

ALEXANDER DUGIN AND WESTERN ESOTERICISM:
THE CHALLENGE OF THE LANGUAGE OF TRADITION
Jafe Arnold¹

This article seeks to examine the Russian Traditionalist Alexander Dugin (1962-) in the context of Western Esotericism by clarifying the nature and context of Dugin's theorized "language of Tradition" and "metalanguage of Traditionalism." Firstly, existing scholarship on Dugin's thought is critiqued for problematically dismissing Dugin's self-proclaimed Traditionalism as a political motive rather than a coherent worldview whose structure and context are worth studying. To the contrary, this article argues that Dugin, in his major work, *The Philosophy of Traditionalism* (2002), presents a worldview articulately based on his interpretation of 20th century Traditionalism, and that Dugin's understanding of Traditionalism can be contextualized in the historical evolution of theories of language and their relationship to the currents and corpus of Western Esotericism. Dugin's evaluations of a number of phenomena ranging from Marxism to geopolitics to Herman Wirth's (1885-1981) "sacred proto-language" are addressed as indicative of his "linguistic" Traditionalist approach. By clarifying the centrality of Traditionalism to Dugin's thought and his particular rendition of Traditionalism's relevance to Western Esoteric concepts and currents, it is argued that fruitful scholarship on Dugin is possible in the context and field of Western Esotericism.

33

Keywords: Alexander Dugin, Herman Wirth, naturalism, realism, René Guénon, Traditionalism, Western Esotericism.

¹ Jafe Arnold (jafe.arnold@gmail.com) holds a BA in European Culture from the University of Wrocław (Poland), and is currently undertaking an RMA in Religious Studies and Western Esotericism at the University of Amsterdam (The Netherlands). He is the founding Editor-in-Chief of Eurasianist Internet Archive.

1. Introduction²

34 Of all the currents and figures which scholars of Western Esotericism have endeavored to reintroduce to the academy for serious study, the case of one of the leading contemporary Russian esotericists, Alexander Dugin (1962-), remains a curious and emblematic unturned stone. With the exception of Mark Sedgwick's milestone work on Traditionalism which features a chapter devoted to Dugin as the "centrally important" Russian Traditionalist (Sedgwick 2004: 221), scholarly accounts of Dugin and the various facets of his thought and undertakings have largely been the enterprise of the political sciences. This has manifested itself in numerous instances of the employment of preconceived models of reified political spectra which render further scholarship on Dugin at best frivolous and at worst politically suspect. Tellingly enough, the leading proponents of classifying Dugin as a "fascist intellectual" have warned against recognizing and addressing Traditionalism in Dugin's thought, insofar as such might "prove useful for him in this endeavor" (Shekhovtsov & Umland 2009: 676). This and other indicative terminological predicaments have yielded the impression that among scholars there prevails a distinct lack of an adequate and unbiased conceptual framework which can hermeneutically address Dugin's intellectual corpus.

Indeed, many axes have been ground and swung at the tree of Alexander Dugin's worldview and philosophico-political identity. While Dugin has conclusively stated that Traditionalism is the central anchor of his worldview³ and claimed that

² This paper's earliest drafts benefited greatly from editing suggestions from Prof. Wouter J. Hanegraaff of the Center for the History of Hermetic Philosophy and Related Currents (University of Amsterdam) and John Stachelski (PhD candidate, Yale University). The final stages of this work were made possible thanks to the suggestions and encouragement of Dr. Hans Thomas Hakl, Michele Olzi, and Prof. Nemanja Radulović.

³ "First of all in my early youth I was deeply inspired by Traditionalism of Rene Guenon and Julius Evola. That was my definitive choice of camp – on the side of sacred Tradition against the modern (and post-modern) world. This choice and all consequences are still there in the present... Traditionalism was and rests central as the philosophic focus of all my later developments" (Dugin 2014) See Dugin's autobiographical statement on becoming a Traditionalist in the 1980's, to which he adds "I did not outgrow [this]". (Dugin 2006, alternatively translated and cited in Umland 2007: 146).

(neo-)Eurasianism remains the unique apperception and application of his outlook within the specific context of the current world order⁴, this has not stopped scholars and pundits from striving to corral Dugin's thought into one or another conjured label and even to artificially cast some of his "inconvenient" theses out of the picture. The pressing relevance of scholarly discussion of Dugin's ideas has received particular impetus in recent time. In addition to growing scholarly attention to Eurasianism in general and Dugin's affiliated political projects and ideological tendencies, unprecedented mainstream Western media attention to Dugin - employing such appellations as "Putin's brain" (Barbashin & Thoburn 2014; Shekhovtsov 2014), "Putin's Rasputin" (MacCormac 2015; Meyer & Ant 2017), "crazy Russian mystic" (Carli 2017), and even "one of the most dangerous human beings on the planet today" (Beck 2015) - has presented scholars with a sense of responsibility to approach this sensitive topic with integrity. The increasing hysterical or prejudiced treatments of Dugin by mainstream media and political organizations should remind Western Esotericism scholars of the hysteria with which they or their subjects have been similarly lambasted in one historical period or another.

35

This paper aims to address one of the long-standing questions among scholars that is Alexander Dugin's self-proclaimed Traditionalism and his consequential relationship to Western Esotericism. That Dugin has described himself as a Traditionalist should render such an obvious imperative. The plane upon which our study will unfold will begin with a brief review of existing scholarly discussion of Traditionalism in Dugin's thought. Subsequently, we will turn to an examination of Dugin's 2002 compilation, *Filosofia traditsionalizma*, or *The Philosophy of Traditionalism*, as a primary source for understanding Dugin's digestion and profession of 20th century Traditionalism. We will show based upon a textual analysis of the first, programmatic chapter of this early, pivotal work of Dugin's that Traditionalism indeed forms the foundation of his outlook as a hermeneutic-semantic framework through which he understands basic philosophical and historical categories as well as political phenomena, and to which he dares to contribute his own summations and innova-

⁴ Dugin describes himself as "an ideologist and active practitioner of Eurasianism" in Altukhov (2015).

tions. We will demonstrate over the course of this analysis that Dugin's philosophy of Traditionalism is deeply intertwined with the heritage of Western Esotericism, specifically on the question of language and its relation to metaphysics. Thereafter, we will examine how this worldview is reflected in Dugin's evaluation of Herman Wirth in chapters four and five of *The Philosophy of Traditionalism*. Finally, we will briefly extrapolate the implications of our findings to studies of Dugin's thought in general and the potential for further research within the context of Western Esotericism in particular. *Hic Rhodus, hic salta*.

2. "Armed Doctrine": Existing Appraisals of Dugin's Traditionalism

36 Existing studies of Dugin's thought have been inclined towards narrow categorizations which ultimately privilege one facet of his ideological expressions over another. This has indeed been the case with Dugin's Traditionalism, which has been variously assigned either a central or peripheral role in his corpus. Of more particular interest to us, however, are those scholarly accounts which have interpreted Traditionalism as relevant to Dugin's outlook only to rather peculiarly assign such an "instrumentalized" role, the contours and problems of which we will explore below.

The leading Western scholar of Eurasianism, Marlene Laruelle, has posited that the "influence of Traditionalism on Dugin seems to be fundamental: it constitutes his main intellectual reference point and the basis of his political attitudes..." (Laruelle 2006: 10). This thesis, however, is coupled with the caveat that Dugin reserves "Traditionalism and other philosophical and religious doctrines" for "small but influential and consciously elitist intellectual circles" (Laruelle 2006: 22). While at first glance this discernment might seem to be analytically harmless, it bears rather significant implications. Thus, despite its anchoring of Dugin's referential worldview and having "been his mainstay since the beginning, displaying a high degree of doctrinal consistency" (Laruelle 2006: 5), Laruelle nonetheless argues that Traditionalism in the plethora of Dugin's intellectual expressions remains a rather concealed or selectively channelled ideological focus of Dugin's resigned to the role of being but one "underlying influence", one even purposefully kept less visible in relation to his "most classic and best-known

‘business cards’ for public opinion and the political authorities,” i.e., Eurasianism and geopolitics (Laruelle 2006: 1). In this sense, Traditionalism is backpedaled to be but one of “several intellectual tendencies [which] manifest themselves in his thought” as a basis for his political theories which, overall, according to Laruelle, are more fruitfully comparable to those of the European New Right, and principally the works of Alain de Benoist, as if Dugin is only a “Russian version of the European radical right” (Laruelle 2006: 12-14). The fact remains, however, according to Laruelle, that: “All these elements of occultist culture are not specific to the New Right, they have their roots in the esoteric ideas of the founding fathers of Traditionalism...” (Laruelle 2006: 15). By way of rather roundabout deduction, Dugin’s Traditionalism is thus to be sought within a nexus or dialectic of other prominent ideological legacies much in the same way that Traditionalism, although dear to some representatives of the European New Right, fulfills more of a role of the origin of the “occultist culture” subsequently built upon and explored within a distinctly political framework rather than a consistently relevant worldview. Thus, here we can detect, albeit subtly, a conflation of Traditionalism and 20th century “occultist leanings” as well as a treatment of Traditionalism in Dugin’s thought more as a springboard of interests or thematic overtone among numerous others as opposed to a foundational “worldview” that is worth investigating.

