual paths. One is the right hand path. It is evident in most forms of religion and mass movements. Its method is the magic of the light and its goal includes that the individual melts together with God. The other path is the left hand path. It emphasizes the unique, the deviant and the exclusive. Its method is dark magic and antinomianism (going against the grain). The goal is to become a god. Among the magical writers that includes the left hand path we are reading among others Carlos Castaneda, Julius Evola and Kenneth Grant. Most philosophers interest us. We study texts by classical philosophers like Herakleitos, Plato and Plotinos, as well as newer thinkers like Nietzsche, Heidegger and Henri Bergson. We are also incorporating non-European philosophy and are reading classical Indian and Chinese texts like the Upanishads and Tao te ching. A major part of the philosophy of the left hand path can be found among the tantric teachings.⁵⁸

Granholm has probably already answered that question by referring to Evola's *Yoga of Power* (1992) – the “sex magical” elements within Dragon Rouge (Granholm 2005: 142-144) seem to be influenced by the book in question: “The difference between the right hand path and the left hand path is eloquently explained by Julius Evola in the book ‘The Yoga of Power’”⁵⁹: The Dragon symbol (Granholm 2005: 3.2.1.) and its explicit references to the Tao might perhaps be influenced by Evola's work *Taoism* (1993) and the Ouroboros symbol is in turn perhaps an intertextual reference to *The Hermetic Tradition* (Evola 1995; see also Goodrick-Clarke 2002: 55). It is particularly important to note that the above-mentioned books by Evola might be just a limited number of many possible influences in these regards.⁶⁰ Correspondingly, it is also pertinent to emphasize that I am not implying/guessing that these are the only of Evola writings that members of the Dragon Rouge get inspiration from. The

⁵⁷Dragon Rouge – General Information: <http://www.dragonrouge.net/english/general.htm>.

⁵⁸Dragon Rouge: General Information: <http://www.dragonrouge.net/english/general.htm>.

⁵⁹Dragon Rouge: General Information: <http://www.dragonrouge.net/english/general.htm>.

⁶⁰This is also something that the founder of Dragon Rouge, Thomas Karlsson, agrees with – we had a brief mail correspondence during December 2010. He has also said that all of Evola's books are of interest and that it is not problematic if they contradict each other or other writings. He did also stress that many Dragon Rouge members dislike Evola's “hysterical elitism”.

lack of *manifest intertextuality*, with *Yoga of Power* as one exception, makes it difficult to discern which specific writings of Evola that are being used within the movement in question.

Another aspect, partly linked to the Left-Hand Path practices of Tantrism that Evola describes in *Yoga of Power*, is the moral outlook of Dragon Rouge members in general (see Granholm 2005: 3.3.). Granholm points out that members of the Dragon Rouge in general advocate a kind of individual and situation-based morality. All actions should be in alignment with his/her true Will. (Ibid: 150-152) This outlook – although it might be linked to Aleister Crowley or any other famous occultist who vindicated an antinomian standpoint (see for instance Crowley 2004) – seems to be congenial with Evola’s rather complex advocating of the Left Hand-Path which he wrote about in *Ride the Tiger* and explained in *The Path of Cinnabar*; he believed that it was the only option during the current epoch. (Evola 2009: 213) Evola writes:

Naturally, we are not dealing here with normal existence, but with those possible forms of it that are already differentiated, that have a certain intensity, while still being defined in a chaotic ambience, in the times to come they will surely proliferate. The state in question is that of the man who is self-confident through having as the essential center of his personality not life, but Being. He can encounter everything, abandon himself to everything, and open himself to everything without losing himself. He accepts every experience, no longer in order to prove and know himself, but to unfold all his possibilities in view of the transformations that they can work in him, and of new contents that offer and reveal themselves on this path. (2003: 65)

These “instrumentations of actions” can perhaps be linked to ritualistic pragmatics in which everything that can work in favor of the magician is practiced, including antinomian measures. So, did Evola believe that his descriptions of esoteric could be put into practice? During at least his final years in life, he did not believe so:

As for most of my other books dealing with various ‘inner’ or ‘esoteric’ traditional doctrines, they should be read for the sole purpose of broadening one’s intellectual horizons, and certainly not in the foolish hope of achieving any of the goals they describe – goals that, even in times more favourable than our own, were only achieved in extraordinary circumstances by individuals that possessed highly uncommon personal qualifications. (Evola 2009: 258)⁶¹

⁶¹This statement is from an interview from 1972 that is included as an appendix in *The Path of Cinnabar*.

And as a follow question – are his own views on the matter important for his followers? Yes and no, would perhaps the overall answer be. Regarding Dragon Rouge it is hard to say anything in particular about this matter, but perhaps breaking norms is to ignore Evola’s warnings too? It is also likely that few members, if any, of the Dragon Rouge has actually read *The Path of Cinnabar* – the book was released in 2009⁶² and the movement in question was formed during the early 1990’s; their philosophical tenets were not shaped yesterday and the same goes for the general information on the official website. (see Granholm 2005: 3:3) Once again Evola *did* advocate the Left-Hand Path so his ambiguous advices could certainly lead to several “misunderstandings” in this restricted sense. Nevertheless, it is likewise important to, once again, stress that Evola is one of many possible influences in this respect and that Evola was in turn influenced by Nietzsche – another thinker that has influenced Dragon Rouge – although he rejected many of his ideas due to, as he saw it, the lack of transcendent dimensions and a misunderstanding of the Dionysian myth (Evola 2003: chapter six, seven, eight, ten).

Another aspect of interest is the cyclical view of Dragon Rouge and their dichotomy between “The Dark” draconian philosophy and “The Light”:

To illustrate the difference between the dark and the light, as well as the left and the right hand path, we can experiment with the disposition below. It is paradoxical that the philosophy of the dark side is based on a polar holism where some of the qualities of the light is included in a unity together with the dark. The draconian philosophy includes dark and light, male and female while the light side is based on dualities as darkness or light, male or female.

The Dark

The chtonic – earthly/the underworld
 Organic
 Nature
 Pantheism and polytheism
 Realism
 Idealism
 Cyclic time
 Polar holism

The Light:

Uranic – heavenly
 Mechanic
 Civilization
 Monotheism
 Utopism
 Materialism
 Linear time
 Dualism⁶³

⁶²The book was originally published in Italian in 1963 as *Il Cammino del Cinabro*, but even the second edition from 1972 has been out of print for a long time (see notes to the foreword of *The Path of Cinnabar*) and in general it is seldom that Swedish people can read Italian.

⁶³Dragon Rouge: Contra M: http://www.dragonrouge.net/english/Contra_3_M.pdf.

There are a number of characteristic traits that fit together with Evola's beliefs, such as cyclical time, idealism, realism⁶⁴ and the organic metaphor (Evola 1995: 75, 2002: chapter 4). On the other hand, Evola regarded the chthonic Tradition as inferior and the Uranic as superior (Goodrick-Clarke 2002: 59-61) and it seems that the philosophy of Dragon Rouge is a mixture of both the Uranic tradition and the Telluric tradition. Several other of the described tenets are harder to point out as being typical for Evola's writings, but he did certainly neither reject the idea of a civilization nor hoped for a human "dominance over nature". (Evola 2003: chapter 18) It is striking that Dragon Rouge has absorbed several ideas that are typical for Evola's beliefs, while they have rejected numerous other such.

One may assume that Dragon Rouge is a more isolated instance of "Evolianism" and does not seem to have any connections to Motpol or any other domains of the Swedish far right-wing, although one exception would perhaps be the metal musician and front figure of the quite successful band Therion, Christoffer Johnsson, who is an outspoken member of Dragon Rouge and a fellow of the municipal assembly of the party Sverigedemokraterna (Sweden Democrats).⁶⁵ However, this particular aspect will need a more immense study of both Dragon Rouge and the Swedish far right-wing in order to say something less sweeping and assumptive.

If one changes perspective and looks upon how for instance Oskorei regard the Left-Hand Path it is obvious that he has never promoted Satanism, and when he wrote about Edred Thorsson, also known as Stephen Flowers – who is also an outspoken member of the Temple of Set (Petersen 2009: 92) – he emphasized that he is a controversial person (and, implicitly, perhaps due to the above-mentioned membership). In this sense one may assume that it is Thorsson's "runological" aspects that are of interest for Oskorei's readers rather than the more "Satanic" Left-Hand Path traits. Oskorei has also mentioned David Myatt as an influence in a specific

⁶⁴One should note, though, that it is a specific kind of idealism and realism that Evola promotes; he also reject both Immanent Idealism and Kantian Transcendent Idealism (see Evola 2009: 5-19), although it is possible to entitle Evola's Traditionalism as a kind of Idealism from an etic perspective. The kind of realism that he enfold is described in Evola 2003: chapter 16.

⁶⁵Internationalen about Christoffer Johnsson: <http://www.internationalen.se/news.php?extend.3207>. The Swedish far right-wing web paper Nationell has also commented Johnsson's membership in the Dragon Rouge: <http://www.nationell.nu/2010/03/10/djavulsdyrkande-sd-are-vill-konkurrera-ut-nd-i-sodertalje/>.

and restricted sense, but emphasized that he is a national socialist⁶⁶ and not a founding member of the Satanic Order of Nine Angles (see Senholt 2009).

6. Oskorei: “Life stance” – worldview, anthropology and morals

One aim of this chapter is to examine Oskorei’s outlook regarding what might be called *life stance*, a concept that I have borrowed from the field of Systematic Theology and Studies in World Views. Note that I am inspired by this specific definition of life stance when I analyze Oskorei’s text. For a deeper understanding of a person’s life stance one most perhaps carry through deep interviews. What I put focus on is an overall approach to the world and life, as well as moral outlook and anthropology (self-image, ethnicity, sex and gender) and their connection to Evola’s writings, based on certain blog posts. Another aim of this chapter is to discern the relationship between Traditionalism and Identitarianism from Oskorei’s viewpoint and how Evola fits into that double self-descriptive equation.

According to Anders Jeffner a person’s life stance is tripartite: 1) something that has significant importance for an overall conception of the humanity and the world, 2) something that creates a central evaluation system, and 3) something that expresses a basic attitude to life. (1988: 5-9). Oskorei has claimed that he is both an Identitarian and Traditionalist, which indeed indicates that he is influenced by several authors within these two rather – but definitely not completely – intertwined ideologies. Oskorei has written about many authors, philosophers and politicians during more than four years as an active blogger and it is therefore not easy to point out which of these that are the most salient for his beliefs (both politically, culturally and spiritually). However, in an interview with Mohamed Omar he mentioned a number of chief influences: “Besides, it is doubtful that I can label myself as nationell⁶⁷ due to its links to the historical National Socialism. I’m a traditionalist, radical right, and Identitarian, and my role models are Evola, Marx, de Benoist and Jünger,

⁶⁶Oskorei: Therefore Identitarian: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=518>.

⁶⁷I have not translated this concept due to the hardship of finding an English equivalent.

not Hitler.”⁶⁸ In an interview with SNUS (Swedish Nihilist Society), Oskorei once again mentions Julius Evola as a role model, as well as Nietzsche and Stirner.⁶⁹

If one for a moment ignores the other role models and put focus upon Evola one may ask how and why his ideas are important. Oskorei has stated that he is a Traditionalist, which might imply that he agrees with the perennial truths and revelations that have been described by Evola. In the interview with SNUS he discussed his viewpoint in this respect and more precisely regarding why there tends to be a dualism between the physical reality and subjective imagination among people in general (my translation from Swedish):

According to Wagner this is due to a not completely harmonic synthesis between both a heathen and Christian heritage, but it is in general also a recurrent phenomenon in all historical civilization developments. One can, for example, notice that in Hinduism there was at first a crystal clear and simple but challenging doctrine which was in harmony with reality. But gradually it was distorted by human’s need for comforting and encouraging messages and transformed into something that was separated from its origins. The responsibility was then laid on Buddha’s shoulders to restore the message and bring it back to its origin. But after his death, we see again how the simple message is encumbered with various redemptive gods and the likes. Whereupon Zen Buddhism enters the scene etcetera.

This is an eternal cycle that we are going through and is probably best explained by human psychology and human needs, but as an individual, it’s easy to seek out the authentic traditions and their origins. Personally, I regard the Italian traditionalist Julius Evola as a good example here, preferably in combination with Nietzsche and Stirner.

Oskorei has already mentioned a number of “original” forms of traditions, such as Vedic Hinduism and two types of Buddhism. To understand the latter and their relation to Evola one must turn to his writings that treat these subjects. In *Doctrine of the Awakening* (1943)⁷⁰ Evola discusses the earliest Pali texts in order to formulate what he regards as the true kernel of the Buddhist doctrine, and in the collection of essays *Zen* (1993) Evola examines Zen Buddhism and its relationship to both the Japanese Samurai’s and other forms of Buddhism. Oskorei is an outspoken Pagan and Traditionalist and the latter might imply that he analogically has a positive relationship to Islam; however the second point needs to be

⁶⁸Mohamed Omar Interviews Oskorei: <http://alazerius.wordpress.com/2009/03/09/liberalismen-ar-det-storsta-hotet-intervju-med-oskorei/>. It is unhesitatingly Julius Evola, Alain de Benoist, Karl Marx and Ernst Jünger that he has in mind.

⁶⁹SNUS Interviews Oskorei: <http://www.anus.com/tribes/snus/kultur/intervjuer/oskorei.html>. He unhesitatingly refers to Friedrich Nietzsche and Max Stirner.