37

For Mark Sedgwick, “a form of Traditionalism that is both distinctively Soviet and distinctively Russian...lies at the heart of Dugin’s politics” (Sedgwick 2012: 273). Contextualizing Dugin’s person and intellectual range as part of “occult dissident culture” in the late Soviet Union and early Russian Federation, Sedgwick ultimately suggests that Dugin’s Traditionalism can be reduced to a “power of the idea” motive, i.e., its significance to Dugin’s thought lies in its explanatory virility and employment as a mobilizing force seeking power by virtue of its correctness. From this perspective, Dugin’s Traditionalism is said to be “redolent of Soviet culture” and Soviet Marxism; it represents an ideological response to post-Soviet conditions (Sedgwick 2012: 292). In other words, Traditionalism, while forming the basis of Dugin’s thought, does so essentially in the capacity of a reaction to the surrounding environment, a compensation for ideological crisis, whose significance lies not in its philosophical principles

and outlook, but in its historico-ideological circumstances and potential as a template which is to be filled with political content relevant to such circumstances. It is through this lens that Sedgwick recognizes Traditionalism as central to Dugin not *sui generis*, but only in relation to subsequently developed political doctrine and the surrounding ideological environment's need for "solutions," "modifications," and "complements" to ideas that can be at least partially derived from such a broad current as Traditionalism. From this perspective, the "distinctively Russian" dimension of Dugin's Traditionalism is its instrumentalization as a replacement for since dethroned official Soviet Marxism and as a sentiment upon which a number of additional philosophical and political visions are built. Hence Sedgwick's emphasis on the "despair" experienced by Dugin in late Soviet society as translatable into his adoption of the mobilized despair of Traditionalism as an "undiscovered Marxism" (Sedgwick 2012: 277). Scholars of Western Esotericism might discern here a certain functionalist or reductionist understanding of the appeal of esoteric currents that was typical of sociologists' view on the "occult explosion" and New Age movements in the 1960's and '70's.⁵ Operating with preconceived notions of modernity and rather than taking the unexpected appearance of alternative worldviews and movements on their own grounds as historically and philosophically contextualizable phenomena with their own systematic logic, such were belittled as psychological coping mechanisms or ideological compensations ultimately encouraged by charlatans with profit motives. Sedgwick's historical situation is an important contextualization, but it is by no means the endpoint or culmination of Traditionalism for Dugin - Sedgwick's input concerns, after all, context, not content.

The exploitative value or instrumentality assigned to Traditionalism as a building block of Dugin's thought by Laruelle and Sedgwick finds perhaps most explicit expression in the works of Anton Shekhovtsov and Andreas Umland, the main proponents of classifying Dugin's thought as "fascist", who in relatively influential essays have argued that Dugin's appeal to Traditionalism is parodical, and nothing more than distinctly exploitative of a "corruption" of Integral Traditionalism. Shekhovtsov claims: "Dugin

⁵ See Campbell (1972/2002), Webb (1976), Galbreath (1983). On criticism of this tendency, Hanegraaff (1995: 119).

uses the 'Perennialist' apparatus for different purposes, and, by doing so, distorts 'integral Traditionalism'...to exploit the doctrine for political aims" (Shekhovtsov 2008). In other words: "Dugin - in a way analogous to Evola - utilises the 'Perennialist' doctrine, or rather its paligenetic themes, in order to corroborate his own fascist ideology" (Ibid). In a later article, Shekhovtsov and Andreas Umland expand on this point, suggesting that it is "Evola's peculiar (re-)interpretation of Traditionalism, rather than Guénon's original version of the doctrine" that forms the basis of "Dugin's amalgamation of Traditionalist concepts" which are not "legitimate successors" to "Guénonian Traditionalism" or "are at best skewed interpretations of Integral Traditionalism" (Shekhovtsov & Umland 2009: 665, 666). Upon attempting to illustrate certain divergences between Dugin's thought and Guénon's by isolating individual quotes out of context, Shekhovtsov & Umland admit that there can be "no doubt that Dugin has contributed to the development of Russian Traditionalism," but only by virtue of his "being an industrious publisher" of works which represent "ENR [European New Right] instrumentalizations of Traditionalism" (Shekhovtsov & Umland 2009: 672). It is alleged that "Dugin's form of 'Traditionalism' - if one chooses to use this term - has little relation to the philosophical school...Perennial Philosophy serves Dugin as an arsenal of unconventional terms and offbeat notions - freely reagggregated in Dugin's worldview - rather than as an organic precursor or ideational foundation..." (Shekhovtsov & Umland 2009: 676). According to these authors, while "In view of his massive 'presence' in Russia, Dugin's specific interpretation of Traditionalism could be declared seminal... By stretching the notion of Traditionalism to include Duginism, we deprive the term of its heuristic and communicative value" (Shekhovtsov & Umland 2009: 677). Shekhovtsov and Umland's ultimate argument that Dugin be reduced to a "fascist" has been repeatedly contested, including by scholars of fascism (Gregor 2004 & 2006). In our context, however, this thesis epitomizes the perspective that Traditionalism is for Dugin purely utilitarian in value, even going a step further to allege the necessity of re-thinking the entire history of Traditionalism as an intellectual current to the point of questioning the place of one of its most prominent associates for the sake of "pragmatically and etymologically" (Shekhovtsov & Umland 2009: 677) avoiding associating Dugin with Traditionalism. In effect, Shekhovtsov and Umland

seem to assume some kind of one and only true Traditionalism whose reified imposition is the touchstone of determining other thinkers' diversions from this perfect form. In the end, for Shekhovtsov, Dugin should only be understood as a "fascist intellectual" and research should focus on situating him in light of the European New Right (Shekhovtsov 2009 & 2015).

The Russian scholar of Western Esotericism, Pavel Nosachev, has posited on this matter: "Revealing contradictions between the views of Evgeniy Golovin, Alexander Dugin, René Guénon, and Julius Evola, we are merely pointing out the ambiguity of the very term 'traditionalism' and the even greater ambiguity of so-called 'Russian Traditionalism'" (Nosachev 2011: 183) - a clarification of which Nosachev attempts elsewhere (Nosachev 2013). It can be clearly gleaned from Nosachev's work, however, that such a rectification of scholarly understandings of Traditionalism is meant to serve a better understanding of Dugin in particular, whose fundamental coordinates coincide with Traditionalism regardless of this or that instance of instrumentalization.

40 Another perspective on Dugin and Traditionalism is offered by the American Evangelical Lutheran Bishop James Heiser's polemic against Alexander Dugin and Traditionalism, entitled *"The American Empire Should Be Destroyed": Aleksandr Dugin and the Perils of Immanentized Eschatology*, whose relevance is due to the fact that it remains the only book-length treatment of Dugin in English. Heiser rightly posits that "to properly understand the worldview of Aleksandr Dugin, it is necessary to understand him in the context of an intellectual movement...which is now known as 'Traditionalism'" (Heiser 2014: 14). Heiser criticizes scholars for failing to grasp Dugin's Traditionalism as the "heart of his position" underlying all of his other views, thus calling Dugin's other distinguishing ideological tags, particularly (neo-)Eurasianism, the "Armed Doctrine of Traditionalism" (Heiser 2014: 69). However, Heiser's otherwise cogent thesis that Dugin's thought and career are inseparable from Traditionalism is distorted by his work's fundamental theological and ideological ambition to discredit Traditionalism as a baseless ideology and assert an infallible Western truth and logos "built upon the foundations of Athens and Jerusalem" (Heiser 2014: 127), a motive which leads him to reify Traditionalism as a perennial evil whose lifeblood is delusion and deviltry. In other words, Heiser's work is best seen as a theological polemic.

It is thus clear that the few existing scholarly explorations of the role and place of Traditionalism in Dugin's thought are, at best, contradictory, and, at worst, characterized by preconceived political approaches endemic to the political sciences or prejudiced ideological motives. Overall, allegations of "exploiting Traditionalism" are largely irrelevant and even self-defeating insofar, as we will see, that Dugin indeed formulates a uniquely and explicitly Traditionalist outlook and therein draws further inductions related to philosophical and political questions. Moreover, on the question of "rethinking Traditionalism", it is worth bearing in mind that applying ahistorical, rigid definitions and parameters to recent historical or contemporary schools of thought always entails the danger of cutting scholars off from a whole crucial range of explicitly associated phenomena which can furnish a wealth of primary sources. It is thus wholly out of place to immediately exclude Dugin from the Traditionalist corpus for the sake of theoretical reconsiderations which are in fact far from "pragmatic and etymological." On the contrary, in order is a turn away from certain scholars' caricatures and towards Dugin's own presentation of his philosophy of Traditionalism as laid out in his book of the very title, *Filosofia traditsionalizma*, or *The Philosophy of Traditionalism*.

41

3. *The tradition of language and the language of Tradition*

As the title may indicate, Alexander Dugin's *Filosofia traditsionalizma*, or *The Philosophy of Traditionalism*, occupies a crucial place in his oeuvre and expounds essential contours of Dugin's worldview in general and his adoption or incorporation of Traditionalism in particular. Although this work was published 17 years ago, it remains Dugin's most elaborate presentation of Traditionalism and he continues to cite it as seminal to this day. The contextual importance of *The Philosophy of Traditionalism* lies in that it represented the culmination of Dugin's discourse on Traditionalism as he intellectually and professionally evolved beyond and had already begun to shape the legacy of the "Iuzhinskii Circle." The book's content was originally delivered as a series of lectures at the "New University" between 1998 and 2001 and published in print form in 2002. A "small institution that provides Traditionalist and occultist teachings to a select

few” (Laruelle 2006: 1), the New University was essentially a series of thematic lectures sporadically organized by Dugin and his fellow esotericists from the Soviet-era “occult dissident group”, the “Iuzhinskii Circle.” According to Laruelle, “The Circle sought to move beyond the classical discourse on Russia’s distinctive path by counterbalancing it with broader references coming from European metaphysical and traditionalist doctrines,” and the “intellectual heritage of the Circle was reconstituted” with “the creation of the New University in Moscow by Dugin, Mamleev (who returned to Russia after the collapse of the Soviet Union), Golovin, and Djemal in 1998” (Laruelle 2015: 563, 577). Dugin’s presentation of his *Philosophy of Traditionalism* in this context can be seen as a crystallization of “the discoveries and interests that have been [Dugin’s] group’s main subject for a long time” (“Geopolitica”), in particular propagating among its attendants and future “cadre” Dugin’s unique interpretation of Traditionalism.