⁷⁰Inner Traditions edited the English translation in 1996.

variegated. As has already been noted, Oskorei has been interviewed by the Swedish Islamist Mohamed Omar, and during December of 2010 Oskorei in turn made an interview with Omar.⁷¹ This has caused many of Oskorei's readers to if not deprecate themselves from him, then at least criticize his supposed "Islamophilia"⁷², albeit he has rejected Islam as an adequate alternative on the Traditionalistic smorgasbord⁷³ due to so-called ethno-political reasons, something that it is relevant to discuss at a later place.⁷⁴ In this regard it seems like the Identitarian aspect is superior to Traditionalism, but since it is more or less possible according to Oskorei to choose another authentic Tradition than Islam – he suggests Orthodox Christianity, Catholicism and perhaps also specific forms of Paganism (Asatru Folk Assembly) as at least three available options – he has offered a solution for this dilemma. Therefore, the relationship to Omar may seem like a will to collect interesting collocutors rather than to cooperate with Swedish Muslims.

In this sense it is also important to point out Oskorei's ambiguous relationship to Christianity. As it has been stated he does regard it as a possible option, or rather options, but in general – since he is an outspoken Pagan – he has preferred to promote Paganism and pre-Christian history and cultural influences rather than Christianity. In this specific sense it is hard to identify how important the links to Evola's authorship are. Evola expressed early in his life a ferment anti-Christian approach, especially in the book *Imperialismo pagano* (1928); this outlook was later at least partly revised although he emphasized that the hope for a Catholic revival was false and the religion in question was often distorted by the destructive processes that are ubiquitous during *Kali Yuga*. (see Evola 2009: 129-134)

Before one continues it is relevant to consider some of Evola's philosophical main tenets. *Revolt Against the Modern World* (1934)⁷⁵ is perhaps his most important piece of work (Evola 1995: 135), and in this book he formulates his specific Traditional outlook on the historical matters. Besides from Guénon's *Crisis of the Modern World* (1927), Evola's work was partly influenced by Oswald Spengler's magnum opus the *Decline of the West* (first volume 1919,

⁷¹Oskorei: Interview with Mohamed Omar: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=4192>.

⁷²Oskorei: Oskorei being Interviewed by Mohamed Omar: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=1274>.

⁷³Oskorei: Therefore Identitarian: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=518>, Oskorei: Ride the Tiger 2008 – fragments: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=748>.

⁷⁴With this he denotes the inevitable need to repatriate Muslim immigrants in the future.

⁷⁵From now on I will refer to the English translation from 1995.

second volume 1922)⁷⁶, the Swiss anthropologist and sociologist Johann Jakob Bachofen (Sedgwick 2004: 100; Goodrick-Clarke 2002: 59), the Italian philosopher Giambattista Vico (Evola 2009: 189), as well as the Greek philosopher Hesiod's meta historical opus, the *Work and Days*. (Ibid: 103, 137-138) Evola used what he regarded as corresponding analyze models like the Hindu *Yuga Kalpan* theory and Hesiod's five ages in order to describe how every civilization passes through various stages and ultimately are deemed to collapse. This was however not due to material or biological factors but because of a certain metaphysical law. (Sedgwick 2004: chapter 5; Goodrick-Clarke 2002: 56-57)

The doctrine of the cycles has already been mentioned, and in relation to this it is also pertinent to point out the almost corresponding theory: the regression of the castes. Basically, almost all traditional civilizations have been ruled by three or four classes – and in India they consist of the *Brāhmaṇa* (priest caste), *Khsatriya* (warrior caste), *Vaishya* (salesmen caste), and *Sudra* (servants/workers caste). All of these correspond to other kinds of (spiritual) classes around the world (for instance: the *Vaishya* caste corresponds to the Third estate/bourgeoisie and the bankers that rule in the USA, and the *Sudra* caste corresponds to the proletarians in Soviet and China) as well as to different epochs of a civilization cycle: the *Satya Yuga* corresponds to the priest rule; *Treta Yuga* to the warrior rule; *Dvapara Yuga* to the salesmen rule; and *Kali Yuga* to the servants' rule.⁷⁷ (Goodrick-Clarke 2002: 63-64; see also Evola 1995: chapter 14 and 22)

One may note, however, that Oskorei almost never uses the doctrine of the castes and the *Kalpan* theory in order to explain the current situation in the modern world; there is only a very limited number of instances in which *Kali Yuga* are mentioned in his blog posts⁷⁸, although in at least one post he does so implicitly⁷⁹. One reason for this may be strategic – for readers who are not Traditionalists it may seem obscure to refer to a Hindu term both for pedagogic and political reasons: many people will perhaps not understand what he refers to or even consider it hogwash. Another related reason is an obvious disagreement with Evola in

⁷⁶Although Evola has stated that after he had scrutinized Spengler's thoughts, he was in fact not influenced by them at all. (2009: 206)

⁷⁷This is however an oversimplification for pedagogic reasons – Evola had a much more complex relation to these matters. (see Evola 1995)

⁷⁸Webblogg Oskorei: Mircea Eliade and the Eternal Return: http://oskorei.webblogg.se/260506093033_mircea_eliade_och_myten_om_den_e.html.

⁷⁹Oskorei: Julius Evola and the Crusades: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=482>.

one decisive sense, namely *apoliteia*. To understand this term, one has to turn to another of Evola's works.

If *Men Among the Ruins* can be regarded as a set of advices for those few Italians who, according to Evola, had the possible authority to change the conditions of the postwar situation, then *Ride the Tiger* (1961)⁸⁰ constitutes a number of advices for what Evola called the “differentiated man”, most likely persons with *Brāhmaṇa* or *Kshatriya* dispositions. In this, at various parts quite complex book – it demands the reader to know about Nietzsche, Sartre and Heidegger among other things – Evola discusses modern phenomena such as contemporary science and philosophy, but also drugs, modern culture and how the differentiated man should relate to his own death. Almost all of Evola's books, including this one, are characterized by pessimism: modern man is living in *Kali Yuga* and not many things seem to be as they should – not even the residues of the Tradition, i.e. true spiritual forms of religion, such as Sufi Islam, are of any significance at the end of the cycle. (Evola 2009: 230-231) On the other hand, the title of the book stresses that the man Evola had in mind should “ride the tiger”; that is, he should get on the back of the beast and if he manages to survive until it collapses he could easily kill it. In other words: to be a part of the modern society (the tiger) is (spiritually) dangerous, but it could turn out to be favorable in the end, or rather in the next Golden age. Therefore, Evola chooses the Left-Hand Path⁸¹ – it is the only option in the current epoch (Ibid: 213). Evola's pessimism did also lead to the advocating of *apoliteia* – for the differentiated man that lives in the current epoch, it is as spiritually relevant, that is irrelevant, to be involved in party politics as it is to speculate on the stock market. (Evola 2003: chapter 25)⁸² In an attempt to illustrate how Evola looked at the development history one can for pedagogic reasons use a dollar sign: the s-curve symbolizes the cyclical pattern in regard to how the civilizations develop from one phase to another, whereas the straight line symbolizes time which always is linear no matter what⁸³. He could not see any true progression in the modern world, and viewed contemporary science – especially the speculations in physics – as another sign of regression:

⁸⁰From this point I will refer to the English translation from 2003.

⁸¹Evola implicitly uses *Trimurti* – the three chief gods of Hinduism: Brahma, Vishnu and Shiva – in order to describe the differences between the Right-Hand Path and the Left-Hand Path. The last mentioned gods' function, destruction, is what characterizes the Left-Hand Path and its practices.

⁸²Sedgwick (2004: 183) also discusses how Evola's adherents, and to some degree also scholars, have interpreted the notion of *apoliteia*. My opinion is that chapter eleven, “Action Without Desire” in *Ride the Tiger could possibly be interpreted* as an implicit urging for the differentiated man to call for arms and make heroic deeds.

⁸³For a more exact analysis of how Evola looked at space and time, see Evola 1995 (chapter 19).

The truth is that man has gained nothing from the progress of science and technology, neither in regard to knowledge (...), not in regard to his own power, and still less in regard to any higher law or conduct. At best one could make an exception for medicine, but still only on the physical level. (Ibid: 139)

However, the dollar symbol in itself and what it symbolizes, capitalism – the characteristic trait par excellence of the late modern world – he harshly rejected. (Evola 2002: chapter 3, 4, 11) At some places Evola also stressed that traditional man should “ride the wave” instead of going against it⁸⁴ (Evola 1995: xxix), or “ride the current” for that matter. (Evola 2003: 10, 168) In jest one could say that he should also be able to *ride the currency* in the capitalist society.

Oskorei’s analysis of *Ride the Tiger* is based on questions of how it could be considered in the present situation and he writes from the perspective of being an Identitarian Traditionalist – he advocates a synthesis between these two positions, which has also made him reject the idea of *apoliteia*. Being an Identitarian means struggling for your own people and since Oskorei is “ethnically aware” – which in a high degree is congenial with Richard McCulloch’s ethno-pluralism⁸⁵ (see Deland et al 2010: 104-105) – it includes to be a role model for his people and to fight against “mass immigration” from both a biological and sociopolitical perspective. Therefore, Oskorei rejects drug use in general⁸⁶ – Evola had an ambiguous relationship to drugs but was definitely not against it per se, since many Traditional civilizations had used it for spiritual purposes (Evola 2003: chapter 23) – so in this sense Oskorei does not follow his advices. He also regards criminal activities as noxious; an Identitarian can do more good for his people in other ways.⁸⁷ Evola has quoted Ernst Jünger regarding this matter: “Better a delinquent than a bourgeoisie” (Evola 2009: 258)⁸⁸ and not advised for, but explicitly mentioned arms traffic and white slavery as possible activities for the differentiated and unconditioned person who can “act without desire” and participate in whatever he feels like during the epoch of dissolution. (Evola 2003: 175) Thus, when Oskorei writes within an Identitarian Traditionalist discourse, Evola is articulated in another way than for the non-Identitarian Traditionalists who perhaps do not have to be role models and care for their own people to the same extent.

⁸⁴Both of these metaphorical terms are equivalent to “ride the tiger”.

⁸⁵Oskorei: The Islamization Discourse: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=3524>, Oskorei: Traditionalism and Ethno-pluralism: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=161>.

⁸⁶Oskorei: Ride the Tiger – Fragments: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=748>.

⁸⁷Oskorei: Ride the Tiger – Fragments: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=748>.

⁸⁸In order to understand this quotation it is best to read the whole interview as well as *Ride the Tiger* in full.

The question one must ask in this sense is if Oskorei regards himself as the differentiated person? He has never explicitly stated it but many posts, including the review of *Ride the Tiger*, seem to imply so⁸⁹. The differentiated person is synonymous with the Traditional man (Evola 2003: 2-3), who feels alienated in the contemporary world, and since Oskorei is an outspoken Traditionalist it is rather obvious that his self-image is congenial with the human type that Evola described, although it is not as easy to point out if there is a *Kshatriya* or *Brāhmaṇa* that he has in mind (see also Deland et al 2010: 135). On a more general level it indeed seems that hierarchy is something that Oskorei promotes and in a similar manner as the traditional caste systems; this can however be because he refers to Evola's view on the matter in this specific blog post. The first passage, on the other hand, implies a more meritocratic and contingent elitism (see McNamee & Miller 2004):

The American world view can thus be compared with the European radical conservative. Radical conservatives as Strindberg and Pareto was not hostile to social mobility and elite rotation, on the contrary, they considered it necessary to facilitate the best in the tribe to take place in the elite (and in our time, one can only agree with this. In a radical transformation of society most of our "elites" must be replaced).

The traditional European world view is based on persons rather than individualism. This means that we as individuals are neither interchangeable nor identical. Anybody cannot become everything, no matter what education or training he / she get's. Nor is it desirable to have such single project, but a person is he/she because of where he/she grew up, because of their ethnicity, their traditions, their character (what has been called caste) and so on.⁹⁰

To summarize this aspect, it is highly likely that Oskorei promotes a hierarchical anthropology which is more or less essential in its character – a viewpoint which corresponds to a Traditionalist stratification that Evola has promoted. A more flexible and contingent meritocracy is, however, more desirable than the contemporary (Swedish) society's democracy and the rule of the current "elite". Whether a person is born as or becomes a differentiated person is likewise hard to say without too much guesswork: the former is congruent with the Traditional anthropology while the latter harmonizes with modern meritocracy. One post that treats the "aristocratic ideal" emphasizes that it is about how you

⁸⁹See for instance Oskorei: Urban Exploration and the World's Re-enchantment: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=3010>.

⁹⁰Oskorei: Julius Evola About America: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=431>.

behave as a person and thus anyone can at least strive to be noble-minded and polite. There is thus a possible divergence between an essential view and a contingent outlook.⁹¹

Another aspect is Oskorei's opinions about sex and gender in relation Evola, which he also wrote about in *Ride the Tiger* (2003: chapter 27 and 28) but more profoundly in *Eros and the Mysteries of Love* (1991). Oskorei has discussed feminism⁹² and the relationship between men and women⁹³ in several posts, but the explicit linkage to Evola's writings are to be found in the analyses/reviews of *Ride the Tiger* and *Eros and the Mysteries of Love*. Oskorei writes that Evola himself regarded the current epoch too unfavorable to find a woman that was feminine enough to be married to and have children with but disagrees with him at this point: for an Identitarian Traditionalist it is also relevant to pass your own genes on. Oskorei does also claim that northern Europe historically has had a more "complementary relationship" between the sexes unlike Mediterranean countries like Italy.⁹⁴ I will not dwell on the contents of the *Eros and the Mysteries of Love* – the reader can turn to Goodrick-Clarke (2002: 60) or Evola himself (1991, 2009: 206-213) – but a general comment about the method that Evola used in his analysis might be valuable. Overall Evola made a thricotomized scrutiny on the matter – he regarded biological and psychological explanations of several amorous and sex related issues as inadequate; in those cases where Darwinian and Freudian interpretations could not stand the test he offered metaphysical or rather Traditional explanations.

Oskorei's review of Evola's *Eros and the Mysteries of Love* (1991) put focus upon *descriptions* and *explanations* of the work in question – no distinctive *evaluative* passages are included. It is conspicuous that he has emphasized that not all women are made to be married and procreators – some can even have a social function as (temple) prostitutes (my translation from Swedish):

My comment would be that not all women are destined to a life as mothers or wives, and for them prostitution comes naturally. Traditional societies grouped them in this case in their own social and religious sphere, they had their own rites, sometimes even their own "craft" (ars amatoria, Kama Sutra, etc.), their organizations/guilds, and so on. The same cannot be said about the situation in modern society, one need only to compare the old day's geishas and courtesans with today's street girls.⁹⁵

⁹¹Oskorei: Brief About Elitism and Ethnic Preservation: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=2313>.

⁹²Oskorei: Camille Paglia: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=1697>.

⁹³Oskorei: The Crisis of the Modern Man: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=922>.

⁹⁴Oskorei: Ride the Tiger 2008 – fragments: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=748>.

⁹⁵Oskorei: Eros and the Mysteries of Love: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=171>.

He continues to discuss the basic metaphysics of the sexes (my translation from Swedish):

Evola also examines the metaphysics of the both sexes. This is their ideal types, he is well aware that there are no men who do not have any feminine sides at all, and vice versa. These sections are probably deeply offensive to every radical feminist, Evola describes woman as fundamentally (i.e. spiritual) passive, and is incapable of realizing her meaning other than in relation to a man (either mother or partner). The man, on the other hand, is active and spiritually virile, and does not realize his whole meaning if he put all his energy in women and family.

Regarding the two metaphysical sexes, Evola is aware that some individuals may have a biological sex but is dominated by the contrary. These are naturally homosexual, and were often subsumed into their own social spheres in traditional societies.⁹⁶

The striking thing is that the sexes, as they are described above, are essential since they are separated as two distinct poles, but since every man and woman has – more or less – something of the opposite sex’ characteristics it seems like it is due to biological (in a Traditional sense?) factors that a man can be rather feminine or the other way around. Evola did not treat the gender aspect almost at all in his book and Oskorei has not added anything on the matter.

Lastly, I will examine some of the moral aspects that Oskorei has presented in his writings. A total ethical system has never been expressed in any blog post and therefore I have to turn to texts that express more overall morals (see Pojman & Fieser 2009: chapter 1), whether explicitly or implicitly. It is suitable to use the ethno-pluralist and “ethnically aware” stance as a point of departure: Oskorei does without hesitation prioritize Swedish people and Europeans and regard them as not more valuable or superior – that is incompatible with a ethno-pluralistic perspective – but worth of saving as a bio-ethnic group or race.⁹⁷ These points do not seem to be connected to Evola, albeit he did write about race from a Traditional perspective which was contrary to Nazi Germany’s biological racism. (Bar-On 2007: 122) The more general critique against non-European “mass immigration” and a necessary repatriation of a vast amount of immigrants⁹⁸ is more related to the ideas that have been expressed by the *Nouvelle Droite*, but one should note that Evola wrote about the need for a strong European unification (2002: chapter 16) and thus the ideas in question may indirectly

⁹⁶Ibid.

⁹⁷Oskorei: The Islamization Discourse: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=3524>.

⁹⁸Oskorei: Therefore Repatriation: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=3154>.

be linked to his writings. The difference is that there were very few “non-Europeans” on European ground during the 1950’s when *Gli oumini le rovine* (1953) was written. My point is that Evola might have expressed the similar values if he would have lived today (Merkl 1986; Evola 1995, 2003: chapter 23), but Oskorei has not used his writings⁹⁹ in this particular respect.

On a more individual basis it is hard to pinpoint any general patterns but the fact that being an Identitarian implies to care about your people, one may note that the more morally “detached” lifestyle that Evola advocated in *Ride the Tiger* (2003: 76) is incompatible with the former stance. In a blog post – which was referred to above – Oskorei discussed elitism and aristocratic behavior:

When an anti-liberal talks about elitism and aristocracy contemporaries are often quick to misinterpret this, a misunderstanding based on the history we take part of in school and the media. First of all these concepts are interpreted in purely political and economic terms, like an antidemocratic idealization of earlier slave societies. Secondly these are interpreted as something inherited. Thirdly these are often interpreted as an insensitive standpoint, a form of misanthropy and general lack of empathy.

In fact it is primarily a *personal* ideal, something you strive to achieve in your life. You have a picture of what sort of person you want to be, and finds that there are great similarities with the historical aristocracies demands on themselves and the goals they had. Values as self-restraint, politeness, loyalty, courage and civility are central, but also grace, hospitality and kindness to the weaker and against a beaten opponent. You separate your higher sides from your lower, and strive to not become a slave to the lower (fear, gluttony, hate, et cetera), while being aware of their function in specific situations.¹⁰⁰

It is tempting to link the above-mentioned traits to virtue ethics. (See Swanton 2005: Introduction) On the other hand, the last sentence shows a drift towards more situation-based ethics. Not all of these traits can be directly linked to Evola’s writings, but with a small volition it is possible to tie Oskorei’s more general penchant for using the words “bad” rather than “sinful”,¹⁰¹ to the moral exposition that Evola does – often via Nietzsche’s philosophical tenets – in *Ride the Tiger* (2003: 71-72). This particular aspect will, however, need a more immense study in order to say something more general.

⁹⁹In the chapter “America Negrizzata” in *L’Arco e La Clava*, Evola expresses ideas that are unequivocally racist.

¹⁰⁰Oskorei: Brief About Elitism and Ethnic Reservation: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=2313>.

¹⁰¹Oskorei: The Four Indo-Aryan Goals of Life: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=274>.

To conclude what has been said in this chapter it is conspicuous that the relationship between Identitarianism and Traditionalism seems to be in harmony, and if Islam is rejected due to ethno-political reasons, then Christendom and Paganism are other available options on the Traditionalist smorgasbord. However, being an Identitarian does also include fighting for your own people, which makes Oskorei reject Evola's idea of *apoliteia*. Oskorei seem to regard himself as the Traditional man, or differentiated person, although he seems to advocate the true noble sides of aristocracy rather than hereditary stratification and sheer wealth. Other posts problematize this viewpoint, but a general problem is that these points are made implicit in blog posts – if Oskorei quotes Evola it does not necessarily mean that he shares the beliefs, at least always. From a moral perspective Oskorei's Identitarian and ethno-pluralist stance has made him advocate repatriation of mostly non-European immigrants. On a more individual level there are tendencies towards both virtue ethics and situation-based ethics.

7. SolGuru: “Life Stance “ – worldview, anthropology and morals

In the previous chapter I used the life stance definition that Jeffers has elaborated as a flexible point of departure in order to examine some basic attitudes towards life, the world, mankind and morals based on certain Evola-related writings of Oskorei. This chapter does not differ in that respect and I now turn to the Motpol fellow blogger SolGuru, who likewise is both Identitarian and Traditionalist. SolGuru has stated that he uses Perennialism as a takeoff for his blog¹⁰², and in one of his first blog posts one can sense a pluralistic perspective on religion: God has many names and it differs from one place to another.¹⁰³ He has not specified his beliefs, but seems to be sympathetic towards most religious forms that are in accordance with Traditionalism – Christianity, Buddhism, Hinduism, Paganism and Islam (needless to say it is impossible to cover all religious forms in the history of mankind). A number of these will however need a closer examination.

Regarding Christianity, SolGuru has stated that Svenska kyrkan (The Swedish Church) is a “secularized intercourse association”¹⁰⁴ while he regards Catholicism and the Orthodox Church as true forms of the religion in question. The reason why one can jump to these conclusions and neglect other forms of Christianity is that they seldom are included in the

¹⁰²Motpol: Blogs: <http://www.motpol.nu/bloggar.php>.

¹⁰³SolGuru: The Lord's Eye: Brief Nation Day Post: <http://solguru.motpol.nu/?p=11>.

¹⁰⁴SolGuru: Put down the Public Service!: <http://solguru.motpol.nu/?p=90>.

Traditional school (see Sedgwick 2004: chapter 1, 2), and SolGuru has never written about them either. Regarding Paganism SolGuru has sarcastically rejected modern forms such as Svenska Asatrosamfundet (Swedish Asatru Foundation)¹⁰⁵, while Islam is discarded due to ethno-political reasons¹⁰⁶. For instance, Confucianism, Taoism and Hinduism have never been treated on the blog and SolGuru has neither discussed the choice of Tradition in the same explicit sense as Oskorei, which makes it harder to really know his opinions in this regard. Contrariwise, what SolGuru *has* emphasized is the lack of purpose in contemporary men's life and that people in general strive for so-called abstract goals when they should strive for to find the objective keystone, which is the sacred or God. Or to use SolGuru's own words (my translation from Swedish):

Something is rotten in the secular state. There is desperation in people's eyes when they look happy. The awareness that nothing, really nothing, has any fundamental meaning drains them. The anti-apostles of Modernity would like to say that this is a freedom - a chance. Without band and compulsion the individual can reach "self-fulfillment." But this individual, disengaged from the sacred, its people and its history, does not exist. He is a grain of sand, an absurdity - he is *dust in the wind*, but without Dylan's Buddhist undertones. He flashes of eternity and disappear into the darkness without leaving the slightest trace, and he knows it.

107

One may note that SolGuru has written about a vast number of topics and far from all of these deal with metaphysical or moral questions, but still it is possible to identify general patterns from an Identitarian and Traditionalist perspective. SolGuru has even summarized the Identitarian ideology in several blog posts and treated its specific ethics¹⁰⁸ and main tenets – albeit he emphasizes that he sums them up in a more general and simplified manner which may not be shared by all ideological kinsmen.¹⁰⁹ The main idea is that the individual, the family, the local community, and state is the main concern from the Identitarian ethical viewpoint – an “abstract humankind” in which every individual is interchangeable to another is rejected (hedonism and utilitarianism is explicitly or implicitly mentioned as inadequate ethical standpoints).¹¹⁰ This is, however, developed in another post and the region (or rather province, from a Swedish perspective) as well as Europe is also integral parts of an Identitarian

¹⁰⁵SolGuru Comment Rimfaxe: Archeofuturism part I: <http://rimfaxe.motpol.nu/?p=2527>.

¹⁰⁶SolGuru: My Foe's Foe: <http://solguru.motpol.nu/?p=209>.

¹⁰⁷SolGuru: Purpose: <http://solguru.motpol.nu/?p=26>.

¹⁰⁸SolGuru: Identitarian Ethics: <http://solguru.motpol.nu/?p=18>.

¹⁰⁹SolGuru: Identitarian Main Concerns: <http://solguru.motpol.nu/?p=42>.

¹¹⁰SolGuru: Identitarian Ethics: <http://solguru.motpol.nu/?p=18>.

worldview.¹¹¹ This does not imply that the rest of the world is totally cut off from the European mind and that cooperation on a global level should be neglected.¹¹² Like Oskorei, SolGuru does advocate ethno-pluralism.¹¹³

And what about Evola – is he not even mentioned in the above pamphlets? I stated in the introduction that his ideas, or name, have been presented either more in passing or in longer and more detailed ways, and needless to say the latter are more fruitful to say something in particular about these aspects. The post “Guillaume Faye criticizes the traditionalism” is interesting since it is a link between his Identitarian and Traditionalist stance. What SolGuru, according to him, does is that he uses a polemic writing that Faye addressed during 1996 – he criticizes those Evolians (and Heideggerians) that interpret their “master’s words” in order to feel superior and have as an excuse of not being involved in politics – and tries to present a more nuanced analysis of the essay in question. He comes to the conclusion that Faye is both right and wrong – depending on the question – but regarding supposed self-inflated, pseudo-elitist and solipsistic Evolians he agrees with him (my translation from Swedish):

Faye’s perhaps most striking criticism, which typically is separated from some of his more fanatic ideas about how things are or should be, concerns two things:

1. The isolationism and passivity that often accompanies a particular type of traditionalists. The pessimism regarding society makes it possible to isolate yourself from the living expression of what man and creation means, and places the individual in a solipsistic world of imaginary superiority. The fact that Faye mixes this up with real contemplation whatsoever, is certainly problematic, but that this type of development can occur everyone who has dealt with traditionalists, regardless of school, should be well aware of.
2. This, in turn, leads ironically, to an extremely intense form of bourgeois individualism. Cultural expressions linked to traditionalism as an abstract idea, intended to highlight the individual identity, and community-generating markers in all conceivable areas risk converting one of the most perspicuous expressions of criticism of the modern world to a fly or a hip, alternative trend - and one that can also be used as an excuse to be passive and uninterested in reality. (...)A further objection of how traditionalism sometimes manifests itself (perhaps especially concerning youngsters) is when it turns into pseudo-elitist misanthropy – it seems that one is trying to escape that fact that the very fundament of every traditionalistic viewpoint is that most people are not “priests or warriors”, not “elite”, and that is entirely in order. Then the risk is that it turns into a general disdain for the groups in society who probably have changed least over the past centuries - "people of reality", to joke a little.

114

¹¹¹SolGuru: Identitarian Main Concerns: <http://solguru.motpol.nu/?p=42>.

¹¹²SolGuru: Identitarian Ethics: <http://solguru.motpol.nu/?p=18>.

¹¹³SolGuru: <http://solguru.motpol.nu/?p=13>.

It is obvious that SolGuru is skeptical towards specific forms of, as he regards it, quasi-Traditionalism and its self-absorbed followers, but how does he regard himself in general?

Another post treats self-awareness and show similarities with Oskorei's meritocratic discourse – people should be able to be introspective and tolerate other people's judgments about themselves in order to both develop as human beings and to avoid self-deceit: not everyone is made to do anything. This does also seem to correspond to an "organic" society and a static Traditionalist or even caste discourse, but SolGuru's presentation implies a seemingly higher degree of contingency and "social rotation"¹¹⁵, albeit he explicitly promotes hierarchy.¹¹⁶ On a socio-political level does Evola's view seem slightly too reactionary, but on a personal level SolGuru has in fact stated that he tries to "ride the tiger" (my translation from Swedish): "To ride the tiger – to live in the modern misery but still be spiritually unscathed – is optimal in order to live a harmonious life, without in any way compromise and internalize the norms of the modern society and its principles."¹¹⁷ It certainly seems that he regards himself as the "differentiated person", although in a quite humble manner.