42

Moreover, *Filosofia traditsionalizma* can be seen as a “break-through” of Dugin’s, since his earlier work on Traditionalism, *Puti Absoliuta* (“The Ways of the Absolute”, 1989) presented itself in the foreword and in references throughout as merely a summary of the interpretation of Traditionalism that Dugin was taught by his former “spiritual guide”, the Iuzhinskii Circle’s Geydar Dzhemal, whose particular version of metaphysics Dugin admitted “determined the particular structure” of this early work (Arnold 2018: 5). In this light, *Filosofia traditsionalizma* should be seen as Dugin’s seminal presentation of his own philosophy of Traditionalism. There has yet to be any extensive research into the real impact of the New University, but the fact remains that a definite portion of its participants would accompany Dugin throughout his career, and they and others digested Traditionalism through Dugin’s lens presented there. In his study on the “social networks of Russian philosophy”, Vladimir Krasikov distinguishes the New University as part of the broader “contextualist” camp of Russian intellectuals characterized by “revolutionary conservatism,” independent institution-building, and increasing influence by virtue of “colorful leaders” and “the rise of nationalism” (Krasikov 2014: 378).

Dugin sets the objective of his *The Philosophy of Traditionalism* in the introduction as the inculcation of “a new state of being and new state of consciousness” and “a new system of co-

ordinates... between languages, paradigms, and ‘operative systems’ of thinking”, i.e., a hermeneutical worldview. This worldview, we learn, is to be elucidated on the basis of deconstructing the “language of modernity” and arriving at an understanding of the “philosophy of Traditionalism” through the “language of Tradition” (Dugin 2002: 10-11). This proposal is contextualized as central to the New University’s teaching of “eschatological humanism” and “being in a soteriological light” (Dugin 2002: 11). It is thus as precisely this “system of coordinates” between all paradigms and operative systems that Dugin presents his philosophy of Traditionalism, seeking to “internalize it” as a hermeneutical language and therein draw conclusions on its “instrumentalization”, i.e., analytical and political employment.

Evoking Nietzsche’s *We Philologists*, Dugin’s presentation of Traditionalism begins with a curious discussion of 20th century structural linguistics and structuralism, which he acclaims for having insightfully situated language as its own autonomous category, as that which lies “between the idea (or, let us say, spirit) and deed” (Dugin 2002: 16). According to Dugin, the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis that “our surrounding reality is forged by our language” fully concurs with Traditionalism and “the world of Tradition’s characteristic view that the actual being of things is encapsulated in their names, and that names are capable of creating, imbuing, and materializing concrete things” (Dugin 2002: 16). Dugin thus posits a “‘theurgical’ significance” of words and compares linguistics to “operative magic” (Dugin 2002: 17). The very logic of structural linguistics, Dugin accounts, points to the relevance of a “metalanguage” by which all other languages can be studied. But, Dugin summates, the structuralists were inhibited from realizing and pursuing further revelations due to their own latent, restrictive paradigmatic “languages”, deemed either “positivist-Kantian” or “Marxian.” Hence, in his words, the “crisis of structuralism and poststructuralism,” the “exhaustion of these trends,” the “crisis of modern ‘new left’ philosophy” (Dugin 2002: 20).

Already at this first juncture, Dugin is prefacing his presentation of Traditionalism and situating his discourse in the context of one of the most definitive philosophical polemics in the history of Western culture and, indeed, one of the touchstones of the historical demarcation of what is now called the referential corpus of Western Esotericism. At hand is the dispute be-

tween the conventionalist and naturalist interpretations of language and the related grand debate between nominalism and realism. Whereas realism asserts the metaphysical existence of “universals” and “particulars,” nominalism alleges only the existence of “particulars,” with “universals” being a product of human representative invention (Rodriguez-Pereyra 2016). The complex debate between these two philosophies of reality and knowledge can be seen as developing out of or aligning itself with earlier interpretations of the role of language, the trajectory of which we can outline from Plato to Dugin through the evolution of European culture and Western Esotericism.

44 Whether language is a system of particulars exemplifying universals or a set of arbitrarily assigned particulars dates back to and is the essential question of Plato’s *Cratylus* where in its more specific linguistic interpretation it is framed by scholars as the contention between naturalism and conventionalism. What exactly Socrates (Plato) decides as to the nature of language in the *Cratylus* remains widely disputed largely due to uncertainty over whether portions of Socrates’ arguments are to be read literally, ironically, or in the specific context of historical linguistics (Sedley 2013). What is clear, however, is that the naturalist interpretation was taken up by the Neoplatonists who, based on their unique readings of Plato and Aristotle, “accepted the idea that there were such things as divine languages in which words expressed the essence of things” (Coudert & Corse 2007: xxvii). In a more general sense, the issues raised by the *Cratylus* led to the conviction that “the Platonic philosopher needs his own language, a purified and improved version of ordinary language that fits the intelligible realm” (Berg 2008: xv). Whether this language would be a philosophical system or an actual tongue would become a question answered variously, including, as we will see, in Dugin’s work. In addition to being exemplified in Hellenistic Hermetism, the realist-naturalist conception of language was applied by the Jewish Neoplatonist Philo of Alexandria (c. 20 BCE - c. 50 CE) to the Greek Septuagint; ensuingly it can be detected in the writings of certain Church Fathers; and it became “an underlying assumption of medieval exegesis” (Coudert & Corse 2007: xxvii). The centrality of conceptualizations of language to exegetical and theological systems soon manifested itself in the medieval debate between nominalism and realism that would yield two archetypal

philosophical approaches in Western culture (Stuckrad 2008: 428). Accordingly, conventionalism and naturalism became enshrined in greater philosophical polemics against which the identity of both mainstream religious and intellectual culture and the esoteric “counter-culture” came to be dialectically defined. In other words, language became an essential variable in contending worldviews, the trajectory of which in European culture ultimately leads us to Western Esotericism.

In the fertile soil of Renaissance Neoplatonism, Hermeticism, and Kabbalah, the possibility of a natural-realist language or, alternatively, operating with/on language in a natural-realist manner, became an essential part of the currents and corpus now known as Western Esotericism. Understandings of language became a touchstone in the Renaissance debate over magic (Coudert 1978: 74), and the search for, restoration, or employment of a divine, primordial, or natural language became so ubiquitous that “[d]uring the early modern period more books were written on this subject than in any previous period” (Coudert & Corse 2007: xxxii). With the Enlightenment, however, the notion of divine, holistic linguistics in particular and the realist paradigm in general became “rejected knowledge,” assigned to the “waste-basket category” with Western Esotericism whose currents such so often accompanied. This “disjunctive” process represented the fruition of the nominalist school (Stuckrad 2008: 429). The death-bell rang in the words of the archetypal Enlightenment philosopher and “Father of Liberalism,” John Locke: “Let him try if any words can give him the taste of a pineapple, and make him have the true idea of the relish of that celebrated delicious fruit.” In Coudert and Corse’s words, the realist-naturalist conceptualization of language became an “optimism and exhilaration that is quite out of place in our pessimistic, post-modern, and deconstructed world” (Coudert & Corse 2007: xxxviii).

This “rejected knowledge”, and in particular its realist-naturalist linguistic thesis, was inherited by 20th century Traditionalism whose founder, René Guénon, in seeking to critically systematize the heritage of Western Esotericism and religious traditions, primarily from the “East”, in the framework of his meta-historical Tradition, unambiguously summated on the matter of language that “language itself is nothing other than symbolism” (Guénon 1995: 13), and that “true symbolism, far from being

artificially devised by man, is found in nature itself; or better, nature in its entirety is nothing but a symbol of transcendent realities” (quoted in Evola 1995: 149). Furthermore, Guénon posited: “in reality there is nothing arbitrary even in human language, every signification at the origin necessarily having its basis in some natural conformity or harmony between the sign and the signified” (Guénon 1995: 15). Guénon left no doubt that he believed that there was an “original sacred language”, a “lost word”, and “primordial language,” (Guénon 1995: 35) of which historical and existing languages, as well as religious-philosophical semantics, are but degraded permutations. Evola, who became one of the most eminent 20th century Traditionalists, also claimed that “ancient languages were three-dimensional” and that change in the meaning of words “provides an interesting measure of corresponding changes in their speakers’ general sensibility and world-view” (Evola 2018: 39). Thus, in our context, Traditionalism can in a certain sense be seen as carrying to its logical culmination the historically developed naturalist-realist tradition on language in Western Esotericism. Dugin, in turn, is preparing his audience to carry Guénon’s considerations on language to Dugin’s own programmatic conclusion, his linguistic philosophy of Traditionalism. First, as we will show, Dugin argues for a philosophical metalanguage of Traditionalism and, later, following the logic of the former postulate, turns to the possibility of reconstructing an actual, primordial tongue.

In the very first pages of his *The Philosophy of Traditionalism*, Dugin is thus affirming the case of realism, taking with him both the “linguistic baggage” attached to Western Esotericism in general and Traditionalism in particular, and proceeds to conceptualize Traditionalism in precisely such a linguistic light, as a universal metalanguage through which all other particular languages and discourses can be deciphered. Having presented a picture of structural linguistics suspended in dilemma and related contemporary philosophy in disarray by virtue of lacking such a diagrammatic metalanguage, Dugin proposes his thesis: René Guénon’s Traditionalism is to be understood as an analogous answer to the dilemma of structural linguistics, as a hermeneutical tool for resolving the philosophical impasse of discovering a metalanguage capable of elucidating the ontological dimension of language and the names of things. In other words, Traditionalism is to be revealed as a universally explanatory

worldview - an ideal philosophical language in the naturalist-realist sense - whose terminologies and references are capable of interpreting the semantic and semiotic bases of all other modes of thought. Given his critical assessment of “the crisis of structuralism and poststructuralism” and affinity for a “magical” interpretation of language in the realist-naturalist line discussed above, Dugin’s metalanguage is clearly set up as radically denying the logico-positivist “paradigm” and, as will be seen, is explicitly formulated as based upon his reading of Traditionalism, as opposed to one literal school of linguistics or semiotics.