SolGuru has written rather extensively about sex and sexuality-related issues on his blog. I will not treat all of them here, but to begin with it might be said that not any of these are linked to Evola manifestly. Therefore, one has to, once again, try to trace more oblique intertextual connections. The overall depiction is that the contemporary society, or rather modernity in general, is too depraved and a sexual moralist position is preferable to promiscuity.¹¹⁸ It partly depends on which aspects of Evola's writings one emphasizes, but he was unhesitatingly not a sexual moralist. In general, he was more interested in the so-called metaphysics of sex, which – from a patriarchal viewpoint – also included "sexual asceticism" (Evola 1991: 216-219) rather than profane and mere physical and indulgent sex. (Ibid: Introduction, Evola 2003: chapter 28) Albeit it is difficult to be certain, SolGuru's texts regarding these matters seem to correspond more to a sociopolitical moralist position than an ascetic ideal enunciated in a Traditionalist discourse. Or as he puts it:

The recognition of human imperfection and inability to act morally beyond reproach shall not prevent a public norm, and public culture, can and should reflect something more, higher and better than just depraved self-

¹¹⁴SolGuru: Guillaume Faye criticizes the traditionalism: <http://solguru.motpol.nu/?p=1014>.

¹¹⁵SolGuru: About Self-Awareness: <http://solguru.motpol.nu/?p=523>.

¹¹⁶SolGuru: Identitarian Main Concerns: <http://solguru.motpol.nu/?p=42>.

¹¹⁷SolGuru: About Self-Awareness: <http://solguru.motpol.nu/?p=523>.

¹¹⁸SolGuru: Sexual Morals: <http://solguru.motpol.nu/?p=25>.

indulgence, exploitation and exposure. Nor does it prevent that one have demands on how citizen behaves in public, and strive to make these requirements integrated standards within people. And then you may call me a sexual moralist as much as you want - it's not like I'm ashamed of it.¹¹⁹

To conclude SolGuru's general outlook on the world, mankind, morals, sexuality and himself it is perhaps most useful to turn to the several Identitarian manifests that he has written – although they are personal rather than general for the whole movement in question – rather than to Evola's writings. At most, the latter is concerned indirectly because he to some extent has influenced the *Nouvelle Droite* which in turn has influenced the Identitarian movement. Hierarchy is promoted but it must be contingent rather than static, although it is hard to tell whether a Traditionalist society with its fixed positions between groups and people should be fully neglected. On a more personal level, however, the philosophical tenets that Evola presented in *Ride the Tiger* seem congenial with SolGuru's self-image, although this cannot be separated from the contemporary society in full; a society that, from his viewpoint, is characterized by dissolution, self-deceit, sexual depravity, and secularization.

8. The Path of Cinnabar

The aim of this chapter is to by the means of discourse analysis (see 3.1.) and genre analysis (see 3.3.) examine what SolGuru and Oskorei have written about Evola's book *The Path of Cinnabar* and link the content to certain ideological traits of Evola's writings.

8.1. SolGuru's review

SolGuru has written a rather lengthy review of *The Path of Cinnabar* (3297 words), which is divided into several passages: a very short introduction, a mentioning of two prejudices about Evola, an analysis of some of Evola's chief ideas, a discussion about three controversies concerning Evola, as well as a final summary. It also includes two photos of Evola: one portrait of him, as well as one of his paintings from his period as a Dadaist artist (see Evola 2009). The introduction does however point out that this is a biased review and that he is fond of Evola (my translation from Swedish):

¹¹⁹SolGuru: Sexual Morals: <http://solguru.motpol.nu/?p=25>.

SolGuru today reviews the first English translation of Julius Evola's intellectual autobiography: "The Path of Cinnabar". It is a long-awaited and intensely relevant depiction and critique of his own intellectual history, from one of the 1900s most important thinker's pen.

It is overall apparent that the SolGuru shifts from a review discourse to a Traditionalist discourse, or rather write the review from a Traditionalist discourse: some parts are rather objective summaries of the book (he especially refers to the chapter "Personal Background and Early Experiences"), although some other are more biased and *evaluative*, which is obvious when Evola's three controversies are being discussed (my translation from Swedish):

Evola had a strong repulsion against the bourgeois lifestyle, an aversion which in his practical life came to be stronger than his anti-communism (although he clearly emphasized that communism marked a lower stage than the bourgeois, something that you can hardly disagree with).

The bracketed assertion could be just a normal subjective value, but according to Evola in his theory of the regression of the castes, the bourgeoisie represents the third estate and is therefore superior to the fourth estate, i.e. the proletarian/Communist caste (Evola 1995: 331, 2009: 140). Evola writes in *Men Among the Ruins*:

A bourgeois mentality and spirit, with its conformism, psychological and romantic appendices, moralism, and concerns for a petty safe existence in which a fundamental materialism finds its compensation in sentimentality and the rhetoric of the great humanitarian and democratic words—all this has only an artificial, peripheral, and precarious life, no matter how resolutely it survives due to the inertia in wide social strata of many countries of the "free world". (...) The first possibility corresponds to a direction that leads even lower, toward a collectivized and materialist subhumanity, under the banner of Marxist realism—to social and proletarian values against the "bourgeois decadence." It is indeed possible to conceive a liquidation of everything that pertains to the conventional, subjectivist, and 'unrealistic' world that was generally bourgeois, leading not higher but lower than what it is proper to the normal ideal of personality. (2002: 218)

Since SolGuru labels himself as a Traditionalist he also agrees with Evola's opinion in this regard, albeit this opinion does not necessarily have to be linked to "the master's words". The passage above is both *descriptive* and *explicative*, but implicitly *evaluative* as well. The latter is also evidence of that SolGuru enunciates Evola within a Traditionalist discourse.

The other two controversies that are being discussed in the review are "race and anti-Semitism" and "political activity" – subjects that are to some extent closely intertwined. In this explicatory passage it is obvious that SolGuru makes fewer descriptions and instead focuses on more *evaluative* parts (my translation from Swedish):

Regardless if one dismisses Evola's approach to spirituality as unrealistic, however, many of his arguments against the idea of biological race as the sole or main civilization fundament are difficult to dismiss - how do you else explain for example that in a physiological sense extremely pure-breed countries like the Scandinavian and the Netherlands, long before any mass immigration came to positions, developed an ideological climate of self-denial, total lack of spirituality (in any form), egalitarianism and individualism and alienation and atomization? Manifest in the spiritual and cultural ethnicity, regardless of how much importance you want to attach to the biological conditions, a considerable plasticity – a group's "bio ethnical" composition is not a definite indicator of that a certain type of society will develop.

Besides from his extensive writing about esoteric doctrines Evola is perhaps most known for his collaboration with the Italian Fascist movement, his encounter with the Romanian nationalist Corneliu Zelea Codreanu (Sedgwick 2004: 114), as well as his lectures in Nazi Germany during the 1930s. For more information about these topics it is perhaps most suitable to turn to Goodrick-Clarke (2002: chapter 3) or Sedgwick (2004: chapter 5), but in short one can mention that he had an ambiguous relation to all of these controversial matters including anti-Semitism: he saw potential in both Fascism and the German SS but at the same time he criticized them for their brutality, in the latter case against the Jews, and lack of true spiritual knowledge. (Sedgwick 2004: 103-108) Evola was not an anti-Semite in the sense that he believed that all Jews were bad persons or that they carried a metaphysical evil, although some of his descriptions had metaphysical undertones. (Goodrick-Clarke 2002: 66)¹²⁰ Evola was in fact early influenced by two Jewish thinkers: Otto Weininger and Carlo Michelstaedter. Ironically the former created the concept of "anti-Jewishness" in order to describe his repulsion for self-denial, capitalism, communism and weak feminine men – negative traits and ideologies that he thought belonged to many secular Jews¹²¹. (Gregor 2006: chapter 4; see also Weininger 2005) However, an Aryan person for Evola had little to do with a dichotomy between Jews and Northern-Europeans: a Jew could be an Aryan, i.e. someone with more or less high spiritual rank, as the three upper classes in India. (Evola 2002: 79-88) However, it is worth noticing that SolGuru most likely does not want Evola to be discredited as a blatant anti-Semite or biological racist and therefore he perhaps has chosen to bring these subjects up for discussion. The same goes for Evola's "Christendom-phobia" – SolGuru emphasizes that Evola's relationship to Christianity has changed over the years, from

¹²⁰In this respect I assert that Goodrick-Clarke exaggerates the importance of so called metaphysical anti-Semitism, since Evola never stated that Jews were metaphysically evil or that they could not be Aryans in the spiritual sense. A German could have a "Jewish attitude" and a Jew could have an "Aryan attitude", according to Evola.

¹²¹Evola had an ambiguous relationship to Judaism and for example he criticized Jewry for their claims of being "God's Chosen People". On the other hand, at various places in his books he refers to Hermetic Qabalah and the TaNaK, and thus he did not exclude Judaism from the rightful Tradition so to speak.

ferment repulsion to a more nuanced and balanced view. As a Traditionalist, SolGuru, like Oskorei, regards Catholicism as an available spiritual option and the implicit meaning is perhaps that Catholics should not hesitate to read Evola.

Regarding polemicists it is conspicuous that SolGuru only mentions the deceased author Stieg Larsson¹²², who according to him has stressed that Evola had “an almost medieval worldview”. He does not mention any scholar by name, although he refers to both (my translation from Swedish) “‘anti-fascists’ and humanistic scholars who rages and screams because of elements contrary to modernistic sensibilities such as ‘racism’ and ‘sexism’”¹²³. The quote marks on the word fascism indicates that he does not take these people – whoever they may be – serious: it has an implicit deriding tone. “Modernistic sensibilities” can also be regarded as something deriding or pejorative. The truth, from SolGuru’s perspective, is seldom to be found within the polemic left-wing and humanistic scholarly discourses.

On the other hand, SolGuru also addresses critique against those who have misunderstood Evola’s work but likewise he does not mention any specific person or movement by name. These people do belong to the second category of people that reads his works with a positive pre-understanding (my translation from Swedish):

Those who read him with a positive pre-understanding, but lack the ability and the insights that are needed to, using modern university jargon, “putting his work in a proper context”. It often ends with a full, undifferentiated acceptance of just about every word Evola has written (to the extent that they have understood it), and thus, ironically, often with various strange forms of religious-political-spiritual syncretism, or semi superstitious activities that would make the author himself rotate in his grave. This type of Evolianism is as destructive as any other form of silly fanaticism - Evola himself points to that in one of the interviews that are included at the end of *The Path of Cinnabar*, "Jokingly I once said That Beside 'Evolians' [...] we now Have Evolomaniacs".

Once again SolGuru articulates Evola from the Traditionalist discourse, but this time at the expense of an invisible group of people who, in his opinion, does not understand Evola’s works properly. SolGuru thus competes against two diametrically opposed discourses – the polemic discourse and the “Evolomaniac” discourse – with the aim to articulate Evola, the *element*, as a specific *moment* in the Traditionalist discourse.

¹²²Besides from his commercial success, *The Millennium Trilogy*, Larsson has written several books on topics such as right-wing extremism and anti-racism.

¹²³With that said, it is not unlikely that SolGuru have read for instance Goodrick-Clarke (2002), Eco (1995), or Raudvere et al (2001).

The overall picture of Evola that SolGuru addresses is more or less positive, which perhaps can be regarded as self-evident since I stated in the introduction that this is the analytical definition of an Evolian. But even though SolGuru explicitly states in the introduction, as well as in the final summary of the review – needless to say the most explicitly *evaluative* part – that *The Path of Cinnabar* is one of the most important and awaited books over the last years, he still exposes a rather nuanced picture of the writer in question: SolGuru does not want to belong to the “Evolomaniacs” after all. However, since his aim is to present Evola as he should be understood, many parts of the text consist of amplifications – even though it is mostly Evola’s ideas themselves that are the basis of the analyses rather than self-invented explanations (my translation from Swedish):

Another category is of course among the right-wings who work inside the Enlightenment and secular science room. These may be upset over such things as Evola’s view of the biological concept of race, as with him, although neither denied, or a priori, let it be subordinated to cultural-social factors, but together with the latter are subjugated the overhead structure that for him remains the foundation of consciousness, the world and their relationship to each other, and in the end is discussed as a material phenomenon, among others. That such a distinction passed many by (and in some cases led to the interpretation that Evola advocated some form of "cultural nationalism" or ethnic relativism of postmodern design, which is a completely absurd conclusion) is perhaps not surprising. It is significant that neither the “anti-Fascists” nor the “Neo-Nazis” usually only has a very shallow acquaintance with Evola’s concrete authorship, and also somewhat impressive that both sides usually totally have misunderstood even these relatively clear and simple elements of his thinking.

In this sense it might be relevant to bring in Roy Wallis’ concept *epistemological authoritarianism* (1975). This does not imply that SolGuru uses an alleged Traditionalist gnosis in order to convince his readers that his interpretations are correct – nothing in the text indicates this at least – but rather that due to an extensive reading of Evola he has managed to understand his works properly and that he is now arguing for his standpoints. On the contrary, an Evolian and Traditionalist would for natural reasons claim that his descriptions of Evola are correct and thus expresses a certain degree of authoritarian knowledge.