It is René Guénon, according to Dugin, who laid bare the paradigm(s) of metalanguage(s) by distinguishing two basic, universal linguistic worlds: the “language of modernity” and the “language of Tradition,” the dialectic between which explains and undergirds all other “languages” that have been employed as or falsely claimed the role of being “metalanguages.” Not only is Guénon said to have exposed these two linguistic paradigms, but his Traditionalism is to be understood as a proposal of a metalanguage. It is on this account that, in Dugin’s words, Guénon is not only the greatest thinker of the 20th century, but can be seen by some of his followers as not even human insofar as “a human is by definition the product of [his] environment,” (Dugin 2002: 26) whereas Guénon’s revelations transcended and qualitatively uprooted his surrounding socio-historical context, his “personal destiny consisting of transitioning from affirming theoretical Traditionalism to being-in-Tradition” (Dugin 2002: 29). The metalanguage of “Traditionalism” attributed to Guénon, is therefore to be understood as universal in that it, in line with pure naturalism-realism, deciphers the names of and therefore touches the essences of the two paradigmatic forms of human society, “modern” and “traditional”, and explains their complex semantic, discursive, epistemological, and worldview faculties.

It is here that Dugin introduces perhaps his most intriguing qualification, namely, that “upon gradually studying the history of religions,” he arrived at the conclusion that Guénon’s thesis on the “transcendental unity of all traditions” which Dugin says he “once (uncritically) treated as an undoubtable truth” is in fact more complex. Dugin argues: “[T]here exists not a transcendental unity of traditions, but a transcendental unity of the language of traditions. All traditions boil down not to one and the same metaphysical truth, but to one and the same language

- some kind of symbolic paradigm...” (Dugin 2002: 100-101). Thus, while “historical traditions represent different expressions, they are one in that they flow from a common language” (Dugin 2002: 101). Dugin does argue that there once existed a Primordial Tradition, but that such was manifested in a sacred language rather than a single system of dogma (Dugin 2002: 135-166). This distinction, Dugin posits, is necessary to distinguish between religions and Tradition. The language of Tradition, expressed in different forms, is the general antithesis of the language of modernity, whereas religions “occupy an intermediate position between the holistic ensemble of the language of Tradition” and modernity (Dugin 2002: 102). Dugin evidently sees this “clarification” as having been at the heart of Guénon’s Traditionalism as a metalanguage, but left ambiguously suspended in the space between the “discourses” of specific religions which, Dugin suggests, are but instances of straying away from Tradition in the direction of modernity.

48 Counterposed to Tradition is the “language of modernity”, to be understood as the other paradigmatic language, akin to a computer coding, with its own “programs” and “discourses” which underwrite modern humanity’s consciousness. Modernity, Dugin says, must be deconstructed and exposed for what it is: “a malicious, anomalous, perverse, deeply inorganic and inharmonious illusion of artificial origin, an artifact, a simulacrum, a machination” which is peculiar for its reduction of the fundamental ontological categories of time, space, and being, and human consciousness of them, to a linear process of becoming beyond which any philosophizing is only “pure non-ontological abstraction” (Dugin 2002: 25, 33). Dugin writes: “Unidirectional time, equating time and being, and viewing the world as that which exists only in becoming and having a positive ontological (and axiological) character - such is the most important law of the paradigm of modernity” (Dugin 2002: 34). This axiom of modernity finds its “most orthodox” reflection in the “positivist approach generalized into a worldview among liberal philosophy’s representatives (F. von Hayek, B. Russell, K. Popper, I. Lakatos)”, but also alternative expression in Marxism which, despite its attempt to formulate a universal metalinguistic alternative to the positivist liberal approach, “stays within the framework of the language of modernity” (Dugin 2002: 34, 35).

Space, meanwhile, “is seen in the language of modernity as

something non-qualitative and uniform, as something quantitative...which is nothing other than the range of the corporeal distribution of sub-corporeal spread (pure matter)", a thesis whose epistemological foundations can be traced back in the history of philosophy to whom Dugin calls "one of the catechists of the language of the modern world, René Descartes" who "said that there exist only two things: 'rational thinking', or 'rational discourse', and *etendue*, or 'extension', space" (Dugin 2002: 40). Dugin's presentation of these notions is essentially a recapitulation of Evola's "Space, Time, the Earth" in his seminal *Revolt Against the Modern World* (Evola 1995: 143-156) and Dugin's assessment of modernity is paraphrasal of Guénon's *The Crisis of the Modern World*.

The language of modernity in all its incarnations is meta-historically contrasted by the "language of Tradition", which affirms "the existence of eternity, eternal being, and the logically consequential notion of time as an ontological process of existential decline" which is simultaneously teleological and cyclical, given that "insofar as eternity is absolute, constant, and whole, and time is relative and waning, it cannot decline eternally or even indefinitely. According to the Traditionalist language, time declines to a certain critical point and, when the sector of reality captured by time reaches a certain limit, eternal being re-discovers itself, and a new cycle arises" (Dugin 2002: 36, 37). Through the lens of Tradition, Dugin extrapolates, space is a qualitative essence which, by virtue of the existence of eternity and cyclical reality, is something charged with not only symbolic value, but a real "voice" and therefore influence, regardless of whether a given space or spatialized subject is the work of human hands or nature. "Space is transformed, illuminated, spiritualized, and becomes alive. Tradition's widely recognized iconography, symbolism, and sacred geography are founded on this" (Dugin 2002: 42). This is the living sacred world of Tradition, with its own language, opposed to the dead, profane, material world and language of modernity.

Thus, we are presented with a kind of hierarchy of philosophical "languages" which underly, contain, and explain all other ideational constructs including time and space. We have the diametrically opposed languages of Tradition and modernity and their specific linguistic manifestations corresponding to each of them. These languages can "use different, more narrowly understood languages (including religious, scientific,

cultural, and secular ones, etc.), everywhere implanting in them fundamental, invisible, not directly grasped, unpronounced, but implicit elements,” and they can “interpret in their own paradigmatic key, interpretive system, and conceptual-logical structure the most different doctrines as individual discourses and expressions deciphered and evaluated in accordance with [their] particular model” (Dugin 2002: 38). Dugin cites Marxism as a linguistic offshoot of the language of modernity and liberalism as as the “ideal language” of modernity-cum-post-modernity, i.e., “the final push of the modern world towards its own ideal language” (Dugin 2002: 49). Traditionalism as developed by Guénon is advanced as the metalanguage which boasts the key to understanding all other languages and the ingenuity of having finally systematized the language of Tradition. Each of these languages, as we have seen, are said to contain their own formulations of philosophical concepts. Dugin unambiguously states: “[T]he main methodological foundation for examining all questions in the New University is the juxtaposition, the contrast of two fundamental concepts: the language of Tradition and the language of modernity” (Dugin 2002: 193).

50

As an interesting point of reference, this proposed system can be classified according to Gerd Baumann’s grammars of identity/alterity as “encompassment”, or the “selfing by appropriating...or co-opting selected kinds of otherness” (Baumann & Gingrich 2005: 25). Dugin is purporting Traditionalism as a metalanguage which encompasses and explains all other expressions of the “language of Tradition” and claims to decipher and dissect the Other, the “language of modernity”, itself. In fact, this encompassing approach of Dugin’s is not historically alien since, as Wouter Hanegraaff posits in his historical outline of Traditionalism: “Tradition, or perennial philosophy, has become an approach to the comparative study of religions and cultures in general, or even a general philosophical perspective on reality as such...it is seen as the true metaphysics that can be found in *any* ‘authentic’ tradition” (Hanegraaff 2005: 1133). While Dugin’s sweeping rejection of modernity as the Evil Other might be seen as qualifying his grammar of identity/alterity as essentially “orientalizing,” Baumann’s specific orientalism (Baumann & Gingrich 2005: 20), which includes an at least partial, albeit subtle or reflective positive assessment of the Other, is absent in this treatise of Dugin’s, and only surfaces elsewhere

in his conditional proposal of “modernization without Westernization” as a temporary means of deflecting the brunt of the globalization of modernity (Dugin 2016a).

It is here that we arrive at a genuinely telling, indeed striking revelation pertaining to the structure and nature of Dugin’s worldview and its encompassment. Dugin views phenomenon explicitly through the language of Tradition, and engages this or that ideology or form of science on the basis of its accordance or divergence with such. The Traditional understanding of space, in Dugin’s words, has been partially re-incarnated in the methodology and worldview of none other than geopolitics, whose foundational theses and dualism can be found not only in the works of the founding fathers and visionaries of geopolitics, but “in most pure form” in René Guénon’s book, *East and West* (Dugin 2002: 42). In other words, the “founder of modern Russian geopolitics” is openly telling us that the precepts of geopolitics are to be found in Traditionalism, a statement of profound significance to understanding the logic of Dugin’s worldview and enterprises. Elsewhere, he asserts: “This path is not from sacred geography to geopolitics, but on the contrary, from geopolitics to sacred geography” (Dugin 1991). In Dugin’s schema, political regimes are also to be classified according to their greater correspondence to either the language of Tradition or that of modernity, a point which Dugin exemplifies in comparing the 20th century “Third Way” and “communist” regimes in their being more or less Traditional. In other words, Dugin’s view of Traditionalism aims to encompass otherwise chronologically or even nominally modern phenomena within his overall framework. This starkly contrasts Evola’s profound antipathy towards all political movements considered modern in his *Men Among the Ruins*, a point which has led Dugin to propose reading Evola “from the left” (Dugin 2011).

On this note, Dugin’s numerous interspersed references to Marx and Marxism are wholly indicative of his approach. While such might be interpreted as either a lingering of the familiarities of Soviet life or in light of Sedgwick’s understanding of Dugin’s Traditionalism as a “power of the idea” replacement for Soviet Marxism, it is in fact very clear that Dugin is approaching Marxism precisely through his interpretative lens of Tradition. Rather than simply seeing Traditionalism as a potential new Marxism and Guénon as the new Marx - although the comparison is in-

deed made, with important caveats - he contextualizes Marxism within the language of modernity in contrast to the attributes of the language of Tradition. For him, Marxism's appeal was that it represented "the most contradictory normative expression of the paradigmatic linguistics of modernity", and was therefore a kind of paradoxical "philosophical heresy" (Dugin 2002: 35). However, considering that Marxism still maintained some of the essential precepts of modernity, and therefore belonged to the category of the language of modernity, Dugin considers René Al-leau's comparison of Guénon to Marx⁶ only valid "up to a certain point. Marx stands at the boundary of the language of modernity; Guénon is on the other side of this border" (Dugin 2002: 35). In this instance⁷, we see that Dugin's definitive landmark, his referential orientation, is his Traditionalist metalanguage from the standpoint of which he identifies the language of Tradition to which he adheres, and from which he critiques and classifies other "languages" and ideologies, including such a complex ideology as Marxism.