8.2. Oskorei’s review

Oskorei has written a less lengthy review of the very same book, *The Path of Cinnabar* – it consists of 1713 words and two pictures (one depicts a white tiger and the other effigies Gilgamesh). The fundament of the text constitutes a rather objective book review in which non-referenced parts of Evola’s life and authorship – most of it seems to be taken from the book in

question – are *described*, or at some parts *explained*. It does however also consist of more subjective and *evaluative* parts, where his Traditionalist beliefs lead to a slightly polemical approach (my translation from Swedish):

Something you easily miss in meeting Evola is that he initially was a radical "anarchist", an anti-bourgeois individualist who gradually discovered the philosophy that underlies the traditions of alchemy and Tantrism, and myths such as the Roman and the Grail myth. As a pseudo-religious, politically correct, "anarchist" it is easy to interpret Evola's development as an "apostasy", but then one misses the main theme that is actually there. Evola himself admits that these things were youthful excesses, but his description of the Tantric Kaul makes Nietzsche's human dreams and Stirner's "selfishness" appears as painful, diffuse and very "19th century". The same applies to his descriptions of such things as how Pythagoreans said that man, through the initiation can become a god, or how the alchemists believed that their *ars regia* made them kings. When you first discover Evola, these elements may easily lead to a naive approach that is reminiscent of Nietzsche's superhuman ideal, but it tends to be balanced with time and is in every case preferable to the modern alternatives.

Terms like "pseudo-religious", "anarchist" and "politically correct" implies that Oskorei criticizes those groups or people who have misunderstood Evola. Perhaps this passage bears an echo of SolGuru's text – thus an instance of *intertextuality* – which includes similar polemics addressed to those adherents who he claims to have misunderstood Evola. Oskorei also shows his respect for Evola's works and compares them to, from his viewpoint, less impressive and convincing philosophers, such as Nietzsche and Stirner; in fact Evola made the comparison with Nietzsche and Stirner (2009: 70-71) and Oskorei seems to agree: Traditional teachings are superior to atheistic ideas. In the last sentence, he does however change perspective and appears as more pedagogic and less polemic.

The following passage continues to analyze Evola from this viewpoint – the last two sentences are however more polemic; this does not however imply any scholars but actually two left-wing politicians from different epochs (my translation from Swedish):

This was, by the way, also one of the elements that got me interested in Evola to begin with. His depictions of the traditional elites, both ksatriyas and alchemists, and his ability to put them in an understandable context, where an act of self-realization and self-control rather than "exploitation" (he did not deny that any system can degenerate over time). It has been argued that Evola's ideas concerns "hero worship", the reality of this would then be to ask if the worldview behind mythical and historical heroes' lives, the results of the global picture is better than the results of the contemporary world, and if it is possible to live in a similar manner today. To make a long story short, the mythos of Gilgamesh, Odin or Achilles are more complex and much more rewarding than

those of a Kropotkin or worse yet Schyman's moral collectivism. In any case, if there is true self-realization that one looks for.

If one turns to the first passage of the text, Oskorei emphasizes that Evola was an anti-liberal and anti-modernist – things which can hardly be questioned if one read Evola's books that treat these aspects. In his perhaps most political work, *Men Among the Ruins* (2002), Evola developed his anti-bourgeoisie and anti-communist stances and described liberalism and socialism as a pseudo-dichotomy: both of them were almost equally harmful for the European civilization – although he still preferred the former since it was ruled by the third estate while communism is ruled by the fourth (Evola 1995: chapter 37, Evola 2003: 176) – and were clear signs of that the world is now in its Iron age or *Kali Yuga*. Evola also rejected totalitarianism and compared it with the “organic state” – much like the Roman Empire during its proper phases or the Ghibelline civilization during the Middle Ages – which he saw as the righteous form of a true spiritual civilization, in which the economy was subordinate to politics and an authentic tradition “from above” was the center of all life. (Evola 2002: chapter 4) Evola has written about these topics in several works (and some of them have been mentioned in chapter six), but for instance *Revolt Against the Modern World*, *Men Among the Ruins* and *Ride the Tiger* – all of them have been summarized and shed light on in *The Path of Cinnabar*. Thus Evola, which can be considered not just an *element*, but also a *nodal point*, has, in comparison to SolGuru's text, a quite different signifier chain inside the Traditionalist discourse: Evola are linked to not just Traditionalism, but also to anti-liberalism and anti-modernism – two *elements* that Oskorei articulates in his review.

The last passages of the review include a brief discussion about so-called meta politics – a trait that the French far right-wing GRECE have borrowed from Antonio Gramsci via the *Nouvelle Droite* (see Deland et al 2010: 110-113), and therefore this might be a diverse example of *intertextuality*, although not manifest. In this sense Oskorei also criticizes Evola for being naive, although he also emphasizes the importance of strategic changeability in relation to history's current zeitgeist (my translation from Swedish):

Evola's thoughts on meta politics are not as developed as for example those of the New Right (the hopes for an alliance with the old aristocracy was not realistic), and towards the end of his life he doubted the possibilities to change society at all. The advices from *Men Among the Ruins* are however still of great value to new generations of anti-liberals. However, this presupposes that one can read him critically. Evola's advices in *Men Among the ruins* are not identical with the ones that the 19th century liberals gave, because the conditions have

changed. Similarly, our situation differs from the 1960s in Italy, and we must therefore adjust our strategies accordingly.

It is obvious that Oskorei sees Evola as a role model, both politically and spiritually, and besides from some reservations about his ideas – whether it concerns things that are outside of their historical context for contemporary Swedish right-wing activists or un-realistic traits within his writings – he implicitly describes him as a true-teller. The overall description of Evola is definitely positive, and perhaps less nuanced than SolGuru’s counterpart – possibly because he has chosen to write a shorter text and left another blogger that belongs to the same blog portal to write a more extensive and “initiated” analysis. Oskorei uses Evola as a *nodal point* within the Traditionalist discourse – an *element* with major significance.

9. Which currency? Oskorei and SolGuru’s relationship to de Benoist and Faye and political main tenets

In chapter 6, 7 and 8 I examined some of Oskorei and SolGuru’s anti-modern traits and their relationship to Evola’s writings. I now turn to more political and economic aspects – or “anti-liberal” to use Oskorei’s expression – that are more connected to the French far right-wing thinkers Alain de Benoist and Guillaume Faye, but still with the main focus on the Identitarian Traditionalist discourse and the links to Evola.

Alain de Benoist is unhesitatingly one of the persons who have influenced the Identitarian movement to the furthest extent. Basically, de Benoist promotes a reestablishing of a new and strong European culture and political unity – a European *ecumene* to put it in other words – and at the same time he promotes ethno-pluralism, which is the idea that a nation-state should be more or less ethnically homogenous. (Böhm 2008: 125-140) Every ethnicity should have a “right to difference” (*Droits des peuples*), an own identity¹²⁴, which sometimes make assimilation as a sort of negative compulsion. (Ibid: 157-189) That viewpoint put in to practice would most certainly lead to repatriation or segregation in countries like France and Sweden which have quite many immigrants from foreign countries and cultures, but probably

¹²⁴There is an inherent contradiction in this viewpoint, since it leads to cultural relativism – every ethnicity and culture are of equally worth – while at the same time it promotes its own (European) identity and the will to save it from external threats, i.e. other cultures and ethnicities, at every price. Faye has tried to solve this dilemma, at a later time, by explicitly stating that European culture is superior. (Faye 2010: 35-26)

not to apartheid as Dahl asserted. (Raudvere et al 2001: 130) On a political level it is palpable that de Benoist and the Identitarian ideology have partly been influenced by Evola's *Men Among the Ruins* in some regards. Evola states in his chapter "The problem of births":

Aside from war, the population overload can only lead some countries to seek "space" among other peoples as an emigrating exportation of "cheap labor" who are eventually destined to lose their identity and be scattered among other peoples. As the congestion continues, the fatal effects will be inner crises and social tensions representing manna from heaven for the leaders of the Marxist subversion. (2002: 268-269)

The ethno-cultural identity is often promoted as something incredibly valuable (Bar-on 2007: 168-184); therefore the notion Identitarianism among some new European far right-wing groups. Another characteristic trait that de Benoist has borrowed from Evola – this is a more distinctive example since he refers directly to his works – is the idea of the organic civilization or Imperium, which he discusses in the chapter "D'idée D'empire" (the idea of empire) of his book *Critiques, théoriques*. An empire can never be built on pure force or violence – it can only exist if it is animated by a spiritual fervor, to paraphrase Evola (2002: 459).¹²⁵ On the other hand de Benoist does not reject democracy in the same ferment manner as Evola did (Evola 2002: chapter 3) – instead he promotes a genuine representative democracy as an alternative to today's watered down counterparts.¹²⁶

de Benoist does not label himself as a Traditionalist, although he wants Europeans to re-establish European culture and traditions – in the words' wider senses – in order to make the continent stronger and more cohesive. To analyze de Benoist's ideas in relation to the dollar symbol – which I let depict Evola's thoughts regarding the European civilization in a simplified manner in chapter 6 – it is apparent that he has a similar outlook. Time is linear, while the history of civilizations is cyclical. (de Benoist 2004) The anti-liberal and anti-capitalist stances are perhaps not blatant but indeed palpable. (Böhm 2008: 190-205; see also de Benoist 2002: 12-27)

Guillaume Faye – a former collaborator of de Benoist and indeed one of the most influential persons in the *Nouvelle Droite* – has taken a clearer stance for modern technology in

¹²⁵de Benoist also refers to *Revolt Against the Modern World*, but also to chapter two and four of *Men Among the Ruins* in the above mentioned chapter.

¹²⁶de Benoist: Democracy – Representative and Participatory:
http://www.alaindebenoist.com/pdf/democracy_representative_and_participatory.pdf.

comparison with both Evola and de Benoist. Faye has developed a synthesis in his book *L'archofuturism* (1998) – a book that has been recently for sale at the partly Swedish-based web shop Arktos¹²⁷. In this book, Faye points out a number of potential risks in the near future – somewhere between 2010 and 2020 (Faye 2010: 13) – and argues that the antidote would be archaic values¹²⁸ (anti-egalitarianism, social order, elitism, but not autocracy) combined with modern technology. The title of this book is an oxymoron, which implies that a synthesis of two seemingly diametrically opposed elements is the proper solution for the European peoples.

Faye's relation to Evola's ideas are even more complex, and perhaps less positive than de Benoist's, but on the other hand – in an article from 1996 that recently was translated to English he was indeed polemical to some Evolians rather than to Evola himself.¹²⁹, and has explicitly said that Evola is one figure among many that should be reconciled¹³⁰. (Faye 2010: 14) If one analyzes Faye's ideas that are expressed in *Archeofuturism* and relates them to the dollar symbol, it first seems obvious that he considers civilizational development as cyclical processes, while the time dimension is nothing but linear: “Is this thought *revolutionary*? It must be such today, for our civilisation is situated at the end of a cycle.” (Ibid: 53) On the other hand, Faye writes:

Nietzschean view of history, which Locchi described as ‘spherical’, differs from both the linear and the cyclical notions of progress. (...) Let us imagine a sphere, a billiard ball moving in disorderly fashion across a surface, or moved by the (necessarily imperfect) will of a player: after a number of spins, the same point on the surface of the ball will inevitably touch the cloth. This is the ‘eternal return of the *identical*’, but not of the ‘same’. For the sphere is moving and even if the very ‘same’ point is touching the cloth, its position is not the same as before. (...) The same image can be applied to the succession of the seasons and the historical outlook of Archeofuturism: the return to archaic values should not be understood as a cyclical return to the past (a past that has failed, as it has engendered the catastrophe of modernity), but rather as the *re-emergence of archaic social configurations in a new context*. (Ibid: 74)

¹²⁷ Arktos: Books – Guillaume Faye's Archeofuturism: <http://www.arktos.com/guillaume-faye-archofuturism.html> I bought my own copy of *Archeofuturism* from the web shop in question.

¹²⁸ He defines archaic values as fundamental values that derive from a “founding impulse”.

¹²⁹ Counter-Currents Publishing: Traditionalism – This is the Enemy: <http://www.counter-currents.com/2010/06/traditionalism-this-is-the-enemy/>.

¹³⁰ I would without hesitation say that Faye is more of a Nietzschean than an Evolian; in fact he has explicitly stated that he is the former (Faye 2010: 42). Like both of these men, Faye expresses an anti-bourgeois attitude and has perhaps an even sharper and provocative style of writing than both of them, almost like an *enfant terrible*. (Ibid:31) The critique of for instance contemporary sport that Faye outlines (Ibid: 108-110) is however almost identical with the one that Evola sketches out in *Mediations on the Peaks*. (1998: 37-41, 43-46) and chapter 18 in *Ride the Tiger*.

Therefore, I will call this synthetical relationship to the current European situation¹³¹ that Faye advocates the Euro model. This term is also suitable due to the fact that Faye wants to create a transnational Eurosiberian federation that more or less should strive for to shut the rest of the world out. Even if Faye may seem as an anti-Islamic Orientalist he in fact rejects both Paleo-Conservatism and Neo-Conservatism – the former’s obsolete nationalism and the latter’s imperialistic tendencies. Every block in the post-catastrophic world should take care of itself and never interrupt with other’s business, or strive for to expand its borders. (Faye 2010: chapter 2, 4) The C of the symbol depicts the spherical civilization which is always identical in essence; although it is open for new content and forms, while the first straight line symbolizes the linear time and the second technological progress. Faye is rather ambiguous regarding capitalism (needless to say the Euro in itself symbolizes capitalism) and has proposed a certain type of Third-way politics (Ibid: 50), but is overall negative to the present situation and “the third estate rulers”. (Faye 2010: chapter 4).



Left model – Evola and de Benoist position: 1) Civilizations have a cyclical nature (s-curve). 2) Time is linear (straight line). 3) Capitalism is rejected – economy should be subordinated politics (Dollar symbol as a whole).

Right model – Faye position: 1) Civilizations are spherical. (C) 2) Time is linear (first straight line). 3) Modern technology is progressive and can be regarded as an antidote or necessary evil in the future (second straight line). 4) Capitalism is rejected – economy should be subordinated to politics (Euro symbol as a whole).

Needless to say, these two models are ideal types – expressing values and ideas in a simplified manner. Especially de Benoist has a rather indefinite relationship to modern technology. (de Benoist 2004)

¹³¹Or rather World situation – although he says that only 10-20% should live in techno-science societies due to environmental reasons, while the rest should live materially simple and traditional lives.

Oskorei is definitely influenced by all of the above-mentioned ideologues to different extents. I will not dwell on details since it has already been stated that he also disagrees with at least de Benoist and Evola at various points. First of all, it almost goes without saying that Oskorei believes that civilizations are cyclical – he is a Traditionalist. This does not mean, however, that he believes that time is non-linear in a factual meaning, but perhaps that it is cyclical or rather spherical/“poly chronic” in a more ontological sense; contrary to the progressive outlook on history that dominates both Marxism and liberalism, according to Oskorei (this is interesting since Faye has adopted Nietzsche’s spherical outlook on history). Oskorei has examined the concept of “poly chronocity” in one post that treats Michael O’Meara and as an Evolian he has most certainly read the chapter “Space, Time, the Earth” in *Revolt Against the Modern World*. However, it is nothing that indicates that he regards the spherical outlook as superior – or inferior – to the cyclical perspective of Traditionalism; perhaps he regards them as compatible.¹³² The latter is even explicitly stated in a chronicle that was published in the nationalistic journal *Folkets nyheter*, in which Oskorei summarizes the Traditional/anti modern outlook on history and compares them to the liberal and socialist equivalents. Oskorei writes (my translation from Swedish):

But their attitude was not only pessimistic. First, they believed the last age would end by a massive conflict between the representatives of the regime (the gods) and disorder (the giants of Asatru). Thereafter, a new Golden Age would begin. This approach is called the cyclic, since one does not believe that history has an "end", but regards it as a constant succession of ups and downs. First, they believed that it was always possible to return to the origin of both individuals and collectives (much like what Nietzsche called the eternal return).¹³³

Like Evola and de Benoist, Oskorei can also be regarded as an anti-liberal and anti-capitalist, and he explains his own viewpoint through his reviews of de Benoist’s writings¹³⁴ as well as in other blog posts.¹³⁵ To reiterate myself, it can be an obstacle to really know what a blogger that touts about books really believes, since he or she describes someone else’s thoughts, but since Oskorei – in an interview that was carried through by the already mentioned Islamist Mohamed Omar¹³⁶ – has stated that liberalism is the largest threat for Sweden and Europe (and Muslims), or rather the world as a whole, it is evident that he is against capitalism.¹³⁷ He

¹³²Oskorei: The New Right and Archeofuturism: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?cat=4&paged=9>.

¹³³Oskorei: It Can Always Get Better: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=454>.

¹³⁴Oskorei: de Benoist and Economic Increment: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=2093>, Oskorei: de Benoist and the Classical Liberalism: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=3298>.

¹³⁵Oskorei: Our Anti-Capitalism and Theirs: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=450>.

¹³⁶Omar: Liberalism is the Largest Threat – an Interview with Oskorei: <http://alazerius.wordpress.com/2009/03/09/liberalismen-ar-det-storsta-hotet-intervju-med-oskorei/>.

¹³⁷See also Deland et al (2010: 179-181).

does not, however, have a dualistic outlook in this respect and believes that a state-controlled market should be a part of society rather than being a market society, contrary to most contemporary Western countries, where economics often are superior to politics.¹³⁸ He does so often without referring to Evola's writings explicitly, but besides from de Benoist (and other critics of liberalism – Oskorei stresses the he is influenced by for example Marx and Jünger), Evola's *Men Among the Ruin's* (chapter six and twelve) and the latter's less famous lampoon *American "Civilization"* have quite certainly influenced his anti-liberal stance in this regard. One may note, however, that the last-mentioned writing treats individualism rather than economic aspects of "Americanism".¹³⁹ Thus it is possible to distinguish an almost straight diachronic relationship between Evola, de Benoist and Oskorei's opinions in this regard.

Oskorei's interest for Guillaume Faye's archeofuturism is flagrant, and he has even started a side blog for this specific matter; however, most of the blog post have been transferred to the main blog and can now rather be regarded as one of many elements that are dealt with, although perhaps one of the most salient and ideologically important.¹⁴⁰ I wrote that Faye regards modern technology as means of a necessary evil rather than something that is intrinsically valuable. According to Faye, if "disaster convergences" occurs, then a combination of archaic values and modern technology is required or even obtruded. (Faye 2010: chapter 2) Even if Oskorei problematizes and nuances his outlook on archeofuturism and does not propagate for technological progression for the sake of progression, he is still overall very positive to Faye's ideology. But since he is a Traditionalist and has explicitly taken a stand for the cyclical outlook on civilization, his opinions are not totally equivalent to either Evola/de Benoist or Faye. His quite positive outlook on technological progress demands a second line – the Dollar symbol is not enough – as the former Portuguese currency escudo. The symbol, which indeed looks like a dollar sign with two straight lines, is called cifrão and the model itself that corresponds to Oskorei's opinions the Cifrão model.

SolGuru has a quite similar relationship to cyclical civilization philosophy – he is a Traditionalist. Nothing indicates, however, that he believes that time is non-linear. He has a

¹³⁸Oskorei: de Benoist and Classical Liberalism: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=3298>.

¹³⁹Oskorei: Julius Evola About America: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=431>.

¹⁴⁰Oskorei: Archeofuturism Category: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?cat=13>.

similar outlook on contemporary capitalism as de Benoist, Faye, and Oskorei¹⁴¹, and eventual differences concern degree rather than ideology. Perhaps he has adopted Evola's caste regression doctrine – and Oskorei, as a former Marxist, seems generally more anti-liberal than anti-socialistic – in regard to at least economics. In a comment to a post – which treats Guénon and Evola's outlook on modern society and their predications that there is a pseudo-battle between liberalism and Marxism, since both of them have economy as the center and superior factor of society – that was made by the Motpol blogger Olympiark, SolGuru wrote:

I still think it might be a good idea to preserve the "caste regression doctrine" here. The liberal capitalist society, in theory at least, will still allow individual variation, which makes it possible to at least partially escape the misery. Capitalism still recognizes certain qualitative factors in life. You are still allowed to be something, and be different. Marxism, including the cultural and social variations that have penetrated the Western world, accepts nothing but the absolute equality, and hence absolute nihilism. However, it seems that the latter follows the former, because the capitalist notion of individual/person is so unrealistic and inconsistent that it opens up for subversion.¹⁴²

The relationship between the third and the fourth estate has already been treated, but it is still relevant to make a few clarifications in this regard and recall what Evola said in *Ride the tiger*:

Turning to a particular point, one can only maintain an attitude of detachment when facing the confrontation of the two factions contending for world domination today: the democratic, capitalist West and the communist East. In fact, this struggle is devoid of any meaning from a spiritual point of view. The "West" is not an exponent of any higher ideal, based on essential negation of traditional values, presents the same destructions and nihilistic background that is evident in the Marxist and communist sphere, however different in form and degree. (...) That certain margin of material freedom that the world of democracy still leaves for external activity to one who will not let himself be conditioned inwardly, would certainly be abolished in a communist regime. Simply in view of that, one may take a position against the soviet-communist system: not because one believes in some higher ideal that the rival system possesses, but for motives one might almost call basely physical. (2003: 175-

176; see also Evola 1995: chapter 37)

It seems that with concern for the physical plane, SolGuru agrees with Evola, but he has not – as one may note – stopped his analysis at a personal-spiritual level: he believes the third estate rule as a political system opens for subversion and leads to as an even worse (that is

¹⁴¹SolGuru: Pest eller kolera: <http://solguru.motpol.nu/?p=1053>.

¹⁴²Olympiark: Beyond Materialism and Economism: <http://olympiark.motpol.nu/2010/05/03/bortom-materialism-och-ekonomism/#comments>.

Communist/Marxist) society. It is noticeable that SolGuru, contrary to fellow blogger Oskorei¹⁴³, has never dealt with third-way politics explicitly. One might guess – on the basis of the previous discussion – that perhaps it is not a mixed economy, or even seldom the economic system itself, that is the main problem for an Identitarian Traditionalist, but the values of society and the hierarchy of economics and politics which has been reversed. It is important to remember that both of the above-mentioned bloggers have rejected *apoliteia* – at least in the sense that they are not detached from society and ignore politics – and the situation is different in Sweden during the 00’s than in Italy during the 1950’s and 60s when *Cavalcare la tigre* was written and published.¹⁴⁴ This is also something that Oskorei noted in his review of *The Path of Cinnabar* (see page 45).

If one instead turns to archeofuturism and technological progression one can note that SolGuru, contrary to Oskorei, criticizes Faye more explicitly (my translation from Swedish):

To be critical of how some forms of technological and structural development of society helped to alienate, divide and destroy both individuals and communities in Europe, the West and the world is a necessity for a right-wing critique of modernity - there are at least not necessarily related to unrealistic, nostalgic swarming for everything that does not currently exist. You have to say no to an unlimited cult of change and technological-economic "development", without rejecting positive expression that emerges from human creativity. The choice is not between primitive hatred of any material change on one hand, and a general enthusiasm for an evidently destructive phenomenon, grounded in a belief that it expresses a “Faustian spirit”, on the other.¹⁴⁵

Skeptical does not mean that he is against technological progression per se, but rather expresses, as he himself puts it, a sound skepticism to forces that have helped to alienate Western man; the criticism is primarily directed to progression for the sake of progression¹⁴⁶ and Faye’s – in SolGuru’s opinion – modernistic traits. Similarly, he has also stated in a review of *Archeofuturism* that he believes that technocracy is too salient at the expense of Traditionalism in Faye’s synthesis.¹⁴⁷ Ideal typically speaking, it is quite obvious that SolGuru opinions in this specific context are equivalent to those expressed by means of the Dollar model.

¹⁴³Oskorei: Social Democracy in Crisis: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=3689>.

¹⁴⁴According to Dr. H.T. Hansen (Preface to *Men Among the Ruins* 2002) *Cavalcare la tigre* was written before *Gli oumini e le rovine* (1953).

¹⁴⁵SolGuru – Guillaume Faye Criticizes Traditionalism: <http://solguru.motpol.nu/?p=1014>.

¹⁴⁶It is conspicuous that Faye himself has stressed that he is against technological progress for the sake of progress (2010: chapter two).

¹⁴⁷SolGuru – Guillaume Faye’s Archeofuturism: <http://solguru.motpol.nu/?p=1157>.



Left model – SolGuru’s position (equivalent to Evola /de Benoist: 1) Civilizations have a cyclical nature (s-curve). 2) Time is linear (straight line). 3) Capitalism is rejected – economics should be subordinated to politics (Dollar symbol as a whole)

Right model – Oskorei’s position (semi equivalent to both Evola/de Benoist and Faye): 1) Civilizations have a cyclical nature (s-curve). 2) Time is linear (first straight line). 3) Modern technology is progressive and can be regarded as an antidote or necessary evil in the future (second straight line). 4) Capitalism is rejected – economics should be subordinated to politics (Cifrão symbol as a whole).

10. Conclusive Discussion

My research question is: How do the subjects of study – Oskorei, SolGuru and Dragon Rouge – both explicitly and implicitly use Evola’s writings? In order to answer this question I have divided the analysis into five chapters and used discourse analysis, intertextuality and comparisons. The first one of these chapters treated transnational “Evolianism” in a rather brief and descriptive manner, but did also put focus upon the Swedish-based yet transnational Left-Hand Path movement Dragon Rouge. In this regard it is likely that some of his Evola’s writings are more important than others (such as *Yoga of Power* and *The Hermetic Tradition*), although the founder of Dragon Rouge, Thomas Karlsson, has stated that all of his books are pertinent and it does not matter if they contradict each other or other sources of influence. It is important to note that Evola is just one of many influences within Dragon Rouge, but his writings include at least traces of the truth – such as cyclical history and idealism – as they see it. The lack of *manifest intertextuality* is nevertheless an obstacle when it comes to discerning which one of Evola’s writings that possibly have had a major significance within the movement.

The penultimate sentence is congruent with the two Identitarian Traditionalists and Evolians Oskorei and SolGuru, but it is palpable that Evola – firstly as a writer but perhaps also a

person and role model – is *particularly important* as an influential thinker albeit he is not the only salient one. From an anthropological perspective, it is apparent that both Oskorei and SolGuru regard themselves as differentiated or Traditional men; they are harshly critical against the dissolution of the current European and Swedish civilization but tries to “ride the tiger”. Regarding Traditional hierarchy there is ambivalence or hesitation, which might be due to the fact the present situation (in Swedish society) does not offer anything other than, at best, meritocracy. SolGuru has especially emphasized self-awareness – a person should know his or her proper place or do what it takes to be worthy of being there – as an important personal trait, while Oskorei has accentuated an ”aristocratic behavior”. Whether this could be traced back to Evola’s writings is not certain.

In this regard it must also be stressed that SolGuru has written an Identitarian manifest – perhaps more influenced by Alain de Benoist and Guillaume Faye – while Oskorei has manifestly referred to Evola’s beliefs on the matter. It can be difficult to really know what a blogger that summarizes someone else’s thoughts really believes – sometimes it is due to a will to let the readers draw their own conclusions – but since Oskorei is an outspoken Traditionalist and has mentioned Evola as one of his main influences one can unhesitatingly conclude that his beliefs at least are very relevant, even true to certain extents. Oskorei is the only the one that writes within an Identitarian Traditionalist discourse, a combination of ethno-pluralist and Traditionalist values which make him reject some of Evola’s ideas, such as *apoliteia*, that are expressed in *Ride the Tiger*.