52 It is only at this point, having established Traditionalism as a metalanguage that makes up the interpretive anchor and universal reference point, that Dugin turns to the application of such as an imperative, which he coins as "post-Guénonism."

4. *Post-Guénonism and Fluency in the Language of Tradition*

The essence of the philosophical metalanguage of Guénon's Traditionalism, Dugin asserts, is only partially realized in recognizing and affirming Guénon's metalanguage. Dugin's discussion of comparisons of Guénon to Marx thus finds fruition in an unspoken "the philosophers have only interpreted the world; the point is to change it." The point, Dugin contends, is realizing the "task" of post-Guénonism. Defining "Guénonists" as those who merely "engage in repeating Guénonist discourse", post-Guénonism is presented as "profoundly mastering Guénon's Traditionalism as a fundamental language," thereby realizing that Guénon's Traditionalism is "not simply a position, but a mis-

⁶ See Alleau (1984).

⁷ For more elaborate discussion by Dugin on Marxism, see Dugin (1997, 2012, 2016b).

sion, an imperative, an action, and process” (Dugin 2002: 44). Russia specifically, Dugin asserts, must take up the mantle of realizing the post-Guénonian mission of opposing the West’s profane and Liberal “End of History”: “For, us realizing the program of post-Guénonism is the main, only, and fundamental state, national, social, and cultural task” (Dugin 2002: 50). In so doing, one can “discover” those aspects of Russia’s culture, history, and traditions which are “genuinely meaningful” - otherwise, “any change of government, any cataclysms and social shifts (even the most positive) will be metaphysically tantamount to zero, insofar as outside of post-Guénonism there is no spirituality, no social justice, no life - nothing” (Dugin 2002: 50-51). In other words, for Dugin, even the most radical events and processes in Russia are inexplicable or senseless without the worldview framework of Traditionalism as a metalanguage and its post-Guénonian apperception. In the context of Traditionalism in particular, Dugin’s Traditionalist-inspired Eurasian Empire and Russian “national Guénonism” can be traced back to Julius Evola’s conviction that an eschatological or “sacred” empire is the specific political incarnation of Tradition (Evola 1995) and Guénon’s discussions of the transcendental symbol of the emperor and “spiritual centers” (Guénon, 2004).

53

On the level of ideological imperatives, “realizing” post-Guénonism comprises two assignments. The first is “studying, cognizing, and mastering a living, specific Tradition from the standpoint of Traditionalism (Guénonism)”, which Dugin claims to have done in distinguishing the Old Believers as Russia’s distinct “national Guénonism” which “preserves in broad terms the paradigmatic Traditionalist language lying at the heart of the entire Christian Tradition” and “represents that conceptual reality which emerges to the forefront in the application of the Traditionalist method to examining the entire Orthodox tradition” (Dugin 2002: 51; Dugin 1999). This represents an application of the notion of Traditionalism as a metalanguage to traditions themselves. Rather curiously, however, Dugin’s rather clear declaration and demonstration of having applied his understanding of his Traditionalist metalanguage to reveal the virtue of adhering to the Old Believers Rite is suggested by Sedgwick to have political motives (Sedgwick 2012: 286-287) and is altogether dismissed by Shekhovtsov as “inimical to the spirit of Integral Traditionalism” (Shekhovtsov & Umland 2009: 676). Yet such a

conclusion can only be seen as imposing a narrative over Dugin's own logic, an attempt which can hardly be considered scholarly treatment of a primary source. Dugin is working from Traditionalism to religious and political matters as explicitly expounded in his system, not backwards.

54 In fact, the latter approach also compromises any potential comprehension of Dugin's second proposed endeavor of post-Guénonism, which is employing the Traditionalist understanding of the "language of modernity" to understand the real, conditional manifestations of modernity in all their nuances, variations, and taking into account the potential lingering of "traditional archetypes" inherited and recycled in modernized form. For Dugin, the relevance of this "post-Guénonian mission" is imparted with newfound relevance with the appearance of alleged "post-modernity", which is understood as "the final push of the modern world towards its own ideal language" and the "threshold of the manifestation of the language of modernity in its final, 'eschatological' form" (Dugin 2002: 49). The challenge of post-Guénonism, according to Dugin, is what draws a defining line between "soft Traditionalists" or those "who can be hardly termed 'traditionalists' in the Guénonian sense" (Dugin 2002: 30) such as Mircea Eliade and Carl Gustav Jung, who are said to study the residue of Tradition in secularized modern forms, and the "orthodox 'Guénonists'" - whom Dugin names as Julius Evola, Michel Valsan, and Titus Burckhardt - who are concerned with the affirmation of Tradition itself (Dugin 2002: 30). The key, in Dugin's thesis, is utilizing Traditionalism as a metalanguage to understand global paradigms, movements, ideologies, and thinkers, including "Traditionalists" themselves, employing such as a kind of "psychoanalysis" (Dugin 2002: 38). This metabolization of the metalanguage of Traditionalism, thus, is an incentive to both analyze the properties and historical conditions of modernity and propose a radical Traditionalist alternative.

In this aspect, Dugin thus displays a consistent, logical deduction of politico-philosophical practice and corresponding assessment of different intellectuals from his philosophy of Traditionalism as a metalanguage. Dugin presents Traditionalism as a metalanguage, guides us to interpret the languages of Tradition and modernity, as well as their sub-languages, through this metalanguage, and then translates this into a doctrine of

philosophical orientations and politico-ideological imperatives. In the distinction between “Guénonism” and “post-Guénonism,” we are faced with a unique digestion of Traditionalism which, seeking at once to properly understand and rectify “linguistic doctrine” itself where deemed appropriate, proceeds to express itself in a worldview that lends itself to discerning historical and contemporary trends in its own logic. Rather than a cynical “instrumentalization” of Traditionalism for the sake of political conspiracy, we find in Dugin’s logic a distinct approach to religious and political exercise that is derived from a particular perception of the elucidatory perspicacity of Traditionalism. In illustrative terms, the metalanguage of Traditionalism is used to understand the languages of Tradition and modernity and their relevant discourses or languages of politics, ideology, religion. Fluency in the language of Tradition, rendered possible by learning the metalanguage of Traditionalism, is then translated into a formulation of imperatives. Any backwards reading of this thought process might be interesting, but it is not a reading of Dugin, whose worldview we are trying not to tamper with or inverse according to this or that prejudice, but understand in its cogitation. This is not a question of sequence, i.e., following with one’s finger the order in which he discusses language, discourse, politics, etc., but a question of grasping the way and trajectory in which the world plays out according to the model which he introduces. Summarizing the relevance of Guénon to his proposals, Dugin writes: “We have only one objective: to understand what he meant to do. His thinking is our way of thinking, his language is our language...” (Dugin 2002: 50).

55

The lucid demonstration of Dugin’s proposed worldview in action as modeled in his *The Philosophy of Traditionalism* is in danger of being fundamentally ignored by scholars if we follow Shekhovtsov and Umland’s cues. Taking note of Dugin’s mention of Eliade, Shekhovtsov seizes the opportunity to revive the “fascist Eliade controversy”⁸ and therein purport that Dugin is interested in appropriating authors or ideas regardless of whether they represent part of the Traditionalist legacy or not, as long as they are politically relevant to his supposed “fascism.” In a rather telling example of superimposing a preconceived model over Dugin’s worldview, Shekhovtsov even criticizes Dugin for

⁸ See Fisher (2010).

being “inconsistent” and “non-Traditionalist” insofar as he does not emphasize Eliade’s “flirtation with the Iron Guard” (Shekhovtsov & Umland 2009: 672). Instead of understanding the dots that Dugin connects through his assimilation of Traditionalism and seeking to illuminate how and why he does so, here we see a disregarding of the dots and lines altogether, and the imposition of a narrative and logic onto Dugin’s which subsequently renders necessary “corrections” of his own “inconsistency.” Shekhovtsov and Umland’s assumption of a “true” Integral Traditionalism to which Dugin can never measure is thus coupled with a dismissal of any relationship between Eliade and Traditionalism, a point which is the opposite of what has been cogently highlighted by scholars.⁹ In general, such an approach would leave a review of the rest of Dugin’s *The Philosophy of Traditionalism* irrelevant at worst or, at best, subject to a prejudiced reading intent on finding political inversions at the heart of each and every philosophical thesis. Yet it is in the remainder of this crucial work of Dugin’s that he continues to clearly demonstrate his hermeneutical dissection of numerous concepts, paradigms, thinkers, and other historical and “meta-historical” phenomena proceeding from his extrapolation of Traditionalism as a metalanguage. The fourth and fifth chapters on Herman Wirth are of paradigmatic interest in this regard.

5. *The “Great Unknown” Herman Wirth and the Tongue of Tradition*

Having established his Traditionalist metalanguage’s concepts and imperatives, Dugin turns from the advertisement of Traditionalist philosophical language to the pursuit of an actual language, or tongue of the Primordial Tradition. In the fourth and fifth chapters, Dugin identifies the Dutch-German scholar Herman Wirth (1885-1981) as the “great unknown” discoverer of the primordial language of humanity, the lost archetype of the naturalist-realist language. Whereas Dugin’s profound interest in and esteem for the works of Herman Wirth has been contextualized by those scholars who have noticed it as an eclectic inclusion of Ariosophist currents (to which Wirth in fact cannot

⁹ On the relationship between Eliade and Traditionalism, see Hanegraaf (2012: 306-307), Sedgwick (2004: 109-116, 189-192), Spineto (2001).

be said to belong without controversy), or to an easy confirmation of “non-Traditionalism” and “fascistic occultism,” Dugin’s presentation of Wirth and his ideas clearly shows that Wirth is of interest precisely through the lens of Dugin’s linguistic Traditionalism. As we have sought to argue, this demonstrates the logic of Dugin’s Traditionalist worldview and its relevance in the context of Western Esotericism. Before highlighting this point in Dugin’s own words, some background on Wirth will be sufficiently illustrative.