In chapter 8 I scrutinized two reviews of Evola’s intellectual autobiography *The Path of Cinnabar*, written by SolGuru and Oskorei. These two reviews are particularly important since they manifestly refer to one of Evola’s writings. SolGuru strives to articulate Evola – the *element* – and make him into a *moment* within the Traditionalistic discourse. Both of them tend at various places to write in a manner that makes themselves competitors against polemics – whether they are academics or biased authors – and so called “Evolomaniacs” in order to convince the readers about how Evola and his ideas should be properly understood. These polemics are however not mentioned by name, and in fact the only persons who are mentioned are two left-wing politicians and a famous Swedish author and outspoken anti-racist. Neither does SolGuru, or Oskorei too for that matter, mention any specific group or person that have misunderstood Evola – whether they like his ideas or not – besides from anti-fascists, neo-Nazis and “Evolomaniacs”. SolGuru and Oskorei present Evola in a quite similar and positive manner, albeit the first-mentioned blogger, unlike the

latter, does not mention his anti-liberal and anti-modernist tenets explicitly. The way in which Oskorei presents a Traditionalist discourse in his review – around the *nodal point* Julius Evola – Traditionalism, anti-liberalism and anti-modernism can all be regarded as *elements* within a signifying chain. SolGuru only emphasizes Traditionalism, but on the other hand he puts more effort into precluding other discourses, such as polemic scholar, anti-fascist, neo-Nazi, and “Evolomaniac” discourses. Even though both Oskorei and SolGuru do not hesitate to criticize Evola he is still overall seen as a truth-teller and ideological role model for these two Evolians and Identitarian Traditionalists.

It exists both similarities and differences between Oskorei and SolGuru, and Evolians such as Alain de Benoist and Guillaume Faye from Evola’s historical aspect. It is a question of degree, but Oskorei seems to be more positive to modern technology that are expressed by Faye in his synthesis archeofuturism than SolGuru, who expresses a more “sound skepticism” to technocracy. However, I have let SolGuru’s relationship to Evola, de Benoist and Faye be expressed by the Dollar model (he is thus similar to de Benoist and Evola since their beliefs are also expressed by this ideal type), while Oskorei’s opinions are instead uttered by means of the Cifrão model. The second line in the latter model emphasizes pro-technology, equivalent to the second line in the Euro model, which depicts Faye’s spherical outlook on civilization history. The sphere metaphor is not shared by SolGuru; he believes that civilization history is cyclical in its nature, much like Evola did. Oskorei on the other hand, seems to regard it as equivalent to the cyclical view, but these things are perhaps just mere details and should therefore not be overstated from either an ontological or political perspective. There seems, however, be various options for a person who tries to *ride the currency* in contemporary Sweden and perhaps at other places of the world too.

References

Printed Sources

Bar-On, Tamir. (2007). *Where have all the Fascists gone?*. Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing.

Barthes, Roland. (1989). "Death of the Author". *Image-Music-Text*. New York: Noonday Press. First published in French in 1967 as "La mort de l'auteur".

Betz, Hans Georg. (1994). *Radical Right-Wing Populism in Western Europe*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Böhm, Michael. (2008). *Alain de Benoist und die Nouvelle Droite: Ein Beitrag zur Ideengeschichte im 20. Jahrhundert*. Berlin: Lit Verlag.

Clayton, Jay, Rothstein, Eric. (1991). *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History*. London: Wisconsin Press.

Crowley, Aleister. (2004). *The Book of the Law*. UK: Weisser Books. First published in 1925.

Dahl, Göran. (1999). *Radical Conservatism and the Future of Politics*. London: Sage Publications.

Dahl, Göran. (2006). *Radikalare än Hitler: de esoteriska och gröna nazisterna: inspirationskällor, pionjärer, förvaltare, ättlingar*. Stockholm: Atlantis.

de Benoist, Alain. (2004). *On Being a Pagan*. USA: Ultra Publishing. First published in French in 1981 as *Comment peut-on être païen*.

de Benoist, Alain. (2002). *Critiques, theoretiqes*. Paris: L'Age D'Homme.

Deland, Mats. Hertzberg, Fredrik. Hvitfeldt, Thomas. (2010). *Det vita fältet: samtida forskning om högerextremism*. Uppsala: Historiska institutionen.

Drake, Richard. (1988). "Julius Evola, Radical Fascism, and the Lateran Accords" in *The Catholic Historical Review*. Vol. 74, No. 3, pp. 403-419. Washington: Catholic University of America Press.

Eatwell, Roger. (2007). *Fascism and the Extreme Right*. London: Routledge.

Eco, Umberto. (1989). *Foucault's Pendulum*. UK: Secker & Warburg. First Published in Italian in 1988 as *Il pendolo di Foucault* by Bompiani.

Evola, Julius. (1991). *Eros and the Mysteries of Love: The Metaphysics of Sex*. Rochester: Inner Traditions. First published in Italian in 1958 as *Metafisica del Sesso*.

Evola, Julius. (1928). *Imperialismo pagano: Il Fascismo Dinanzi al Pericolo Euro-Cristiano, con una Appendice sulle Reazioni di parte Guelfa*. Rome: Atanor.

Evola, Julius. (1995) *L'arco e la clava*. Rome: Mediterranee. First published in 1968.

Evola, Julius. (1998). *Meditations on the Peaks: Mountain-climbing as a Metaphor for the Spiritual Quest*. Rochester: Inner Traditions. First published in Italian in 1974 as *Meditazioni delle cette* in by Edizioni del Tridenti.

Evola, Julius. (2002). *Men Among the Ruins: Post-war Reflections of a Radical Traditionalist*. Rochester: Inner Traditions, 2002. First published in Italian in 1953 as *Gli uomini e le rovine*.

Evola, Julius. (2003). *Ride the Tiger: A Survival Manual for the Aristocrats of the Soul*. Rochester: Inner Traditions. First published in Italian in 1961 as *Cavalcare la Tigre* by Edizioni Mediterranee, Rome.

Evola, Julius. (1995). *Revolt Against the Modern World: Politics, Religion and Social Order in the Kali Yuga*. First published in Italian in 1934 as *Rivolta contra il mondo moderno*.

Evola, Julius. (1993). *Tao: The Magic, the Mysticism*. USA: Holmes Publishing Group. First published in Italian as *Il Taoismo* in 1972 by Mediteranee.

Evola, Julius. (1948). *The Doctrine of the Awakening: The Attainment of Self-Mastery According to the Earliest Buddhist Texts*. First published in Italian in 1943 as *La dottrina del risveglio*.

Evola, Julius. (1995). *The Hermetic Tradition: Symbols & Teachings of the Royal Art*. First published in 1931 as *La tradizione ermetica: Nei suoi simboli, nella sua dottrina e nella sua "Arte Regia."* Bari: Laterza.

Evola, Julius. (2007). *The Metaphysics of War: Battle, Victory, and Death in the World of Tradition*. Rochester: Inner Traditions. Second edition. The book consists of collected essays that Evola wrote during the 1930s and 1940s, firsthand *Metafisica della Guerra* (1935).

Evola, Julius. (2009). *The Path of Cinnabar: An Intellectual Autobiography by Julius Evola*. Rochester: Integral Tradition Publishing. First published in Italian as *Il Cammino del Cinnabro* in 1963 by Vanni Scheiwiller.

Evola, Julius. (1992). *Yoga of Power: Tantra, Shakti, and the Secret Way*. Rochester: Inner Traditions. First published in Italian as *Lo Yoga Della Potenza: Saggio sui Tantra* in 1968 by Edizioni Mediterranee, Rome.

Evola, Julius. (2005). *Zen: The Religion of the Samurai*. USA: Holmes Publishing Group.

Fairclough, Norman. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fairclough, Norman. (2003). *Analyzing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. New York: Routledge.

Faye, Guillaume. (2010). *Archeofuturism: European Visions of the Post-Catastrophic Age*. UK: Arktos Media. First published in French in 1998 as *L'archeofuturism*.

Foucault, Michael. (1991). "What is an Author?". *The Foucault Reader: an Introduction to Foucault's Thoughts*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books. First published in French in 1969 as *Ce qui est un auteur?*.

Gardell, Mattias. (2003). *Gods of the Blood: The Pagan Revival and White Separatism*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Goodrick-Clarke, Nicholas. (2002). *Black Sun: Aryan Cults, Esoteric Nazism, and the Politics of Identity*. London: New York University Press.

Granhölm, Kenneth. (2005). *Embracing the Dark: The Magic Order of Dragon Rouge – Its Practice in Dark Magic and Meaning Making*. Åbo: Åbo Akademi University Press.

Gregor, Anthony. (2006). *The Search for Neo-Fascism: the Use and Social Abuse of Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Guénon, René. (1968). *La crise du monde moderne*. Paris: Gallimard. First published in 1927.

Hammer, Olav. (2001). *Claiming Knowledge: Strategies of Epistemology from Theosophy to the New Age*. Leiden: Brill.

- Hannerz, Ulf. (1996). *Transnational Connections: Culture, Peoples, Places*. London: Routledge.
- Howarth, David. (2000). *Discourse*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Häggqvist, Martin. (2004) "Modernitet och undergång: Om traditionell tidsuppfattning och Kali Yuga" in the culture journal *Subaltern*, number one.
- Jeffner, Anders. (1988). *Livsåskådningar i Sverige. Inledande projektpresentation och översiktlig resultatredovisning*. Uppsala universitet: Teologiska institutionen.
- Laclau, Ernesto & Mouffe, Chantal. (2001). *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. Second edition. New York: Verso. First published by Verso in 1985.
- Larsson, Stieg & Ekman, Mikael. (2001). *Sverigedemokraterna: den nationella rörelsen*. Stockholm: Ordfront förlag.
- Lincoln, Bruce. (1999). *Theorizing Myth: Narrative, Ideology and Scholarship*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- McNamee, Stephen. Miller Jr., Robert. (2004). *The Meritocracy Myth*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Merkel, Peter H. (1986). *Political Violence: Motifs and Motivation*. London: University of California Press.
- Moynihan, Michael. Söderlund, Didrik. (2003). *Lords of Chaos: The Bloody Rise of the Satanic Metal Underground*. Venice: Feral House.
- Omar, Mohamed. (2010). *Islamisten*. Uppsala: Aguéli.
- Orr, Marry. (2003). *Intertextuality: Debates and Contexts*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Petersen Aagaard, Jesper. (2009). *Contemporary Religious Satanism: A Critical Anthology*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing.
- Pojman, Louise. Fieser, James. (2009). *Ethics: Discovering Right and Wrong*. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Raudvere, Catharina. Andrén, Anders. Jennbert, Kristina. (2001). *Myter om det nordiska: mellan romantik och politik*. Lund: Nordic Academic Press.

Sedgwick, Mark. (2004). *Against the Modern World: Traditionalism and the Secret Intellectual History of the Twentieth Century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sheehan, Thomas. (1986) "Diventare dio: Julius Evola and the Metaphysics of Fascism" in *Stanford Italian Review*, number six.

Sheehan, Thomas. (1981) "Myth and Violence: The Fascism of Julius Evola and Alain de Benoist". *Social Research*, number 48: 45-73.

Wallis, Roy. (1975). *Sectarianism: Analyses of Religious and Non-religious Sects*. London: Owen.

Weininger, Otto. (2005). *Sex and Character: An Investigation of Fundamental Principles*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. First published in German as *Geschlecht und Charakter* in 1903.

Winther Jørgensen, Marianne. Phillips, Louise. (2000). *Diskursanalys som teori och metod*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Internet Sources

Arktos Media: <http://www.arktos.com/guillaume-faye-archeofuturism.html>, <http://www.arktos.com/lifestyle/fashion.html>. Visited during December 2010.

Bernsand, Niklas. "Friend or foe?". Downloaded from <http://www.anst.uu.se/matwe309/Bernsand.pdf> during December 2010.

Café Exposé: <http://cafeexpose.wordpress.com/2008/03/05/seyyed-hossein-nasr-om-sitt-mote-med-julius-evola/>. Visited during December 2010.

Counter –Currents Publishing: <http://www.counter-currents.com/2010/06/traditionalism-this-is-the-enemy/>. Visited during December 2010.

de Benoist, Alain. Downloaded from http://www.alaindebenoist.com/pdf/democracy_representative_and_participatory.pdf during December 2010.

Dragon Rouge: <http://www.dragonrouge.net/english/general.html>. Visited during December 2010.

Eco, Umberto. "Ur-Fascism". *The New York Review of Books*. (1995). June 22. Downloaded from http://www.pegc.us/archive/Articles/eco_ur-fascism.pdf. Visited during December 2010.

Fabbri, Renaud. (2005). "Introduction to the Perennialist School". Downloaded from <http://www.religioperennis.org/documents/Fabbri/Perennialism.pdf> during January 2011.

Integral Tradition: <http://www.integraltradition.com>. Visited during December 2010.

Internationalen: <http://www.internationalen.se/news.php?extend.3207>. Visited during December 2010.

Karlsson, Thomas (founder of Dragon Rouge). E-mail correspondence (thomas.karlsson@rel.su.se) during December 2010.

Metal Archives: <http://www.metal-archives.com/release.php?id=207457>. Visited during December 2010.

Metapedia: <http://www.metapedia.org/>. Visited during January 2011.

Motpol: <http://motpol.nu/bloggar.php>. Visited during January 2011

Nationell: <http://www.nationell.nu/2010/03/10/djavulsdyrkande-sd-are-vill-konkurrera-ut-nd-i-sodertalje/>. Visited during December 2010.

Occidental Quarterly: <http://www.toqonline.com/>. Visited during December 2010.

Olympiark: <http://olympiark.motpol.nu/2010/05/03/bortom-materialism-och-ekonomism/#comments>. Visited during January 2011.

Omar, Mohamed: <http://alazerius.wordpress.com/>. Visited during January 2011.

Order of the Nine Angles. Downloaded from <http://users.skynet.be/theriomorph/dotab/pdf/ona/nexion.pdf> during December 2010.

Oskorei: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/>. Visited during January 2011.

Rimfaxe: <http://rimfaxe.motpol.nu/?p=2527>. Visited during January 2011.