Herman Wirth is rightly called by Dugin the “great unknown.” There is a distinct paucity of scholarship on Wirth, and if he is recognized by scholars at all, it is exclusively for his brief career as one of the pre-war brains of the Nazi Research and Teaching Community of the Ancestral Heritage, or “Ahnenerbe,” godfathered by himself with Heinrich Himmler’s patronage. In Joscelyn Godwin’s words: “There are two groups of people, neither of them large, who know who Herman Wirth was. One group has heard that in 1935 he was one of the founders of the Deutsches Ahnenerbe, and that is enough for them. The other group knows what Wirth meant by *Ahnenerbe* (“ancestral heritage”), and something of the history of the institution” (Godwin 2004: 263). Even in Wirth’s own time, his treatment was severely paradoxical: the very Nazi official who oversaw the ousting of Wirth from the Ahnenerbe, Wolfram Sievers, would write in 1943: “We owe Herman Wirth a wealth of seminal stimuli in the area of Indo-European intellectual history. Among other things he may be considered the founder of what today is the serious science of *Sinnbildforschung*” (Mees 2008: 160). The latter remarks are indicative of the fact that Wirth’s biography and allegiances remain the subject of disparate dispute and speculation. For example, while it has since been revealed that Wirth was indeed a member of the Nazi Party from 1925-1926 and again from 1933 until an unspecified end-date, and in connection with his Ahnenerbe status was also affiliated with the SS for some time (Mees 2008: 138, 140, 156), scholars continue to disagree in their assessments of how to appropriately situate Wirth and his ideas in context. While an original discussion of this controversial question is beyond the scope of this article, it is sufficient to say that, in the very least, Wirth’s Nazi affiliations have discouraged scholars from devoting adequate attention to the impact his ideas have left in the history of Western Esotericism, particularly Traditionalism, culminat-

ing in Dugin's treatment of Wirth. Indeed, it is precisely Dugin's "Traditionalization" of Wirth's ideographical-linguistic theories relevant here that might simultaneously furnish new perspectives for understanding both Dugin's ideology and Wirth's legacy.

58 Wirth's theories were laid out in several works released in a number of editions whose reception was polarized even in his own time and milieu. In his 1910/1911 doctoral dissertation, *Der Untergang des Niederländischen Volksliedes* ("The Decline of Dutch Folksong"), Wirth examined the history of Dutch folksong to argue that a higher, spiritual and organic folk music culture had been degraded by the Church and modernization processes that led to the adoption of an "artificial high culture" (Godwin 2004: 268). The collection of symbols and artifacts of this superior "folk culture" that Wirth gathered across the Northern European countryside soon expanded into what Wirth believed was voluminous evidence of a lost Nordic civilization of the Arctic, the ancestor of "Atlantic-European" culture whose vestiges can be found in the most diverse peoples and institutions the world over. Wirth's 1928 magnum opus, *Der Aufstieg der Menschheit* ("The Ascent of Mankind" or "The Emergence of Mankind") is in fact a history of descent, in which the original Arctic-Nordic people, embracing a pure cosmic-monotheism and purely realist-naturalist sacred language centered on the movement of the Arctic sun, was compelled to leave its homeland with the onset of the Ice Age and subsequently mixed with other races, among whom it both imparted and lost crucial elements of its worldview and language. The central component of Wirth's purported *prisca theologia* and *philosophia perennis*, the sacred Nordic proto-language, was explored in depth in the continuation of his magnum opus, *Die Heilige Urschrift der Menschheit* ("The Sacred Proto-Script of Humanity") from 1931. Thanks to the attention drawn by these books by both academic conferences and Nazi representatives, Wirth advanced to professorship at the University of Berlin in 1933 (Mees 2008: 141-142). In the same year, however, Wirth's translation of and commentary on the *Oera Linda Book* (which was widely regarded as a forgery, but which Wirth is understood to have seen either as a genuinely archaic mythological document, or in the very least as "a very ancient version of a pre-Christian mythological tradition processed and stylized much later by a Dutch humanist" that confirmed his theories [Dugin 2017; Mees 2008: 152]), set a precedent for his ambigu-

ous, and ultimately negative treatment by scholars and Nazi officials. Despite briefly enjoying authority in the Ahnenerbe under Himmler's patronage starting around 1934/1935, by 1938 Wirth had fallen out of favor with Nazi officials, fell victim to institutional power struggles, was excluded from the Ahnenerbe and his professorship, and was ultimately marginalized (and in some accounts threatened) for his views, which increasingly contradicted more mainstream Nazi narratives on prehistory, race, and gender. Wirth expressed disillusionment with the "perversion" of Nazi ideology, and struggled to operate independently. He was interned by the US Army from 1945-1947, and, upon release, would be relegated to the margins of private scholarship first in Sweden and then back in Germany until he died in 1981, by and large forgotten and unknown.

Wirth's work is characterized by several contextual markers of relevance to our study. Firstly, he belonged to the tradition of scholars who have sought the origins of mankind on a lost continent in the North under different atmospheric conditions, a trend that has historically overlapped with and drawn from esoteric currents (Godwin 1996). Secondly, Wirth believed that this primordial civilization, its people, language and worldview, could be rediscovered through empirical scholarship which would benefit the degenerate and materialist modern world with the spirit of a kind of "secular mysticism" and re-enchanted view of nature (Godwin 2004: 278). Thus, Wirth "inhabited that borderland that lies between scholarship and the world of the imagination" (Godwin 1999/2000: 2), or, as Wirth himself described his *Der Aufgang der Menschheit*, "a combination of science (*Wissenschaft*) and knowledge of God (*Gotteserkenntnis*) on the basis of historical development" (Wirth 1928: 5). Thirdly, and connected to his role in the Ahnenerbe, Wirth operated in the general philosophical and political climate in which ideas of his sort are now - albeit not wholly accurately - associated with Ariosophy, the ever-controversial phenomenon of "Nazi Occultism,"¹⁰

¹⁰ In modern scholarship, the term "Nazi Occultism" can be understood as referring to one of two phenomena. On the one hand, "Nazi Occultism" can refer to the occult and esoteric currents which really or purportedly influenced historical Nazism. On the other hand, "Nazi Occultism" can refer to a genre of literature alleging that not only Nazi ideology as a whole, but Nazi policy-makers themselves were directly inspired by and even immersed in esoteric and occult ideas and groups. See Black & Kurlander (2015), Go-

or the racial and historical discourse from which Nazism would at least partially draw. Wirth himself stands out as unique from the former milieus associated with his subject matter precisely because “he was not an occultist or an esotericist,” (Godwin 2004: 277) but sought to base his theories of a proto-language of mankind, the Northern origins of humanity, and the historical degradation of culture strictly on collections of empirically analyzable ethnographic artifacts, geological observations, evolutionary theory, comparative mythology, and historical and comparative linguistics as “an original researcher who backed up his theories with mountains of evidence and yards of rational argument” (Godwin 1999/2000: 2). Wirth’s situation in the history of ideas is therefore difficult to assess unambiguously. On the one hand, he has been seen as representative of German antiquarian scholarship up to the National Socialist era, in which his theories purported to be the “scholarly” version of popular runology and Ariosophical tropes; on the other hand, Wirth’s “empirical”, “rational”, and “scientific” studies nonetheless dealt with the very same themes that were largely resonant with occult and esoteric currents of the time (Mees 2008: 150-160). Rather tellingly, Wirth’s works were addressed by the major Traditionalists of the 20th century who otherwise despised “profane scholarship.” Both Guénon and Evola wrote on Wirth’s *Der Aufgang der Menschheit*, and while they critiqued Wirth’s conflation of Atlantis and Hyperborea and disagreed with Wirth’s “naturalistic” narrative, both nevertheless saw Wirth’s findings as “congenial” to their conceptualizations of the cycles of time and origins of humanity expounded in their narratives on Tradition (Godwin 2011: 165-166).

Indeed, it is through this crossing of Traditionalist paths that Dugin arrived at Wirth. Dugin apparently first heard of Wirth in Julius Evola’s autobiography, in which Evola named Wirth as one of his principal influences alongside Guénon (Evola 2009: 96). Dugin claims to have discovered Wirth’s extremely rare works unperused in the private library of the major European New Rightist Alain de Benoist, as well as in a Soviet storage room (the location of which is undisclosed) where they were supposedly left in poor shape since the Red Army confiscated them from Berlin in 1945 (Dugin 2002: 139-140). Dugin recounts

odrick-Clarke (2002, 2005), Hakl (2000).

that for two years he “was glued to his [Wirth’s] works, trying to understand at least something” (Dugin 2002: 139). Although he disregards Wirth’s “positivist methods” and “transposing of modern physical processes onto ancient times” as “incorrect” (Dugin 2002: 142), and although Dugin considers Wirth a “positivist scholar,” not a Traditionalist, Dugin is in awe of Wirth’s homeland and linguistic theory; his brief biography of Wirth reads almost hagiographically (Dugin 2017), and Dugin explicitly lays out the connection: “Looking at Wirth through the eyes of Guénon, we see all that Guénon did not say, but which undoubtedly follows from what he did” (Dugin 2002: 140). In other words, Dugin is not interested in Wirth’s methodology or even motivations, but in the points where Wirth’s theories corroborate Dugin’s extrapolation of Traditionalism and the language of Tradition in particular.

Dugin prefaces his introduction of Wirth with the assertion that “the existence of a single proto-language of humanity derives from the very logic of Traditionalism. If there is a single Primordial Tradition, then the language of this Tradition must have a particular expression” (Dugin 2002: 135). Dugin then situates the search for this language of Tradition in the history of Western Esotericism, citing in passing, sporadic order a number of major esoteric figures from Johannes Trithemius (1462-1516), Heinrich Cornelius Agrippa von Nettesheim (1486-1535), and Heinrich Khunrath (c. 1560-1605), to Antoine Fabre d’Olivet (1767-1825), Alexandre Saint-Yves d’Alveydre (1842-1909), Paul Le Cour (1871-1954), Schwaller de Lubicz (1887-1961), Fulcanelli (1920’s), and the Ariosophists Guido von List (1848-1919) and Rudolf von Sebottendorf (1875-1945) (Dugin 2002: 136-137). Dugin then proceeds to cite a number of modern linguistic theories as “analogous” to his own “individual (unsuccessful)” attempts at reconstructing the proto-language whose existence he believes logically follows from the very doctrine of Tradition (Dugin 2002: 138). The “profane Western scientists” cited by Dugin as having pursued “analogous” reconstructions include the “founding father of linguistic monogenesis”, Alfredo Trombetti (1866-1929), the German comparative Indo-European linguist, Franz Bopp (1791-1867), the Russian linguist Alexander Potebnya (1835-1891), the Georgian “Japhetic” theorist, Nicholas Marr (1865-1934), and the Nostratic linguist, Vladislav Ilich-Svitych (1934-1966) (Dugin 2002: 137-138).

Meticulously summarizing Wirth’s theories of the correla-

tion between runes, vowels, and consonants with the movement of the sun and the motive of the “eternal return,” Dugin ultimately asserts that the “closest of all to the language of Tradition in its purest, most archaic form is Herman Wirth’s concept with his restoration of the primordial, Arctic Hyperborean language” (Dugin 2002: 193). Wherever Wirth “strays”, such as in his “positivist methods” of evolution and time, Dugin summons Guénon to the rescue (Dugin 2002: 142). Even more indicatively, Wirth’s linguistic reconstructions, according to Dugin, “are that universal interpretive scheme which allows one to definitively explain everything else, including even the Hermetic tradition,” for the latter of which Dugin cites Evola’s *The Hermetic Tradition*, thus arguing for an understanding of Wirth and an application of his theories as unavoidably “changing the picture of modern Traditionalism” (Dugin 2002: 163, 141). In hyperbolic fashion, Dugin proclaims: “What comprises Wirth’s ideas, his message? Wirth deciphered the very proto-language which we have been talking about. He did this in a reliable manner without occultist exaggerations and positivist skepticism. No more nor less. His work is maximally close to this language. No one has done more reliable metaphysical, historical, linguistic, or conceptual (if you will) studies into the language of the Primordial Tradition” (Dugin 2002: 140).

Several indicative points can be distinguished here. Firstly, Dugin explicitly shows that he is proceeding from Traditionalism as a philosophical metalanguage to the real, lost tongue of Tradition. This tongue of Tradition, which Dugin suggests Wirth has most successfully restored, is quintessentially naturalist - its ideographs and structure are direct representations of universals such as the “eternal return,” the movement of the sun, and the year as the perfect symbol of the cosmos and God - and is the “expression” of a purely realist worldview, in which all the particulars of life and language are reflections of cosmic universals enshrined in an ancient Arctic synthesis of cosmo- and monotheism. Dugin’s approach to Wirth’s theories is therefore based on Dugin’s understanding of their logical confirmation of his postulation of a language of Tradition, and Dugin’s employment of the term “Hyperborea,” which is Traditionalism’s stringently preferred synonym for Wirth’s “Arctica”, reflects Dugin’s approach to Wirth as Traditionalist in motivation and apperception.

In line with the logic we distinguished earlier, Dugin transi-

tions from an outline of Wirth's theories and their significance to Traditionalism to the political apperception of such, alleging that Russia is the heir of Wirth's Arctica, and therefore "deciphering" Russia's symbolic "elements of great knowledge bequeathed to us by our ancestors" is "our duty" (Dugin 2002: 176). The tools for deciphering Russia's symbolic heritage are afforded by the meta-language of Traditionalism and the content imparted to such by Wirth's reconstruction of the language of Tradition, the application of which is the endeavor of Dugin's 1991 *Mysteries of Eurasia*.

Thus, we are presented with a clear illustration that Dugin's worldview, his approach to historical thinkers and themes, and his political proclamations are deductions of the understanding of Traditionalism which he lays out in *Filosofia traditsionalizma*, and this Traditionalism of Dugin's is saturated with concepts and currents that are not only familiar but integral reference points in Western Esotericism and, even when not necessarily so, as in the case of Wirth, are rendered as such by Dugin. It is only logical, therefore, that further research into Dugin's *Filosofia traditsionalizma*, his worldview and corpus is desirable within the framework of the field of Western Esotericism.

6. Towards new scholarship on Alexander Dugin

The still-growing corpus of Alexander Dugin is an immense mass of works written from different angles and under varying circumstances which, in conjunction with Dugin's colorful political career and polarized receptions in different parts of the world, makes research on Dugin present scholars with a formidable and dicey challenge. The foregoing study has been undertaken with the aim of introducing crucial reorientations to spur further, rectified research. Pointing out some of the key issues facing scholarship on Dugin's thought, particularly on classifying his worldview and addressing his relationship to Traditionalism, we turned to an understudied but important primary source, Dugin's *The Philosophy of Traditionalism*, to highlight the centrality of Dugin's interpretation of Traditionalism to his worldview and how he therein approaches a vast range of other phenomena which, without contextualization in the light of Traditionalism and Western Esotericism, remain an eclectic mass of material that can, and has been, selectively probed to fit far from

unbiased preconceptions of his ideological propensities. In other words, we have endeavored to turn to the very primary source material that Dugin explicitly presents as his Traditionalist worldview and sought to disseminate as such to listeners. Over the course of this survey, we drew attention to significant, problematic instances in which existing scholarship has rather characteristically provoked the notion that Dugin's own works, particularly on Traditionalism, cannot be taken seriously insofar as they are seen as manipulative or unfaithful instrumentalizations as opposed to "genuine" philosophical foundations. Moreover, we have seen that crucial elements of Dugin's thought as presented in *Filosofia traditsionalizma* are familiar, and indeed integral to the field of inquiry of Western Esotericism.

64

To be clear, we do not dare to claim that all of Dugin's thought, corpus, and significance can be reduced to his *The Philosophy of Traditionalism* at face value, nor do we claim that Traditionalism is Dugin's only source. The task of scholarship, of course, is not to merely recapitulate a subject's expressions, but to critically dissect and contextualize them, and to trace their evolution (or lack thereof) over time. Our analysis of Dugin's Traditionalism has merely, we believe, accomplished part of the scholarly equation by rectifying prejudiced views that render pointless or even suspect further research. In a sense, we have sought to bring the centrality of Traditionalism to Dugin back to the round-table of the academy, and in particular to the field of Western Esotericism. Dugin's many other works should be investigated in the light of his Traditionalism presented here, and only then can conclusions be drawn as to whether or not Dugin is consistent and worth studying from this angle. For our part, we are convinced that *The Philosophy of Traditionalism* offers a useful grounding for understanding the premises from which Dugin addresses an enormous range of other ideologies, schools of thought, and historical phenomena in the developing and associative corpus of Western Esotericism.

Intimately connected with this, we propose that Dugin's Traditionalism, its ideas, historical context, and philosophico-political implications be investigated by the field of Western Esotericism, which we believe can produce meaningful scholarship by virtue of its particular field of inquiry, corresponding methodologies, and dedication to exploring precisely those currents and figures which have been subject to violent treatment by other domains. Dugin's works should be studied with

an eye towards deciphering their place in the history of Traditionalism in particular and Western Esotericism in general. The discoveries made therein can help pave the way for further, interdisciplinary research. None of the foregoing is possible, however, if we follow the current trajectory of scholarship on Dugin and purposefully, premeditatively cover our ears to the language of Dugin's philosophical complex for the sake of seeking to uncover schemes, instead of translating, understanding, and scrutinizing Dugin's language and its proximity to Western Esotericism.

References

- Alleau, René (1984). «De Marx a Guenon: d'une critique «radicale» a une critique «princielle» des sociétés modernes,” Les dossiers H, Paris.
- Altukhov, Vyacheslav (2015). “Dugin breaks year of silence: ‘We are at a new impasse.’” Translated by J. Arnoldski. *Fort Russ*. (<https://www.fort-russ.com/2015/10/dugin-breaks-year-of-silence-we-are-a/>).
- Arnold, Jafe (2018). “From Traditionalism and Sufism to ‘Islamic Radicalism’: The Peculiar Case of Geydar Dzhemal (1947-2016).” (https://www.academia.edu/37260926/From_Traditionalism_and_Sufism_to_Islamic_Radicalism_The_Peculiar_Case_of_Geydar_Dzhemal_1947-2016_2018_).
- Barbashin, Anton and Hannah Thoburn (2014). “Putin’s Brain.” *Foreign Affairs*. (<https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/russia-fsu/2014-03-31/putins-brain>).
- Baumann, Gerd and Andre Gingrich (eds.) (2005). *Grammars of Identity / Alterity: A Structural Approach*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Beck, Glenn (2015). “What You Need To Know About Russian Leader Aleksandr Dugin.” Glenn Beck Program / The Blaze. (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5KuRmiXjAgg>).
- Berg, R.M. van den (2008). *Proclus’ Commentary on the Cratylus in Context: Ancient Theories of Language and Naming*. Leiden/ Boston: Brill, 2008.
- Black, Monica Eric Kurlander (2015, eds.). *Revisiting the “Nazi Occult”: Histories, Realities, Legacies*. Rochester/New York: Camden House.