Senholt, Jacob C. (2009). *The Sinister Tradition: Political Esotericism & The Convergence of Radical Islam, Satanism and National Socialism in the Order of the Nine Angles*.

Downloaded from http://www.lulu.com/items/volume_68/7955000/7955147/2/print/The-Sinister-Tradition.pdf during January 2011.

Schwarz, Martin. *Kshatriya: Tradition und Metaphysik*: <http://traditionundmetaphysik.wordpress.com/>. Visited during December 2010.

SolGuru: <http://solguru.motpol.nu/>. Visited during January 2011.

Spöknippet: <http://spoknippet.blogspot.com/2006/01/excerpts-evola-men-among-ruins.html>. Visited during December 2010.

Svenska nihilistsällskapet: SNUS Interviews Oskorei: <http://www.anus.com/tribes/snus/kultur/intervjuer/oskorei.html>. Visited during December 2010.

Sverige är inte världens navel: <http://ligator.wordpress.com/2010/07/22/identitar-livbatsetik-utan-flytvast-svar-till-solguru/>. Visited during December 2010.

Tidningen kulturen: <http://tidningenkulturen.se/ess-mainmenu-57/litteratur-mainmenu-95/1007-julius-evola-frdadaismen-till-traditionen>. Visited during December 2010.

Tyr: Myth – Culture – Tradition: http://tyrjournal.tripod.com/about_the_journal.html. Visited during December 2010.

YouTube: Jonas De Geer: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=00Q_WI8D5ic&feature=related, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TYi1KROIQqA&feature=related>, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pU2JQnPfZCs&feature=related>, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AL596JG3IT4&feature=related>. Visited during December 2010.

YouTube: Zyklon Boom: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jFTQQ5drTNI>. Visited during January 2011.

Appendix 1: Oskorei Quotes

”Evola går även igenom de två könen metafysik. Det rör sig om deras idealtyper, han är väl medveten om att det finns inga män som inte har några feminina drag alls, och vice versa. Dessa avsnitt är sannolikt djupt kränkande för varje radikalfeminist, Evola beskriver Kvinnan som i fundamental (alltså spirituellt) mening passiv, och som oförmögen att uppnå sin mening annat än i relation till en man (antingen som mor eller som partner). Mannen däremot är aktiv/spirituellt viril, och uppnår inte sin mening om han lägger hela sin energi på kvinnor och familj.

Avseende de två metafysiska könen, är Evola medveten om att vissa individer kan ha ett biologiskt kön men domineras av det andra. Dessa är naturligt homosexuella, och har ofta inordnats i egna sociala sfärer i traditionella samhällen.” (Review of *Eros and the Mysteries of Love*: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=171>)

”Min kommentar skulle kunna vara att inte alla kvinnor är ämnade till ett liv som mödrar eller hustrur, och att för dessa kan prostitution falla sig naturligt. Traditionella samhällen inordnade dem i detta fall i en egen social och religiös sfär, de hade egna riter, tidvis egna ”hantverk” (ars amatoria, Kama Sutra et cetera), egna organisationer/gillen, och så vidare. Detsamma kan inte sägas om situationen i det moderna samhället, man behöver bara jämföra forna tiders geishor eller kurtisaner med dagens gatflickor.” (Ibid)

”Den amerikanska världsbilden kan här jämföras med den europeiska radikalkonservativa. Radikala konservativa som Strindberg och Pareto var inte fientliga till social rörlighet och eliternas rotation, tvärtom ansåg de att man måste underlätta för de bästa i folkstammen att ta plats i eliten (och i vår tid kan man bara instämma i detta. Vid en radikal samhällsomvandling måste större delen av våra ”eliter” bytas ut).

Den traditionellt europeiska världsbilden är dock personalistisk snarare än individualistisk. Detta innebär att vi som personer inte är vare sig utbytbara eller likadana. Vem som helst kan inte bli vad som helst, oavsett vilken utbildning eller träning han/hon får. Inte heller är det önskvärt med sådana likriktande projekt, utan en person är det han/hon är just på grund av var han/hon vuxit upp, på grund av sin etnicitet, sina traditioner, sin karaktär (det som kallats kast) och så vidare.” (Julius Evola About America: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=431>)

”När man som antiliberal talar om elitism och aristokrati är ens samtida ofta snabba att misstolka detta, en misstolkning som bygger på den historieskrivning vi tar del av i skola och media. För det första tolkas begreppen i rent politiska och ekonomiska termer, som en antidemokratisk idealisering av tidigare slavsamhällen. För det andra tolkas det som något ärflikt. För det tredje tolkas det ofta som en okänslig ståndpunkt, en form av misantropi och allmän brist på empati.

I själva verket handlar det i första hand om ett *personligt* ideal, något man strävar efter att förverkliga i det egna livet. Man har en bild av vilken sorts människa man vill vara, och finner att det finns stora likheter med de krav historiska aristokratier ställde på sig själva och de mål de hade. Värden som självbehärskning, hövlighet, lojalitet, och mod står här i centrum, men också nåd, gästfrihet och barmhärtighet mot de svagare och mot en slagen motståndare. Man skiljer på sina högre och lägre sidor, och strävar efter att inte bli en slav under de lägre (rädsla, frosseri, hat, et cetera) samtidigt som man är medveten om deras funktion i specifika situationer.” (Brief about Elitism and Ethnic Preservation: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=2313>)

”Något man lätt missar vid mötet med Evola är att han till en början var en radikal ’anarkist’, en anti-borgerlig individualist som sedan gradvis upptäckte den världsåskådning som ligger till grund för traditioner som alkemin och tantrismen, och myter som de romerska och Graalmyten. Som pseudo-religiös, politiskt korrekt, ”anarkist” kan man lätt tolka Evolas utveckling som ett ”avfall”, man missar då den röda tråd som faktiskt finns där. Evola medger själv att det var ungdomliga överdrifter, men hans skildring av de tantriska *kaulas* och *viras* får Nietzsches övermänniskodrömmar och Stirners ”egoism” att framstå som pinsamma, diffusa och *väldigt* ’1800-tal’. Detsamma gäller hans beskrivningar av sådant som hur pytagoréerna menade att människan genom invigning kan bli en gud, eller hur alkemisterna ansåg att deras *ars regia* gjorde dem till kungar. När man först upptäcker Evola kan dessa inslag lätt leda till en naiv hållning som påminner om Nietzsches övermänniskoideal, men det brukar balanseras med tiden och är oavsett vilket att föredra framför de moderna alternativen.” (Review of *The Path of Cinnabar*: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=1747>)

”Detta var, i förbigående sagt, också ett av de inslag som fick mig att intressera mig för Evola till att börja med. Hans skildringar av traditionella eliter, både ksatriyas och alkemister, satte dem i ett begripligt sammanhang, där det snarare handlade om självförverkligande och självkontroll än ’utsugning’ (han förnekade heller inte att alla system kan degenerera med tiden). Det har hävdats att Evolas tankar går ut på ”hjältedyrkan”, realiteten i detta skulle i så

fall vara att han ställer frågan om vilken världsbild som låg bakom mytiska och historiska hjältars liv, om resultaten av den världsbilden är bättre än resultaten av dagens, och om det är möjligt att leva på ett liknande sätt idag. För att göra en lång historia kort är myterna om Gilgamesh, Oden eller Achilles både mer komplexa och betydligt mer givande än en Krapotkins eller, än värre, en Schymans, moralistiska kollektivism. I varje fall om man eftersträvar självförverkligande på riktigt.” (Ibid)

”Evolas tankar om metapolitik är dock inte lika utvecklade som exempelvis den Nya Högers (tankarna om en allians med den gamla aristokratin var exempelvis inte realistiska), och mot slutet av sitt liv misströstade han om möjligheterna att förändra samhället överhuvudtaget. Råden i *Men Among the Ruins* är däremot fortfarande av stort värde för nya generationer av antiliberaler. Det förutsätter dock att man kan läsa kritiskt. Evolas råd i *Men Among the Ruins* är inte identiska med de råd som 1800-talets antiliberaler gav, eftersom förutsättningarna förändrats. På samma sätt är vår situation en annan än det italienska 1960-talets, och vi måste därför också anpassa våra strategier därefter.” (Ibid)

”Men deras inställning var inte bara pessimistisk. Dels ansåg de att den sista åldern skulle avslutas genom en massiv konflikt mellan företrädarna för ordningen (gudarna) och oordningen (jättarna i asatron). Därefter skulle en ny guldålder börja. Detta synsätt kallas det cykliska, eftersom man inte tror att historien har ett ’slut’, utan ser den som en ständig följd av upp- och nedgång. Dels ansåg de att det alltid var möjligt att återvända till ursprunget, både för individer och kollektiv (ungefär det som Nietzsche kallade för *den eviga återkomsten*).” (It can Always Get Better: <http://oskorei.motpol.nu/?p=454>)

Appendix 2: SolGuru Quotes

”Något är ruttet i den sekulära staten. Det finns en desperation i människors ögon när de ser lyckliga ut. Medvetenheten att inget, verkligen inget, har någon fundamental mening, tär. Modernitetens antiapostlar vill gärna få det till att detta är en frihet – en möjlighet. Utan band och tvång kan individen ’förverkliga sig själv’. Men den här individen, löskopplad från det heliga, sitt folk och sin historia, existerar inte. Han är ett sandkorn, en meningslöshet – han är *dust in the wind*, utan Dylans buddhistiska undertoner. Han blinkar till i evigheten och försvinner ut i mörkret utan att lämnat det minsta spår, och han vet om det.” (Purpose: <http://solguru.motpol.nu/?p=26>)

”Fayes kanske mest träffande kritik, som betecknande nog är skild från vissa av hans mer fantastiska uppfattningar om hur saker och ting är eller bör vara beskaffade, rör två ting:

- 1) Isolationismen och passiviteten som ofta följer för en viss typ av traditionalister. Pessimismen rörande omgivningen gör att man isolerar sig från levande uttryck för vad människan och skapelsen innebär, och placerar individen i en solipsistisk värld av inbillad överlägsenhet. Att Faye blandar ihop detta med verklig kontemplation överhuvudtaget är visserligen problematiskt, men att denna typ av utveckling kan förekomma är nog de flesta som haft med traditionalister, oavsett skola, att göra väl medvetna om.
- 2) Detta leder i sin tur, ironiskt nog, till en extremt intensiv form av borgerlig individualism. Kulturuttryck kopplade till traditionalismen som abstrakt idé ämnade att markera den individuella identiteten, och gemenskapsgenererande markörer inom alla möjliga områden riskerar att omvandla en av de mest skarpsynta uttrycken för kritik av den moderna världen till en fluga eller en hipp, alternativ trend – och en som dessutom används som ursäkt för att förhålla sig passiv och ointresserad av verkligheten.” (Guillaume Faye Criticizes Traditionalism: <http://solguru.motpol.nu/?p=1014>)

”Ytterligare en invändning mot hur traditionalismen stundom tagit sig uttryck (kanske i synnerhet hos yngre) är när den övergår i pseudoelitistisk misantropi – man tycks här undgå att själva fundamentet för en traditionalistisk samhällssyn är att de flesta människor inte är ’krigare och präster’, inte är ’elit’, och att detta är helt och hållet i sin ordning. Då riskerar man att övergå i ett generellt förakt för de grupper i samhället som förmodligen förändrats minst under de gånga århundradena – ’verklighetens folk’, för att skoja till det lite.” (Ibid)

”De som läser honom med en negativ förförståelse. Hit hör förstås främst de ”antifascister” och humanistiska akademiker som rasar och gapar över inslag som strider mot humanistiska och modernistiska sensibiliteter – ’rasism’, ’sexism’ och ’en närmast medeltida världsbild’ (det sista ett citat av allas vår favorittrotskist Stieg Larsson, vilken av någon anledning ansåg sig ha rätt att kombinera sitt stöd för Kronstadtslaktaren med moraliserande över i allt väsentligt självständiga tänkare som Evola). En annan kategori finns förstås bland den höger som söker verka inom upplysningens och sekulärvetenskapens rum. Där kan man uppröra sig över exempelvis Evolas syn på det biologiska rasbegreppet, som hos honom visserligen vare sig förnekas, eller *a priori* underordnas kulturella-sociala faktorer, men tillsammans med det senare underställs den överliggande struktur som hos honom är och förblir fundamentet för medvetandet, världen och deras relation till varandra, och utöver det diskuteras som ett materiellt fenomen bland andra. Att en dylik distinktion går många förbi (och i vissa fall lett till tolkningen att Evola förfäktat någon form av ’kulturnationalism’ eller etnisk relativism av postmodernt mönster, vilket är en fullständigt absurd slutsats) är kanske inte ägnat att förvåna. Det är betecknande att varken ’antifascisterna’ eller ’nynazisterna’ vanligen har annat än en högst ytlig bekantskap med Evolas konkreta författarskap, och även smått imponerande att bägge sidor vanligen fullständigt missförstått till och med de här förhållandevis tydliga och enkla punkterna i hans tänkande.” (Review of *The Path of Cinnabar*: <http://solguru.motpol.nu/?p=118>)

”De som läser honom med en positiv förförståelse, men saknar de kunskaper och insikter som behövs för att, för att använda modern universitetsjargong, ’sätta hans verk i kontext’. Det slutar inte sällan med en fullständig, odifferentierad acceptans av snart sagt varje ord Evola skrivit (i den utsträckning man förstått det), och därmed ironiskt nog ofta med diverse märkliga former av religiös-politisk-andlig synkretism eller halvvidskepliga föreställningar som skulle få författaren själv att rotera i graven. Denna typ av Evolianism är förstås lika destruktiv som alla andra former av enfaldig fanatism – Evola själv påpekar i en av de intervjuer som trycks i slutet av *The Path of Cinnabar*: ’*Jokingly I once said that besides ‘Evolians’ [...] we now have Evolomaniacs’.*” (Ibid)