- Campbell, Colin (1972). "The Cult, the Cultic Milieu and Secularization," *A Sociological Yearbook of Religion in Britain* 5 (1972), 119-136; reprinted in Jeffrey Kaplan & Heléne Lööw (eds.), *The Cultic Milieu: Oppositional Subcultures in an Age of Globalization*, Altamira: Walnut Creek 2002, 12-25.
- Carli, James (2017). "Aleksandr Dugin: The Russian Mystic Behind America's Weird Far Right." *The Huffington Post*. (https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/aleksandr-dugin-the-russian-mystic-behind-americas_us_59a1fca2e4b0doef9f14ac).
- Coudert, Allison P. (1978). "Some Theories of a Natural Language from the Renaissance to the Seventeenth Century." *Studia Leibnitiana Sonderheft* 7: 56-114.
- Corse, Taylor (2007). *The Alphabet of Nature*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Dugin, Aleksandr (1991). *Misterii evrazii*. Moscow: Arktogeia.
- (1997). *Tamplery proletariata*. Moscow: Arktogeia, 1997.
- (1999). *Absolutnaia Rodina*. Moscow: Arktogeia
- (2002). *Filosofia traditsionalizma*. Moscow: Arktogeia.
- (2006). "Pravye lyudi: novye imena - Dugin Aleksandr Gel'evich (r. 1962)," [Interview] *Pravaya.ru*. February 22, 2006 (<http://www.pravaya.ru/ludi/451/6742>).
- (2008). *Znaki Velikogo Norda. Giperboreiskaia teoriia*. Moscow: Veche.
- (2011). "The Mission of Julius Evola." *Open Revolt*. (<https://openrevolt.info/2011/10/27/the-mission-of-julius-evola/>).
- (2012). *The Fourth Political Theory*. Translated by Mark B. Sleboda and Michael Millerman. London: Arktos.
- (2014). "The Long Path: An Interview With Alexander Dugin", *Open Revolt* (<https://openrevolt.info/2014/05/17/alexander-dugin-interview/>)
- (2016a). "Modernization without Westernization." Translated by Jafe Arnold. *Eurasianist Internet Archive*. (<https://eurasianist-archive.com/2016/10/12/modernization-without-westernization/>).
- (2016b). "Paradigm of the End." Translated by Jafe Arnold. *Eurasianist Internet Archive*. (<https://eurasianist-archive.com/2016/10/12/paradigm-of-the-end/>)
- (2017). "Herman Wirth: Runes, Great Yule, and the Arctic Homeland." Translated by Jafe Arnold. *Eurasianist Internet Archhiv*. (<https://eurasianist-archive.com/2017/04/13/herman-wirth-runes-great-yule-and-the-arctic-homeland/>)

- Evola, Julius (1995). *Revolt Against the Modern World*. Translated by Guido Stucco. Vermont: Inner Traditions International.
- (2002). *Men Among the Ruins: Postwar Reflections of a Radical Traditionalist*. Translated by Guido Stucco. Vermont: Inner Traditions.
- (2009). *The Path of Cinnabar: An Intellectual Autobiography*. Translated by Sergio Knipe. United Kingdom: Integral Tradition Publishing.
- (2018). *The Bow and the Club*. Translated by Sergio Knipe. London: Arktos.
- Fisher, Elaine (2010). “Fascist Scholars, Fascist Scholarship: The Quest for Ur-Fascism and the Study of Religion,” in Christian K. Wedemeyer & Wendy Doniger (eds.), *Hermeneutics, Politics, and the History of Religions: The Contested Legacies of Joachim Wach and Mircea Eliade*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 261-284.
- Galbreath, Robert (1983). “Explaining Modern Occultism,” in: Howard Kerr & Charles L. Crow (eds.), *The Occult in America: New Historical Perspectives*, University of Illinois Press: Urbana / Chicago 1983, 11-37.
- Godwin, Joscelyn (1996). *Arktos: The Polar Myth in Science, Symbolism, and Nazi Survival*. Kempton: Adventures Unlimited Press.
- (1999/2000). “Out of Arctica? Herman Wirth’s Theory of Human Origins.” In *Runa* 5: 2-7.
- (2004). “Herman Wirth and Folksong.” *Tyr* 2: 263-283.
- (2011). *Atlantis and the Cycles of Time: Prophecies, Traditions, and Occult Revelations*. Rochester/Toronto: Inner Traditions, 2011.
- Goodrick-Clarke, Nicholas (2002). *Black Sun: Aryan Cults, Esoteric Nazism and the Politics of Identity*. New York/London: New York University Press.
- (2005). *The Occult Roots of Nazism: Secret Aryan Cults and their Influence on Nazi Ideology*. London: Tauris Parke Paperbacks.
- Gregor, A. James (2004a). “Andreas Umland and the ‘Fascism’ of Alexander Dugin.” *Erwägen Wissen Ethik* 15:3: 426-429.
- (2004b). “Response to Dr. Andreas Umland.” *Erwägen Wissen Ethik*, 15:4: 594-595.
- (2006). “Once again on fascism, classification, and Aleksandr Dugin.” In Griffin, Roger, Werner Loh and Andreas Umland (eds), *Fascism Past and Present, West and East: An International Debate on Concepts and Cases in the Comparative Study of the Extreme Right*, Soviet and Post-Soviet Politics and Society, Vol. 35. Stuttgart: 495-499.

- Guénon, René (1995). *Fundamental Symbols: The Universal Language of Sacred Science*. Translated by Alvin Moore. Jr. Cambridge: Quinta Essentia.
- (2004). *The Crisis of the Modern World*. Translated by Marco Pallis, Arthur Osborne, and Richard C. Nicholson. Hillsdale, NY: Sophia Perennis.
- Hakl, Hans Thomas (2000). *Unknown Sources: National Socialism and the Occult*. Edmonds WA: Holmes Publishing Group.
- Hanegraaff, Wouter J. (1995) “Empirical Method in the Study of Esotericism,” *Method & Theory in the Study of Religion* 7:2.
- (2005, ed., in collaboration with Antoine Faivre, Roelof van den Broek & Jean-Pierre Brach), *Dictionary of Gnosis and Western Esotericism*, 2 vols., Brill: Leiden/Boston/Köln. 2 voll.
- (2012) *Esotericism and the Academy: Rejected Knowledge in Western Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heiser, James (2014). “*The American Empire Should Be Destroyed: Aleksandr Dugin and the Perils of Immanentized Eschatology*.” Texas: Repristination Press.
- 68 Krasikov, VI (2014). *Sotsialnyie seti russkoi filosofii, XIX-XX vv.* Moscow-Berlin: Direct Media.
- Laruelle, Marlene (2006). “Aleksandr Dugin: A Russian Version of the European Radical Right?”. Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars; Kennan Institute Occasional Papers Series #294.
- (2015). “The Iuzhinskii Circle: Far-Right Metaphysics in the Soviet Underground and Its Legacy Today.” *The Russian Review* 74, October, 563–80.
- MacCormac, Sean (2015). “Aleksandr Dugin: Putin’s Rasputin?”. *Center for Security Policy*. March 4. (<https://www.centerforsecuritypolicy.org/2015/03/04/aleksandr-dugin-putins-rasputin/>).
- Mees, Bernard (2008). *The Science of the Swastika*. Budapest/New York: Central European University Press.
- Meyer, Henry and Onur Ant (2017). “The One Russian Linking Putin, Erdogan and Trump.” *Bloomberg*. February 3. (<https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2017-02-03/who-is-alexander-dugin-the-man-linking-putin-erdogan-and-trump>).
- Nosachev, Pavel (2011). “*K voprosu o russkom traditsionalizme*”, *Tochki* 1:1-2/10: 176-183.
- (2013). “*Integralny traditsionalizm: mezhdu politikoi i ezoterikoi*”. *Gosudarstvo, religiiia, Tserskov v Rossii i za rubezhom*. 4: 203-222.

- Rodriguez-Pereyra, Gonzalo (2016). "Nominalism in Metaphysics." In Zalta, Edward N., *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Winter 2016 Edition. (<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2016/entries/nominalism-metaphysics/>).
- Sedgwick, Mark (2004). *Against the Modern World: Traditionalism and the Secret Intellectual History of the Twentieth Century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (2012). "Occult Dissident Culture: The Case of Aleksandr Dugin." In Menzel, Birgit, Michael Hagemester, and Bernice Glatzer Rosenthal (eds.), *The New Age of Russia: Occult and Esoteric Dimensions*. München/Berlin: Verlag Otto Sagner: 273-292.
- Shekhovtsov, Anton (2008). "The Palingenetic Thrust of Russian Neo-Eurasianism: Ideas of Rebirth in Aleksandr Dugin's Worldview." *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions* 9/4: 491-506.
- (2009). "Aleksandr Dugin's Neo-Eurasianism: The New Right a la Russe." *Religion Compass*, 3/4: 697-716.
- (2015). "Aleksandr Dugin and the West European New Right, 1989-1994." In Laruelle, Marlene (Ed.), *Eurasianism and the European Far Right: Reshaping the Europe-Russia Relationship*. (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books): 35-54.
- (2014). "Putin's Brain?". *New Eastern Europe* 8-9.
- Spineto, Natalie (2001). "Eliade and Traditionalism," *Aries: Journal for the Study of Western Esotericism*, 1:1 (2001), 62-87.
- Stuckrad, Kucko von (2008). "Rewriting the Book of Nature: Kabbalah and the Metaphors of Contemporary Life Sciences." In *Journal for the Study of Religion, Nature, and Culture* 2/4: 419-442.
- Umland, Andreas (2007). "Post-Soviet 'Uncivil Society' and the Rise of Aleksandr Dugin: A Case Study of the Extraparliamentary Radical Right in Contemporary Russia." PhD diss., University of Cambridge. Retrieved from: https://www.academia.edu/2635113/Post-Soviet_Uncivil_Society_and_the_Rise_of_Aleksandr_Dugin_A_Case_Study_of_the_Extraparliamentary_Radical_Right_in_Contemporary_Russia_Ph_D_in_Politics_University_of_Cambridge_2007_.
- (2009). "Is Aleksandr Dugin a Traditionalist? 'Neo-Eurasianism' and Perennial Philosophy." *The Russian Review*, Vol. 68, No. 4, October: 662-678.
- Webb, James (1976). "The Struggle for the Irrational," in: *The Occult Establishment*, Open Court: La Salle, Ill. 1976, 7-20.

- Wirth, Herman (1928). *Der Aufgang der Menschheit: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Religion, Symbolik und Schrift der Atlantisch-Nordischen Rasse*. Jena: Eugen Diederich.
- (1933). *Die Ura-Linda Chronik*. Leipzig: Koehler & Amelang.
- (1936). *Die Heilige Urschrift der Menschheit: Symbolgeschichtliche Untersuchungen diesseits und jenseits des Nordatlantik*. Leipzig: Koehler & Amelang.
- Other Internet resources on Alexander Dugin Geopolitica*. “Alexander Dugin.” (<https://www.geopolitica.ru/en/person/alexander-dugin>).